EUGEN PAVEL

THE BEGINNINGS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN OLD ROMANIAN WRITING

1.1. Contrary to some opinions advanced on this subject, the first attempts at critical text editing in written Romanian culture date further back than the 19th century. In the mid-17th century, the scholars in Alba Iulia adopted the humanist method of comparing multiple versions in translating and editing biblical writings, by applying textual criticism in establishing both the basic text and the prolegomena and scholia that accompanied it. In two monumental printed texts, the *New Testament*, published in 1648, and the *Psalter*, published in 1651, the editors used marginal glosses, in which they rendered parallel translations after secondary sources and signalled out the lexical differences recorded in the control versions. Thus, they managed to compile an incipient critical apparatus. Some of the prefaces or epilogues these texts were equipped with seem to comply with the requirements of notes on an edition, as they stated the sources and the working method used. An example is the "Foreword to the Readers" (*Predoslovia către cetitori*), placed at the end of the *Psalter* of Bălgrad, where the book's sources are mentioned. These consisted, according to the authors, primarily in the Masoretic Text ("we fully exerted ourselves to reckon the sources of the Jewish tongue"). In addition, there were the "manuscripts of many great teachers" (*izvoadele a mulți dascali mari*). The reference was here to the *Vulgate*, as well as to other undisclosed Latin editions[1], and to the *Septuagint,* referred to as "the manuscript of the 72 teachers", the translators being aware of the accuracy of the originary texts, "for water is cleaner and clearer in springs than in rivulets, and the farther away water flows from the spring, the more admixed and the muddier it becomes". The passage which refers to the collation of sources and the compilation of an elementary critical apparatus, by recording the differences in the Hebrew text in brackets or on the margins of the text, is eloquent: "And where we saw that they were not far removed from the Jewish source, we left them in place, simply noting down how they differ from the Jewish ones, and we put some of the words in the lines, closing them between brackets, like so ( ); and we put others on the margin, marking them with these letters: *not Jew*., meaning they do not appear in the Jewish text".

[1] The source I have identified here belonged to Santes Pagnino (Pavel 2001, p. 182–200).

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XXI, 2016, nr. 1, Cluj-Napoca, p. 17–30

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

The specifications concerning the composition, for each psalm, of a small summary (*suma*) and the indication of its component parts, the rendition of overwritings (*tituluşul*) and the numbering of the verses reflect the rigorous accuracy of the Transylvanian scribes. They had adopted the editing principles promoted in the European philological circles of the time, which were under the influence of Lutheran criticism, known as the "second humanism". Accepted by both the Calvinist and the Orthodox milieus in the Alba Iulia circles, the type of Greek-Latin critical edition legitimized in the period, which had been developed by Theodore Beza (Théodore de Bèze) and, respectively, by Santes Pagnino (Sante Pagnini), was used in the circle of translators and recensors in the entourage of Metropolitan Simion Ştefan, regardless of their confessional affiliation. There was, however, during that period, a certain reluctance to state exactly the sources used and to acknowledge the distance from consecrated sources, which could have indicated the canonical status of a text.

1.2. This should come as no surprise, because Nikolai Spathari (Nicolae Milescu), followed by the recensors of his translation, incorporated within the *Bible* of Bucharest (BB), printed in 1688, also valorized, to a considerable extent, a Protestant Edition of the *Bible*. Incidentally, the "teachers of the place" who embarked on revising Milescu's manuscript ultimately carried out a genuine critical editing work (Cândea 1978, p. 122–125), whose principles and guidelines "towards understanding this book" were presented at large in "Foreword to the Readers" (*Cuvântu înainte către ci<ti>tori*), in MS 45 BAR Cluj. This time, the sources of the primary translation were indicated with great accuracy: the 1597 edition of the *Septuagint*, from Frankfurt, considered to be a "manuscript that is more exquisite than all others". To this was added, for comparison, the "Slavonic version" (*izvodul slovenescu*), identified with the edition of Ostrog, from 1581, then another in Latin, probably one of the usual editions of the *Vulgate*, printed in the former Plantin Press in Antwerp/Anvers ("in the city of Antverpia", as indicated in the preface from MS Rom. 4389 BAR, attributed to Daniil Panoneanul), such as those published in 1599, 1619, 1628 or 1645. We do not think these sources included any of the similar texts previously printed in this centre by Christophe Plantin, because these were, as a rule, polyglot editions and the author of the foreword would not have left this unnoted in his explanations of the sources. The introduction also brings into question "another Latin manuscript, which has recently been printed after the Jewish language". We may assume that this was one of the new translations of the *Biblia Sacra* made by renowned Hebraists like Santes Pagnino, Sebastian Münster or Immanuel Tremellius, along with Franciscus Junius (François de Jon), which were published successively in the 16th century, some being reedited in the next century. Based on these models of humanist criticism, the author of MS 45 insisted on clarifying that he had faithfully reproduced Milescu's version, but that he had also "added other Greek texts" available to him. Up to book *1 Paralelipomena,* an edition from England had been

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

used, probably the one printed by Roger Daniel in London in 1653, under the care of John Biddle, re-edited in Cambridge in 1665. For the remainder of the text, another Greek source was used, "different from the one in Frangofort, after which Necolae also wrote". Unfortunately, the incipient critical apparatus announced in the preamble to the manuscript versions was no longer used in the printed edition of the *Bible* from 1688.

