Giuseppe Stabile (Napoli)

iD https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1427-9466

Rumanian Slavia as the Frontier of Orthodoxy
The Case of the Slavo-Rumanian
Tetraevangelion of Sibiu

In the *Tetraevangelion* also known as the *Slavo-Rumanian Evangeliarion of Sibiu*[1], the slow sunset of the Slavonism seems to face the dawn of the Rumanian literary tradition. Not only is it the earliest extant text in Slavonic and Rumanian languages, but it is also the earliest provided with parallel bilingual transcription, and the only version of the Gospels printed in such a form, at least in the 16th century[2].

Regardless whether it originally contained all four – or just three – Synoptic Gospels, only two fragments of the SRT are preserved today, both from the Gospel of Matthew:

1. the more extensive one (ff. 1[R]–117[V], Mt 3, 17 – 27, 55), in the *Saltykov-Ščedrin Library* in Saint Petersburg[3];

2. the shorter one (ff. 36[V]–37[R], Mt 12, 12–28), in the Orthodox Church of Oiejdea (Alba Iulia), where it was discovered in the 1970s[4].

---

[1] *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551–1553)*, ed. E. Petrovici, L. Demény, Bucureşti 1971 (cetera: SRT).

[2] Cf. G. Mihăilă, *Textele bilingve slavo-române şi unele aspecte ale studiului calcului lingvistic*, [in:] *Contribuţii la istoria culturii şi literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti 1972, p. 236–244, esp. 241. For a critical up-to-date overview on the SRT, cf. I. Gheţie, A. Mareş, *Originile scrisului In limba română*, Bucureşti 1985, p. 337–342; E. Pavel, *Textul evanghelic în cultura românească*, LR 66, 1, 2012, p. 30–31.

[3] Cf. L. Demény, *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu – Prima tipăritură în limba română cunoscută pînă azi*, [in:] SRT, p. 22–98.

[4] Cf. E. Mârza, *Un fragment din Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551–1553)*, LR 27, 2, 1978, p. 173–175 (= *Explorări bibliografice*, Sibiu 2008, p. 14–16).

Only a handful of fragments of the indirect tradition of the SRT were identified in *Codicele Bratul*[5], a Slavo-Rumanian intercalated miscellaneous text, which contains – among other texts – parts of the Acts of the Apostles and the Gospels, copied perhaps in Southern Transylvania and dated 1559–1560 by Pop Bratul, the copyist himself[6].

While the Slavonic text – late and "peripheral" – has been almost entirely overlooked by Slavists, the parallel Rumanian one used to arouse a certain interest among Rumanists, especially after it was discovered, about half a century ago, that it was the earliest preserved printed text (the *Catehism luteran de la Sibiu*, printed in 1544 and considered to be the earliest, has not survived)[7].

Actually, the SRT has to be considered as a bilingual text, an icastic metaphor for a multiple frontier – linguistic, but also chronological, geographic and cultural – by which our text is crossed and obviously defined.

Since it came out of the printing press in Sibiu between 1551 and 1552–1553, the SRT contains the earliest preserved Rumanian translation of the Gospels, made probably after 1526 (assuming the translation, as well as the printing of the SRT, was of Lutheran origin indeed). The SRT print followed shortly the appearance of the first writings in Rumanian vernacular and signed the beginning of the slow decline of Slavonism, a process which had to span more than one century. In fact, it was not before the 18th century that Rumanian became the official language of the Church, State, and written culture, replacing Church and chancery Slavonic.

The translation and the final edition of the Rumanian text took place, respectively, in Banat or Moldavia and Transylvania, that is on the frontier between the Orthodox East with its Byzantine-Slavic tradition, and the Catholic or Reformed Latin West.

In the mid-16th century, the majority of Rumanians formed still part of the so called *Slavia Orthodoxa*: Rumanian Orthodoxy was firmly based on the primacy of the Church Slavonic, which, while not implying any official ban on using vernacular as the language of worship or in the Scripture, did not encourage it

---

[5] Cf. *Codicele Bratul*, ed. A. Gafton, Iași 2003 (cetera: CB) (= http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/txt/text [26 IX 2016]).

