Linguistic Boundaries for the Denominational Faiths. On the Translations of the Greek *καθολική* in the old Romanian and Slavonic Creeds

Călin POPESCU

Le mot sobornicească n'a pas été le seul employé dans le Symbole de Nicée-Constantinople en roumain. Au contraire, le mot premièrement usité a été catolicească. Ce mot a été replacé ultérieurement, comme une réaction face au prosélytisme des uniates en Transylvanie. Le même chose s'est passé dans la langue slave: le mot usité par le Grec Cyrille était каволическоую, en accord avec Rome, qui a elle-même translittéré l'original, créant une tradition presque universelle dans les langues européennes modernes. Les russes ont fait l'imaginatif changement dans une époque ou les relations avec les Grecs s'étaient dégradées, et l'uniatisme diminuait leur tolérance. Les slavophiles ont compris le Sobornost comme une définition de l'orthodoxie. Mais ce terme ne peut pas être que synonymique avec le concept du Symbole original. Autrement, comme les occidentales remarquent, L'Orient serait coupable d'hérésie.

Mots-clés: Calques, contactes slavo-roumaines, Symbole de Nicée-Constantinople, Sobornost, catholicité

1. Preliminaries

The translation of religious texts into the vernacular began, in South Eastern Europe, a few centuries earlier than in Western countries, through the action of the Byzantine missionary brothers, Constantine (Cyril) and Methodius, among the Slavonic-speaking population. After them, a multisecular tradition carried on and accomplished their traductological movement's aims. Among the translation problems this movement faced in creating the Slavonic Christian terminology was the rendering of the adjective *καθολική* in the Nicene Creed.

2. The translation into Old Church Slavonic

2.1. *Каволическоую, the original rendering*

As all preserved Glagolitic documents show us clearly enough, initially, in brothers Cyril and Methodius' time, the Slavonic version of the Creed employed exclusively the loanword *каволическоую*[1]. Nor did the changing into *съборноую* come from their direct successor, St Clement of Achrida, as only the

[1] Or its other forms such as *каволикинсоую* (or *каволикинскаѧ*), *каволикию, каволикѣи, каволичьскую.* For more details, see Gezen (1884, p. 50, 54, 94-95 ff).

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

School of Preslav accomplished the transition to the Cyrillic alphabet[2], the only one in which the latter variant can be found in old manuscripts – as a matter of fact, it didn't appear either in the subsequent documents in the Greek alphabet, elaborated in the Slavic area – such as the Confession of the Metropolitan Mogila of Kiev (1645). *Съборноую* is only to be found lately, in a secondary redaction of the Creed, dating to the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth century[3]. And, for a long time, there was no contradiction between it and the former variant, that is why, in order to designate more specifically the Eastern Orthodox Church, both words, *каѳоликиѧ* and *съборнаѧ*, could even be used together (Gezen 1884 and Deubner 1929). Later on, the Slavic translation of *καθολική* became to be regarded as a distinguishing mark of the Orthodox Slavic Churches, although Cyril and Methodius seemed to make nothing at all of the differences of rite between the Latin and Greek liturgy in their time (Lacko 1963). Their biographies make no mention of the rite the two brothers promoted in their mission in Moravia – they employed in services Greek terms and prayer formulas, and on the other hand they celebrated Roman liturgies and accepted consecrations after the Roman ritual (Duthilleul 1963) – at that time, at least theoretically, this was perfectly possible and natural, as the Church was one. Moreover, 'from a missionary's viewpoint, the Greek liturgy would not be of any more value than the Latin, since the Moravian Slavs understood neither language' (Lacko 1963). The two missionaries had to counteract the Latin intransigence by the conciliatory gesture of employing, besides daily prayers translated after the Greek *Euchologion*[4], an adaptation of the Latin text of St Peter's Liturgy (Tarnanidis 1988, 108): in this way they could respond to the Bavarian propaganda in Moravia and subsequently present themselves in Rome, where Methodius received, in 867, an explicit authorisation from the Roman Pontiff to use the Slavonic language in the services in Great Moravia[5] (and Cyril lived to see, in 869, his liturgy used in four churches of the metropolis). The character of the Glagolitic manuscripts from Sinai (of the eleventh-twelfth centuries, and with fragments which go back to the period of the mission of the two brothers) shows a clear Western provenance in their liturgical translations (Tarnanidis 1988), and even the texts translated from Greek have, as token of Western contacts, ornamentations done in the Italian style (Ševčenko 1991). The lack of specificity of their biographies regarding the rite (Lacko 1963) is seemingly due to the fact that they have translated in Moravia, besides the Byzantine liturgy – with prayers

[2] Cyrillic script was a more Bulgarian than Macedonian phenomenon. See Obolensky (1971, ix, p. 7), Pavlov et al. (2008: 58) or Tachiaos (2001: 116).

[3] See Gezen (1884: 44-45). And, since it derives from the noun *съборъ*, it may transpose a concept from the Apostolic Symbols of faith of Western inspiration (there, the Catholic Church was also called *congregatio* or *unio sanctorum*), as Deubner (1929) alleges.

[4] The *Euchologion* was rather a free compilation, but the text and the terminology were Greek. See Tarnanidis (1988: 66-67).

[5] See Lacko (1963: 103) and *Vita* (1976: 77, 79).

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

of Western composition in the preparatory part, *proscomide* (Tarnanidis 1988), the Roman Mass[6], including a Creed. As a matter of fact, a form of Latin liturgy already preexisted in the region – and the compromise made on this issue by the missionaries must have been the cause of the mixed form of the subsequent Central European Slavonic liturgy[7].

