

THE TRANSLATION OF “HIGH PRIEST” IN THE SLAVO-ROMANIAN TETRAEVANGELION OF SIBIU. DOES IT REVEAL A *WESTERN* INFLUENCE?*

Giuseppe STABILE
Università degli Studi di Napoli “L’Orientale”
gstabile@unior.it

Rezumat Este interesant de observat că textul român din Tetraevanghelul bilingv de la Sibiu transpune NT-Gr. ἀρχιερεύς ‘mare preot’ prin patru sau cinci traduceri diferite. O atare hiper-traducere nu se găsește în niciuna dintre versiunile Evangheliei după Matei virtual accesibile unui traducător și/sau revizor aflat în spațiul carpato-dunărean, mai probabil în Banat, Sud-Estul Transilvaniei sau Moldova, în prima jumătate a veacului al XVI-lea. Articolul de față își propune să compare această particularitate a textului românesc din Tetraevanghel nu numai cu tradiția biblică (în special mateiană), dar și cu toate tradițiile *vulgare* susceptibile de a-i fi influențat traducerea și revizuirea, fără să uite „uzul profan” al slavonei. Obiectivul autorului este acela de a arunca o lumină nouă asupra unor *vexate questions*, ca de pildă posibila matrice eterodoxă fie a traducerii, fie a editării textului, precum și existența, în textul însuși, a unei stratificări redacționale marcate de influențe diferite în planul lingvistic și confesional.

Cuvinte cheie: arhieru, Evanghelie, Sibiu, Reforma luterană, Transilvania, Moldova, Banat, slavonă, Filip Maler.

1. Introduction

The *Slavo-Romanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu* (SRT) was the last and most important book to be printed in Cyrillic in the Saxon city between 1551 and 1552-53.¹ It is believed that the volume was printed by Filip Maler “the Moldavian” who was

* The present article is the English version, revised and extended, of “Tra Slavonismo e Riforma: la traduzione di *sommo sacerdote* nel Tetraevangelo slavo-rumeno di Sibiu”, appeared in *România Orientale* 29 (2016), 143-157; English text by Colum Fordham and Giuseppe Stabile.

¹ It is the oldest Biblical text in Slavonic and Romanian, the earliest printed book in the two languages with a parallel text (Mihăilă 1972: 241-242). Two fragments of it have survived, both of the Gospel of Matthew and still waiting for a critical edition: one fragment, the longer of the two (ff. 1^r-117^v, Mt 3:17-27:55), kept at the *Saltykov-Šchedrin* National Library in St Petersburg (Demény 1971: 22-98), the other shorter one (ff. 36^v-37^r, Mt 12:12-28), kept in the Orthodox Church of Oieidea, in the province of Alba Iulia, where it was discovered in 1978 (Mârza 1978: 173-175). As regards the dating of SRT, see the most recent studies: Gheție/ Mareș (1985: 337), Demény (1986: 303), Mareș (1990: 238-239).

actually almost certainly a Saxon from Moldavia. In 1544, he had already used the local printing press to publish a Romanian Catechism, which has been lost, and a Slavonic Tetraevangelion (STS) in 1546; the former, at least, had been commissioned by the local *Stadtrichter*.² Note that the Slavonic Tetraevangelion of Sibiu was a faithful reprint of the *editio princeps* of the Palæoslavonic Four Gospels Book (Trg), printed at Târgoviște in 1512 by the Serbian Hieromonk Makarije (see Demény 1971: 90). It is widely believed that the Saxon authorities of Sibiu funded a bilingual edition of the Tetraevangelion since, having recently embraced Lutheran Reform, they wanted to spread knowledge of it among the Romanians of Transylvania through the local Orthodox clergy.³

2. An Early Lutheran Four Gospels Book?

The unprecedented publication of the Tetraevangelion in the vernacular, only a few years after the printed edition of the Catechism, fitted in perfectly with the quintessential forms of Lutheran propaganda. A more unusual feature was the parallel Slavonic text which reflects the attempt to reach the Romanian clergy for whom the linguistic communion with Orthodox Slavs remained as important as the spiritual one, a cornerstone of Orthodoxy. In the mid-16th century, Slavonic was still the main liturgical language throughout the Romanian area, including Transylvania and Banat but the need to translate it or supplement it with Romanian was becoming increasingly apparent, especially among the Transylvanian secular clergy (Mihăilă 1972: 244).

The fact that the religious texts printed at Sibiu-Hermannstadt by Filip Maler, between 1544 and 1551-53, maintained a stronger Lutheran influence than the texts printed at Braşov-Kronstadt by the Deacon Coresi between 1560 and 1567, seems to be confirmed by the STS: in the *Prědislovie* of the Gospel of St John by Teophylact of Ohrid, the Sibian editors eliminated the sentences that described the Evangelist as the defender of Orthodoxy against heresies or denied the importance “of the word and knowledge inherent in language” (*i.e.*, the authority of Holy Scripture as

² Between 1521 and 1554, a *Ma(g)ister* Philip is recorded by the *Konsularrechnungen* as working in Sibiu on behalf of the city, not just as a typographer but also as an engraver-illustrator (*cf. Moler/Pictor*), scribe-translator for Romanian (*cf. scriba/interpres*) and envoy (see Binder/ Huttmann 1968: 150-156, 165 and 170-174). His origins are uncertain but at least three things suggest that he was a Saxon from Moldavia: 1. he definitely knew at least German (and Slavonic) as well as Romanian; 2. the Romanian text of SRT has various Saxon (German) traits; 3. Philip apparently referred to himself as Filip’ Moldovėnin’ **Филипъ Молдовѣнникъ** in the *colophon* of STS (see Gheţe 1966: 77, Mareş 1967: 72 and 1968: 86).

³ In fact, the Hungarian Calvinist authorities were mainly responsible for the attempt to introduce, from the second half of the 16th century onwards, the use of Romanian as a liturgical and pastoral language (though with negative results, at least initially). *Cf.* Alzati (2010: 188-189).

the witness of Revelation, on whose importance for Luther see Bainton 1952: 44-45).⁴ Moreover, a Hungarian document dating to 1752 seems to refer to the same Filip, defining him as the “apostle” of the Reform among the Vlachs (“Filep Oláh Apostol Oláhul irt könyve az oláhok reformatió-jára”, see Jakó 1977 [1970]: 121).⁵

An equally significant aspect is the fact that the Romanian text of the SRT displays analogies with Luther’s German text, ascribable to translation or revision prior to printing within the context of the Saxon-Lutheran press, or to both (*cf.* Petrovici 1971: 10-14, Mareş 2005 [1982]: 267).

However, the most convincing evidence for the Lutheran character of the SRT comes once again from the cultural context in which the bilingual text was written and printed: 1. It is thanks to Protestant propaganda that Sibiu became, together with nearby Braşov, the centre of a significant output of printed volumes (until the 17th century, the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia depended on Transylvania for the printing of books in Romanian, *cf.* Demény 1973: 104, Deletant 1975: 168); 2. In the eyes of the Orthodox authorities of the Principalities, the translation of sacred texts in Romanian was suspected – with good reason – to be a means of propagating heresy but, above all, it clashed with the Orthodox ecclesiastical tradition, still formally based on Church Slavonic (Gheţie 1974: 88-92).

The main redactional features in the Romanian text of the SRT refer to a Saxon Lutheran context, and can be localised in Banat-Hunedoara, Moldavia and southern Transylvania (Gheţie/ Mareş 1985: 334). The first evidence for Lutheran propaganda aimed at swaying Orthodox Romanians in Banat-Hunedoara (Binder 1971: 273-275) dates to 1526 while a Romanian translation of the New Testament dating to 1532 was possibly done in Moldavia (by “quidam doctor ex Walachia”, who even brought it to Wittenberg to print, *cf.* Papacostea 1958: 62-63, Rosetti 1958: 20-22).

According to a classic hypothesis, that dates back to the end of the 19th century, the Romanian text of the SRT would have been translated from the same parallel Slavonic text, or a related/similar text (see Bogdan 1891: 36 but *cf.* Petrovici 1971: 10, 14).