[6] Gheție and Mareș observed the following correspondences in the fragments of Mt 26, between CB and SRT: vv. 7, 14–8, 20 and 24 – SRT ff. 105^r_{11-13}, 105^v_{16}–$106^r_{5,10-14}$, 106^v_{1-2}; CB ff. 440_{16-19}, 441_{1-20}. Cf. I. Gheție, Al. Mareș, *Originile scrisului…*, p. 336–357 and G. Mihăilă, *Primul manuscris românesc pre-coresian datat: Codicele Popii Bratul din Brașov (1559–1560) și sursele sale*, [in:] *Studii de lingvistică și filologie*, Timișoara 1981, p. 64–71.

[7] In 1965, access to the microfilm with the entire text and unprecedented flowering of paleographic and philological studies revolutionized the knowledge of the SRT, that had achieved little progress since 1891 (the printing had been dated back to 1580, assuming the 1579 Slavonic Tetraevangelion of Coresi as a *terminus a quo*). About the progress occurred in dating the SRT since the middle of the 1960s, cf. I. Gheție, [rec.:] *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu 1551–1553…* – SCL 23, 6, 1972, p. 664–670 (esp. p. 666–667).

either, rightly claiming that it contributed to the spread of heresies[8]. In this regard, the printing of the Slavo-Rumanian Tetraevangelion represented a formal compromise between the Lutheran proselytism, which almost certainly inspired the Rumanian translation, and the Slavonic tradition.

However, the same necessity for such a compromise indicates that a cultural boundary continued to exist between the two parallel texts of the SRT, and that the Rumanian text (or rather the biblical use of Rumanian vernacular) was still beyond it.

Bearing in mind that the contrast between the Latinity of language and the Slavicity of rite was just starting to emerge, the fact that, in the 16th century, a number of texts appeared featuring parallel or alternated Rumanian and Slavonic, may be explained in two ways:

1. Slavonic was less and less known and had to be translated not so much for the faithful, as for the uneducated Orthodox clergy (especially in Transylvania, where Orthodoxy was discriminated and consequently no stable Orthodox hierarchy existed at that time)[9];

2. at most, the Rumanian text could integrate the canonical one in Slavonic, although its use was not allowed in the liturgy[10].

As a consequence, the Church Slavonic was itself beyond a linguistic boundary, though it had, apart from its liturgical, sacral value, a kind of identitarian value: throughout the Middle Ages and later, the spiritual and linguistic communion (Slavonism) with the Orthodox Slavs were the principal, if not the unique mainstay of the Rumanian identity, especially in those frontier areas where Rumanian Orthodoxy was exposed to Catholic or Protestant proselytism[11]. Only thanks to the Union with Rome accepted by the majority of the Orthodox Church of Transylvania (1698–1700) and the consequent emergence of the "Latinist School", the Romanity by descent and the Latinity by language would play such a role[12].

---

[8] Significantly, still in 1698, the instructions of Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, to the Neo-Metropolitan of Transylvania, Athanasiu, indicated church Slavonic and Greek as the sacred languages to be used in the Orhtodox liturgy and in the comments on the Scripture, restricting the use of Rumanian to sermons – if addressed to Rumanians, and reading of the Gospels, but the latter only in the first 1688 official translation (the so called *Bible of Bucharest*). Cf. *Acte si fragmente latine romanesci pentru istori'a Beserecei romane mai alesu unite*, *edite si adnotate*, ed. T. Cipariu, Blasiu 1855, p. 243–244.

[9] Cf. C. Alzati, *Terra romena tra Oriente e Occidente. Chiese ed etnie nel tardo '500*, Milano 1981, p. 89–98, 99–105.

[10] Cf. G. Mihăilă, *Textele bilingve…*, p. 233–245, esp. 244.

[11] Cf. C. Alzati, *Terra romena…*, p. 89–90.

[12] Cf. L. Valmarin, *La latinità dei rumeni come arma politica dalla Scuola transilvana a oggi*, [in:] *La latinité hier*, *aujourd'hui*, *demain*, *Actes du Congrès international procurés par Georges et Ilinca*

The printing of the Tetraevangelion in Rumanian a few years after the Cat-
echism, was an unprecedented event, and yet the appearance of these two Church
books in vernacular was quite typical for the Lutheran proselytism.

There are no more than two translations inspired by Protestantism in the
Rumanian text of the SRT, concealing a radical condemnation of the Orthodox
ecclesiastical hierarchies, one of "Pharisee" with *duhovnic* 'confessor, spiritual
(priest)', the other of "high priest" with *mitropolit* 'metropolitan', *vlădică* and *pis-
cup* 'bishop'[13].