All these facts could prove by themselves the traductological choice that the old Glagolitic documents reveal (i.e. a quick adaptation of *καθολική* /catholica, instead of finding an equivalent), was the one the apostles of the Slavs could had made. Considering all the justifications they had to provide, according to their biographies, for the use of a new language in the worship, it would have been obviously impossible for them to defend the replacement of a sensitive word in the Creed[8] as well, so much the less a replacement of its sense[9]. In fact, nothing antioccidental in general or antipapal in particular could be found in Cyril and Methodius (Obolensky 1971) and it would denote a misunderstanding to ascribe to them any disrespect to the Pope, whom their biographies honour with the title of *Apostolic*[10], as he was still enjoying the primacy of honour in the united Christendom. The Slavic peoples adopted indeed during that epoch the Slavonic liturgy as a pledge of a certain independence, but it was with respect to the Greeks in the first place[11]. Whereas for the Greek apostles of the Slavs the replacement of the consecrated term could not have been justified on any political grounds. The avoiding of каѳоличєскоую would have meant, rather than rejecting Roman resonances, a repudiation of the language of the Byzantine Empire with which they remained in contact, which they thought to be eternal[12], and where the original meaning of the Creed was expressed.

---

[6] 'Today it is an accepted fact that the Roman-Slavonic liturgy was initiated simultaneously with the Byzantine-Slavonic, and that the author of both was St. Cyril' (Lacko 1963). See also Obolensky (1971, ix, p. 3-4).

[7] See Obolensky (1971, ix, p. 4, 6). The liturgy was used until the second half of the eleventh century, when it was eliminated by the Romans.

[8] As a matter of fact, they also used a previous translation of the Creed already existent in Moravia, made from Latin and written in the Roman alphabet (Obolensky 1971).

[9] As later on suggested by the Slavophiles. Even in Moldavia and Wallachia more than eight centuries later, Dosoftei and Anthimus, who had to provide many justifications for translating for the first time the Slavonic service into the Romanian vernacular, could not even think of touching the word (*sobornuju*) in the Creed.

[10] According to *Vita* (1976), the Brothers were consecrated in Rome, where Constantin even took his monastic vows, then was buried in a Roman basilica. Pope escaped Methodius from prison and supported him. At his burial, the service was celebrated in *Latin*, *Greek* and Slavic. In Moravia, according to the instructions from Pope, the Gospel and the Epistles were read first in *Latin*, then in Slavic. And even the *Vita* of Methodius employs, in its manuscript dating from the late twelfth century or early thirteenth century, the word каѳоликиєю (p. 78).

[11] See Obolensky (1971, ix, p. 6). Thus the Bulgarians decide to adopt the Slavonic Liturgy, after the death of the two brothers and after the expulsion of the Methodius' disciples from Moravia and the Central Europe, their initial missionary area.

[12] See Vita (1976: 19, 31, 39) and Obolensky (1971, p. ix, 7).

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

2.2. *The need of the new word*

The diplomatic situation remained by and large unchanged until the Great Schism in 1054, and even a long period after[13]. Then, traumatic experiences with the proselytising Roman Catholicism beginning in the thirteenth century[14], which became a serious problem at the end of the fourteen century[15], dramatically changed the perspective. The simultaneous downfall of the Byzantine state and frictions between the Russian Church and Constantinople over canonical independence[16] only made things worse. The elimination of *каѳолическоую*, which previously would have seemed a pointless provocation. now became a necessity. Anyway the replacement of the loanword by a translation, was, certainly, decided subject to the preservation of the meaning, with no intention of altering the orthodoxy of the Creed at all. And – as Deubner (1929) points it out – , any understanding of the word in a different way from its traditional meaning would have equalled a denial of Nicene Creed.

3. The subsequent history of the word in Moldova and Wallachia

3.1. *First known translations of the Creed into Romanian*

For the Romanian language, by virtue of its Latin origin, grammatical structure, and basic Christian vocabulary[17], nothing would had been easier than to

[13] 'The little we know about relations between the Russia and the Latins from 1054 to 1240 (or at any rate to 1204) shows a curious mixture of tolerance and moderation and almost entire absence of hostile attitude on either side. Prior to 1054 there is no evidence of any antagonism or disagreement between the nascent Russian Church and Rome' (Fennell 1995). After the Fourth Crusade (1204), the metropolitans of Kiev were 'consecrated and indoctrinated' in the anti-Latin centre of Niceea (and 'briefed in the current official Orthodox attitude to Rome'), until 1261. 'The time had not yet come, however, for the hostile reaction of church – *and* State – in Russia to the Latin West to be openly manifested in propaganda and polemics. This was only to appear in the centuries following the Tatar-Mongol invasion when Russia found itself faced on its western boundaries with the aggresive might of Catholic Lithuania and Poland, to say nothing of the Teutonic Knights on its north-western Baltic frontier'.

[14] 'Les tendances agressivement prosélytes des communautés latines installées sur le sol russe provoquèrent des réflexes de rejet' (Roberti et al. 1989).

[15] Rome and Kiev entered then in an open ecclesiastical conflict. 'In 1372 Pope Gregory XI ordered the archbishop of Cracow to appoint a Latin bishop to what was Antony's metropolitanate (Galich, Peremyshl`, Vladimir and Kholm) and to remove the "schismatic" [i.e. Orthodox] bishops' (Fennell, 1995).

[16] 'La rupture avec Constantinople, le mépris des Grecs provoquèrent un désaffection pour la tradition byzantine et son remplacement par une tradition locale' (Roberti et al. 1989). Since the end of the fourteenth century the Russian Church became more and more nationalist and unable to resist the aggression of the state: 'L'église russe devint bientôt un enjeu politique entre les princes'. On the other hand, 'knowledge of the Greek language gradually declined and become exceptional after about 1200' (Vlasto 1970).

[17] Due to its origins dating back to the first generation of the Church - a commonplace in Romania. See, for instance, Păcurariu (1991: 71-79). The words in the *Creed* and in the *Lord's Prayer* are almost all Latin, as well as the names for *Christmas, Easter, Sunday, Resurrection, Church, God, Virgin, Cross*, the name *Christian* itself (*creştin*, coming from the popular Latin *chrestianus*) and so on.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

adopt, in the Nicene Symbol of Faith, the Greek/Latin word *καθολική* /*catholica* in its Romanian form, *catolică*, just as so many other languages have done. Yet, although they are not Slavs, the Romanians in the two Principalities were urged by similar circumstances to establish the same Slavonic rendering, as we will see below.

