THE TRANSLATION OF "HIGH PRIEST" IN THE SLAVO-ROMANIAN TETRAEVANGELION OF SIBIU. DOES IT REVEAL A *WESTERN* INFLUENCE?*

Giuseppe STABILE
Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale"
gstabile@unior.it

Rezumat Este interesant de observat că textul român din Tetraevanghelul bilingv de la Sibiu transpune NT-Gr. ἀρχιερεύς 'mare preot' prin patru sau cinci traduceri diferite. O atare hiper-traducere nu se găseşte în niciuna dintre versiunile Evangheliei după Matei virtual accessibile unui traducător şi/sau revizor aflat în spaţiul carpato-dunărean, mai probabil în Banat, Sud-Estul Transilvaniei sau Moldova, în prima jumătate a veacului al XVI-lea. Articolul de faţă îşi propune să compare această particularitate a textului românesc din Tetraevanghel nu numai cu tradiţia biblică (în special mateiană), dar şi cu toate tradiţiile *vulgare* susceptibile de a-i fi influenţat traducerea şi revizuirea, fără să uite „uzul profan" al slavonei. Obiectivul autorului este acela de a arunca o lumină nouă asupra unor *vexatæ quæstiones*, ca de pildă posibila matrice eterodoxă fie a traducerii, fie a editării textului, precum şi existenţa, în textul însuşi, a unei stratificări redacţionale marcate de influenţe diferite în planul lingvistic şi confesional.
Cuvinte cheie: arhiereu, Evanghelie, Sibiu, Reforma luterană, Transilvania, Moldova, Banat, slavonă, Filip Maler.

1. Introduction

The *Slavo-Romanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu* (SRT) was the last and most important book to be printed in Cyrillic in the Saxon city between 1551 and 1552-53.[1] It is believed that the volume was printed by Filip Maler "the Moldavian" who was

* The present article is the English version, revised and extended, of "Tra Slavonismo e Riforma: la traduzione di *sommo sacerdote* nel Tetraevangelo slavo-rumeno di Sibiu", appeared in *Romània Orientale* 29 (2016), 143-157; English text by Colum Fordham and Giuseppe Stabile.

[1] It is the oldest Biblical text in Slavonic and Romanian, the earliest printed book in the two languages with a parallel text (Mihăilă 1972: 241-242). Two fragments of it have survived, both of the Gospel of Matthew and still waiting for a critical edition: one fragment, the longer of the two (ff. 1^{r}-117^{v}, *Mt* 3:17-27:55), kept at the *Saltykov-Ščedrin* National Library in St Petersburg (Demény 1971: 22-98), the other shorter one (ff. 36^{v}-37^{r}, *Mt* 12:12-28), kept in the Orthodox Church of Oiejdea, in the province of Alba Iulia, where it was discovered in 1978 (Mârza 1978: 173-175). As regards the dating of SRT, see the most recent studies: Gheţie/ Mareş (1985: 337), Demény (1986: 303), Mareş (1990: 238-239).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

actually almost certainly a Saxon from Moldavia. In 1544, he had already used the local printing press to publish a Romanian Catechism, which has been lost, and a Slavonic Tetraevangelion (STS) in 1546; the former, at least, had been commissioned by the local *Stadtrichter*.[2] Note that the Slavonic Tetraevangelion of Sibiu was a faithful reprint of the *editio princeps* of the Palæoslavonic Four Gospels Book (Trg), printed at Târgovişte in 1512 by the Serbian Hieromonk Makarije (see Demény 1971: 90). It is widely believed that the Saxon authorities of Sibiu funded a bilingual edition of the Tetraevangelion since, having recently embraced Lutheran Reform, they wanted to spread knowledge of it among the Romanians of Transylvania through the local Orthodox clergy.[3]

2. An Early Lutheran Four Gospels Book?

The unprecedented publication of the Tetraevangelion in the vernacular, only a few years after the printed edition of the Catechism, fitted in perfectly with the quintessential forms of Lutheran propaganda. A more unusual feature was the parallel Slavonic text which reflects the attempt to reach the Romanian clergy for whom the linguistic communion with Orthodox Slavs remained as important as the spiritual one, a cornerstone of Orthodoxy. In the mid-16th century, Slavonic was still the main liturgical language throughout the Romanian area, including Transylvania and Banat but the need to translate it or supplement it with Romanian was becoming increasingly apparent, especially among the Transylvanian secular clergy (Mihăilă 1972: 244).

The fact that the religious texts printed at Sibiu-Hermannstadt by Filip Maler, between 1544 and 1551-53, maintained a stronger Lutheran influence than the texts printed at Braşov-Kronstadt by the Deacon Coresi between 1560 and 1567, seems to be confirmed by the STS: in the *Prědislovie* of the Gospel of St John by Teophylact of Ohrid, the Sibian editors eliminated the sentences that described the Evangelist as the defender of Orthodoxy against heresies or denied the importance "of the word and knowledge inherent in language" (*i.e.*, the authority of Holy Scripture as

[2] Between 1521 and 1554, a *Ma(gi)ster* Philip is recorded by the *Konsularrechnungen* as working in Sibiu on behalf of the city, not just as a typographer but also as an engraver-illustrator (*cf. Moler/Pictor*), scribe-translator for Romanian (*cf. scriba/interpres*) and envoy (see Binder/ Huttmann 1968: 150-156, 165 and 170-174). His origins are uncertain but at least three things suggest that he was a Saxon from Moldavia: 1. he definitely knew at least German (and Slavonic) as well as Romanian; 2. the Romanian text of SRT has various Saxon (German) traits; 3. Philip apparently referred to himself as Filip' Moldověnin' (**Филипъ Молдовѣнинъ**) in the *colophon* of STS (see Gheţie 1966: 77, Mareş 1967: 72 and 1968: 86).

[3] In fact, the Hungarian Calvinist authorities were mainly responsible for the attempt to introduce, from the second half of the 16th century onwards, the use of Romanian as a liturgical and pastoral language (though with negative results, at least initially). *Cf.* Alzati (2010: 188-189).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

the witness of Revelation, on whose importance for Luther see Bainton 1952: 44-45).[4] Moreover, a Hungarian document dating to 1752 seems to refer to the same Filip, defining him as the "apostle" of the Reform among the Vlachs ("Filep Oláh Apostol Oláhul irt könyve az oláhok reformatió-jára", see Jakó 1977 [1970]: 121).[5]

An equally significant aspect is the fact that the Romanian text of the SRT displays analogies with Luther's German text, ascribable to translation or revision prior to printing within the context of the Saxon-Lutheran press, or to both (*cf.* Petrovici 1971: 10-14, Mareş 2005 [1982]: 267).

However, the most convincing evidence for the Lutheran character of the SRT comes once again from the cultural context in which the bilingual text was written and printed: 1. It is thanks to Protestant propaganda that Sibiu became, together with nearby Braşov, the centre of a significant output of printed volumes (until the 17th century, the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia depended on Transylvania for the printing of books in Romanian, *cf.* Demény 1973: 104, Deletant 1975: 168); 2. In the eyes of the Orthodox authorities of the Principalities, the translation of sacred texts in Romanian was suspected – with good reason – to be a means of propagating heresy but, above all, it clashed with the Orthodox ecclesiastical tradition, still formally based on Church Slavonic (Gheţie 1974: 88-92).

The main redactional features in the Romanian text of the SRT refer to a Saxon Lutheran context, and can be localised in Banat-Hunedoara, Moldavia and southern Transylvania (Gheţie/ Mareş 1985: 334). The first evidence for Lutheran propaganda aimed at swaying Orthodox Romanians in Banat-Hunedoara (Binder 1971: 273-275) dates to 1526 while a Romanian translation of the New Testament dating to 1532 was possibly done in Moldavia (by "quidam doctor ex Walachia", who even brought it to Wittenberg to print, *cf.* Papacostea 1958: 62-63, Rosetti 1958: 20-22).

According to a classic hypothesis, that dates back to the end of the 19th century, the Romanian text of the SRT would have been translated from the same parallel Slavonic text, or a related/similar text (see Bogdan 1891: 36 but *cf.* Petrovici 1971: 10, 14).

