

LUCIE MAZALOVÁ

Masaryk University, Masarykova univerzita Filozofická fakulta, Brno
ORCID: 0000-0002-2688-5033

MICHAŁ RZEPIELA

Instytut Języka Polskiego PAN, Kraków
ORCID: 0000-0002-6233-4669

Were *Bohemus* and *haereticus* used as synonymous designations?*

1. Introduction

Nominal phrases combining the ethnonym *Bohemus* and the appellative *hereticus* were among the most common multi-word designations for the Hussite heretics in Medieval Latin. Aside from perhaps the most frequent phrase within this group, *Bohemi heretici* (mostly found in plural), grammatical variants, such as *heretici de Bohemia* and *heresis Bohemorum*, are encountered in the text sources¹. This study argues that the two main components of similar phrases might have been identified as synonymous in certain

* This study, presented at the 3rd Workshop eFontes: „Słowa i rzeczywistość” [Words and reality] in Kraków (1–2 December, 2021), was written within the framework of two projects: GAČR EXPRO – Observance Reconsidered: The Uses and Abuses of the Reform (Individuals, Institutions, Society), GX20-08389X, and Długosz 2.0. Elektroniczny korpus i narzędzia analizy języka Jana Długosza [Długosz 2.0. Electronic Corpus and Linguistic Analysis Tools of the Language of Jan Długosz], 31H 17 0444 84, financed by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education within the NPRH Programme.

¹ We do not have at our disposal reliable data provided by a sufficient number of electronic corpora related to texts from the Hussite period. Therefore, our observations are based on a selective examination of the sources, but as far as possible supported by the data from corpora. To illustrate the popularity of the phrase *Bohemi heretici* in only one corpus, namely The Corpus of the Works of Jan Długosz (CDI) containing 968,527 words: of the total number of 107 occurrences of the form *hereticus* in plural (in all cases) attested in this corpus, 38 appear in the phrase *Bohemi heretici*. Hence, about 40 percent of the occurrences of *hereticus* attested to in CDI appear in this phrase. As for the orthography of Latin examples, to avoid inconsistency here and throughout the article, we adopt the spelling used by the editors of medieval texts.

contexts by the users of Medieval Latin. This examination focuses mainly on texts by Polish authors, especially the letters written by Polish secular and ecclesiastical chanceries as well as letters written to Polish sovereigns and dignitaries by their foreign correspondents. In addition, the *Annals* of J. Długosz are taken into account.

1.1. The most exhaustive study to have been devoted to Hussite-related terminology was conducted by P. Soukup (2017, p. 197) who recalled a 1965 remark from Ferdinand Seibt about the dearth of research on the term *Hussites*. In Poland, more systematic study of Hussite-related nomenclature began only in 1985 with an article by S. Bylina discussing the perception of the Hussite movement in medieval Poland. Bylina individuated in text sources, some single words and multi-word units denoting the Hussites and their supporters. He examined, among other things, fifteenth-century ecclesiastical court records and concluded that “the practice of Church courts and their phraseology disseminated the stereotype of the heretic Bohemian” (Bylina, 2013, p. 22)². He pointed out the role of restrictions on contacts with Czechs promoted by the Polish Church and secular authorities as anti-Hussite preventive measures in building this stereotype (2013, pp. 22–23). However, since he concentrated on the historical and social aspects of the Hussite movement’s activities, he basically set aside the related Latin terminology and mainly provided Polish translations of terms and phrases denoting the Hussites (2013, p. 23).

1.2. Bylina’s work was resumed by P. Kras, who, in contrast, in his monograph fundamental for understanding the perception of the Hussite movement in medieval Poland (1998), widely worked with Latin terminology. Kras distinguished three main referents which Polish ecclesiastical courts used to name the Hussites’ supporters. These were adjectives or nouns referring to the Hussites, occurring in such phrases as *secta Hussitarum* and *secta Hussitica*; the Bohemian people, *secta Bohemica* or *secta Bohemorum*; or Hus himself, *secta Hus* (Kras, 1998, pp. 104–105). Kras considers the turning point in shaping anti-Hussite terminology to be the condemnation of Jan Hus and Jerome of Prague by the Council of Constance and describes how the term *Hussites* entered into common use after that point. He also claims that it was just after the Council of Constance when the Roman Church and Catholic polemicists started to use terminology associating the new heresy with the Bohemian people. He provided as examples of this phenomenon, aside from the examples quoted in (1998, pp. 104–105), phrases such as *doctrina Bohemica*, ‘Bohemian doctrine’, and *pestilentia Bohemica*, “Bohemian pestilence” (Kras, 2018, pp. 374–375).

1.3. Also, P. Soukup (2017), who principally aimed to explain the reason for the diminishing popularity of the term *Wyycliffites* during the first three decades of the fifteenth century, made important remarks about terms referencing Bohemia and the Bohemian

² We quote the English version of Bylina’s article accessible online. See References.

people. As far as the examination of sources, he took as principle to confront the documents from the Roman Curia written during the pontificate of Martin V (1417–1431) and the early-fifteenth-century polemics against the Hussites of various provenance (to only limited degree taking into account Polish sources).³ He has shown (2017, p. 202) that it was the papal curia that in 1422–1423 introduced the term *Bohemi heretici* on a large scale. He has also proven that subsequently in the papal correspondence terms referencing Bohemia and Bohemians, such as *haeretici in regno Bohemie*, were used during the wars waged against the Hussites from 1430 to 1435. Soukup believes that appellations combining the components *Bohemia(ns)* and *heresy* (or *heretics*), regardless of whether they occurred in papal documents or in polemical treatises, were rather technical terms situating the particular heresy geographically (2017, p. 200, 202, 206). He points out, in addition, that after the Council of Basel it was the term *Bohemi* used singly that was the most neutral and prevailed in the Latin usage of Church authorities (2017, p. 206, 210–211).

By contrast, we intend to demonstrate that multi-word appellations containing the components *Bohemia(ns)* and *heresy* (*heretics*) not only may have been employed to indicate the exact geographical location of heresy, but also in some contexts had clearly negative connotations and may have reflected the generalization of the Bohemian people as heretics. As a consequence, *Bohemus* and *hereticus* may have entered into a specific relation of lexical synonymy with one another.