Only two translations contained in the Romanian text of the SRT were considered heretical: *dubovnic* for the Ch. Sl. **ФАРИСЕЙ** *farisej* (*cf.* Gr. φαρισαῖος) and *mitropolit*,

⁴ Teophylact’s preface (PG¹²³: 1133-1135) was faithfully reproduced by Makarije (Trg: ff. 213^v₅₋₈, 214^r₁₉-214^v₁, *cf.* STS: p. 423-426) and Coresi (CST [1562]: ff. 159^r₁₄₋₁₉, 159^v₁₋₆). Noticed for the first time by Demény (see Demény-Simonescu 1965: 11), these adjustments have more recently turned out to be wider: At least two passages have been omitted and replaced with others from Teophylact’s preface to the Gospel of Mark (see Stabile 2019: 64-65). However, it’s strongly plausible that the STS was edited and printed in a Lutheran milieu.

⁵ Jakó claimed that the book “written” by Filip (“irt könyve”) is the lost *Romanian Catechism* (*ibid.*: 121-127).

piscup or *vlădică* for the Ch. Sl. архiereй *arhierej* (cf. Gr. ἀρχιερεύς). The heretical aspect of these two translations lays in an allusive analogy made between the Orthodox clergy and the Pharisees and the High Priests, condemned by the Christ and/or implicated in His crucifixion (cf. Mareş 1967: 72, Demény 1971: 98 and Bodogae 1972: 86, 88).

3. The Translation of “High Priest” in the Slavo-Romanian Tetraevangelion

This article focuses on the translation of *high priest*, rendered in the Slavonic text simply as архiereй (cf. Miklosich: 8), which, in the parallel Romanian text, corresponds to as many as four or five terms which vary but are unlikely to have been randomly chosen: 1. The singular, which always refers to Caiaphas, is translated six times as *mitropolit* ‘archbishop, metropolitan’ and twice as *piscup* ‘bishop’; 2. The plural, which refers to the priestly caste, is translated six times as *vlădici* ‘(arch-) bishops, governors’, three times as *piscupi* and three times as *preuți (cei [mai]) marș*.

These correspondences are virtually heretical due to their distribution in the Romanian text of the SRT, mainly located, in the Gospel of Matthew, from the plot against Jesus to the Passion, including Judas’ betrayal (*Mt* 26:3-27:41) and with one exception in which even Christ questions the very authority of the priests (*Mt* 21:23).⁶ In the rest of the Gospel (*Mt* 20:18; 21:15 and 21:45), the plural *high priests* is translated with the more general term *preuți (cei/mai) mari* literally ‘great priests’ (cf. Rom. *preut/preot* < Vulg.-Lat. **prebutū* [*presbyter*] ‘priest’,⁷ corresponding, in the parallel Slavonic text, to *иерей ierej* and *свѣщенникъ sveštenik*”).

Coresi’s Romanian translation of the Tetraevangelion seems to have displayed greater caution in these lexical correspondences. Neither in Coresi’s Romanian Tetraevangelion (1560-61, CRT) nor in the Tetraevangelion by Radu de la Mănicești, otherwise known as the *Evangheliar de la Londra* (The London Gospel [1574], LRT), are Orthodox metropolitans or bishops equated with high priests blamed as Christicides: *întăiul preot* ‘first priest’ and *(mai) mare preot* ‘great priest’ never alternate with *mitropolit* and *piscup* and only twice with *vlădică*.⁸

⁶ A brief discussion of the issue is to be found in Mareş (2005: 267, note 29).

⁷ Old Rom. *preut* (cf. Dalm. *prat/pretro*, Alb. *prift*, from *prevtu*, Arom. *preftu* [Popinceanu 1964: 200, Mihăescu 1993: 41, 298]), well attested from the 16th century, left significant traces already in Slavo-Romanian sources from the early 15th (DERS: 193, DLR^{8:4}: 1320).

⁸ By indicating SRT, CRT and LRT with I, II and III, the translations *întăi/mare preot*, *piscup*, *vlădică* and *mitropolit* with A, B, C, D for high priest/-s and the singular and plural of each one with 1 and 2 as a subscript, the framework of the respective occurrences in the three Romanian Tetraevangelia is as follows: *Mt* 20:18 I-II A₂; 21:15 I-II A₂; 21:23 I C₂, II A₂; 21:45 I-II A₂; 26:3 I B₂₋₁, II A₂₋₁ (2 occ.); 26:14 I B₁, II A₁; 26:47 I B₂, II A₂; 26:51 I B₁, II A₁; 26:57 I D₁, II A₁; 26:58 I D₁, II C₁; 26:59 I D₁, II A+C₁; 26:62 I D₁, II A₁; 26:63 I D₁,

It is true that Caiaphas and the high priests may have been represented in the Romanian text of the SRT as a metropolitan among his bishops with the sole intention of bringing St Matthew’s Gospel closer to an Orthodox context. However, besides the fact that this does not undermine the presumed Lutheran background of the SRT, such a possibility fails to explain either the choice of different matching terms only for *Mt* 26:3 – 27:41 and 21:23, or their concentration in the part of the Gospel in which there was the greatest risk of provoking the outrage of the Orthodox religious authorities beyond the Carpathians, as well as the ordinary Orthodox clergy and the faithful in Transylvania. The original ecclesiastical titles (cf. the Psl. митрополитъ *mitropolit*”, пискоупъ *piskup*” and владыка *vladyka*) were also so similar to the respective Romanised forms and so deeply rooted in the Orthodox Slavonic tradition that anyone slightly familiar with it and the Slavonic language could have hardly failed to acknowledge their meaning. *Mitropolit*, *piscup*/*piscop* and *vladicǎ* were, in Old Romanian, not acclimated Slavonic terms on a par with *arhieru*, from which they differed both because of a presumably more common use and because they corresponded more precisely to the Orthodox ecclesiastical hierarchy.⁹

All these translations for ‘high priest’ find no correspondence in either the parallel Slavonic text or in the older Church Slavonic tradition of Matthew’s Gospel, which was unerringly faithful to the Greek text (cf. NTG-NA₂₈, GNT-UBS₅ and EMCT).

Like the Greek tradition, the Old Church Slavonic tradition presents, in the aforementioned verses of Matthew, just one translation for ‘high priest’ (cf. архiereй = ἀρχιερεύς).¹⁰ But the Greek and Church Slavonic traditions are not the only case: the Latin *Vulgate* (cf. *princeps sacerdotum* in BSV-WG₅) and the pre- and post-Lutheran German versions (cf. *Fürst den Priester* in MB [1466], *Hobepriester* in ST [1522] and LB [1541], ZFB [1531], EB [1537] and DB [1540]) also follow the same translation approach.

The same is also true for other traditions that may have influenced the Romanian text of the SRT, such as the Hussite and pre-Hussite Czech tradition (cf. *knězě pop* [ové]

II A₁; 26:65 I D₁, II A₁; 27:1 I C₂, II A₂; 27:3 I C₂, II Ø; 27:6 I C₂, II A₂; 27:20 I C₂, II A₂; 27:41 I C₂, II A₂ (III Ø).

⁹ Apart from митрополитъ *mitropolit* – which entered the Romanian language unchanged –, all these slavonisms were already acclimated by the late 15th century: the Slavo-Romanian documents attest пископ(ь) *piscop* from 1464, владыка *vladica* from 1469 and архiereй *arhieru* from 1500 (see DERS: 177, 264 and DLRV: 72; for митрополитъ [1488, tr. 1784], cf. Tikin²: 722 and DRHA³: 32/53).

¹⁰ In *Mt* 3:17-27:55, EMCT registers only one exception to архiereй, *arhieru*, namely старѣшина жрьцьскъ *starěšina ž’r’ě’sk*” (cf. Miklosich: 882, ἀρχιερεύς). This sporadic *varia lectio* occurs only in 4 out of 14 Aprakos and 2 out of 13 Tetraevangelia and New Testaments, mostly of Eastern Slavonic redaction.

in Dr [c. 1360] and Ol [c. 1416]), and in the Hussite and Lutheran Hungarian tradition (cf. *pap[iz] fejdelem* in HB [1466] and ÚTS [1541]).¹¹

The early Lutheran phase of the Polish tradition is contemporary with the printing of the SRT and has only one translation for ‘high priest’ but it seems to be independent from all the other traditions mentioned so far (both EM [1551] and NTSM [1553] render ‘high priest’ by *biskup*, which is coherent with the earliest extant translations of the Bible into Polish, cf. Babiacyk 1906: 84).¹²

It therefore seems clear that the four or five different translations of ‘high priest’ cannot stem from a specific version of the New Testament among those that appeared before roughly the first half of the 16th century and were accessible, at least virtually, to translators and revisers of the SRT.