1.3. As regards the critical editing of old texts in the medieval Romanian space, one of the first successful attempts was the famous work, *A Dialogue against Heresies* (*Dialog în contra ereziilor*), written by Symeon of Thessalonica in Greek in the late 14th century. Surviving in manuscript form, it saw the light of print in Iaşi, in 1683, accompanied in the *colligatum* by *An Explanation of the Church Order,* the work of St. Mark Eugenikos, Archbishop of Ephesus. The editor, who was no inexpert amateur, was the Greek scholar John Comnen Molyvdos of Heraclea[2], who later became the physician of Constantin Brâncoveanu. The latter, upon the recommendation of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch Dositheus, edited Symeon's doctrinal work for the first time. He endowed the book with an Index of subjects (*Pinax*) and a critical apparatus in the footnotes, ensuring that every fifth line was numbered in the margins (Dima-Drăgan 1973, p. 234–236). Moreover, at the end of the book it is noted: "It was printed in Iaşi, in Moldova, by the God-loving Bishop of Huşi, Kir Mitrofan, in the year 1683, having been edited and amended by the most learned Ioan Molivd Perinteanul, at the expense of the most illustrious, most pious and mightiest ruler of the whole Moldo-Wallachia, master and ruler of the whole Ukraine". It was not by chance that Comnen's edition, published in Iaşi, exerted a tremendous impact on Greek spirituality, being integrated in the great *Bibliotheca Graeca* (Fabricius 1728, vol. XIV, chap. II, lib. VI) and in the *Patrologia Graeca* (Migne 1886, tome CLV, p. 155).

2.1. The beginning of the 18th century witnessed the first attempt at transcribing and correcting the manuscript of the work *Amphilochia* 231 by Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, after a copy owned by Nicholas Mavrocordatos, which the latter intended to edit. The intention of the erudite voivode emerges from one of his annotations, made on 20 June 1707 on the pages of the manuscript, which had in the meanwhile reached the library of the Monastery of Patmos. In this note, Mavrocordatos mentioned the transcription, at his expense, "from an uncorrected book, with a few amendments made by comparing other copies", and the fact that if he received the "blessing to work, I shall find the old book kept on the Holy Mountain and add what is missing in it; and having completed this book through accurate research and much exertion, I shall pass it on like a treasure to those who will come after me" (Beza 1936, p. 3).

[2] On the personality of John Comnen (Komnenos), also known as the monk Ierotei of Dristra, see Russo 1939, p. 424 and *passim*; Bulat 1966, p. 356–368; Cicanci–Cernovodeanu 1971, p. 143–186; Nicol 1971, p. 511–526.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

However, the undertaking of the enlightened prince did not come to fruition at that time. Still, within a few years, he persevered by conceiving new editorial projects. The one who supported him in carrying out his plans was a man who was virtually unknown in the Romanian circles, but who had already won a reputation in Europe. This was the Transylvanian humanist scholar Stephan Bergler (c. 1680–1738), a native of Braşov, who had studied in Leipzig, settled in Amsterdam and then in Hamburg, becoming a renowned Hellenist in his time (Halm 1875, p. 391–392; Marinescu 1941–1942, p. 163–215; Marinescu-Himu 1960, p. 365–372). He compiled scholarly editions of the *Onomasticon* by Julius Pollux and of works by Homer, Sextus Empiricus, Aristophanes and Herodian, some in collaboration, as well as the *editiones principes* of the fictional letters of Alciphron (1715) and of the work of the Byzantine historiographer Joseph Genesios (1733), providing them with amendments and commentaries. He also distinguished himself by compiling a Greek-Latin edition of the work *De oficiis*, printed in Leipzig in 1722, a translation of the moral philosophical treatise *On Debt* (*Despre datorii*) by Nicholas Mavrocordatos, printed originally in Greek, in Bucharest, in 1719. Recalled to the Wallachian voivodal court, Bergler became a librarian and preceptor of Mavrocordatos's sons, entering into the grace of his illustrious patron. In his new capacity, the Hellenist from Braşov prepared for printing, in 1723, *Saint Cyril's Lexicon* (*Lexiconul Sf. Chiril*), one of the first critical editions accomplished here, whose text had been established on the basis of two manuscripts found in the library of the Mavrocordatos family, one on parchment and the other one on paper. In addition to this, the intention was to valorise the "prototype" owned by Chrysanthos Notaras and a version that was to be purchased from Venice, with the aid of Nicholas Caragiani, as specified in the letters of 14 July and 8 September 1723, which Mavrocordatos sent to the Patriarch of Jerusalem. Bergler was recommended as the recensor (*îndreptătorul*) of the book, as a "good connoisseur of the Hellenic language, unsurpassed by any other in all the Academies of Europe" (Legrand 1888, p. 172–174; Hurmuzaki 1917, p. 886–888). The fate of the *Lexicon*[3] edited by Stephan Bergler at the initiative of Nicolas Mavrocordatos is unknown. It is a work from which Mitrofan Gregoras, himself a recensor[4], had printed a single sheet in Bucharest, which had been sent for comparison to Chrysanthos Notaras (Russo 1912, p. 75; Russo 1939, p. 613). Perhaps the lack of an appropriate typesetter, which the ruler complained about in his correspondence, as well as some well-known animosities between him and the Greek chronicler Gregoras led him to postpone or abandon finishing this edition.