2. Degrees of synonymy

2.1. Certainly, the term *synonymy* requires some further clarification here. Above all, the question arises: to what degree, if any, can the lexemes *Bohemus* and *hereticus* be viewed as synonyms? What is striking in modern linguistic studies about synonymy is the distinction of different degrees of synonymy (e.g., Lyons, 1981, p. 148; Fruyt, 1994, p. 28; Apresjan, 1995, p. 207; Cruse, 2002, p. 156; Moussy, 2010, p. 9). Generally, linguists agree on the definition of *absolute synonymy* as a term denoting lexical items representing complete identity of meaning in all contexts (e.g., Cruse, 2002, p. 157). At the same time though, they admit that it is difficult to achieve this type of identity of meaning in real linguistic usage (Lyons, 1977, pp. 98–10; Cruse, 2002, p. 157; Apresjan, 1995, p. 208; Fruyt, 1994, p. 28). But, the lower degree of identity of meaning, the more differentiated interpretations of individual terms scholars provide.⁴

³ For a complete list of his sources, see: Soukup, 2017, pp. 211–220.

⁴ The modern terminology regarding synonymy was essentially developed in English and, consequently, in other languages, by J. Lyons, although he was not always the first to coin individual terms. Aside from the term *absolute synonymy*, thanks to him terms such as *complete synonymy*, *partial synonymy*, and *near synonymy* were adopted. Cruse (2000) adds the term *propositional synonymy*. A synthetic overview of this terminology is provided, for instance, in N. Manukyan and H. Nikoghosyan, 2016, pp. 26–30.

2.2. For the purposes of this study, we will use the term *partial synonymy* as interpreted by M. Fruyt (1994). Partial synonymy is, in fact, a very broad term since it encompasses all lexical items that do not satisfy the criterion of absolute synonymy. As Fruyt outlines (1994, p. 28), the former can most easily be observed when the sememes of two compared words intersect, whereby their common semantic part is more or less extended. Fruyt also pays attention to lexemes with a limited common semantic part and provides, among others, after J. Adams (1983), the example of *puella* ‘girl’ and *meretrix* ‘prostitute’ as both lexemes that might in Ancient Latin designate ‘prostitute’. However, as she concludes (in contrast to Adams, 1983, p. 347), these lexemes can hardly be defined as synonyms since the specific context in which *puella* denotes ‘prostitute’ is too occasional to interpret *puella* as a synonym of *meretrix* (Fruyt, 1994, pp. 28–29). To some degree, the semantic intersection between *Bohemus* and *haereticus* can be viewed as a similar relationship. *Girl* and *prostitute* are categorized into two different semantic classes, the names of female human beings and the names of professions, exactly the same way *Bohemians* and *heretics* can be categorized into two different classes, the names of nations and the names of dissenters, respectively. From this point of view, the lexemes put together in these two-word pairs have semantically nothing in common since the point of semantic intersection between them is exclusively established by the specific context in which they are used interchangeably. After all, apart from the criterion of semantic intersection, Fruyt postulates, when examining lexical synonymy, also considering the criterion of frequency of common meaning (1994, p. 29).

2.3. When examining the synonymy of lexemes with narrow or occasional semantic intersections, the term *contextual synonymy* introduced by R. Kocourek (1968, pp. 133–134, 139) and elaborated by C. Moussy (2010, p. 86) with regard to Latin is also worthy of attention. Moussy uses this term to refer to lexemes that normally have different meanings, but may be used interchangeably either in syntagma or in looser contexts. Kocourek places greater emphasis on terms that can substitute paradigmatically non-synonymous items (1968, p. 139), while Zeng Xian-mo (2007, p. 33) defines as “contextual synonyms” words that are not synonymous semantically but are synonymously used in certain specific texts. He opposes “contextual synonyms” to “semantic synonyms”. Nowadays, the term *contextual synonyms* is chiefly used in computational linguistics with regard to the automatic retrieval of “candidates for synonyms” (e.g., Burstein, Pedersen 2010). To conclude, our theoretical considerations about synonymy, we argue that the semantic intersection between *Bohemus* and *hereticus* can be explained in terms of contextual and partial synonymy. Obviously, the context that semantically unifies both lexemes is that of the Hussite heresy. In other words, the relation of synonymy may be observed between them insofar as the Hussite heresy is concerned.

3. The sources

Our examination is based on the most relevant and representative texts from the Hussite period in Poland, which in a broader sense lasted the entire fifteenth century. At the same time, these texts represent a wide range of linguistic registers. They are contained in the following editions: “Liber cancellariae Stanislai Ciołek, ein Formelbuch der polnischen Königskanzlei aus der Zeit der Husitischen Bewegung”, Vol. 1–2 (hereafter Cioł. Lib.), a volume mainly containing the letters written around the mid-1420s by King Władysław II Jagiełło and several other European sovereigns and dignitaries; “Codex Epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti”, tomus II of similar content to Cioł. Lib., encompassing letters from 1382 to 1445 (hereafter CodEp II); “The Correspondence of John of Capistrano”, Vol. 1: “Letters related to Poland and Silesia (1451–1456)” (hereafter *The Correspondence*), in greater part encompassing the letters exchanged between Capistrano and Polish correspondents; and “Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesium Gneznensis et Poznaniensis” (1403–1530) (hereafter AC II), containing a significant number of ecclesiastical court records related to accusations of the Hussite heresy. Moreover, we make use of “The Corpus of the Works of Jan Długosz” (CDł), mentioned in note 1, enabling us insight into the terminological choices made by the Polish historian (1415–1480) when reporting on Hussite-related events in his “Annals” (hereafter Dł)⁵. Additionally, for the purposes of comparing our data and those of Christian and Medieval Latin from other regions and periods, we have consulted two other corpora, namely “Patrologia Latina” (84,009,692 words; hereafter PatrL) and “Cross Database Searchtool of Brepols Publisher” (150,000,000 words; hereafter CDS).

4. The signs of generalization

We discuss below examples that seem to support the thesis that lexemes referring to the Bohemian people and their land, either used singly or in nominal phrases (together with lexemes referring to heresy) might have had negative connotations in the Hussite context. We group these examples starting from, in our opinion, the most ambiguous ones and moving forward to those more clearly confirming our thesis.

- (1) *Ceterum vestra sanctitas me hortatur, ut ad extirpacionem et subversionem hereticorum de Bohemia omnibus modis, quibus possem [...] Wladislaum regem Polonie, dominum nostrum graciousum, invitarem* (Cioł. Lib., p. 90, yr. 1424?).

“Your Sanctity encourages me to induce by all means my gracious lord, King Wladislaus, to uproot and subvert the heretics from/of Czechia.”⁶

⁵ This corpus was compiled by a team from the Department of Medieval Latin at the Institute of Polish Language, of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Pracownia Łaciny Średniowiecznej Instytutu Języka Polskiego PAN) as part of the project mentioned in note *.

⁶ The translations of the Latin examples, with the exception of examples (8) and (9), are those of the authors.