The hypothesis most consistent with the Lutheran context of Sibiu is that the person who edited the Romanian text of the SRT necessarily based his work on Luther’s text and everyday language. This may be explained by the militant nature of the Lutheran edition and the lack of adequate models for a translation of the Tetraevangelion into Romanian (Luther’s revolutionary ideas on biblical translation are well known).¹³

What is certain is that the Sibian revisers did not even conform to the austere simplicity of Luther: of the various translations of ‘high priest’ contained in the Romanian text of the SRT, only the term *preuțu (celu/mai) mare* (cf. *intăiu/mare preot* and variants in the CRT) resembles the Lutheran *Hohepriester*, but the St Petersburg fragment seems to attribute only a marginal or residual role to it (obviously, we cannot

¹¹ Florescu (2010: 50-54, 65-70) argues that the archetype of the Romanian text may also have been translated from Hussite Czech and pre-Lutheran German texts.

¹² The later Polish versions of the Gospel, printed between 1556 and 1599, are quite more various, cf. *książe/przełożony káplánskie* (Szarffenberger’s [1556] and Leopolita’s [1561] NTs); *przedniejszy/książe kapłan* (*Biblia brzeska* [1563]); *aryofiarownik* (Budny’s NT [1570]); *przedniejszy ofiarownik* (Czechowic’s NT [1577]); *arykáplán/nawyszy káplán* (Wujk’s NT [1593 and 1599]). Such a lexical variety might reflect a confessional one implying distinct redactional criteria if not the use of distinct sources (Only four out of the nine 16th century Polish versions might be defined “Catholic” [1556, 1561, 1593 and 1599], being the other five rather “Calvinist” [1563], “Socinian” or “Unitarian” [1570, 1577] and, as was just said, “Lutheran” [1551, 1553]). Cf. [https://ewangelie.um.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1551&g=1&c=26&f=\[10.4.2019\]](https://ewangelie.um.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1551&g=1&c=26&f=[10.4.2019]).

¹³ See how Luther justified the biblical usage of common people’s German in *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen* (1530): “man mus die mutter jhm hause, die kinder auff der gassen, den gemeinen man auff dem marckt drumb fragen vnd den selbigen auff das maul sehen wie sie reden vnd darnach dolmetschen” (cf. *Sendb.*: 637¹⁹⁻²²; for a critical edition and English translation, cf. also: <https://editions.mml.ox.ac.uk/editions/sendbrief/> [21.04.2020], for a Romanian translation with a critical commentary, cf. Munteanu-Nastasia 2017: 16-23 [esp. 18]).

know if it was equally marginal or residual in the rest of the supposed Four-Gospels Book printed at Sibiu).

The Romanian text of the SRT presents each translation of 'high priest' in a distinct part of the Gospel of Matthew, occasionally alternating between them. There are exceptions such as *preuți (cei/mai) mari* and *vlădicî* in *Mt* 21:23, where there seems to be a clear intention on the part of the revisers to depict the Jewish priests as Orthodox prelates (it is only the short passage in ch. 21, in which 'high priest' is translated with the term *vlădică* and the first chapter of Matthew in which Jesus clashes with religious leaders). *Vlădică* appears always in the plural and six times out of seven in *Mt* 27 which gives the high priests a key role in the sentencing of Christ and includes them among those who mock Him on the Cross. *Piscop* and *mitropolit* appear in *Mt* 26, the former three times in the plural and twice in the singular (see *Plot to kill Jesus*, *Judas betrays Jesus* and *Arrest of Jesus*), the latter six times, all in the singular (only in *Jesus' trial before the Sanhedrin*).

These variants can be traced back to three simple criteria, none of which require a profound knowledge of Romanian and/or Church Slavonic: 1. The difference between singular and plural which seems to allude to the difference between the clergy and their chief priest; 2. The recognisability of the ecclesiastical titles as Orthodox ones; 3. The symbolic importance of each place in *Mt* which is translated, and therefore its importance in terms of religious propaganda.

What seem to vary, according to the Easter cycle, are the editorial criteria and not, or not just, the translators and sources used (*cf.* Tasmowski 2009: 334). Of the two clearly distinct redactional layers, one attributable to the translation and the other to the revision carried out at Sibiu, the latter is thought to have introduced the (anti-) Orthodox references that were lacking in the former or were not particularly evident. Indeed, a Lutheran or Hussite translation would surely have had (anti-) Catholic references due to the sources and the context: from Banat to Moldavia, all the regions in which the Romanian text of the SRT may have been translated were located on the edge of the "Latin" world and had been exposed to Catholic propaganda.¹⁴ The main objective of all the religious reformist movements from the west was inevitably the Catholic Church and their propaganda, at least initially, had to be presumably aimed at Romanian Catholics, even in the Carpathian-Danubian area (the Romanian-Cyrillic spelling of the SRT betrays the influence of Latin-Hungarian

¹⁴ Documentary evidence indicates that there were three Latin bishoprics in Moldavia, the land from where Filip Maler probably came, between the 13th and 16th centuries: the bishoprics of Milcov or Cumania (1227-1241), Siret (1370-1434 or 1497) and Baia (1418-1523), as well, but only from the early 17th century, as the episcopate of Bacău (1607-1818). During the first few centuries, the bishops of these three Moldavian bishoprics were Polish, Hungarian and Italian, already members of the Franciscan and Dominican orders (see Sabău 1943: 235-242, especially 238, note 4).

spelling and/or of Saxon pronunciation, leading to the first Lutheran infiltration of the Latin communities of Banat-Hunedoara or of Moldavia, see Petrovici 1971: 18, Gheție 1979: 84-86).¹⁵ It also means that the base-translation of ‘high priest’ in the Romanian text of SRT – and therefore in its *Urtext* – is the same as in the CRT, in other words in another edition of the Tetraevangelion which has a clear Lutheran background. It goes without saying that the general term *prentū* (*celū/mai*) *mare* should be ascribed to the translation while *mitropolit* and *vlădică* are due to the revision carried out at Sibiu. The case of *piscup* is less obvious: the SRT displays the old Romanian polysemy but also combines uses and possibly influences that do not coincide with those of *vlădică*.

With respect to *piscup*, the old Romanian word *vlădică* had a more restricted meaning in a confessional sense, but a broader absolute meaning, which made it the perfect equivalent of *arhieru*, but just more usual and recognisable as Orthodox.

The origins and usage of the two ecclesiastical titles in 16th and 17th century Romanian texts can be summarised as follows:

Vlădică < Ch. Sl. **владыка** *vладыка*, see Byz. Gr. δεσπότης (LLP⁵: 195-196, Sophocles: 352): 1. ‘lord, governor’ (cf. NTG-NA₂₈, GNT-UBS₅ ἡγεμών; EMCT **владыка, гемонъ** *gemon*”; see SRT: 28^v₅ (*Mt* 10:18) = in the parallel Slavonic text; CRT: 19^v₃ (51); 2. Honorary title of Orthodox prelates (Scriban: 1416), cf. *vlădicie* ‘seignury or principality’ but also the rank of bishop or metropolitan (CP: 9⁸₈ [227]); Ch. Sl. **владычество** *vladyc’stvo* (cf. Miklosich: 66; T534: 371/371; 374/373; DRHB⁸: 268/432); 3. ‘prelate, (Orthodox) bishop’ (cf. Popinceanu 1964: 226 and DERS: 264);

Piscup/piscop < Ch. Sl. **пискоупъ** cf. Byz. Gr. πῖσκοπος and/or Vulg. Lat. **piscopus* (ESJS¹¹: 646, Mihăescu 1967: 97):¹⁶ 1. ‘bishop (of any confession)’ (CC²: 101, 30 [97], PO: 6⁸₄ [10]), cf. the first occurrence of **пискоупъ** ‘Armenian bishop’ in Moldo-Slavonic documents (DRHA¹: 14/21 [1401]) and ‘Orthodox bishop’ in Wallacho-Slavonic documents (DRHB⁸: 294/432 [1580]).