The first scholar who acted for the introduction of the vernacular in the Church of Romanians[18] – which for centuries had used Old Church Slavonic[19] – was the pioneer typographer and deacon Coresi, who published two translated versions of the Symbol of Faith: in his *Molitvelnic* [=Prayer Book] (1564), and in the volume *Carte cu învăţătură* [=Book with teachings] (1581). While he tried to maintain the wording of Article IX close to the Old Church Slavonic version (which employed the adjective *съборноую*), his translations sounded clumsy[20], as the Romanian language did not yet have a corresponding word, but only the loan *săbor*, equivalent to *σύνοδος, σύναξις – synod, assembly* (Miklosich 1862-1865): one variant was '*a săborului apostolilor'*, which could mean at best 'of the assembly of Apostles', while the other, '*de săboru*', was rather equivalent to 'of the synod'. His two different versions showed once more that these translations were neither official nor established[21]. His Creeds, as well as his other publications, were the fruit of his personal initiative, somehow at the limit of ecclesiastical acceptance, as in the more pluralistic province – which was influenced by the practice of other denominations – of Transylvania, where he did not have to obey an Orthodox state, like in his native Wallachia[22], but where his works seemed to remain, anyway, little known[23].

[18] Before considering Romania in general, this article is treating separately the three Principalities in which it was formerly divided: Moldavia (north-east), Transylvania (north-west), and Wallachia – the southern province, also having Transylvania under its ecclesiastical authority.

[19] The Romanians had been compelled by circumstances and by the start obtained by Slavonic literature (Urechia 1885) to abandon, for a period, their own linguistic way. The Slavonic influence in the Romanian Orthodox area was now at its peak, as it had been officially used by the Church and State for many centuries.

[20] 'Şi într-una sfîntă a săborului apostolilor besearecă' (1581) and 'Şi de săboru apostolească beseareca' (1564). See Coresi (1914: 562).

[21] So N. Iorga is wrong when he says the Creed in Coresi's *Molitvelnic* belongs to an earlier period, when the basic Christian texts were translated (see Iorga 1904: 26). In fact, at that time, the Creed was uttered only in Slavonic.

[22] Moreover, an important part of the population (the Saxons and many of the Hungarians), who had just adhered to the Reformation, put an increasing pressure on the Orthodox Romanians to abandon their Slavonic worship in favour of the vernacular, hoping this way they would be converted more easily to Protestantism – see Maior (1976: 323); decades later, a Calvinist ruler – George Rákóczi – even enforced it by law).

[23] Istvan Fogarasi, author of a Calvinist Catechism in the province a century later (1648), was not aware of his publications.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

3.2. *First borrowing, as 'săbornică'*

After a lost century for Romanian Orthodox printing, the next culturally flourishing period took place at the end of the seventeenth century and the beginning of the eighteenth century, under growing Greek influence. In the Principality of Moldavia, the service was celebrated, according to its prince chronicler Cantemir[24], antiphonally, part in Slavonic, part in Greek[25], while some readings of the Liturgy, like the Gospels and the Epistles, were already being said in Romanian. The metropolitan Dosoftei (1671-1973; 1675-1686) translated the Liturgy as well as the other services into Romanian, and his Creed had a form largely similar to the one recited today. Article IX even contained a rhyme ('în una svîntă *săbornică* şi *apostolică* Besearică'[26]), which made it more fit for public recitation. As for the term *săbornic*, it seemed to have already some tradition in the churches, as Metropolitan Varlaam felt free to invoke it vigorously in his Answer (1645) against the Calvinist Catechism issued in Transylvania (1642). He employs the Slavonic loanword strictly in the Greek sense, designating a universal Church: '*Săbornică* [=Catholic] it is called, because it is gathered from all tongues'. Whereas the Calvinist one 'is not *săbornică*, because it is not in the whole world, nor from all the tongues assembled'[27]. The term can also be found in the 1696 *Ceasloveţ*[=Book of Hours] of Sibiu, in Transylvania, which contains a liturgical form of the Creed more evolved than the translation of the sixteenth century of Coresi, although not as good as the contemporary one of Dosoftei[28] – anyway, Article IX had the same form as quoted by Varlaam[29].

3.3. *The hesitant beginnings of 'săbornicească'*

[24] He also indirectly gives us a reason why theological concepts had to be imported in a Slavonic form. After the Council of Florence, all Moldavian documents in Roman script were burned and, at the instigation of a metropolitan of Bulgarian origin, the Cyrillic alphabet was adopted instead (Cantemir 1956) – a measure subsequently taken by all Romanians, in order to avoid 'the popish soiling', as a footnote in a reprinted edition of *Descrierea Moldovei* (by Neamţ Monastery), in 1825 explained. The Roman See had managed to attract not only the Moldavian representatives in Florence, but also, in 1588, the Metropolitan Gheorghe Movilă – see Suttner (1991: 56-57).

[25] See Cantemir (1956: 290). The practice was accepted in Wallachia, too. In 1698, Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, as a resident in Wallachia, urged, on behalf of the Wallachian religious authorities, Bishop Athanasius of Transylvania not to give in but avoid the unauthorized use of the vernacular in the services (See Cipariu, 1855: 243). The fact is also mentioned (with a negative commentary) by the Uniate priest (Bălan, 1914) – while the Orthodox chronicle '*Condica sfîntă*' records it together with a positive commentary Ghenadie (1886).

[26] In *Molitvelnicul de-nţăles* (1681)[=Understandable Prayer Book].

[27] 'Săbornică se cheamă, că din toate limbile iaste adunată' (...) 'nu-i săbornică, că nu-i în toată lumea, nici din toate limbile adunată' (Varlaam 1984).

[28] It still mixes up theological terms, such as '*fire*' [=nature] and '*fiinţă*' [=substance].