Only two translations contained in the Romanian text of the SRT were considered heretical: *duhovnic* for the Ch. Sl. **фарисей** *farisej* (*cf.* Gr. φαρισαῖος) and *mitropolit*,

[4] Teophylact's preface (PG[123]: 1133-1135) was faithfully reproduced by Makarije (Trg: ff. 213$^{v}_{5-8}$, 214$^{R}_{19}$-214$^{v}_{1}$, *cf.* STS: p. 423-426) and Coresi (CST [1562]: ff. 159$^{R}_{14–19}$, 159$^{v}_{1–6}$). Noticed for the first time by Demény (see Demény-Simonescu 1965: 11), these adjustments have more recently turned out to be wider: At least two passages have been omitted and replaced with others from Teophylact's preface to the Gospel of Mark (see Stabile 2019: 64-65). However, it's strongly plausible that the STS was edited and printed in a Lutheran milieu.

[5] Jakó claimed that the book "written" by Filip ("írt könyve") is the lost *Romanian Catechism* (*ibid.*: 121-127).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

piscup or *vlădică* for the Ch. Sl. **архиерей** *arhierej* (*cf.* Gr. ἀρχιερεύς). The heretical aspect of these two translations lays in an allusive analogy made between the Orthodox clergy and the Pharisees and the High Priests, condemned by the Christ and/or implicated in His crucifixion (*cf.* Mareş 1967: 72, Demény 1971: 98 and Bodogae 1972: 86, 88).

3. The Translation of "High Priest" in the Slavo-Romanian Tetraevangelion

This article focuses on the translation of *high priest*, rendered in the Slavonic text simply as **архиерей** (*cf.* Miklosich: 8), which, in the parallel Romanian text, corresponds to as many as four or five terms which vary but are unlikely to have been randomly chosen: 1. The singular, which always refers to Caiaphas, is translated six times as *mitropolit* 'archbishop, metropolitan' and twice as *piscup* 'bishop'; 2. The plural, which refers to the priestly caste, is translated six times as *vlădici* '(arch-) bishops, governors', three times as *piscupi* and three times as *preuţi (cei [mai]) marĭ*.

These correspondences are virtually heretical due to their distribution in the Romanian text of the SRT, mainly located, in the Gospel of Matthew, from the plot against Jesus to the Passion, including Judas' betrayal (*Mt* 26:3-27:41) and with one exception in which even Christ questions the very authority of the priests (*Mt* 21:23).[6] In the rest of the Gospel (*Mt* 20:18; 21:15 and 21:45), the plural *high priests* is translated with the more general term *preuţi (cei/mai) mari* literally 'great priests' (*cf.* Rom. *preut/preot* < Vulg.-Lat. **prebutŭ* [*presbyter*] 'priest',[7] corresponding, in the parallel Slavonic text, to **іерей** *ierej* and **свѧщеникъ** *svęšteniķ"*).

Coresi's Romanian translation of the Tetraevangelion seems to have displayed greater caution in these lexical correspondences. Neither in Coresi's Romanian Tetraevangelion (1560-61, CRT) nor in the Tetraevangelion by Radu de la Măniceşti, otherwise known as the *Evangheliar de la Londra* (The London Gospel [1574], LRT), are Orthodox metropolitans or bishops equated with high priests blamed as Christicides: *întăiul preot* 'first priest' and *(mai) mare preot* 'great priest' never alternate with *mitropolit* and *piscup* and only twice with *vlădică*.[8]

---

[6] A brief discussion of the issue is to be found in Mareş (2005: 267, note 29).

[7] Old Rom. *preut* (*cf.* Dalm. *prat/pretro*, Alb. *prift*, Irom *prevtu*, Arom. *preftu* [Popinceanu 1964: 200, Mihăescu 1993: 41, 298]), well attested from the 16th century, left significant traces already in Slavo-Romanian sources from the early 15th (DERS: 193, DLR[8.4]: 1320).

[8] By indicating SRT, CRT and LRT with I, II and III, the translations *întăi/mare preut*, *piscup*, *vlădică* and *mitropolit* with A, B, C, D for high priest/-s and the singular and plural of each one with 1 and 2 as a subscript, the framework of the respective occurrences in the three Romanian Tetraevangelia is as follows: *Mt* 20:18 I-II A_2; 21:15 I-II A_2; 21:23 I C_2, II A_2; 21:45 I-II A_2; 26:3 I $B_{2\text{-}1}$, II $A_{2\text{-}1}$ (2 occ.); 26:14 I B_1, II A_1; 26:47 I B_2, II A_2; 26:51 I B_1, II A_1; 26:57 I D_1, II A_1; 26:58 I D_1, II C_1; 26:59 I D_1, II A+C_1; 26:62 I D_1, II A_1; 26:63 I D_1,

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

It is true that Caiaphas and the high priests may have been represented in the Romanian text of the SRT as a metropolitan among his bishops with the sole intention of bringing St Matthew's Gospel closer to an Orthodox context. However, besides the fact that this does not undermine the presumed Lutheran background of the SRT, such a possibility fails to explain either the choice of different matching terms only for *Mt* 26:3 – 27:41 and 21:23, or their concentration in the part of the Gospel in which there was the greatest risk of provoking the outrage of the Orthodox religious authorities beyond the Carpathians, as well as the ordinary Orthodox clergy and the faithful in Transylvania. The original ecclesiastical titles (*cf.* the Psl. **митрополитъ** *mitropolit"*, **пископъ** *piskup"* and **владыка** *vladyka*) were also so similar to the respective Romanised forms and so deeply rooted in the Orthodox Slavonic tradition that anyone slightly familiar with it and the Slavonic language could have hardly failed to acknowledge their meaning. *Mitropolit*, *piscup/piscop* and *vlădică* were, in Old Romanian, not acclimated Slavonic terms on a par with *arhiereu*, from which they differed both because of a presumably more common use and because they corresponded more precisely to the Orthodox ecclesiastical hierarchy.[9]

All these translations for 'high priest' find no correspondence in either the parallel Slavonic text or in the older Church Slavonic tradition of Matthew's Gospel, which was unerringly faithful to the Greek text (*cf.* NTG-NA_{28}, GNT-UBS_5 and EMCT).

Like the Greek tradition, the Old Church Slavonic tradition presents, in the aforementioned verses of Matthew, just one translation for 'high priest' (*cf.* **архиєрей** = ἀρχιερεύς).[10] But the Greek and Church Slavonic traditions are not the only case: the Latin *Vulgate* (*cf. princeps sacerdotum* in BSV-WG_5) and the pre- and post-Lutheran German versions (*cf. Fürst den Priester* in MB [1466], *Hohepriester* in ST [1522] and LB [1541], ZFB [1531], EB [1537] and DB [1540]) also follow the same translation approach.

The same is also true for other traditions that may have influenced the Romanian text of the SRT, such as the Hussite and pre-Hussite Czech tradition (*cf. kniežě pop[ové]*

II A_1; 26:65 I D_1, II A_1; 27:1 I C_2, II A_2; 27:3 I C_2, II Ø; 27:6 I C_2, II A_2; 27:20 I C_2, II A_2; 27:41 I C_2, II A_2 (III Ø).

[9] Apart from **митрополитъ** *mitropolit* – which entered the Romanian language unchanged –, all these slavonisms were already acclimated by the late 15th century: the Slavo-Romanian documents attest **пископ(ъ)** *piscop* from 1464, **влъдика** *vlădica* from 1469 and **архїєрєѳ** *arhïereu* from 1500 (see DERS: 177, 264 and DLRV: 72; for **митрополитъ** [1488, tr. 1784], *cf.* Tiktin²: 722 and DRHA³: 32/53).

[10] In *Mt* 3:17-27:55, EMCT registers only one exception to **архиєрєи**, *arhierei*, namely **старѣишина жьрьчьскъ** *starĕišina ž'r'č'sk"* (*cf.* Miklosich: 882, ἀρχιερεύς). This sporadic *varia lectio* occurs only in 4 out of 14 Aprakos and 2 out of 13 Tetraevangelia and New Testaments, mostly of Eastern Slavonic redaction.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

in Dr [c. 1360] and Ol [c. 1416]), and in the Hussite and Lutheran Hungarian tradition (*cf. pap[i] fejdelem* in HB [1466] and ÚTS [1541]).[11]

The early Lutheran phase of the Polish tradition is contemporary with the printing of the SRT and has only one translation for 'high priest' but it seems to be independent from all the other traditions mentioned so far (both EM [1551] and NTSM [1553] render 'high priest' by *biskup*, which is coherent with the earliest extant translations of the Bible into Polish, *cf.* Babiaczyk 1906: 84).[12]

It therefore seems clear that the four or five different translations of 'high priest' cannot stem from a specific version of the New Testament among those that appeared before roughly the first half of the 16th century and were accessible, at least virtually, to translators and revisers of the SRT.