The five cases in the Romanian text of the SRT are the oldest known occurrences of *piscup*, if not in absolute terms, but at least in terms of a Romanian translation of the Scriptures; they are also the only examples of *piscup* as translation of the term ‘high priest’ in the Gospels, excluding the translation in the *Bratu Codex* (ca. 1560,

¹⁵ On the attitude of Bohemian and Lutheran reformist movements to the Orthodox authorities, see Panaitescu (1964: 280-281), Binder (1971: *ibid.*).

¹⁶ The unaccented *u* < *o* of *piscup* is indistinguishable from that of inherited Romanian latinisms (Densusianu 1938: 92), but the hypothesis of a pre-Slavonic, Greek or Latin, etymology has not found many supporters (cf. Ionescu 1994: 29). On the other hand, northern-Greek loanwords in Palaeoslavonic display an analogous vowel closing, e.g.: **ѡрарѡ** *urur* < ὄρῳριον ‘stole (liturgical vestment)’, **пискоупъ** < πῖσκοπος ‘bishop’ (see Фасмер 1906: 451).

CB), which seems to come from the same SRT (*cf. piscupii* in CB 441₄ = SRT 105^v₂₀₋₂₁, [Mt 26:14]).¹⁷

In an old Romanian text such as the SRT, it was inevitable that the use of *piscup* followed the ecclesiastical use of Slavonic, or rather the curial use or chancery writing with which Filip Maler and his “workshop” (*cf. It. bottega*) were probably most familiar.¹⁸

Along the border between *Slavia orthodoxa* and *Slavia latina*, in Chancery Slavonic were regularly used: 1. **пискѡупъ**, in internal documents, for Orthodox bishops and bishops of all denominations; 2. **вискѡупъ** *biskup*” in external documents, solely for Latin bishops (almost always non-residents and foreigners, like their faithful, at least in the Principalities); 3. **владыка**, both in internal and external documents, solely for Orthodox bishops.

More precisely, the coexistence of three titles may date to the 13th-14th centuries in Serbian and Croatian Slavonic (Skok¹: 157), to the 14th-15th centuries in the case of Lithuano-Ruthenian and Russian Slavonic (Срезневский¹: 88, ГСБМ²: 8-10 and ССМ¹: 96) and to the 15th-16th centuries for Moldavian Slavonic (*cf. DRHA*²: 84/120 [1454] and DŞM²: 180/448 [1499]). From the same border, this lexical *facies* is also reflected outside *Slavia*, in Hungarian chancery (*cf. püspök* ‘Latin and reformed bishop’, [v]ladika ‘Orthodox bishop’ in EOE¹⁻³: I/4 [1540]; VII/260 [1566]; VII/16 [1577]; TörtT^{3,19}: I/86 [1564]) and Saxon chancery of Transylvania (*cf. the Germ. Bischof/Pischof* ‘Latin and Lutheran bishop’, *Wladicka* ‘Orthodox bishop’ in QGSK⁴: 182 [1556], 498 [1528] and *passim*; Hurm.¹¹: 96/656 [1582]; MV¹: 149/420 [1600]), but also the Turkic-Tartar chancery of the Crimean Khanate (*cf. the Tk. püskub* ‘Catholic bishop’, *vladika* ‘Orthodox bishop’ in Kolodziejczyk 2011: 20/653 [1520], 34/770 [1592]).¹⁹

¹⁷ The CB is a Slavo-Rumanian miscellany, an interlinear text with the two languages printed on alternate lines and containing parts of the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels, copied in Southern Transylvania and dated by Pop Bratul to 1560 (see Mihăilă 1981: 69, and on the correspondences with SRT, Gheţie/ Mareş 1985: 342).

¹⁸ Assuming that the title of *Magister/Meister*, attributed to Filip by the sources, did not imply proficiency in a specific art or craft but higher education, this is unlikely to have included the *litteræ slavonicae* or *rutenicales* (*cf. Hervay* 1965: 124-125). The children of the Saxon elite received – preferably at Krakow, Prague, Vienna or some other German-speaking city – a Catholic or Protestant education, but always a western one (Papacostea 1958: 61).

¹⁹ The form in *p-* of the German is attested from the 11th century (*cf. Piskofes*, MhDW¹: s.v.) and it is thought that it might be the origin of the Hungarian word *püspök* (*cf. Rocchi* 1987: 50 and Mollay 1992: 112). Both the German term *Bischof/Pischof* and the Hungarian term *püspök* may have come into contact with the Psl. **пискѡупъ** with which they share the meaning ‘Orthodox bishop’.

The entire form *episcop/episcup* < Byz. Gr. ἐπίσκοπος cf. Psl. епискоупъ *episkup*” (Tiktin²: 136, Popinceanu 1964: 154-155) followed Slavonic usage and was the most frequently used term in official titulary and therefore almost always referred to Orthodox bishops (its acclimation is attested in Wallacho-Slavonic documents from 1535, cf. *ѣпискѹпѹ ѣпискури*, in DERS: 74 and DRHB³: 194/320).²⁰ However, the apharetic form appears to have been more sensitive to the variability of the vernacular Romanian and to the influence of other languages.

It was not until the early 18th century – from the Union of the Orthodox Church of Transylvania with Rome – that *piscup/piscop* took on, popularly, the more restricted meaning of ‘Catholic bishop’, while *vlădică* and *episcop* retained the meaning of ‘Orthodox bishop’ (see Popinceanu 1964: 194, “[*piscup*] mancherorts mundartlich katholischer Bischof, während der orthodoxe *vlădică* oder heute *episcop* heißt”).²¹ The first Wallachian documents following the Union use the term *piscup* to refer to the bishop of Transylvania in the sense of Roman or “united”, i.e. ‘Uniate’ (Stinghe¹: 8/15, 16 [1701]).²² Nonetheless there are examples of Latin *piscupi* and *piscopi* in Transylvania or Moldavia, in earlier documents (cf. *Șeveruș piscop* and *vlădicii, piscupii* [...] *și toți ai Îpăratului* in MV¹: 142/392, 148/412 [1600]; *piscopul de la Bacău* in SDIR¹⁻²: 7/83 [1685]).

Actually, in earlier sources, the meaning of ‘Latin bishop’ used to come under the general term ‘bishop’ which was supposed to emphasise the reference of *piscup/piscop* to a coeval and possibly local ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The antiquity and adaptability of *piscup/piscop* to different confessional milieus are confirmed by the numerous toponyms which stem from these words and which are widespread throughout the Romanian *Sprachraum* (see Iordan 1963: 236, 241, 360). Sometimes, the link with non-Orthodox and especially Catholic communities does

²⁰ The whole form rarely referred to bishops of different confessions. A Moldo-Slavonic document records the killing of the bishop of Baia in 1522, 19 years after the event took place, solely because it had happened during a visit to the diocese and the *voivode* had confiscated the property of the deceased за сьмьрть единого епископа латинского [on the death of a latin bishop] see DȘV: 63/314, 323-325). *Episcop/episcup* is first attested in a vernacular text in 1560: in the preface to his Romanian Catechism, Coresi stresses that he printed the book кѢ ширѣ епѣкѹдади [with the knowledge of] the Orthodox bishop of Hungary = Transylvania (cf. DLR¹⁻⁷: 634-637 and TR16: 101).

²¹ An opposition which, even by the late 19th century, had become merely a vernacular archaism, cf. Șăineanu: 483 (1887: 245-246), Damé³: 220.

²² Orthodox Transylvanian sources used the masculine *vlădic* for all the bishops of the Romanians, whether Uniate or not (cf. Stinghe¹: 9/17 [1701] and Laurianu-Massimu: 576). There is little doubt yet that this use of *vlădic* relied on the more traditional (and older) use of *vlădică*, since the Romanians of Transylvania had traditionally been Orthodox of Byzantine-Slavonic rite in their large majority.

seem probable: 1. **Пискѣщи** *Piscupești* = **Пискѣщилор** *Piscupeștilor* (DRHB¹: 4: 129/221 [1465]; 279/329 [1549]) is the oldest toponym of the “family”; location: Oltenia, border with Banat (Gorj/Mehedinti), *i.e.* a region which was particularly exposed to Hungarian Catholic and Serbian Orthodox influence (see Alzati 1981: 160-163); 2. **Рѣвѣник Пискѣшлов** *Răvenic Piscupulov* (DRHB²²: 237/462 [1626]), rare; location Oltenia (Vâlcea/Argeș), *i.e.* in the heart of the ancient Latin diocese of Argeș (see Alzati 1981: *ibid.*); 3. **(Горь) Пископ(а)** (*Gor'*) *Piskop(a)* = [*Dialul*] *Piscop[ului]* (DIRA XVII⁴: 5/3 [1616], 618/486 [1620]; DRHA²³: 72/88 [1635]); location Moldavia (Iași), near Cotnari, which between 1562 and 1563 was the official residence of a Socinian or Calvinist bishop, and had previously been a colony of Catholic Saxons and Hungarians (see Giurescu 1967: 216).