[29] 'Şi într-una sfîntă săbornică şi apostolească Besearecă'. Another Transylvanian liturgical book, the 1689 *Molitvelnic* of Bălgrad, only indicates where the Creed is to be inserted in the service, but without reproducing it – perhaps the Slavonic version could still have been used.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

In that period, the most important typographical, cultural and ecclesiastical centre of the Romanians was Wallachia[30]. Here, the respect for the established Slavonic tradition was higher, and the Romanian services began to be celebrated later[31] – but the decision was to have a national-scale impact. Initially, the custom was to translate only the ritual, the service texts themselves being kept in Slavonic. The first person who translated the Creed was Metropolitan Stephen (1648-1653; 1655-1668), in his manuscript *Slujebnic.* Article IX has the form: 'Întru una Sfîntă, *săbornicească* şi apostolească Besearecă' – employing, for the first time the term appended with the combined adjectival suffix, '*nicească*' (equivalent to '*nică*', and without any semantic change), as currently recited in Romanian Orthodox churches. But, for Stephen, '*săbornicească*' was not supposed to exclude its synonym '*catolicească*'. His manuscript was not for the Church's use as such[32], while his printed *Mystirio* [=Book of Sacraments] (1651), which still included the Creed in Slavonic[33], when it comes to describing the rituals[34], used, for designating the Church in the vernacular, '*catolicească*'[35]. So did another bishop, Gregory, on his installation in the diocese of Buzău (1668): he recited the Symbol of Faith in Slavonic, then the ecclesiastic chronicle records that he swore allegiance (Ghenadie 1886) to 'Apostoleasca şi *catoliceasca* sfinta bisearecă a lui Hristos' [=the Apostolic and catholic holy church of Christ]: although in the vernacular vocabulary the word *săbor* (for *synod*) was very present[36], the derivative 'săbornicească' seemed less fit than 'catolicească'.

[30] Under the aegis of the enlightened prince – and, eventually, martyr – Constantin Brîncoveanu.

[31] The service entirely in Romanian began to be celebrated in 1710 – according to Metropolitan Nifon (1851), The Italian secretary of Prince Brîncoveanu confirms this: in 1718, he notes that this custom began recently – 'questo religioso abuso introdotto a' nostri giorni' (Del Chiaro, 1914).

[32] 'He did not have the courage to utter it in the Church' (Ghenadie 1886).

[33] Only the ritual norms were translated into Romanian – they stipulate, however, that if the baptized one couldn't understand the Creed, he must have it explained: 'You should also know this, priest: if the one to be baptized doesn't know our language, then you are to translate it to him.' ('În ştire să-ţi fie şi de aceasta o Popo, că de nu va şti limba noastră cel ce va să se boteaze, atunci să i-o tălmăceşti.') Here, 'our language' means the Slavonic language, in which the service was officiated, and in which the Creed had to be memorized: 'And in case of a small child the godfather can say it instead of him. And he is to pay attention to teach it to his godchildren, so as they may know it by heart, or else you will be held responsible for it before God.' ('Iară la copil mică poate să zică şi naşul în locul lui. Şi să poarte grijă naşul să înveaţe pre fini să o ştie de rost, iară denu tu vei da seama la Dumnezeu.')

[34] In the section 'Pentru botezul eriticilor' [=On the Baptism of the Heretics].

[35] 'Ereticii carii vin la Sfînta Pravoslavnică şi Catholiciasca besearică, şi jeluesc să se împreune Pravoslavnicilor…' [=The heretics who come to the Holy Orthodox (or the Pravoslavie) and *Catholic* church, and beg to unite with the Orthodox (or the Pravoslavni)…]; 'şi cu deadinsul să-i înveţi sfînta leage pravoslavno (sic!) Catholicească' [=and insistently teach them the holy pravoslavno Catholic law].

[36] 'Lîngă aceastea crede şi se supune celor şapte sfinte şi a toatea lumea săboare' [=Besides these, he believes and obeys the seven holy and of the whole world synods (*săboare*)], says the Chronicle (Ghenadie 1886) – 'săboare', obviously, belonged to the current language, while the derived 'săbornic/săbornicesc', which designated the Church, was not part of the Wallachian vocabulary, even at the highest ecclesiastical level.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

Anyway, the next metropolitan of Wallachia, Theodosius (1668-1672; 1679-1708)[37], tried to avoid both loans by picking a word from Romanian linguistic soil[38]: he chose '*adeverită*', which is derived from '*adevăr*' [=truth], and means *confirmed, ascertained as true,* thus promoting a free translation[39]. This version was the one commonly used during his pastorship, even by the suffragan bishops ordained for Transylvania, but it was not adopted by all scholars and it did not survive his death[40]. In 1702, Damaskinos 'The Doctor', one of the major liturgical translators of the time[41], reverted to Stephen's version when he uttered the Creed, on his installation as bishop of Buzău[42].

3.4. *The establishment of the word and its context*

The person who imposed the actual form of the Creed was the scholar (and eventually martyr) Anthimus the Iberian, who recited it on his installation as bishop of Rîmnic, in 1705, for the first time integrally and officially, and almost identical to the version of today. He, too, reverted to Stephen's wording for Article IX: '*Şi întru una sfîntă, săbornicească şi apostolească besearică*'. This version of the Creed, slightly improved and with small variations in his editions of *Molitvelnic* [=Prayer book for Priests][43] (1706 and 1713), remained established

[37] A character involved in the beginning of the vast process of translating into Romanian all the biblical and liturgical texts – for which 'he had gathered around him at Tîrgovişte all the men of science and of merit' ('adunase la Tîrgovişte pe toţi bărbaţii ştiinţei şi ai meritului'. However, he preferred, for the time being, that only the ritual rules be published in vernacular, 'not daring' ('necutezînd') to use the 'Romanian short language' ('limba scurtă românească') for any more: see Bianu & Hodoş (1903: 234). His caution was seemingly justified, at least concerning him: as he uttered the Creed in Romanian (for the first time in Wallachia, on his investiture as hierarch) without sufficient theological accuracy – for instance, he still uses 'connatural' ('de o fire') instead of 'consubstantial' ('deofiinţă').

[38] Things like this were possible, in an epoch when the religious terms were being created. His Article IX of the Creed is: 'Întru sfîntă *adeverită* şi apostolească besearică' (Ghenadie 1886).