- (2a) [...] *quantum hec iniqua et crudelis heresis Bohemie maiestatem diuinam offendat [...] non est opus me referre* (Cioł. Lib., p. 135, yr. 1423).
 “[...] I do not have to say [...] how much is injured the divine majesty by this hostile and cruel heresy of Bohemia.”
- (2b) *Jam vbique notorium existit, quanta abhominacione et contemptu in Deum perfidi heretici Boemie usi sunt et cottidie utantur* (Cioł. Lib. p. 136, yr. 1423).
 “It is known everywhere how great aversion and contempt towards God have had and every day have perfidious heretics of Bohemia.”
- (3) [...] *pro extirpacione errorum et heresum quibus Bohemi operante hoste humani generis detinentur.* (Cioł. Lib. p. 54, yr. 1426).
 “[...] for uprooting the errors and heresies by which Bohemians because of the activity of the enemy of mankind are kept.”
- (4) *Nosti iam diu et doluisti, scio, corruptas Bohemorum mentes a fide Christi vehementer errasse.* (CodEp II p. 202, yr. 1426).
 “I know that you have been aware of this for a long time, and you have got hurt from this that the depraved minds of the Bohemians exceedingly went astray from the faith of Christ.”
- (5) *Adverte igitur et considera o Bohemia! Utinam saperes et intelligeres in te rewolvendo status tui in temporibus prewiis excellenciam! [...] Quid dicemus de tua civitate metropoli Praga! Revera olim erat paradus terrestris [...] Sed heu, mutatus est hic color optimus, nam iam ex te procedit omnis mali radix, scilicet secta Hussitica, omnium sectarum primewarum perniciosissima. Idcirco deplange, Praga, deplange tui status enormitatem!* (CodEp II p. 223, nr 172, yr. 1428?).
 “Do take a look and consider, o Bohemia! Would that you knew and could understand by contemplating the excellence of your condition in previous times! [...] What to say about Prague, the capital city! Actually, it was, once, a terrestrial paradise [...] Oh! This best complexion was changed as, now, the root of all evil started from you, namely the Hussite Sect, the most pernicious one among all youthful sects. Therefore, bewail, Prague, bewail the enormity of your condition!”

4.1. The quotation in example (1) is taken from a letter from Cardinal Oleśnicki to Pope Martin V. In fact, it is unclear what the cardinal believes that the pope expects from him as the result of the king’s suggested insistence: the liberation of Bohemia from heretics or the liberation of the Catholic world, in a general sense, from Bohemian heretics. At the syntactic level such hesitation can be demonstrated in the segmentation of the discussed phrase either as *subversionem hereticorum* from where: *de Bohemia*, where the prepositional phrase *de Bohemia* has no attributive relation with *heretici*; or *subversionem* of whom: *hereticorum de Bohemia*, where the prepositional phrase expresses

such a relation. However, no matter how the phrase is interpreted, Bohemia is always perceived here as a place embodying heresy.

4.2. The identification of Bohemia with heresy can also be noticed in the words of Cardinal Branda addressed to King Władysław II Jagiełło (2a, 2b). What is surprising in both quotations is the modifier⁷ of the nouns *heresis* and *heretici* taking the form of the genitive of the land's name, *Bohemiae*. We argue that this modifier plays, with regard to the referents “heresy” and “heretics”, a localizing function in a cognitive sense but not in a spatial one, since it identifies them by making reference to common knowledge about the Hussite heresy. In reality, it indicates “the heresy which everyone knows about is this Bohemian one” and “the heretics whom everyone knows about are these Bohemian ones” and not, as it would be in the spatial sense “the heresy that (just) takes place in Bohemia” and “the heretics that are (at the moment) active in Bohemia”.⁸ In the Hussite-related context, it seems, modifiers in the form of either prepositional phrases, such as *heretici in Bohemia* (cf. Soukup 2017, p. 200) and *heretici de Bohemia* (Cioł. Lib., pp. 41, 45, 137), or genitive declensions referring to the Bohemian people, such as *errores Bohemorum* or *articuli Bohemorum* (cf. Soukup, pp. 218–220),⁹ are preferred to express localization understood in a strictly spatial (geographical) sense.

4.3. The generalization of Bohemians as heretics manifests itself as well in example (3), where the words of Pope Martin V are reported. The pope apparently assigns the errors of heresy to the Bohemian people in a collective sense and wants to see the devil as directly inspiring them to persevere in these errors.¹⁰ A similarly generalizing approach can also be observed in example (4), where the words of an unnamed Polish envoy to Pope Martin V are quoted, who makes in his speech a contemptuous allusion to the depraved minds of the Bohemian people.

Perhaps the most evident instance of the Bohemian people's being identified with the Hussite heretics occurs in a letter, most likely written about 1428, from King Władysław II Jagiełło to the Hussites, example (5).¹¹ Although at the beginning of this letter the king

⁷ We interpret the term *modifier* following Spevak (2014, p. 360) as any expansion of a noun. She writes that a “modifier is used as generic expression covering determiners (demonstratives), quantifiers, possessives, adjectives, prepositional phrases and embedded predications (relative clauses, gerunds etc.) that expand the noun.”

⁸ Our interpretation of localizing modifiers in the cognitive sense is based on Spevak (2014, p. 39).

⁹ It is worth noting that Soukup does not provide any examples of phrases identifying heretics by referencing their Bohemian provenance using the modifier *Bohemiae* in genitive.

¹⁰ On the designation *hostis generis humani* for the devil in the Middle Ages, see de Wilde (2018, p. 164).

¹¹ This is actually the second letter of Władysław II Jagiełło of this type, which can be defined as *litterae diffidatoriae* (rejection letter), addressed to the Bohemian people. Paradoxically, whereas the previous one, written in 1424 (Cioł. Lib. p. 40–41; *Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hussitenkrieges vom Jahre 1419 an. 1: Von den Jahren 1419–1428*, ed. Palacký, p. 348–350), was officially addressed to the Bohemian people, but focused on the faults of the Hussites, the second one was addressed to the Hussite heretics,

addresses the heretics and hurls numerous insults at them, Hus himself included, later on, he addresses an apostrophe to Bohemia and its capital city of Prague, assigning to them, responsibility for the rise of the Hussite heresy. This apostrophe is built on the opposition between the splendid past of Bohemia and Prague and the present day, in which their glory has fallen due to the Hussite heresy.

