EUGEN PAVEL

THE TRANSYLVANIAN SCHOOL – PREMISES UNDERLYING THE CRITICAL EDITIONS OF TEXTS

1. It is widely accepted today that the beginnings of modern Romanian spirituality are marked by the Transylvanian School movement, an ideological and cultural current which also coincided with an unprecedented revival of identity, with the awakening of self-consciousness for a nation that had been relegated, for many centuries, to the periphery of history. Upholding the movement's humanist-emancipatory program, Romanian scholars could assert themselves in the first decades of the eighteenth century, both in thought and deed, as true Europeans, who were open to modernity. The study of this epoch reveals a genuine treasure trove of Romanian thought and feeling, of tremendous and far from obsolete intellectual and formative relevance for all generations. This explains the stringent need for a reconsideration of the writings pertaining to the Transylvanian Enlightenment movements, whether in print or in manuscript, published or unpublished, through the lens of contemporary Romanian historiography and philology. It also explains, implicitly, the pressing necessity for compiling a critical chrestomathy of those texts. To start with, an anthology of this magnitude requires laying down a few methodological principles: explaining the concept, fixing its chronology, providing a critical overview of previous editings, and presenting the criteria underlying the selection of the texts.

1.1. It should be noted that the term "school" (and, implicitly, its attendant qualifier) was not crystallized spontaneously in the period, at the time of the birth and evolution of the movement itself, even though all its followers experienced a sense of belonging to that group. The denomination of that phenomenon remains the prerogative of historiography, despite the terminological oscillations from the beginning of the twentieth century (Pavel 2017a, p. 364–366). Eventually, the generic syntagm "şcoala ardeleană" ["Transylvanian School"] prevailed, despite the fact that other, more or less appropriate names have been proposed over the course of time. The first such name was that of "şcoala latinistă" ["Latinist School"] (Densusianu 1900, p. 17–25), a rather lax form in terms of its historical relevance, doubled, occasionally, by that of "şcoala transilvăneană" ["Transylvanian School"]. The Bucharest-based professor was not to relinquish these names even two decades later, when he presented his lectures in the first volume of *Literatura română modernă* (1920). The term "şcoala latinistă" was also

DACOROMANIA, serie nouă, XXIII, 2018, nr. 2, Cluj-Napoca, p. 109–133

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

preferred by Sextil Puşcariu in a conference dedicated to the centenary of Petru Maior's death (Puşcariu 1921–1922, p. 111). Over the following years, the linguist was to keep using this name (Puşcariu 1929, p. 109) or resort to a similar one – "direcția latinistă" ["Latinist Direction"] – seen as "the wonder of the Romanian people's resurrection". In it he envisioned "the direction in which the public spirit would develop during the next decades" (Puşcariu 1930, p. 2). Although he adopted a similar definition, Mario Ruffini (1941) analysed "la scuola latinista rumena" from a much broader, undifferentiated perspective.

Believing that it was a "a school-founding movement" (Iorga 1901, II, p. 269), the historian hesitated, at first, between periphrastic and rather imprecise names, which were nonetheless suggestive and impressive: "the era of Petru Maior" or, as the title of a chapter ran, "the renovative school of the historians from Transylvania" (Iorga 1901, II, p. 155), but also "the historical school of Transylvania" which he described, briefly, as "serious and beneficial" (Iorga 1901, II, p. 161; Iorga 1933, III, p. 167). In the end, he formally chose a phrase that had already been validated, reiterating a definition of romantic extraction. He did not generalize, however, the syntagm *Transylvanian School*, which he only used as the subtitle for the third volume of his revised edition of *Istoria literaturii româneşti*. Meanwhile, historians had been the first to use the new term more frequently. Out of a desire to as explicit as possible, Ioan Lupaş used the same type of periphrastic construction, making reference to "Transylvanian historical and philological school" or, more simply, following the model of N. Iorga, "Transylvanian historical school" (Lupaş 1921–1922, p. 89–91). One decade later, in 1933, he decided upon the simplified phrase, *Şcoala Ardeleană*, which he used without explanations as the subtitle of an anthology, *Cronicari şi istorici români din Transilvania*, covering the period from the second half of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century. He was driven not so much by a temptation to completeness, as by an attempt to counterbalance the fact that, in his opinion, up until then "attention had been given almost exclusively to the historians of the so-called *Transylvanian School* from the beginning of the nineteenth century" (Lupaş 1933, I, p. III), even though the beginnings of Romanian historiography in Transylvania dated to much earlier times. In his study dedicated to Petru Maior, Alex. Lapedatu also made use of a periphrastic phrase: "the Romanian historical and philological school from Transylvania" (Lapedatu 1921–1922, p. 79). Lucian Blaga himself evinced this terminological vacillation: at first he described the movement as "the Transylvanian Latinist School" (Blaga, 1943, p. 6–7; Blaga 1972, p. 169–181), but then definitively opted in favour of "Transylvanian School", dissociating it from the Latinist excesses of the second half of the nineteenth century (Blaga 1966, p. 132–133).

In the case of D. Popovici, the principal exegete of the Enlightenment, who tended to contextually define, with comparativist rigor, the first stage of the modern period, synonyms such as "the Romanian Cultural Revival" or "the

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Transylvanian Revival" were sporadically used (Popovici 1944, p. 499–500; Popovici 1972, p. 14). Compared to the syntagm generally preferred at that time, namely the "Transylvanian School", which he adopted only incidentally alongside that of the "Latinist Doctrine" (Popovici 1942, p. 521), the literary historian from Cluj took not so much a divergent as a distancing position, highlighting that this syntagm was somewhat inadequate because it relied on a "regional criterion": in his opinion, the name that was now in widespread use had "the great disadvantage that it entirely particularised a phenomenon of universal import" (Popovici 1944, p. 509; Popovici 1972, p. 24).

1.2. Fixing the chronological limits of the Romanian Enlightenment movement was, as expected, a natural concern for the analysts of the phenomenon. The literary-historical principle proved to be the most efficient, as it highlighted the sequentiality of works throughout time. In his attempt to determine the chronological boundaries of the era dominated by the towering presence of Petru Maior, by N. Iorga resorted to a historical criterion, establishing that the period lasted from 1774 to 1821, respectively, from the Treaty of Küçük Kaynarca to the revolutionary movement of Tudor Vladimirescu (which coincided with the year of Petru Maior's death), albeit the latter had little relevance for the Transylvanian area. Iorga's conclusions had rather strong echoes, which have lasted well into the present. According to D. Popovici, a supporter of the literary criterion, the phenomenon was contained strictly between 1779 and 1829, the literature of the Enlightenment being bounded, on one end, by Samuil Micu's *Cartea de rugăciuni* [Book of Prayers] and, on the other end, by the publication of the *Meditations* authored by Lamartine, the romantic, in Heliade-Rădulescu's translation. Regardless of this overarching perspective on Romanian literature, in general, the suggested timespan is not fully acceptable, the author himself being aware of "the arbitrary nature of a strict chronological determination" (Popovici, 1972, p. 20), which was, in any case, inoperable in the context of the Transylvanian School. Another *a quo* term that was frequently proposed was the year 1780, which coincided with the publication of the first authentic scientific work written by the movement's members, *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae*, the first Romanian grammar printed in Latin script, written by Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Şincai. This chronological moment is definitely important, given that it marks, conventionally, the beginning of the modern era in the history of the Romanian literary language. It was embraced, among others, by O. Densusianu, who believed that this year coincided with the beginning of a new phase, a real "age of regeneration", one of the most prolific in our cultural evolution (1900, p. 17), and by Mario Ruffini (1941), who referred to the period 1780–1871, with extensions up to the Latinist current itself, illustrated by Timotei Cipariu, August Treboniu Laurian and I. C. Massim.

From a purely philological perspective, I. Gheție (1966, p. 113) distinguished in the timeline of the movement two rather well-defined epochs: the first period was

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

that which fostered the "emergence of the linguistic doctrine", lasting from 1779 to 1806–1809 and being linked to the personalities of Micu and Şincai; the second period, which revolved around the personality of Petru Maior, stretched up to the *Lexicon* of Buda, published in 1825. The connection between the two series of scholars was ensured by Ioan Budai-Deleanu.

Trying to prove a certain belatedness compated to the European Enlightenment, Romul Munteanu (1977, p. 5) identified, inexplicably, the first manifestations of this current in Romanian culture in later works, such as the *Supplex Libellus Valachorum* (1791), or a sermon by Sava Popovici (1792).

Whether we include in this pleiad of humanist scholars certain so-called precursors or pre-Enlightenment thinkers (Inochentie Micu-Klein, Gherontie Cotore), who were active in 1743–1746 and who were followed by Petru Pavel Aaron and the other co-authors of *Floarea adevărului* [The Flower of Truth] (1750), all of them truly committed to the movement, or consider that certain works attributed with certainty to Samuil Micu date from 1774–1778, it becomes very clear that the origins of the Transylvanian School go back earlier in time.