Needless to say, the SRT, already as a product of the Lutheran proselytism for
Rumanian of Orthodox faith, would cross a linguistical and cultural frontier with
the West of the Reformation and its local representatives, the Saxons, Hungarians,
but also reformed Slavs, of both Latin and Orthodox origins[14]. The latter, like the
Rumanians, are better known for their loyalty to Orthodoxy, loyalty which has
not prevented them from contributing to the activity of the Transylvanian Cyrillic
presses established by "Latins" (reformed Saxons or Hungarians)[15].

Filip Maler "the Moldavian", the printer and probably the editor of the SRT,
can also be seen as a "frontier-figure". A native of Moldavia or Banat, Filip was
almost certainly a Saxon, and as such he belonged to a community that shared
strong Latin traditions, in recent times converted to Hussitism and later to Luther-
anism[16].

Between 1521 and 1554, a *Magister* Philippus is mentioned in the *Konsularrech-
nungen* of Sibiu in the service of the city government as a typographer, engraver/

Barthouil-Ionesco, *Avignon – 10–13 mai 1978*, ed. G. Barthouil, I. Barthouil-Ionesco, Bucarest
1981, p. 403.

[13] Cf. I. Gheție, A. Mareş, *Originile scrisului…*, p. 342.

[14] They were a part of what I would call the little *Slavia transylvanica mixta*, community of Czechs
and Slovakians, but also Bulgarians, Serbians and Ruthenians, not to mention the Şchei. Between
the 15th and the 16th century, Rum. *Şcheau* designated Bulgarians from Transylvania (and perhaps
Rumanians coming from Bulgaria), mainly Orthodox, but among which the Lutheran and Catholic
propaganda seem to have found proselytes in a significant number, cf. F. Miklośich, *Die Sprache
der Bulgaren in Siebenbürgen*, Wien 1856, p. 2; Л. Милетич, *Дако-ромънитѣ и тѣхната славян-
ска писменость*, II, *Нови влахо-български грамоти отъ Брашовъ*, СНУНК 9, 1896, p. 9–17, 29.
About etymology and meaning of Rum. *Şcheau*, cf. also I. Hurdubețiu, *Originea Scheilor și răspîn-
direa lor pe teritoriul carpato-dunărean*, SAIst 14, 1969, p. 196–199, 202–204; about *Şcheau/Bulgar*
alternation in Transylvanian documents, A.M. Gherman, *Lexic românesc în documente transilvăne-
ne. Socotelile oraşelor Braşov şi Sibiu*, D [s.n.] 13, 1, 2008, p. 57.

[15] Hard to say, realistically, whether their contribution was motivated by a missionary spirit or by
profit. Cf. P. Atanasov, *L'imprimerie en Roumanie et les bulgares de Braşov au XVIe s. (La collabora-
tion culturelle bulgaro-roumaine au XVIe s.)*, EB 6, 1967, p. 123–139.

[16] Cf. I. Gheție, *Considerații filologice asupra Evangheliarului din Petersburg*, SCL 17, 1, 1966, p. 54,
61, 77; idem, *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu și textele românești cu litere latine și ortografie
maghiară*, LR 28, 2, 1979, p. 84; A. Mareş, *Observații cu privire la Evangheliarul din Petersburg*, LR
16, 1, 1967, p. 72 and idem, *Evangheliarul din Petersburg, tipărirea unei mai vechi traduceri moldove-
nești*, LR 17, 1, 1968, p. 86.

illustrator (*Moler*/*pictor*), scribe and translator of "Wallachian" (*scriba*/*interpres*), and a liaison and envoy to the Rumanian countries[17]. In 1544, the versatile typographer was commissioned by the Saxon authorities of Sibiu – recently converted to the Lutheran Reformation – to print the (now lost) *Rumanian Catechism* and in 1546 the *Slavonic Tetraevangelion*[18], whose colophon bears the signature **Филипъ Мо(л)довѣнинь**[19].

Considering his functions, it is highly probable that apart from German and possibly Latin, Filip knew Slavonic and Rumanian. He presumably knew the kind of Slavonic used in tribunals, legislation and chancery rather than the ecclesiastical one, while he had a practical knowledge of Rumanian, as a non-native speaker but grown up in constant relation with the Rumanophone communities.

Since as a non-Orthodox layman he did not have access to higher education in Slavonic, it was impossible for him to receive it in Rumanian: at the time, no literary tradition existed, much less biblical, in the vernacular, only recently and sporadically used in its written form (a handful of proto-translations of the Gospels we know would be seen as pioneering and isolated attempts).