[3] A Greek miscellaneous codex (MS Gk. 692 BAR), containing also *St. Cyril's Lexicon*, was signalled by Litzica 1909, p. 305, at position no. 612.

[4] This Greek monk, the author of epigrams and of a *Chronicle of Wallachia* (*Cronica Țării Româneşti,* 1714–1716), edited several Greek books from 1705 to 1715, including *The Tome of Joy* (*Tomul bucuriei*), published in Râmnic in 1705. On its title page, he noted: "Edited and corrected by Mitrofan Gregoras of Dodona", resumed, with slight modifications, in the other texts he printed; on his activity, see Erbiceanu 1888, p. 125–129; Russo 1939, p. 409–461.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

2.2. Our historiographical approach highlights the meaning that was granted to the notion of a critical edition at that time, which was quite similar to the one entrenched in modern codicology. Determining the genealogy of manuscripts and choosing the reference text by comparing different versions of manuscripts are accepted as defining elements from which one must proceed towards reconstituting the manuscript's primary form, through as accurate as possible a reading of the corrupted text, which has been altered with the passage of time.

Rendering a text with the greatest possible accuracy represented the watch-word in the world of writing and printing. However, the first to distort the texts, affecting their authenticity and clarity, were the copyists themselves, relentless toilers in the monasterial scriptoria. While they were driven by good intentions, they nonetheless wrote, as their apologies at the end of these manuscripts suggest, "with hands of dust". For instance, Dimitrie Cantemir admonished such a careless copyist, on the occasion of the fourth revision of the book *The Chronicle of the Ancient History of the Romano-Moldavians-Wallachians* (*Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor*), for the inaccuracies perpetrated in relation to the primary text. As the autographed note in the manuscript cautioned, the erudite prince was outraged by the fact that the scrivener, "possessing insufficient knowledge of the Romanian spelling, drove us to the great toil of properly setting these errors right, many of which may have been overlooked, though we trust the typesetters to set them all right (should the Lord grant us breath until that time)" (Cantemir 1901, facs. II).

Furthermore, in the epilogues to his writings, a Greek chronicler, Constantine Caesarius Dapontes, who had also been attracted to the Court of Constantine Mavrocordatos, reviled against the copyists and the editors who would fail to carefully collate his texts, threatening that they risked incurring infernal damnation otherwise (Russo 1912, p. 16–17; Russo 1939, p. 556). In the *Historical Catalogue of Notable People of the 18th Century* (*Catalogul istoric al oamenilor însemnați din secolul XVIII*), edited by C. Erbiceanu, Dapontes expressed his dissatisfaction with the achievements of those who "scribe (*prescriu*) books and they are right to do so, but they do not read them at the end to rectify the mistakes; therefore, they are bound to go wrong and they are indeed in the wrong, and it is thus that very many books have been altered and are altered on a daily basis by such negligent and ignorant scribes" (Erbiceanu 1888, p. 184–185).

We ask, in this context, what was the role of recensors in olden times, whether their duties were limited to those of a simple modern proof-reader or they also embarked on a process of editing these works. In the latter case, they would have had to provide a commentary on the texts or to sketch a minimal critical apparatus. Of course, not all of the recensors who frequently aspired to overcome their positions of anonymity by writing prefaces or epilogues to old Romanian books were genuine editors, as they only rarely managed to surpass the mere status of proof-readers. Naturally, we are considering the term editor not in the sense of

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

one who commissioned and served as the patron of a printed text, or of a "book clerk" (*ispravnic de carte*), but of one who diligently prepared an edition, in a way that was quite similar to the modern practice.

2.3. During the age of the Enlightenment, there was a very active team of recensors who operated in the entourage of Bishop Chesarie of Râmnic. Among these was Hierodeacon Anatolie, characterized in the epilogue to the *Menaion for the Month of December* (*Mineiul lunii lui dechemvrie,* Râmnic, 1779) as "industrious at hand writing, as can well be seen, correcting and reorganizing the texts of translators" (f. 231^{r}). This note was reiterated on other publications in the Menaia series. In addition to this, a mention that appeared on some texts was that Iordan biv vel gramatic Capadochianul had "corrected the translation". He was always seconded by the proof-reader Rafail, a monk from Hurezi Monastery. A renowned calligrapher in the monastic environments (Smântânescu, 1958, p. 65–71), the latter copied numerous patristic and liturgical writings, translated the *Halima* and recensed several texts printed in Râmnic in the second half of the 18th century, among which was the massive *Anthologion* from 1766. The transcription of a work like *The Life of Peter the Great, Autocrator of Entire Russia* (*Viața marelui Petru, aftocrator a toată Rosiia*) demonstrated his incipient skills as an editor, as he actually confessed in a note from 1755: "And since that text was badly written and no deadline had been imposed or, rather, since I was unwise and unlearned, I struggled for as long as the Lord desired until I finished it, and then I checked it word for word after that text" (MS Rom. 2353 BAR, f. 303^{v}). A humble monk, Rafail therefore carried out a meticulous work of collation, of *protocălire,* in his own words, of confronting the text with the original, all of these operations foreshadowing the future editor. At the end of the *Psalter* of Râmnic from 1779, Anatolie and Rafail signed a set of lyrics in which they assured the readers that the work was "well prepared for printing" for "we have made strenuous efforts to recense it". An equally diligent editor was Lavrentie Dimitrievici, also a hieromonk at Hurezi, who was rightly considered to be the *klironómos* of the manuscripts compiled by Bishop Damaschin of Râmnic, the translator of our major books of worship, many of which have remained in manuscript form (Lapedatu, 1906, p. 577). Lavrentie was, indeed, the heir of an impressive pool of translations, which he prepared for printing, providing some of them with prefaces and publishing them after Damaschin's demise, which occurred in 1725. In a note included in the *Anthologion* published in Râmnic, in 1737, he acknowledged the fact that he had guided himself after the "text of the Romanian *Menaion*", left from Damaschin, on which he had toiled for a long time, "turning nights into days, sometimes", and striving to correct it, "word for word, changing nothing, but righting it all as it is found in that text". Moreover, on the last page of the *Gospel* of Râmnic, from 1746, the same Lavrentie stated that he had followed "the translation of Fr. Damaschin, the bishop and the great teacher, compiled after the translation of Theophylact, and I never set a word before also reading its meaning". All this confirms his qualities as an editor.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