As regards the *ad quem* term, the year 1821 (advanced by N. Iorga), it is accepted more or less symbolically, as the "boundary of some lives", which was not crossed by any of the senior figures of the movement (Duțu 1968, p. 297). For the latter author, the new stage of "patriotic Enlightenment" is placed, rather restrictively, from the eighth decade of the eighteenth century until the third decade of the next century; in other words, it lasted for about six decades (Duțu 1972, p. 123). This chronology was accepted, at one point, by several researchers (Lungu 1978, p. 106–112). In their turn, Dumitru Ghişe and Pompiliu Teodor suggested the much more plausible scenario according to which the limit should be moved into the era immediately following the year 1821, more precisely towards the end of this decade (Ghişe–Teodor 1972, p. 18), the year 1830 also representing the end-limit of the old retrospective national bibliography.

In its first edition, an anthology compiled by Florea Fugariu that comprehensively covered the period of the Transylvanian School went from the 1779 *Cartea de rugăciuni* [Book of Prayers] to Constantin Diaconovici-Loga's *Epistolariul românesc* [Romanian Epistles] from 1841 (Fugariu 1970, I–III); in the revised edition, the spectrum was broadened, encompassing the period between the historical work of Samuil Micu from 1778, *Historia Daco-Romanorum sive Valachorum*, and the writing of Ioan Barac, *Cei trei fraţi gheboşi* [The Three Hunchback Brothers], published in 1843 (Fugariu 1983, I–II). Of course, the upper limit was chosen randomly, each and every time, but the overall picture of the collection is enlightening for the attempt to reenvision the current, in which both a so-called Transylvanian pre-Enlightenment and a loosely defined post-Enlightenment were naturally included. Other scholars have also opted in favour of the fourth decade of the nineteenth century as a final point (Bocşan 1986, p. 154). Finally, another researcher who followed the trend of forcibly assimilating the

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Latinists, who asserted themselves starting from the mid-nineteenth century, into the Transylvanian School movement was D. Macrea (1969, p. 10–11).

2. The work of editing the writings produced by the members of the Transylvanian School gained a certain momentum in the first half of the nineteenth century, in the context of the revival of the national spirit, even though the romantic stage of cultural recuperations was not yet surpassed (Pavel 2017b, p. 106–109). A significant case for the mindset of those times was the re-editing of Petru Maior's *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [The History of the Beginnings of the Romanians in Dacia], "preprinted" a second time in Buda, in 1834, with support from Ban Iordachi of Mălinescu from Moldavia and with the actual involvement of Damaschin Bojincă, one of the last representatives of this current of thought. This book was not, however, a mere reprint with Cyrillic characters of the *princeps* edition of 1812, for it also had some elements of novelty. What was also edited, besides *Disertația pentru începutul limbei româneşti* [Dissertation on the Beginnings of the Romanian Language] and *Disertația pentru literatura cea vechie a românilor* [Dissertation on the Old Literature of the Romanians], the traditional annexes of the work, was the *Dialogu pentru începutul limbei română între nepot şi unchiu* [Dialogue between Nephew and Uncle on the Beginnings of the Romanian Language], solely in Cyrillic script. This was 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 it was resumed as such in *Lexiconul de la Buda* [Lexicon of Buda] from 1825. The three answers provided by Petru Maior in 1814, 1815 and 1816 – originally printed in Latin – to the severe critical reviews that Jernej Bartolomeu Kopitar, an Austrian Slavicist of Slovenian origin, had published in the Viennese press are reproduced in the second part of this edition, in Romanian, under the title *Disputațiile asupra Istoriei pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [Disputes on the History of the Beginnings of the Romanians in Dacia]. The answers of the Romanian scholar were translated from Latin by Damaschin Bojincă, who prefaced them with an argument explaining the manner of conceiving this edition:

"It should come as no surprise that I have translated them into Romanian, since the author himself says, *e Valachico in latinum translatae,* in other words, they are converted from Romanian into Latin, perhaps because the late [author] will have written them in Romanian too, but I have little inkling whether he had them printed, or whether they are in manuscript somewhere, even though I have investigated this quite meticulously" (Maior 1834, p. IV).

Bojincă's undertaking, otherwise successful in terms of its cultural intentions, does not meet the exigencies of a modern edition, being a relatively faithful reproduction of the Cyrillic text of 1812, but with several (unmotivated) phonetic or graphic substitutions: *este* (ed. 1834) instead of *iaste* (ed. 1812) [is], *datoare – detoare* [indebted], *străini – streini* [foreigners], as well as *seau – sau*

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

[or], *strenepoți – strănepoți* [grandchildren], *împeratul – împăratul* [emperor], *însămna – însemna* [mean], *deschelecarea – descălecarea* [dismounting], *Țesar – Chesar* [emperor] etc. What is important, still, is that Maior's work was provided with three complementary texts, which had now been translated into Romanian, making for an adequate reception of a seminal work from the patrimony of the Enlightenment movement in Transylvania.

The third edition of *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia* [A History of the Romanians' Beginnings in Dacia], printed using Latin script under the aegis of the "Petru Maior" Literary Society in Budapest and Gherla, in 1883, had a less than perfect manner of reproduction, but made many concessions to purist etymological spelling, considered in *Precuvântare* [Foreword] as the only one that "can protect us from linguistic barbarisms and from incorrect provincial spelling" (Maior 1883, p. XLII). Although the editors had intended, in principle, to leave the text and the word order unchanged, they nonetheless felt entitled to make certain necessary linguistic changes: "We have not interfered with the text and the order of the words. We have only corrected the printing errors, the places where the interpunctuation did not look sufficiently correct to us, where nominal and verbal agreement was wrong, and also where the adopted system of spelling called for it" (Maior, 1883, p. XLIII).

In other words, the interference is visible almost everywhere. The intention of lexical modernisation produced rather devastating effects, of which we retain only a few examples from *Precuvântare* [Foreword]: *Dacia* (ed. 1883) – *Dachia* (ed. 1812), *Spiritul – Duhul* [Spirit – Ghost], *causă – pricină* [cause], *timp – vreame* [time], *popor – norod* [people], *ginți – ghinte* [nations], *sceptru – schiptru* [sceptre] etc.

Continuing his historiographic concerns, carried out together with N. Bălcescu at "Magazin istoric pentru Dacia", August Treboniu Laurian published, with assistance from Alecu Donici, Anastasie Panu and M. Kogălniceanu, the first full edition of Gh. Șincai's *Hronica românilor şi a mai multor neamuri* [Chronicle of the Romanians and of Several Nations] (I–III, Iaşi, 1853–1854), albeit not after the autographed manuscript, but after a copy from Iaşi, partially also edited by Gherman Vida, in 1843. Printed with Cyrillic letters, the edition was not exempt from errors of transcription, even though the aim had been "to tamper as little as possible with the original text, by changing or adding something to it", out of a desire to be a "faithful reproduction" of *Hronica*. In 1886 Gr. G. Tocilescu published another scholarly edition in three volumes, in Latin script, using the same manuscript as the previous edition and aiming to record the text "with full accuracy, with the spelling, and even with the errors and omissions of the copy", but without a necessary textual criticism. At the end of the third volume is given a list of concordances of some readings resulting from the comparison of the manuscripts and editions of *Hronica* in existence at that moment. However, the last two editions are considered by some exegetes to be inferior to Alexandru Gavra's

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

partial edition, published in Buda, in 1844 (more precisely, in 1844–1848), which was "endowed with several explanatory notes" (Veress 1927, p. 493). Highly committed to the legacy of the Transylvanian School, Al. Papiu-Ilarian reproduced and commented on several linguistic papers of Gheorghe Şincai in *Tezaur de monumente istorice pentru România* [Treasure Trove of Romania's Historical Monuments]: Şincai's preface to *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae*, the edition of 1805, and the 1804 *Epistle* to Ioan of Lipszky, both in Latin (Papiu-Ilarian 1862, I, p. 87–105). Moreover, in his annexes to his 1869 reception speech from the Romanian Academy, Papiu-Ilarian edited the full text of Şincai's *Elegia* [Elegy] (Papiu-Ilarian 1869, p. 106–126).

In the context of repeated changes of the orthographic systems, the need for editing the texts of the Enlightenment was more and more pressing. Besides the fluctuating use of certain transcription rules, where partial transliteration interfered with a rough, interpretive transcription, the quality of the editions was also affected by etymological spelling, which was laxer than Cyrillic script and gave some leeway in terms of the reconstruction of the linguistic forms from the texts. Many of the editions that were published did not, therefore, have a solid scientific character. The accuracy of text reproductions was often deemed to be of lesser importance, and the tendency of linguistic modernisation (or even the return to more archaic forms) could often reach paroxysm. An example of flawed editing is the publication of the second edition of Samuil Micu's *Propovedanii* [Sermons], in Sibiu, in 1842, in Cyrillic script, "with the blessing of the non-Uniate Bishop of Transylvania, Vasile Moga", and under the care of Bucur Bucurenci. The text is coarsely falsified through the addition of six other sermons belonging to Petru Maior and through several inappropriate lexical changes. What is more, the counterfeit edition was reproduced exactly, with Latin letters, also in Arad, in 1907.

