EUGEN PAVEL

TEXTUAL CRITICISM AND THE EDITING OF ROMANIAN WRITINGS IN THE 19TH CENTURY

In a previous article I was examining the way in which the critical editing of old Romanian texts had gradually imposed itself as an editorial and printing practice in the 17th and the 18th centuries (Pavel 2016, p. 17–30). Of course, this had not become a mainstream and fully assumed operation, but the fact that some of the patrons and the recensors of the printing offices carried out editorial activities too – which involved, in addition to selecting and accurately conveying the texts, providing a commentary or sketching a critical apparatus – is indicative of this. In the first decade of the 18th century, the scholarly Prince Nicolae Mavrocordat's intention to gather several copies of Patriarch Photius's *Amphilochia* and to compare, correct and publish them already denoted an awareness of how a text could be recovered and introduced into the public circuit.

We will continue this research approach, focusing, first, on several printed works that evince a considerable editing effort, especially in light of the change of spelling systems, but also with quite a few distortions of the text's reality. Beginning in the 19th century, the editing or re-editing of old Romanian writings gained a new impetus in the context of a resurrection of the national spirit, fostered by the Enlightenment movement, without surpassing the romantic stage of cultural retrievals. Compared to previous eras, less and less emphasis was laid on disseminating works through manuscript copies, as the editor, albeit an improvised one, replaced the medieval copyist.

A significant example for a re-edited work, illustrative of the frame of mind of that period, is Petru Maior's *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [*A History of the Romanians' Beginnings in Dacia*]. This work was "pre-printed" ["pretipărită"] for a second time in Buda, in 1834, with the support of Ban Iordachi of Mălinescu, Secretary of the State Archive of the Principality of Moldavia, and with the actual involvement of Damaschin Bojincă, one of the last representatives of the Transylvanian School. The latter, a native of the Banat region, had just been summoned by Gh. Asachi to Iasi, one year before. There he was to serve as a permanent legal adviser to the Logofeția Dreptății [Chancellery of Justice], and as Professor of Law at the Academia Mihăileană [Michaelian Academy] over the coming years. This book, however, was not a mere reprint in Cyrillic script of the *editio princeps* of 1812, since it had some elements of novelty. What was also reproduced, thus, in addition to the *Disertația pentru începutul limbei româneşti* [*Dissertation on the*

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XXII, 2017, nr. 2, Cluj-Napoca, p. 106–120

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

Beginnings of the Romanian Language] and the *Disertaţia pentru literatura cea vechie a românilor* [*Dissertation on the Old Literature of the Roman*], the traditional annexes of the work, was the *Dialogu pentru începutul limbei română întră nepot şi unchiu* [*Dialogue between Nephew and Uncle on the Beginnings of the Romanian Language*], solely in Cyrillic script, first published as an appendix in Maior's work of 1819 *Orthographia Romana sive Latino–Valachica*, *una cum clavi qua penetralia originationis vocum reserantur*, and resumed as such in the *Lexiconul de la Buda* [*Lexicon of Buda*] of 1825. Moreover, in the second part of this edition there are reproduced, in Romanian, under the title *Disputaţiile asupra Istoriei pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [*Disputes on the History of the Beginnings of the Romanians in Daci*], the three answers provided by Petru Maior in 1814, 1815 and 1816 and originally formulated in Latin to the critical reviews of Jernej Bartolomeu Kopitar, an Austrian Slavicist of Slovenian origin, which had appeared in the Viennese press (Kopitar 1813; Kopitar 1816).

In fact, the textual criticism undertaken by Petru Maior in his responses to the observations made by the Viennese linguist, many of which were well grounded, amounted to an exemplary, targeted and impassioned philological and historical demonstration, whose arguments supported beyond any doubt both the viable theories and the purist tendencies of the Transylvanian scholar. He was irritated, and rightly so, by the assertion that Romanians should give up the biased self-assessment as *pure Romans*, since they were actually *semi-Romans*; Maior considered this to be one of the "German concoctions". Similarly, Maior could not approve of B. Kopitar's opinion that the Cyrillic alphabet should not be abandoned, on the alleged grounds that our language contained sounds that did not have corresponding graphic signs in the Latin alphabet. Although the reviewer urged Maior for a more temperate approach in the end, the latter was to give vent to a veritable tirade against the "slanderous attacks" brought against his historical and linguistic creed.

The replies of the Romanian scholar were translated from the Latin by Damaschin Bojincă, who in the *Foreword* motivated his manner of structuring this edition thus:

> So in order to make it known to all that the most celebrated History was subjected to the critique of the most learned men, who, eventually coming to know the truth, received it as a trustworthy history, I reckoned it would be useful to translate the said English disputes and add them to the end of the said history. So no one should be surprised seeing that I have translated them into Romanian, since the author himself says, *e Valachico in latinum translatae*, that is, converted from Romanian into Latin, perhaps because the late [author] will have had them in Romanian too, but I have no knowing whether he had them printed thus, or whether they are in manuscript somewhere, even though I have researched this quite thoroughly. Perhaps he intended to have them see the light of print in the Romanian language, too, and then, as death prevented him from doing so, that manuscript got lost, like many other manuscripts of his (Maior 1834, p. IV).