The hypothesis most consistent with the Lutheran context of Sibiu is that the person who edited the Romanian text of the SRT necessarily based his work on Luther's text and everyday language. This may be explained by the militant nature of the Lutheran edition and the lack of adequate models for a translation of the Tetraevangelion into Romanian (Luther's revolutionary ideas on biblical translation are well known).[13]

What is certain is that the Sibian revisers did not even conform to the austere simplicity of Luther: of the various translations of 'high priest' contained in the Romanian text of the SRT, only the term *preutŭ (celŭ/mai) mare* (*cf. întâiu/mare preot* and variants in the CRT) resembles the Lutheran *Hohepriester*, but the St Petersburg fragment seems to attribute only a marginal or residual role to it (obviously, we cannot

[11] Florescu (2010: 50-54, 65-70) argues that the archetype of the Romanian text may also have been translated from Hussite Czech and pre-Lutheran German texts.

[12] The later Polish versions of the Gospel, printed between 1556 and 1599, are quite more various, *cf. książę/przełożony kápłáńskie* (Szarffenberger's [1556] and Leopolita's [1561] NTs); *przedniejszy/książę kapłan* (*Biblia brzeska* [1563]); *arcyofiárownik* (Budny's NT [1570]); *przedniesży ofiárownik* (Czechowic's NT [1577]); *arcykápłan/nawyssży kápłan* (Wujk's NT [1593 and 1599]). Such a lexical variety might reflect a confessional one implying distinct redactional criteria if not the use of distinct sources (Only four out of the nine 16th century Polish versions might be defined "Catholic" [1556, 1561, 1593 and 1599], being the other five rather "Calvinist" [1563], "Socinian" or "Unitarian" [1570, 1577] and, as was just said, "Lutheran" [1551, 1553]). *Cf. https://ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1551&g=1&c=26&f=* [10.4.2019].

[13] See how Luther justified the biblical usage of common people's German in *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (1530): "man mus die mutter jhm hause, die kinder auff der gassen, den gemeinen man auff dem marckt drumb fragen vnd den selbigen auff das maul sehen wie sie reden vnd darnach dolmetzschen" (*cf.* Sendb.: 637$_{19-22}$; for a critical edition and English translation, *cf.* also: *https://editions.mml.ox.ac.uk/editions/sendbrief/* [21.04.2020], for a Romanian translation with a critical commentary, *cf.* Munteanu-Nastasia 2017: 16-23 [esp. 18]).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

know if it was equally marginal or residual in the rest of the supposed Four-Gospels Book printed at Sibiu).

The Romanian text of the SRT presents each translation of 'high priest' in a distinct part of the Gospel of Matthew, occasionally alternating between them. There are exceptions such as *preuți (cei/mai) mari* and *vlădici* in *Mt* 21:23, where there seems to be a clear intention on the part of the revisers to depict the Jewish priests as Orthodox prelates (it is only the short passage in ch. 21, in which 'high priest' is translated with the term *vlădică* and the first chapter of Matthew in which Jesus clashes with religious leaders). *Vlădică* appears always in the plural and six times out of seven in *Mt* 27 which gives the high priests a key role in the sentencing of Christ and includes them among those who mock Him on the Cross. *Piscup* and *mitropolit* appear in *Mt* 26, the former three times in the plural and twice in the singular (see *Plot to kill Jesus*, *Judas betrays Jesus* and *Arrest of Jesus*), the latter six times, all in the singular (only in *Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin*).

These variants can be traced back to three simple criteria, none of which require a profound knowledge of Romanian and/or Church Slavonic: 1. The difference between singular and plural which seems to allude to the difference between the clergy and their chief priest; 2. The recognisability of the ecclesiastical titles as Orthodox ones; 3. The symbolic importance of each place in *Mt* which is translated, and therefore its importance in terms of religious propaganda.

What seem to vary, according to the Easter cycle, are the editorial criteria and not, or not just, the translators and sources used (*cf.* Tasmowski 2009: 334). Of the two clearly distinct redactional layers, one attributable to the translation and the other to the revision carried out at Sibiu, the latter is thought to have introduced the (anti-) Orthodox references that were lacking in the former or were not particularly evident. Indeed, a Lutheran or Hussite translation would surely have had (anti-) Catholic references due to the sources and the context: from Banat to Moldavia, all the regions in which the Romanian text of the SRT may have been translated were located on the edge of the "Latin" world and had been exposed to Catholic propaganda.[14] The main objective of all the religious reformist movements from the west was inevitably the Catholic Church and their propaganda, at least initially, had to be presumably aimed at Romanian Catholics, even in the Carpathian-Danubian area (the Romanian-Cyrillic spelling of the SRT betrays the influence of Latin-Hungarian

[14] Documentary evidence indicates that there were three Latin bishoprics in Moldavia, the land from where Filip Maler probably came, between the 13th and 16th centuries: the bishoprics of Milcov or Cumania (1227-1241), Siret (1370-1434 or 1497) and Baia (1418-1523), as well, but only from the early 17th century, as the episcopate of Bacău (1607-1818). During the first few centuries, the bishops of these three Moldavian bishoprics were Polish, Hungarian and Italian, already members of the Franciscan and Dominican orders (see Sabău 1943: 235-242, especially 238, note 4).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

spelling and/or of Saxon pronunciation, leading to the first Lutheran infiltration of the Latin communities of Banat-Hunedoara or of Moldavia, see Petrovici 1971: 18, Gheție 1979: 84-86).[15] It also means that the base-translation of 'high priest' in the Romanian text of SRT – and therefore in its *Urtext* – is the same as in the CRT, in other words in another edition of the Tetraevangelion which has a clear Lutheran background. It goes without saying that the general term *preutŭ (celŭ/mai) mare* should be ascribed to the translation while *mitropolit* and *vlădică* are due to the revision carried out at Sibiu. The case of *piscup* is less obvious: the SRT displays the old Romanian polysemy but also combines uses and possibly influences that do not coincide with those of *vlădică*.

With respect to *piscup*, the old Romanian word *vlădică* had a more restricted meaning in a confessional sense, but a broader absolute meaning, which made it the perfect equivalent of *arhiereu*, but just more usual and recognisable as Orthodox.

The origins and usage of the two ecclesiatical titles in 16th and 17th century Romanian texts can be summarised as follows:

Vlădică < Ch. Sl. **владꙑка** *vladyka*, see Byz. Gr. δεσπότης (LLP5: 195-196, Sophocles: 352): 1.'lord, governor' (*cf.* NTG-NA28, GNT-UBS5 ἡγεμών; EMCT **владыка**, **гѣмонъ** *gemon"*; see SRT: 28v5 (*Mt* 10:18) = in the parallel Slavonic text; CRT: 19v3 (51); 2. Honorary title of Orthodox prelates (Scriban: 1416), *cf. vlădicie* 'seignury or principality' but also the rank of bishop or metropolitan (CP: 9R8 [227]); Ch. Sl. **владꙑчьство** *vladyč'stvo* (*cf.* Miklosich: 66; T534: 371/371; 374/373; DRHB8: 268/432); 3. 'prelate, (Orthodox) bishop' (*cf.* Popinceanu 1964: 226 and DERS: 264);

Piscup/piscop < Ch. Sl. **пискоүпъ** *cf.* Byz. Gr. πίσκοπος and/or Vulg. Lat. **piscopu* (ESJS11: 646, Mihăescu 1967: 97):[16] 1. 'bishop (of any confession)' (CC2: 101, 30 [97], PO: 6R4 [10]), *cf.* the first occurrence of **пискоүпъ** 'Armenian bishop' in Moldo-Slavonic documents (DRHA1: 14/21 [1401]) and 'Orthodox bishop' in Wallacho-Slavonic documents (DRHB8: 294/432 [1580]).