[39] An interpretation more than a translation, seemingly echoing the argument of St. Irinaeus: 'It is within the power of all, therefore, in every Church, who may wish to see the truth, to contemplate clearly the tradition of the apostles manifested throughout the whole world' (*PG* vii, 848A. tr. Roberts & Rambaut, 1885).

[40] Ghenadie, the author of *Condica Sfîntă* [=The Holy Chronicle] (1886) cannot hide his surprise at the choice of Metropolitan Theodosius. 'We cannot explain how could he translate the term *καθολική* or *съборная* by *adeverită.* We understand he might avoid the term *catolicească*, but not the term *săbornicească*' (as he uses many other slavicisms).

[41] Despite his preference for a more traditionalist style. As a former teacher of Slavonic, in his revision of the *Psalter* of Anthimus the Iberian, he replaced some overbold Greekisms with old and rooted Slavicisms. Yet, his translations of almost all service books determined the eventual complete abandon of the Church Slavonic by the Romanians.

[42] See Ghenadie (1886: 90, 93). But only the Ist Article of his Creed was written down – either because only so much was uttered in Romanian, or for other reasons, as even some Greeks Creeds confessed by Greek hierarchs were not completely written.

[43] Provided with long canonical and theological justifications, assuring that prayers in the vernacular are not forbidden, either by the Scripture or by and tradition (as Dosoftei had to do, in his turn, in Moldavia).

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

by *Ceasoslovul* [=The Book of Hours] of 1715[44], as after his death (1716), the newly installed Phanariote regimes in Moldavia and Wallachia[45] were less propitious for an authentic Romanian cultural life. Things had to freeze for a long time with respect to the evolution of the liturgical language – fortunately, this happened right after the services were translated, and most of them had already been introduced into the circuit of worship practice, under the patronage of a great ecclesiastical figure, St Anthimus[46].

Meanwhile, the Orthodox in the third Romanian principality, Transylvania, faced a different kind of problem. At the end of the seventeenth century, the Austrian Catholic Empire seized the opportunity of annexing Transylvania[47] and concocted a quick religious 'Union', after a form already established, thereby cynically exploiting the unbearable social status of the Transylvanian Church (Roberti 1922: 7, 45-46). At first, a union with the local Orthodox leadership was settled, even with faked documents[48], then, by blackmail and humiliating gestures[49], subsequently by arrests, tortures, killings, by using the army for baptizing children and, eventually, by the demolition of the Orthodox monasteries with cannons[50], a great chunk of it was torn out of the jurisdiction of the metropolitanate of Wallachia. The Church which did all these things, and to which the local bishop had to swear allegiance[51], was called 'the c*atoliceasca* Church of Rome The feeling inside the Orthodox Wallachian Church was easy to guess, and the times left little room for diplomacy: Hilarion – the one who

[44] The same definitive formula can already be found in 1708, used by Joasaph of Buzău on his installation as hierarch – see Ghenadie (1886: 105-106). However, these last little variations did not touch Article IX.

[45] Although it emphasized the cultural affinities and denominational ties between the Romanians and the Greek rulers, this regime was founded on the murder of the illustrious Costantin Brîncoveanu (the prince), and Anthimus the Iberian (the metropolitan) – both today called martyrs, by the Romanian Orthodox. There was little surprise that a lack of big cultural figures in Wallachia and Moldavia followed – See Iorga (1926: 489). What was already elaborated in the linguistico-theological field had to be preserved for a century at least. Then, in course of time, its authority increased with age.

[46] Since 1710 the Liturgy (including the Psalms 102 and 145) was used 'from time to time' in Romanian (see Note 31), and since the 1730s the translated version became authoritative within the jurisdiction of the Wallachian Metropolitanate. See Barbu Bucur (1969: 1071).

[47] This was settled in 1699 by the Treaty of Karlowitz.

[48] For more details, see Păcurariu (1994a: 29-33) or Păcurariu (1994b, ii, p. 289-306).

[49] The Orthodox bishop was reordained, then permanently overseen by a envoy (Păcurariu, 1994b: 34-6).

[50] Initially, the union was made without bringing it to the attention of the mass of the people. After a few decades, when a theologically coherent opposition came into being, the priests guilty of being ordained in Wallachia were imprisoned for life, beaten and tortured, their wives persecuted and their followers ruined. When, finally, after 60 years, a hieromonk organized a rebellion, a general was sent to solve the problem: he destroyed with cannons all monasteries of stone or brick, burned down all their wooden structures, and moved part of the population (See Păcurariu, 1994a: 374-93).

[51] A person of little intellectual and moral value – but even these weaknesses were cunningly exploited by the Uniates' harsh proselytism.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

preceded Anthimus as the bishop of Rîmnic – was dismissed just for some very small, practical concessions made to the local Catholics[52], while Anthimus' Iberian (Georgian) origin, which tied him more to the Russian world, must have been, on his appointment, a pledge of his lack of any affinity for Catholicism[53]. On the other hand, for Anthimus, a foreigner, supported distantly, only by the ruler[54], it would have been impossible to undertake anything against the general current, even if he had wanted to. That is why he couldn't sponsor any other rendering of the term *καθολική* in the Creed. Even though the direct transliteration from Greek or Latin might have been more intelligible to the Romanians, it was the Slavonic loanword that provided the necessary refuge against easy confusions. So much the more as the use of *catolicească* had begun to be monopolized by the Catholic Catechisms spread by the Transylvanian Uniates: 'Dottrina Christiana'[55], for instance, used the expression 'Sfînta biserică *katolicească*' [=Holy catholic church], And, although the word *katolicească* was explained by the simple fact that the Church (i.e. 'those who serve Christ'[56]) 'is an assembly'[57], the ecclesiological rigour was maximal with respect to the affiliation to the Roman Church: 'Whereas those who baptize themselves according to their own will and are not partakers of the union of the saints', 'are not in the Church's bosom', but 'denied the Christian church', so that 'they are cursed' and 'are slaves of the devil'[58].