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

Of course, Bojincă's undertaking does not meet the exigencies of a modern edition, being primarily a relatively faithful reproduction of the Cyrillic text from 1812, with some (unmotivated) phonetic or graphic replacements: *străini* (ed. 1834) instead of *streini* (ed. 1812) [foreigners], *este – iaste* [is], *datoare – detoare* [indebted], or *seau – sau* [or], *strenepoți – strănepoți* [grandchildren], *împeratul – împăratul* [emperor], *însămna – însemna* [meant], *causă – cauză* [cause], *deschelecarea – descălecarea* [dismounting], *Țesar – Chesar* [emperor] etc. It is important, however, that Maior's work was endowed with three complementary texts, transposed into Romanian, which rounded off the manner of perception of a seminal work from the patrimony of the Transylvanian Enlightenment movement. Bojincă's penchant for highlighting the polemical substrate of the re-edited work can be explained by reference to the vitriolic response he provided to the pamphlet written by the Serbian Sava Tököly, who had denigrated the origin of the Romanians. Bojincă's ruthless response came as the *Răspundere dezgurzătoare la Cârtirea cea în Hale* [*Disgusting Answer to the Defamation in Hale*], published in Buda, in 1828, in a slightly amplified version of the similar writing in Latin from 1827. In the *Disputations* included in the edition of 1834, the scholar gave not only a linear translation of Maior's polemical triptych, but also a glossary of the text, many of its equivalences being accompanied by corresponding terms in brackets, and sometimes by an indication of the form in Latin. Here are some of the synonymic series Bojincă recorded in an attempt to facilitate the penetration of a neologistic lexicon: *abuz* (*rea întrebuințare*) [*abuse* (*bad usage*)], *argument* (*temeiu*) [*argument* (*ground*)], *confuzie* (*învăluială*) [*confusion* (*shrouding*)], *consonantă* (*nesunătoare*) [*consonant* (*nonsonorant*)], *cultură* (*luminare*) [*culture* (*enlightenment*)], *deşertul* (*loc pustiu*) [*desert (waste land*)], *însuşeşte* (*alipeşte*) [*appropriates* (*adjoins*)], *orațiile* (*cuvântările*) [*orations* (*speeches*)], *perfecție* (*covârşire*) [*perfection* (*flawlessness*)], *polită* (*cioplită*) [*polished* (*carved*)], *postpositive* (*în urmă puse*) [*postpositioned* (*placed at the end*)], *reflexiile* (*luările-aminte*) [*reflections* (*reminiscences*)], *repetuita* (*respusa*) [*repeated* (*retold*)], *scrisoare* (*epistolă*) [*letter* (*epistle*)], *serioase* (*adevăroase*) [*serious* (*truthful*)], *tainele* (*secretele*) [*mysteries* (*secrets*)], *wailing* (*mourning*) [*văierarea* (*jeluirea*)], *vocale* (*sunătoare*) [*vocals* (*sonorants*)], *deosebire* (*distinctio*) [*difference* (*distinction*)], *îndreptată* (*correcta*) [*straightened* (*corrected*)], *particularnic* (*accidentaliter*) [*particular* (*accidental*)], *pronumile arătătoriu* (*demonstrativum*) [*indicative pronoun* (*demonstrative*)].

The third edition of *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [*A History of the Romanians' Beginnings in Dacia*] was printed, in Latin script, in Budapest and Gherla, in 1883. Many concessions were made, however, to the purist etymological spelling, considered in the *Precuvântare* [*Foreword*] as the only one that "can protect us from linguistic barbarisms and from spelling in incorrect provincial manner" (Maior 1883, p. XLII). Although the editors aimed, in

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

principle, to leave the text and word order unchanged, they felt entitled to operate essential linguistic changes:

> We only made corrections where there were printing error(s), where interpunctuation did not appear to us to be sufficiently correct, where nominal and verbal agreement was erroneous, and also where the consequence of the adopted spelling system demanded it (Maior 1883, p. XLIII).

The levelling zeal of the young men in Buda[1] produced even more devastating effects, of which we retain only a few examples from *Precuvântare* [*Foreword*]: *ginți* (ed. 1883) – *ghinte* (ed. 1812) [nations], *romanii după datina lor – romanii după datina sa* [Romans after their traditions], *dacii* [...] *nu se înfrânau – dachii* [...] *nu se înfrâna* [Dacians ... did not abstain themselves], *mulți cădeau şi se pleguiau – mulți cădea şi se pleguia* [many fell and bent down], *Dacia – Dachia* [Dacia], *Tracia – Trachia* [Thracia], *Spiritul – Duhul* [Spirit – Ghost], *timp – vreame* [time], *causă – pricină* [cause], *popor – norod* [people] etc.

The re-entry into the scientific circuit – for the first time, in Cyrillic alphabet – of Dimitrie Cantemir's *Hronicul* (*vechimei a*) *romano-moldo-vlahilor* [*Chronicle (of the Ancientness) of the Romano-Moldavo-Wallachians*], under the editorial care of Gheorghe Săulescu, in Iaşi, in two volumes, in 1835–1836, also demands a special analysis. The manuscript had been borrowed thanks to the generosity of Metropolitan Veniamin Costache from the "imperial Archive of Moscow"[2], as specified on the title page, and had been transcribed by the Moldovan cup bearer, who undertook, as he insisted in the *Înştiințarea* [*Notification*] to the first volume, to fully comply with the original form:

> This manuscript [...] has been printed exactly after the author's style, both in terms of the syntax, which is rather figurative, and of the words, which bear, in themselves, quite a few antiquated forms of the Romanian language (Săulescu 1835, p. XVII).

Unfortunately, in this case the editor again failed to comply with his promise, confirming a longstanding concern of Cantemir's, expressed on the occasion of the fourth revision of the *Hronicul* [*Chronicle*], when he noticed that there were still many mistakes "but even more that had been made by the scrivener, who wrote it from our manuscript, but since the scrivener was not fully familiar with the Romanian spelling, he gave us plenty of toil to correct those errors" (Cantemir 1901, facsimile II). Reviewing some of Săulescu's errors, which distorted the text, the historian Gr. G. Tocilescu, the author of the forthcoming reprint of *Hronicul* [*Chronicle*], gave examples of this kind, "some due to an oversight, but most of them having been deliberate" (Cantemir 1901, p. XLVIII), among which there were:

[1] The authors of the transcription listed in the preface are Georgiu Crăiniceanu, Georgiu Pop and Georgiu Ilea.

[2] At present, the manuscript is preserved in Russia's State Archive of Old Documents, Fund 181, Ms. 1420.