5. *Bohemus hereticus* as nominal phrase

5.1. For any further analysis of the phrase *Bohemus hereticus*, it is important to determine what kind of semantic and syntactic relations the two words constituting this phrase have. At the most basic grammatical level, are they both nouns? Is one of them a noun and the other an adjective (if so, which is which)? Linguists have established criteria that allow making such distinctions with regard to nominal phrases in Latin. Anticipating the answer, we will interpret the discussed phrase in terms of apposition, as composed of two nouns then. In Latin grammars the term *apposition* is traditionally used for the complements of a noun that also have the form of a noun whereby the first constituent (the head) of such a construction is specified by the second constituent (Spevak, 2014, p. 261). Spevak quotes as an example of apposition the phrase *Cicero consul*. She distinguishes two types of apposition, close apposition and free apposition, and provides as an example of the former *Cicero consul* and of the latter *Cicero consul designatus* (2014, p. 261). Pinkster (2015, pp. 1056, 1061) analogically uses the terms *restrictive* and *unrestrictive appositions*. He considers a typical manifestation of restrictive apposition to be when two constituents have a semantic relation of *classified–classifying* or *specific–general* and belong to the lexical categories of proper names and common names. He points out that unrestrictive apposition seems not to reveal similar restrictions (2015, p. 1061). He opposes, in addition, nominal apposition (encompassing both restrictive and unrestrictive appositions) with clausal apposition (2015, p. 1053).¹² We will only concentrate our attention on nominal apposition. Pinkster (2015, p. 1054) specifies four criteria identifying nominal apposition: if two constituents in a given structure have the same syntactic function, if the structure maintains its identity when either constituent is omitted, if the same entity is referred to by both constituents, and if the constituents agree in case, and often in number.

5.2. If we decided to interpret the phrase *Bohemi heretici* as composed of two nouns it is because it exhibits the properties of close apposition. So, then, it consists of two

but clearly pointed out the responsibility of Bohemia itself for the Hussite heresy. However, as Paweł Kras suggested to us, due to stylistic reasons it is unclear whether this letter really was written by Władysław II Jagiełło or rather only by him signed.

¹² Pinkster (2015) interprets as examples of clausal apposition nouns and noun phrases that “can be added or inserted in clauses as non-restrictive appositive without a clear relation to one particular nominal constituent in that clause” (p. 1070).

constituents belonging to the categories of proper names and common names. The former constituent as the more specific one is defined by the latter, more general one; both constituents agree in case, number, and gender. Examples (6a), (6b), and (7)¹³ allow us to observe further characteristics of close apposition:

(6a) *numquam debuit de regno nostro et presertim ad Bohemos hereticos et alios eorum fautores se movere [...] nuper cum nonnullis hominibus nostri regni, quos secum seduxit, et quibusdam, qui a nobis stipendia contra dictos hereticos receperant, prefatis Bohemis [...] prestiturus auxilia [...] ad Bohemiam clam discessit* (Cioł. Lib., p. 42, yr. 1424).

“he never should have moved away from our kingdom, and especially not to the Bohemians-heretics and other supporters of them [...] he recently, with a number of people from our kingdom whom he took with him and certain persons who got from us pay against the aforementioned heretics, marched off secretly to Bohemia with the intention to furnish aid to the mentioned Bohemians.”

(6b) *Frater meus Bohemos hereticos eorumque complices [...] diffidauit et belligeros suos in magna copia armatorum [...] expedit ... Sigismundus Korybut receptis secum nonnullis Regni Polonie vasalis et eciam aliis per dictum fratrem meum contra dictos hereticos sallariatis ... noviter in ipsam Bohemiam clamdestine rediit* (Cioł. Lib., p. 50, yr. 1424).

“My brother declared war against the Bohemians-heretics and their allies and sent among the huge number of other armed people his warriors [...] Sigismund Korybut after he kept some vassals of the Kingdom of Poland and others rented by my aforementioned brother against the aforementioned heretics [...] recently just secretly came back to Bohemia.”

(7) *Nuper ad manus nostras delate sunt certe copie litterarum Sigismundi nepotis tui apud Bohemos hereticos commorantis, in quibus ipse videtur appetere, ut causa Bohemorum predictorum apud nos et Sedem Apostolicam audiat* (Cioł. Lib., p. 185, yr. 1426).

“The copy of the letter of your nephew Sigismundus, staying at the Bohemians-heretics, recently was delivered to my hands in which he seems to ask for an audience before me and the Holy See for presenting the matter of the aforementioned Bohemians.”

¹³ The quotations in examples (6a) and (6b) are taken from the letters by the Polish King Władysław II Jagiełło and his brother, Grand Duke of Lithuania Vytautas. Both letters refer to the same event: the unconsented-by-King Władysław departure of his nephew, Duke Sigismund Korybut, to Bohemia. The brothers complain about Duke Sigismund to Pope Martin V. In turn, the pope himself is the author of the words referring to the diplomatic initiative of Duke Sigismund in example (7).

What is conspicuous in the examples above is the use any of two constituents of the phrase when this phrase is further referred to. Moreover, as can be seen in example (6a), even within the same utterance the interchangeable use of two constituents may take place. The attributively used past participles (or adjectives) *dictus* and *prefatus*, 'aforementioned', signaling the state of affairs prior to that currently being described in the sentence, are added to 'heretics' once, and then to 'Bohemians'. It is clear, then, that both these nouns refer to the same thing, that is, both of them, even if used singly, denote 'Bohemian heretics' as the referential entity. Thus, the criterion of integrity of the structure is also met since when one of the two constituents of the phrase is omitted, the whole sentence remains correct and understandable (as postulated by Pinkster, see Section 5.1.).

5.3. An important conclusion about the relation of synonymy between both examined lexemes also suggests itself. They seem, as mentioned in Section 2.3., to exhibit a relationship of contextual synonymy. As Kocourek (1968, p. 133) points out, context is the means by which lexical synonymy may be tested. He perceives contextual synonymy thus, as the test of synonymy between two sentences differing in only one lexical unit. According to this interpretation, contextual synonymy of the phrase *Bohemos hereticos* is, in our examples, represented by the phrases *dictos hereticos* (6a, 6b), as well as *prefatis Bohemis* (6a) and *prefatorum Bohemorum* (7). Lexical substitution also intervenes at the paradigmatic level, namely when the "missing" lexemes are each time replaced by the participle forms *dictus* and *prefatus*.

6. The national background of the Hussite movement

We intend to show next that the semantic relationship between the constituents of the phrase *Bohemi heretici* might reflect the identification of the Bohemian people with heretics as existing at the extralinguistic level. The fact itself that both these words were used when denoting the Hussites, either together as a nominal phrase or singly, or even interchangeably, apparently proves that they were perceived by foreign (not Czech) opponents of the Hussites as semantically close items.