In the case of the vineyards of Cotnari, in particular, local memory of a Latin bishop seems to be confirmed by the form *Dealul Bi<_s>cop*, which is perhaps the oldest (*cf.* *Dealul Pescop*, DRHA¹⁹: 23: 101/121 [1626]; 77/98 [transl. 1794]). The form in *b-* – of Polish, Czech or Ruthenian origin – remained restricted to Moldavia where, from the mid-15th century to beyond the mid-18th century (in Romanian vernacular, from the early 17th century), it is recorded sporadically in internal documents and translations, alternating with the form in *p-* but always with the meaning of ‘Latin bishop’ (see Mitu 1963: 206, Ionescu 1976: 403).²³ It is indicative that the two forms could alternate within the same document, referring both to a Latin bishop and his bishopric (*cf.* **вископ Баковски** *biskop Bakovski* and **Пископѣи ѿ Бакѡв** *Piskopii ot Bakov* [Bașău] in DRHA²³: 439/449 [1636]).

Moreover, in the Church Slavonic tradition, the form **пискоупъ** appears referring to Latin bishops from the early 13th century, though in Latino-Slavic border sources like the Croatian and Ruthenian ones (*cf.* Срезневский²: 937-938; ССУМ²: 148; Даничић²: 306).²⁴

It is therefore reasonable to suppose that the use of *piscup* in the Romanian text of the SRT, despite being based on local Slavonic, was affected by other languages including non-Slavic ones (those spoken and written in the Latin-Reformist milieu of translation and printing, *i.e.* especially German and Hungarian).

However, not even Slavonic explains the two occurrences of *piscup* in the singular, where it would be more usual to find *mitropolit* (104^v₁₃, 110⁸₉, *cf.* *Mt* 26:14 and 51). Considering that the titles in question are not similar either in Slavonic or in ancient Romanian (*cf.* LLP¹: 18: 25: 54-55; 217; 39; Tiktin¹: 2: 133; 136, 722) and that they are clearly distinguished in the text of the SRT, it could be argued that: (a) the individual parts of the Gospel were translated separately, without any attempt at harmo-

²³ Although, interestingly, a *biscop armenescu* does appear in Moldavia (Iorga 1927: 72 [1754]).

²⁴ On the controversial origin of the form in *b-*, *cf.* ESJS¹: 62-63; Rocchi (1990: 167-168). Berneker, instead, doesn't seem to have doubt: “Aus ahd. *bischof*, mhd. *bischof*” (SEW¹: 58).

nisation, and that there was no final revision process, or, alternatively, that (b) a rushed final revision introduced the term *mitropolit*, where the translation envisaged both for the singular and plural forms of ‘high priest’ solely the term *piscop* (and possibly *prentii* [celii/mai] mare in the rest of the Gospel).

In case (b), the Romanian *Urtext* of the SRT clearly reflects a context in which the highest ecclesiastical authority was represented by the bishops, more probably Latin bishops, rather than the metropolitan.²⁵ Equally clearly, the context of linguistic influences exerted on the Romanian *Urtext* must have reflected cultural and confessional influences.

The only translations of ‘high priest’ genetically and/or semantically similar to the Rum. *piscop*, and capable of influencing its usage in the SRT, are the Germ. *Bischof* (MB), the Hung. *püspök* (HB and ÚTS), and the Cz. and Pol. *biskup* (Dr, Ol and NTSM). *Bischof*, *püspök* and *biskup* are used, in the respective traditions of the Gospel exactly like *piscop* in the Romanian text of the SRT, in the singular and the plural, both for the priestly caste and for Caiaphas. However, it should be emphasised that these traditions are mainly faithful to the *Latin Vulgate* and that the variants of *piscop* translate the Lat. *pontifex* in St John’s Gospel and hardly ever in the Synoptic Gospels (cf. *Mc* 15:11, *Jn* 7:45 and cc. 11, 18, 19 *passim*).²⁶ The only exception is the Polish Lutheran tradition, with an initial version of the Tetraevangelion printed in around the same period of the SRT, which generally presents *biskup* for ‘high priest’ in all the Gospels (see above *biskup*, in NTSM).

Already well-documented in Latin-Germanic sources (DC-Lat⁶: 408, Diefenbach: 298), the medieval custom of confusing *pontifex* with *episcopus* is probably linked to the custom of referring to Caiaphas as a bishop, widespread in Polish, Hungarian and Czech Catholic contexts, as well as German contexts, from the 14th century, through breviaries, passionals (martyrologies) and various collections of evangelical passages for devotional and liturgical reading (cf. Szarvas-Simonyi²: 1345-1346, Gebauer¹: 57 and Urbańczyk^{1,2}: 95).

²⁵ As is known, similar conditions existed in the Banat, Transylvania and in Moldavia, from the 15th century due to the infiltration of the Hussite Reform already before the Lutheran Reform (cf. Alzati 1981: 39-56, 249-264). Cartoian claimed that “the hotbeds of the Hussite Reform weren’t yet totally extinguished in *Ardeal* when, from Germany” – more exactly from Leipzig and Wittenberg, around 1520 –, Saxon merchants and students started to introduce Luther’s ideas” (Cartoian 1980 [1940]: 84-85). Not only Transylvania, but Banat, Maramureş, Moldavia too had received Hussitism from Hungary and Poland-Lithuania. Moldavia is likely to have helped spreading it in the Novgorod Rus’ (cf. Birnbaum 1973: 249 and De Michelis 1993: 23-24, 25 and 147, on Waldo-Hussitism in Eastern Europe). On the spread of Hussitism in the Romanian countries, cf. Macürek (1927: 53-75), Dan (1944: 84-86), Šmahel (1993: 141, 143-144).

²⁶ “In Matthew there is not a single deviation from *princeps sacerdotum*” (Nestle 1907: 501-502).

It is unlikely that this use of *piscup* as an alternative to *mitropolit*, in the Romanian text of the SRT, stems from an Orthodox translation context, unless by mistake, and it can be excluded that it derives from the direct tradition of the Palaeoslavonic Tetraevangelion (although cf. *вискѹпъ* for the Latin word *pontifex* in Croatian hagiographies and lectionaries, LLP³: 90).²⁷ Vice versa, it is likely that the two cases of *piscup* = *Caiaphas* may have eluded those who carried out the revision prior to printing and introduced the Orthodox distinction between bishops and metropolitan. Only as a result of the existence of an older redactional layer is it possible to admit the interference of *Caiaphas* = *episcopus/pontifex*, which derives from the languages of the “Latin” tradition (Hungarian, German, Czech or Polish), either directly or through Salvonic.²⁸ This connecting role between the vernaculars of the Banat-Transylvanian and Moldavian area was effectively carried out, in the 15th and 16th centuries, by Transylvanian, Moldavian and Lithuano-Ruthenian Slavonic (see Olteanu 1958: 77, 79, Macûrek 1968: 14-19).²⁹

4. Conclusions

The translation of ‘high priest’ suggests certain final considerations about the Romanian text of the SRT and its sources which need to be summarised: 1. the hyper-translation of ‘high priest’ in the Romanian text of SRT cannot be explained either in the light of the Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospel of Matthew or in the German Lutheran tradition; 2. no other translation of Matthew, among those considered in this study, comes as close to reproducing an entire ecclesiastical

²⁷ The earliest Old Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospels of Mark and John usually uses *архирей*, with a few variations which do not relate just to the Gospel of John: *жрьць žr’c’*, *старѣйшина жрьцьскъ starějšina žr’c’sk* [rare *жидовьскъ/ниуденскъ židov’sk* or *ijudeisk*], *свѣщеніе svěštenije* [LLP³⁶: 46 = *ordo sacerdotalis*], *кнѣзь knenz* (cf. Mar and Zogr for *Mc*, ЕИюСТ for *Jn*).