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

prefaţie instead of *pridoslovia* [preface], *timpuri – vremi* [times], *răpaos – odihnă* [rest], *popoare – năroade* [peoples], *oşteni – slujitori* [soldiers], etc. The interventions made on account of a possible censorship were equally inappropriate and it would suffice to mention two examples*: prea puternicul monarh al turcilor – zmăul cu şeapte capete Turcul* [*the mighty monarch of the Turks – the seven-headed dragon*, *the Turk*]; *ascultătoare sânt monarhii turci – ascultătoare sint tiranii turceşti* [*obedient are the Turkish monarchs – obedient are the Turkish tyrants*]. Furthermore, the stunting of the title, by eluding the syntagm *vechimei a* [*Ancientness of the*], indicates a voluntary intention to alter and falsify a most important text for Romanian literature.

Several decades later, the Romanian Academy was to advocate a new return to the sources, in the series "The Works of Prince Dimitrie Cantemir", whose eighth volume was devoted to the *Hronicul* [*Chronicle*], edited by Grigore G. Tocilescu. With a view to reediting the text, the historian had undertaken a documentation journey to Russia, at the main Archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Moscow, when he collated the original manuscript with Săulescu's edition. The rather short time available to him led, again, to various omissions and misreadings, albeit not so blatant as in Săulescu's case. Still, the level of this work was different, worthy in its attempt to draw up a quasi-complete critical apparatus: an ample *Precuvântare* [*Foreword*], including a note on the edition, a general index and a *Glosariu* [*Glossary*].

In 1843, using a transitional alphabet, the Typography of the "St. Sava" College published the *edition princeps* of *Învăţăturile bunului şi credinciosului Domn al Ţării Româneşti Neagoe Basarab Vv către fiul său Teodosie Vv* [*The Teachings of the Good and Faithful Ruler of Wallachia Neagoe Basarab Vv to his son Teodosie Vv*], after a manuscript copied in the last decades of the 17th century or in the first decade of the 18th century (BAR Cluj, Rom. MS 109). The editor of the text, Ioan Eclesiarhul, had taken the liberty to announce on the reverse side of the *Precuvântare* [*Foreword*], that the work had been "corrected" by him, which was the first alarm signal. Hasdeu's reaction was harsh, as he accused the editor of "vandalism", saying that "he made every possible effort to distort the edition, ruthlessly changing the language of the original" (Hasdeu 1879, p. 439–440). Despite these warnings, in 1910, N. Iorga reproduced in Latin script the edition of 1843, "converting the spelling of the 17th century into that of today" (*Învăţăturile* 1910, p. VIII). We may see, then, that great historian resorted to a further modernization of the text, in consonance with a mindset that was still persistent in the textology of the period. This was symptomatic for this pioneering stage in the field of text editing, in which the communication of information prevailed, while an accurate reproduction of the text was of lesser importance, and the trend of language modernization (or even that of rendering it more archaic) was often manifested arbitrarily. On the other hand, Hasdeu's verdict regarding the transcription of Ioan Eclesiarhul, albeit devoid of concrete examples, was deliberately harsh, the improvised editor affording

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

changes that were as radical as those made by Gh. Săulescu's in the Cantemir edition. A simple collation of the 1843 edition with the modern scientific edition of the *Învățăturile* [*Teachings*] of 1970 provides us with sufficient samples of brutal interventions, omissions of certain segments of text, leaps of the "bourdon" type, replacements of words and unacceptable phonetic modifications. Let us list a few substitutions of terms: *veniți dar* instead *ni dar* [come then], *cântând – zicând* [singing – saying], *strigaț – chiuiți* [yell – chant], *norodul – oamenii* [people – men], *casa lui Dumnezeu – slava lui Dumnezeu* [the Lord's house – the glory of God], *blândă – întreagă* [meek – whole] etc. Just as serious were the omissions of words that appeared in the transcript: *să-l slăveşti şi să-l măreşti* [*neîncetat*] *cu glas necurmat*; *şi în tot ceasul ne îndulceam* [*şi fum goniți*] *de hrana raiului*; *o,* [*despuitoare*] *stăpână şi maica lui Dumnezeu*; *am putut cunoaşte* [*cu firea*] *şi a pricepe* (praise him and glorify him [incessantly] in an endless voice; and at all times we tasted the sweet [and were driven away] by the food of heaven; oh, [revealing] mistress and mother of God; I could know [with my nature] and understand). The list of forced phonetic standardizations complete the image of a faulty editorial work: *meu – mieu* [mine], *este – iaste* [is], *ele – iale* [they], *boieri – boiari* [boyars], *cerul – ceriul* [sky], *făcătorul – făcătoriul* [maker], *feluri – feliuri* [kinds], *deschideți – dăşchideți* [open], *deşarte – dăşarte* [vain], *destul – dăstul* [enough], *plimbați – primblați* [walked], etc. With all these lacks, Ioan Eclesiarhul's edition, which was then taken over by N. Iorga, was for a long time the only one that put in circulation the most complete Romanian version of *Învățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab* [*The Teachings of Neagoe Basarab*].

Ion Heliade-Rădulescu, a prestigious philologist and man of letters became involved in the editorial action. He had the initiative of publishing the work of Paul Iorgovici *Observations on the Romanian Language* [*Observații de limba rumânească*], printed in Buda, in 1799, in the first periodicals with a long-lasting appearance that he had set up, namely "Curierul românesc" and "Curier de ambe sexe"[3]. In the preamble, Heliade-Rădulescu motivated his recuperative action, laying emphasis on preserving "most faithfully" the language and spelling of the original, as well as on cultivating the literary Romanian language:

> This booklet, worthy of being acknowledged by our literates, both on account of the time when it was written, and for its beautiful and useful considerations on the language, was very rare and rather unknown in these two principalities. [...] In this publication the author's language and orthography will be preserved most faithfully, so that our philologists may judge how our elders began to cultivate the language, sensing the character and the nature of the language, and taking after the model by which the

[3] Iorgovici's text was edited in full, with the Cyrillic alphabet, in "Curierul românesc", X, 1839, no. 55, 56, 61, 67, 72, in "Curier de ambe sexe", II, 1838–1840, no. 6, p. 82–118, and it was resumed, in transcription with transitional Latin alphabet, in "Curier de ambe sexe", II, 1838–1840, no. 6, ediția a doua, 1862, p. 79–117.