The Romanian Orthodox Churches, like all the other Eastern Churches, forced by the strength of such Catholic proselytism to abandon their old name of *catholic* (calling themselves *orthodox* or *pravoslavie*[59]), had to adapt the wording of the Creed as well, by adopting the Slavonic synonym '*săbornică*', which seemed to secure, as a minimal linguistic barrier, a refuge against easy confusions. However,

[52] About allowing the Catholics to build a church and to bury their dead in the common cemetery. On the dismissal of Hilarion, see Şerbănescu (1964: 188), and Ghenadie (1886: 97). That gives an indication about how tense the atmosphere was and what the expectations of the new bishop were.

[53] And indeed, he proved himself to be such a supporter of the Panslavist cause as to get into trouble with the prince. See Păcurariu (1994a: 156).

[54] Who had imposed him with some difficulty. 'He was elected to the bishopric with the signatures of some strangers, not even the metropolitan Teodosie signed. It seems that a deaf battle was waged, the will of the ruler being too strong, for the high prelates to say anything' (Teodorescu 1960); see also Iorga (1932: 17) and Ghenadie (1886: 97).

[55] Issued in Rome in 1677, translated into Romanian by Vito Pilutio. The same approach was taken by the Catholic Catechism issued by Peter Canisius in 1703 at Cluj, on behalf of the new Transylvanian Catholic Archbishop: see Bianu & Hodoş (1903: 138).

[56] '*Cei ce slujesc lui Hristos'.*

[57] '*Ieste adunetură'.*

[58] 'Pe cînd cei care se botează după voia lor şi nu sînt părtaşi la uniunea sfinţilor' 'nu sînt în sînul bisericii', 's-au lepădat de biserica creştinească', 'sînt blestemaţi', 'sînt robi dracului'.

[59] 'Pour se démarquer d'une catholicité romaine trop souvent perçue comme porteuse d'une universalisme agressif, Les Églises orientales furent obligées, à leur corps défendant, de se rabattre sur le terme *orthodoxe*, tout en ayant parfaitement conscience de leur catholicité' (Roberti 1922).

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

this subterfuge was but a momentary and partial solution. Once the Uniate propaganda took cognizance that the locals adopted another term for 'catholic', it had no restraint in calling the Church of Rome '*săborniceasc*ă', too. The Catholic Catechism of 1726[60] employed the words 'catolicesc' and 'săbornicesc' alternatively[61], and defined them together[62]. And, indeed, the denotative meanings of *sobornicească* and *catolicească* were the same: *catholica*[63]. Nevertheless, they had divergent connotations, as they pointed to different centres for the same reality. The Catholic Catechism assured at the top of the Church could be no other than 'the Pope of Rome'[64], while, on the other hand, in the Orthodox Catechism 'Pravoslavnica mărturisire' [=Orthodox Confession][65] (1691, Buzău), offered Jerusalem as an alternative for the centre of catholicity[66] – avoiding in this way the Roman universality[67]. In fact, on behalf of Romanians it also provided some sort of advantage and a reservation about any other national universality, as, at that time, the Patriarchs of Jerusalem were frequent presences at the Romanian Principalities' courts and Romanian Princes were their protectors[68].

The Greek Church received with some coldness this perspective: its ecclesiology doesn't make any mention or use of Slavonic rendering[69]. But the Roman Church was the one who contested it sharply. In the case of Romanians, this dodging was always criticized as unnatural by their Catholic fellow-

[60] 'Catehismuş sau Învăţătură creştinească în folosul neamului rusesc din Ţara Ungurească', Sîmbăta Mare – with the sanction of Ioan Iosif, the bishop of Sebast and Munkacs.

[61] Even the Catholic Church was named the 'pravoslavnic' [=Orthodox, equivalent to the Russian Pravoslavie].

[62] 'It is called *catolicească*, that is *săborniceasc*ă, because it is everywhere, and is spread in the whole world ', the Catholic catechism said.

[63] According to their Slavonic correspondents. See also *съборьиая* and *католѐ÷ьская* in Miklosich (1862-1865) or in Lysaght (1983).

[64] Who is 'the Deputy of our Lord Jesus Christ, because he remained in St Peter's stead' – 'Vicariş Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos, pentru c-au rămas în locul Sfântului Pătru'.

[65] *Pravoslavnica mărturisire a săborniceştii şi apostoleştii Besearecii Răsăritului* (Buzău, 1691 – Romanian Academy Library, CRV 92), is a translation (using the form '*săbornică* ') of the *Confession* issued in 1643 by the Romanian metropolitan of Kiev, Peter Mogila (Petru Movilă).

[66] 'Secondly, this article teaches that the *săbornic* church is not particularly from any place, be it even the most distinguished one, because the churches belonging to places are all alone, such as the ones in Ephesus, in Philadelphia, in Laodicea, in Antioch, in Jerusalem, in Rome, in Alexandria and the rest. And among all these different churches, that one is called mother of them, which was first enriched by the coming of Christ and received the eternal salvation and the remission of sins, from which the preaching took its origin, beginning at Jerusalem' (Question no. 84).

[67] Whereas the Greek Church, formerly imperial (so concretely universal), was still regarded in the small Romanian Principalities as 'the great Church our mother' ('muma noastră biserica cea mare') – Prince's *Foreword* of the 1688 Bucharest *Bible.* See Bianu & Hodoş (1903: 286).

[68] Patriarch Dositheos even acted, in Wallachia, as 'a sort of *hypermitropolitan*' of Prince Brîncoveanu. See Iorga (1932: 410) and Iorga (1901: 43).

[69] Sticking to the to the Fathers, but also to a conotation of Byzantine universality. Metropolitan Timiadis (1992), for instance, finds a lot of other solutions for the issue of non-ecumenicity – the Church is like a tree in the winter, the catholicity means integrality of the doctrine – but not even one derived from the Slavonic equivalent.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

countrymen, for straying both from the authentic word and from the Roman roots of the Romanian nation[70]. As for the Russians, the investigation of A. Deubner, points out abruptly from the Catholic standpoint that the change of the word *catholic* in the Creed is blameworthy since it 'was made for unscientific reasons'. But can science be invoked against facts, blaming legitimate defensive reactions? The Uniate scholar jumped, even in 1929, to the conclusion that the Church called *catholic* can only be the one ruled by Peter's successor[71].