6.1. For further analysis of the semantic peculiarities of the lexemes that reference 'Bohemia' and 'heresy', the question about the idea of nation in the context of the Hussite movement is of crucial importance. What do we effectively know about how important this idea was for both the protagonists and opponents of this movement? The national element came to the forefront in the context of the Bohemian religious reformation at the end of the fourteenth and the beginning of the fifteenth centuries. Especially at the University of Prague, the controversy surrounding the doctrines of John Wycliffe sharpened tensions between Czech and foreign masters. As the result of the Decree of Kutná Hora, issued on January 1409 by King Wenceslaus IV, which

aimed to regulate the proportions of individual nationalities within the authorities of the University of Prague and which granted the decisive voice to the Czech masters, the foreign masters and students, mainly German ones, decided to leave Prague en masse (Nodl, 2018, pp. 335–363).¹⁴ Šmahel points out that they must have taken at that time prejudice against Bohemian reformer to such an extent that it made them identify not only those reformists but also the whole Czech nation as heretics. Incidentally, as early as 1408 some parsons of Prague's churches stated they were concerned by the fact that due to the Wycliffites the Bohemian people themselves were being referred to as heretics, especially by the Roman Curia (Šmahel, 2000, pp. 50–51). Another factor contributing to the generalization of the Bohemian people as heretics was a linguistic one. Since the Bohemian reformers started to use Czech when preaching, they hardly could be understood by both their foreign supporters and opponents, again mostly those of German nationality. Consequently, the Hussites inevitably focused their message, even when discussing universal Catholic topics, towards the local Czech audience (Šmahel, 2000, pp. 55–56; Nodl, 2015, p. 175). Lastly, these were the Hussites who considered their confession as being common and official of the Bohemian people. This attitude caused religious and ethnic factors to overlap with one another (Šmahel, 2000, p. 165; Nodl, 2015, p. 175).

6.2. The examples we have discussed in this paper were taken from texts written in the mid-1420s, and they therefore reflect the discursive tendency that formed in the first years after the Council of Constance. Against this background, it is interesting to ask how this tendency evolved in subsequent decades. In our overview of the text sources concerning the Hussite period, we will now move to a volume encompassing the correspondence of John of Capistrano, from 1451 to 1456, related to Poland and Silesia (2018). The largest number of letters compiled in this volume are those exchanged between John of Capistrano and Cardinal Zbigniew Oleśnicki (1389–1455). The anti-Hussite policy and rhetoric of Oleśnicki started as early as the early 1420s when he was appointed the bishop of Kraków. As time passed, he became a very influential person in the courts of the Jagellonian kings Władysław II Jagiełło and his son Władysław III. For over three decades Oleśnicki strongly determined the policy of the Polish Church towards the Hussites and to some degree of the Polish court, too.¹⁵ The correspondence between the Polish cardinal and John of Capistrano generally reveals the former's approach towards the Hussites as rather focused on the national aspect of the Hussite heresy, as shown in examples (8) and (9), and earlier in (1).

¹⁴ On the Decree of Kutná Hora and the development of Czech nationalism at the turn of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, see: Nodl, 2015, pp. 168–174.

¹⁵ On Oleśnicki's anti-Hussite initiatives, see Kras, 1998, pp. 244–249. Kras outlines (1998, p. 245) that in view of the lack of episcopal books by Oleśnicki it is only thanks to his biography by Długosz that we can have an idea about the extent of anti-heretical activities of the former.

- (8) [...] *adaugetur spes indubia* [...] *quod Bohemorum gens, Slavorum pars nobilis, in varias opiniones et supersticiones dudum dogmate nephario prolapsa, tuo ductu [...] ad catholice fidei puritatem redibit* (Oleśnicki writes to Capistrano, 2 August, 1451, The Correspondence, p. 90).

“[...] undoubted hope had increased [...] that the Bohemian people, the noble part of the Slavonic <Race>, which has fallen for the long time through nefarious doctrine into various conjectures and superstitions, shall return under your guidance [...] to the purity of the Catholic Faith” (trans. by Stephen Rowell).

Oleśnicki is not Capistrano’s only correspondent who uses the nationally oriented term *the Bohemian people* (*Bohemorum gens*) when denoting the Hussites. Similar terms are used by King Casimir IV, who emphasized the role of Capistrano in his mission to reconvert the Bohemian people, employing the phrase *pro gentis Bohemie reduccione* (The Correspondence, p. 116), and by Bishop Piotr Nowak of Wrocław, who declared to Capistrano that he does not want the Bohemian people to spread pestilential poison (*ne gens Bohemica virus pestiferum effundere valeat*, p. 176). In addition, Oleśnicki uses the term *heresis Bohemica* twice (pp. 132, 168). The third time this term is employed is by Jan Długosz, who, when informing Capistrano about the death of Cardinal Oleśnicki, characterizes the latter as “the hammer of the Bohemian heresy and the most vehement defender against it” (*is enim pater heresis Bohemice malleus et propugnator acerrimus existens*, The Correspondence 286).¹⁶ Moreover, Długosz uses in his *Annals* the phrase *heresis Bohemica* four times, and its variant *heresis Bohemorum* twice, as well as in the plural *Bohemorum hereses* and *hereses Bohemice*, each of them once.¹⁷

6.3. Now, let us return to Oleśnicki. His approach towards the Bohemian people in example (8) is characterized by a certain ambiguity. By employing the adjective *nobilis*, he emphasizes the very distinctive place occupied by these people within the Slavonic community. In contrast, when he indicates them as source of the heresy, he easily makes recourse to pejorative epithets, as found in example (1).¹⁸ Later in the same letter Oleśnicki underlines the linguistic affinity between the Polish and Bohemian people and adds that he is concerned about the salvation of the Bohemians as much as if his own nation were concerned here (p. 92). Surprisingly, he also presents, a little bit earlier, his opinion on the intentions of the anti-Hussite movement as viewed in a historical perspective:

¹⁶ Our translation of the Latin quotation is based on Stephen Rowell’s translation in “Correspondence” (p. 287). However, we interpret the Latin phrase in the quotation differently than Rowell, who seems not to treat the sequence *acerrimus defensor existens* as referring to the ‘Bohemian heresy’.

¹⁷ Dł. 2001 (pp. 100, 176, 181, 205), Dł. 2005 (pp. 174, 236), Dł. 2000 (p. 136). The years refer to the editions of Długosz’s “Annals”. See References, Sources and their abbreviations.

¹⁸ Actually, it is not as visible in the quoted passage in example (1) as in a further part of the document from which this quotation is taken. There, Oleśnicki uses, among others, the phrase *hereses et fremitus huius insanientis populi*, “heresies and roars of this people acting crazily” (Lib. Canc. Cioł., p. 90).

(9) *Repete in animo superiora tempora, quot militares expeditiones indicte, quanti exercitus collecti et thesauri emuncti [...] ut Bohemorum error, vel, ut aliquibus asserere placuit, nacio deleatur.* (The Correspondence, p. 92).