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

> Italians, the French and the Spanish chose what was good in the language of the people, and formed the dialect and the language of the literates (Heliade-Rădulescu 1862, p. 79).

Heliade-Rădulescu transcribed quite accurately Iorgovici's book, reproducing most spelling peculiarities due to the etymological script, such as: *a – ă*, *â* (*romanesci*), *e – ă* (*pecat*, *remeşiţe*, *seu*), *e – ea* (*ave*), *o – u* (*nomele*, *rogaciune*), *o – oa* (*scolă*), *sce*, *sci – şte*, *şti* (*conosce*, *sciinţe*), with some isolated attempts at interpretation: *nascut – născut* [born]. There appeared, occasionally, some phonetic changes: *către – cătră* [towards], *între – întru* [between], *întrebuinţează – întrebuinţază* [utilizes], *sunt – sânt* [are] (isolated), *experienţe – experienţie* [experiences], *naturale – naturalii* [natural], *limbei – limbii* [language], *logica – loghica* [logic] etc. However, the lexis was not altered at all through arbitrary substitutions.

The publication of the old historiography was further assumed by the 1848 generation as a component of the rebirth of the national consciousness, in which the aspect of the content continued to prevail. The examples included the collections of documents and chronicles edited by Mihail Kogălniceanu in "Arhiva românească" (I–II, Iaşi, 1840, 1841–1845; republished in 1860–1862) and in *Letopisiţile Ţării Moldovii* (I, Iaşi, 1852, II–III, Iaşi, 1845–1846), completed, in the second edition (I–III, Bucureşti, 1872–1874), with Wallachian chronicles. Another series of Wallachian and Moldavian chronicles was published by August Treboniu Laurian and N. Bălcescu in the review "Magazin istoric pentru Dacia" (I–V, 1845–1847), the first three volumes and, partly, volume IV with a transitional alphabet, after which a Latinized spelling was adopted. These were followed by a selection of *Cronicarii Ţării Româneşti* (I–II, Bucharest, 1846–1847), printed separately. A. T. Laurian, in collaboration with Anastasie Panu and M. Kogălniceanu, published Gh. Şincai's *Hronica românilor şi a mai multor neamuri* [*Chronicle of the Romanians and of Several Nations*] (I–III, Iaşi, 1853–1854), the first full edition, printed with Cyrillic letters. Gr. G. Tocilescu published a scholarly edition in three volumes, transposed with Latin letters, in 1886. Exegetes consider, however, that the last two editions are inferior to the partial edition of Alexandru Gavra, printed in Buda, in 1844 (recte: 1844–1848), which "is endowed with several explanatory notes" (Veress 1927, p. 493).

The scientific nature of many editions is, not infrequently, questionable, and there are plenty of shortcomings, since what mattered was the dissemination of the chronicles, in other words, a popularization of the contents (Onu 1973, p. 43–44). M. Kogălniceanu was aware of those shortcomings when he acknowledged, in the *Prefaţia la a doua ediţiune* a *Cronicelor* [*Preface to the Second Edition of the Chronicles*], a thing that he had also stated in the first edition, namely that "their correction was the task either of the historians who will use it, or the critics who will shed light on it" (*Cronicele* 1872, p. XVII). And criticisms were soon to be

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

voiced by his contemporaries. In the aforecited preface, Kogălniceanu insisted on the fidelity with which he had reproduced the texts, as well as on his "scrupulous effort" for preserving the chroniclers' language. The only intervention he consciously assumed was the "modernization" made "with regard to the Latin characters we have adopted in this edition, because the Cyrillic letters have become unfamiliar to the majority of readers" (*Cronicele* 1872, p. XIX). A. D. Xenopol spoke rather harshly on the effects of this so-called modernization, in which the editor did not limit himself to transposing the text into a new spelling system, in a review published in "Convorbiri literare" (Xenopol 1872, p. 279–283). He noted that the new edition was inferior to the first edition, given the changed configuration of some words, such as: *sperie* (ed. II) instead of *sparie* (ed. I) [scares], *vedere – videre* [view], *locuitorii – lăcuitorii* [inhabitants], *fie*, *firea – hie*, *hierea* [nature], *voi – oi* [will], *Dacia – Dachia* [Dacia]. A comparison between the two editions can provide us with other examples of literary upgradings, through the removal of some antiquated peculiarities of the language: *veacuri* instead of *vacuri* [ages], *seamă – samă* [account], *sunt – sânt* [are], *risipite – răsipite* [squandered], *deschide – deşchide* [opens], *înțeles – înțăles* [meaning], *înțelepciune – înțălepciune* [wisdom], *obiceiurile – obiceaiurile* [customs], *nădăjdui – nedejdui* [hope] etc. Other objections invoked by Xenopol concerned the conditions that had to be met in a compilation of this kind in order for it to be truly called a critical edition, namely "to ensure as far as possible the authenticity of the published manuscripts and their texts", something that Kogălniceanu had circumvented by failing to mention the sources and the origin of the additional information contained in the notes and in the appendix. B. P. Hasdeu had also passed judgment on the first edition of the chronicles, claiming that it did not meet the requirements of modern science, as it did not specify "the analytical context of the variants" (Hasdeu 1867, p. 34). By contrast, in the second edition, the philologist passed an unexpected verdict on the accuracy of the conveyed text, opposed to that of Xenopol, considering this edition as "most scrupulously compliant with the manuscripts, as more than once I myself could ascertain by confronting them letter by letter" (Hasdeu 1872, p. 274). Similar errors could be encountered in the edition of the *Opere complete* [*Complete* Works] of Miron Costin, edited by V. A. Urechia (1886–1888), with a glossary by Lazăr Şăineanu, considered an example of what a critical edition should avoid being (Russo 1912, p. 77, 87). The accurate establishment of the text of a genuinely scientific edition and of the corresponding critical apparatus were still important desiderata for Romanian philological research.