No doubt, this qualifier could also be applied to other scholars of the period who were preoccupied with selecting texts and preparing them for publication, adopting a new editorial formula, structured thematically, for these writings. Collections of the *florilège* kind, as were those of the "questions and answers" series, which proliferated in the 18th century, were, in fact, editions *in nuce*, following many of the consecrated principles of text establishment. A miscellany of this type was compiled, also under the auspices of the centre in Râmnic, in 1729, by Mihalcea, dubbed the Litterati (written in Latin characters) (Duțu, 1968, p. 129–130). Its title was *A Bunch of Flowers* (*Chita florilor*) and in it "there were many worthy things from philosophical and spiritual books, gathered and deemed to be for the benefit of those who will read them" (MS Rom. 2648 BAR, f. 1^{r}). The term chosen to illustrate the editorial work is here *chiti*, meaning "to arrange, to order", which, added to the terms previously mentioned (*prescrie, protocoli*), outlines a possible specialized jargon in use in the 18th century. In his turn, hieromonk Cozma Vlahul[5] translated from the Greek, in Iaşi, in 1754, the writing *Vactiria, or the Bishop's Staff* (*Vactiria, adecă Cârja arhierească*), preserved in manuscript form. In its preface, Cozma Vlahul insisted on having perfected the text, in close collaboration with the learned printer Duca Sotiriovici, next to whom, "labouring day and night, I reread (*procitit*), paying attention to the lexeis (*lexuri*), word after word, all the way to the end of the book". The translator, who had also been the recensor of the *Psalter* of 1748 and of the *Pentecostarion* of 1753, both printed in Iaşi, resorted to the term *prociti*, meaning to "reread, repeat", so as to suggest the scrupulosity with which the text had been prepared for publication. In addition, he also indicated his recourse to the glossing technique, of multiple translations, noting that "where a Latin (*râmlenesc*) or a Greek (*elinesc*) happens to have been used, given the limited range of the Moldavian language (*scurtă limba moldovenească*), I surrounded it with several other words" (MS Rom. 1468 BAR, f. 2^{v}). The act of translation also entailed a philological effort to reconstruct the text as rigorously as possible.

Leon Gheuca proved to be a catalyst in editing texts in Romanian during this period. He had surrounded himself with an active group of elite translators, concerned to carry out the "zealous desire" of the Moldavian Metropolitan to bring to light writings of the apophthegmatic or *Fürstenspiegel* ("mirrors for princes") types. One of the guests of the Enlightenment prelate, the Serbian travelling monk Dositheus Obradovic referred, in a letter of 13 April 1783, to Gheuca's ambitious intentions, as he had amassed a "very special library, has had sundry books translated into his own tongue and now aims to edit for print, at his own expense", other resounding works, such as *Teatron politicon* by Ambrosius Marlianus and *The Adventures of Telemachus* by François Fénelon so as to bestow them upon his homeland" (Obradovici 1885, p. XX–XXI; Duțu 1968, p. 225–242; Ursu 2002, p. 199).

[5] On the identity and activity of this translator, see Ursu 2002, p. 44–73.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

3.1. Starting with the Transylvanian School, textual criticism experienced a new dimension, the moment of maturity being reached with the edition of the *Bible* of Blaj, published by Samuel Micu Klein in 1795. The new translation of the biblical text is distinguished by the complexity of the editorial apparatus, consisting of several complementary texts, with a rich isagogic content, including a short word "To the Reader" (*Către cetitoriu*), signed by Micu, followed by an ample theological foray concerning the significance of the *Holy Scripture*. To these were added introductions to groups of books ("In the Five Books of Moses"), and to each book in part, as well as summaries of the chapters. With regard to the introductory study titled "Foreword to the Holy Scripture" (*Cuvânt înainte la S<fânta> Scriptură*), we should mention that Micu had originally written a more extensive draft (MS Rom. 497 BAR Cluj), which he had revised and amended as the definitive version. The note of the recensor Petru Gherman, the prefect of the printing press, and the errata also belong to these auxiliary sections. While it had not been used in the classical editions of the *Septuagint*, the method of prolegomena and marginal or infra-page glosses had been widely introduced in the critical editions of the *Biblia Sacra* conceived by the humanist exegetes, especially in the second half of the 16th century. The procedure was also assimilated in the Romanian culture of the mid-17th century, the *New Testament* of 1648 and the *Psalter* of 1651, both printed in Alba Iulia, being the first texts edited in accordance with these philological principles. They were also adopted by Dosoftei in his *Lives of the Saints* (*Viața şi petreacerea svinților*), from 1682–1686. Through the text printed in 1795, Samuel Micu legitimized this manner of establishing and commenting on a text, similar to the modern structure of a critical edition.