“Recall to mind earlier times, and how many expeditions have been proclaimed, how many armies mustered and treasuries emptied [...] so the Bohemian error or, as some were pleased to term it, the very nation itself be wiped out” (trans. by Stephen Rowell).

Oleśnicki encourages Capistrano to recall the multiple efforts undertaken to combat the Hussite heresy and alludes to the opinion of some unnamed people equating the Bohemian error – in other words, the Bohemian heresy – with the Bohemian nation itself. He also reminds Capistrano that these people have identified the necessity to eradicate this heresy by annihilating the Bohemian nation. Regardless of who put forward such ideas, what merits to be emphasized here is the explicit identification of the Bohemian heresy with the Bohemian nation. In any case, it is evident that in the discourse regarding the Hussites the reference to the national element must have been perceived in the mid-fifteenth century as still obvious.

6.4. Nevertheless, the denomination *Bohemi* is also used by Capistrano, who, in contrast to Oleśnicki, deprives it of either negative or positive connotations. Capistrano responding, on 28 August 1451, to Oleśnicki’s letter writes that he appreciates the cardinal’s wise counsel concerning the “Bohemian business” (*causa Bohemorum*, The Correspondence p. 100, 102) that he had recently undertaken and declares that Oleśnicki’s support for his efforts to convert and save the Bohemians has given him great hope (*de Bohemorum conversione*, p. 102; *pro Bohemorum salute*, p. 104). At this point, it is worth mentioning Soukup’s opinion that the appellations used to refer to the Bohemians differed between chanceries, particularly between this used by the Roman Curia and those outside of Rome, especially in the Lands of the Bohemian Crown. Soukup argues that the provincial chanceries often introduced new terms, including those with anti-heretical connotations, that were subsequently adopted by the curia (2017, pp. 201, 203). In addition, in his discussion of the Hussite-related nomenclature of polemical tracts, basically composed in the provinces, he indicates them to be the source of hostile figurative terminology (2017, p. 206). His remarks are for us of pivotal importance because they allow us to put forward the thesis that locally coined and used terminology, more often than that of the Roman Curia, might have been charged with negative connotations about the Hussites.¹⁹ Thus, it is also possible to explain why Oleśnicki and Capistrano use the same appellation, *Bohemi*, with different connotative meanings.

¹⁹ Also, Soukup’s remark on the neutral use of the term *Bohemi* by the Roman Curia after the Council of Basel (see 1.3.) merits mention in this context.

7. Towards partial synonymy

7.1. In Sections 5.2. and 5.3., we discussed the manifestations of interplay, at the syntactic and semantic levels, between the lexemes *Bohemus* and *hereticus* when they occur as two constituents of one nominal phrase. We argued that either of these two lexemes, when used singly further in an utterance, might have encoded the sense normally exhibited by this phrase as a whole. We interpreted this phenomenon in terms of contextual synonymy. However, there are also possible nominal phrases where the place of the second constituent is unexpectedly occupied by a new lexeme used instead of the lexeme normally occupying this place. We mean substitutions of the second constituent affecting the phrases' functioning as more or less fixed collocations. In Section 1.2. we quoted the phrase *secta Bohemorum*. We argue that, when coining it, the author of this phrase most likely used the term *secta hereticorum* as a pattern since the combination of two words as in the latter phrase is frequent in Christian and Medieval Latin, and the phrase *secta hereticorum* can certainly be considered a fixed collocation.²⁰ But what is particular is that the substitution of the second constituent does not entail a new meaning. We believe that the phrases *secta hereticorum* and *secta Bohemorum* were perceived by some users of Latin of the Hussite period to be synonymous, and, consequently, we interpret the nouns *hereticus* and *Bohemus* in the Latin of this period to be partial synonyms since the degree of semantic intersection between them enabled their interchangeable use as the modifiers in genitive of the same noun, *secta*.²¹ The question remains about the extension of partial synonymy as described above in (Polish) Medieval Latin.

7.2. The first scholars to pay attention to the interchangeable use of terms referring to 'heretics' and 'Bohemians' were Bylina and Kras (see Sections 1.1. and 1.2.). The examples of phrases they provide mainly come from the court records of Polish dioceses. We illustrate these examples, additionally, with quotations taken from the text sources indicated by both authors, in examples (10) and (11). Both passages refer to accusations of heresy:

(10) [...] *et alios articulos Bohemicales plures confirmando et [...] sub utraque specie homines communicando* (AC II, p. 103/104, yr. 1437, no. 328).

²⁰ PatrL attests to fifty occurrences of *secta hereticorum* and two of *secta heretica*, and CDS, to forty-two of *secta hereticorum*, four of *secta heretica*, and one of *secta hereticalis*. We also included here occurrences of the phrases worded inversely, e.g., *hereticorum secta*.

²¹ Theoretically, phrases known from Ecclesiastical Latin consisting of *secta* as the first constituent and the name of the concerned heretics in genitive plural as the second one can be considered the derivational pattern of *secta Bohemorum*. However, phrases of this type prefer as a second constituent the names of the supporters of the given heresy, often coined from the name of its leader, or the name of the related social movement, e.g., *secta Waldensium*, *secta Arianarum*, or *secta Phariseorum*. The terms *secta Hussitarum* and *secta Viclefistarum* were certainly coined following this pattern.

“[...] and confirming numerous other Bohemian articles and [...] administrating the holy communion under both kinds”.

(11) *Coram multis personis [...] dicebant sectam Bohemorum ab Ecclesia dampnatam esse meliorem quam fidem Romane ecclesie sancte [...] dicebant se velle mori in fide eadem Bohemorum* (AC II, p. 563, yr. 1449, no. 1236).

“In the presence of numerous persons [...] they said that the condemned by the Church sect of the Bohemian people is better than the faith of the holy Roman Church [...] they said that they wanted to die in this faith of the Bohemian people.”

As suggested, the phrases quoted in examples (10) and (11) most likely were coined through association with phrases typical of Christian and Medieval Latin. Apart from *secta hereticorum*, *articuli heretici* and perhaps also *fides heretica* can be viewed as such. Assuming that these three phrases are not occasional combinations of two lexemes, but are rather typical collocations of anti-heretical discourse, it is unlikely that either judges or scribes of the diocesan courts did not know them.²² If they decided to use the attributive modifier *Bohemicalis* and this in the genitive *Bohemorum* instead of *hereticus* and *hereticorum*, respectively, it is because they had at their disposal an existing grammatical pattern that they could almost automatically use to denote those whom they considered heretics. Of course, they apparently interpreted parallel forms (*Bohemicalis/hereticus*, etc.) as denoting the same entity.²³ It is also possible that such usage reflected the spoken language of the Polish clergy, who, when discussing Hussite infiltration, might have easily made recourse to the national label when referring to the Hussites.