A critical stance on the deliberate altering of texts was subsequently adopted by historian Gr. G. Tocilescu, the editor of Cantemir's *Hronicul*, who undertook a very meticulous comparative study and outlined several principles that should

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

guide the researcher who devoted himself to a painstaking work of critically editing the Romanian historical chronicles:

> He should gather all the codices of a manuscript; give each of these a name; rank them by: age, country and degree of accuracy; distinguish the original text from what was *added*, *interpolated*, *tampered with* or *changed altogether*. For this he will need to collate all codices word for word, and not superficially, not in one section only; to write down the smallest differences, of spelling and even punctuation; for even though history has nothing to gain by this, it is of interest to philology and – what's more – the grouping of these small differences sheds light on the ancientness and internal value of the copies (Tocilescu 1876, p. 418).

A new perspective in identifying, studying and editing old texts was open by the works of Timotei Cipariu, rightly called the founder of Romanian philology. He approached texts from the standpoint of the palaeographer and the historian of language, paying attention to the value of letters and sounds, to aspects concerning dating, location, the filiation or paternity of writings, reproducing the anthologized fragments with unprecedented accuracy, aware of the fact that the old books preserved forms of Romanian language that had disappeared. The Transylvanian philologist drew up an initial list of ancient texts from the 16th and 17th centuries, which he published in "Organul luminării" (Blaj, 1847–1848). In the second edition of *Principia de limbă şi de scriptură* [*Principles of Language and Writing*] (Blaj, 1866), Cipariu presented a smaller catalogue of printed texts, along with some manuscripts from the 17th century, limiting himself to "those of the greatest philological value from that period". A landmark in his editorial work was his publishing of the volume titled *Crestomatia sau Analecte literarie din cărţile mai vechi şi nouă româneşti, tipărite şi manuscrise, începând de la secolul XVI până la al XIX, cu notitia literaria* [*Chrestomathy or Literary Analects of the Older and Newer Romanian Books, Printed or in Manuscript, from the 16th to the 19th Centuries, with Literary Notes*] (Blaj, 1858), the first systematic anthology of fragments of old printed texts, reproduced in the Cyrillic alphabet, whose antecedent, albeit not of the same amplitude, had been Vasilie Popp's 1838 *Disertaţia* [*Dissertation*] on typographic centres. In *Acte şi fragmente latine româneşti pentru istoria beserecei române, mai ales unite* [*Romanian Latin Documents and Fragments on the History of the Romanian Church, Especially the Uniate One*] (Blaj, 1855)[4], and in the periodical "Archivu pentru filologie şi istorie" (1867–1870, 1872),[5] Cipariu also printed historical, linguistic and literary texts, some previously unpublished, mainly belonging to the writings of some representatives of the Transylvanian School.

[4] In Cipariu 1855, p. 273–277, for example, Gheorghe Şincai's *Elegia* was published.

[5] There were published, thus, fragments of Ştefan Crişan-Körösi's *Orthographia Latino-Valachica* from 1805 in "Archivu", 1870, no. XXXVIII, p. 745–750, and passages of Samuil Micu's *Acatistul* from 1801 in issue no. XXXIX, p. 761–765.

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

The thoroughly scrupulous philological activity of B. P. Hasdeu meant that the discipline had reached the stage of full maturity. It should be noted that from 1864 to 1867, in the four volumes of *Arhiva istorică a României* [*The Historical Archive of Romania*], the scholar valorized scientifically an impressive collection of documents accompanied by historical and philological commentaries. In the preamble to the publication, Hasdeu described the method of valorizing documents, providing a set of "archeographic" editing standards. Hasdeu's foremost contribution to the research and editing of Romanian literature was the work entitled *Cuvente den bătrâni* [*The Words of Our Elders*] (I–II, Bucureşti, 1878–1879; *Suplement* la tomul I, 1880; III, *Principie de lingvistică*, Bucureşti, 1881). He anthologized "spoken language texts" from the 16th century, annotated through relevant linguistic and philological commentaries (grouped in chapter *Notanda*), accompanied by a glossary and a rigorous *Index bibliografic istoric* [*Historical Bibliographical Index*]. The collection reproduced for the first time, in the Cyrillic alphabet, *Cronograful lui Moxa* [*The Chronograph of Moxa*] (1620), copied by Gr. Tocilescu after the original in Rumyantsev Museum in Moscow, then the old "popular texts" in *Codex Sturdzanus* (grouped into *Texturi măhăcene* and *Texturi bogomilice*), displayed in two columns, in Cyrillic and in Latin "transcript". This was the best designed and most complete philological edition of those times. Its detailed rules of transcription, which he presented in the opening of *Cuvente den bătrâni*, were viewed with reservation by Demostene Russo (Russo 1912, p. 78–80), who reckoned they were verbose and exaggerated. In 1881, Hasdeu edited Coresi's *Psalter* from 1577, in a first volume, under the auspices of the Romanian Academy, but not in the critical formula he had initially envisaged, "with various notes and versions of comparative texts from other psalters" (AAR, series II, vol. II, 1881, p. 3–4), which had been considered too expensive by the academic forum. In "Trajan's Colum" ["Columna lui Traian"] (1882–1883), he presented the as yet unpublished *Cronica* of Zilot Românul, written in verse and in prose (also published separately in 1884) as well as "extracts" from the *Manuscriptul* românesc din 1574 aflător la Londra în British Museum [*Romanian Manuscript of 1574, Kept in London, in the British Museum*] (in fact, this was the *Tetraevanghelul* [*Tetraevangelion*] copied in Rhodes by Radu of Măniceşti). The activity of this scrupulous editor was completed by the commented transcription of the first party of *Anonymus Lugoshiensis*. *Cel mai vechi dicţionar al limbei române, după manuscriptul din Biblioteca Universităţii din Pesta* [*Anonymus Lugoshiensis*. *The Oldest Dictionary of the Romanian Language, after the Manuscript in the Library of the University of Pest*], as Hasdeu had entitled *Dictionarium Valachico–Latinum*, in "Columna lui Traian" (IV, 1883, no. 11–12, p. 406–429) and in "Revista pentru istorie, arheologie şi filologie" (VI, 1891, p. 1–48). The last writing was edited by Grigore Creţu, under the title *Anonymus Caransebesiensis. Cel mai vechi dicţionar al limbei române, după manuscriptul din Biblioteca Universităţii din Pesta* [*Anonymous Caransebesiensis. The Oldest Dictionary of the Romanian Language,*

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

after the Manuscript in the Library of the University of Pest], in the magazine "Tinerimea română" (I, 1898, p. 320–380).

