

On marginal notes in the first Romanian unabridged version of the *Septuagint* (Ms. 45 kept in the Cluj branch of the Romanian Academy Library)

Mădălina Ungureanu*

Department of Interdisciplinary Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Str. Lascăr Catargi 54, 700107 Iași, Romania

Article info

History:

Received May 6, 2015

Accepted June 29, 2015

Published July 17, 2015

Key words:

biblical text

translation

Old Romanian literary

language

philology

glosses

Abstract

Ms. 45, kept in the Cluj branch of the Romanian Academy Library, contains the oldest complete Romanian translation of the *Septuagint* version of the *Old Testament* preserved until today, carried out by Nicolae Milescu Spătarul in the second half of the 17th century. The history of this text is only partially deciphered; it is known that the manuscript does not contain the translation as such, but a revised version of it. Both the identity of the reviser, and the trajectory followed by the text after this first processing are still subject of debate. This paper aims to study the inventory of marginal notes in two biblical books of the manuscript, namely the *Book of Genesis* and the *Book of Job*, trying to establish a typology. This is a first step towards a highly necessary approach, the study of the whole inventory of notes, which could contribute to clarifying aspects of the history of the text that are still insufficiently explored.

1. Preliminary remarks

1.1. The first complete Romanian translation of the *Septuagint* version of the *Old Testament* (and, at the same time, the first translation of the *Septuagint* in a modern language, cf. Florescu, 2015, p. 74) has been significantly discussed upon ever since the discovery of the manuscript (Cândea, 1979, p. 108). Given the importance of the translated text, researchers have shown an interest in the various problems posed by its study. Nowadays, no one questions the Romanian translator's identity (Nicolae Spătarul Milescu, a major European scholar, mentioned, moreover, in one of the forewords, *Cuvîntu înainte către cititori* [Foreword to readers]¹: "Iară Nicolaie, vrînd să aducă și el cartea aceasta den elinie la rumânie, nefiind altă dată scoasă la rumânie" [And Nicolaie, wanting to translate this book from Greek to Romanian, as it had never been translated into Romanian before]²), though other issues are still disputed. The translation carried out by Nicolae Milescu has been preserved in ms. 45, in the Library of the Cluj Branch of the Romanian Academy. The abundant studies dedicated to this manuscript (Cândea, 1979; Ursu, 2003; Andriescu, 1988, who also presents a synthetic view of the discussions) show that it contains a revision of Nicolae's translation, copied by Dumitru from Cîmpulung (who, in fact, at the end of the table of contents, after the usual verses dedicated to the metropolitan, signs as follows: "A sfinții tale plecată slugă, Dumitru Dălgopolscom" [Your Holiness's humble servant, Dumitru Dălgopolscom]). There is yet no consensus

*Email address: madandronic@gmail.com.

¹Although placed at the end of the manuscript, on four unnumbered pages, this *Foreword* is intended as a preface, containing ideas on the importance of translating the sacred text and the history of its translations (some taken word by word from the foreword of the Greek source, as shown by Cândea, 1979, p. 112), on the sources used by the translator, the revision of the translation and the issues it focused on. Cândea (1979) shows that many of these ideas were probably taken from the foreword of Milescu's translation.

²Since, in this article, we used the transcriptions of ms. 45, ms. 4389, and of B 1688 performed within the series *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688 (MLD)*, I complied with the interpretative transcription rules set out in this project (for which see *Nota asupra ediției* [Note on the edition] in the recent volumes of the series).

among specialists regarding the magnitude of the revision (i.e., whether it was substantial or superficial) and the identity of the revisers³. Nowadays, specialists widely accept the fact that this revision, preserved in ms. 45, underlies the vetero-testamentary text printed in **B 1688**.

Despite the above-mentioned studies, various problems related to the text included in ms. 45 have remained unsolved; one of the causes of this state of affairs consists, most probably, in the fact that the text of the manuscript has not yet been completely available in a philological edition⁴. Besides the identity of the first reviser of Nicolae's translation, we should also recall here the issue of the translation and revision sources; the relation between the translation and the revision (in other words, what belongs to Milescu and what belongs to the reviser); the relation between the text and **B 1688** (what and how much of it does the *Bible* take from ms. 45 and what other sources does the *Bible* of Șerban use in the *Old Testament*); the relation with the other complete translation of the *Old Testament* known at the time, included in the Romanian ms. 4389 B.A.R. and attributed to Daniil Panoneanu (Ursu, 2003, p. 29–30).

As far as the original of Milescu's translation is concerned, the *Foreword to readers* mentions that the main source would be “un izvod carele-i mai ales decât toate altele, tipărit în Frangofort și ales foarte bine pre limba elinească, și dedesupt cu multe arătări și cuvinte puse cum le-au tălmăcit alții” [a most valuable source printed in Frankfurt and in a very accurate Greek language, containing also many notes and words from other translations], identified as the *Bible* printed in Frankfurt in 1597 (Cândea, 1979, p. 112), to which could be added, according to the foreword, other Latin and Slavonic sources (*Ostrog Bible*, 1581). Moreover, the same foreword attributed to the reviser shows the source used by the reviser himself: “Iară și noi pre lângă izvodul lui Necolaie am mai alăturat și alte izvoade grecești, pren care izvoade fost-au unul carele au fost tipărit la Englitera” [Besides the source used by Nicolaie, we also used other Greek sources, among which one printed in England] (*Sept. London*, 1653), to which the *Ostrog Bible* is added, from which he took the marginal biblical references (“și încă am pus și mărturiile cuvintelor prorociilor den cea slovenească, tot pre margine, neavîndu-le cêle grecești” [And so we used that source up to the first *Book of Chronicles*, and then we found a Greek source similar to the one used by Necolaie and we followed that one]), as well as the way in which he alternated the sources (“Și așa am venit cu acela izvod pînă la Paralipomenon dentii, și apoi aflînd și noi izvod grecescu, altul de cêle den Frangofort, dupre care au scris și Necolaie, am urmat aceluia” [And so we used that source up to the first *Book of Chronicles*, and then we found a Greek source similar to the one used by Necolaie and we followed that one]). Showing that the texts of the two Greek sources do not coincide (“ci și acesta [ediția de la Londra, n.n.] nu să potrivia cu cel de la Frangofort, pentru căci pren bogate locuri adăogea și pren bogate locuri lipsia, nu venia cu cestalt” [but this one—the edition published in London (n.n.)—did not match the one from Frankfurt, as in some points the text was larger and in other points it was smaller, it was not the same as the other one]), the reviser also describes the way in which he solved the problems posed by these textual differences between the sources: “pentru acêea lipsele nu s-au socotit, iar adaosele s-au pus precum vom face doslușirea mai jos cu însemnări” [for that reason the lacks have been ignored, and the additions have been put in as we will clarify below with notes]. Therefore, the differences between the Greek sources, writes the reviser, namely *Sept. Frankfurt* (translated by Milescu) and *Sept. London* (used by the reviser himself up to *2Par*, as he was lacking Milescu's main source), were indicated in the text in a way that he also explains and that will be indicated below.

In the present paper, we will focus on the marginal notes of ms. 45. Considering the huge material

³For the latter issue, two solutions were proposed. One of them belongs to N. A. Ursu, who nominates Dosoftei, metropolitan of Moldavia, as the author of the revision (a revision, says the researcher, so radical that the metropolitan can be considered a “coauthor” of the translation), providing linguistic arguments that place the reviser's language in the Northern area of the Romanian territory, and lexical and morphological facts that would be specific to the metropolitan. The other hypothesis considers that those who revised Milescu's translation were Wallachian scholars who, acting at the behest of Metropolitan Theodosius, prepared the text for printing.

⁴The text of the manuscript has been published starting with 1988, partially, in the volumes of the series **MLD**, at the “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House in Iași. A philological edition of ms. 45 is in preparation, within a project coordinated by Eugen Munteanu.

the manuscript offers (ms. 45 contains 906 pages, each with two columns⁵), we limited our research to two biblical books: the *Book of Genesis* and the *Book of Job*. In choosing the two books, we held in view what the reviser stated in his foreword: a. that Milescu, according to his own confession, would have also intended to write down the versions provided by the sources, including the critical apparatus of the Frankfurt edition, but, in fact, he managed to do so only with the first book of the *Pentateuch* (“și au scris și cèle precum să află la letenie și cèle precum să află la slovenie și însemnările și tălmăcirile cèle ce să află mai jos la izvodul acel grecescu, zice că le-au pus tot cu însemnări pre de margine, dară n-au pus nice unele de acêstea la izvodul lui; că au început să facă și acêstea la capul dentii, la *Bitie*, dar mai d-apoi, pentru neașezămîntul vremilor, s-au lăsat și n-au făcut nice unele de acêstea” [he also wrote those things that can be found in the Latin source and those that can be found in the Slavonic source and also the notes and the comments that can be found in the footnotes of the Greek source, he says he has noted all these on the side of the page, but he has not put any of these in his text; he started making all these notes in the first chapter, the *Book of Genesis*, but then he stopped, because of hard times]); b. that until the second *Book of Chronicles* (*2Par*), the reviser himself used another source, different from the one from Frankfurt and once he obtained it, he used it exclusively in the second part of the text. Therefore, we chose a book to exemplify each of the two parts thus defined from the point of view of the sources used, in order to see whether this alternation of sources is reflected in the marginal notes and, even more so, what is the role of these notes.

1.2 The issue of marginal notes in the ms. under discussion was approached by Ursu (2003), in an attempt to motivate Dosoftei’s paternity over the revision of Milescu’s translation. Thus, the author is interested in the formal, linguistic aspect of the notes; more precisely, he is interested in the phonetic, morphological and lexical features that could reveal similarities with the language of Dosoftei’s texts. An attempt to systematize the comments in ms. 45 belongs to Ana-Maria Ginsac (Ginsac, 2013). The author aims to carry out a classification, identifying: 1. Notes concerning the morphology of the text and 2. Lexical notes (2.1. explanations of the terminology used; 2.2. explanations of the calques in the text; 2.3. synonyms that solve the diatopic differences between the translation and the revision; 2.4. synonyms that provide translation versions or are more appropriate to the original meaning).