²⁸ The translation of “pharisee” with the term *dubovnic* in the Romanian text of the SRT seems to belong to the same redactional layer and the same Latin influences mediated by Church Slavonic, cf.: Ch. Sl. *доуховникъ dubov’nik* ‘confessor’ but also ‘cleric, priest’ (Miklosich: 182, Данничѣ: 318-319); Cz. *dubovnik* and Pol. *dubownych* ‘pharisee’ and ‘cleric, priest (esp. Catholic priest)’ (Gebauer¹: 856, Urbańczyk^{2,9}: 219 and Skok 1927: 189). We should infer that *farisei* must have seemed less appropriate and/or usual than *dubovnic* (cf. DLR^{2,2}: 63 and Popinceanu 1964: 157). In the Romanian text of the SRT, *dubovnic* was used 21 times, and *farisei* 8 times, though the latter was a more literal translation of the Ch. Sl. *фарисей* and the Germ. *Pharisäer* (cf. EMCT and LB). It is hardly surprising that it occurs regularly in the CRT and in the coresian *corpus* (cf. Densusianu 1938: 145, 439 and *passim*). Florescu recalls that in the *Poučenija* [Teachings] of Neagoe Basarab (c. 1520), *доуховники dubovniky* “renvoie généralement aux moines vivant dans le monastère” (2010: 60-61).

²⁹ Cf. also Panaitescu (1965: 18-19), on the secular and spoken use of Slavonic.

hierarchy, to which it is worth adding *dubovnici* as the translation of *pharisees* i.e. ‘clerics’ but also ‘separate’ (Hung. *levélt* in HB [cf. Lat. (*a saeculo*) *disiuncti* = fig. monks?])³⁰; 3. without exception, the titles employed belong to the Orthodox Slavic tradition and entered the Romanian language from Church Slavonic, even though only some of them can be considered to be strictly Orthodox (cf. *preutū* and *piscup* vs. *vlădică* and *mitropolî*); 4. the (residual?) cases of *piscup* = *Caiaphas* reflect a change in the redactional criteria and objectives (and therefore, probably, in the print/edition milieu) and confirm the old hypothesis of Latin and Latin-Protestant influence; 5. it is possible that the comparison with the CRT shows a gradual institutionalisation of Lutheran Reform in the same Transylvanian area (although it cannot be excluded that the SRT reused a Romanian proto-translation from the Czech, Hungarian or Polish, which can be ascribed to the Bohemian Reformation, cf. Florescu’s [2010: 65-70] hypothesis).

Whatever the case, the hyper-translation of ‘high priest’ in the Romanian text of SRT shows how profound and vivid the imprint of Slavonism on Romanian civilization must have appeared – even from the West, around the half of the 16th century –, albeit the long Slavo-Romanian Middle Ages was undoubtedly nearing its end.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Biblical and Documentary Sources³¹

- CB = Alexandru Gafton (ed.), *Codicele Brutul*, Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ion Cuza”, 2003, <http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/txt/text> [05.04.2019].
- CC² = Sextil Pușcariu, Alexe Procopovici (ed.), *Carte cu Învățătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textu*, București: Socec & Co., 1914.
- CP = Gheorghe Chivu (ed.), *Pravila lui Coresi*, in Ion Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982, 129-245.
- CRT = Florica Dimitrescu (ed.), *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi (Brașov 1560-1561), comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăcești (1574)*, București: Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1963.
- CST = *Tetraevanghel slavonesc al lui Coresi*, Brașov, 1562 (B.A.R. III 234272).
- DB = *Biblia, beider Allt vnnnd Newen Testamenten* [...] gespürt vnd gesehen durch D. Johann Dietenberger, zum anderennmäll Corrigeret vnd verbessert in synem Leben, Anno MDXL, Augstmänt.
- DIRA = *Documente privind istoria României. A. Moldova, veacul XVII*, vols. I-V (1601-1625), București: Editura Academiei R.P.R., 1952-1957.

³⁰ It could be a criticism of “secluded” observant monks from reformist urban environments (cf. Mareș 1967: 72). The Franciscans played an important role both in disseminating the Lutheran Reform in Transylvania and Banat and in combating it, see Köpeczi (1992: 280-281). With regard to Lutheran criticism of monastic life as a separate and therefore privileged path to salvation, see Bainton (1952: esp. 51).

³¹ For the Greek and Latin text of New Testament, see <https://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/about-the-online-bibles> [26.09.2016].

- Dr = Vladimír Kyas (vyd.), *Staročeská Bible Drážďanská a Olomoucká*, vol. I, *Evangelia*, Praha: Akademia, 1981.
- DRHA-B = *Documenta Romaniae Historica. Seria A. Moldova/B. Țara Românească*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R. [subsequently: Academiei Române], 1965-2014/1965-2013.
- DȘM = Ioan Bogdan (ed.), *Documentele lui Ștefan cel Mare*, vols. I-II, București: Socce & Co., 1913.
- DȘV = Mihai Costăchescu (ed.), *Documentele moldovenești de la Ștefăniță Voevod (1517-1527)*, Iași: Bravo, 1943.
- EB = *Bibel Alt vnd New Testament: nach dem Text in der hailigen kirchen gebraucht, durch doctor Johann Ecken [...] Mit Römi. König. Mai. Gnad vnd Freiheit*, MDXXXVII.
- ЕИюСТ = Анатолий А. Алексеев, Анна А. Пичхадзе, и др. (изд. подг.), *Евангелие от Иоанна в славянской традиции*, С.-Петербург: РБО, 1998.
- EM = Izabela Winiarska-Górska (ed.), *Evangelia według św. Mateusza*, przekład Stanisława Murzynowskiego, Królewiec, 1551, <http://www.evangelie.um.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1551> [10.04.2019].
- EMCT = Анатолий А. Алексеев, Анна А. Пичхадзе и др. (изд. подг.), *Евангелие от Матфея в славянской традиции*, С.-Петербург: РГНФ, 2005.
- EOE = Sándor Szilágyi (szer.), *Erdélyi Országgyűlési Emlékek*, vols. I-III (1540-1596), Budapest: Akadémia Könyvtudó Hivatala, 1875-1877.
- HB = Décsi Gyula (olv.), Szabó T. Ádám (kiad.), *A Müncheneri kódex (1466). A négy Evangélium szövege és szótára*, Békéscsaba: Európa Könyvkiadó, 1985.
- Hurm. = Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, Nicolae Iorga, *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor*, vol. XI (1517-1612), Bucuresci: [s.e.], 1900.
- Iorga 1927 = Nicolae Iorga, “Patru documente botoșănene”, in *Revista istorică* XIII/ 1-4, 71-74.
- Kolodziejczyk 2011 = Kolodziejczyk, Dariusz, *The Crimean Kabnate and Poland-Lithuania. International Diplomacy on the European Periphery (15th-18th C.). A Study of Peace Treaties Followed by Annotated Documents*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2011.
- LB = *Biblia: das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch auff's New zugericht*, D. Mart. Luth. [...], Gedrückt zu Wittemberg, Durch Hans Lufft, MDXLI.
- LRT = Moses Gaster (ed.), “La versione rumena del Vangelo di Matteo tratta dal *Tetraevangelion* del 1574 (ms. del Museo britannico: Harley 3611^b) e pubblicata per la prima volta”, in *Archivio Glottologico Italiano* XII, 1890-1892, 197-254.
- MB = William Kurrelmeyer (hrsg.), [Die Mentelin Bibel] *Die erste deutsche Bibel*, I Bd. *Evangelien*, Tübingen: Gedruckt für den Literarischen Verein in Stuttgart, 1924.
- Munteanu-Nastasia 2017 = Eugen Munteanu, Mariana Nastasia, “Martin Luther, Scrisoare deschisă despre traducere. Versiune românească de E. Munteanu și M. Nastasia”, in *Transilvania* 3, 2017, 14-24.
- MV = *Mihai Viteazul în conștiința europeană*, vol. I, *Documente externe*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982.
- N'TSM = Izabela Winiarska-Górska (ed.), *Nony Testament zupełny*, tzw. Jana Seklucjana, przekład Stanisława Murzynowskiego, Królewiec, 1553, <http://www.evangelie.um.edu.pl/teksty.php?y=1553> [10.04.2019].
- OI = see above Dr.