The five cases in the Romanian text of the SRT are the oldest known occurrences of *piscup*, if not in absolute terms, but at least in terms of a Romanian translation of the Scriptures; they are also the only examples of *piscup* as translation of the term 'high priest' in the Gospels, excluding the translation in the *Bratu Codex* (ca. 1560,

[15] On the attitude of Bohemian and Lutheran reformist movements to the Orthodox authorities, see Panaitescu (1964: 280-281), Binder (1971: *ibid.*).

[16] The unaccented *u* < *o* of *piscup* is indistinguishable from that of inherited Romanian latinisms (Densusianu 1938: 92), but the hypothesis of a pre-Slavonic, Greek or Latin, etymology has not found many supporters (*cf.* Ionescu 1994: 29). On the other hand, northern-Greek loanwords in Palæoslavonic display an analogous vowel closing, e.g.: **оүрарь** *urar'* < ὡράριον 'stole (liturgical vestment)', **пискѳпъ** < πίσκοπος 'bishop' (see Фасмер 1906: 451).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

CB), which seems to come from the same SRT (*cf.* *piscupii* in CB 441_4 = SRT $105^{v}_{20\text{-}21}$, [*Mt* 26:14]).[17]

In an old Romanian text such as the SRT, it was inevitable that the use of *piscup* followed the ecclesiastical use of Slavonic, or rather the curial use or chancery writing with which Filip Maler and his "workshop" (*cf.* It. *bottega*) were probably most familiar.[18]

Along the border between *Slavia orthodoxa* and *Slavia latina*, in Chancery Slavonic were regularly used: 1. **пискоүпъ**, in internal documents, for Orthodox bishops and bishops of all denominations; 2. **бискоүпъ** *biskup"* in external documents, solely for Latin bishops (almost always non-residents and foreigners, like their faithful, at least in the Principalities); 3. **владыка**, both in internal and external documents, solely for Orthodox bishops.

More precisely, the coexistence of three titles may date to the 13th-14th centuries in Serbian and Croatian Slavonic (Skok[1]: 157), to the 14th-15th centuries in the case of Lithuano-Ruthenian and Russian Slavonic (Срезневский[1]: 88, ГСБМ[2]: 8-10 and ССУМ[1]: 96) and to the 15th-16th centuries for Moldavian Slavonic (*cf.* DRHA[2]: 84/120 [1454] and DŞM[2]: 180/448 [1499]). From the same border, this lexical *facies* is also reflected outside *Slavia*, in Hungarian chancery (*cf. püspök* 'Latin and reformed bishop', *[v]ladika* 'Orthodox bishop' in EOE[1-3]: I/4 [1540]; VII/260 [1566]; VII/16 [1577]; TörtT[3.19]: I/86 [1564]) and Saxon chancery of Transylvania (*cf.* the Germ. *Bischof/Pischof* 'Latin and Lutheran bishop', *Wladicka* 'Orthodox bishop' in QGSK[4]: 182 [1556], 498 [1528] and *passim*; Hurm.[11]: 96/656 [1582]; MV[1]: 149/420 [1600]), but also the Turkic-Tartar chancery of the Crimean Khanate (*cf.* the Tk. *püskub* 'Catholic bishop', *vladiqa* 'Orthodox bishop' in Kołodziejczyk 2011: 20/653 [1520], 34/770 [1592]).[19]

---

[17] The CB is a Slavo-Rumanian miscellany, an interlinear text with the two languages printed on alternate lines and containing parts of the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels, copied in Southern Transylvania and dated by Pop Bratul to 1560 (see Mihăilă 1981: 69, and on the correspondences with SRT, Gheţie/ Mareş 1985: 342).

[18] Assuming that the title of *Magister/Meister*, attributed to Filip by the sources, did not imply proficiency in a specific art or craft but higher education, this is unlikely to have included the *litteræ slavonicæ* or *rutenicales* (*cf.* Hervay 1965: 124-125). The children of the Saxon elite received – preferably at Krakow, Prague, Vienna or some other German-speaking city – a Catholic or Protestant education, but always a western one (Papacostea 1958: 61).

[19] The form in *p-* of the German is attested from the 11th century (*cf. Piskofes*, MhDW[1]: s.v.) and it is thought that it might be the origin of the Hungarian word *püspök* (*cf.* Rocchi 1987: 50 and Mollay 1992: 112). Both the German term *Bischof/Pischof* and the Hungarian term *püspök* may have come into contact with the Psl. **пискоүпъ** with which they share the meaning 'Orthodox bishop'.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

The entire form *episcop/episcup* < Byz. Gr. ἐπίσκοπος *cf.* Psl. **епископъ** *episkup"* (Tiktin[2]: 136, Popinceanu 1964: 154-155) followed Slavonic usage and was the most frequently used term in official titulary and therefore almost always referred to Orthodox bishops (its acclimation is attested in Wallacho-Slavonic documents from 1535, *cf.* **їепископꙋ** *iepiscupu*, in DERS: 74 and DRHB[3]: 194/320).[20] However, the aphæretic form appears to have been more sensitive to the variability of the vernacular Romanian and to the influence of other languages.

It was not until the early 18th century – from the Union of the Orthodox Church of Transylvania with Rome – that *piscup/piscop* took on, popularly, the more restricted meaning of 'Catholic bishop', while *vlădică* and *episcop* retained the meaning of 'Orthodox bishop' (see Popinceanu 1964: 194, "[*piscup*] mancherorts mundartlich katholischer Bischof, während der orthodoxe *vlădică* oder heute *episcop* heißt").[21] The first Wallachian documents following the Union use the term *piscup* to refer to the bishop of Transylvania in the sense of Roman or "united", *i.e.* 'Uniate' (Stinghe[1]: 8/15, 16 [1701]).[22] Nonetheless there are examples of Latin *piscupi* and *piscopi* in Transylvania or Moldavia, in earlier documents (*cf. Şeveruş piscop* and *vlădicii, piscupii* [...] *şi toţi ai Îpăratului* in MV[1]: 142/392, 148/412 [1600]; *piscopul de la Bacău* in SDIR[1-2]: 7/83 [1685]).

Actually, in earlier sources, the meaning of 'Latin bishop' used to come under the general term 'bishop' which was supposed to emphasise the reference of *piscup/piscop* to a coeval and possibly local ecclesiatical hierarchy.

The antiquity and adaptability of *piscup/piscop* to different confessional milieus are confirmed by the numerous toponyms which stem from these words and which are widespread throughout the Romanian *Sprachraum* (see Iordan 1963: 236, 241, 360). Sometimes, the link with non-Orthodox and especially Catholic communities does

---

[20] The whole form rarely referred to bishops of different confessions. A Moldo-Slavonic document records the killing of the bishop of Baia in 1522, 19 years after the event took place, solely because it had happened during a visit to the diocese and the *voivode* had confiscated the property of the deceased **за съмрть єдиного епископа латинского** [on the death of a latin bishop] see DŞV: 63/314, 323-325). *Episcop/episcup* is first attested in a vernacular text in 1560: in the preface to his Romanian Catechism, Coresi stresses that he printed the book **кѫ ѡиѳѣ єп҃копѫлѫи** [with the knowledge of] the Orthodox bishop of Hungary = Transylvania (*cf.* DLR[1.7]: 634-637 and TR16: 101).

[21] An opposition which, even by the late 19th century, had become merely a vernacular archaism, *cf.* Şăineanu: 483 (1887: 245-246), Damé[3]: 220.

[22] Orthodox Transylvanian sources used the masculine *vlădic* for all the bishops of the Romanians, whether Uniate or not (*cf.* Stinghe[1]: 9/17 [1701] and Laurianu-Massimu: 576). There is little doubt yet that this use of *vlădic* relied on the more traditional (and older) use of *vlădică*, since the Romanians of Transylvania had traditionally been Orthodox of Byzantine-Slavonic rite in their large majority.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

seem probable: 1. **Пиѫпещи** *Piscupeşti* = **Пиѫпещилор** *Piscupeştilor* (DRHB[1; 4]: 129/221 [1465]; 279/329 [1549]) is the oldest toponym of the "family"; location: Oltenia, border with Banat (Gorj/Mehedinţi), *i.e.* a region which was particularly exposed to Hungarian Catholic and Serbian Orthodox influence (see Alzati 1981: 160-163); 2. **Рѫвеник Пиѫпѫлов** *Răvenic Piscupulov* (DRHB[22]: 237/462 [1626]), rare; location Oltenia (Vîlcea/Argeş), *i.e.* in the heart of the ancient Latin diocese of Argeş (see Alzati 1981: *ibid.*); 3. (**Горь**) **Пископ(а)** *(Gor') Piskop(a)* = *[Dialul] Piscop[ului]* (DIRA XVII[4]: 5/3 [1616], 618/486 [1620]; DRHA[23]: 72/88 [1635]); location Moldavia (Iaşi), near Cotnari, which between 1562 and 1563 was the official residence of a Socinian or Calvinist bishop, and had previously been a colony of Catholic Saxons and Hungarians (see Giurescu 1967: 216).

