EUGEN PAVEL

THE SLAVONIC MODEL *VERSUS* THE LATIN MODEL IN THE ROMANIAN BIBLICAL TEXTS[*]

1.1. Research conducted on the literary influences propagated within the sphere of old Romanian writing entails unravelling aspects that pertain to the pre-eminence of the sacred languages as source-languages, which became consecrated, at a certain time, in the transmission of fundamental religious works. We shall refer herein to the originals of the first translations of the biblical texts: they were organically linked to the medieval tradition of our culture and literature, to an age in which we could speak, to use N. Cartojan's phrase, about the "Romanian soul in Slavonic form". Compiled, at first, in fragmentary manner, in the form of self-standing books, among which *Psalmi* (the Psalms), *Tetraevanghel* (the Tetraevangelion) and *Apostol* (the Apostolos) had become the most widespread by the sixteenth century, they were largely indebted, therefore, to a Slavonic model. According to I.-A. Candrea (PS, I, p. CX–CXII), the first Romanian versions of *Psaltirea* (the Psalter) belonged, with the exception of *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki* (the Hurmuzaki Psalter), to a single translation, which appears to have followed a similar version to the Serbian one of Branko Mladenović from 1346. Candrea's mere hypothesis, issued without further arguments, was not accepted by Ştefan Ciobanu, who contended that the common translation of the Psalms was made after a Ruthenian text, as attested by the presence of the Creed with the addition "Filioque" in *Psaltirea Scheiană* (the Psalter of Scheia)*,* which could be explained by the Catholic "onslaught" in this space (Ciobanu 1947/1989, p. 96). It was also Ştefan Ciobanu who promoted the idea that the prototype of the sixteenth-century psalters was found in *Psaltirea slavo-română* (the Romanian-Slavonic Psalter), with alternative text, from which the unilingual versions were allegedly "extracted" at a subsequent time (Ciobanu 1940–1941, p. 65), a theory shared later by G. Mihăilă (1972, p. 243–244). The opinion regarding the extensive bilingualism of the first Romanian translation was regarded with reserve by Ştefan Paşca (1956, p. 82–85) and rejected, more categorically, by I. Gheţie. While acknowledging the didactic function of bilingual texts, the latter author believed that they could not be

---

considered as the sole sources from which all the Romanian renditions of the holy books stemmed (Gheție 1974, p. 201).

Reviewing the results of research on the foreign versions underlying the first translations of the Holy Scripture into Romanian, Al. Mareş draws several reasonable conclusions based on textual criticism (Mareş 1982; Mareş 2005, p. 259–281). Candrea's assumption about the original of the *Psalter of Scheia* is, however, only partially confirmed, as the source is an intermediate version between the initial old Slavonic translation, revised by collation with the Greek text (a revision present in Mladenović's manuscript, as well as in MS. Sl. 205 BAR), and the later lections in which this new version was transposed. As regards the *Hurmuzaki Psalter*, which features several textual differences from the other Romanian translations of the *Psalter*, an accredited idea is that the original is situated both in the line of the new version and in that of old Glagolitic translations, of the *Psalterium Vindobonense* and *Psalterium Sinaiticum* type, or of the Palaeoslavic version, of the *Psalterium Bononiense* type.

1.2. Transmitted through two sixteenth-century versions, namely the 1551–1553 edition from Sibiu and the Coresi edition of 1561, the translation of the four Gospels was also based on a Slavonic model, as was the 1574 manuscript copy of Radu of Măniceşti. Summarizing the problem of the sources valorized in the Romanian *Tetraevangelion*, we shall retain, first, the indication provided by Emil Petrovici, concerning the dependence of the translation printed in 1551–1553 on the Slavonic text arranged in parallel, taken from the *Tetraevangelion* that appeared in Sibiu, in 1546, identical with the edition printed by Macarie in 1512. According to Emil Petrovici, this appears to have belonged to the Bulgarian version, evincing, in some situations, also forms pertaining to the Serbian or Russian versions. Opinions regarding the source of *Tetraevangelion* from Braşov inclined, first, towards a version similar to that existing in Coresi's Slavonic edition of 1562, different, that is, from the Macarie's (Gaster CR, I, p. XXVI–XVIII). The prevailing views, however, were those maintaining that the translation of 1561 was dependent of the version of Macarie's Slavonic *Tetraevangelion*. In this case too, the dissociations operated by Al. Mareş were decisive in terms of philological clarifications: he considered that Coresi's version was not limited to a single Slavonic source, being the result of multiple source compilation, and that foremost among these sources was the edition printed in Sibiu, correlated with a type B Slavonic version (different from the type A Macarian version). At the same time, Mareş admitted that the newly drafted version of the gospels was initially constructed as a bilingual text, which was fragmentarily preserved in the copy from the *Codicele Bratul* (Bratul Codex) (1559–1560).

2.1. The Slavonic versions were not the only ones invoked as possible sources of the sixteenth-century Romanian translations. Having found several dissimilarities from the Slavonic form, Emil Petrovici claimed in his introductory study to the 1971 edition that the translators of the *Tetraevangelion* from Sibiu may also have resorted to Luther's *New Testament*, pointing out a series of correspondences that may be explained only by analogy with the German text. Having analyzed the examples given by Petrovici, as well as new ones, Al. Mareş

rightly asked whether the translation had been carried out first from German and whether it was later collated, with a view to its appearance in print, with a type A Slavonic version. The author recognized that it was more difficult to establish the manner in which the two foreign sources were valorized in compiling the Romanian version (simultaneously or sequentially, and in what order).