If we hold in view the definition of the gloss as “o formă perfecționată de împlinire a textului în limba țintă. Forme și structuri proprii acesteia se concentrează asupra cîte unui conținut din limba sursă în scopul redării deslușite a respectivului conținut...” [A perfected form of fulfilling the text in the target language. Forms and structures inherent to it focus on a given content in the source language, in order to render it clearly...] (Gafton, 2005, p. 44), we need to distinguish between the marginal notes and the glosses, meaning that only a part of the notes are glosses. Anticipating, we will state that not all the marginal notes (as a matter of fact a rather limited subset) in ms. 45 result from the contact between two (or more) different linguistic systems and the need for (linguistic) adjustments. Some notes result from the confrontation of several sources and the need to provide the reader with a comprehensive text; some others are taken precisely from the sources and have the role of orienting the reader inside the biblical system. Moreover, if the glosses are not introduced as a consequence of a pre-established system (Gafton, 2005, p. 198), the notes we examine have a systematic character, demonstrated by the various graphic signs used consistently for each category and by the description of this system in the foreword.

The secondary literature referring to the glosses in the old Romanian texts—the old and early modern period—is rich (for an overview, see Gafton, 2012, p. 329, note 282; Soare, 2015, p. 3, note 4; the authors mention the contributions of D. Șesan, G. Țepelea, N.A. Ursu, Mario Roques), întrucît materialul în sine este bogat și variat. since the material itself is rich and varied. The most extensive discussion on this topic is provided by Gafton, 2005, p. 44–46 and 196–268.

⁵See the description of the manuscript in *Nota asupra ediției* [Note on the edition] in the recent volumes of *MLD*.

Seen as a composing part of the act of translation, as a result of the translator gaining awareness of the difficulties involved in the act of translation, glosses can be classified into: explanatory, complete, orienting (Gafton, 2005, p. 44–46). Moreover, analysing a considerable number of glosses, taken from different types of texts dating back to the 16th – 17th centuries, the author also establishes other categories; in establishing them, he uses as a classification criterion the role of the notes in the text, the need that generated them. The glosses had multiple functions, the most important one being the harmonisation of the morpho-syntactic and lexico-semantic features of the two linguistic systems connected through the act of translation, by means of explanations, additions, translations of some borrowed words, detailed explanations of referents that are not familiar to the Romanian space, indications addressed to the reader. Not all these glosses are marginal; some of them are integrated in the text in the form of appositions, introduced by the adverb *adecă* [namely]. The glosses constitute a “parallel discourse” (Gafton, 2005, p. 259, 267), which tends to solve the shortcomings of literal translation and contributes to the creation of the literary Romanian language.

In what follows, we will focus on the inventory of marginal notes in the two biblical books, as they appear in ms. 45, following a quantitative and a qualitative analysis. We shall try to determine the typology of the notes, their textual function, the indications offered on the relation between the text itself, the one included in ms. 45 and the textual tradition (not just the Romanian one) of the *Bible*⁶.

1.3. It is again the *Foreword to readers* that provides the “key” to the signs used for marking the textual insertion of the various notations inside the text or the marginal notes (in a special section, called “Doslușirea cărții aceștia cum vei putea să o înțelegi, citindu-o mai pre iușor” [Explanations on how to understand this book, reading it easier]). Thus, a special sign (~~~), called “sile” indicates synonymic glosses or different versions in the sources: “Iar unde vei vedea acesta ~~~⁷ asupra unui cuvânt, câte vor fi înlăuntru și afară silele acêstea, acela sau e cuvânt de îndoire, de zice sau așa, sau așa, sau el s-au aflat într-un izvod într-un chip, și într-alt izvod într-alt chip și fără bănuială sînt așa” [And where you will see this ~~~ sign above a word, either there is doubt regarding that word, whether it says this or that, or one of the sources uses one word, while another source uses another, and this without a doubt]. A red sign (“silă”) with a dot underneath marks an omission in the text: “acoleă iaste cuvînt sărit și s-au îndreptat afară” [that word was skipped, but it was corrected on the margin]. Two parallel lines are used for marking biblical references: “să știi că de acoleă să încêpe cuvîntul mărturiei ce însemnează afară, și precum însemnează capetile, așa le vei afla”, while intratextual references are marked by the indications *sus* ‘up’ and *jos* ‘down’. Finally, other types of marginal notes mentioned here are the references to fragments of Messianic interpretation, marked by a special drawing, a red hand with the index pointing towards the precise excerpt. The aim of this system of notes, argues the author of the foreword, is to clarify, facilitating the reader’s orientation in the text: “Așa luînd bine aminte nu te vei învâlu, ci toate pre tocmêle le vei afla” [Thus, being careful, you will not fall into error, but you will find everything well organized]⁸.

There is, thus, a coherent system used for marking the interventions on the text, the corrections arising from the comparison between Milescu’s translation and the original, the additions made by comparing the other Greek source, the system of relations inside the biblical text itself. This system of notations is not characteristic to this text alone; it is also encountered in other manuscripts dating back to the same period. Nevertheless, we will see that the history of the text—after the foreword was written—occasioned the occurrence of other types of notes, besides the ones mentioned here.

⁶As regards the *Bible* as a hypertext, see Munteanu, 2011, p. 16.

⁷Written in red in the text and repeated on the margin.

⁸Apart from marginal notations, there are also mentioned notations indicating changes of word order (by placing the letters with numeral values **B**, **A**, **r** above the sequences to be permuted), signs marking the beginning and end of verses, sequences or terms only present in some of the sources (without their absence altering the meaning of text), with a special red sign marking those that were only present in the London version.

2. Inventory of marginal notes

Given the existence of a *hiatus* (mentioned above, §1.1.) in regards to the inquiry of the Greek sources during the revision process, we stopped at the marginal notes present in two biblical books: the *Book of Genesis* and the *Book of Job*. We will discuss each one at a time, attempting at a classification of the notes, in order to follow whether the two books comprise similar types of marginal notes.

2.1. Marginal notes in the *Book of Genesis*

In the manuscript, the *Book of Genesis* spans between pages 1 and 51; there are approximately 300 notes of various types marked on the side.

2.1.1. Notes sending back to the biblical system⁹

Most of them are **references** to passages from other biblical books (of the type: *Iosia 24*) or within the same book (marked, as indicated in the foreword, by the terms *jos* ‘down’ and *sus* ‘up’: *jos 31* – to 28, 18; *sus 26* – to 27, 46, etc.). A note can comprise several biblical references or biblical references of both types (*Mth. 19*; *1 Cori. 11*; *Colas. 3*; *gios* [up] 8 *și* [and] 9, to 1, 27). The titles of the biblical books are abbreviated. Their number is significant: 122 such notes in the *Book of Genesis*. As stated in the foreword, these were taken from the Slavonic source (**Ostrog Bible**): “și încă am pus și mărturiile cuvintelor prorociilor den cea slovenească, tot pre margine, neavîndu-le cêle grecești” [and I also noted the testimonies from the words of prophecies from the Slavonic source, also on the edge of the pages, because the Greek source did not have them].

In the same category, of notes that indicate a relation inside the biblical system, we integrate the marking of the **fragments susceptible of a messianic interpretation**, indicated, as stated in the foreword, through a drawing representing a hand with the index finger pointing towards that particular excerpt. There are 20 such notes in this book.

Also placed marginally, but with no special marking, there are **biblical indications** (short comments with a summarizing-orientation purpose)¹⁰. Most of them are written in red, by the same hand: 65 such comments (curiously, starting with the 19th chapter, before which there are no such notations). Many of these comments have an indicative character, a role marked by the use of the adverb *aici* [here]: *Aici au adăpat pre Lot fetele lui* (19, 32); *Aici puse Avraam giurămîntul cu Aviméleh* (21, 24); *Aici au făcut Isaac jurămîntu cu Aviméleh* (26, 26); *Aici să blagoslovéște Isav* (27, 39); *Aici au vădzut Iacov tabăra lui Dumnedzău* (32, 1), etc. Others have a summarizing character, and the notations indicates an action: *Sluji Iacov pentru Rabil 7 ani* (29, 18); *Să dăosăbi Isav de Iacov* (36, 6); *Aflară cupa* (44, 12), or an object that constitutes the core of the excerpt: *Movila Mărturiei* (31, 46); *Daruri ce au trimis Iacov lui Isav* (32, 13); *împreunarea fraților* (33, 3). Most of them use the third person, although the second person is also used once, as the comment is directly taken from part of a verse: *Luîndu pre tatăl vostru, veniți* (45, 18). From the point of view of construction, most have a prepositional, simple realization: *Prăvăli piatra* (29, 10); *Plînse Iosif* (43, 30), or a complex one: *Poftiră oamenii a să obrăzui* (34, 20); less frequently, they are expressed by a full sentence: *Să arătă Dumnedzău lui Iacov și să pogorî cu însul la Eghiptu* (46, 3), and only sometimes the indication is expressed by a nominal group: *Visul lui Iosif* (37, 4); *Argintul și cupa* (44, 2). In a few instances, the continuity between comments is indicated; the copulative conjunction *și* [and] shows these are part of the same syntactic unit: *Și ochi muierea stăpînului Pentefri pre Iosif* (39, 7) *și-l trase de contoș* (39, 12); *Puse pre Iosif domnu Eghiptului* (41, 41) *și-i dède lui Iosif pre Asineth* (41, 45); *Și lipsi argintul din Eghiptu* (47, 15) *și dobitocul* (47, 17).

Such indications, so numerous in the *Book of Genesis*, are fewer and fewer in the following books of the *Pentateuch*, and starting with the *Book of Deuteronomy* they are completely absent.

⁹By the notion of *biblical system* we understand here the ensemble of biblical texts from various cultures, together with the universal biblical tradition and the tradition characteristic to each individual culture; cf. the Biblical fractal (Florescu, 2015, p. 57).

¹⁰These comments are not present in the declared sources of the translation.

An ample marginal *comment*, written in black and inserted in the text by a red star, is found in 3, 23. The verse is given below: “Și-l scoase pre însul Domnul Dumnedzău den grădina desfătăciunei ca să lucrêdze pămîntul dentru care s-au luat.” [And the Lord God sent him forth from the orchard of delight to till the earth from which he was taken, **NETS**]. The marginal note comments: “Cel de viață lemn era lucrare de dare de viață ce să zice celor destoinici vieții și morții nesupuși, cu o dată prin hrană; ci Adam, după ce a gustat din lemn, fu supus morții și vieții nedăstoinic, precum și Iov mărturisêște grăind: «Chiemaiu moartea în loc de tată», pentru aceasta Dumnezeu grăiêște ca nu cîndva să tinză mîna și să ia din lemnul vieții, și va fi viu în vîci; că era contenită lucrarea cea de dare de viață carele întru cêle dentîiu era în om și striin de fericita viață și de hrană, precum Dumnezeu cătră dînsul grăiêște: «Întru grijă să mănînci în toate zilele vieții tale.»” [The tree of life was a life-giving work intended for those worthy to live and unsubject to death; but Adam, after eating from the tree, was subject to death and unworthy of life, as Job says: «I called on death to be my father» (**NETS**), therefore, God tells him not to stretch out his hand to take a fruit from the tree of life, and so he will live forever; because the life-giving work which was originally into the man ended, and he was far from happy life and food, as God says to him: «With pains you will eat in all the days of your life»].