In the case of the vineyards of Cotnari, in particular, local memory of a Latin bishop seems to be confirmed by the form *Dealu Bi<s>cop*, which is perhaps the oldest (*cf. Dealul Pescop*, DRHA[19; 23]: 101/121 [1626]; 77/98 [transl. 1794]). The form in *b-* – of Polish, Czech or Ruthenian origin – remained restricted to Moldavia where, from the mid-15th century to beyond the mid-18th century (in Romanian vernacular, from the early 17th century), it is recorded sporadically in internal documents and translations, alternating with the form in *p-* but always with the meaning of 'Latin bishop' (see Mitu 1963: 206, Ionescu 1976: 403).[23] It is indicative that the two forms could alternate within the same document, referring both to a Latin bishop and his bishopric (*cf.* **бископ Баковски** *biskop Bakovski* and **Пископїи ѡ Баков** *Piskopii ot Bakov* [Bacău] in DRHA[23]: 439/449 [1636]).

Moreover, in the Church Slavonic tradition, the form **пискоүпъ** appears referring to Latin bishops from the early 13th century, though in Latino-Slavic border sources like the Croatian and Ruthenian ones (*cf.* Срезневский[2]: 937-938; ССУМ[2]:148; Даничић[2]: 306).[24]

It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the use of *piscup* in the Romanian text of the SRT, despite being based on local Slavonic, was affected by other languages including non-Slavic ones (those spoken and written in the Latin-Reformist milieu of translation and printing, *i.e.* especially German and Hungarian).

However, not even Slavonic explains the two occurrences of *piscup* in the singular, where it would be more usual to find *mitropolit* (104$^{v}_{13}$, 110$^{R}_{9}$, *cf. Mt* 26:14 and 51). Considering that the titles in question are not similar either in Slavonic or in ancient Romanian (*cf.* LLP[1; 18; 25]: 54-55; 217; 39; Tiktin[1; 2]: 133; 136, 722) and that they are clearly distinguished in the text of the SRT, it could be argued that: (a) the individual parts of the Gospel were translated separately, without any attempt at harmo-

[23] Although, interestingly, a *biscop armenescu* does appear in Moldavia (Iorga 1927: 72 [1754]).

[24] On the controversial origin of the form in *b-*, *cf.* ESJS[1]: 62-63; Rocchi (1990: 167-168). Berneker, instead, doesn't seem to have doubt: "Aus ahd. *biskof*, mhd. *bischof* " (SEW[1]: 58).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

nisation, and that there was no final revision process, or, alternatively, that (b) a rushed final revision introduced the term *mitropolit*, where the translation envisaged both for the singular and plural forms of 'high priest' solely the term *piscup* (and possibly *preutŭ [celŭ/mai] mare* in the rest of the Gospel).

In case (b), the Romanian *Urtext* of the SRT clearly reflects a context in which the highest ecclesiastical authority was represented by the bishops, more probably Latin bishops, rather than the metropolitan.[25] Equally clearly, the context of linguistic influences exerted on the Romanian *Urtext* must have reflected cultural and confessional influences.

The only translations of 'high priest' genetically and/or semantically similar to the Rum. *piscup*, and capable of influencing its usage in the SRT, are the Germ. *Bischof* (MB), the Hung. *püspök* (HB and ÚTS), and the Cz. and Pol. *biskup* (Dr, Ol and NTSM). *Bischof*, *püspök* and *biskup* are used, in the respective traditions of the Gospel exactly like *piscup* in the Romanian text of the SRT, in the singular and the plural, both for the priestly caste and for Caiaphas. However, it should be emphasised that these traditions are mainly faithful to the *Latin Vulgate* and that the variants of *piscup* translate the Lat. *pontifex* in St John's Gospel and hardly ever in the Synoptic Gospels (*cf. Mc* 15:11, *Jn* 7:45 and cc. 11, 18, 19 *passim*).[26] The only exception is the Polish Lutheran tradition, with an initial version of the Tetraevangelion printed in around the same period of the SRT, which generally presents *biskup* for 'high priest' in all the Gospels (see above *biskup*, in NTSM).

Already well-documented in Latin-Germanic sources (DC-Lat^{6}: 408, Diefenbach: 298), the medieval custom of confusing *pontifex* with *episcopus* is probably linked to the custom of referring to Caiaphas as a bishop, widespread in Polish, Hungarian and Czech Catholic contexts, as well as German contexts, from the 14th century, through breviaries, passionals (martyrologies) and various collections of evangelical passages for devotional and liturgical reading (*cf.* Szarvas-Simonyi^{2}: 1345-1346, Gebauer^{1}: 57 and Urbańczyk$^{1.2}$: 95).

---

[25] As is known, similar conditions existed in the Banat, Transylvania and in Moldavia, from the 15th century due to the infiltration of the Hussite Reform already before the Lutheran Reform (*cf.* Alzati 1981: 39-56, 249-264). Cartojan claimed that "the hotbeds of the Hussite Reform weren't yet totally extinguished in *Ardeal* when, from Germany" – more exactly from Leipzig and Wittenberg, around 1520 –, Saxon merchants and students started to introduce Luther's ideas" (Cartojan 1980 [1940]: 84-85). Not only Transylvania, but Banat, Maramureș, Moldavia too had received Hussitism from Hungary and Poland-Lithuania. Moldavia is likely to have helped spreading it in the Novgorod Rus' (*cf.* Birnbaum 1973: 249 and De Michelis 1993: 23-24, 25 and 147, on Waldo-Hussitism in Eastern Europe). On the spread of Hussitism in the Romanian countries, *cf.* Macůrek (1927: 53-75), Dan (1944: 84-86), Šmahel (1993: 141, 143-144).

[26] "In Matthew there is not a single deviation from *princeps sacerdotum*" (Nestle 1907: 501-502).

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

It is unlikely that this use of *piscup* as an alternative to *mitropolit*, in the Romanian text of the SRT, stems from an Orthodox translation context, unless by mistake, and it can be excluded that it derives from the direct tradition of the Palæoslavonic Tetraevangelion (although *cf.* **вискоупъ** for the Latin word *pontifex* in Croatian hagiographies and lectionaries, LLP[3]: 90).[27] Vice versa, it is likely that the two cases of *piscup* = *Caiaphas* may have eluded those who carried out the revision prior to printing and introduced the Orthodox distinction between bishops and metropolitan. Only as a result of the existence of an older redactional layer is it possible to admit the interference of *Caiaphas* = *episcopus/pontifex*, which derives from the languages of the "Latin" tradition (Hungarian, German, Czech or Polish), either directly or through Salvonic.[28] This connecting role between the vernaculars of the Banat-Transylvanian and Moldavian area was effectively carried out, in the 15th and 16th centuries, by Transylvanian, Moldavian and Lithuano-Ruthenian Slavonic (see Olteanu 1958: 77, 79, Macůrek 1968: 14-19).[29]

4. Conclusions

The translation of 'high priest' suggests certain final considerations about the Romanian text of the SRT and its sources which need to be summarised: 1. the hyper-translation of 'high priest' in the Romanian text of SRT cannot be explained either in the light of the Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospel of Matthew or in the German Lutheran tradition; 2. no other translation of Matthew, among those considered in this study, comes as close to reproducing an entire ecclesiatical

---

[27] The earliest Old Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospels of Mark and John usually uses **архиєрєй**, with a few variations which do not relate just to the Gospel of John: **жрьць** *žr'c'*, **старѣйшина жрьцьскъ** *starějšina žr'c'sk"* [rare **жидовьскъ/июдеискъ** *židov'sk"* or *ijudeisk"*], **свѧщєниє** *svęštenije* [LLP[36]: 46 = *ordo sacerdotalis*], **кънѧзъ** *knęz"* (*cf.* Mar and Zogr for *Mc*, ЕИоСТ for *Jn*).