We shall not analyze here all the commented examples, but shall focus only on two contexts. In the first part of Matt 9, 16, the ES version is as follows: *Nimenile nu cârpeaşte cu petecul nov veşmântul vechi* [*No one sews a new patch on an old garment*]. The equivalence is different from the Slavonic text, where for the phrase *petecul nov* [*new patch*] there appears *plata nebĕlena* (meaning "unwhitened, unbleached cloth"). In CT the correspondence with the Slavonic original is obvious: *Nime amu nu poate spărtura cârpi cu pânză nenălbită spre cămaşă veche* [*No one can now sew a patch of unwhitened cloth onto an old shirt*]. After showing that even in the *Vulgate* there appears the form *rudis*, meaning "rough, raw, uncultivated", Petrovici indicates the segment corresponding to Luther's translation: *einem Lappen von neuem Tuch* (meaning "a piece of new cloth"). We should make here a remark on the configuration of that passage in various Latin versions. Indeed, in VgCl, that verse reads as follows: *Nemo autem immittit commissuram panni rudis in vestimentum vetus*. A similar version is encountered in Erasmus: *Nullus autem immittit assumentum panni rudis in vestem veterem*. At Beza, however, the phrase *petecul nov* [*new patch*] corresponds precisely to the form *panniculus novus* in the following verse: *Nullus autem indit panniculum novum in vestimentum vetus*. In another Romanian translation of the seventeenth century, *Noul Testament* (the New Testament) from 1648, whose lineage we shall analyze below, we may also find a faithful transposition of the Latin text established by Theodore Beza[1]: *Deci nime nu va cârpi veşmântul vechiu cu peatec nou* [*So no one shall sew a new patch on an old garment*].

Another example evincing correspondences with Luther's text as mentioned by E. Petrovici appears in Matt 12, 43: PS *locure uscate* [*dry places*] (cf. Sl. *bezĭ vodnaa* "without water") – Germ. *dürre Stätten*; cf. CT *fără-de-apă* [*waterless*]. The correspondence appears, however, in all the Latin versions: VgCl *loca arida*; Erasm *arentia loca*; Beza *arida loca*. The German source is therefore not the only one that can be invoked in these contexts. We shall return on another occasion to the correspondences between the Sibiu version of the first gospel and a possible secondary Latin model, in competition with the German one.

A more recent hypothesis, formulated by Ioan-Florin Florescu (2010, p. 38–90), admits the presence of concordances between ES and the Hussite Czech versions (*Biblia Olomoucká*), as well as with the old German ones from the late

---

[1] On the complex personality of the French theologian Théodore de Bèze, with the Latinized named Theodorus Beza (1519–1605), a disciple of Calvin's, see especially Clavier 1960; Geisendorf 1967; Dufour 2006.

fifteenth century, edited and printed by Johannes Mentelin, a hypothesis on which we shall not pronounce ourselves at this moment.

2.2. In connection with the translation of the *Apostolos,* philologists again admit the existence of a Slavonic model, based on the well-known conclusion of Bohuš Tenora, according to whom the *Apostolos* belongs to the fourth version, present in manuscripts and printed documents of Eastern Slavic origin, which came into circulation in the fourteenth century. According to Mariana Costinescu, the common translation from which the three Romanian versions descended – the *Codicele Voronețean* (the Codex of Voroneț), dated c. 1563–1583 (CV), the Coresian *Apostolos* of 1566 (CPr) and the one written by the priest Bratul in 1559–1560 (CB) – followed a Medio-Bulgarian prototype, revised through different Slavonic versions for each individual variant. In parallel, at a certain stage in the translation, recourse was made, in this case too, to Luther's *Bible*, as Mariana Costinescu, the late editor of CV contended, as well as to a Latin source, which may explain the text portions that do not find their counterpart in the Slavonic versions investigated. Costinescu stated, however, that the text translated from Slavonic was not collated directly with Luther's edition, as in the case of the *Tetraevangelion* from Sibiu, but with a Romanian source translated from German. It is true, however, that these lineages should not be regarded as absolutely foolproof, since not all the Slavonic editions of the *Apostolos* can be consulted. The problem of identifying the Latin source is not fully elucidated, as the Reformed environment in which the translation was made preferred, probably, to a greater extent, more recent renditions of the *New Testament* text to the *Vulgate*. It should be noted that the version of Erasmus' *New Testament* in Greek and Latin, published in Basel in 1516, was reissued by the Lutheran ecclesiastical circles in Transylvania, at Braşov, in 1557. It remains, therefore, for the future comparative investigations to bring new information concerning the Latin version and the proportions in which it was used.

We have outlined a few benchmarks regarding the state of research on the authority of the Slavonic model in the accomplishment of the first Romanian translation of the biblical text, against the background of its rather pale contenders, namely the Latin model and, respectively, the German one.

We shall not insist on the status of the Hungarian model, adopted solely in the translation of the *Palia de la Orăştie* (*Palia* from Orăştie), 1582, comprising the first two books of the Old Testament (*Bitia* = Genesis and *Ishodul* = Exodus), but whose influence on other Romanian translations of the biblical text represents a chapter that is still open. The statement from the preface to this work, whereby the translation was made from Hebrew, Greek and Slavonic, proved to be without real support. However, the authors themselves suggested that they had also consulted sources "in other languages, too, of the kind no longer in use". Still, the conclusions of Mario Roques (1913, p. 515–531), resumed in the introduction to the 1925 partial edition of the *Palia*, are relevant. The central idea of Roques' study is that the features that set the *Palia* apart from the Hungarian model are not

derived from a Hebrew, Greek, Slavonic or Lutheran version. The translators resorted, in his opinion, to a corrected edition of the *Vulgate*, which came close to the *Bible* published by Lucas Osiander in Tübingen in 1573. Recourse to textual criticism enabled the French philologist to observe, for example, that the *Vulgate* was translated, preferably, in Gen 1–5 and Exod 1–16. But not all the different passages in Gáspár Heltai's *Pentateuch* of 1551 had a counterpart in Osiander's edition, which led Roques to assume the use of other versions, too, for some concordancies and glosses. While the division of chapters 36–39 in Exod corresponds to the traditional sections of the *Vulgate*, in other portions the verses are arranged just like in Luther's *Bible* or the versions inspired by it. The special division of the chapters could have been operated, however, subsequent to the translation, in accordance with another source, unvalorized hitherto, which had a similar structure. The comparative textual analysis undertaken by Roques emphasizes also some "contaminations"[2] appearing between the various original texts, among which the one of Slavonic extraction seems to have played a more formal role.