A manuscript of Samuil Micu's *Istoria românilor cu întrebări şi răspunsuri* [The History of the Romanians with Questions and Answers], dating from 1791, considered lost, was recovered, partially and in different ways, two decades later. First, Gabriel Laso Pop, a teacher from Blaj, printed the first part of Sibiu, in 1848, using a Cyrillic transition alphabet and entitling it *Istorie scurtă a românilor de la Almu, povăţuitoriul ungurilor, încoace, scrisă din un fragment de a părintelui Klein şi cu însemnări însemnată* [A Short History of the Romanians from Almu, Counsellor of the Hungarians, to This Day, Written from a Fragment of Father Klein and Recorded with Notes], which he accompanied, therefore, with a series of clarifying notes. In 1867, in issues no. 10 and 11 of "Sionul românesc", a religious, literary and scholastic periodical published in Romanian in Vienna, Gabriel Pop resumed the printing of some excerpts, this time using the Latin alphabet and etymological spelling. He created a conglomerate that could be circulated only thanks to the absence of the original, despite the doubtful authenticity and honesty of this "historical catechism". However, the editor of the 1867 version sometimes pinpointed his interferences with the text, mentioning in a note: "I have replaced a

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

word that was missing in the manuscript, putting the word 'learned' in its stead, because the context demanded it" (Micu 1867, p. 128).

Ion Heliade-Rădulescu, a prominent philologist and man of letters, also became involved in the action of editing the writings of the Transylvanian School. He took the initiative of publishing Paul Iorgovici's work *Observații de limba rumânească* [Observations on the Romanian Language], which he printed in Buda, in 1799, in the first periodicals with a long-lasting appearance that he had founded: "Curierul românesc", X, 1839, no. 55, 56, 61, 67, 72, "Curier de ambe sexe", series II, 1838–1840, no. 6, p. 82–118, and resumed, in transcription with a Latin transition alphabet, in "Curier de ambe sexe", series II, 1838–1840, no. 6, second edition, 1862, p. 79–117. Heliade-Rădulescu transcribed with suffiecient scrupulousness 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 as well: *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. Still, the lexis was not altered at all through arbitrary substitutions (Pavel 2017b, p. 111–112).

Other periodicals of the time also dedicated a substantial space to the edited texts. Among them was "Instrucţiunea publică", a pedagogical journal that appeared in Bucharest between 1 September 1859 and July 1861, under the direction of A. T. Laurian. In the issue of March–April 1861 it published fragments of Samuil Micu's *Historia Daco-Romanorum sive Valachorum*, after the copy of 1778, preserved in the Brukenthal Museum in Sibiu, entitled *Brevis historica notitia originis et progressus nationis Daco-Romanae seu, ut quidam barbaro vocabulo appellant, Valachorum, ab initio usque ad saeculum XVIII*. After the journal ceased publication, A. T. Laurian re-edited the writing of Samuil Micu, in serial format, in "Foaie pentru minte, inimă şi literatură" in 1862, issues no. 11–26, p. 29–30. To the same register belonged the journal "Sionul românesc", mentioned above, where Grigore Silaşi published Petru Maior's work *Protopopadichia*, in serial format, "faithfully and without any changes", starting with issue no. 10 of 15 November 1865 and also continuing during the following year.

A constant concern for editing the writings of the Transylvanian School was manifested in "Archivu pentru filologia şi istoria", printed in Blaj by Timotei Cipariu, in which was published Petru Maior's new work *Disertaţie despre articlii limbei româneşti* [Dissertation on the Romanian Article] (1867, no. II, p. 27–31), in a transition alphabet, followed by other grammatical excerpts, then by Gheorghe Şincai's *Elegia* [Elegy], along with explanatory notes, in Latin and in translation (1868, no. XIII, p. 247–256, no. XIV, p. 274–276, no. XV, p. 290–296), as well as excerpts from both editions of *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae*,

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

by Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Şincai, (1869, no. XXIX, p. 564–570, no. XXX, p. 587–594, IV, 1870, no. XXXI, p. 602–607). It was also here that Al. Papiu-Ilarian edited fragments of *Fundamenta grammatices linguae Romaenicae* by I. Budai-Deleanu (1870, no. XXXVI, p. 706–710, no. XXXVII, p. 721–724), and T. Cipariu published and translated parts of Ştefan Crişan-Körösi's *Orthographia Latino-Valachica* from 1805 (1870, no. XXXVIII, p. 745–750), specifying his option for preserving textual integrity, which is questionable here: "There are also some vices of language and punctuation, but we have left them all in place, as we did not feel entitled to change anything in someone else's work". Further, the philologist from Blaj published important passages from Samuil Micu's *Acatistul* [Akathist] in Latin script from 1801, together with the hymn *Stabat Mater*, reproduced as "samples of spelling" (1870, no. XXXIX, p. 761–765). Cipariu had actually published, in 1855, in *Acte şi fragmente* [Acts and Fragments], several chapters from the historical writings of Samuil Micu, Petru Maior and Gheorghe Şincai, rendered in Cyrillic alphabet, but also Samuil Micu's *De ortu, progressu, conversione Valachorum* and Gheorghe Şincai's *Elegia*, both in Latin. Unlike in its previous edition from "Archiv", the latter work is reproduced without notes, "more as a historical curiosity than for its internal value" (Cipariu 1855, p. 277). Mention should be made of the historian and theologian Constantin Erbiceanu, who published Petru Maior's *Procanonul* in the periodical "Biserica Ortodoxă Română", volume XVIII of 1894 (also with excerpts) for the first time, "after the autographed manuscript preserved at the Romanian Academy", more specifically after Rom. MS 565 BAR.

Making Ioan Budai-Deleanu's work accessible to the public again was also met with obstacles that proved difficult to overcome over time. After the author's failed attempts to publish *Lexiconul românesc–nemțesc* [Romanian–German Lexicon] during the last years of his life, the work of editing his writings failed to enjoy more favourable circumstances even after his death. The rather cumbersome recovery of the manuscripts that had remained in the custody of his descendants from Galicia by the tireless Gheorghe Asachi, in 1868, and their publication only in 1876–1877, by Theodor Codrescu, of the first version of *Țiganiada* [The Gypsiad] in a less visible periodical, "Buciumul român", had narrowed the reception horizon of the writer's impressive work, left for so many decades in obscurity. Moreover, the difficult dissemination of Budai-Deleanu's writings was accompanied, at first, also by editing distortions, which seriously affected the veracity of the text. Thus, Virgil Onițiu was of the opinion that *Țiganiada*, to which he had added an *ad-hoc* subtitle in 1900, *Alexandria ai țigănească* [Gypsy Alexandria], had to be "made comprehesible". This allegedly entitled him to resort to totally inadequate interventions, such as the removal of some stanzas and of most of the footnotes, omissions and substitutions of words or inversions of the lyrics compared to the text of version A. It is beyond comprehension why this "stunted" edition was republished over three decades later, in 1930, by Grațian C. Mărcuş, with the

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

endorsement of G. Bogdan-Duică. To a large extent, the "styilisations" from the previous edition were maintained, and the list of brutally replaced words was very long: *buciumul* [alphorn] instead of *trâmbă* [clarion] (line 181, in the original), *cuget* [reason] instead of *scopos* [aim] (v. 189), *cioroiască* [crow-like] instead of *murgă* [dark] (v. 246), *căpitanul* [captain] instead of *ducul* [duke] (v. 343), *țâmbale* [cimbalom] instead of *tândale* [idleness] (v. 587), *hodinea* [rested] instead of *răpăusa* [respited] (v. 3786), *strigoaiele* instead of *strâgele* [ghouls] (v. 3796), *înholbând* [gaping] instead of *învolbind* [swirling] (v. 3829), *năpârca* [adder] instead of *vipera* [viper] (v. 5948) and so on. Mihail I. Pricopie was just as "creative" when he published at Chernivtsi, in 1931, an anthological edition of *Țiganiada* (A). Although he warned us from the beginning that he had respected "*ad litteram* the plot in its entirety, as well as the author's ideas", he took the liberty of changing some words with others, which, he thought, "express the idea more clearly", or of shortening some of stanzas, "remarkably", as he boasted.

I undertook, on another occasion (Pavel 2012, p. 106–113), an analysis of the following editions derived from the works of I. Budai-Deleanu, with special reference to those compiled by Gh. Cardaș, J. Byck and Florea Fugariu, of much improved standards. However, even these failed to be entirely scrupulous, as required for an accurate edition, devoid of approximations and questionable solutions. It is incomprehensible, for instance, why Gh. Cardaș initially aimed to "strictly" respect the form of the manuscript in his first edition of *Țiganiada* from 1925, but provided an altered variant in the second edition of 1928, with the text "modernised" in places, "to the extent allowed by the form of the lyrics", as he ostensibly wanted "to throw off the rough clay, to polish the archaic verses" (Budai-Deleanu 1928, p. LXXX). D. Popovici was so justified to decry the fact that the circumstances had been so harsh with the work of Budai-Deleanu. On the one hand, it had lain long buried in unknown manuscripts; on the other, some editors had progressively corrupted the text, as they probably felt licensed "collaborate" arbitrarily with the writer (Popovici 1951, p. 95).

Such aberrant interventions are often not random, but knowingly undertaken, legitimising a practice perpetuated in many types of editorial work. We can also encounter it with Monsignor Iacob Radu from Oradea. When he published, for the first time, in the 1930s, Samuil Micu's *Îndreptarea păcătosului* [The Sinner's Reformation], a spinoff from 1780, after Paolo Segneri, he warned readers, from the outset, that "in addition to our desire to leave the original of Clain's translation whole and untouched, lest there should be too many notes and parentheses, or where the explanation that could not be given in this way seemed insufficiently clear, I replaced those expressions and words with new ones or with some that are easier to understand" (Micu 1930, p. 4–5).