[28] The translation of "pharisee" with the term *duhovnic* in the Romanian text of the SRT seems to belong to the same redactional layer and the same Latin influences mediated by Church Slavonic, *cf.*: Ch. Sl. **доуховьникъ** *duhov'nik"* 'confessor' but also 'cleric, priest' (Miklosich: 182, Даничић[1]: 318-319); Cz. *duchovník* and Pol. *duchownych* 'pharisee' and 'cleric, priest (esp. Catholic priest)' (Gebauer[1]: 856, Urbańczyk[2.9]: 219 and Skok 1927: 189). We should infer that *farisei* must have seemed less appropriate and/or usual than *duhovnic* (*cf.* DLR[2.2]: 63 and Popinceanu 1964: 157). In the Romanian text of the SRT, *duhovnic* was used 21 times, and *farisei* 8 times, though the latter was a more literal translation of the Ch. Sl. **фарисей** and the Germ. *Pharisäer* (*cf.* EMCT and LB). It is hardly surprising that it occurs regularly in the CRT and in the coresian *corpus* (*cf.* Densusianu 1938: 145, 439 and *passim*). Florescu recalls that in the *Poučenija* [Teachings] of Neagoe Basarab (c. 1520), **доуховникы** *duhovniky* "renvoie généralement aux *moines* vivant dans le monastère" (2010: 60-61).

[29] *Cf.* also Panaitescu (1965: 18-19), on the secular and spoken use of Slavonic.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

hierarchy, to which it is worth adding *duhovnici* as the translation of *pharisees i.e.* 'clerics' but also 'separate' (Hung. *levált* in HB [*cf.* Lat. *(a sæculo) disiuncti* = fig. monks?])[30]; 3. without exception, the titles employed belong to the Orthodox Slavic tradition and entered the Romanian language from Church Slavonic, even though only some of them can be considered to be strictly Orthodox (*cf. preutŭ* and *piscup vs. vlădică* and *mitropolit*); 4. the (residual?) cases of *piscup* = *Caiaphas* reflect a change in the redactional criteria and objectives (and therefore, probably, in the print/edition milieu) and confirm the old hypothesis of Latin and Latin-Protestant influence; 5. it is possible that the comparison with the CRT shows a gradual institutionalisation of Lutheran Reform in the same Transylvanian area (although it cannot be excluded that the SRT reused a Romanian proto-translation from the Czech, Hungarian or Polish, which can be ascribed to the Bohemian Reformation, *cf.* Florescu's [2010: 65-70] hypothesis).

Whatever the case, the hyper-translation of 'high priest' in the Romanian text of SRT shows how profound and vivid the imprint of Slavonism on Romanian civilization must have appeared – even from the West, around the half of the 16th century –, albeit the long Slavo-Romanian Middle Ages was undoubtedly nearing its end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Biblical and Documentary Sources[31]

CB = Alexandru Gafton (ed.), *Codicele Bratul*, Iaşi: Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ion Cuza", 2003, *http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/txt/text* [05.04.2019].

CC² = Sextil Puşcariu, Alexe Procopovici (ed.), *Carte cu Învăţătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textu*, Bucureşti: Socec & Co., 1914.

CP = Gheorghe Chivu (ed.), *Pravila lui Coresi*, in Ion Gheţie (coord.), *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982, 129-245.

CRT = Florica Dimitrescu (ed.), *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi (Braşov 1560-1561), comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănicești (1574)*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1963.

CST = Tetraevanghel slavonesc al lui Coresi, Braşov, 1562 (B.A.R. III 234272).

DB = *Biblia, beider Allt vnnd Newen Testamenten* [...] gespürt vnd gesehen durch D. Johann Dietenberger, zum anderernmäll Corrigeret vnd verbessert in synem Leben, Anno MDXL, Augstmänt.

DIRA = *Documente privind istoria Romîniei. A. Moldova, veacul XVII*, vols. I-V (1601-1625), Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1952-1957.

[30] It could be a criticism of "secluded" observant monks from reformist urban environments (*cf.* Mareş 1967: 72). The Franciscans played an important role both in disseminating the Lutheran Reform in Transylvania and Banat and in combating it, see Köpeczi (1992: 280-281). With regard to Lutheran criticism of monastic life as a separate and therefore privileged path to salvation, see Bainton (1952: esp. 51).

[31] For the Greek and Latin text of New Testament, see *https://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/about-the-online-bibles* [26.09.2016].

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

Dr = Vladimír Kyas (vyd.), *Staročeská Bible Drážďanská a Olomoucká*, vol. I, *Evangelia*, Praha: Akademia, 1981.

DRHA-B = *Documenta Romaniæ Historica. Seria A. Moldova/B. Ţara Românească*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R. [subsequently: Academiei Române], 1965-2014/1965-2013.

DŞM = Ioan Bogdan (ed.), *Documentele lui Ştefan cel Mare*, vols. I-II, Bucureşti: Socec & Co., 1913.

DŞV = Mihai Costăchescu (ed.), *Documentele moldoveneşti de la Ştefăniţă Voevod (1517-1527)*, Iaşi: Bravo, 1943.

EB = *Bibel Alt vnnd New Testament:* nach dem Text in der hailigen kirchen gebraucht, durch doctor Johann Ecken [...] Mit Römi. Künig. Mai. Gnad vnd Freihait, MDXXXVII.

ЕИоСТ = Анатолий А. Алексеев, Анна А. Пичхадзе, и др. (изд. подг.), *Евангелие от Иоанна в славянской традиции*, С.-Петербург: РБО, 1998.

EM = Izabela Winiarska-Górska (ed.), *Ewangelia według św. Mateusza*, przekład Stanisława Murzynowskiego, Królewiec, 1551, *http://www.ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1551* [10.04.2019].

ЕМСТ = Анатолий А. Алексеев, Анна А. Пичхадзе и др. (изд. подг.), *Евангелие от Матфея в славянской традиции*, С.-Петербург: РГНФ, 2005.

EOE = Sándor Szilágyi (szer.), *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek*, vols. I-III (1540-1596), Budapest: Akadémia Könyvkladó Hivatala, 1875-1877.

HB = Décsi Gyula (olv.), Szabó T. Ádám (kiad.), *A Müncheni kódex (1466). A négy Evangélium szövege és szótára*, Békéscsaba: Európa Könyvkiadó, 1985.

Hurm. = Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, Nicolae Iorga, *Documente privitóre la istoria românilor*, vol. XI (1517-1612), Bucuresci: [s.e.], 1900.

Iorga 1927 = Nicolae Iorga, "Patru documente botoşănene", in *Revista istorică* XIII/ 1-4, 71-74.

Kołodziejczyk 2011 = Kołodziejczyk, Dariusz, *The Crimean Kahnate and Poland-Lithuania. International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th-18th C.). A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2011.

LB = *Biblia:* das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch auffs New zugericht, D. Mart. Luth. [...], Gedrückt zu Wittemberg, Durch Hans Lufft, MDXLI.

LRT = Moses Gaster (ed.), "La versione rumena del Vangelo di Matteo tratta dal *Tetraevanghelion* del 1574 (ms. del Museo britannico: Harley 3611[b]) e pubblicata per la prima volta", in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* XII, 1890-1892, 197-254.

MB = William Kurrelmeyer (hrsg), [Die Mentelin Bibel] *Die erste deutsche Bibel*, I Bd. *Evangelien*, Tübingen: Gedruckt für den Literarischen Verein in Stuttgart, 1924.

Munteanu-Nastasia 2017 = Eugen Munteanu, Mariana Nastasia, "Martin Luther, Scrisoare deschisă despre traducere. Versiune românească de E. Munteanu şi M. Nastasia", in *Transilvania* 3, 2017, 14-24.

MV = *Mihai Viteazul în conştiinţa europeană*, vol. I, *Documente externe*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982.

NTSM = Izabela Winiarska-Górska (ed.), *Nowy Testament zupełny*, tzw. Jana Seklucjana, przekład Stanisława Murzynowskiego, Królewiec, 1553, *http://www.ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1553* [10.04.2019].