3. The attempts to identify a dominant Latin model in the same period, which may have preceded or have been simultaneous with the Slavonic one, requires a special discussion. In an article published in "Revista de istorie şi teorie literară", I. C. Chiţimia (1981, p. 151–156) cast an unusual perspective on the originals of the first Romanian translations. The literary historian advanced the idea that the primitive translation of the Psalms into Romanian, with special reference to the *Psalter of Scheia*, capitalized upon a previous translation from Latin, which, for "remaining in the Oriental Orthodox canon", was revised or rewritten on the basis of a Slavonic text. He grounded his theory on the recurrences of terms of Latin origin, such as *mesereare* "mercy", *pănătare* and *părătare* "passion", *păraţ* "hard palate", *vence, vânce, învence, prevence* "to defeat", *a deşidera* "to desire". Moreover, the author makes some parallels between the "Latinisms" in the PS and the corresponding places in the *Vulgate*, concluding that one cannot speak about "a chance encounter of the texts". However tempting such a hypothesis might be, it cannot, for now, dismantle the conclusions reached in this chapter of philological research. Ion Gheţie's intervention (1982, p. 181–185) was not only a response to the theory put forward by I. C. Chiţimia, but also a methodological approach that any investigation of sources should guide itself by. First, the mere presence in the PS of words of Latin origin is no guarantee that they derived from the aforementioned hypothetical Latin source, rather than from the live speech of the translator or copyists. Second, the coincidences with the Latin text do not exceed, as I. Gheţie observed, 30–35% of the situations considered. We believe that I. C. Chiţimia selected only examples that attested similarities between the Latin and the

---

[2] Regarding the contribution of the two main sources, Hungarian and Latin, see also Gafton 2012, p. 113–204.

Romanian wording. If we juxtapose other parallel segments, the said lineage has no support, as can be seen in Ps 106, 38, where the presence of terms of Slavonic origin – *blagoslovi* "to bless" and *umnoji* "to multiply" – excludes any correspondence with the Latin text (cf. KJV):

> PS: *Şi blagoslovi ei şi umnojiră-se foarte; şi vitele lor nu nişchite.*
> VgCl: *Et benedixit eis et multiplicati sunt nimis; et jumenta eorum non minoravit.*
> KJV: *He blesseth them also, so that are multiplied greatly; and suffereth not their cattle to decreasse.*

The only way to indicate correctly the source of the translation is, as I. Gheție concludes, to conduct an exhaustive comparison between the Romanian text and the Slavonic and Latin one, which may allow one to infer the extent to which the Romanian version reflects solutions specific to one of the two versions that might have served as its model.

A re-examination of the issue of the source language for the oldest Romanian translations of the *Psalter* has lately been undertaken by Eugen Munteanu (1994, p. 57–70; 2008, p. 122–144). He started from the idea that during the process of compiling the translation, one or several of the translators or revisers used also a Latin version, either exclusively or in conjunction with a Slavonic version. In order to support his demonstration, the Iaşi-based philologist has compared the oldest Latin versions, concluding that PS shows convergences with PsRom, actually a corrected version of the first translation of the sacred text into Latin, known as the *Vetus Latina* (or *Itala*). In parallel, there are rendered the forms in PsGal, the second translation of Ieronim, a variant adopted in the *Clementine Vulgate* too. Among the examples mentioned, several are enlightening as regards the correspondences between PS and PsRom, as in Ps 102, 3 (cf. KJV):

> PS: *Ce curăţeaşte toate fără-legile tale, ce vindecă toate lângorile tale.*
> PsRom: *Qui propitius fit omnibus iniquitatibus tuis, qui sanat omnes languores tuos.*
> PsGal: *Qui propitiatur omnibus iniquitatibus tuis, qui sanat omnes infirmitates tuas.*
> VgCl: *Qui propitiatur omnibus iniquitatibus tuis; qui sanat omnes infirmitates tuas.*
> KJV: *Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases*.

Indeed, there is thus a textual identity between the Lat. *languores* and the Rom. *lângorile*, which may also be identified in Coresi's *Psalter*. The form is present only in PsRom, as opposed to the Lat. *infirmitates* in PsGal and VgCl. In

other cases, however, such coincidences are not attested between PS and PsRom[3]. We shall resume the example given by the author from Ps 21, 30, which we shall now present more extensively:

> PS: *Mâncară şi închirară-se toţi graşii pământului; şi întru-însu cadu toţi ce deştingu îm pământu.*
>
> PsRom: *Manducaverunt et adoraverunt omnes divites terrae; in conspectu eius procident universi qui descendunt in terram.*
>
> PsGal: *Manducaverunt et adoraverunt omnes pingues terrae; in conspectu eius cadent omnes qui descendunt in terram.*
>
> Vg Cl: *Manducaverunt et adoraverunt omnes pingues terrae; in conspectu ejus cadent omnes qui descendunt in terram.*
>
> KJV: *All they that be fat upon eartth shall eat and worship: all they that go down to the dust shall bow before him.*

The Rom. *deştingu* – Lat. *descendunt* pair, highlighted by E. Munteanu in support of his hypothesis about the sources, is common to the rest of the Latin versions. Still, there appears the divergence *graşii – divites* "the rich" between PS and PsRom; in PsGal and VgCl, the concordance is clear: *graşii – pingues*. These examples are sufficient, therefore, for questioning the current use of a particular Latin version (*Psalterium Romanum*) in the initial translation of the *Psalter of Scheia*. Research on the possible use of a Latin model in the translation of the first biblical texts in Romanian has not yet reached definitive, unanimously acceptable conclusions.

4.1. We believe that the actual transition from the Slavonic to the Latin model occurred only at the middle of the eighteenth century, with the printed versions that appeared in Bălgrad (Alba Iulia). The first, rather vague clues regarding the original of the translation of the *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* (New Testament from Bălgrad, 1648), appear on the very title page, which states explicitly that the text is derived "with great discernment" from a Greek source and a Slavonic source. The two prefaces with which the book opens – the former being dedicatory, offered to the Prince of Transylvania, and the latter being addressed to the readers – broaden the range of sources by mentioning, in addition to the already specified ones, an original Latin document. We believe that this was in fact the main version after which the translation into Romanian was made, the other two sources representing merely control versions, meant to sanction, at the same time, the canonical character of the text destined for the Orthodox clergy. We assumed in a previous paper (Pavel 2001, p. 163–167) that the translation of the *New Testament* followed a bilingual edition with parallel text, in line with the stage of Lutheran biblical criticism at that moment. Promoted by the Calvinist circles in

---

[3] For comparison, we have used the famous edition of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples (Jacobus Faber Stapulensis), *Quincuplex Psalterium. Gallicum. Romanum. Hebraicum. Vetus. Conciliatum*, Paris, Henrici Stephani officina, 1509 (BAR Cluj, call no. C 59570).