A few remarks on this comment: it bears the same handwriting, but the ink is not the same colour as the ink used for the biblical text (it is a bit toned-down), which would mean that it was added at a later stage; also, its author could be the reviser, and the copyist recorded it, as he did with all the other remarks. The comment contains two biblical quotes, one from the *Book of Job* (17, 14) and another from the *Book of Genesis* (3, 17); none of them reproduces the text in ms. 45, not even the fragment in *Gen*, 3, 17¹¹, which can be found on the same page as the comment, which shows that the author of the comment quotes, as it often happened at the time, from memory. The comment has the role of placing the verse in context and orienting the reading, revealing the meanings of the excerpt.

Such comments, marked by an asterisk, are present in the text in two more cases: *Jgs*, 2, 1 (“Și să sui îngerul Domnului de la Galgála la locul plîngerii și la Vethil și la casa lui Israil și dzise cătră ei”): “Jid[ovii] dzic să fie Finees” (the first two words are written in red, the others in black, which is probably a mistake of the copyist who did not classify the comment in the correct class from the very beginning; the asterisk is placed above the syntagm “îngerul Domnului”, the comment sending back to the identification, present in some Hebrew verses, between the angel and Phineas, one of the high priests mentioned in the *Exodus*); *1Kgs*, 14, 14 (“Și să făcu rana cea dentîi, carea au lovit Ionathan și cela ce rădica ciniile lui, ca vro 20 de oameni, cu lovituri și cu aruncări de pietri și cu bulgări de ai cîmpului): “Alții dzic cît ară putea ara 2 boi într-o dzi” (by means of the indefinite pronoun *alții* [others], the reviser designates the versions outside the tradition of the *Septuagint*, cf. **Vulg. Antwerp**: “quam par boum in die arare consuevit”, and especially the **Ostrog Bible**: “юже два волы днь изорати”; apart from the asterisk, the comment is additionally marked by several red signs—“sile”—on the last part of the verse, because it is not just a comment, but it also records another version of the biblical text

2.1.2. Marginal notes on the relation of the text with the sources

A large part of the marginal notes refer to the aspects mentioned in the foreword, taking note of the use of the various sources of translation. Most of the notes result from the involvement of the two Greek sources mentioned: the Frankfurt edition (1597), the translator’s main source, and the London edition (1653), the reviser’s main source until the second *Book of Chronicles*. Various notations result, which can be classified into the following categories:

- a. marginal notes that illustrate an *omission of the translator or the copyist*, bringing the necessary additions (it aims at sequences that can be found in both Greek sources). Most are written by the same handwriting, marked by a special sign (a red ‘silă’ with a dot underneath): 6, 12 “Și vădzu (marginal note: *Domnul* [The Lord], cf. Gr. *κύριος ὁ θεός*) Dumnedzău pămîntul”; 11, 2 “Și fu după ce au

¹¹In ms. 45, the two verses read as follows: “Moartea am chemat tată să-mi fie” (*Job*, 17, 14); “întru scîrbe vei mîncă pre însul toate dzilele vieții tale” (*Gen*, 3, 17).

purces ei de la răsărit, află rădăcina în locul lui Senaar și lăcuiră (marginal note: *acolo* [there], cf. Gr. *κατώκησαν ἐκεῖ*); 27, 13 “Și-i dzise lui maica sa: Pre mine blăstăm (marginal note: *tău* [your], cf. Gr. *ἡ κατάρα σου*), fiul mieu”; 32, 28 “ce numai Israil să fie (marginal: *numele* [the name], probabil omisiune a copistului) tău, căci te-ai întărit cu Dumnedzău”; 33, 8 “Pentru ca să afle (marginal note: *sluga ta* [your servant], cf. Gr. *ὁ παῖς σου*) har înaintea ta, doamne”; 41, 34 “Și făcă faraon și tocmască mai mari preste locuri pre pământu și să trimiță toate pîinele (marginal note: *pământului* [of the earth], cf. Gr. *τῆς γῆς αἰγύπτου*) Eghiptului a celor șapte ani a ieftinătății” etc. In some cases, as it can be noticed, the omission can undoubtedly be attributed to the copyist (the text lacks a compulsory component, inferred by the context); in others, it can be assumed that the omission belongs either to the copyist, who returned on the text later and noticed it, or to the translator.

In three cases, the omission is corrected by a marginal note written in another handwriting and marked by a ‘silă’ without the dot: 2, 8 “Și răsădi Dumnedzău grădină în Edem, cătră răsărit, și puse (marginal note: *acolo* [there], cf. Gr. *ἐκεῖ*) pre om”; 3, 24 “Și-l scoasă afară pre Adam și-l lăcuî pre însul în preajma grădinei (marginal note: *desfătăciunii* [of relish], cf. Gr. *τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς*); 7:13 “Întru aceasta dzi întră Noe, Sim, Ham, Iafeth, ficiorii lui Nôe (marginal note: *și fămêia lui Noe* [and Noe’s woman], cf. Gr. *καὶ ἡ γυνὴ Νῶε*) și tustrei fâmeile ficiorilor lui cu însul în săcrii”. We can speculate upon the identity of this scrivener. Could he be one of the revisers from Bucharest who corrected the text in view of its printing? Interventions of this kind are much too rare to authorize such an assumption.

- b. marginal notes that record additional *sequences* in *Sept. London* compared to *Sept. Frankfurt*. As announced in the foreword, the revision only records what the 1653 edition has, in addition to the earlier version (“acesta [izvorul de la Englitera] nu să potrivia cu cel de la Frangofort, pentru căci pren bogate locuri adăogea și pren bogate locuri lipsiia, nu veniia cu cestalalt; pentru acêea lipsele nu s-au socotit, iar adaosele s-au pus precum vom face doslușirea mai jos cu însemnări”): 3, 8 “Și să ascuseră Adam și muiêrea lui de fața Domnului Dumnedzău în mijlocul (marginal note: *lemnului* [of the wood], cf. *Sept. London*: *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου* vs *Sept. Frankfurt*: *ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου*) raiului” (the critical references present in the footer of the Frankfurt edition record the addition); 6, 3 “Să nu rămîie duhul mieu întru oamenii aceștia (marginal note: *întru vac* [forever], cf. Gr. *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* in *Sept. London*, mentioned in the footer of *Sept. Frankfurt*) pentru că trupuri sîntu ei”; 7, 14 “Și toate jigăniile după fêliu-și și toate dobitoacele după fêliu-și și tot tîrîitoriul ce să clătêște pre pământu după fêliu-și și toată pasărea (marginal note: *zburătoare* [flying], cf. Gr. *πάν ὄρνεον πετεινόν* *Sept. London*, compared to *πάν πετεινόν* *Sept. Frankfurt*) după fêliu-și”; 17, 27 “Și toți bărbații casei lui; și cei născuți în casă (marginal note: *ai lui* [his], cf. Gr. *αὐτοῦ* *Sept. London*, mentioned in the critical apparatus of *Sept. Frankfurt*) și cei cumpărați pre argintu dentru alte fêliuri de limbi”; 28, 13 “Eu (marginal: *sînt* [am], cf. Gr. *ἐγὼ εἰμί* *Sept. London*, compared to *ἐγὼ* *Sept. Frankfurt*) Dumnedzăul lui Avraam, tătine-tău”.
- c. marginal notes that record the *differences between the Greek sources* signalled by means of ‘sile’ signs. It is commonplace that there is no *textus receptus* of the *Septuagint*, since there are differences between its various editions, depending on the versions of the manuscripts underlying them; therefore, the study of the relation between a modern translation of the *Septuagint* and the Greek text should not consider any modern edition, but the source text itself that was used for the translation; otherwise, the comparison may lead to false conclusions¹². The early translators—including those involved in the realisation of the first Romanian version of the *Septuagint*—were aware of this fact, first of all because the reviser reclaims the need to get hold of the Frankfurt edition, the one used by Milescu, for a judicious comparison (he uses the London edition only because he could not find the Frankfurt source and, the moment he finds it, continues the revision on its basis); then, since he does not replace words in the text, but records the differences on the margin. Let us exemplify. In v. 10, 28 “Și Avimeil, și Sovef” (marginal note: *Sava*), the note records a different form of the proper name in *Sept. London*

¹²See, in this respect, Florescu, 2015, p. 24–26.

(Σαβά) compared to **Sept. Frankfurt** (σωβεύ). Different versions of the Greek sources are also visible in v. 11, 8 “Și-i rășchiră (marginal note: *sămănă* [spread, dispersed]) de acoló Domnul preste fața a tot pământul și potoliră a face cetaatea și turnul”; in **Sept. Frankfurt**, the verb *σπειρω* ‘to sow seeds; to plant; to scatter abroad, disperse’ (**Muraoka**; cf. also **Liddell–Scott**: ‘scatter like seed; spread abroad, extend’) is used, while **Sept. London** has *διασπειρω* ‘to disperse, scatter’ (**Muraoka**). The lections in the Greek texts are different; however, this note seems rather to specify the meaning; the limitation is either a misinterpretation, or a choice imposed by tradition (for the role of tradition in the translation of the biblical text, see the chapter *Pentru o reevaluare a literalismului* [For a reassessment of literalism] in **Florescu, 2015**). **B 1688** uses, in this context, the verb *a rășipi* [spread], by means of which the revisers from Bucharest replace, in an inconsistent manner, the dialectal Moldavian form *a rășchira* they find in the text of ms. 45 (**Arvinte, 1988**, p. 54–55). In v. 30, 13 “Și să duse Ruvim, în dzilele sêcerii de grâu, și află miere de mătregună (marginally marked in the text by a ‘silă’ above the last letter of the word; it is the correction –e, proposing thus the version *mătrăgune*) și le aduse la Lia, maica lui”, the marginal note indicates the difference between the Greek sources, which contain the same term (*μανδραγόρας*), in the singular in **Sept. Frankfurt**, but in the plural in **Sept. London**. In v. 36, 13 “Și aceștia-s ficiorii lui Raguil: Nahoth, Zare, Some, Moze. Acesta (marginal note: *aceștia* [these], correcting an error made by the translator) au fostu ficiorii Vasamath (marginal correction marked by an inverse red ‘silă’ above the second vowel: e, indicating the lection *Vasemath*), fiii lui Isav”; it is possible for the form *Vasemath* to be due to a graphic error, because the form in **Sept. Frankfurt** is *Βασμάθ* (cf. also “ficiorii Vasmathii”, **B 1688**; in **Sept. London**: *Βασεμάθ*). In 43, 7 “Au știut-am să (marginal note: *că* [that]) ne va dzice noao”; the marginal note does not contain, as one may believe, a correction by the reviser, but instead records the different version in **Sept. London**: *ἔτι*, as compared to **Sept. Frankfurt**: *εἰ*.