In his prologue "To the Reader", he stated the advantages and, especially, the disadvantages of literal transposition, word for word, according to the rigours of utmost fidelity imposed by tradition for any translation of the biblical text and in keeping with the principle of hermeneutics set forth by St. Jerome (Hieronymus), in *Liber de optimo genere interpretandi (Epistula LVII)*: "Ubi et verborum ordo [et] mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu". In Samuel Micu's interpretation, certain obscurities inherent in the text should not confuse the reader, "for the language will sound, here and there, unfathomable, but that is no reason to lose one's mind, or hasten to blame and disparage the work, for this unfathomableness also comes from the fact that we wished to avoid adding even a single word to the Holy Scripture for a more enlightened meaning, wishing instead to leave everything as it is, pure and clean, in all its truth, just like in the Hellenic version". Guided by the rules of literality, canonically supported, he accepted this manner of translation, being convinced that "it is very difficult to translate from one language into another in an enlightened manner, with a clear meaning, without adding a single word and by maintaining the idiomatic sense of the source language, for every language has its own particular idioms". Although he complied, in principle, with this conservative vein, the scholar did not mechanically adopt the

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

imperative of servility to the text. He also plead, with great philological gusto, in favour of stylistic unity in the translation of the biblical text: "Thus, lest the style and linguistic structure in one and the same Bible should be different, using some from one man's translation [i.e. the translation of Petru Pavel Aron] and others from another's, it was deemed necessary to translate the *Bible* using one and the same style and linguistic structure".

3.2. Through his intention, indicated in the preamble, of improving the translation of the *Bible* of 1688, Samuel Micu implicitly acknowledged one of the sources of his edition, to which he frequently referred, either through the adoption of common solutions for establishing the equivalence of certain excerpts, or by recording, in his glosses on the sources, different lections and additional or missing text segments. In doing that, he ultimately accomplished a negative critical apparatus. Parallelisms with the Bucharest *Bible* are constantly featured in the *Bible* of 1795, even though, in some cases, the notes are slightly different from the original text[6]:

> Ge 11,7: *să amestecăm (b) acolo limba lor*; nota (b), p. 10: *să turburăm* (BBl); cf. BB *să turburăm acolo limbile lor*.
>
> Ex 4, 6: *şi s-au făcut mâna lui (a) ca zăpada*; nota (a), p. 55: *Bibliia cea veachie are: plină de bubele stricăciunei* (BBl); cf. BB *şi s-au făcut mâna lui plină de bubele stricăciunii ca zăpada*.
>
> Ex 30, 38: *va peri (e) din norodul său*; nota (e), p. 82: *Bibliia cea veachie are: sufletul aceluia* (BBl); cf. BB *va peri sufletul aceluia den norodul lui*.
>
> Dt 1, 15: *ispravnici (a) judecătorilor voştri*; nota (a), p. 158: *În cea veachie easte: purtători de cărţi în loc de ispravnici* (BBl); cf. BB *aducători de cărţi judicătorilor voştri*.
>
> Ecc 2, 9: *Şi m-am mărit şi am adaos (v) mai mult*; nota (v), p. 541: *În cea veachie easte: Şi am adaos înţelepciune* (BBl); cf. BB *Şi mă măriiu şi adaoş înţelepciune*.

Translation differences also appear in the verses for which the 1688 edition is claimed as the exclusive model in that context:

> Is 56, 12: *Veniţi să bem vin şi să ne îmbătăm, şi să fie această zi, mâne, mare mai mult foarte (a)*; nota (a), p. 588: *Acest verş în unele Biblii nu să află, iară în cea veachie easte* (BBl); cf. BB *Veniţi să luăm vin şi să ne îmbătăm beţie, şi va fi ca această zi, mâine, mare împrejurul tău*.

There are situations in which the translation solutions are identical in the editions of 1688 and 1795, but S. Micu carefully glossed several seemingly obscure passages in the footnotes, further clarifying the semantic sphere of some terms:

[6] For the biblical books we have cited, we have used the following abbreviations: 2 Ch = *2 Chronicles*; Dt = *Deuteronomy*; Ecc = *Ecclesiastes*; Ex = *Exodus*; Ge = *Genesis*; Jon = *Jonah*; Is = *Isaiah*; Lv = *Leviticus*; Ne = *Nehemiah*; Hos = *Hosea*; Pr = *Proverbs*; 1 Sa= *1 Samuel*.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

Ne 10, 29: *şi au întrat (a) în blăstăm şi jurământ*; nota (a), p. 423: *Au făcut, adecă au făgăduit cu blăstăm şi jurământ* (BBl); cf. BB *şi întrară în blestem şi jurământ*.

Pr 22, 1: *Cu buzele va paşte împăratul (a)*; nota (a), p. 532: *Adecă: împăratul cu vorbele gurii sale paşte pre norod* (BBl); cf. BB *Cu buzele va paşte împăratul*.

Hos 7, 15: *pentru nepedepsirea limbii lor (a)*; nota (a), p. 704: *Că nu şi-au învăţat limba sa* (BBl); cf. BB *pentru necertarea limbilor*.