3. In our research, the selection of works which could be included in a representative anthology of the Romanian Transylvanian Enlightenment came first

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

and foremost. The establishment of the core text of an edition entails, first, clarifying some issues related to the authorship of the texts, as well as the originality of the works, depending on the sense this notion had in that epoch, when the notion of literary copyright was still elusive, insufficiently assumed. Some of the writings from the sphere of the Transylvanian School, many of which are translations, compilations, rewritings or adaptations, must therefore be reconsidered in terms of their authorship. Such a case is, for example, Ioan Piuariu-Molnar's *Retorica* [Rhetoric], from 1798, deemed to be an original writing by some literary historians. However, as demonstrated convincingly by N. A. Ursu, on the basis of linguistic evidence, the first manual of rhetoric in Romanian does not belong, in reality, to the oculist doctor from Sibiu: he was neither the author, nor the translator, but merely the editor of an older translation from Greek of Francis Scufos's rhetoric textbook, printed in Venice, in 1681 (Ursu 1983, p. 7–8; Ursu 2002, p. 332–346). Another situation of predetermined authorship invalidation concerns the spelling book titled *Povăţuitoriul tinerimei către adevărata şi dreapta cetire* [A Guide to the Youth for Learning How to Properly and Correctly Read], printed in Buda in 1826, which had allegedly "been authored thus for the first time" by Gheorghe Lazăr. This hypothesis, accepted by N. Iorga (1901, II, p. 526), was false. The book is, in reality, a plastography of Zaharia Carcalechi, a mystifying compilation, designed to facilitate its sale. Although Onisifor Ghibu had revealed this quasi-plagiarism (1916, p. 99–113), this writing had remained entrenched in the memory of literary historians as authored by Gh. Lazăr. This prompted N. A. Ursu to get back on the case, believing that Carcalechi's blame was real, but not so serious in terms of its immediate cultural consequences (2002, p. 431–437).

These blatant filiations and ascriptions cannot be extrapolated to the case of other important authors, whose literary sources have been identified, without having had their paternity of the works denied. Thus, it has been suggested that Petru Maior's *Predici* [Sermons] is derived from the collection of *Quaresimale* by the Italian Jesuit orator Paolo Segneri, to whom Samuil Micu had also resorted. Even if certain ideas, parables or biblical quotes are common to them, their oratorical approach is different, and the sermons could not be labelled "unconfessed borrowings", being conceived with much discernment and adapted to the local specificity (Georgescu 1940, p. 12–24). In fact, many of the authors did not unscrupulously assume the texts, confessing, in the title, when the writings had been "converted" from another language, and some textbooks and educational or utilitarian works were not even signed by names such as Gheorghe Şincai or Petru Maior. As regards translations and adaptations, they were usually introduced with the formulas: "thus rendered in the Romanian language", "converted into Romanian" or "this book is transposed into the Romanian language", the freedom of the wording being slightly higher in the case of adaptations. Indeed, Samuil Micu is not entirely original in his philosophical or theological writings. Recent

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

scholarship has identified models such as the Friedrich Christian Baumeister, Karl Steinkellner, Wenzel Schanza or Honoré Tournely. Micu's adaptations are, in many cases, quite personal, as he rearranges the exposition, clarifies certain passages, makes omissions or simplifications from the original, provides references, examples and localisations of his own, so much so that by the "infidelities" of his text he appears to be appropriating even more the adapted text (see also Popovici 1972, p. 202; Micu 1966, p. 42–43). Interested in perfecting the text, Samuil Micu offers over the years several variants for the same work: for example, *Loghica* [Logic], first "transformed into Romanian" in 1781, revised two years later, and then, as he himself noted, in 1786 and 1787, "written a second time also by me, Samoil Clain, in a more refined and clear manner, with better words and more extensively" (Rom. MS 113, f. 3^{r}, BAR Cluj). The latter version saw the light of print in 1799, but it was not signed. His decisive contribution remains the creation of a Romanian philosophical language, what often grants his transpositions and rewritings the aspect of ever renewed works. His searches for finding the most appropriate equivalent terms in Romanian, on the basis of constructions derived from the common wordstockand appealing to neologisms only when required, are voiced at the end of the chapter *De cuvinte* [Of words] from the first Part of *Loghica*:

"Again where our Romanian language lacks and we don't have the words with which we can say some words, especially in scholarly matters and in the sciences, then, with great discernment and only to fill the gaps, we can stretch out to borrow words either from Greek, as of the most learned, or from Latin, as if from our very mother, because our Romanian language is born from the Latin language" (Micu 1799, p. 58).

Similarly, three versions have been preserved from *Dreptul firei şi Etica* [Natural Law and Ethics], from 1781, 1782 and 1786, significant for the oscillations and crystallisations of philosophical terminology, whose legitimisation was well under way (Teodor 1960, p. 242–243). In 1800 the author published only the first two parts of the quadruple treaty on *Filosofia cea lucrătoare* [Applied Philosophy]. When he listed the works he had written until then, in *Scurtă cunoştinţă asupra istoriii românilor* [A Brief Overview of the Romanians' History], Samuil Micu made a general distinction between original and translated works, but without grouping them into the two categories: "all these I myself have either written or translated into Romanian".

The same thing happens in the case of Gheorghe Şincai, whose *Istoria naturei sau a firei* [History of Nature or of Being] starts from the massive work of Johann Heinrich Helmuth, *Volksnaturlehre zur Dämpfung des Aberglaubens* [The Science of Nature for Dispelling the People's Superstitions], without being totally dependent on it. In *Vocabularium*, above all, Şincai restructures his data and becomes quite inventive, distancing hiself from the various possible sources, such as J. H. Helmuth, József Benkő or Peter Sigerus, because, like the authors of the

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Lexicon of Buda, he independently works through a body of information extracted from different sources that are not necessarily derived from one another (Chivu 2015, p. 296). These would be sufficient reasons to pass a lot of the triumvirs' works as their own, and not as simple translations or mechanical adaptations, devoid of originality and a personal imprint, as translations were almost the equivalent, in those times, "with a creation" (Blaga 1972, p. 173).

Dimitrie Țichindeal is hesitant in this regard. He acknowledges bluntly that he is a "dragoman" in the books of morals translated from Dositei Obradovici, but evades this truth in the case of fables adapted after the same author. He does not indicate the source, considering, probably, that Obradovici himself translated them from Aesop and other fabulists. Moreover, a large part of the fables rewritten by him are tailored and localised, and some of the "teachings", more extensive compared to the classical scheme of the genre, even take on national, easily recognisable overtones.

A theologian from Maramureş, Vasile Ghergheli of Ciocotiş, is quite ingenious in such matters. As he confesses in the title, he "translated and added" in Vienna, in 1819, a code of good manners by the German Gottfried Immanuel Wenzel, entitled *Omu de lume* (*Mann von Welt*) [Worldly Man]. Overstepping his role as a translator, he gives a set of rules and correspondences in the beginning, *Scurtă îndireptare a zicerei afară sau pronunțației literelor dacoromâneşti* [A Brief Guide to Speaking Aloud or to the Pronunciation of Daco-Romanian Letters], after which he dedicates a whole chapter, *Cultura limbei şi a graiului* [Cultivating Language and Speech], a plea for the ideas of Romanism and of Latinity, aiming to enable people to "speak accurately from a grammatical standpoint". The translation turns out to be a subterfuge, a pretext for promoting, in the subtext, the ideas of spelling with Latin letters and of exaggerated etymologism that he upheld.

3.1. In the selection included in this study we decided, on the other hand, to eliminate *ab initio* some writings with an uncertain or forced authorship, which cannot belong, thus, to the legacy of the Transylvanian School. We may consider here, for instance, the first grammar of the Romanian language written in Latin, preserved in manuscript, with the title *Institutiones linguae Valachicae*, accompanied by a *Lexicon compendiarum Latino-Valachicum*, dated in around 1768–1776, edited in 2001 by Mihai Gherman, who assigned them to Grigore Maior. The paleographic, filigranological and philological arguments brought by Gheorghe Chivu, in the context of a new exemplary edition, have definitively determined the status of the two texts, which "cannot be placed in relation with the concerns for the standardisation of the literary language expressed by the intellectuals of the Transylvanian School" (*Institutiones* 2001, p. 41). Grigore Maior's scholarly profile remains, however, a chapter that has so far been insufficiently analysed. We have had the same reservations about including an *Arhieraticon* manuscript in the collection. The manuscript contains a 1748 ex-libris

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

belonging to Inochentie Micu-Klein, but he was only the possessor of the writing, and not its copyist, as it was previously assumed.