4. The 19th century Sobornost' and today's semantic adventures of the term

By virtue of their nineteenth century nationalistic ideology, the Pravoslavni Russians (from whom the Romanians imported the word) also replied to these linguistico-theological attacks by a hermeneutical counterattack, Thus, Aleksey Khomyakov[72] came up with a perspective in which the translation by *съборноую* is even more correct than the original term: Unlike the old 'catholic' (which does have a meaning but in Greek, the Latin sense of 'universal'[73] being 'too commonplace for a Creed of the Church'), the Slavonic term is also able to express the quality of being *catholic* in an etymological sense – *τὸ καθ' ὅλον* – (Khomyakov 1872). His interpretation became a 'wellnigh ubiquous motif' of the so-called Slavophile philosophical current, of which he was one of the first representatives, and the *Sobornost*', a Russian commonplace (Nichols 1989). For Sergius Bulgakov (1935), *Sobornost*' is 'the soul of Orthodoxy' because, although it preserves the same sense as the initial *catholicity,* that 'assembles and unites', it brings something in addition: the *conciliarity,* in contrast with the monarchic authoritarianism, attributed to the Roman Catholicism.

With respect to the conciliarity, the theory was adopted in modern Romania as well, where the derivation of the word in the Creed from the noun 'sobor' was exploited, so the Orthodox Church can also be called 'the church of the *sobors*'[74]. This theological development may have in common with the adoption of the present *собориую* /sobornicească in the Creed a certain adversity towards the Western ecclesiologies, especially the Uniate Catholic one[75], yet it must be

[70] The Uniate clergyman Ioan Bălan (1914), for instance, denounces the translation by *sobornicească* as inexplicably inaccurate. These two were always favourite topics of the Catholic propaganda.

[71] While Dejaivfe (1952) resorts to a Russian philosopher sympathetic to the Roman Church (Solov'ev) in order to prove it.

[72] In whose opinion the Slavs – as 'Iranians' – have also a racial superiority, in particular over the Latins – 'Kushites' (Walicki, 1975: 209-210).

[73] And, as Deubner (1929) points out, since Augustine and especially since Gregory the Great, the sense in which the Romans employ the word *catholic* is *universal*.

[74] 'Biserica soboarelor', as Viorel Mehedinţu (1966) calls it in his thesis, elaborated under the supervision of Fr Dumitru Stăniloae. However, the Assembly which proclaimed this note of the Church was only the second Ecumenical Council.

[75] Mehedinţu – like Khomyakov (1872) – indirectly and directly accuses the Roman Church of promoting a 'poorer' catholicity.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

confronted with the historical facts: a distinction should be made between the content of this doctrine – no matter how true –, and the limited goal of the translation. Khomyakov's theory does not expound – as he takes it for granted[76] – on the reasons St Cyril had for conceiving the new word in a *scientific* (as Deubner puts it) manner, in a time of ecclesiastical peace: the evidence we have proves there was not such a thing. Khomyakov was only relying on the presence in the Slavonic Creed of the late translation, which, even in his time, was explained by the Russian Catechisms in the same old way[77]. And, however, the recent interpretation of the term as *conciliarity* couldn't work as a distinguishing mark of Eastern Church, since we can have equally elaborate Catholic argumentations, according to which the conciliar notion is to be found, if not exclusively, at least equally authentically, in the Roman Church[78].

5. Epilogue

For some, confusion and unneccesary questions would arise even now, so the Slavonic rendering may be still useful in the Creed. In fact, it would be unwise and against the Orthodox ecclesiastical principle of 'economy' to modify, for abstract reasons, such a delicate formulation that has taken root. However, it won't work as a boundary in the same way as in fourteenth- to eighteenth-century, after the change in Orthodox-Catholic relations made Vatican II and Balamand Agreement (1993). Nor can a word warrant a denominational identity today, when the amount of information became so high. In the modern Russian there is now a clear difference of spelling ('т' vs. 'ф') between the Catholic (Roman) Church and the *catholic* concept of the Creed. In Romania, as the theological language has massively evolved since the seventeenth century, when it consisted almost exclusively of Slavicisms[79], *sobornicitate* (which gained conciliar connotations, due to its Slavonic etymology) can be employed alternatively with *catolicitate*

[76] 'Although we don't have documents, it is doubtless that they chose the word, and this also clarifies its sense, because they were Greeks and in communion with Rome so they could have chosen another one' (Khomyakov 1872). The same conjecture, made by Mehedinţu (1966: 390).

[77] Joseph Wilbois (1908) quotes such an official Catechism from the beginning of the twentieth century, making no difference between *sobornaja* and the word it translated from Greek: 'Why is the Church called *Sabornaja* or *Catholic* or *Universal*? Because it is not limited by any place, time, or people, but includes in itself the true believers of all times, all places, and all peoples'.

[78] The conciliarity, stated explicitly by the decree *Haec Sancta* (1415) pertains, due to the work of *sensus fidelium*, to the *depositum fidei* – 'Ideea conciliara e integrata in *depositum fidei*', as Alberigo (1981), puts it. See also Dejaivfe (1952: 468-469, 473) or Lane (1991: 212).

[79] Treaties such as *Pravoslavnica mărturisire* apparently have, due to their oldness, a too big authority for being subject to any revisions anymore. Yet all the theological explanations in it sound linguistically obsolescent today (the features or qualities of God are not longer called '*osebiri*', but '*însuşiri*' or '*atribute*'; the person is no longer '*obraz*', but '*ipostas*' or '*persoană*'; even Creed is no more the *sign of faith* – '*semnul credinţei*' –, but the *symbol of faith* – '*simbolul credinţei*'). and most Slavonic terms made room for the more precise Greek and Latin loans or to Romanian new words.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

(which could have the advantage of better rendering the theology resorting to Greek etymology[*].