- PG = *Patrologiæ Cursus Completus, Series Græca Posterior*, Theophilacti Bulgariae Archiepiscopi, *Opera quæ reperi potuerunt omnia*, t. I, Lutetiae Parisorum: Exc. J.-P. Migne, 1864.
- PO = Viorica Pamfil (ed.), *Palia de la Orăştie (1581-1582)*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1968.
- QGSK = *Quellen zur Geschichte der Stadt Brassó*, IV Bd., Brassó: Guşt, 1903.
- SDIR = Nicolae Iorga, *Studii și documente privind istoria românilor*, vols. I-II, Bucureşti: Editura Ministeriului de Instrucție, 1901.
- Sendb. = *Martin Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, 30. Bd., 2. Abt., Weimar: Hermann Böhlhaus, 1909, 627-646.
- SRT = *Evangelheliarul Slavo-Român de la Sibiu (1551-1553)*, studiu introductiv filologic de Emil Petrovici, studiu introductiv istoric de Lajos Demény, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1971.
- STS = Tetraevangelhelul slavonesc de la Sibiu, 1546 (B.A.R. II 630838).
- ST = *Die Septemberbibel: Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther*, Berlin: Grote, 1883.
- Stinghe = Sterie Stinghe, *Documente privitoare la trecutul românilor din Șchei (1700-1783)*, vol. I, Braşov: Ciurcu & Co., 1901.
- T534 = Grigore Tocilescu (îngr.), *534 documente slavo-române din Țara Românească și Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346-1603*, Bucureşti: Cartea Românească, 1931.
- TörtT = *Történelmi Tár*, 3. sorozat 19. kötet, 1896-diki Évfolyam.
- TR16 = Ion Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1982.
- Trg = Hans Miklas et al. (hrsgg.), *Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der 1^{te} kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck. Faksimile-Ausgabe*, Paderborn-München-Wien-Zürich: F. Schöningh Vrlg., 1999.
- ÚTS = *Sylvester János Új Testamentum. Újszövet 1541*, A kiserő tanulmányt írta és a faksimile szövegét gondozta: Varjas Béla, Budapest: Akadémiai Klado, 1960.
- ZFB = *Die ganze Bibel der ursprünglichen ebraischen und griechischen [...]*, Getruickt zuo Zürich, bey Christoffel Froschouer, MDXXXI [Die Zwingli-Froschauer Bibel].

B. Lexica and Dictionaries

- Babiaczyk = Babiaczyk Adam, *Lexikon zur altpolnischen Bibel 1455 (Sophienbibel, Ausgabe von Malecki)*, Breslau: Fleischmann, 1906.
- Damé = Fr. Damé, *Nouveau dictionnaire roumain-français*, vols. I-IV, Bucarest: Imprimerie de l'Etat, 1893-1895.
- Даничкиѣ = Ђура Даничкиѣ, *Рјечник на Къивених Старица Српских*, vols. I-III, Бнограду, Државној Штампарији, 1863-1864.
- DC-Lat = Charles du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis*, vols. I-VIII, Niort: Favre, 1883-1887.
- DERS = Gheorghe Bolocan, *Dicționarul elementelor românești din documentele slavoromâne, 1374-1600*, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 1981.
- Diefenbach = Lorenz Diefenbach, *Novum latino-germanicum mediae et infimae Aetatis*, Frankfurt A. M.: J. D. Sauerländer's, 1867.
- DLR = *Dicționarul limbii române*, [s.n.], vols. I-XIX, Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române R.S.R. [subsequently Editura Academiei Române], 1965-2000.

- DLRV = Gheorghe Mihăilă, *Dicționarul limbii române vechi. Sfârșitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI*, București: Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1974.
- ESJS = *Etymologický Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnskébo*, vols. 1-17, Praha: Akademia, 1989-2010.
- Gebauer = Jan Gebauer, *Slovník Staročeský*, vol. I, v Praze: Unie, 1903.
- ГСБМ = *Гістарычны Словнік Беларускай Мовы*, vols. 1-20, Менск: Навука і Тэхніка [subsequently: Беларуская Навука], 1982-2002.
- Laurianu-Massimu = August Tr. Laurianu, Joan C. Massimu, *Glossariu care coprinde vorbele d'in limb'a romana straine prin originea sau form'a loru comu si celle de origine indouiosa*, Bucuresci: Noua Typographia a Laboratoriloru Romani, 1871.
- LLP = *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae. Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnskebo*, vols. 1-52, Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie Věd Praha, 1958-1992, Nakladatelství Akademie Věd České Republiky, 1995-1997.
- MhDW = Georg F. Benecke, Wilhelm K. Müller, Friedrich K. Zarncke, *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, Leipzig: Hirzel, 1854-1863, http://woerterbuchnetz.de/cgi-bin/WBNetz/wbgui_py?sigle=BMZ&mainmode [03.04.2019].
- Miklosich = Franc Miklosich, *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum. Emendatum Auctum*. Vindobonae: Braumueller, 1862-65.
- Scriban = August Scriban, *Dicționarul limbii românești*, Iași: Presa Bună, 1939.
- Șăineanu = Lazăr Șăineanu, *Dicționarul universal al limbei române*, Craiova: Scrisul Românesc, 1929 [1896].
- SEW = Erich Berneker, *Slavisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bde 1-2, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's, 1924.
- Skok = Petar Skok, *Etimološki Rječnik Hrvatskoga ili Srpskoga Jezika*, vols. I-III, Zagreb, JAZU, 1971-1973.
- Sophocles = Evangelinos A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, New York-Hildesheim: G. Olms Verlag, 1975 [1914].
- Срезневский = Измаил И. Срезневский, *Материалы для Словаря древне-русского языка по письменным памятникам*, Т. I-III, С.-Петербург: Типография Императорской Академии Наук, 1893-1912.
- ССУМ = *Словник Староукраїнської Мови XIV-XV ст.*, т. 1-2, Київ: Наукова Лумка, 1971-1978.
- Szarvas-Simonyi = Gábor Szarvas, Zsigmond Simonyi, *Lexicon Linguae Hungaricae Aevi Antiquioris*, vols. I-II, Budapest: Kladja Hornyánszky Viktor Akadémiai Könyvkereskedése, 1890-1911.
- Tiktin = Hariton Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, Bde 1-3, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Clusium, 2000-2005 [1895-1925].
- Urbańczyk = Stanisław Urbańczyk, *Słownik Staropolski*, vols. 1-11, Warszawa [subsequently Kraków]: Polska Akademia Nauk, 1953-2002.

C. Secondary Literature

- Alzati, Cesare, 1981, *Terra romena tra Oriente e Occidente. Chiese ed etnie nel tardo '500*, Milano: Jaca Book.
- Alzati, Cesare, 2010, “Tradizione culturale slava, appartenenza confessionale e identità culturale tra i Romeni transilvani nella seconda metà del '500”, in *Slavica Ambrosiana* 1, 181-193.