Although there are obvious points of convergence between the two biblical texts, the 1795 version reflects, in many ways, a radical modification of the previous translation, based on a new reading of the "Hellenic manuscript of the seventy teachers", vaguely mentioned in the preamble, in this case in Lambert Bos's 1709 edition from Franeker, alongside a Greek-Latin edition by François Vatable (Pavel 2007, p. 96–106). Valorising the extensive scholia in the two primary sources, which also render the lections in the main versions of the *Septuagint*, either in manuscript or in print, Micu annotated the text thoroughly, in many situations, attesting his cultural horizon and erudite background as a translator. Although he did not explicitly indicate the edition he used, as had been the case with the foreword to MS 45 BAR Cluj, he made references in the notes to the *Bible* from Alexandria, to the one from Complutum (Alcalá de Henares), to the Masoretic Text, to Symmachus, the *Vulgate*, the Aramaic and Syriac versions, the *Aldine Bible* or the *Codex Vaticanus*, recording either the original segments or secondary translation variants, without, however, generalizing this technique. Let us provide some examples of the glossed excerpts, some references being made via Bos's edition. The fragments are placed side by side with the sources of reference:

Ge 1, 11: *să fie sămânţa lui într-însul, după fealiu (e)*; nota (e), p. 1: *Bibliia grecească cea de la Alexandriia are: după fealiu şi după asemănare* (BBl); cf. ed. Bos, p. 1, nota 21: *Ms. Alex.* γένος, εἰς ὁμοιότητα, ἐπὶ; cf. Rahlfs: κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ'ὁμοιότητα.

Ge 37, 7: *Mi să părea că voi (b) legaţi snopi în mijlocul câmpului*; nota (b), p. 36: *Jido., sir., arab., lat., hald., samar. are: că noi legam snopi în ţarină* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *Putabam nos ligare manipulos in agro*; cf. Rahlfs: ᾠμην ἡμᾶς δεσμεύειν δράγματα ἐν μέσῳ τῷ πεδίῳ**.**

Lv 19, 26: *Să nu mâncaţi pre munţi (b)*; nota (b), p. 110: *Cea jido., latinească, arăbească, persească au: să nu mâncaţi sânge sau cu sânge* (BBl); cf. ed. Bos, p. 154, nota 53: *sic O.C. et Ald. sed Ms. A.* οἰωνιεῖσθε οὐδέ ὀρνιθοσκοπήσεσθε; cf. VgCl: *non comedetis cum sanguine*; cf. Rahlfs: Μὴ ἔσθετε ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων.

1 Sa 15, 4: *şi din Iuda treizeci de mii de pedestraşi (a);* nota (a), p. 252: *Bibli. cea de la Vatican are: patru sute de mii de rânduri. Cea de la Complut: doao sute de mii de rânduri. Şi cea letinească: zeace mii pedestri* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *ducenta millia peditum, et decem millia virorum Juda*; cf. Rahlfs: καὶ τὸν Ιουδαν τριάκοντα χιλιάδας ταγμάτων.

1 Sa 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: ca să-şi deşearte pântecele* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *ut purgaret ventrem*; cf. Rahlfs: καὶ Σαουλ εἰσῆλθεν παρασκευασασθαι·.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

To highlight the textual differences from the Greek model, the critical apparatus of the *Bible* of 1795 also contains other explicit references to the *Clementine Vulgate*, which is, on many occasions, compared with other sources, by providing a more or less complete set of equivalences in Latin:

> 1 Sa 13, 3: *S-au viclenit robii (b)*; nota (b), p. 250: *În cea letinească; auză evreii. Simah: auză robii* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *Audiant Hebraei*; cf. Rahlfs: ἠθετήκασιν οἱ δοῦλοι.
>
> 2 Ch 21, 19: *Şi au fost din zile în zile, şi când au venit vreamea zilelor zile doao (a)*; nota (a), p. 390: *În cea letinească easte: şi au fost din zi în zi, până ce s-au plinit doi ani* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *Cumque diei succederet dies, et temporum spatia volverentur, duorum annorum expletus est circulus*; cf. Rahlfs: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐξ ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας, καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν καιρὸς τῶν ἡμερῶν ἡμέρας δύο.
>
> 2 Ch 30, 5: *(a) Şi au pus cuvânt ca să treacă strigarea peste tot Israilul*; nota (a), p. 398: *În cea letinească easte: şi au aşezat ca să trimită soli să strâge* (BBl); cf. VgCl: *Et decreverunt ut mitterent nuntios in universum Israel*; cf. Rahlfs: καὶ ἔστησαν λόγον διελθεῖν κήρυγμα ἐν παντὶ Ισραηλ.
>
> Is, 27, 10: *Turma cea lăcuită să va lăsa ca o turmă părăsită şi va fi multă vreame la păşune şi acolo vor odihni turme (b)*; nota (b), p. 568: *Simah aşea tălmăceşte din jidovie: că cetatea cea întărită, singură frumoasă, şi să lasă şi să părăseaşte ca o pustie. Iară Bibliia cea letinească, de S. Ieronim de pre jidovie tălmăcită, aşea are: că cetatea cea întărită va fi pustie, cea frumoasă să va lăsa şi să va pustii ca pustiia* (BBl); cf. VgCl; *Civitas enim munita desolata erit; speciosa relinquetur, et dimittetur quasi desertum ; ibi pascetur vitulus, et ibi accubabit, et consumet summitates ejus*; cf. Rahlfs: τὸ κατοικούμενον ποίμνιον ἀνειμένον ἔσται ὡς ποίμνιον καταλελειμμένον· καὶ ἔσται πολὺν χρόνον εἰς βόσκημα, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται.