Nevertheless, not all the differences between the Greek sources are signalled. For instance, the verse 30, 16: “Și veni Iacov de la țarină sara și întră (marginal note: *veni* [came]) Lia în timpinarea lui și dzise”. In the position signalled by the marginal note, in **Sept. Frankfurt** the verb *εἰσῆλθε* (from *εἰσέρχομαι* ‘to enter, make entry’) occurs, correctly rendered in ms. 45 by *întră* [entered]. **Sept. London**, however, uses the verb *ἐξῆλθε*, from *ἐξέρχομαι* ‘to exit, depart from a confined place’; ‘to emerge, appear’ (**Muraoka**, who indicates as its antonym precisely the verb present in **Sept. Frankfurt**). Therefore, if the marginal note had been an indication of the different version in the London edition, it should have contained the verb *a ieși* (cf. also **B 1688**: “și ieși Lia întru întimpinarea lui”). The marginal note could have the following explanation: in this verse, the verb *εἰσέρχομαι* also occurs, apart from the mentioned place, in the beginning of the verse, translated in ms. 45 by *veni*; the reviser probably considers that the same Greek verb should have the same equivalent in the Romanian translation.

- d. marginal notes that **correct erroneous translations**: 11, 20 “Și trăi Ragav 139 (marginal note: *132*, cf. Gr. *ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα καὶ δύο*, **B 1688** ρλ ши в, probably an error of the copyist, who misinterpreted в as θ) ani și născu pre Seruh”; 18, 4 “Să iasă (marginal note: *să ia* [to take], cf. Gr. *λαμβάνω*, from *λαμβάνω* ‘to take’; cf. **B 1688**: *să să aducă* [to be brought]; **NETS**: “do let water be taken”) dară apă și să spēle picioarele voastre și vă răcoriți suptu copaci”; 29, 30 “Și vâdzu Domnul Dumnedzău cum să uraște Lia, deșchise zgăul ei; iară Rahil era văduă” (the last word is crossed out in red in the text; marginal note: *stearpă* [barren], cf. Gr. *στειρα*; in fact, as shown in the context, both Lia and Rahil were the wives of Lavan); 36, 13 “Și aceștia-s ficiorii lui Raguil: Nahoth, Zare, Some, Moze. Acesta (marginal note: *aceștia* [these], cf. Gr. *οὔτοι*, just like at the beginning of the verse where it is rendered correctly; perhaps a copying error, not of translation) au fostu ficiorii Vasamath”; 35, 22 “Și fu cîndu sălășlui Iacov (marginal note: *lăcui Israil* [Israel dwelt]) întru pământul acela, mērse Ruvim și dormi cu Valá, țitioarea tătîne-său; și audzi Israil și rău să arătă înaintea lui” (this note remedies an error due probably to the confusion caused by the context, where Iacov and Israil alternate as subjects; the error may belong to the copyist); 40, 13 “Încă 3 dzile și-și va duce aminte faraon de boieria ta și te va pune pre mărimea păharnicilor și vei da păharul lui faraon pre (marginal note: *în* [in], cf. Gr. *εἰς*; **B 1688**: *ἰν*) mîna lui”.

- e. in some cases, the marginal note records a *translation version* considered by the reviser as more appropriate than the Greek source (which does not mean that the translation in the text is wrong). The correction in the text can be grammatical or lexical. The first category comprises situations such as: 4, 2 “Și adaoșe a naște pre fratele lui, pre Ável. Și să făcu Ável păstor de oi, iară Căin lucra (marginal note: *era lucrîndu* [was working]); in the Greek texts, ἦν ἐργαζόμενος, it is possible that the structure in the note be due to the reviser’s desire to be faithful, including at grammar level, to the Greek text; the structure is also preserved in **B 1688**) pămîntul”¹³; 6, 13 “Vrêmea a tot omul vine cătră mine (marginal note: *înaintea mea* [before me], cf. Gr. ἐναντίον μου) pentru că s-au împlut pămîntul de strîmbătate”; 12, 15 “Și o vădzură pre însă boiêrii lui farao și o lăudară (marginal note: *pre ea* [her], marked by a red sign above a dot, which shows that the reviser considered he made there an addition to the text, cf. Gr. ἐπήνεσαν αὐτήν; the direct object expressed by the personal pronoun in third person singular feminine accusative was already expressed in the Romanian text, but before the verb and in an unstressed form; the author of the note also keeps the word order of the Greek text) cătră farao și o adusără pre însă lui farao”; 42, 27 “Și, dezlegîndu unul sacul său să dea iarbă (marginal note: *ierburi* [herbs], cf. Gr. χορτάσματα; **B 1688**: *hrană*) măgarilor săi unde au poposit” (a similar situation occurs a bit lower, in 43, 22 “Și argintu altul am adus cu noi ca să ne cumpărăm de mîncat”, marginal: *bucate*, cf. Gr. βρώματα ‘foodstuff. Used mostly in plural’ —**Muraoka**, s.v.; the reviser notices the plural in the Greek text and he is not pleased with its being rendered by a supine, although the result is semantically correct). A somewhat more complex situation occurs in v. 40, 16 “Și eu am vădzut vis și mi să părea 3 coșnițe de pîini le rădicam pre capul meu” (marginal note: *mă gîndiiam* [I was thinking]). The Greek texts use here the first person singular indicative imperfect middle of οἶμαι ‘to assume as probable’ (**Muraoka**). The reviser probably tried to find a form that was grammatically closer to the source text (i.e., a verb in the first person). Semantically, the form inside the note is not wrong (but merely inadequate to the context; cf. also **B 1688**: *mi să părea*); in Classical Greek, the verb also has the meaning ‘think, suppose, believe’ (**Liddell–Scott**).

Sometimes, the reviser feels the difficulty of trying to reconcile two different linguistic systems. This is the case in v. 35, 3 “Și, sculîndu-vă, să ne suim la Vethil”, where the marginal note suggests the version *sculîndu-ne* [let us arise], in the attempt to find an appropriate personal form in Romanian to express the action of the original impersonal verb (Gr. ἀναστάντες, aorist active participle).

The note does not always respect the grammatical form of the Greek original. For instance, in v. 24, 37 “Să nu iêi fămêie fiului meu den fêtele hananeilor, întu cari eu sîntu prișleț întu pămîntul lor”, the note suggests the equivalence of *înstriinat* [rootless] for *prișleț* [wandering] (considered, most probably, a very restricted term; for this term, **DLR** indicates only occurrences from texts belonging to the northern area of the Daco-Romanian territory, with the exception of the *Book of Psalms* from Alba-Iulia), although the source text has, in this place, a verb in present indicative, first person singular (cf. also *eu sălășluiesc* [I dwell] in **B 1688**).

Other attempts to find appropriate versions for the source text are visible in the contexts: 9, 17 “Acesta iaste sămnul făgăduinței carele am tocmit (marginal note: *pus* [put]) întu mijlocul meu și întu mijlocul a tot trupul carele iaste pre pămîntu” (the verb in the source, Gr. τίθεμι, means ‘to put, set, place’; the reviser prefers to provide an equivalent, through a verb with a broader meaning); in a similar context: 17, 7 “Și vom întări (marginal note: *voi pune* [I will put]) făgăduința mea întu mijlocul tău și întu mijlocul săminției tale după tine”, the same verb *a pune* is preferred by the reviser to render Gr. ἵστημι ‘to stand firm; to stand still; to place’ (the note is mixed: it also contains a morphological correction; in the Greek text, the verb is in the first person singular, not plural; **B 1688**: *voi întări*); 15, 17 “Iară după ce fu soarele cătră apus, pară să făcu și iată, cuptor afumîndu-să, și făclii de foc carele au

¹³**Frâncu** (2009, p. 306), citing also the example of this verse from **B 1688**, shows that the structure named by him “imperfect perifrastic” [periphrastic imperfect] is not an *ad hoc* creation, even though in the Greek text there is an equivalent structure, because such constructions are also to be found in non-translated texts, and that translations from Slavonic and Greek contributed to the stabilization of this imperfect form inherited from Latin (see also **Frâncu**, 1983–1984, p. 29).

petrecut pentru acêstea împărțituri” (marginal note: *despicături* [halves] the note clarifies the Greek term *διχοτόμημα* ‘part of a thing cut in two; any portion of a thing cut up’, suggesting an equivalent more suited to the context, also regarded as such by the revisers of **B 1688**, which also uses *despicături*. **Muraoka** explains: “pieces of sacrificial animal”, referring to this very context); 23, 17 “Și iaste țarina (marginal note: *satul* [village]) lui Efron carea era întru peșterea cea îndoită, carele iaste de cătră fața Mamvrî, țarina și peșterea carea era întru ea” (the note suggests another equivalent for Gr. *ἀγρός*; for the *Septuagint*, **Muraoka** only attests the meanings ‘1. field for agricultural cultivation, 2. area of land outside of settled area’, although in classical Greek it also means ‘sat’, cf. **Liddell–Scott**, s.v.; **B 1688** also preserves the term *țarină*, cf. “the field of Ephron” **NETS**); 32, 31 “Și răsări soarele cîndu trecu chipul (marginal note: *videniia* [apparition]) lui Dumnedzău” (the note suggests a different equivalent for Gr. *εἶδος* ‘form, shape’, also present under 32, 30, context in which ms. 45 uses *vidêrea*). In v. 50, 11 “Și vădzură lăcuitarii pămîntului Hanaan plîngerea la ariia lui Atad și dziseră: «Plîngere mare aceasta iaste eghiptênilor». Pentru acêea au numit numele locului acelaia Plîngerea Eghiptênilor (marginal note: *Eghiptului* [of Egypt])”; probably because of the context, the translator renders the syntagm *πένθος αἰγύπτου* erroneously; the note indicates the correct translation.