CDI provides two further examples of the phrases *secta Bohemica* (Dł. 2000, 200; Dł. 2001, 205) and *secta Bohemorum* (Dł. 2000, p. 174; Dł. 2001, p. 100). What is more interesting is that Długosz uses in the context of the Hussite heresy the phrase *secta heretica* as well, namely, when he mentions Jan Rokycana as its principal defender (Dł. 2003, p. 111). A particularly fascinating illustration of the nominal phrase coined by the substitution of the second constituent *hereticus* for *Bohemicus* can be found in the sermon of Nicolaus Pszczółka de Błonie.²⁴ Nicolaus mentions John Wycliffe and Jan Hus as the authors of the “Bohemian treachery”:

²² CDS attests to two occurrences in the form of *articuli heretici* and *articuli hereticorum*; and PatrL to three in the form *hereseos articulus* (and in plural *hereseos articuli*). In PatrL we also encounter three occurrences of *hereticorum fides* and one of *heretica fides*.

²³ It should be added that the phrase *articuli Bohemicales* and its grammatical variants (*articuli Bohemorum*, etc.) appear in common use after the Taborite Manifesto (1430–1432); see Soukup (2017, pp. 217–220). It is possible, then, that after the Taborite Manifesto and the Council of Basel these phrases mainly functioned as technical terms and ceased to be perceived by the users of Latin as motivated by *articuli heretici*. Consequently, they must not have been charged with negative connotations towards the Bohemian people.

²⁴ We express our gratitude to Lidia Grzybowska from the Old Polish Literature History Department (Katedra Historii Literatury Staropolskiej) of the Jagellonian University for giving us information about the passage discussed here.

(12) *qua temeritate quaque fatuitate viles heretici Hus et Wicleph, Bohemice perfidie auctores, dicunt non esse obediendum pape.* (Sermones de tempore et de sanctis I ch. Rv4).

“with how great temerity and foolishness the mean heretics Hus and Wycliffe, authors of Bohemian treachery, assert there is no need to obey to the pope.”

M. Stachura (2010, p. 139) observes that in the texts of the late Roman Empire, *perfidia* was opposed to orthodox faith, *fides*, and referred exclusively to heretics and pagans, not to Jews. It rather denoted the criminal nature of the doctrine of heretics. Besides this historical argument, it is worth noting that the data provided by corpora of Christian and Medieval Latin allow us to regard the phrase *perfidia heretica* as an anti-heretical fixed collocation.²⁵ As such, it could have served Nicolaus Pszczółka as a grammatical pattern for coining (if not reusing as borrowed from some other source) his *perfidia Bohemica*.

7.3. The fact that we managed to find further examples of phrases in which *Bohemus* replaces *hereticus* as the second constituent proves that such constructions were in Polish Medieval Latin neither incidental nor marginal. It is also worth asking about the chronological and genre characteristics of the texts from which the discussed examples were taken. The quotations in examples (10) and (11), dating from 1437 and 1449, respectively, were taken from ecclesiastical court records, that is, from pragmatic texts written more in a lower linguistic register. In contrast, Długosz’s *Annals*, written between 1455 and 1480, definitely represents a higher register. Sermons are also in a higher register, such as that of Nicolaus Pszczółka de Błonie quoted in example (12). The incunabula that contain his sermons were published in 1498, but he must have written these sermons earlier as he most likely died between 1430 and 1440. Simply put, all these texts represent different genres and registers and cover the greater part of the fifteenth century.

8. Conclusion

At the linguistic level, this study focused on examining the syntactic and semantic relationships between the lexemes *Bohemus* and *hereticus* in cases where they function as two constituents of a nominal phrase. We argued that they exhibit a relationship of apposition (5.2.). This examination has shown that both lexemes, after occurring together in a sentence as a nominal phrase, might subsequently be used in the same sentence or in following sentences singly and interchangeably, but still encoding the sense of the whole phrase. This phenomenon was interpreted as a manifestation of contextual synonymy (5.3.). We hypothesized that the manifestation of synonymy at the syntactic and paradigmatic levels may reflect the close identification of the entities denoted by *Bohemus*

²⁵ PatrL attests to twenty-three occurrences of *perfidia heretica*; CDS to three occurrences of *perfidia heretica* and thirteen of *perfidia hereticorum*; and CDi to two occurrences of *perfidia hereticorum*. We also include the occurrences of these phrases in inverse word order.

and *hereticus* at the extralinguistic level (6). The generalization of the Bohemian people as heretics was reflected as well in the usage of lexemes such as *Bohemia*, *Bohemus*, and *Bohemicalis* in and outside the context of nominal phrases formed by them with *hereticus* (4.1.–4.3., 6.2.). We argued that it is connotative meaning that allows us to determine whether a given usage of these lexemes may be classified as a reflection of the stereotypically negative attitude towards the Bohemian people in the Hussite period or not (4.2., 6.4.). The strong identification of the Bohemian people with heretics also might entail nominal phrases made by substituting the second constituent *hereticus* for *Bohemicus* (e.g., *perfidia heretica* → *perfidia Bohemica*). We interpreted this type of substitution as a manifestation of partial synonymy (7.1., 7.2.). To more precisely determine the scale of the discussed phenomena, a study of more data provided by corpora containing enough texts related to the Hussite period is indispensable.