Other sources individually specified in the glosses include the Russian *Bible* (*cea rusască*), more precisely, the Moscow edition of 1663, and the year of Dosoftei's lectionary *Paroimias* (*Parimiile preste an*), printed in Iaşi, in 1683, from which Micu quoted (albeit imprecisely) in several places:

> Pr 16, 4: *Frica Domnului easte învăţătură şi înţelepciune şi începutul mărirei răspunde ei; şi mearge mărirea înaintea celor smeriţi (a)*; nota (a), p. 528: *În Parimiiariul tipărit în Iaşi în anul 7191 [1683] şi în Trioadele tipărite în Ţara Românească să află şi stihurile aceastea: 5. La om easte voirea inimii; iară de la Domnul răspunsul limbii. 6. Cât eşti de mare, atâta te smereaşte; şi vei afla mila înaintea Domnului Dumnezeu* (BBl); cf. DP, f. II/9^{v}: *La om osârdiia inemii şi la Domnul răspunsul limbii. Cât eşti de mare, atâta te smereaşte şi-naintea Domnului Dumnedzău vei afla har*.
>
> Jon 4, 5: *Şi au zis Domnul către Iona: "Foarte te-ai supărat tu (a)?"*; nota (a), p. 717: *În Parimie: Şi au zis: "Foarte m-am scârbit eu până la moarte"* (BBl); cf. DP, f. II/53^{r}: *Şi dzâsă Domnul Dumnedzău către Iona: "Oare foarte te scârbişi tu pentru tigva?" Şi dzâsă: "Foarte m-am mâhnit până către moarte"*.

The examples we have presented eloquently illustrate the genuinely competent philological approach Micu undertook in translating and editing, with great accuracy, the new *Bible* version and in equipping the book with enlightening com-

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

plementary texts and an adequate critical apparatus. The fact that the 1795 edition became, for over a century, the standard for subsequent reprints and that it was, as Bishop Filotei confessed in the foreword to the Buzau edition of 1854–1856, "better translated and more enlightening to understand" than all the *Bibles* printed in the Romanian language represents an irrefutable argument for considering Samuel Micu Klein an unquestionable precursor of modern textual criticism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Sources

Ald. = *Sacrae Scripturae veteris novaeque omnia*, Venetiis, in aedibus Aldi et Andreae soceri, 1518.

B = *Codex Vaticanus*, gr. 1209 (cf. ed. Rahlfs).

BB = *Bibliia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură ale ceii Vechi şi ale ceii Noao Leage*, Bucureşti, 1688 (ed. I. C. Chiţimia, Mihai Moraru, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1988, reed. 1997; *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*, Pars I, *Genesis*, ed. Paul Miron, Vasile Arvinte *et alii*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza", 1988 şi urm.; ed. Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manea, N.A. Ursu, vol. I–II, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza", 2001–2003).

BBl = *Bibliia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a ceii Noao*, Blaj, 1795 (ed. Ioan Chindriş, Eugen Pavel, Roma, Tipografia Vaticana, 2000).

Bos = *Vetus Testamentum, ex versione Septuaginta interpretum, secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum* […]. Summa cura edidit Lambertus Bos, Franequerae, excudit Franciscus Halma, 1709.

C = *Biblia políglota complutense. Vetus testamentum multiplici lingua* […] de mandato ac sumptibus […] Francisci Ximenez (Jiménez) de Cisneros, Alcalá de Henares, Universidad Complutense, Arnao Guillén de Brocar, 1514–1517 (cf. ed. Bos).

DP = Dosoftei, *Parimiile preste an*, Iaşi, 1683 (ed. Mădălina Ungureanu, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Al. I. Cuza", 2012).

Ms. Alex. = *Codex Alexandrinus* (cf. ed. Bos, Rahlfs).

O = *Codex Oxoniensis* (cf. ed. Bos).

Rahlfs = *Septuaginta*. *Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (ed. Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979).

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

B. Works of reference

Beza 1936 = Marcu Beza, *Biblioteci mânăstireşti în Patmos*, in "Analele Academiei Române", Memoriile Secţiunii Literare, seria III, tom. VIII, 1936, p. 1–6.

Bulat 1966 = T. G. Bulat, *Ioan Comnen, "iatro-filosoful", profesor la Academia Domnească şi mitropolit al Dristrei (†1719)*, in "Biserica Ortodoxă Română", LXXXIV, 1966, nr. 3–4, p. 356–368.

Cantemir 1901 = Dimitrie Cantemir, *Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor*, publicat […] de Gr. G. Tocilescu, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Carol Göbl", 1901

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

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

Cicanci–Cernovodeanu 1971 = Olga Cicanci, Paul Cernovodeanu, *Contribution a la connaissance de la biographie et de l'oeuvre de Jean (Hierothee) Comnene (1668–1719)*, in "Balkan Studies. A Publication of the Institute for Balkan Studies", XII, 1971, nr. 1, p. 143–186.

Dima-Drăgan 1973 = Corneliu Dima-Drăgan, *Ex libris. Bibliologie şi bibliofilie*, Bucureşti, Editura Litera, 1973.