f. *other situations*

A few marginal notes contain notations that cannot be explained by the Greek sources (some of them cannot be explained by any source). In the context of v. 24, 47 “Și-i puș cerceii pre brațul (marginal note: *urechile* [ears]) ei și brățările pre mînule ei”, the sequence “pre brațul ei” correctly translating Gr. *ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονα αὐτῆς*, present, as the critical apparatus of the Frankfurt edition indicate, only in some versions of the *Septuagint*; it is missing from **Sept. London**. Neither **Vulg. Antwerp**, nor **Ostrog Bible** justifies the presence of the noun *urechile* [ears] here; it is likely that it was dictated to the annotator by the context (by association with the earrings). In v. 29, 2 “Și vède, și iată fintînă în cîmpu”, the verb *vède* correctly translates Gr. *ὄρᾶ*, third person singular present indicative from *ὄρω* (cf. also **B 1688**: *vède*); the variant *vedea* is noted marginally, and it could be explained by **Vulg. Antwerp** (*vidit*) or by **Ostrog Bible** (*οὐζρηκε*, cf. *văzu* ms. 4389). In v. 36, 39 “Și împărăți pentru el Arad, ficiorul lui Varad”, there is a sign marked above the toponym *Arad*, which is not explained on the margin. The annotator might have intended to mark in this way the fact that the name occurs, in other versions of the vetero-testamentary text, in another form, *Adar* (**Vulg. Antwerp**) or *Adad* (**Ostrog Bible**; cf. also ms. 4389). In *Fac*, 37, 10 “Și-l zavistuiră pre însul frații lui, iară tată-său au păzit (marginal note: *socotit*) cuvîntul” [*heeded* the word], the verb *a păzi* translates Gr. *διατηρέω*, glossed by **Muraoka**, in this context, by ‘to retain in memory’, but which also has the meaning ‘to have in one’s care temporarily’; the marginal note can be explained by a resort to the *Vulgate*: *considerabat* (cf. also ms. 4389: *socotiia*). In turn, in 11, 14 “Și trăi Cainan 130 ani și născu (marginal addition marked by a ‘silă’: *șie*) pre Sală”, the marginal note cannot be explained by a recourse to the declared or plausible sources; it is possible for the annotator to have been influenced by the context, since there are multiple phrases with the same structure, some containing a pronoun in the Dative (cf. 11, 11 “Și trăi Sim după ce au născut *șie* pre Arfaxad”; 11, 13 “Și trăi Arfaxadu după ce *i* să născu Cainan”, etc.).

2.1.3. *Marginal notes concerning the relation of the text with the linguistic norm*

a. *glosses marking the differences between the dialectal or individual norms*

The history of the text in ms. 45 indicates the fact that it contains the traces of a confrontation between two linguistic norms, the one from Moldova, of the translator, and the one from Walachia, the linguistic norm of the copyist (and, maybe, of a second reviser). This is visible including in some marginal notes, by means of which marked terms or grammatical elements or even elements that are less familiar to the annotator are replaced; to these are added elements the annotator was aware of, since they circulated throughout the entire Daco-Romanian territory, but which he replaces with more common or less folkloric elements. A few examples: 3, 24 “și pusă heruvimii și sabiia cea de pară (marginal note: *văpaie* [flame])” (with the exception of **Coresi’s Evangelhia învătătoare**, **DLR** indicates, for the term

pară, attestations from northern texts; moreover, in parallel contexts, Dosoftei's and the rhotacizing books of Psalms contain this noun, while the *Book of Psalms* of Alba-Iulia has *văpaie*); 29, 2 "Și vede și iată fîntînă (marginal note: *puț* [well]) în cîmpu" (according to **DLR**, *puț* [well] is frequent in the texts from Walachia dating back to the period, but it also appears in Dosoftei's *Molitvenic* and in *Parimiile preste an*, including in the toponymic phrase *Puțul Giurămîntului*); 32, 25 "Și vădzu cum nu poate și să atinse de lățimea stinghei lui și amorți lățimea stînghei (marginal note: *coapsei* [of the thigh]) lui Iacov întru cît să lupta el cu însul" (the annotator probably considers *stînghe* to be too regional; the noun also occurs frequently in Dosoftei's texts); "Întră tu și toată casa ta în săcriiu" (marginal note: *raclă* [coffin]; for *sicriu*, **DLR** records the meaning 'ladă' [crate, box], attested at Varlaam, Dosoftei, etc., therefore in the northern areas); 40, 11 "Și păharul lui faraon în mîna mea; și luai poama (marginal note: *strugurul* [the grape])" (according to **DLR**, the noun *poamă* meaning 'strugure' [grape] is specific to the region of Moldavia); 37, 30 "Și, luîndu haina lui Iosif, au junghiat un iedu de capră și imară (marginal note: *întinară* [tainted]) haina cu sîngele" (the glossed verb, *a ima*, translates Gr. *μολύνω* 'to make physically dirty', cf. *unseră* **B 1688**; both **DLR** and **TDRG** indicate Dosoftei's texts as the first occurrences of this verb and its derived forms *imat*, *imăciune* in the literary language, and the verb *a ima* does not occur in Milescu's known writings, which indicates that its presence in the text may be due to Dosoftei, who is not the author of the marginal glosses); 24, 37 "Să nu iei fămêie fiului mieu den fetele hananeilor, întru cari eu sîntu prișleț (marginal: *înstriinat* [wanderer, stranger]) întru pămîntul lor" (for *prișleț*, **DLR** only indicates attestations in the northern texts, starting with *Codicele Voronețean* [The Codex of Voroneț]); 32, 23 "Și luă pre înșii și trecu puhoiul (marginal note: *pîriul* [the stream]) și trecu toate ale lui și rămase Iacov sîngur" (the glossed term renders Gr. *χειμάρρους* 'winter-flowing', equivalated to *wadi* by Muraoka in this context—*wadi* being a valley that gets flooded only as a consequence of abundant rainfall—; for *puhoi*, **DLR** indicates, for the 17th century, attestations only from Moldavia); 35, 8 "Și muri Dévorra, mamca (marginal note: *doica*) Revécăi" (*mamca* translates Gr. *τροφός* 'wet-nurse'; according to **DLR**, the noun *mamcă*, of Ukrainian origin, is specific to the region of Moldavia, as shown by parallel contexts from *Pravila Moldovei* and the *Pravila* of Govora, which contain *mamce* and *doice*, respectively; cf. *doica* **B 1688**). In v. 43, 27 "Sănătos iaste tatăl vostru cel bătrîn, carele ați dzis cum custă (marginal note: *trăiește* [lives])?", the note explains a term that circulated in the second half of the 17th century in Moldavia, Banat, Southeastern Transylvania, Crișana (**Arvinte**, 1988, p. 85); in ms. 45 it is used seven times (*Gen*, 43, 27; *Dan*, 12, 7; *Job*, 21, 7; 27, 15; *2Par*, 23, 11; *3Kgs*, 1, 25; *Ps*, 48, 8), and is glossed by *trăiește* [lives] in only two places (here and in *3Kgs*).

In v. 47, 9 "Dzilele anilor vieții mèle carele prișleşescu (marginal note: *lăcuiesc* [live, dwell]), 130 ani; mici și rèle s-au făcut dzilele anilor vieții mèle, n-au agiunsu la dzilele anilor vieții părinților miei care dzile au prișleșit (marginal note: *au lăcuit* [lived, dwelled])", both notes are marked by black 'sile', and the writing belongs to a different hand. The verb *a prișleși* in the text correctly renders Gr. *παροικέω*, '1. to live in the proximity of...; 2. to stay as (short term) resident alien; to dwell (in general)'; for the second meaning, **Muraoka** mentions the context of 47, 9 as probably being a literal translation of the Hebrew original, which means 'j'ai passé sur la terre', cf. *Bible d'Alexandrie*. **DLR** indicates, for *a prișleși*, the meaning 'a se stabili în altă parte; a se strămuta, a se înstrăina' [to move to a different place], attested only in **B 1688**. In the manuscript, the verb *a prișleși* occurs nine times (in the books of *Genesis* and *Exodus* alone), the only glosses being those mentioned above; other terms in the same lexical family are *prișleț* (12 occurrences only in the *Pentateuch*) and *prișleşenie* (6 occurrences in the books of *Genesis* and *Exodus* alone). In **B 1688**, the verb in question is replaced by *a locui*, *a se sălășlui* [to live, to dwell] or, as in the case of 47, 9, *a nemernici*. An interesting observation—from the point of view of the relation between the two texts (*ms. 45* and **B 1688**)—is that *a prișleși* appears in the printed text in contexts where, in *ms. 45*, we have an equivalent verb (cf. *Jgs*, 5, 17, *a nemernici* in *ms. 45*; *1Par*, 5, 26, *a înmuta*, glossed *înstriina*, in *ms. 45*; *1Par*, 9, 1, *a înstriina* in *ms. 45*), which shows that the research regarding the relation between the two texts is only incipient, and the issue can only be settled by an exhaustive comparison. It is noteworthy that the Wallachian translation in

ms. 4389 does not contain any of the terms in question.

In the context of v. 48, 1 “Și fu după cuvintele acêstea și să porînci lui Iosif că tată-său să dodăiêște (marginal note: *bîntuiêște*)”, by a *dodei*, the translator tries to render Gr. *ἐνοχλέω* ‘1. to annoy; 2. pass. to be ill’; Muraoka indicates, for this context, the second meaning (the Greek verb is here in the present indicative, passive voice); cf. “Your father is ill” **NETS**; “ægrotaret pater suus” **Vulg. Antwerp**; “tată-său slăbêște” ms. 4389. It seems that the translator did not identify correctly the contextual meaning and transposed it erroneously by a *dodei* ‘a necăji’ [trouble], also used by **B 1688**. Even stranger is the marginal note, which suggests the verb *a bîntui*, for which Scriban’s dictionary indicates the meaning ‘a vătămă’ [to harm], while Cihac’s gives ‘a necăji’ [to bother]. The verb in question has 22 occurrences in ms. 45 (without being confined to a certain part of the text), but only in the Pentateuch is it glossed consistently (by *a mînia*, *a supăra*, *a bîntui* under *Num*, 14, 11, where *a bîntui* updates the meaning ‘a supăra’); similarly, the noun *dodeială* appears 10 times in the text, glossed in the first two books by *învăluială*, *îngustare*, and in *Sir*, 2, 1 by *bîntuială*. These observations would indicate the existence of a fracture, between the *Pentateuch* (or rather the first part, up to *1Par*) and the second part, not only with regards to the sources of revision (as explained in the preface), but also to the treatment of regionalisms¹⁴.