At a quick glance, the list of chrestomathies and collections of texts from this period also includes the vast, albeit "noncritical collection" (Şăineanu 1895, p. 320) of Theodor Codrescu, *Uricariul sau Colecțiune de diferite acte care pot servi la istoria românilor* [*Charter or Collection of Various Documents That May Contribute to the History of the Romanians*] (I–XXV, Iaşi, 1852–1895), followed by Alexandru Papiu-Ilarian's massive *Tesaur de monumente istorice pentru România* [*Treasure of Historic Monuments for Romania*] (I–III, Bucharest, 1862–1864), which includes historical writings or documents about the Romanians, many of them by foreign authors, translated and edited for the first time, the chronicles of Balthasar Walther, Stavrinos, Matei al Mirelor, Dionisie Eclesiarhul, along with *Istoria othomanicească* [*The History of the Ottomans*] by Ienăchiță Văcărescu, accompanied by prefatory "historical dissertations". Very dedicated to the legacy of the Transylvanian School, Papiu Ilarian also reproduced linguistic works in the *Tesaur*, such as Gheorghe Şincai's foreword to the edition of 1805 of *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae*, and Şincai's *Epistola* [*Epistle*] to Ioan de Lipszky, from 1804, both in Latin. To the same register belongs the anthology of Alexandru Lambrior, *Carte de citire (Bucăți scrise cu litere chirilice în deosebite veacuri). Cu o introducere asupra limbei româneşti* [*Reading Book (Fragments written with Cyrillic letters in extraordinary ages). With an Introduction on the Romanian Language*], Iaşi, 1882 (second edition, Iaşi, 1890; third edition, with an addition of texts from *Psaltirea Scheiană*, from *Codicele Voronețean* and five documents in the original by Gh. Ghibănescu, Iaşi, 1893). This work is considered to be the most popular chrestomathy of old Romanian texts, the third in the history of the discipline, after those of T. Cipariu and B. P. Hasdeu, which, incidentally, it partially recycles. An indispensable work for studying the monuments of the Romanian language is the collection of Moses Gaster, *Chrestomatie română* [*Romanian Chrestomathy*], I–II, Leipzig & Bucharest, 1891, presenting "extracts" from 98 manuscripts and 95 printed works published up to 1830, as well as from a few unpublished dialectal and folkloric texts. As in the case of A. Lambrior, the illustrative texts are reproduced in the Cyrillic script. In the same manner, Gaster edited the "Archivio glottologico italiano" (X, 1886–1888, p. 273–304), under the title *Il Physiologus rumeno*, the earliest version in the Romanian language, discovered by that date, of the Physiologus (the present-day Rom. MS BAR 1151). Another of his editions is dedicated to the *Tetraevanghelul* [*Tetraevangelion*] copied by Radu of Măniceşti in 1574, preserved in the British Library, the Harley Collection, a volume printed in 1892–1895, but distributed only in 1929, unbeknownst to the author, with the wrong title of *Tetraevanghelul diaconului Coresi din 1561* [*Deacon Coresi's Tetraevangelion from 1561*].

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

The Romanian Academy became effectively involved in this editorial approach, through the Lexicographic Commission, which aimed to provide a body of Romanian manuscripts and books from the 16th and 17th centuries, to be included in the reference bibliography of the future Thesaurus Dictionary of the Romanian Language, as well as through the Historical Commission of Romania, focused on the publication of documents and studies concerning national history of (Iorga 1903, p. 1–127; Ursu 1966, p. 531–547; Gheție–Mareş 1974, p. 20–26). The Lexicographic Commission was to establish, in 1877, a table of correspondences for the transliteration of the old texts written in Cyrillic, but in terms of the spelling, "it was up to each of the editors to decide upon the particularities" (AAR 1878, vol. XI, section I, p. 219–220). Based on these principles, there were published: *Catechismul calvinesc* [*The Calvinist Catechism*] from 1656, by G. Bariț, solely in Latin script, in 1879; *Pravila de la Govora* [*The Pravila of Govora*], from 1640, by A. I. Odobescu, in 1884, without the critical apparatus envisaged by the editor; *Codicele Voronețean* [*The Voroneț Codex*], I. G. Sbiera, in 1885, and Mardarie Cozianul's *Lexiconul slavo-românesc şi tâlcuirea numelor* [*Slavonic-Romanian Lexicon-and the Translation of Names*], by Grigore Crețu, in 1900: the latter two were distinguished by indexes of words, with which had been endowed for the first time. From 1872 to 1901, under the auspices of the Romanian Academy, eight volumes of Prince Dimitrie Cantemir's works were published. Moreover, Ioan Bianu edited Antim Ivireanul's *Predicile* [*Sermons*] (1886), Dosoftei's *Psaltirea în versuri* [*Psalter in Verse*] (1887) and *Psaltirea Scheiană* [*Scheian Psalter*] (1889), in a transcript doubled by facsimiles, with marginal glosses on the differences in Coresi's *Psaltirea* [*Psalter*] from 1577. Compared with the edition that was to be published later, in 1916, with a rich critical apparatus, but in which I.-A. Candrea had ventured to reconstruct the original translation of the *Psaltirea* [*Psalter*], I. Bianu's edition of Rom. Ms. BAR 449 remains the only credible and usable one at present. O. Densusianu published for the first time an edition of *Vieața sfântului Vasile cel Nou* [*The Life of St. Basil the New*], based on a "manuscript from Paris" (Densusianu 1898, p. 59–106).