References

Alberigo, G., *Chiesa Conciliare: Identità e significato del conciliarismo*, Brescia, 1981

Barbu Bucur, S., *Monumente Muzicale, Filotei Sin Agăi Jipei – prima Psaltichie românească cunoscută pînă acum*, in 'Biserica Ortodoxă Română', LXXXVII (1969), p. 1066-1075

Bălan, I., *Limba cărţilor bisericeşti*, Blaj, 1914

Bianu. I. and Hodoş N., *Bibliografia românească veche 1508-1830*, vol. I, Bucharest, 1903

Bulgakov, S., *The Orthodox Church*, tr. Elisabeth Cram, London, 1935

Cantemir, D., *Descrierea Moldovei*, tr. Petre Pandrea, Bucharest, 1956

Del Chiaro, A.-M., *Istoria delle Moderne Rivoluzioni della Valachia,* ed. N. Iorga, Bucharest, 1914

Cipariu, T., *Acte si Fragmente latine romanesci pentru istoria beserecei romane mai alesu unite*, Blaj, 1855

Cooper, H., *Slavic Scriptures*, London, 2003

Coresi, *Carte cu învăţătură (1581)*, ed. S. Puşcariu and A. Procopovici, vol. I, Bucharest, 1914

Dejaivfe, G., *Sobornost' ou Papauté ? II. La notion catholique de la Papauté*, in 'Nouvelle Revue Théologique', vol. 74/5 (1952), p. 466-484

Deubner, A., La traduction du mot «καθολικὴν» dans le texte slave du symbole de Nicée-Constantinople, in 'Orientalia Christiana', XVI – 1/55 (1929), p. 54-66

Duthilleul, P., *L'évangélisation des Slaves: Cyrille et Méthode*, Tournai, 1963

Fennell, J., *A History of the Russian Church to 1448*, London & New York, 1995

Gezen, A., *Исторія славянскаго перевода символовъ вѣры*, St Petersburg, 1884

Ghenadie, *Din istoria Bisericii Românilor. Mitropolia Ungro-Valachiei. Condica Sfîntă*, vol. I, Bucharest, 1886

Iorga, N., *Istoria Bisericii Româneşti şi a vieţii religioase a românilor*, vol. II, Bucharest, 1932

Iorga, N., *Istoria literaturii române*, vol. II, Bucharest, 1926

Iorga, N., *Istoria literaturii religioase a românilor pînă la 16*88, Bucureşti, 1904

Iorga, N., *Istoria literaturii române în secolul al XVIII-lea*, vol. I, Bucharest, 1901

Khomiakoff, A.- S., 'Lettre au Redacteur de *l'Union Chrétienne*' in *L'Église latine et le Protestantisme au point de vue de l'Église d'Orient*, Lausanne & Vevey, 1872, p. 391-400

Lacko, M., *Saints Cyril and Methodius*, Rome, 1963

Lane, E., *Conciliarity,* in *Dictionary of the ecumenical movement,* edited by N. Lossky, J. Bonino, J. Pobee, T. Stransky, G. Wainwright and P. Webb, Geneva, 1991

[*] The work of Calin Popescu was supported by the project SOP HRD 159/1.5/S/138963 – 'PERFORM'.

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)

Lysaght, T. A., *Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) – Middle Greek – Modern English Dictionary*, Wien, 1983
Maior, P., *Scrieri*, ed. Florea Fugariu, vol. I, Bucharest, 1976
Mehedinţu, V., *Sobornicitatea Bisericii în ecumenismul contemporan*, in 'Ortodoxia', XVIII (1966), p. 387-402
Miklosich, Fr., *Lexicon Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum*, Wien, 1862-1865
Aidan Nichols, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora: Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afanas'ev (1893–1966)*, Cambridge, 1989
Nifon, *Tipic bisericesc*, Bucharest, 1851
Obolensky, D., *Byzantium and the Slavs: collected studies*, London, 1971
Pavlov, P., Orachev A. and Handjiyski A., *Bulgarian script, a european phenomenon*, Sofia, 2008
Păcurariu, M., *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române*, vol. I-II, Bucharest, 1991, 1994 (a)
Păcurariu, M., *Pages from the history of the Romanian Church (the uniatism in Transylvania)*, Bucharest, 1994 (b)
Roberti, J.-C., Struve, N., Popspielovsky, D., Zielinsky, W., *Histoire de l'Église russe. Dès origines à la fin du XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1989
Roberti, J.-C., *Les Uniates*, Paris, 1922
Şerbănescu, N., *Episcopii Rîmnicului*, in 'Mitropolia Olteniei', XVI (1964), p. 171-212
Ševčenko, I., 'Report on the glagolitic fragments (of the Euchologium Sinaiticum?) discovered on Sinai in 1975 and some thoughts on the models for the make-up of the earliest glagolitic manuscripts' in *Byzantium and the Slavs in letter and culture*, Cambridge – Massachusetts, Napoli, 1991, p. 618-650
Suttner, E., *Church Unity. Union or Uniatism?*, Rome, 1991
Tachiaos, A.-E., *Cyril and Methodius of Thessalonica. The acculturation of the Slavs*, Crestwood, New York, 2001
Tarnanidis, I., *The Slavonic manuscripts discovered in 1975 at St Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai*, Thessaloniki, 1988
Teodorescu, B., *Episcopul Damaschin şi contribuţia sa la crearea limbii literare române*, in 'Mitropolia Olteniei', XII (1960), p. 627-645
Timiadis, E., *Lectures on Orthodox Ecclesiology*, vol. II, Joensuu, 1992
Urechia, V. A., *Schiţe de istoria literaturei române*, Bucharest, 1885
Varlaam, *Opere*, ed. M. Teodorescu, Bucharest, 1984
The Vita of Constantine and The Vita of Methodius, tr. Marvin Kantor and Richard White, ed. Vladislav Matejka, Michigan, 1976
Vlasto, A. P., *The Entry of the Slavs into Christendom. An introduction to the Medieval History of the Slavs*. Cambridge, 1970
Walicki, A., *The Slavophile controversy, History of a Conservative Utopia in Nineteenth-Century Russian Thought*, tr. Hilda Andrews-Rusiecka, Oxford, 1975
Wilbois, J., *Russia and reunion* (tr. Davey Biggs – the original title: *L'Avenir de l'Église Russe*), London, 1908

BDD-A26416 © 2016 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.108 (2026-11-17 20:54:55 UTC)