Similarly, *Cuvântare despre posturile Besearicii Greceşti a Răsăritului* [A Discourse on the Fasts of the Greek Church of the East], printed in Buda, in 1828, translated from Greek, cannot be certainle placed in correlation with the work in Latin entitled *Dissertatio de ieiuniis Graecae orientalis Ecclesiae. Conscripta ab Samuele Klein de Szad, diocesis Fagarasiensis in Transilvania*, published in Vienna, in 1782, as accredited by the insufficiently motivated inclusion of the Romanian edition in an anthology of Samuil Micu's writings (cf. Micu 2010, p. 22, 97–124). The more recent ascription of *Laude* [Commendations] in verse to Samuil Micu is still a matter of conjecture – tempting of course, but not documented enough. While sharing the Enlightenment creeds, other scholars such as Dimitrie Eustatievici Braşoveanu or Sava Popovici from Răşinari did not manifest their adherence to the Transylvanian School and cannot be assimilated thereto.

4. Trying to reconstruct this defining chapter in our cultural history as faithfully as possible, we have included no less than 175 texts in a new edition. These are diverse and representative, structured thematically (historical, linguistic, literary, theological and religious, philosophical, didactic and instructive texts), starting with the first memoir of Inochentie Micu-Klein, *Supplex Libellus*, from 1743, and ending with *Antropologhia sau scurta cunoştinţă despre om şi despre însuşirile sale* [Anthropology or a Brief Lecture on Man and His Qualities], published by Pavel Vasici-Ungurean, in Buda, in 1830. To open this series with the name of Inochentie Micu-Klein, the *de facto* founder of the movement, is a emblematic and reparatory gesture, because he was the first to draw up, through the "supplicatory cartha" (*supplex libellus*) that he launched, an ambitious and audacious program of national, social, political and cultural revival, through which his fellows could obtain a legitimate place among the other nations, by virtue of their divine, canonical and natural rights. While his presence in the chrestomathy has, above all, a symbolic value, the author who towers over the pleiad of Transylvanian historians of the Enlightenment period remains the nephew of Inochentie, Samuil Micu, the scholar par excellence. A visionary, he was depicted by N. Iorga in sympathetic colours and unmistakably placed among "the evangelists of the new religion": "Lacking the fiery spirit of Şincai, but also his severity against the entire world, lacking the confrontational spirit of this vehement preacher of the truth, inferior to Petru Maior in terms of judgment and conceptual powers, he nonetheless surpasses him in the calm serenity of the form" (Iorga 1901, II, p. 162). Only such a spirit, possessed of an austere, profoundly creative humility, could be able to develop a unique, pioneering, modern historical construction, acknowledging its roots in the ideas of Cantemir's *Hronicul* [Chronicle], a work from which we could not but include in this corpus the historical-religious memorandum, *De ortu, progressu, conversione Valachorum,*

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

episcopis item, archiepiscopis et metropolitis eorum, alongside *Istoria românilor cu întrebări şi răspunsuri* [The History of the Romanians with Questions and Answers], *Scurtă cunoştinţă a istoriii românilor* [A Brief Overview of the Romanians' History], *Istoriia şi lucrurile şi întâmplările românilor* [The Romanians' History, Deeds and Events], ending with *Istoria, lucrurile şi întâmplările românilor pre scurt* [The Romanians' History, Deeds and Events in Short]. Always driven by an unbeatable creed, that "the deeds and events of the Romanian people should be written about more extensively so that all may come known to them" (*Cătră români*, To Romanians – a text programmatically resumed, with small variations, in the prologue of two of his writings), Micu remains the first historian of the Transylvanian School who was aware of the fact that his undertaking was not purely bookish, factual, or didacticist. Driven by higher interests, he conceived his work by imprinting it from the beginning with a clear militant goal, in which "he subsumed historical arguments to a political idea" (Teodor 2000, p. 194).

He was seconded, in terms of the volume of anthologised material, by Petru Maior, who is striking not so much through the novelty of the topics addressed, those of our purely Roman bloodline, of our ceaseless continuity ("lingering") on this territory and of the formation of the Romanian language from the old vulgar Latin (on this point he was in consensus with Ioan Budai-Deleanu), as through the verve of his unbridled, inimitable polemical style. Therefore, he cannot be concessive to the authors of the malevolent "fables". A phrase from Flavius Vopiscus on the Roman colonists' leaving Dacia is subject to a careful, long-drawn textual criticism, so the arguments seem to completely silence their opponents. The same phrase was to be dissected without the right of appeal by I. Budai-Deleanu in *Introducerea istoricească* [Historical Introduction] from *Lexiconul românesc–nemţesc* [Romanian–German Lexicon]. Moreover, Maior countered his Viennese reviewer, Bartolomeu Kopitar, through a series of acerbic criticisms, which captivate us and in which even some of the exaggerations seem natural, almost convincing. What surprises in Petru Maior's historical discourse is a certain dissonance between the direct, fluent, far from terse narrative style, on the one hand, and the almost prolix critical apparatus, with numerous footnotes in Latin, as he cites ancient or modern historians and philologists in support of the facts he writes about, building up an irrefutable documentary scaffolding. It is, of course, a reflex of the scholarly historiography of those times, with overabundant references to the sources, also with the intention of preventing potentiallu unscrupulous adversaries.

The third component of this golden triad, Gheorghe Şincai, had the same strong cult for historical documents, which he collected with rare tenacity, while remaining the adept of a mainly annalistic, evental history, apparently dry, but enlivened by inserts of a participatory nature: "You be the judge now, reader, what use was it for the Romans when the imperial seat was moved from Rome to

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Constantinople?". The author of *Hronica* lives and breathes history, identifies with and suffers for it, especially after the confiscation of his manuscript, which the censors were afraid, allegedly, might imperil the state order. The eternal wanderer seems a victim of his erudition, which did not prevent him from exerting his vocation as a historian who is overwhelmed by the facts he records or from rethinking the first grammar printed here in Latin, from reviewing his biography in an elegiac key and devoting himself, at the same time, to reforming the education system. The historian was doubled by the linguist, the creator by the translator and the teacher, all these roles representing, in fact, the distinguishing marks of the entire pleiad of Enlightenment thinkers from Transylvania.

Like his predecessors, Budai-Deleanu equipped his work in Latin, *De originibus populorum Transylvaniae*. *Commentatiuncula cum observationibus historico-criticis* [On the Origins of the Peoples of Transylvania. A Brief Dissertation with Historical and Critical Remarks], with a set of references that attest to a rich historiographical horizon. A historical work must be credible, in his opinion, it must persuade, and the commentator, starting from the "its deep sources", must penetrate beyond the flat surface of events and discern the interaction of the facts. What remains almost inexplicable in the case of this encyclopedic mind, a positivist researcher and writer alike, is the tenacity and perseverance with which he created, without having the certainty that his vast work would get published.

Other Transylvanian translators of the time were convinced that history cannot be re-read only through the lenses provided by major works, the so-called "books of the nation", but also through those that are open to universality, to "the world", the collective mentality being ready to enjoy both the wanderings through the "old ages" of Claude-François-Xavier Millot and the anti-Napoleonic pamphlets from the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Linguistics and philology were in the close vicinity of history in terms of the richness and diversity of works written under Enlightenment patronage, works that are nonetheless unified by the intrinsic message of unravelling and proving our Latin roots, as Latinity is seen as a *modus vivendi* for our becoming a self-standing entity, subsidiary purist deviations notwithstanding. The entire set of philological instruments of the time (grammars, dictionaries, orthographic projects) was subordinated, first, to the political idea, to the ideal of national "regeneration" which concentrated all the linguistic debates of the time. Second, the scholars were committed to the idea of the uninterrupted cultivation and standardisation of our literary language, because "the language of the muses" is, as Budai-Deleanu contended in *Dascalul românesc pentru temeiurile gramaticii româneşti* [Romanian Teachings on the Bases of Romanian Grammar], the "language clarified and compliant with grammar rules, and then enriched with scholarly words, which are not used by the masses".

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Grammars are the first great accomplishment of linguists in the Enlightenment period, being so designed as to demonstrate, without a doubt, "in a time when grammar was a weapon" (Iorga, 1938, p. 167), the Latin origin of the Romanian language. Intended, primarily, for use in schools, they illustrate the efforts of introducing in Romanian the linguistic terms used in foreign grammars, taken as a model. What are eloquent, therefore, are the fragments retained from Gheorghe Şincai, *Prima principia Latinae grammatices quae ad usum scholarum Valachico-nationalium* (1783), a bilingual text, edited here by us for the first time, from Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, *Deutsch-Wallachische Sprachlehre* (1788), from Radu Tempea, *Gramatică românească* [Romanian Grammar] (1797), from Ioan Budai-Deleanu, *Temeiurile gramaticii româneşti* [The Principles of Romanian Grammar] (1815–1820) or from Constantin Diaconovici-Loga, *Gramatica românească pentru îndreptarea tinerilor* [Romanian Grammar for Correct Usage among the Young] (1822).