Alba Iulia, this type of Greek-Latin edition was made available, in our opinion, to the translators and revisers in Simion Ştefan's entourage; they valorized this edition in the first full translation of the New Testament text into the Romanian language. This should not be surprising, as a few decades later, Nicolae Milescu – followed by the subsequent reviewers of his translation, which was incorporated into the content of the *Bible* published in Bucharest in 1688 – also resorted, for the most part, to an edition of the *Septuagint*, published in Frankfurt in 1597, in a Protestant environment. The manner of editing established by the polyglot *Bibles* had increasingly gained ground in the Bibliology of the time.

Based on similarities detected between the *şumele* (summaries) of each chapter in the printed document from 1648 and the text of the corresponding Latin schools, as well as on the role of the marginal glosses, which recorded variants of translation and semantic-lexical differences from other control versions, we may take into consideration the possibility that the translators from Alba Iulia prevalently used a Greek-Latin edition of the polyglot type. Such bilingual editions appeared in the printing shop of the Estienne family, from the middle of the sixteenth century on. The standard text was the Editio Regia (Royale Edition) published by Robert Estienne (Stephanus) in Paris in 1550, which capitalized on Erasmus' version. In 1565, a new version of Erasmus' text in Latin began to be edited systematically in the same chancery, completed and thoroughly annotated by Theodore Beza (first published by Robert Estienne in 1556), in parallel with the Greek text and the old version of the *Vulgate*, with numerous conjectural amendments (Krans 2006, p. 195–332). However, neither the printed text from 1569, nor the first editions comprising Beza's translation had a full critical apparatus, or a reproduction in parallel of all the versions, as would be the case of the Geneva edition in 1580. An edition that was closer to the date of the translation was the *Novum Testamentum graece & latine*, printed at Geneva in 1611, in the chancery of Samuel Crispin, who resumed the text established by Henri II Estienne, with a three-column presentation (in Greek, Beza's new version and the old version in the *Vulgate*), each chapter being accompanied by a summary (*argumentum*). Identical summaries also appeared in the Geneva edition of 1604, but the text was arranged in two columns here: the Greek version and Beza's version. The very thorough explanatory marginal glosses and the possibility of confronting two Latin versions with the Greek prototype were, thus, for the editors from Alba Iulia a model of high-class textual criticism, which they applied consistently. The fact is that this type of scientific editing of the biblical text, based on the translation from the Greek of the *New Testament* made by Theodore Beza, was one of the most authorized sources in that period. It was also followed closely by the English translators of the King James Version (Backus 1980) and stood at the basis of the Elzevirian editions, from 1624 on, subsequently adopted as the "textus receptus".

We have demonstrated that most of the coincidences between the summaries of the chapters of the *New Testament* from 1648 and those found in Beza's edition

are not haphazard, but suggest a possible relationship of filiation. We shall offer other examples in this respect; these prove the existence of obvious correspondences, which were not translated mechanically but were accurately correlated by the translators from Bălgrad:

Mark 16
Beza

1. Christi resurrectio. 9. Christus apparet Maria Magdalenae et aliis. 15. Mittit Apostolos ad praedicandum. 19. Ascensio Christi.

NTB

1. Scularea lui Hristos. 9. Hristos să arată Mariii Magdalinii şi altor. 15. Trimise apostolii a propovedui. 19. Suirea lui Hristos. [*1. The resurrection of Christ. 9. Christ appears to Mary Magdalene and to others. 15. He sent the apostles to preach. 19. The ascension of Christ.*]

Rev 5
Beza

1. Librum septem sigillis obsignatum. 3. Quem nemo aperire poterat. 6. Agnus ille Dei. 6. Dignus qui ipsum aperiat. 12. Omnium cœlistium voce decantatur.

NTB

1. Carte sămnată cu 7 peceţi. 3. Pre carea nime nu o poate deşchide. 6. Mielul lui Dumnezău. 9. Destoinic să o deşchidă, cum cântă toţi ai ceriului. [*1. A scroll signed with 7 seals. 3. Which no one can open. 6. Gods' Lamb. 9. Worthy to open its seals, as everyone in heaven sings.*]

The similarities with some Latin sources are not limited to the introductory summaries, nonexistent in the *Vulgate*, but appear in other parts of the text too. An indication as to the use of a certain Latin source as the basic version is the gloss to the toponym *Vad Bun* [*Good Ford*]: *greceaşte îl chema acel loc Pulcru* [*that place was called fair havens in Greek*] (Acts 27, 8). The term corresponds, in reality, to the form in Beza's version, where there appears *Pulchros portus*, unlike in the Greek version, where we find the syntagm Καλοὺς Λιμένας. We should note that *Pulchriportus* appears in Erasmus' translation, while in Tremellio's version the phrase is *Portus pulchri*, unlike in the *Vulgate*, where the equivalence is *Boniportus*.

We shall further compare a verse from the Lord's Prayer in the two evangelical occurrences. In Luke 11, 3, the wording in the NTB (*Pâinea noastră de toate zilele dă-ne noao astăzi*) corresponds exactly to the *Vulgate* (*Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*), but also partly to the versions of Beza (*Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis in diem*) and Erasmus (*Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis quotidie*); cf. KJV: *Give us day by day our daily bread*. By contrast, in Matt 6, 11, the translators from Bălgrad trenchantly opted for Beza's new variant, identical, in this place, with that of Erasmus: *Panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie*; NTB: *Pâinea noastră de toate zilele dă-ni-o noao astăzi*; cf. the *Vulgate*:

Panem nostrum supersubstantialem da nobis hodie; cf. KJV: *Give us this day our daily bread*. Note should be made that, in the same context, in 1760–1761 Petru Pavel Aron translated the passage from the *Vulgate* faithfully and with some stylistic adequacy: *Pânea noastră ce mai presus de fire dă-ne noao astăzi*. The translation from the paradigm of Slavic origin (*Pita noastră săţioasă dă-ne noao astăzi/în toate zilele* [*Give us our hearty bread today/day by day*]), found in Coresi, to the one of Western inspiration was generalized, therefore, in the formula of the Lord's Prayer, which circulated at that time, as well as throughout the first translation of the *New Testament* into Romanian.