Although we are not talking about a confrontation between literary dialects, but rather about a confrontation between two individual norms, we will recall here the situation in v. 21, 27 “Și luă Avraam oi și vițai și dède lui Aviméleh; și au făgăduit amîndoi făgăduință”, where *făgăduință* [covenant] is explained by *făgăduire* [promise].

The construction formed of the interjection *ia* and the second person imperative or the first person present plural of the verb *a îmbla* [to walk] is used in Dosoftei’s texts to express the urge (meaning ‘hai, haideți’ [let’s]). It also occurs in ms. 45, where N.A. Ursu considers it an argument for the paternity of the Moldavian metropolitan over the revision of Milescu’s translation (*apud Arvinte*, 1988, p. 80); nevertheless, constructions of this kind were not frequent at the time (they are not recorded in *Gramatica limbii române* by C. Frâncu, who only talks about forms of the type *blăm*, *blați*). In ms. 45, they are explained marginally by forms of the verb *a veni* [to come]: 37, 12 “Nu frații tăi pascu la Sihem? Ia-mblă (marginal note: *veno*) și te voi trimite cătră înșii” (the sequence is equivalent to Gr. *δεῦρο*, which has here the role of an interjection, meaning ‘let’s, come’); 37, 19 “Acum, dară, ia-mblați (marginal note: *veniți*) să-l omorîm pre el și să-l aruncăm într-una de gropi”.

The subordinating conjunction *să* ‘dacă’ [if], about which Frâncu (2009, p. 334) says that towards the middle of the 17th century it was met especially in texts representing the northern dialects, in the south predominating *de* (idea exemplified by parallel contexts from Varlaam’s *Cazania* and the subsequent homilies from Muntenia) is often glossed by *de* (sometimes with a hard *d*, specific to Muntenia: *dă*): 38, 17 “Și ea dzise: «Să (marginally, marked by a “silă” above the consonant *s*, note *d*, implying the version *dă*) vei da arravon pînă vei trimite»”; 42, 20 “Și pre fratele vostru cel mai tînăr să-l aduceți la mine și să vor încrède cuvintele voastre, iară să (marginal note: *de*) nu, veți muri” (similarly: 43, 3; 43, 5).

b. glosses of Greek loans

The Greek loans, taken directly from the translated text, are explained marginally: 14, 6 “Și pre horei, pre cei den Munții Siir pînă la tereminthos (marginal note: *stăjari* [oaks]; cf. Gr. *τερεμίνθος*) a i Faran”; 20, 14 “Și luă Aviméleh 1000 de didrahmi (marginal note: *feali bani* [type of money]; cf. Gr. *διδραχμον*) și boi și vițai, slugi, slujnice”.

c. corrections concerning the text morphology or writing technique: 42, 2 “Pogorîți acoló și cumpărați noă de acoló puțini (marginal note: *puține* [few]) bucate pentru ca să trăim și să nu murim”; 41, 22 “Și iată, ca cîndu are fi 7 spice să suia dentru o rădăcină, plini și buni (marginal correction *e*, marked by

¹⁴There is also an inconsistency at the graphic level, concerning the notation of the vowels *ă* and *î*; if up to 3Rg the character *z* is used with both values, from 4Rg onwards there is a consistent rendering of *ă* by *z* and of *î* by *z*.

a ‘vrahie’ sign (˘) above the last characters of the words *plini* and *buni*, suggesting the lections: *pline* [full], *bune* [good]; in this case, the translation preserves the gender of the adjectives in the original, masculine plural); 2, 14 “Și riul al treilea – Tigris; acesta ce mergea înaintea (marginal note: *înainte* [forward]) în preajma Assiriilor”; 6, 16 “Și ușa săcristului o vei face den coaste, cu beciuri dedesuptu, cu doăă rînduri de podină și cu 3 rînduri îl vei face pri-nsu (written $\pi\rho\iota\epsilon\text{c}\delta$; marginal note: $\pi\rho\epsilon\text{c}\delta$)”. Other notes repeat words that are not clearly written in the text (9, 24; 29, 27; 29, 32).

2.1.4. Marginal or text markers

In some cases, a certain word in the text is marked by the special signs “sile”, repeated on the margin but with no explanation. In v. 6, 16 “Și tot adunîndu-l vei face săcristul”, the coordinating conjunction does not correspond to the Greek sources (cf. also **B 1688**: “Adunîndu-l vei face sicristul”), but only to the Slavonic text; perhaps this is exactly what the annotator wants to indicate. In v. 35, 13 “Sui-să Dumnedzău de la însul, dentru locul carele au grăit cu însul”, on the last syllable of the preposition *dentru* there is a “silă”, which is repeated on the margin without any further explanations; it may well be that the annotator does not agree with rendering the preposition in Gr. *ἐκ*, in this context, by *dentru*, but rather by *den* (which would explain why only the last part of the word is marked); a similar situation occurs under 9, 15.

2.2. Marginal notes in the *Book of Job*

We also considered the inventory of marginal notes in this book in order to see whether we can identify here the same types of notes as in the first book of the *Pentateuch*. In the *Book of Job* (which in ms. 45 has 23 pages, from p. 422 to p. 444) there are 93 marginal notes that can be classified as follows:

2.2.1. Notes sending back to the biblical hypertext

In the *Book of Job* there are 37 notes that mark biblical references: in other books, inside the same book, or mixed. However, we cannot find here marginal biblical comments or indications regarding the messianic excerpts; summarising indications are to be found in the manuscript only up to the fourth book of the *Pentateuch*.

2.2.2. Marginal notes on the relation of the text with the sources

a. notes that mark translation or copying omissions:

- written by the same hand and marked by the system announced in the foreword (“silă” with a dot underneath, in red) or simply by means of multiple “sile”: 1, 3 “Și era dobitoacele lui oi 7000, cămile 3000, părechi de boi 500, măgărițe (marginal note: *păscătoare* [grazing], cf. Gr. *βομῳδες*) 500”; 1, 7 “Împregiurînd pămîntul și îmblînd (marginal note: *cea* [the one], cf. Gr. *τὴν ὑπὸ ὀρφάνων*) pre supt cer, sînt de față”; 6, 27 “Fără numai că pre sărăimani (marginal note: *cădeți și* [fall and]) vă săltați preste prietenul vostru”; 7, 10 “Nici să va mai întoarce la a sa (here, the sequence *a sa* [his], probably omitted, was filled in above the line of text and then repeated in a more clear way on the margin) casă”; 31, 22 “Să să dăspărță, dară, umărul meu dentru încheietură și brațul meu (marginal note: *din cot* [from the elbow]) să să surpe”; 31, 25 “Sau de m-am veselit făcîndu-mi-să avuție multă, sau de am pus (marginal note: *și* [and], equivalent to a *δέ* that remained untranslated) mîna mea și preste cei nenumărați”;
- by another hand: 17, 11 “Zilele mele trecură cu alergare și să rumpseră (marginal note, written by another hand and in another ink: *mădulările* [the limbs]) inimii mele”; 22, 9 “Și văduile le-ai trimis deșarte (marginal note by another hand: “și pre sirmani i-ai chinuit” [and you mistreated orphans]); 27, 5 “Nu-mi fie (marginal note by another hand: *mie* [to me]) drepti pre voi a răspunde”; 28, 6 “Locul samfirului – pietrele lui; și lutul – aurului (marginal note by another hand: *lui* [his]); 33, 21 “Pînă unde să vor putrezi lui pielîtele și va dovedi (marginal note: *oasele* [the bones], omission of the copyist) lui deșarte”.

In 32, 20 “Grăi-voi, pentru ca să mă odihnesc dășchidzînd budzele” (marginal note written by another hand: *mêle* [my]), the addition does not follow **Sept. Frankfurt** (where there is no pronoun; cf.

deșchizînd buzele **B 1688**), but can only be justified by the use of the *Vulgate*: “labia mea” or the **Ostrog Bible** (*oycma cu*), cf. “și-mi voiu deșchide gura” ms. 4389.

- b. notes that **mark an element that does not exist in the translated Greek text**. Some ‘additional’ sequences compared to the source come, in fact, from the attempt to reconcile the two linguistic systems, the language of the source text and the target language; these are framed by semi-brackets (in the first part of the text, this marking was used to indicate the sequences that are in addition in **Sept. London** as compared to **Sept. Frankfurt**) and their presence is indicated marginally by a sign (“silă”); other sequences that are not present in the Greek text can be explained by the use of other sources (the Latin and the Slavonic text). Examples: 11, 13 “Pentru că tu, dă ai fi pus curată inima ta și să verși mîinile [*tale*] cătră el” (cf. “cum manus tuus” **Vulg. Antwerp**, *pyyрb ceou Ostrog Bible*); 14, 5 “Măcară și o zi [*va fi*] viața omului pre pămînt”, situație similară la 34, 26; 24, 16 “Săpat-au întru întunêrec casă; dzua au pecetluit pre sine și n-au cunoscut lumină” (the conjunction is absent from the Greek text, but present in the Latin one). In v. 38, 38 “Și iaste răvârsat ca pămîntul cu pulberea, și l-am lipit pre el ca pre o piatră cu patru muchi [*de piatră*]”, the expression between square semi-brackets is marked by “sile” repeated marginally, without any other explanations; the notation indicates the fact that the sources do not justify the repetition of this noun.

- c. marginal notes that **correct wrong translations**: 2, 9 “Și tu sîngur întru putrejune a viermilor ședzi, mîind descoperit, și eu – rătăcită și slujnică, loc den loc împregiurînd și den casă în casă, așteptînd soarele cînd va apune, pentru ca să mă odihnesc de ostenêlele mêle și de durori carele astădzi (marginal note: *acum* [now], cf. Gr. *νῦν*; all possible versions contain the interpretation “acum” [now], not “astăzi” [today]) pre mine mă țin”. In v. 39, 15 “Și au uitat că piciorul va răsîpi și jiganiile cîmpului vor (marginal note: *va* [will]) călca”, the note corrects the version in the text according to the translated Greek source. The question is: why does the plural appear in the verse? Of the consulted sources, only some versions of the *Vulgate* (others than **Vulg. Antwerp**) have here the plural *conterant*. Of the Romanian texts, **B 1688** takes the plural from ms. 45, also kept, in turn, by the *Bible* of Samuil Micu. Either the translator (or copyist) of the ms. 45 uses the plural under the influence of the context, or the text also has a Latin source, other than **Vulg. Antwerp**.