Duțu 1968 = Alexandru Duțu, *Coordonate ale culturii româneşti în secolul XVIII (1700–1821)*, Bucureşti, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968.

Erbiceanu 1888 = Constantin Erbiceanu, *Cronicarii greci carii au scris despre români în epoca fanariotă*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Cărților Bisericeşti, 1888.

Fabricius 1728 = J. A. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. XIV, cap. II, lib. VI, Hamburg, Christian Liebezeit & Theodor Christoph Felginer, 1728.

Halm 1875 = Karl Felix Halm, *Bergler Stephan*, in *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, vol. 2, Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1875, p. 391–392.

Hurmuzaki 1917 = Eudoxiu Hurmuzaki, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*, vol. XIV. *Documente greceşti privitoare la istoria românilor*, publicate după originale, copiile Academiei Române şi tipărituri de N. Iorga, partea a II-a, 1716–1777, Bucureşti, Atelierele Grafice Socec & comp., 1917.

Lapedatu 1906 = Alex. Lapedatu, *Damaschin, episcopul şi dascălul, traducătorul cărților noastre de ritual*, in "Convorbiri literare", XL, 1906, nr. 6–8, p. 563–581.

Legrand 1888 = Émile Legrand, *Épistolaire grec ou Recueil de lettres adressées pour la plupart à Chrysanthe Notaras, patriarche de Jérusalem, par les princes de Valachie et de Moldavie*, Paris, Maisonneuve et Ch. Leclerc libraires-éditeurs, 1888.

Litzica 1909 = Constantin Litzica, *Catalogul manuscriptelor greceşti*, [I], Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Carol Göbl", 1909.

Marinescu 1941–1942 = Maria C. Marinescu, *Umanistul Ştefan Bergler (1680–1738), viața şi activitatea sa*, in "Revista istorică română", XI–XII, 1941–1942, p. 163–215.

Marinescu-Himu 1960 = Maria Marinescu-Himu, *Un elenist braşovean la începutul veacului al XVIII-lea*, in "Studii clasice", II, 1960, p. 365–372.

Migne 1886 = J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, tom. CLV, Paris, Imprimerie Catholique, 1886 http://patristica.net/graeca/

Nicol 1971 = D. M. Nicol, *The Doctor-Philosopher John Comnen of Bucharest and his Biography of the Emperor John Kantakouzenos*, in "Revue des études sud-est européennes", IX, 1971, nr. 3, p. 511–526.

Obradovici 1885 = Dositei Obradovici, *Fabulele lui Demetriu Cichindeal*, în traducere nouă din originalul sârbesc al lui…, [ediție îngrijită şi prefață] de Ioan Russu, Arad, Tipografia Diecezei Române Gr. Or., 1885.

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, Editura "Biblioteca Apostrof", 2007.

Russo 1912 = D. Russo, *Critica textelor şi tehnica ediţiilor*, Bucureşti, Socec & Co., 1912.

Russo 1939 = D. Russo, *Studii istorice greco-române. Opere postume*. Publicate, sub îngrijirea lui Constantin C. Giurescu, de Ariadna Camariano şi Nestor Camariano, tomul II, Bucureşti, Fundația pentru Literatură şi Artă "Regele Carol II", 1939.

Smântânescu 1958 = Dan Smântânescu, *Rafail Monahul*, in "Mitropolia Olteniei", X, 1958, nr. 1–2, p. 65–71.

Ursu 2002 = N. A. Ursu, *Contribuții la istoria culturii româneşti. Studii şi note filologice*, Iaşi, Editura Cronica, 2002.

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)

THE BEGINNINGS OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM IN OLD ROMANIAN WRITING

Abstract

Without becoming a mainstream operation during the 17th-18th centuries, textual criticism underwent several attempts to become imposed in editorial and printing practices. The efforts of the scholars in Alba Iulia (Bălgrad) or of the "teachers of the place" in Wallachia to revise biblical texts represented the first manifestations of competent critical editing. One of the first to scrupulously edit a book was the Greek scholar John Komnenos Molyvdos in Iaşi. The next attempts recorded were made at the Court of Nicholas Mavrocordatos. Most remarkable among these were the undertakings of the Transylvanian Hellenist Stephan Bergler, who critically edited a few medieval manuscripts. His endeavours were followed by the strenuous efforts of several book recensors, such as the Greek monk Mitrofan Gregoras, or Rafail, Anatolie and Lavrentie, from Hurezi Monastery, Mihalcea Litterati and Cozma Vlahul, who demonstrated their incipient skills as editors. The Moldovan Metropolitan Leon Gheuca also encouraged editorial practices. During this period, the peak of maturity in the field of text editing was reached by the *Bible* of Blaj, published by Samuel Micu Klein in 1795. The new biblical version stood out through the accuracy of its editing process: the book was provided with several complementary texts, including two prefaces, introductions to groups of books and to each individual book, as well as summaries of the chapters. To these were added infra-page glosses on the sources, with several translation versions. All these formed a negative critical apparatus, close to the modern structure of a rigorous edition.

Cuvinte-cheie: *Ioan Comnen*, *Ştefan Bergler*, *compararea versiunilor*, *aparat critic*, *Samuil Micu*.

Keywords: *John Comnen (Komnenos)*, *Stephan Bergler*, *comparison of versions*, *critical apparatus*, *Samuel Micu Klein*.

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

BDD-A24615 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.31 (2026-11-27 13:13:49 UTC)