Editing historical texts was tackled with the same assiduity by Ioan Bogdan, who published the first chronicles of Moldavia written in Slavonic, in works like *Vechile cronici moldoveneşti până la Ureche* [*The Old Moldavian Chronicles until Ureche*] (1891), *Cronici inedite atingătoare de istoria românilor* [*Unpublished Chronicles Referring to the History of the Romanians*] (1895), plus the publication of some Slavonic documents. An important discovery he made in Russia, in 1890, refers to the presence of 662 Romanian glosses in a Slavonic manuscript of Matei Vlastaris's *Sintagma* [*Syntagm*], dating from 1516–1536, which were to be edited and commented on in the same year (Bogdan 1890, p. 727–752). What cannot be overlooked is I. Bogdan's editing a popular book from the 18th century *Viața lui*

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

Bertoldo [*The Life of Bertoldo*] (Bogdan 1891, p. 315–324). Even if the historian offered only a sample of text, the philological and linguistic commentary was particularly relevant.

The historian and theologian Constantin Erbiceanu was a prolific editor: he restored several important works for Romanian history and culture. Among these, we should mention Gavriil Protul's historical-hagiographical writing *Viața şi traiul Sfinției Sale Părintelui nostru Nifon, patriarhul Țarigradului* [*The Life and Being of His Holiness, Our Father Nifon, Patriarch of Țarigrad*] (1888), Rom. MS 464 from BAR; Anthim Ivireanul's *Didahiile* [*Didaches*] (1888), after a copy located at Căldăruşani Monastery; *Învățătură bisericească la cele mai trebuincioase şi mai de folos pentru invățătura preoților* [*Church Teachings for What is Most Useful to Priests*] (1894), by Antim Ivireanul, which had been printed at Târgovişte in 1710; Petru Maior's *Procanon* (1894), after autograph manuscript number 565 at BAR. He also prefaced an edition of Coresi's *Tetraevanghelul* [*Tetraevangelion*], published by Gherasim Timus Piteşteanu (1889). Some of its editions, accomplished at the standards of those times, are usable even today.

With his characteristic self-assurance, N. Iorga reported and edited, albeit not always with maximum exigency, impressive collections of documents, including: *Acte şi fragmente cu privire la istoria românilor, adunate din depozitele de manuscrise ale Apusului* [*Documents and Fragments on the History of the Romanians, Gathered from the Deposits of Manuscripts in the West*] (I–III, 1895–1897), *Manuscripte din biblioteci străine relative la istoria românilor* [*Manuscripts from Foreign Libraries Referring to the History of the Romanians*] (I–II, 1898–1899); *Documente româneşti din arhivele Bistriței* (*Scrisori domneşti şi scrisori private*) [*Romanian Documents in the Archives of Bistrița (Princely Letters and Private Letters)*] (I–II, 1899–1900), the most considerable part of the works he edited belonging to the first decades of the next century.

Besides the fluctuating manner in which certain transposition rules were used, in which partial transliteration interfered with a rough interpretive transcription, the quality of the editions was also influenced by the etymological spelling, promoted by the Romanian Academy until the Reform of 1904, which left it up to the reader to re-establish certain linguistic forms inside the texts.

This – by the force of things – limited retrospective of the preoccupations for the critical editing of old texts in the 19th century highlights the hesitations and searches registered by an activity that was seminal for the valorisation of written Romanian culture. The evolution of the editing principles became ever more visible in Romanian textual criticism.

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

REFERENCES

Bogdan 1890 = Ioan Bogdan, *Glose române într-un manuscript slavon din secolul XVI*, in "Convorbiri literare", XXIV, 1890, no. 9, p. 727–752.

Bogdan 1891 = Ioan Bogdan, *O traducere moldovenească din veacul al XVIII-lea a "Vieții lui Bertoldo"*, in "Convorbiri literare", XXV, 1891, no. 4, p. 315–324.

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

Cipariu 1855 = Timotei Cipariu, *Acte şi fragmente latine româneşti pentru istoria beserecei române, mai ales unite*, Blaj, Tipografia Seminarului Diecesan, 1855.

Cronicele 1872 = *Cronicele României sau Letopisețele Moldaviei şi Valahiei*. A doua ediţiune revăzută, înzestrată cu note, biografii şi facsimile [...] de Mihail Kogălniceanu, tomul I, Bucureşti, Imprimeria Națională C. N. Rădulescu, 1872.

Densusianu 1898 = O. Densusianu, *Vieața sfântului Vasile cel Nou*, in "Anuarul Seminarului de istoria limbei şi literaturei române. Studii de filologie română", 1898, p. 59–106.

Gheție–Mareş 1974 = Ion Gheție, Al. Mareş, *Introducere în filologia românească. Probleme. Metode. Interpretări*, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974.

Hasdeu 1867 = B. P. Hasdeu, *Arhiva istorică a României*, vol. III, Bucureşti, Imprimeria Statului, 1867.

Hasdeu 1872 = B. P. Hasdeu, "*Cronicele României"*, in "Columna lui Traian", III, 1872, no. 31 (131), p. 273–275.

Hasdeu 1879 = B. P. Hasdeu, *Cuvente den bătrâni*. Tomul II. *Cărțile poporane ale românilor în secolul XVI în legătură cu literatura poporană cea nescrisă.* Studiu de filologie comparată, Bucureşti, Noua Tipografie Națională C. N. Rădulescu, 1879.

Heliade-Rădulescu 1862 = [I. Heliade-Rădulescu], *Paul Iorgovici*, în "Curier de ambe sexe", periodul II, ediția a II-a, 1862.

Iorga 1903 = N. Iorga, *Despre adunarea şi tipărirea izvoarelor relative la istoria românilor. Rolul şi misiunea Academiei Române*, in *Prinos lui D. A. Sturdza la împlinirea celor şaptezeci de ani*, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Carol Göbl", 1903, p. 1–127.

Învățăturile 1910 = *Învățăturile lui Neagoe-Vodă (Basarab) către fiul său Teodosie*. Cu o prefață de N. Iorga, Vălenii de Munte, Editura Societății "Neamul Românesc", 1910.