4.2. In the case of the *Psalter* of Bălgrad from 1651, the basic version that the Transylvanian scholars used was, as we have shown in detail elsewhere (Pavel 2001, p. 180–200), the translation into Latin made by Sante Pagnini[4]. The famous Italian Orientalist achieved, after having worked on it for 30 years, a new translation of the *Bible* from Hebrew, the first one in Latin in which the verses are numbered separately for each chapter. The new translation of the *Bible* was published, first, by Robert Estienne in Lugdunum (Lyon) in 1528, another edition of the same text being edited by Michel Servet, in Lyon, in 1542. Pagnini's Latin *Bible*, appreciated for its very literal translation, was adopted, in the second half of the sixteenth century, into the polyglot editions published first by Plantin, and later in those edited by François Vatable. These editions stood out through some common principles of editing: the use of a four-column layout for the biblical text (Hebrew, Greek, the *Vulgate* and Pagnini's new translation), a rigorous critical apparatus, with ample infra-page notes, as well as with the titles of the *Old Testament* books rendered in Hebrew. We have taken into consideration, for comparison, an edition of the *Biblia Sacra*, in two volumes, published in the care of Arias Montanus, at Antwerp/ Antwerpen, in the Plantinian Office, in 1572. In addition, we have also considered the edition annotated by Vatable, also accomplished on the basis of Sante Pagnini's version, printed in two volumes in Heidelberg, in 1616. The model used in the *Psalter* of Bălgrad, in 1651, is recognizable, therefore, both through the Hebrew titles reproduced and, especially, through the correspondences that can be highlighted between the Romanian text and the Latin text established by Pagnini, with which most of the solutions adopted by the Transylvanian translators are consistent. We found, on the other hand, sporadic references to the Greek text, in addition to those regarding the structure and numbering of the Psalms, and to the *Vulgate*, many of these being included in the marginal glosses that form, in many cases, a *sui generis* critical apparatus. We shall bring some new examples supporting the idea of the lineage we have proposed. In Ps 86, 4, the dependence of PB on Pagnini's Latin text is total, as opposed to the text of the *Vulgate*:

---

[4] In connection with the personality and the work of Sante Pagnini, whose Latinized name was Xantes Pagninus (c. 1470–1541), see Simon 1685, p. 313–318; Centi 1945, p. 5–51; Luzzi 1946; Wind 1944, p. 211–246; Guerra 1990, p. 191–198.

PB: *Pomeni-voiu Eghipetul şi Vavilonul între cunoscuţii miei; iată Palistina şi Tirul şi cu Arapiia, cesta au născut acolea.* [*I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon to them that know me; behold Philistia, and Tyre, with Ethiopia; this man was born there*.]

VgCl: *Memor ero Rahab et Babylonis, scientium me; ecce alienigenae, et Tyrus, et populus Æthiopum, hi fuerunt illic.*

LXX: *μνησθήσομαι Ρααβ καὶ Βαβυλῶνος τοῖς γινώσκουσίν με· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀλλόφυλοι καὶ Τύρος καὶ λαὸς Αἰθιόπων, οὗτοι ἐγενήθησαν ἐκεῖ.*

Pagnini: *Memorabo Ægyptum et Babel inter scierntes me; ecce Pelesthina, et Tyrus cum Æthiopia, iste nmatus est ibi.*

Another example of how complex the modality of double translation is may be illustrated by Ps 2, 12:

PB: *Sărutaţi Fiul (luaţi învăţătură); ca să nu să mânie (Domnul) şi să periţi din calea direaptă.* [*Kiss the Son (take teaching), lest He 9the Lord) be angry, and ye perish from the right way*.]

VgCl: *Apprehendite disciplinam, nequando irascatur Dominus, et pereatis de via justa.*

LXX: *δράξασθε παιδείας, μήποτε ὀργισθῇ κύριος καὶ ἀπολεῖσθε ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαίας.*

Pagnini: *Osculamini Filium, ne forte irascatur, et pereatis in via.*

In the sequence *sărutaţi Fiiul (luaţi învăţătură)* [*Kiss the Son (take teaching)*], the translation from Hebrew *via* Latin (*osculamini Filium*) is doubled, in parentheses, by the variant in the other versions: LXX *δράξασθε παιδείας*; Vg *apprehendite disciplinam*; Sl. **прїимите наказанїє**; see also PS, CP₁, CM *luaţi învăţătură* [*take teaching*]; cf. also PH *prindeţi învăţătura* [*catch the teaching*]; CP₂ *certarea învăţătură* [*admonition teaching*]. The remainder of the verse in PB also follows the structure of the *Septuagint* and the *Vulgate*. The scholars from Alba Iulia established the humanistic method of comparing sources in translation practice and accomplished the first editions with a strong critical bent.

Another attempt at detachment from the Latin original in favour of the Slavonic occurred in the second half of the seventeenth century, when Dosoftei stated, in the epilogue of *Psaltirea de-nţăles* (Psalter to be Understood) of 1680, that "it has been interpreted from the source of St. Ieronim, which is in Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew", adding that "we took great lengths to put the words as they are found in that source". We shall analyse on another occasion the polyglot version and type of edition used by the Moldovan scholar (cf. Moldovanu 1984, p. 420–425).