Also, the series of dictionaries compiled by the Transylvanian School members, envisaged not so much for teaching purposes, but as scientific instruments in themselves, is richly illustrated. It starts with *Lexiconul Germanico–Latino–Daco–Romanum* [Germanic–Latin–Daco–Roman Lexicon] (1793), by Aureliu-Anton Predetici Nasodi, followed by *Dicţionarul român–latin–maghiar* [Romanian–Latin–Hungarian Dictionary] (1802–1803), by Ştefan Crişan-Körösi. Both of them have been edited for the first time here, together with *Dictionarium Valachico–Latinum* (1801), by Samuil Micu, *Vocabularium pertinens ad tria Regna Naturae*. *Vocabulariu ce se ţine de istoria naturei* [Vocabulary Pertaijning to the History of Nature] (1806–1810), by Gheorghe Şincai, *Lexiconul românesc–nemţesc şi nemţesc–românesc* [Romanian-German and German-Romanian Lexicon] (1818), by Ioan Budai-Deleanu, *Wörterbüchlein Deutsch und Wallachisches*. *Vocabularium nemţesc şi românesc* [German and Romanian Vocabulary] (1822), by Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, and *Dicţionariu rumânesc, latinesc şi unguresc* [Romanian, Latin and Hungarian Dictionary] (1822–1823), edited by Ioan Bob. The series ends, significantly, with *Lexiconul românesc–latinesc–unguresc–nemţesc* [The Romanian–Latin–Hungarian–German Lexicon] of Buda (1825), the first normative dictionary here, which marked, no doubt, the beginnings of modern Romanian lexicography.

The replacement of the Cyrillic alphabet with the Latin one remains the most important linguistic revolution triggered by the Enlightenment generation. That is why, we have included illustrative passages in this respect also from religious or didactic writings, such as *Carte de rugăciuni pentru evlavia omului creştin* [Prayer Book for the Piety of Christian Men], by Samuil Micu, the first text printed in Latin letters with etymological spelling, or from the textbooks with parallel text in Cyrillic and Latin script that Gheorghe Şincai published for the "use of pedagogical schools", starting from 1783.

4.1. The literature of Latin expression, an integral part of Romanian culture, comprises varied texts on theological topics, secular writings in prose (works

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

of fiction, of historiography, linguistics, ethnography, and medicine) and verse, which we have reproduced both in the original and in translation. Thus, besides the well-known *Elementa linguae Daco-Romanae sive Valachicae* by Samuil Micu and Gheorghe Şincai, our first normative grammar compiled after the Latin model, we have also included *Grammatica Daco-Romana sive Valachica* by Ioan Alexi, an unpublished text so far. We have also chosen to add *Dissertatio canonica de matrimonio* by Samuil Micu, printed in Vienna, in 1781, and have reproduced fragments from the Romanian anonymous version of *Despre căsătorie* [On Marriage], dated 20 June 1782 and located in Rom. MS 413 BAR Cluj. These are canonical texts whose originality still remains to be proved. Well represented, with a significant number of writings, are both the leaders (the so-called triumvirs, alongside Ioan Budai-Deleanu and Ioan Piuariu-Molnar), on whom we shall not insist anymore, and apparently obscure names, poorly circulated in histories of literature. An example would be that of Vasile Popp, a polimath of multiple talents. Alongside his pioneering works in Romanian, such as *Despre apele minerale de la Arpătac, Bodoc şi Covasna şi despre întrebuinţarea aceloraşi în deschilinite patimi* [On the mineral waters of Arpătac, Bodoc and Covasna and on the use thereof in different ailments] or the preface to the second edition of Ioan Prale's *Psaltirea în versuri* [The Psalter in Verse], from 1827, an ingenious sketch of the history of Romanian literature, this doctor in medicine and philosophy is present in our anthology with several elegies composed in Latin and with a major ethnological writing, published in Vienna, in 1817, also in Latin: *Dissertatio inauguralis historico-medica de funeribus plebeis Daco-Romanorum sive hodiernorum valachorum et quibusdam circa ea abusibus* [Inaugural Historical-Medical Dissertation about the Funerals of Daco-Romanians or Wallachians Today and about Some of the Related Superstitions]. Finally, a dispute in Latin from 1815 on the topic of spelling between Petru Maior and Ioan Corneli brings back into actuality an insufficiently known chapter in Romanian philology.

4.2. Alongside historical and linguistic writings, we have also reconsidered literary works, in a new overall approach. The meteoric position of a masterpiece such as *Ţiganiada* by Ioan Budai-Deleanu, our first great writer of "fiction", out of phase with the literary context, does not cover by any means the amplitude of this whole cultural period. It is an era in which literary preferences evolve spectacularly, through an accelerated synchronisation of Romanian culture with the western one, new literary genres and forms being assimilated. This is what Budai-Deleanu advocates, in fact, in the prologue to his allegory, through his alter ego Leonachi Dianeu, where he confesses that he wrote "this poetical, or better said playful composition, wanting to form and to introduce a new taste for Romanian poetry". The central place of the literature produced by representatives of the Transylvanian School is held, naturally, by the heroic-comic epic of Budai-Deleanu, together with memorable replica to *Don Quixote* from the poem *Trei viteji* [Three Men of Valour]. The range of Enlightenment literary productions is,

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

however, much broader. It opens with the farse *Occisio Gregorii in Moldavia vodae tragedice expressa* [The Murder of Grigore Vodă in Moldova Exposed in Dramatic Form], considered the oldest original Romanian play, written, probably, by several authors, and continues with the elegies of Gheorghe Şincai and Vasile Popp, with the fables in prose of Nicholas Oţălea and Dimitrie Ţichindeal, as well as with odes and didactic, often facile, poems of Baroque inspiration, written by Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, Gheorghe Lazăr, Gheorghe Montan (Munteanu), Ioan Teodorovici-Nica, Ioan Tincovici, Naum Petrovici and Moisi Bota. We have also re-read Ioan Barac's versified adaptations, in the "popular style", after works of antiquity and German classicism, even if these creations do not seem to exceed "the lower artistic registers" (Popovici, 1972, p. 454). In addition to promoting minor genres in creations of "skilful runes", such as "cheerful lyrics" or "joking lyrics", Vasile Aaron is present with an extensive quasi-philosophical poem, *Reporta din vis*, a poem that according to some literary historians lies immediately in the vicinity of *Ţiganiada*, being more than a simple imitation, as previously believed. Translations from Lucian of Samosata, Metastasio, Marmontel, Fénelon or Giulio Cesare Croce complete the literary scene of that time, a rich tableau in which rewritings and adaptations from other literatures compete with original literature. "Hidden" literary pages can be discovered in the contents of various other writings, such as Samuil Micu's translation in verse of the religious hymn *Stabat Mater* by Jacopone da Todi, inserted at the end of *Acatistul* [Akathist] from 1801, or the translations from the fables of Aesop, added to Ioan Alexi's Latin *Grammatica*, in different variations from those made by Oţălea and Ţichindeal. In some of the didactic writings, such as Ţichindeal's *Arătare despre starea acestor noao întroduse scolasticeşti instituturi ale naţiei româneşti, sârbeşti şi greceşti* [Report on the State of These New Scholarly Institutions of the Romanian, Serbian and Greek Nations], from 1813, we find encomiastic or moralising lyrics, and part of his fables are also reproduced in *Povăţuitorul tinerimei către adevărata şi dreapta cetire* [A Guide to the Youth for Learning How to Properly and Correctly Read], printed by Carcalechi in 1826. Such poetic inserts appear in *Oglindă arătată omului înţelept* [Mirror Shown to the Wise Man], by Nicolae Horga-Popovici, from 1807, in *Chemare la tipărirea cărţilor româneşti şi versuri pentru îndreptarea tinerilor* [Call for the Printing of Books in Romanian and Lyrics for the Reformation of the Youth], by Constantin Diaconovici-Loga, from 1821. Similar are the "songs" from *Scurte învăţături pentru creşterea şi buna purtare a tinerimei române* [Short Teachings for the Raising and Good Behaviour of the Romanian Youth], published by Ioan Tomici in 1827, marked by the refrain "make poems, peoples", or the hymns in which Damaschin Bojincă praises the "sun of culture" in *Diregătoriul bunei-creştere* [Guidelines for a Proper Education] from 1830.

4.3. The place reserved for religious and theological texts in this context deserves, in the end, a special analysis. Marginalised or undervalued in Marxist exegesis and in sociologistical interpretations from the '50s–'60s, where they were

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

considered to be idealistic, "adverse to advanced ideas" because of the "obscuring character of religious books as such" (Lungu 1978, p. 103), writings of this kind did not come into contradiction with the ideology of the Transylvanian School, which cannot be reduced to a component of secularism, rationalism, or anticlericism. The proliferation of the ideas of the Catholic Reformation, in the spirit of Jansenism and Gallicanism, found a ripe field among the Enlightenment thinkers in Transylvania, attracted by the ideals of the Mitteleuropean Aufklärung and determined to take over and implement the new doctrinal, moral and pastoral guidelines and trends in ecclesiastical literature. The rationale specific to the Enlightenment thinkers of Catholic extraction permeated the Transylvanian movement, favouring the harmonisation of religious discourse with the historical and cultural one. Clerics with solid theological and philosophical training, acquired in Josephine Vienna and in eternal Rome, they created a varied liturgical, homiletic, catechistic and moral-theological literature, destined to a broad readership.