Ol = see above Dr.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

PG = *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Series Græca Posterior*, Theophilacti Bulgariæ Archiepiscopi, *Opera quæ repериri potuerunt omnia*, t. I, Lutetiæ Parisorum: Exc. J.-P. Migne, 1864.
PO = Viorica Pamfil (ed.), *Palia de la Orăştie (1581-1582)*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1968.
QGSK = *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Brassó*, IV Bd., Brassó: Gußt, 1903.
SDIR = Nicolae Iorga, *Studii şi documente privind istoria românilor*, vols. I-II, Bucureşti: Editura Ministeriului de Instrucţie, 1901.
Sendb. = *Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 30. Bd., 2. Abt., Weimar: Hermann Böhlaus, 1909, 627-646.
SRT = *Evangheliarul Slavo-Român de la Sibiu (1551-1553)*, studiu introductiv filologic de Emil Petrovici, studiu introductiv istoric de Lajos Demény, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1971.
STS = Tetraevanghelul slavonesc de la Sibiu, 1546 (B.A.R. II 630838).
ST = *Die Septemberbibel: Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther*, Berlin: Grote, 1883.
Stinghe = Sterie Stinghe, *Documente privitoare la trecutul românilor din Şcheĭ (1700-1783)*, vol. I, Braşov: Ciurcu & Co., 1901.
T534 = Grigore Tocilescu (îngr.), *534 documente slavo-române din Ţara Românească şi Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346-1603*, Bucureşti: Cartea Românească, 1931.
TörtT = *Történelmi Tár*, 3. sorozat 19. kötet, 1896-diki Évfolyam.
TR16 = Ion Gheţie (coord.), *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982.
Trg = Hans Miklas *et al.* (hrsgg.), *Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der 1te kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck. Faksimile-Ausgabe*, Padeborn-München-Wien-Zürich: F. Schöningh Vrlg., 1999.
ÚTS = *Sylvester János Új Testamentum. Újszíget 1541*, A kísérő tanulmányt írta és a fakszimile szövegét gondozta: Varjas Béla, Budapest: Akadémiai Kladó, 1960.
ZFB = *Die gantze Bibel der vrsprünglichen ebraischen und griechischen* [...], Getruckt zuo Zürich, bey Christoffel Froschouer, MDXXXI [Die Zwingli-Froschauer Bibel].

B. Lexica and Dictionaries

Babiaczyk = Babiaczyk Adam, *Lexikon zur altpolnischen Bibel 1455 (Sophienbibel, Ausgabe von Małecki)*, Breslau: Fleischmann, 1906.
Damé = Fr. Damé, *Nouveau dictionnaire roumain-français*, vols. I-IV, Bucarest: Imprimerie de l'Etat, 1893-1895.
Даничић = Ђура Даничић, *Рјечник на Књивенних Старина Српских*, vols. I-III, Биограду, Државној Штампарији, 1863-1864.
DC-Lat = Charles du Cange, *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*, vols. I-VIII, Niort: Favre, 1883-1887.
DERS = Gheorghe Bolocan, *Dicţionarul elementelor româneşti din documentele slavoromâne, 1374-1600*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1981.
Diefenbach = Lorenz Diefenbach, *Novum latino-germanicum mediæ et infimæ Ætatis*, Frankfurt A. M.: J. D. Sauerländer's, 1867.
DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, [s.n.], vols. I-XIX, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române R.S.R. [subsequently Editura Academiei Române], 1965-2000.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

DLRV = Gheorghe Mihăilă, *Dicţionarul limbii române vechi. Sfîrşitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI*, Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974.
ESJS = *Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnského*, vols. 1-17, Praha: Akademia, 1989-2010.
Gebauer = Jan Gebauer, *Slovník Staročeský*, vol. I, v Praze: Unie, 1903.
ГСБМ = *Гістарычны Слоўнік Беларускай Мовы*, vols. 1-20, Менск: Навука і Тэхніка [subsequently: Беларуская Навука], 1982-2002.
Laurianu-Massimu = August Tr. Laurianu, Joan C. Massimu, *Glossariu care coprinde vorbele d'in limb'a romana straine prin originea sau form'a loru comu si celle de origine indouiosa*, Bucuresci: Noua Typographia a Laboratoriloru Romani, 1871.
LLP = *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae. Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnskeho*, vols. 1-52, Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd Praha, 1958-1992, Nakladatelství Akademie Věd České Republiky, 1995-1997.
MhDW = Georg F. Benecke, Wilhelm K. Müller, Friedrich K. Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Lepizig: Hirzel, 1854-1863, *http://woerterbuchnetz.de/cgi-bin/WBNetz/wbgui_py?sigle=BMZ&mainmode* [03.04.2019].
Miklosich = Franc Miklosich, *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum. Emendatum Auctum*. Vindobonae: Braumueller, 1862-65.
Scriban = August Scriban, *Dicţionaru limbiĭ româneşt*ĭ, Iaşi: Presa Bună, 1939.
Şăineanu = Lazăr Şăineanu, *Dicţionarul universal al limbei române*, Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, 1929 [1896].
SEW = Erich Berneker, *Slavisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bde 1-2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's, 1924.
Skok = Petar Skok, *Etimologjiski Rječnik Hrvatskoga ili Srpskoga* Jezika, vols. I-III, Zagreb, JAZU, 1971-1973.
Sophocles = Evangelinos A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, New York-Hildesheim: G. Olms Verlag, 1975 [1914].
Срезневский = Изма́ил И. Срезневский, *Матералы для Словаря древне-русскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ*, Т. I-III, С.-Петербургъ: Типографія Императорской Академіи Наукъ, 1893-1912.
ССУМ = *Словник Староукраїнської Мови XIV-XV ст.*, t. 1-2, Київ: Наукова Лумка, 1971-1978.
Szarvas-Simonyi = Gábor Szarvas, Zsigmond Simonyi, *Lexicon Linguæ Hungaricæ Ævi Antiquioris*, vols. I-II, Budapest: Kladja Hornyánszky Viktor Akedémiai Könyvkereskedése, 1890-1911.
Tiktin = Hariton Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Bde 1-3, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Clusium, 2000-2005 [1895-1925].
Urbańczyk = Stanisław Urbańczyk, *Słownik Staropolsky*, vols. 1-11, Warszawa [subsequently Kraków]: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1953-2002.

C. Secondary Literature

Alzati, Cesare, 1981, *Terra romena tra Oriente e Occidente. Chiese ed etnie nel tardo '500*, Milano: Jaca Book.
Alzati, Cesare, 2010, "Tradizione culturale slava, appartenenza confessionale e identità culturale tra i Romeni transilvani nella seconda metà del '500", in *Slavica Ambrosiana* 1, 181-193.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