Not all the translation/copying errors are corrected. For instance, in v. 27, 18 “Nu să istovi casa lui ca niște molii și ca niște păianjini” the negation cannot be justified by any of the sources (neither by the Greek, nor by the Latin or Slavonic versions) and it is not corrected. Cf. **B 1688**: „Și să va istovi casa lui ca niște molii”; **ms. 4389**: „Și casa lui se va umplea ca de molii”.

- d. marginal notes recording **translation versions** that are more appropriate in relation to the source. In v. 13, 8 “Au veți îndoii? Voi și voi (marginal note: *aceștia* [these]) judecători vă faceți”, the personal pronoun *voi* equals two different Greek pronouns: *σύ* and *αὐτός*, in the sequence *ὑμεῖς καὶ αὐτοί*. Probably the translator was confused by the particle *καὶ* and wanted to respect the word order of the original. Cf. **B 1688**: “Voi și înșivă” (wrongly transcribed in the 1988 edition issued by the Patriarchy: “voiși înșivă”). In v. 24, 20 “Și ca o ceață a roaăi nevăzută s-au făcut. Și să deade lui carele au poftit (marginal note: *făcut* [done]), și să zdrobască tot strîmbul, atocma cu un lemnu nevindecăt”, the gloss mentions the suitable contextual meaning of Gr. *πράσσω* ‘to do’ (**Muraoka**), cf. also **B 1688** *au făcut*. In Classical Greek, *πράσσω* also has the meaning ‘to obtain, demand’ (**Liddell–Scott**), which the translator renders here, though it is not suitable in this context (cf. also **NETS**: “may what he did be paid back to him”). In v. 39, 1 “Dă ai cunoscut vrêmea nașterii pietrii țapcerbului (the version *țapcerbilor* is suggested on the margin, by replacing the last two syllables of the word)? Și ai păzit chinurile cerbilor?”, the note corrects the text according to the version of the *Septuagint*, in which the plural is present (but the critical apparatus of **Sept. Frankfurt** also mentions versions with the singular form). **B 1688** exactly reproduces the text of ms. 45, subsequently corrected in *Biblia Micu* (*cerbilor*). In 33, 28 “Mîntuiește sufletul meu, ca să nu viu la pierire (marginal note: *stricăciune* [perdition]), și viața mea lumină va vedea”, the note suggests a translation alternative for Gr. *διαφθορά* ‘ruining, destruction; instrument of ruin; abode of the dead’ (**Muraoka**), ‘destruction, ruin’ (**Liddell–**

Scott); **B 1688** preserves the version *peire* [perdition]. In v. 5, 23 “Căci cu pietrele cîmpului (marginal note: *țarenii* [of the land]) – făgăduința ta, și jiganiile țarenii vor împăca ție”, the annotator probably remedies what he considers to be an unfaithful rendering of the text; the nouns *cîmp* and *țarină*, in the genitive, are two different rendering of the same adjective, Gr. *ἀγριος* ‘living in the fields, wild, savage’. A similar situation is recorded in 8, 9, where *mreață* is glossed by *cursă* [trap], because in the preceding verse *mreață* had already been used to render a different Greek word.

In 7, 8 “Nu mă va mai vedea ochiul celui ce mă vede, ochii tăi – întru mine, și nu voi mai fi” (marginal note: *încă mai sînt* [I still am]), the note indicates the correct version as compared to the *Septuagint*, where the sequence *οὐκ ἔτι εἶμι* occurs. The presence of the future tense in the text could be explained by the influence of the *Vulgate*. Also by comparison with the Greek original, we could explain the note in v. 9, 5 “Cela ce vechêste munții și nu știu; cel ce-i surpă pre înși cu mînie (marginal note: *urgie* [wrath], cf. Gr. *ὀργή*). In 27, 7 “Însă nu, ce fie neprietenii miei ca surparea celor necurați (marginal note: *necredincioși* [unfaithful])”, the note suggests a more precise equivalence of Gr. *ἀσεβής* ‘ungodly, impious’.

The reverse situation is met in v. 29, 6: “Cînd să vărsa căile mîle cu unt și munții miei să vărsa (marginal note: *turna* [poured]) cu lapte”; the Greek text uses the same verb (*χέω* ‘to pour, shed; spread’, **Muraoka**) in both positions translated consistently by *a vărsa* [to spill] in the text of ms. 45 (and also in **B 1688**). **Ostrog Bible** uses the same verb in both positions (*ὀβλυωαμι*), rendered by *a vărsa* in ms. 4389. Conversely, the *Vulgate* uses *lavabam* and *fundebat* (‘to wash; to wet, moisten’, but also ‘to pour’, **OLD**). Either the annotator in ms. 45 intended to achieve variation, or he had in view the Latin model.

The solutions suggested in the marginal notes are not always correct. Thus, in v. 33, 27 “Și apoi, atuncea va trimite om, el șie dzicînd: În ce fêl făcea (marginal note: *trimetea* [was sending])!”, the first verb (*va trimite* [will send]) is probably the result of a copying error, because in the *Septuagint* one has *ἀποπέμπεται* “va mustra” (in **Vulg. Antwerp**, *respiciet*, cf. also ms. 4389: “Va bănui omul însuși pre sine”, **B 1688** “atuncea să va huli omul însuș luiș”). In turn, the second verb is rendered correctly in the text from a lexical point of view (Gr. *συντελέω* ‘to complete, finish; to make an end, destroy; to perpetrate’, *a face* in ms. 45), but not from a grammatical one (in the Greek text it is in the first person singular, translated in Romanian as *făcea*). The marginal note reiterates the grammatical error, but it cannot be justified as a rendering option either; perhaps it is redacted under the influence of the error in the first part of the verse. In **B 1688**, the grammatical error is corrected: “în ce fêl făceam”.

e. *other cases*

The variants suggested in some marginal notes are not justified if we compare them to the sources mentioned in the *Foreword to readers*. In 1, 1 “Om oarecare era în țara Avsitidei, căruia numele Iov”, the proper name *Avsitida* is taken from Gr. *Ἀβσῆτις* (cf. “the land of Ausitis” **NETS**) with the dative ending, to which is added the Romanian genitive ending. The marginal note (*-ditei*) suggests the replacement of the last two syllables of the word, suggesting the sequence *Avsiditei*. The *d* variation is not replaced in the Greek sources, and the Latin and Slavonic traditions suggest, in referring to the respective country, the name *Hus* (cf. ms. 4389: “Era un bărbat în țara Husului”). The only place we met the form with *d* instead of *t* is the critical edition of the Slavonic *Parimejnik* (Zdenka Rivarova, Zoe Hauptova, *Grigorovicev Parimejnik*, 1. Tekst s criticiki aparat, Skopje, 1998), which records (p. 69^v) such forms in some of the manuscripts (but *Avsitidii* in *Parimiile preste an*). Perhaps the metathesis proposed by the annotator is based on a known previous version (not necessarily Romanian) of the *Book of Job*.

In 9, 2 “Căci cum va fi drept pămînteanul (Gr. *βροτός* ‘human being, mortal’, antonym: *ἀτάναθος* or *θεός*, cf. **Liddell–Scott**; marginal note: *omul*) lîngă Domnul?”, the note may be justified by the influence of the Latin text (which has *homo*; cf. also ms. 4389: *omul*); in general, for expressing mortality, Romanian texts use the noun *pămîntean* (cf. also *Parimiile preste an*, III, 95^v, where *peminteanii* is used to render Gr. *vroti*—written in Cyrillic script—from the hymn reproduced in parallel).

No source justifies the annotation in v. 31, 30 “Bine-i să audză, dară, urêchea blăstămîl meu și să mă

povestesc, dară, de cătră nărodul (marginal note, written by another person: *Domnul* [The Lord]) mieu chinuindu-mă”; the term in the comment does not occur either in later edition or in parallel texts. Probably the note is the result of confusion, an erroneous interpretation of the context.

2.2.3. Marginal notes on the relation of the text with the linguistic norm

- a. **glosses marking the differences between the dialectal or individual norms:** 6, 26 “Pentru că nu de la voi vîrtute cer, nice certarea (Gr. *ἐλεγχος* ‘act of questioning; that which deserves open criticism’; marginal note: *mustrarea* [reprimand]) voastră cuvintele mēle vor înceta” (cf. also B 1688, ms. 4389 *mustrarea*); 16, 13 “Puseră-mă ca un străjar (marginal note: *strajnic* [guard]), încungiură-mă cu fușturi, lovind întru mușchii miei” (according to DLR, *străjer* is attested especially in texts from Moldavia, while *strajnic* occurs in texts from Muntenia); 28, 12 “Și înțelepția (marginal: *înțelepciunea*) de unde s-au aflat”; 30, 30 “Și piēlea mea s-au ucis tare și oasele mēle să ojojiră de arșiță” (marginal note: *arsură* [burn]); 41, 16 “Inima lui iaste înfiptă ca o piatră și stă ca un ilău (marginal note: *o năcovalnă* [an anvil]) nerăsărit”.
- b. **corrections concerning the text morphology or writing technique:** 12, 16 “Dă va opri apa, va usca pămîntul; iar de o va slobodzi, au pierdut pre el zdrobindu-l” (the sequence “pre el” is repeated marginally, as it is poorly written in the text); 18, 21 “Preste însă au suspinat cei de apoi, iară (marginal note: *pre*) cei dentii ii cuprinse minune” (the note is a clear marking of the direct object; a similar situation occurs in 24, 1); 29, 2 “Cine m-are (marginal note: *m-ar*) pune pre lună înaintea dzilelor căroră Dumnedzău m-au cruțat” (Frâncu, 2009, p. 316, shows that the innovation *ar* first occurs in Wallachia in the 17th century, and only in the next century does it spread in the rest of the territory; therefore, a form perceived as regional is being replaced here); 31, 38 “De au suspinat pămîntul vreodinioară asupra-mi sau de rozoarele ei (marginal note: *lui* [his]; in the Greek text, the pronoun is in the feminine) au plînsu toate odată” (a similar situation occurs under 31, 39); 39, 13 “Aripa celor ce să veselesc neclasa, să (marginal note: *dă*) va zemisli asida și nessa?”.

2.2.4. Marginal or text markers (without further explanations)

41, 16 “Inima lui iaste înfiptă ca o piatră”; 34, 26 “Și au stinsu pre cei necurați și văzuți înaintea lui [sînt]”; they indicate the presence of an additional element in the Romanian text compared to the Greek source.