5. The complete editions of the Holy Scripture, starting with the *Bible* of Bucharest from 1688, were largely based on the Greek model, more specifically on the *Septuagint*, while the Slavonic and Latin sources were relegated to the background, without being totally ignored. Thus, the sources of Nicolae Milescu's primary translation, made between the years 1661–1664 (Cândea 1978, p. 106–171), are mentioned in *Foreword to the readers* in MS. 45 (BAR Cluj), from which the BB is derived, namely the *Septuagint* edition of 1597, from Frankfurt ("Frangofort"), considered to be a "source that is more special than all others". To this is added, for

comparison, "izvodul slovenescu" [a Slavonic source], identified with the Ostrog edition of 1581, then another in "leteneşte" ["Latin"], probably one of the usual editions of the *Vulgate*, printed in the former Plantinian Office from Antwerp/Antwerpen, like the ones that appeared in 1599, 1619, 1628 or 1645. We shall not opt for one of the previous similar printed texts from this center, produced by Christophe Plantin, since they were usually polyglot editions, and the writer of the preface would not have glossed this over in his explanations of the sources. In the preamble, there is also a reference to "another Latin source that has recently come out in the Jewish language", which, we might assume, was one of the new translations of the *Biblia Sacra* into Latin made by renowned Hebrew scholars like Sante Pagnini, Sebastian Münster, Léon de Juda, Sébastien Castalion or Emanuele Tremellio, together with François de Jon, which appeared successively in the sixteenth century, while some were re-edited into the next century. Another declared Slavonic source underlies yet another complete translation of the Holy Scripture, preserved in MS. BAR 4389, attributed to Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, in whose preface the models followed are defined thus: "Drept aceaea, alăturând izvodul slovenesc carele au fost tipărit în Rusiia cea mică, în cetatea Ostrovului, şi izvodul lătinesc, care au fost tipărit în cetatea Antverpiei, şi acel izvod rumânesc de care se spuse mai sus, aşa de pre dânsele cu multă socotinţă am prepus". ["Wherefore putting together the Slavonic source that was printed in Smaller Russia, in the city of Ostrov, and the Latin source, which was printed in the city of Antverpia, and that above said Rumanian source, so I have put them with great discernment".]

Regarding the *Bible* printed in Blaj in 1795, the sources used besides the *Bible* of 1688 and the landmark critical edition of the *Septuagint*, published by Lambert Bos at Franeker, in 1709, also included, to a lesser extent, a Greek-Latin edition of François Vatable, such as those that appeared in Heidelberg in 1586, 1599 or 1616, edited by Corneille-Bonaventure Bertram, a text re-printed, in Paris, in 1729–1745 (Pavel 2007, p. 102–103). The critical apparatus of Samuil Micu's *Bible* also contains a number of references to other sources, among which the *Vulgate* stands out (from which we shall render the passages corresponding to each reference):

> Num 11, 25: *Iară deaca s-au odihnit duhul într-înşii, au prorocit şi apoi nu au mai adaos (a)*; nota *a*, p. 132: *Bibliia letinească Vulgata are: Şi după ce au odihnit întru ei Duhul, au prorocit, şi mai mult nu au încetat*; [*And if the Spirit rested in them, they prophesied and then did not add again (a)*; note *a*, p. 132: *Latin Vulgate Bible has: And after the Spirit rested in them, they prophesied, and more they did not cease*]; cf. VgCl: *Cumque requievisset in eis Spiritus, prophetaverunt, nec ultra cessaverunt*.
>
> Judg 8, 13: *Şi s-au întors Ghedeon, feciorul lui Ioas, de la războiu, de la suirea Aresului (a)*; nota *a*, p. 221: *Vulgata are: înainte de răsăritul soarelui*; [*And Gideon, son of Joash, returned from war, from the Pass of Heres (a)*; note *a*, p. 221: *Vulgate has: before sunrise*]; cf. VgCl: *Revertensque de bello ante solis ortum*.

> 1 Sam 24, 4: *şi Saul au întrat ca să se gătească (a);* nota *a*, p. 262: *Sirul are: şi Saul au întrat ca să doarmă. Latinul are: ca să-şi deşearte pântecele*; [*and Saul went in to dress up (a);* note *a*, p. 262: *The Syrian has: and Saul went in to sleep. The Roman has: to relieve himself*]; cf. VgCl: *ut purgaret ventrem*.

The Latin model categorically imposed itself through the translation of the *Vulgate* into Romanian, in 1760–1761, by the Transylvanian Bishop Petru Pavel Aron and his collaborators. The source of the transposition of the Western Old Testament corpus is the revised version of the *Vulgate*, published in Rome in 1592, the so-called *Bible* of Pope Clement VIII (*Sixto-Clementina*), which became, after corrections in the existing editions of 1593 and 1598, the *textus receptus* of the Catholic Church. The actual edition that the Romanian translators used, in all likelihood, entitled *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae editionis*, saw the light of print in Venice, in the chancery of Nicolò Pezzana, in 1690. Unfortunately, the impact of this work in the Romanian culture was limited, not because of the excessive literality of the translation, with a language replete with calques and semi-calques from Latin, but because of the non-publication of the manuscript (now kept at BAR Cluj) at the time of its compilation. It is possible that a certain reluctance of the ecclesiastical environments in Transylvania, where the Greek-Catholic Church had preserved its Byzantine-rite orientation, coupled with the death of Bishop P. P. Aron in 1764 and, later, with the publication, in 1795, of the *Bible* translated by Samuil Micu, led to relegation into quasi-anonymity of the second complete translation of the Latin text of the Bible into Romanian (Pavel 2012, p. 58–68).

6. Several conclusions are necessary regarding the status of the Slavonic vs. the Latin model in the Romanian biblical translations during the sixteenth-eighteenth centuries:

A. The Latin versions were used in the beginning only as control versions during translation or revision.

B. As multiple translators collaborated on the same work, it may be the case that only some of them resorted to the Latin original; hence, the appearance of coincidences and obvious equivalences only in certain parts of the text.

C. In cases where they departed from the Slavonic source, the translators/ editors attempted to conceal this fact in several ways:

a) by rendering the Slavonic text in parallel, even when it was not consistent with the Romanian translation (CB);

b) by maintaining biblical book titles, subtitles or references in Slavonic (PO, NTB)

c) by misleadingly emphasizing, in the preface, the probity with which the traditional Orthodox source was used ("printed in the Land of the Muskovite", as stated in NTB);

d) by maintaining the compositional structure of Slavonic inspiration and, respectively, by dividing the text into pericopes (*zaceale*), in parallel with the division into verses, taken from the original Greek-Latin source;

e) by inserting liturgical and ritual guidelines in Slavonic, for liturgical use.