Bainton, Roland H., 1952, *The Reformation of the 16th Century*, Boston: Beacon Press.
Binder, Pavel, 1971, "Începuturile Reformei din Transilvania şi Românii din Hunedoara", in *Limba română* 20/ 3, 273-276.
Binder, Pavel/ Huttmann, Arnold, 1968, "Contribuţii la biografia lui Filip Moldoveanul, primul tipograf român. Evoluţia vieţii culturale româneşti la Sibiu în epoca umanistă", in *Limbă şi literatură* 16, 145-174.
Birnbaum, Henrik, 1973, "On Some Evidence of Jewish Life and Anti-Jewish Sentiments in Medieval Russia", in *Viator* 4, 225-255.
Bodogae, Teodor, 1972, "Şi totuşi prima carte românească s-a tipărit la Sibiu. Consideraţii despre Evangheliarul slavo-român din 1551-1553", in *Mitropolia Ardealului* 17/ 1-2, 82-89.
Bogdan, Ioan, 1891, "O Evanghelie slavonă cu traducere română din secolul al XVI-lea", in *Convorbiri literare* 25/ 1, 33-40.
Cartojan, Nicolae, 1980 [1940-1945], *Istoria literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti: Editura Minerva.
Dan, Mihail P., 1944, *Cehi, Slovaci şi români în veacurile XIII-XVI*, Sibiu: Progresul.
Deletant, Dennis, 1975, "A Survey of Rumanian Presses and Printing in the 16th Century", in *The Slavonic and East European Review* 53/ 131, 161-174.
Demény, Lajos, 1971, "*Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu* – Prima tipăritură în limba română cunoscută pînă azi", in *SRT*, 22-98.
Demény, Lajos, 1973, "Cartea şi tiparul. Promotori ai legăturilor culturale dintre ţările române în secolul al XVI-lea", in *Studii şi materiale de istorie medie* 6, 91-109.
Demény, Lajos, 1986, "Filigranele Evangheliarului slavo-român de la Sibiu", in Lajos Demény, Lidia A. Demény, *Carte, tipar şi societate la Români în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Kriterion, 294-306.
Demény, Lajos/ Simonescu, Dan, 1965, "Un capitol important din vechea cultură românească (*Tetraevanghelul*, Sibiu 1546)", in *Studii şi cercetări de documentare şi bibliologie*, Supl. la nr. 1, 1-18.
De Michelis, Cesare, 1993, *La Valdesia di Novgorod*, Torino: Claudiana.
Densusianu, Ovid, 1938, *Histoire de la Langue Roumaine*, vol. II, *Le seizième siècle*, Paris, Librairie Ernest Leroux.
Фасмер, Макс Ю., 1906, "Нѣсколько новыхъ трудовъ по лингвистикѣ", in *Византийский Временникъ* 13/ 2, 450-469.
Florescu, Ioan-Florin, 2010, "Le *Tetraévangile* de Sibiu (1551-1553). Nouvelles informations sur les sources de la première traduction en roumain des Evangiles", in *Biblicum Jassyense. Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutics* 1, 48-89.
Gheţie, Ion, 1966, "Consideraţii filologice asupra Evangheliarului din Petersburg", in *Studii şi cercetări de lingvistică* 17/ 1, 47-79.
Gheţie, Ion, 1974, *Textele rotacizante şi originile scrisului literar românesc. Chestiuni de metodă*, in *Începuturile scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 44-97.
Gheţie, Ion, 1979, "Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu şi textele româneşti cu litere latine şi ortografie maghiară", in *Limba română* 28/ 2, 165-172.
Gheţie, Ion/ Mareş, Alexandru, 1985, *Originile scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 336-357.
Giurescu, Constantin C., 1967, *Târguri sau oraşe şi cetăţi moldovene din secolul al X-lea pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

Hervay, Ferenc, 1965, "L'imprimerie du maître Philippe de Nagyszeben et les premiers livres en langue roumaine", in *Magyar Könyvszemle* 81/ 2 sz., 119-127.

Ionescu, Anca Irina, 1976, "Contribution à l'étude du lexique employé dans les traductions roumaines du «Synopsis de Kiev»", in *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 21/ 3, 401-408.

Ionescu, Ion, 1994, "Doi termeni paleocreştini din epoca daco-română", in *Limba română* 43/ 1-2, 28-31.

Iordan, Iorgu, 1963, *Toponimia românească*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.P.R.

Jakó, Zsigmond, 1977, "Tiparul cu literele latine din Sibiu în secolul al XVI-lea", in *Philobiblon Transilvan*, Bucureşti: Editura Kriterion, 93-116.

Köpeczi 1992: Köpeczi, Béla, 1992, *Histoire de la Transylvanie*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Macůrek, Josef, 1927, "Husitství v rumunských zemích", in *Časopis Matice Moravské* 51, 1-98.

Macůrek, Josef, 1968, "A influenţat actul ceh de cancelarie documentele moldoveneşti în a doua jumătate a secolului al XV-lea?", in *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 21/ 1, 3-20.

Mareş, Alexandru, 1967, "Observaţii cu privire la *Evangheliarul din Petersburg*", in *Limba română* 16/ 1, 65-75.

Mareş, Alexandru, 1968, "Evangheliarul din Petersburg, tipărirea unei mai vechi traduceri moldoveneşti", in *Limba română* 17/ 1, 85-87.

Mareş, Alexandru, 1990, "Cîteva observaţii asupra *Tetraevanghelului* slavo-român de la Sibiu", in *Limba română* 39/ 3, 235-242.

Mareş, Alexandru, 2005, "Originalele primelor traduceri româneşti ale *Tetraevanghelului* şi *Psaltirii*", in *Scriere şi cultură românească veche*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei, 259-281; in Ion Gheţie (coord.), *Cele mai vechi texte româneşti. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*, Bucureşti: Universitatea din Bucureşti, 1982, 183-205.

Mârza, Eva, 1978, "Un fragment din Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551-1553)", in *Limba română* 27/ 2, 173-175; in *Explorări bibliografice*, Sibiu: Techno-Media, 2008, 14-16.

Mihăescu, Haralambie, 1967, *Influenţa grecească asupra limbii române pînă în secolul al XV-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Enciclopedică.

Mihăescu, Haralambie, 1993, *La Romanité dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.

Mihăilă, Gheorghe, 1972, "Textele bilingve slavo-române şi unele aspecte ale studiului calculului lingvistic", in *Contribuţii la istoria culturii şi literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti: Editura Minerva, 231-249.

Mihăilă, Gheorghe, 1981, "Primul manuscris românesc pre-coresian datat: Codicele Popii Bratul din Braşov (1559-1560) şi sursele sale", in *Studii de lingvistică şi filologie*, Timişoara: Facla, 59-114.

Mitu, Mihai, 1963, "Termeni de origine polonă în documentele slavo-moldoveneşti. I. 1388-1517", in *Romanoslavica* 8, 155-224.

Mollay, Karl, 1992, "Die deutsch-ungarischen Sprachkontakte", in Honti, László *et al.* (hrsgg.), *Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachen zwischen dem germanischen und dem slavischen Sprachraum*, Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 111-116.

Nestle, E., 1907, "The Gospels in the Latin Vulgate", in *The American Journal of Theology* 11/ 3, 501-502.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)

Олтяну, Панделе, 1958, "Некоторые особенности славянского языка Трансильвании", in *Romanoslavica* II, 77-114.

Panaitescu, Petre P., 1964, "Husitismul şi cultura slavonă în Moldova", in *Romanoslavica* X, 275-287.

Panaitescu, Petre P., 1965, *Începuturile şi biruinţa scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.P.R.

Papacostea, Şerban, 1958, "Moldova în epoca Reformei. Contribuţie la istoria societăţii moldoveneşti în veacul al XVI-lea", in *Studii. Revista de istorie* 11/ 4, 55-76.

Petrovici, Emil, 1971, "Observaţii asupra grafiei şi limbii textului românesc al Evangheliarului Slavo-Român de la Sibiu", in *SRT*, 9-21.

Popinceanu, Ion, 1964, *Religion, Glaube und Aberglaube in der Rumänischen Sprache*, Nürnberg: Hans Karl.

Rocchi, Luciano, 1987, "Per una storia della terminologia cristiana ungherese", in *Quaderni Patavini di linguistica* 6, 31-69.

Rocchi, Luciano, 1990, *Latinismi e romanismi antichi nelle lingue slave meridionali*, Udine: Campanotto.

Rosetti, Alexandru, 1958, "Cu privire la datarea primelor traduceri româneşti de cărţi religioase", in *Limba română* 7/ 2, 20-22.

Sabău, Ioan, 1943, "O nouă listă a episcopilor catolici din Moldova", in *Revista istorică* 29/ 7-9, 235-242.

Skok, Petar, 1927, "La terminologie chrétienne en slave: l'église, les prêtres et les fidèles", in *Revue des études slaves* 7/ 3, 177-198.

Stabile, Giuseppe, 2019, "Rumanian *Slavia* as the Frontier of Orthodoxy. The Case of the Slavo-Rumanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu", in *Studia Ceranea* 9, 59-87.

Šmahel, František, 1993, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 4, *Epilog bouřlivého věku*, Praha: Univerzita Karlova.

Tasmowski, Liliane, 2009, "În ajunul unei ediţii transliterate şi electronice a Evangheliarului bilingv slavo-român de la Sibiu", in Giampaolo Borghello *et al.* (eds.), *Per Teresa. Studi e ricerche in ricordo di Teresa Ferro*, vol. 2, *Obiettivo Romania*, Udine: Forum Editrice, 327-338.

BDD-A32159 © 2019-2020 Centrul de Studii Biblico-Filologice
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-16 04:56:38 UTC)