References

- Adams, J.N. (1983). Words for ‘prostitute’ in Latin. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 126, 321–358.
- Apresjan, Ju.D. (1995). *Semantika leksykalna. Sinonimiczne środki języka. Tłum. Z. Kozłowska, A. Markowski*. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich.
- Burstein, J., & Pedersen, T. (2010). Towards Improving Synonym Options in a Text Modification Application. *University of Minnesota Supercomputing Institute Research Report UMSI-2010/165*, 20.
- Bylina, S. (2013). Image of a Heretic in Late Medieval Poland. *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 57, 5–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/OiRwP.SI.2013.01> First published as: Wizerunek heretyka w Polsce późnośredniowiecznej. *Odrodzenie i Reformacja w Polsce*, 30 (1985), 5–24.
- Cruse, D.A. (2002). *Lexical Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fruyt, M. (1994). Typologie des cas de synonymie en latin. In C. Moussy (ed.), *Les problèmes de la synonymie en latin* (pp. 25–46). Paris: Presses de l’université Paris-Sorbonne.
- Kocourek, R. (1968). Synonymy and Semantic Structure of Terminology. *Travaux linguistique de Prague*, 3, 131–141.
- Kras, P. (1998). *Husyci w piętnastowiecznej Polsce*. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Kras, P. (2018). The Imagined Communities of Heretics: Constructing the Identity of the Religious Enemy in the Late Middle Ages. In A. Pleszczyński et al. (Eds.), *Imagined Communities: Constructing Collective Identities in Medieval Europe* (pp. 364–387). Leiden: Brill.
- Lyons, J. (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manukyan, N., & Nikoghosyan, H. (2016). On Some Issues of Synonymy. *Օտար լեզուները բարձրագույն դպրոցում [Foreign languages in high school]*, 1–2(20), 26–30.
- Moussy, C. (2010). *Synonymie et antonymie en latin*. Paris: L’Harmattan (Collection: Kubaba-Grammaire et linguistique).
- Nodl, M. (2018). Corporative Interests Versus Nationalism: Prague University at the Turn of the 15th Century. In A. Pleszczyński et al. (Eds.), *Imagined Communities: Constructing Collective Identities in Medieval Europe* (pp. 335–363). Leiden: Brill.
- Nodl, M. (2015). Národ sobě: Ryzí Čechové a moderní nacionalismus. In M. Nodl (Ed.) *Středověk v nás* (pp. 168–174), Praha: Argo.
- Pinkster, H. (2015). *The Oxford Latin Syntax* (vol. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Soukup, P. (2017). The Waning of the “Wycliffites”: Giving Names to Hussite Heresy. In J.P. Hornbeck II, & M. von Dussen (Eds.), *Europe after Wycliffe* (pp. 196–226). New York: Fordham University Press.
- Spevak, O. (2014). *The Noun Phrase in Classical Latin Prose*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Stachura, M. (2010). *Wrogowie porządku rzymskiego Studium zjawiska agresji językowej w Kodeksie Teodozjusza, Nowelach Posteodozjańskich i konstytucjach*. Kraków: Historia Jagellonica.
- Šmahel, F. (2000). *Idea národa v husitských Čechách*. Praha: Argo.
- Wilde de, M. (2018). Enemy of All Humanity. The Dehumanizing Effects of a Dangerous Concept. *Netherlands Journal of Legal Philosophy*, 2(47), 158–175.
- Zeng, X. (2007). Semantic relations between contextual synonyms. *Us-China Education Review*, 4(9), 33–37.

Sources and their abbreviations

- AC II – Ulanowski, B. (Ed.). (1902). *Acta capitulorum nec non iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum selecta. Acta iudiciorum ecclesiasticorum dioecesium Gneznensis et Poznaniensis (1403–1530)* (vol. 2). Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- Cioł. Lib. – Caro, J. (Ed.). (1871). *Liber cancellarie Stanislai Ciolek, ein Formelbuch der polnischen Königskanzlei aus der Zeit der Husitischen Bewegung* (vol. 1–2). Wien: Karl Gerold's Sohn.
- CodEp II – Lewicki, A. (Ed.). (1891). *Codex Epistolaris saeculi decimi quinti, tomus II*. Kraków: Akademia Umiejętności.
- The Correspondence – Kras, P., Manikowska, H., Starzyński, M., & Zajchowska-Bołtromiuk, A. (Eds.). (2018). *The Correspondence of John of Capistrano, Vol. 1: Letters related to Poland and Silesia (1451–1456)*. Warszawa–Lublin: Tadeusz Manteuffel Institute of History, Polish Academy of Sciences–Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Dł. 2000 – Turkowska, D. (Ed.). (2000). *Joannis Długossii Annales sue Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, liber undecimus 1413–1430*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dł. 2001 – Pirożyńska, Cz. (Ed.). (2001). *Joannis Długossii Annales sue Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, liber undecimus et liber duodecimus 1431–1444*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Dł. 2003 – Turkowska, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Joannis Długossii Annales sue Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, liber duodecimus 1445–1461*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności–PWN.
- Dł. 2005 – Turkowska, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Joannis Długossii Annales sue Cronicae incliti Regni Poloniae, liber duodecimus 1462–1480*. Kraków: Polska Akademia Umiejętności.
- Mikołaj z Błonia (Nicolaus de Blonie) *Sermones de tempore et de sanctis, sive Viridarius*.
- Strassburg: Typ. Iordani i.e. Georg Husner; 23 VIII 1498, Jagiellonian Library at Kraków: BJ St. Dr. Inc. 2857.

Corpora

- CDł – *The Corpus of Works of Jan Długosz*
<https://voces.scriptores.pl/#dashboard?corpname=dł>
- CDS – *Cross Database Searchtool of Brepols Publisher*
<http://apps.brepols.net.ezproxy.muni.cz/BrepolsPortal/default.aspx>
- PatrL – *Patrologia Latina*
<https://voces.scriptores.pl/#dashboard?corpname=PL>

SUMMARY

Keywords: Hussite-related terminology, Medieval Latin, contextual synonymy, partial synonymy, connotative meaning

This article discusses the terms used in medieval text sources to denote the Hussites. It pays particular attention to the nominal phrase *Bohemi heretici* arguing that its lexeme constituents functioned in fifteenth-century Latin as synonyms. A more detailed examination focuses on types of synonymy established between two mentioned lexemes. The terms *contextual synonymy* and *partial synonymy* are used here. In addition, the importance of *connotative meaning* is pointed out as a criterion for analysing the usage of lexemes referring to Bohemia and the Bohemian people in the context of the Hussite heresy. The study is based on letters written by Polish secular and ecclesiastical chanceries as well as those written to Polish sovereigns and dignitaries by their foreign correspondents. In addition, the "Annals" of Jan Długosz are taken into account.

STRESZCZENIE

Czy określić *Bohemus* i *haereticus* używano synonimicznie?

Słowa kluczowe: terminologia dotycząca Husytów, łacina średniowieczna, synonimia kontekstowa, synonimia częściowa, znaczenie konotacyjne

Artykuł omawia terminologię używaną w łacinie średniowiecznej na oznaczenie husytów. Szczególną uwagę poświęcono frazie nominalnej *Bohemi heretici* 'Czesi heretycy', podkreślając, że leksemy współtworzące tę frazę wchodziły w relację synonimii. Tę relację interpretuje się tutaj bądź jako *synonimię kontekstową*, bądź *synonimię częściową*. Ponadto uwypukla się rolę *znaczenia konotacyjnego* jako kryterium analizy użycia terminów odnoszących się do Czech i Czechów w kontekście herezji husyckiej. Za podstawę materiałową prowadzonych analiz posłużyła korespondencja polskich dostojników duchownych i świeckich, także listy kierowane do nich przez zagranicznych korespondentów, a także „Roczniki” Jana Długosza.