At the same time, the books produced in Blaj were dominated, alongside writings of theological doctrine, by religious books. These reproduced, with fidelity, Wallachian religious works and do not denote a spirit enclosed in confessionalism. This led, among other things, to the unification of the standard literary norms, as a deliberate act, in around 1750. The translation of the *Vulgate* and then the publication, for the second time in Romanian culture, of a new full version of the *Bible* marked, for over a century, Romanian biblical language. Of course, the question of the origins, of the Roman roots and of the continuity of the Romanian people, of the Latinity of its language, the militant spirit advocating national emancipation were the lines of force of the Romanian Enlightenment movement, with a distinctive note in the context of the Central and South-Eastern European Enlightenment. It would be an error, however, to assess the contributions of this movement only from the perspective of its primarily national-political side or of that related to the vulgarisation of knowledge and the much clamoured "Enlightenment of the masses" – without a doubt essential, but not exclusive features of this current of ideas. What should also not be generalized, then, is the Greek-Catholic identity of the representatives of the movement. Among them were also "Orthodox" members, such as Ioan Piuariu-Molnar, Radu Tempea, Ioan Barac, Paul Iorgovici or Constantin Diaconovici-Loga, along with other scholars from the Banat. On the other hand, trying to make a distinction between a so-called moderate, reformist branch, on the one hand, and a radical one, of the other hand (Lungu 1978, p. 115–116), does not seem fully feasible.

Apparently heterogeneous, the movement should be perceived in its phenomenological complexity. It was relevant in terms of the socio-cultural impact it created in the Romanian spirituality of the eighteenth century. The Transylvanian School can be defined, therefore, as a current generated on the basis of assumed ideological affinities, a unique humanistic synthesis, with works written in Romanian and in Latin, with a great diversity of ideas and styles. In these texts the

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

religious is interwoven with the profane, theoretical concepts with practical ideas, the partisan critical spirit with the introspective, meditative one, polemical with analytical discourse, heuristic with expository style, all of these offering a dazzling image of the first period of Romanian literary modernism.

4.4. Besides well-established names and the already known or mentioned titles, we have also included in the anthology other authors, of higher or lower prestige, with original writings and translations. Some have remained unpublished until now, but they cannot be ignored in any analysis of the current. Their authors are scholars such as the austere Bishop Petru Pavel Aaron, present, along with the collective works *Floarea adevărului* [The Flower of Truth] and *Vulgata* [The Vulgate], with *Păstoriceasca datorie dumnezeieştii turme vestită* [The Pastoral Duty Announced to the Lord's Flocks] and with *Începaperea, aşezământul şi iscăliturile sfântului şi a toată lumea Săbor de la Florenţiia* [The Beginnings, Place of Worship and Works of the Holy and Universal Synod of Florence], – followed by the singular hieromonk Gherontie Cotore, with *Despre articuluşurile ceale de price* [On the Articles of Blame], the anonymous Toma Costin, discovered by Petru Maior, with *Discussio descriptionis Valachorum Transylvanorum* and a polemic writing in Hungarian, the Aromanian doctor and philologist Gheorghe Constantin Roja, with *Măiestria ghiovăsirii româneşti cu litere latineşti, care sânt literele românilor ceale vechi* [The Art of Writing in Romanian with Latin Letters, Which Are the Old Letters of the Romanians], the Blaj "master" Nicolae Maniu Montan, who gave the final blow to writing with the Cyrillic alphabet (*Orthoepia Latina, Latino-Valachica, Hungarica, Germanica et Serbo-Valachica*), the inspired epigone Teodor Aaron, with *Scurtă apendice la Istoria lui Petru Maior* [A Short Annex to the History of Petru Maior], the tenacious polemist Damaschin Bojincă, with *Răspundere dezgurzătoare la Cârtirea cea în Hale* [A Disgusting Answer to the Blasphemy from Hale], doctor Alexandru Teodori, with *Scurtă arătare despre om şi despre întocmirile lui* [A Short Lecture on Man and His Making], the Banatian teacher Ioan Tincovici, with *Înţeleapte învăţături sau regule pentru îndreptarea năravurilor* [Wise Teachings or Rules for Correcting Vices]. They were joined, among others, by the Serb Dositei Obradovici, with *Sfaturile a înţeleajerii cei sănătoase* [Advice for Sound Understanding] and *Adunare de lucruri moraliceşti, de folos şi spre veselie* [A Collection of Moral, Helpful and Cheerful Things], translated by Dimitrie Ţichindeal.

The titles above are part of didactic and instructive writings that captures the readers' interest not through a surprising diversity of themes, in which school textbooks and books of pedagogy, indebted to the European models of the time, are accompanied by innovative works in each of the branches approached, whether we refer to geography, natural science, anatomy, anthropology, medicine ("for the prevention and cure of diseases", "on healing the ailments of people from the countryside" or on "the art of a life life"), agrarian economy (on the cultivation of hemp and tobacco, "farming vine", "the economy of the hives", "the culture of

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

bees", "the culture of wild strawberries and silk worms"), most of them translated. They are also intriguing in terms of the scientific language they put into circulation. The erudite vocabulary of the Romanian language underwent a true resurrection, speared by the Transylvanian School under the same dome of reasserting national identity and pursuing the aspiration to universality.

We discover, thus, in these works we are editing now, one of the most effervescent periods in the history of Romanian culture, dense pages of history, of literary fiction or of scientific writings, partially obsolete from an aesthetic point of view, but having a remarkable stylistic flavor, with strands of ideas and of literary language that have been insufficiently studied, but that can now be restored to light and published, based on a fresh, well-informed re-reading of the texts transposed directly from the primary sources.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

AAR = "Analele Societății Academice Române", Bucureşti, I, 1867 and seq.; as of 1879, "Analele Academiei Române".

AIIN = "Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Națională", Cluj, I–X, 1921/1922–1945.

Blaga 1943 (1972) = Lucian Blaga, *Şcoala Ardeleană-latinistă*, in "Vremea", XV, 1943, no. 726, p. 6–7; reproduced in idem, *Isvoade. Eseuri, conferințe, articole*, edited by Dorli Blaga and Petre Nicolau, foreword by George Gană, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1972, p. 169–181.

Blaga 1966 = Lucian Blaga, *Gândirea românească în Transilvania în secolul al XVIII-lea*, edited by George Ivaşcu, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiințifică, 1966.

Bocşan 1986 = Nicolae Bocşan, *Contribuții la istoria iluminismului românesc*, Timişoara, Editura Facla, 1986.

Budai-Deleanu 1925 (1928) = Ion Budai-Deleanu, *Țiganiada. Poemă eroi-comică în 12 cânturi*, published in the final form 1800–1812, with introduction, name index and glossary by Gheorghe Cardaş, Bucureşti, Editura Casei Şcoalelor, 1925 (Second edition, with the modern version of the text and a complete introduction, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Oltenia", 1928).

Chivu 2015 = Gh. Chivu, *Vechi texte româneşti. Contribuții filologice şi lingvistice*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2015.

Cipariu 1855 = Tim. Cipariu, *Acte şi fragmente latine româneşti pentru istoria beserecei române, mai ales unite*, Blaj, Tip. Semin. Diecesan, 1855.

CL = "Cercetări de lingvistică", Cluj, I–XXXVIII, 1956–1993.

Densusianu 1900 = Ovid Densusianu, *Şcoala latinistă în limba şi literatura română,* in "Noua revistă română", I, 1900, no. 1, p. 17–25.

Densusianu 1920 = Ovid Densusianu, *Literatura română modernă*, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Librăriei Alcalay & Co., 1920.

DR, s. n. = „Dacoromania", serie nouă, Cluj-Napoca, I, 1994–1995 and seq.

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

Duțu 1972 = Alexandru Duțu, *Sinteză şi originalitate în cultura română (1650–1848)*, Bucureşti, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1972.

Fugariu 1970 = *Şcoala Ardeleană*, vol. I–III, critical edition by Florea Fugariu, introductory study and final notes by Romul Munteanu, Bucureşti, Editura Albatros, 1970.

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Fugariu 1983 = *Şcoala Ardeleană*, vol. I–II, critical edition, notes, bibliography and glossary by Florea Fugariu, introduction by Dumitru Ghişe and Pompiliu Teodor, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1983.

Georgescu 1940 = Ioan Georgescu, *Un izvor literar al lui Petru Maior: Paolo Segneri*, ***Quaresimale***, in "Studii italiene", VII, 1940, p. 12–24.

Gheţie 1966 = Ion Gheţie, *Opera lingvistică a lui Ion Budai-Deleanu,* Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1966.

Ghişe–Teodor = Dumitru Ghişe, Pompiliu Teodor, *Fragmentarium iluminist*, Cluj, Editura Dacia, 1972.

Ghibu 1916 = Onisifor Ghibu, *Din istoria literaturii didactice româneşti*, in AAR, Mem. secţ. lit., seria II, tomul XXXVIII, 1916, p. 1–359.

Institutiones 2001 = *Institutiones linguae valachicae. Prima gramatică a limbii române scrisă în limba latină*. Critical edition by Gheorghe Chivu. Latin text revised and translated by Lucia Wald, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2001.

Iorga 1901 = N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii române în secolul al XVIII-lea (1688–1821)*, vol. I–II, Bucureşti, Institutul de Arte Grafice şi Editură "Minerva", 1901.

Iorga 1925–1933 = N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii româneşti*, vol. I–III, Bucureşti, Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, Editura Fundaţiei "Regele Ferdinand", 1925–1933.

Iorga 1938 = N. Iorga, *Istoria românilor*, vol. VIII, *Revoluţionarii*, Bucureşti, Imprimeria Naţională, 1938.