D. In terms of the sources, we witness, for the first time, a mutation, a shift from the Slavonic model and, respectively, from the sixteenth-century Hungarian one, to the Greek-Latin humanist model enshrined in the European space through the translations of the biblical text made by Sante Pagnini and Theodore Beza in Alba Iulia in the mid-seventeenth century.

E. The complete translations of the Holy Scripture into Romanian from the seventeenth-eighteenth centuries adopted, with a few exceptions, the prototype from LXX, the Slavonic and the Latin models being referred to only in a few isolated works, which no longer received the endorsement of print.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

BB = *Bibliia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură ale ceii Vechi şi ale ceii Noao Leage,* Bucureşti, 1688; editions by: I. C. Chiţimia, Mihai Moraru, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1988, reed. 1997; Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manea, N. A. Ursu, vol. I–II, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2001–2003.

BBl = *Bibliia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a ceii Noao*, Blaj, 1795; edition by Ioan Chindriş, Eugen Pavel, Rome, Tipografia Vaticana, 2000.

Beza = *Novum Iesu Christi Testamentum, graece & latine*, Theodoro Beza interprete, [Geneva], *apud* Samuelem Crispinum, MDCXI [1611].

CB = *Codicele Bratul*, 1559–1560; edition by Al. Gafton, Iaşi, Editura Univesităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2003.

CM = Coresi, *Molitvenic rumânesc*, Bălgrad, c. 1567–1568; edition by Vladimir Drimba, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1998.

CP = Coresi, *Psaltire*, Braşov, 1570.

CP$_1$ = Coresi, *Psaltirea slavo-română*, Braşov, 1577; edition by Stela Toma, Bucharest, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1976.

CP$_2$ = Şerban Coresi, *Psaltirea slavo-română*, Braşov, c. 1589.

CPr = Coresi, *Praxiu*, Braşov, c. 1566; edition by I. Bianu, Bucureşti, Editura Cultura Naţională, 1930.

CT = Coresi, *Tetraevanghelul*, Braşov, 1561; edition by Florica Dimitrescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1963.

CV = *Codicele Voroneţean*, c. 1563–1583 (BAR Bucureşti, MS. Rom. 448); edition by Mariana Costinescu, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1981.

Erasm = *Novum Testamentum Iesu Christi, graece et latine*, primo quidem studio et industria Des. Erasmi Roter. accurate editum, Basileae, Per haeredes Nicolai Bryling, 1571.

ES = *Tetraevanghelul slavo-român*, Sibiu, 1551–1553; facsimile edition by Emil Petrovici, L. Demény, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1971.

Gaster CR = Gaster, M., *Chrestomatie română*, vol. I–II, Leipzig–Bucharest, F. A. Brockaus & Socec et co., 1891.

KJV = *The Holy Bible. King James Version, 1611 Edition*, Peabody, MA, Hendrickson Publishers, 2006.

LXX = *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*; edition by Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.

NTB = *Noul Testament sau împăcarea au Leagea Noao a lui Isus Hristos, Domnului nostru*, Bălgrad, 1648; edition by Dalila-Lucia Aramă *et al.*, Alba Iulia, Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române, 1988; reed. 1998.

Pagnini = *Hebraicorum Bibliorum Veteris Testamenti latina interpretatio*, opera olim Xantis Pagnini Lucensis nunc verò Benedicti Ariae Montani Hispalensis […], Antuerpiae, Christophorus Plantinus regius prototypographus excudebat, [1572].

PB = *Psaltire*, Bălgrad, 1651; edition by Alexandra Moraru, Mihai Moraru, Alin Mihai Gherman, Alba Iulia, Editura Reîntregirea, 2001.

PH = *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, c. 1501–1510 (BAR, MS. Rom. 3077); edition by Ion Gheţie, Mirela Teodorescu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

PO = *Palia de la Orăştie*, 1582; editions by: Viorica Pamfil, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1968; Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Iaşi, Editura Univesităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2005.

PS = *Psaltirea Scheiană*, c. 1573–1578 (BAR, MS. Rom. 449); edition by I. Bianu, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Carol Göbl", 1889; cf. *Psaltirea Scheiană comparată cu celelalte Psaltiri din sec. XVI şi XVII traduse din sloveneşte*, critical edition by I.-A. Candrea, vol. I–II, Bucureşti, Atelierele Grafice Socec & Co, 1916.

PsGal = *Psalterium Gallicanum*; edition by Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Paris, Henrici Stephani officina, 1509.

PsRom = *Psalterium Romanum*; edition by Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Paris, Henrici Stephani officina, 1509.

VgA = *Biblia Vulgata*, trans. P. P. Aron *et al.*, 1760–1761 (BAR Cluj, MS. Rom. 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 68); edition by I. Chindriş, Niculina Iacob, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

VgCl = *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae editionis Sixti V.P.M. iussu recognita atque edita*, Romae, Ex Typographia Vaticana, MDXCVIII [1598]; edition by Michael Hetzenauer, Ratisbonae et Romae, Sumptibus et typis Friderici Pustet, 1914.

Studies

Backus 1980 = Irena Dorota Backus, *The Reformed Roots of the English New Testament: The Influence of Theodore Beza on the English New Testament*, Pittsburgh, PA, Pickwick Press, 1980.

Cândea 1978 = Virgil Cândea, *Raţiunea dominantă. Contribuţii la istoria umanismului românesc*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1978.

Centi 1945 = Timoteo M. Centi, *L'attività letteraria di Santi Pagnini (1470–1536) nel campo delle scienze bibliche*, in „Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum", XV, 1945, p. 5–51.

Chiţimia 1981 = I. C. Chiţimia, *Urme probabile ale unei vechi traduceri din latină în Psaltirea Scheiană*, in RITL, XXX, 1981, no. 2, p. 151–156.

Ciobanu 1940–1941 = Ştefan Ciobanu, *Începuturile scrisului în limba românească*, in AAR, series III, Mem. secţ. lit., tom X, 1940–1941, p. 21–78.

Ciobanu 1947/1989 = Ştefan Ciobanu, *Istoria literaturii române vechi*. Ediţie, note şi prefaţă de Dan Horia Mazilu, Bucureşti, Editura Eminescu, 1989.