Învățăturile 1970 = *Învățăturile lui Neagoe Basarab către fiul său Theodosie*. Text ales şi stabilit de Florica Moisil şi Dan Zamfirescu. Cu o nouă traducere a originalului slavon de G. Mihăilă. Studiu introductiv şi note de Dan Zamfirescu şi G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1970.

Kopitar 1813 = [B.] K[opitar], *Geschichte des Ursprungs der Römer in Dakien, geordnet von Peter Major* [...], in "Wiener allgemeine Literaturzeitung", 1813, no. 98, 7 December, col. 1551–1565.

Kopitar 1816 = [B.] K[opitar], *Eine walachische Antikritik*, in "Intelligenzblatt zur Wiener allgemeinen Literaturzeitung", 1816, no. 7, February, col. 52–53.

Maior 1814 = Petru Maior *Animadversiones in recensionem Historiae: De origine Valachorum in Dacia e Valachico in Latinum conversae*, Budae, Typis Regiae Universitatis Pestinensis, 1814.

Maior 1815 = Petru Maior, *Reflexiones in responsum domini recensentis Viennensis ad Animadversiones în recensionem Historiae de origine Valachorum in Dacia e Valachico in Latinum translatae*. Pesthini, 1815, Typis Joan. Thom. Trattner.

Maior 1816 = Petru Maior, *Contemplatio recensionis in Valachicam anticriticam literariis ephemeridibus Viennensibus, nro 7. Februar, 1816, divulgatae.* Budae, Typis Regiae Univers. Hungaricae, 1816.

Maior 1834 = Petru Maior, *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia.* [...] Iar acum pretipărită prin Iordachi de Mălinescu, secretariul Arhivei Statului a Prințipatului Moldaviei. Cu adaugerea Dialogului şi a Disputațiilor urmate în limba latinească asupra acestei Istorii, şi tălmăcite româneşte prin D. Damaschin Bojinca, iurisconsultul Prințipatului Moldaviei. În Buda, cu tipariul Crăieştei Tipografie a Universitatei Ungureşti, 1834.

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)

Maior 1883 = *Din scrierile lui Petru Maior*, edate de Societatea literaria "Petru Maior" a junimei române studioase din Budapesta. Volumul I. *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dacia*, Budapesta şi Gherla, 1883.

Onu 1973 = Liviu Onu, *Critica textuală şi editarea literaturii române vechi. Cu aplicaţii la cronicarii moldoveni*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1973.

Pavel 2016 = Eugen Pavel, *The beginnings of textual criticism in old Romanian writing*, in "Dacoromania", s.n., XXI, 2016, no. 1, p. 17–30.

Russo 1912 = D. Russo, *Critica textelor şi tehnica ediţiilor*, Bucureşti, Atelierele Grafice Socec & co., 1912.

Şăineanu 1895 = Lazăr Şăineanu, *Istoria filologiei române cu o privire retrospectivă asupra ultimelor decenii (1870–1895). Studii critice*. A doua ediţiune, Bucureşti, Editura Librăriei Socec & comp., 1895.

Tocilescu 1876 = Gr. G. Tocilescu, *Studie critice asupra cronicelor române.* I. *Cum sunt publicate cronicele române*, in "Columna lui Traian", VII, 1876, no. 9, p. 385–419.

Ursu 1966 = N. A. Ursu, *Contribuţia Academiei Române în domeniul editării critice a textelor vechi româneşti*, in "Limba română", XV, 1966, no. 5, p. 531–547.

Veress 1927 = Andrei Veress, *Note şi scrisori şincaiane*, in AAR, Mem. Secţ. Lit., series III, vol. III, 1927.

Xenopol 1872 = A. D. Xenopol, *Cronicele României sau Letopiseţele Moldovei şi a Valahiei*, in "Convorbiri literare", VI, 1872, no. 7, p. 279–283.

CRITICA TEXTUALĂ ŞI EDITAREA SCRIERILOR ROMÂNEŞTI ÎN SECOLUL AL XIX-LEA
(*Rezumat*)

Editarea scrierilor vechi româneşti capătă un nou impuls în secolul al XIX-lea, în contextul unei resurecţii a spiritului naţional, fără a se depăşi faza romantică a recuperărilor de ordin cultural. Faţă de epocile anterioare, se renunţă tot mai mult la activitatea de difuzare a scrierilor prin intermediul copiilor manuscrise, editorul, uneori improvizat, luând locul copistului medieval. Necesitatea editării textelor în spaţiul românesc se impunea, totodată, în condiţiile schimbării sistemelor ortografice. Dincolo de modul fluctuant în care erau utilizate anumite norme de transpunere, în care transliteraţia parţială se interfera cu o transcriere interpretativă aproximativă, calitatea ediţiilor era marcată, totodată, de ortografia etimologizantă, care lăsa o anumită largheţe în restabilirea formelor lingvistice din cuprinsul textelor. Multe dintre ediţiile apărute nu au încă un caracter ştiinţific deplin. Exactitatea reproducerii textului era trecută deseori pe un plan secund, iar tendinţa de modernizare (sau chiar de arhaizare) a limbii se manifesta de multe ori în mod arbitrar. Ediţia *Hronicului* lui D. Cantemir, realizată de Gh. Săulescu în 1835–1836, sau cea a *Învăţăturilor lui Neagoe Basarab*, alcătuită de Ioan Eclesiarhul în 1843, sunt asemenea mostre de editare defectuoasă. Reacţiile unor filologi sau istorici, precum B. P. Hasdeu, A. D. Xenopol, Gr. G. Tocilescu, D. Russo, sunt însă prompte în amendarea unor asemenea tentative de denaturare a textelor. Critica textuală românească va cunoaşte un curs ascendent în secolul următor.

Cuvinte-cheie: *editare critică*, *alterarea textelor*, *modernizarea limbii*, *schimbarea sistemelor ortografice*, *evoluţia principiilor de editare*.

Keywords: *critical editing*, *text alteration*, *linguistic modernization*, *the change of orthographic systems*, *evolution of editorial principles*.

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

BDD-A27775 © 2017 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.75 (2026-11-06 19:22:38 UTC)