Lapedatu 1921−1922 = Alex. Lapedatu, *Petru Maior în cadrul vieţii naţionale şi culturale a epocii sale*, in AIIN, I, 1921–1922, p. 79–86.

Lungu 1978 = Ion Lungu, *Şcoala Ardeleană – mişcare ideologică naţională iluministă*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1978.

Lupaş 1921–1922 = I. Lupaş, *Scrierile istorice ale lui Petru Maior*, in AIIN, I, 1921–1922, p. 87–108.

Lupaş 1933 = Ioan Lupaş, *Cronicari şi istorici români din Transilvania. Şcoala Ardeleană*, vol. I–II, Craiova, Editura Scrisul Românesc, 1933.

Macrea 1969 = D. Macrea, *Şcoala Ardeleană şi problemele de lingvistică romanică*, in CL, XIV, 1969, no. 1, p. 7–13.

Maior 1812 = Petru Maior, *Istoria pentru începutul românilor în Dachia*, Buda, Crăiasca Tipografie a Universităţii Ungureşti din Peşta, 1812 (cf. edition by Florea Fugariu, vol. I–II, Bucureşti, Editura Albatros, 1970–1971).

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

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

Micu 1799 = Samuil Micu, *Loghica*, *adecă partea cea cuvântătoare a filosofiei*, Buda, Crăiasca Tipografie Orientalicească a Universitatei Peştii, 1799 (cf. edition by Mihai Alin Gherman, Cluj-Napoca, Argonaut, 2007).

Micu 1867 = Samuil Micu, *Fragment istoric besericesc* (*decopiat din manuscrise de ale lui Samuil Micu*), ed. Gavril Pop, in "Sionul românesc", III, 1867, no. 10, 15 May, p. 113–115, no. 11, 1 June, p. 126–128.

Micu 1930 = Samuil Clain, *Îndreptarea păcătosului*, after Paul Segneri and revised after the original by Iacob Radu, Oradea, Editura Societăţii "Sf. Ioan Gură de Aur", [1930].

Micu 1966 = Samuil Micu, *Scrieri filozofice,* introductory study and critical edition by Pompiliu Teodor and Dumitru Ghişe, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1966.

Micu 2010 = *Samuil Micu în mărturii antologice*, edited by Ioan Chindriş and Niculina Iacob, Târgu-Lăpuş, Editura Galaxia Gutenberg, 2010.

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

Munteanu 1977 = Romul Munteanu, *Particularités des Lumières roumaines*, in "Cahiers roumains d'études littéraires", 1977, no. 2, p. 4–17.
Papiu-Ilarian 1862–1864 = Al. Papiu-Ilarian, *Tezaur de monumente istorice pentru România*, tom I–III, Bucureşti, Tipografia Naţională Ştefan Bassidescu, 1862–1864.
Papiu-Ilarian 1869 = Al. Papiu-Ilarian, *Viaţa, operele şi ideile lui Georgiu Şincai din Şinca*, Bucureşti, Tipografia Naţională, 1869.
Pavel 2012 = Eugen Pavel, *Arheologia textului*, Cluj-Napoca, Casa Cărţii de Ştiinţă, 2012.
Pavel 2017a = Eugen Pavel, *Şcoala Ardeleană şi editarea ştiinţifică a textelor*, in „Caietele Sextil Puşcariu", III, 2017, p. 364–380.
Pavel 2017b = Eugen Pavel, *Textual criticism and the editing of Romanian writings in the 19th century*, in DR, s. n., XXII, 2017, no. 2, p. 106–120.
Popovici 1942 = D. Popovici, *Contribuţia românilor din Transilvania la literatura română*, in "Transilvania", 73, 1942, no. 7−8, p. 520−525.
Popovici 1944 = D. Popovici, *Etape în dezvoltarea literaturii române*, in „Transilvania", 75, 1944, no. 8−9, p. 495−513 (resumed in *Introducere* la Popovici 1972, p. 9−29).
Popovici 1951 = D. Popovici, *Cu prilejul unei noi ediţii a „Ţiganiadei" lui I. Budai-Deleanu*, în „Almanahul literar", II, 1951, nr. 3, p. 94–102.
Popovici 1972 = D. Popovici, *Studii literare.* I. *Literatura română în Epoca „Luminilor"*, edited and notes by I. Em. Petrescu, Cluj, Editura Dacia, 1972.
Puşcariu 1921–1922 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Părerile lui Petru Maior despre limba română*, in AIIN, I, 1921–1922, p. 109–119.
Puşcariu 1929 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Ce e nou în literatura noastră?*, in „Ţara Bârsei", I, 1929, no. 2, p. 99–110.
Puşcariu 1930 = Sextil Puşcariu, *Istoria literaturii române. Epoca veche*. Second edition, revised and complete, Sibiu, Tiparul şi Editura Krafft & Drotleff S. A., 1930.
Ruffini 1941 = Mario Ruffini, *La scuola latinista rumena (1780–1871)*. Studio storico-filologico, Roma, Signorelli, 1941.
Şincai 1853–1854 = Gheorghe Şincai, *Hronica românilor şi a mai multor neamuri*, tipărită de pe manuscrisul cumpărat de cătră înălţimea sa Grigorie Alexandru Ghica Voievod, Domnitorul Moldovei şi hărăzită Bibliotecei Şcoalelor din Iaşi, tomul I–III, Iaşi, în Tipografia Româno-Franceză, 1853–1854.
Şincai 1886 = Gheorghe Şincai, *Hronica românilor şi a mai multor neamuri*, ediţiunea a doua, tomul I–III, Bucureşti, Tipografia Academiei Române (Laboratorii români), 1886.
Teodor 1960 = Pompiliu Teodor, *Izvoarele lucrărilor de filosofie traduse şi prelucrate de Samuil Micu*, in „Studii şi cercetări ştiinţifice" (Iaşi). Filologie, XI, 1960, fasc. 2, p. 235–244.
Teodor 2000 = Pompiliu Teodor, *Sub semnul Luminilor. Samuil Micu*, Cluj-Napoca, Presa Universitară Clujeană, 2000.
Ursu 1983 = N. A. Ursu, *Originalul grecesc al „Retoricii" publicate de I. Molnar*, in „Cronica", XVIII, 1983, no. 3, p. 7–8.
Ursu 2002 = N. A. Ursu, *Contribuţii la istoria culturii româneşti. Studii şi note filologice*, Iaşi, Editura Cronica, 2002.
Veress 1927 = Andrei Veress, *Note şi scrisori şincaiane*, in AAR, Mem. secţ. lit., seria III, tomul III, 1927, p. 479–503.

ŞCOALA ARDELEANĂ – PREMISE DE EDITARE CRITICĂ A TEXTELOR
(*Rezumat*)

Sunt fixate reperele unei noi crestomaţii care va înmănunchea scrierile Şcolii Ardelene, cuprinzând tipărituri şi manuscrise, edite şi inedite, ediţie concepută în consonanţă cu stadiul actual al

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)

istoriografiei şi filologiei româneşti. Noul corpus consacrat iluminismului românesc din Transilvania îşi propune să reconstituie cea mai completă imagine de până acum a acestei mişcări cultural-ideologice, care s-a cristalizat în primele decenii ale secolului al XVIII-lea. O antologare de acest gen are în vedere, mai întâi, clarificarea conceptului, fixarea limitelor temporale între care se circumscrie acest curent, urmate de un excurs critic al editărilor anterioare, precum şi de expunerea criteriilor care au stat la baza selecției materialelor.

În funcție de principiile şi de criteriile expuse, noua antologie intitulată *Şcoala Ardeleană* este structurată tematic, cuprinzând 175 de titluri, ordonate pe următoarele categorii de scrieri: istorice, lingvistice, literare, teologice şi religioase, filosofice, didactice şi instructive, care vor fi reproduse pe baza unor norme riguroase şi unitare de transcriere interpretativă, adnotate şi comentate. Sunt înglobate texte începând cu primul memoriu al lui Inochentie Micu-Klein, *Supplex Libellus*, din 1743, şi încheind cu *Antropologhia sau scurta cunoştință despre om şi despre însuşirile sale*, publicată de Pavel Vasici-Ungureanu, la Buda, în 1830. Este reconsiderat, totodată, locul pe care trebuie să-l ocupe textele religioase şi teologice în ansamblul mişcării, acestea fiind marginalizate şi subapreciate de exegeza de inspirație marxistă.

Şcoala Ardeleană este definită, aşadar, ca un curent generat pe baza unor afinități ideologice asumate, o sinteză umanistă unică, cu opere scrise în limba română şi în limba latină, în principal, de o mare diversitate ideatică şi stilistică, texte în care religiosul se întretaie cu profanul, conceptele teoretice cu ideile practice, reformiste, spiritul critic partizan cu cel introspectiv, meditativ, discursul polemic cu cel analitic, stilul euristic cu cel expozitiv, oferind imaginea eclatantă a primei perioade a modernismului literar românesc.

Cuvinte-cheie: *definirea conceptului*, *cronologia mişcării*, *critica editărilor anterioare*, *criteriile de selecție a textelor*, *diversitatea tematică*.

Keywords: *definitions of the concept*, *timeline of the movement*, *a critique of previous editions*, *criteria for text selections*, *diversity of themes*.

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

BDD-A28533 © 2018 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 03:00:29 UTC)