Clavier 1960 = Henri Clavier, *Théodore de Bèze: un aperçu de sa vie aventureuse, de ses travaux, de sa personnalité*, Cahors, A. Coueslant, 1960.

Dufour 2006 = Alain Dufour, *Théodore de Bèze, poète et théologien*, Genève, Librairie Droz, 2006.

Florescu 2010 = Ioan-Florin Florescu, *Le Tétraévangile de Sibiu (1551–1553). Nouvelles informations sur les sources de la première traduction en roumain des Évangiles*, in „Biblicum Jassyense". Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutics, vol. I, 2010, p. 38–90.

Gafton 2012 = Alexandru Gafton, *De la traducere la norma literară. Contribuţia traducerii textului biblic la constituirea vechii norme literare*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2012.

Geisendorf 1967 = Paul Frédéric Geisendorf, *Théodore de Bèze*, Genève, Alexandre Jullien, 1967.

Gheţie 1974 = Ion Gheţie, *Începuturile scrisului în limba română. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice,* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1974.

Gheţie 1982 = Ion Gheţie, *A existat un izvor latin al psaltirilor româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea?*, in LR, XXXI, 1982, no. 2, p. 181–185.

Guerra 1990 = Anna Morisi Guerra, *Santi Pagnini traducteur de la Bible*, în *Théorie et pratique de l'exégèse.* Actes du troisième colloque international sur l'histoire de l'exégèse biblique au XVIᵉ siècle (Genève, 31 août–2 septembre 1988). Textes réunis par Irena Backus et Francis Higman, Genève, Libraire Droz S.A., 1990, p. 191–198.

Krans 2006 = Jan Krans, *Beyond What Is Written: Erasmus and Beza as Conjectural Critics of the New Testament*, Leiden & Boston, Brill, 2006 (New Testament Tools and Studies 35).

Luzzi 1946 = Giovanni Luzzi, *Santi Pagnini e la sua traduzione latina della Bibbia*, Torre Pellice (Torino), Arti Grafiche „L'Alpina", 1946 (extract from „Bollettino della Società di Studi Valdesi", LXXIX–LXXXII, 1943–1944).

Mareş 1982 = Alexandru Mareş, *Originalele primelor traduceri româneşti ale Tetraevanghelului şi Psaltirii*, in Ion Gheţie (coord.), *Cele mai vechi texte româneşti. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*, Universitatea din Bucureşti, 1982, p. 183–205.

Mareş 2005 = Alexandru Mareş, *Scriere şi cultură românească veche*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.

Mihăilă 1972 = Gh. Mihăilă, *Contribuţii la istoria culturii şi literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1972.

Moldovanu 1984 = Dragoş Moldovanu, *Miscellanea philologica*, in LR, XXXIII, 1984, no. 5, p. 414–425.

Munteanu 1994 = Eugen Munteanu, *Slavon ou latin? Une réexamination du problème de la langue-source des plus anciennes traductions roumaines du Psautier*, in AUI, Sectiunea III, e. Lingvistică, XI, 1994, p. 57–70.

Munteanu 2008 = = Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 2008.

Paşca 1956 = Ştefan Paşca, *Contribuţii la istoria începutului scrisului românesc*, in CL, I, 1956, no. 1–4, p. 79–90.

Pavel 2001 = Eugen Pavel, *Carte şi tipar la Bălgrad (1567–1702)*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Clusium, 2001.

Pavel 2007 = Eugen Pavel, *Între filologie şi bibliofilie*, Cluj-Napoca, Biblioteca Apostrof, 2007.

Pavel 2012 = Eugen Pavel, *Arheologia textului*, Cluj-Napoca, Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, 2012.

Roques 1913 = Mario Roques, *L'original de la Palia d'Orăştie*, în *Mélanges offerts à M. Émile Picot*, tome II, Paris, Librairie Damascène Morgand, 1913.

Simon 1685 = Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, Rotterdam, Reinier Leers, 1685.

Wind 1944 = Edgar Wind, *Sante Pagnini and Michelangelo. A Study of the Succession of Savonarola*, in „Gazette des Beaux-arts", XXVI, 1944 [published in 1947], p. 211–246.

Abstract

In the beginning, several perspectives on the authority of the Slavonic originals in the compilation of the first Romanian translations of the biblical text in the sixteenth century, are examined against the background of their rather pale contenders, namely the Latin model and, respectively, the German one. The hypothesis that the primitive translation of the Psalms into Romanian valorized a previous translation from Latin – possibly from the *Psalterium Romanum*, a translation that was supposedly revised or rewritten on the basis of a Slavonic version, for inclusion

in the Oriental canon – is not sufficiently credible. Nor is the opinion concerning the use of Luther's original in the translation of portions of text from the *Tetraevangelion* of Sibiu in 1551–1553 irrefutable, as in these passages there are also similarities with Theodore Beza's edition of the New Testament. The actual mutation from the Slavonic to the Latin model occurred only at the middle of the eighteenth century, with the printed versions that appeared in Alba Iulia, which adopted the sources of Greek-Latin humanism, consecrated in the European space through the new translations of the biblical text made by Sante Pagnini and Theodore Beza. The complete editions of Holy Scripture into the Romanian language, among which were included the 1688 *Bible* from Bucharest and the 1795 *Bible* from Blaj, were largely derived from the Greek model, more specifically, from the *Septuagint*, while the Slavonic and Latin sources were relegated to the background, without being totally ignored. The Latin model categorically imposed itself through the translation of the *Vulgate* into Romanian, in 1760–1761, by the Transylvanian Bishop Petru Pavel Aron and his collaborators, whose source was a revised version, published in Rome in 1592 and re-edited in 1593 and 1598: the so-called *Bible* of Pope Clement VIII (*Sixto-Clementina*).

   Cuvinte-cheie: *textul biblic, izvoare ale traducerii, modelul slavon, modelul latin, Sante Pagnini, Théodore de Bèze.*

   Keywords: *the Biblical text, sources of translation, the Slavonic model, the Latin model, Sante Pagnini, Theodore Beza*.

Institutul de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară
„Sextil Puşcariu"
Cluj-Napoca, str. E. Racoviţă, 21
eug.pavel@yahoo.com