- Bainton, Roland H., 1952, *The Reformation of the 16th Century*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Binder, Pavel, 1971, "Începuturile Reformei din Transilvania și România din Hunedoara", in *Limba română* 20/ 3, 273-276.
- Binder, Pavel/ Huttman, Arnold, 1968, "Contribuții la biografia lui Filip Moldoveanu, primul tipograf român. Evoluția vieții culturale românești la Sibiu în epoca umanistă", in *Limba și literatură* 16, 145-174.
- Birnbaum, Henrik, 1973, "On Some Evidence of Jewish Life and Anti-Jewish Sentiments in Medieval Russia", in *Viator* 4, 225-255.
- Bodogae, Teodor, 1972, "Și totuși prima carte românească s-a tipărit la Sibiu. Considerații despre Evangheliarul slavo-român din 1551-1553", in *Mitropolia Ardealului* 17/ 1-2, 82-89.
- Bogdan, Ioan, 1891, "O Evanghelie slavonă cu traducere română din secolul al XVI-lea", in *Convorbiri literare* 25/ 1, 33-40.
- Cartoian, Nicolae, 1980 [1940-1945], *Istoria literaturii române vechi*, București: Editura Minerva.
- Dan, Mihail P., 1944, *Cebi, Slovaci și români în veacurile XIII-XVI*, Sibiu: Progresul.
- Deletant, Dennis, 1975, "A Survey of Rumanian Presses and Printing in the 16th Century", in *The Slavonic and East European Review* 53/ 131, 161-174.
- Demény, Lajos, 1971, "Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu – Prima tipăritură în limba română cunoscută pînă azi", in *SRT*, 22-98.
- Demény, Lajos, 1973, "Cartea și tiparul. Promotori ai legăturilor culturale dintre țările române în secolul al XVI-lea", in *Studii și materiale de istorie medie* 6, 91-109.
- Demény, Lajos, 1986, "Filigranele Evangheliarului slavo-român de la Sibiu", in Lajos Demény, Lidia A. Demény, *Carte, tipar și societate la Români în secolul al XVI-lea*, București: Editura Kriterion, 294-306.
- Demény, Lajos/ Simonescu, Dan, 1965, "Un capitol important din vechea cultură românească (*Tetraevanghelul*, Sibiu 1546)", in *Studii și cercetări de documentare și bibliologie*, Supl. la nr. 1, 1-18.
- De Michelis, Cesare, 1993, *La Valdesia di Novgorod*, Torino: Claudiana.
- Densusianu, Ovid, 1938, *Histoire de la Langue Roumaine*, vol. II, *Le seizième siècle*, Paris, Librairie Ernest Leroux.
- Фасмер, Макс Ю., 1906, "Нѣскольکو новыѣхъ трудовъ по лингвистикѣ", in *Византийский Временник* 13/ 2, 450-469.
- Florescu, Ioan-Florin, 2010, "Le *Tetraevangile* de Sibiu (1551-1553). Nouvelles informations sur les sources de la première traduction en roumain des Evangiles", in *Biblicum Jassyense. Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutics* 1, 48-89.
- Gheție, Ion, 1966, "Considerații filologice asupra Evangheliarului din Petersburg", in *Studii și cercetări de lingvistică* 17/ 1, 47-79.
- Gheție, Ion, 1974, *Textele rotacizante și originile scrisului literar românesc. Chestiuni de metodă*, in *Începuturile scrisului în limba română*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R., 44-97.
- Gheție, Ion, 1979, "Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu și textele românești cu litere latine și ortografie maghiară", in *Limba română* 28/ 2, 165-172.
- Gheție, Ion/ Mareș, Alexandru, 1985, *Originile scrisului în limba română*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 336-357.
- Giurescu, Constantin C., 1967, *Țînguri sau orașe și cetăți moldovene din secolul al X-lea pînă la mijlocul secolului al XVI-lea*, București: Editura Academiei R.S.R.

- Hervay, Ferenc, 1965, "L'imprimerie du maître Philippe de Nagyszeben et les premiers livres en langue roumaine", in *Magyar Könyvszemle* 81/ 2 sz., 119-127.
- Ionescu, Anca Irina, 1976, "Contribution à l'étude du lexique employé dans les traductions roumaines du «Synopsis de Kiev»", in *Revue roumaine de linguistique* 21/ 3, 401-408.
- Ionescu, Ion, 1994, "Doi termeni paleocreștini din epoca daco-română", in *Limba română* 43/ 1-2, 28-31.
- Jordan, Iorgu, 1963, *Toponimia românească*, București: Editura Academiei R.P.R.
- Jakó, Zsigmond, 1977, "Tiparul cu literele latine din Sibiu în secolul al XVI-lea", in *Philobiblon Transilvan*, București: Editura Kriterion, 93-116.
- Köpeczi 1992: Köpeczi, Béla, 1992, *Histoire de la Transylvanie*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Macûrek, Josef, 1927, "Husitství v rumunských zemích", in *Časopis Matice Moravské* 51, 1-98.
- Macûrek, Josef, 1968, "A influențat actul ceh de cancelarie documentele moldovenești în a doua jumătate a secolului al XV-lea?", in *Studii. Revistă de istorie* 21/ 1, 3-20.
- Mareș, Alexandru, 1967, "Observații cu privire la *Evangeliarul din Petersburg*", in *Limba română* 16/ 1, 65-75.
- Mareș, Alexandru, 1968, "Evangeliarul din Petersburg, tipărirea unei mai vechi traduceri moldovenești", in *Limba română* 17/ 1, 85-87.
- Mareș, Alexandru, 1990, "Cîteva observații asupra *Tetraevangelului* slavo-român de la Sibiu", in *Limba română* 39/ 3, 235-242.
- Mareș, Alexandru, 2005, "Originalele primelor traduceri românești ale *Tetraevangelului* și *Psaltirii*", in *Scrieri și cultură românească veche*, București: Editura Academiei, 259-281; in Ion Gheție (coord.), *Cele mai vechi texte românești. Contribuții filologice și lingvistice*, București: Universitatea din București, 1982, 183-205.
- Mârza, Eva, 1978, "Un fragment din *Evangeliarul* slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551-1553)", in *Limba română* 27/ 2, 173-175; in *Explorări bibliografice*, Sibiu: Techno-Media, 2008, 14-16.
- Mihăescu, Haralambie, 1967, *Influența grecească asupra limbii române pînă în secolul al XV-lea*, București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Mihăescu, Haralambie, 1993, *La Romanité dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*, Bucharest: Editura Academiei Române.
- Mihăilă, Gheorghe, 1972, "Textele bilingve slavo-române și unele aspecte ale studiului calcului lingvistic", in *Contribuții la istoria culturii și literaturii române vechi*, București: Editura Minerva, 231-249.
- Mihăilă, Gheorghe, 1981, "Primul manuscris românesc pre-coresian datat: Codicele Popii Bratul din Brașov (1559-1560) și sursele sale", in *Studii de lingvistică și filologie*, Timișoara: Facla, 59-114.
- Mitu, Mihai, 1963, "Termeni de origine polonă în documentele slavo-moldovenești. I. 1388-1517", in *Romanoslavica* 8, 155-224.
- Mollay, Karl, 1992, "Die deutsch-ungarischen Sprachkontakte", in Honti, László et al. (hrsgg.), *Finnisch-Ugrischen Sprachen zwischen dem germanischen und dem slavischen Sprachraum*, Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi, 111-116.
- Nestle, E., 1907, "The Gospels in the Latin Vulgate", in *The American Journal of Theology* 11/ 3, 501-502.

- Олтяну, Панделе, 1958, “Некоторые особенности славянского языка Трансильвании”, in *Romanoslavica* II, 77-114.
- Panaiteescu, Petre P., 1964, “Husitismul și cultura slavonă în Moldova”, in *Romanoslavica* X, 275-287.
- Panaiteescu, Petre P., 1965, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română*, București: Editura Academiei R.P.R.
- Paracostea, Șerban, 1958, “Moldova în epoca Reformei. Contribuție la istoria societății moldovenești în veacul al XVI-lea”, in *Studii. Revista de istorie* 11/ 4, 55-76.
- Petrovici, Emil, 1971, “Observații asupra grafiei și limbii textului românesc al Evangheliarului Slavo-Român de la Sibiu”, in *SRT*, 9-21.
- Popinceanu, Ion, 1964, *Religion, Glaube und Aberglaube in der Rumänischen Sprache*, Nürnberg: Hans Karl.
- Rocchi, Luciano, 1987, “Per una storia della terminologia cristiana ungherese”, in *Quaderni Patavini di linguistica* 6, 31-69.
- Rocchi, Luciano, 1990, *Latinismi e romanismi antichi nelle lingue slave meridionali*, Udine: Campanotto.
- Rosetti, Alexandru, 1958, “Cu privire la datarea primelor traduceri românești de cărți religioase”, in *Limba română* 7/ 2, 20-22.
- Sabău, Ioan, 1943, “O nouă listă a episcopilor catolici din Moldova”, in *Revista istorică* 29/ 7-9, 235-242.
- Skok, Petar, 1927, “La terminologie chrétienne en slave: l'église, les prêtres et les fidèles”, in *Revue des études slaves* 7/ 3, 177-198.
- Stabile, Giuseppe, 2019, “Rumanian *Slavia* as the Frontier of Orthodoxy. The Case of the Slavo-Rumanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu”, in *Studia Ceranea* 9, 59-87.
- Šmahel, František, 1993, *Husitská revoluce*, vol. 4, *Epilog bouřlivého věku*, Praha: Univerzita Karlova.
- Tasmowski, Liliane, 2009, “În ajunul unei ediții transliterate și electronice a Evangheliarului bilingv slavo-român de la Sibiu”, in Giampaolo Borghello *et al.* (eds.), *Per Teresa. Studi e ricerche in ricordo di Teresa Ferro*, vol. 2, *Obiettivo Romania*, Udine: Forum Editrice, 327-338.