3. Conclusions

The present study started from two premises: the confusing textual history of the first Romanian translation of the *Old Testament* in the version of the *Septuagint* (available in Romania in a revised version contained in ms. 45 at the Library of the Cluj Branch of the Romanian Academy), and the fact that the marginal notes of this text, which have not been studied exhaustively so far, could provide information of the stages involved in constituting the text. Considering the *Foreword to readers* and the statement on the existence of a discontinuity in consulting the Greek sources while conducting this revision, we chose to compare the marginal notes in the *Book of Genesis* and in the *Book of Job*, following the typology of the marginal notes, their marking in the text, any possible clues regarding the identity of the annotator.

Several types of notes are announced in the foreword to the manuscript (additions, biblical references, the indication of the various versions in other sources, comments); also, the graphical signs used for marking the notes are decoded, proving the existence of a coherent and relatively consistent graphical system. The study of the inventory of marginal notes in the biblical books mentioned has shown that there are notes that also fulfil other functions besides the ones recalled.

We identified three important categories of marginal notes: notes sending back to the biblical system, notes on the relation with the sources of the translation (sources that are declared or not), notes that are aimed at the differences between the linguistic norms (the glosses as such). To this is added what we called ‘markings’, that is, the marginal presence of some graphic signs marking the existence of a problem in a certain context, without any other indications.

The three important types of marginal notes are present in both biblical books discussed in the present study. In the *Book of Genesis*, the first type is present in the biblical references (to other biblical books or to the same book, by means of the indications *up / down*), the summarising-orientation indications, an ample biblical comment, the marking of the excerpts with a messianic interpretation; the *Book of Job* contains only the category of biblical references, confirming what is said in the foreword (that at the beginning of the translation, Milescu inserted more notes on the margin of the translated text, but he abandoned this practice on the way); the summarizing notes and the messianic indications are to be found only in the first four books of the *Pentateuch*.

The marginal notes on the relation of the text in ms. 45 and the sources of the translation (the two editions of the *Septuagint*, the one from Frankfurt, 1597, indicated as the source of the translation and revision from the first *Book of Chronicles* onward, and the one from London, 1653, indicated as the source used by the reviser until the first *Book of Chronicles*; the *Ostrog Bible*, 1581, an edition of the Vulgate) included in the *Book of Genesis* refer to: omissions of the translator or the copyist; additional sequences in the London *Septuagint* compared to the Frankfurt edition; different versions in the two Greek texts; corrections of erroneous translations; the attempt to adapt the Romanian text to the Greek source at lexical or grammatical (morphological) level. In the *Book of Job*, where *Sept. Frankfurt* is also used for the revision, references to another edition of the text of the *Septuagint* are missing, as the marginal notes are aimed solely at the conformity with the only Greek source: omissions, elements present in the ms. 45, without a corresponding element in the source (conjunctions, copulas), erroneous translations, versions that are closer to the source from a lexical or morphological point of view.

The third category of marginal notes, present in both biblical books, results from the confrontation between the different regional linguistic norms; these are actual glosses (replacement with a lexical or grammatical regionalism specific to the northern area of the Daco-Romanian territory, enjoying broader circulation or specific to Wallachia; the translation of Greek loans or the Hebrew words taken from the *Septuagint*) or morphological or writing corrections.

We also noticed the fact that in both biblical books there are both notes written by the same hand—the same handwriting as in the text—and notes written by a different hand, subsequent to the copying work of Dumitru of Cîmpulung; the latter have a strong character specific to Wallachia. Perhaps their comprehensive study—at lexical level or at the level of textual insertion—could bring insight into the identity of the reviser. Moreover, we noticed the fact that many notes explain a word specific to Moldova by a word specific to Wallachia, which points to the fact that they do not belong to the Moldavian reviser assumed by N.A. Ursu, who identifies the reviser as Metropolitan Dosoftei. On the other hand, the hypothesis of a massive intervention of the copyist in the text, so marked that it could have generated even marginal notes is doubtful; this would mean that, in fact, the translation of Milescu underwent, even before the text was copied by Dumitru, two revisions (if we also admit that of Dosoftei), to which is added the intervention of the person writing the marginal notes following the work of Dumitru of Cîmpulung.

A research direction opened up by the present article is thus aimed at a comprehensive study of the marginal notes in the manuscript, which would provide more useful information in establishing the textual history of Milescu's translation; this seems to be more intricate than it has been known to be so far.

Bibliography

A. Primary sources

B 1688 = *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a ceii Vechi și ale ceii Noao Leage, toate care s-au tălmăcit după limba elinească spre înțelegerea limbii rumânești, cu porunca preabunului Domn Ioan Șarban Cantacozino Basarabă Voievod (...)*, București, 1688.

Biblia Micu = *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a legii vechi și a ceii noao, toate care s-au tălmăcit de pre limba elinească spre înțelesul limbii românești [...]*. Cu blagoslovenia mării sale prealuminatului și preasfințitului domnului domn Ioan Bob, vlădica Făgărașului [...], Blaj, 1795; ediție jubiliară în reproducere anastatică și transcriere interpretativă, coord. Ioan Chindriș și Eugen Pavel, Roma, 2000.

MLD = *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*. Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași. *Pars I. Genesis*, 1988; *Pars II. Exodus*, 1991; *Pars III. Leviticus*, 1993; *Pars IV. Numeri*, 1994; *Pars V. Deuteronomium*, 1997; *Pars VII. Regum I, Regum II*, 2008; *Pars VIII. Regum III, Regum IV*, 2014; *Pars IX. Paralipomenon I, Paralipomenon II*, 2011; *Pars X₂. Iob*, 2012; *Pars XIV. Ieremia. Lamentationes Ieremie*, 2014; *Pars XX. Sapientia, Ecclesiasticus, Susanna, De Belo sive Dracone Babylonico*, 2014; *Pars XXII. Iosephus ad Machabeos*, 2013.

Ms. 45 = Biblioteca Filialei Cluj a Academiei Române, fondul Blaj, *Manuscrisul românesc nr. 45* [c. 1683–1686]. Conține traducerea integrală a *Vechiului Testament*, efectuată de Nicolae Milescu și revizuită de un anonim moldovean (probabil Dosoftei) în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVII-lea.

Ms. 4389 = Biblioteca Academiei Române, *Manuscrisul românesc nr. 4389* [c. 1665–1672]. Conține traducerea integrală a *Vechiului Testament*, efectuată după slavonă și latină de un anonim muntean (probabil Daniil Andrean Panoneanu) în a doua jumătate a secolului al XVII-lea.

NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the other greek translations traditionally included under that title*, Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (editors), International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oxford University Press, 2007.

Ostrog Bible = *Библия сиречь книги Ветхаго и Новаго Завета по языку словенскоу* (...), Ostrog, 1581.

Sept. Frankfurt = *Τῆς Δείας Γραφῆς. Παλαιάς Δηλαδῆ καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης ἀπάντα. Divine Scripture nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece*, a viro doctissimo recognita et emendata, variisque lectionibus aucta et illustra, Frankofurti ad Mœnum, apud Andreae Wecheli hæredes, 1597.

Sept. London = *Ἡ Παλαια Διαθηκη κατα τους ἑβδομηκοντα. Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum*, Londini, Excudebat Rogerus Daniel, 1653.

Vulg. Antwerp = *Biblia ad vetustissima exemplaria castigata* [...], Antwerpiae, ex officina Christophori Plantini, 1565

B. Dictionaries

DLR = *Dicționarul limbii române (ediție anastatică)*, Editura Academiei Române, 2010

Liddell–Scott = *A Greek–English Lexicon*, compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, revised and augmented by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars. With a revised supplement, Oxford Clarendon Press, 1996.

Miklosich = *Lexicon Paleoslovenico–Graeco–Latinum*. Emendatum auctum edidit Fr. Miklosich, Vindobonæ, Guilelmus Braumueller, 1862–1865.

Muraoka = T. Muraoka, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Peeters, Louvain, 2009.

OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, edited by P. G. W. Glare, Oxford Clarendon Press.

TRDG = Hariton Tiktin, *Rumänisch–Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 3. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von Paul Miron und Elsa Lüder, Band I. A–C, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca, 2000; Band II. D–O, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca, 2003, Band III. P–Z, Clusium, Cluj-Napoca, 2005.

C. Secondary sources

Andriescu, Al. (1988). *Locul Bibliei de la București în istoria culturii, literaturii și limbii române literare*, în *MLD, Pars I. Genesis*, Iași, p. 7–45.

Arvinte, V. (1988). *Studiu lingvistic asupra primei cărți (Facerea) din Biblia de la București (1688), în comparație cu Ms. 45 și Ms. 4389*, în *MLD, Pars I. Genesis*, p. 47–105.

Cândea, V. (1979). *Rațiunea dominantă*, Dacia Publishing House, Cluj-Napoca.

Florescu, I.-F. (2015). *În multe chipuri de Scripturi*, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, Iași.

Frâncu, C. (1983–1984). *Geneza și evoluția timpurilor verbale supracompuse*, în *ALIL*, XXIX, p. 23–62.

Frâncu, C. (2009). *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521–1780)*, Demiurg Publishing House, Iași.

Gafton, Al. (2005). *După Luther*, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, Iași.

Gafton, Al. (2012). *De la traducere la norma literară. Contribuția traducerii textului biblic la constituirea vechii norme literare*, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, Iași.

Ginsac, A.-M. (2013). *Les notes marginales sur le texte révisé de l’Ancien Testament traduit par Nicolae Milescu au XVIIe siècle (ms. 45)*, paper presented at the 27th International Congress in Romance Linguistics and Philology, Nancy, July 2013.

Munteanu, E. (2011). *Tradiția biblică românească. Coordonate, stadiu al cercetării potențial*, în Munteanu, E. et al. (ed.), *Receptarea Sfintei Scripturi între filologie, hermeneutică și traductologie. Lucrările Simpozionului Național «Explorări în tradiția biblică românească și europeană»*, Iași, 28–29 octombrie 2010, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Publishing House, Iași, p. 11–21.

Soare, L. (2015). *Învățătură pentru ferirea și doftoria boalelor (1816). Notes on glosses*, în “Diacronia”, 1, Jan. 13, art. A9, CrossRef.

Ursu, N. A. (2003). *Contribuții la istoria culturii românești în secolul al XVII-lea*, Cronica Publishing House, Iași, 2003.