Even if the title of *Magister*/*Meister* implied not the craft but higher education – as Hervay assumed[20] – it did not include *litteræ slavonicæ* or *rutenicales*: sons of Saxon nobility received Western Catholic or Protestant education, preferably in Cracow, Prague, Vienna or some German city[21].

The fact that Filip and his "bottega" (assistants) printed alongside the Tetraevangelion in Church Slavonic does not tell us which knowledge they had of this language: the Slavonic text of the SRT is a faithful reprint of the SST, which, in turn, was a faithful reprint of the Slavonic Tetraevangelion printed in Târgovişte by the Hieromonk Makarije of Montenegro in 1512 (Trg)[22]. Reprinting the SST had

---

[17] Cf. P. Binder, A. Huttmann, *Contribuţii la biografie lui Filip Moldoveanul, primul tipograf român. Evoluţia vieţii culturale româneşti la Sibiu în epoca umanistă*, LL 16, 1968, p. 150–156, 165, 170–174.

[18] *Tetraevanghel slavonesc*, Sibiu 1546, BAR II 630 838 (cetera: SST).

[19] Cf. N. Iorga, *Cinci comunicări la Academia Română, III, Tipărituri româneşti necunoscute*, RI 17, 1–3, 1931, p. 9–10; L. Demény, *Evangheliarul slavo-român…*, p. 81–88; *contra* P.P. Panaitescu, *Les origines de l'imprimerie en langue roumaine*, RESEE 6, 1, 1968, p. 26.

[20] Cf. F. Hervay, *L'imprimerie du maître Philippe de Nagyszeben et les premiers livres en langue roumaine*, MK 81, 2, 1965, p. 124–125.

[21] Cf. Ş. Papacostea, *Moldova în epoca Reformei. Contribuţie la istoria societăţii moldoveneşti în veacul al XVI-lea*, SRI 11, 4, 1958, p. 61 and R. Manolescu, *Cultura orăşenească în Moldova în a doua jumătate a secolului al XV-lea*, [in:] *Cultura moldovenească în timpul lui Ştefan cel Mare*, ed. M. Berza, Bucureşti 1964, p. 79–81.

[22] Cf. *Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der 1te kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck. Faksimile-Ausgabe*, ed. H. Miklas et al., Padeborn–München–Wien–Zürich 1999 (cetera: Trg). The first allusion to typographical analogies between the SRT and the Trg can be found in P. Sîrku (cf. [rec.] *Psaltirea publicată la 1577 de Diaconul Coresi, Reprodusă cu un studiu şi glosar comparativ la B. Petriceicu-Haşdeu* – ЖМНП 228, 1883, p. 393). The discovery that, except for sporadic omissions and spelling differences, the Trg, the SST and the SRT contain the same text can be attributed to Emil Petrovici *apud* L. Demény, *O tipăritură slavo-română precoresiană*, SRI 18, 5, 1965, p. 1031.

the obvious advantage of reduced time and costs, not to mention that no particular knowledge of Slavonic was required. Moreover, the text was the first printed Slavonic Tetraevangelion and, if that was not enough to make it more authoritative, it contained a *poslědoslovie* by Voivode Neagoe Basarab who made it *de facto* an "official" edition[23].

Crossing the Carpathians, however, the Trg seems to have undergone some significant adjustments to the Lutheran milieu in the paratext.

In the *prědislovie* to the Gospel of John, written by Theophylact of Ohrid, two sentences were omitted that the Sibian editor apparently considered to be too openly at odds with Luther's Reformation:

1. [иже дха сила въ немощи съвръшаетъ са· ıако же и писано е̂ и вѣроуемь·] въ немощиже не тѣлеси тъчïѧ, нѫ оубо и слова и прѣмѫдрости на ѧзыцѣ лежѫщєе (Trg, f. 213$^v_{5-8}$; cf. SST[4], p. 25)

[ἡ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται, καθὰ γέγραπται καὶ πιστεύομεν·] ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ δὲ οὐ σώματος μόνον, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ λόγου, καὶ σοφίας ἐν γλώττῃ κειμένης (*PG*, vol. CXXIII, col. 1133)

2. нѣцïи рѣша ıако молиша его православнïи написати тѣмь о горнемь рожєнïи· ıакоже ıавлъшемь са нѣкыимь еретикѡⷨ въ дньехь ѡнѣхь· прѣдажѫщïй чⷧка простабыти Гⷭа (Trg, ff. 214$^R_{19}$–214$^v_1$; cf. SST[4], p. 26)

δέ τινές φασι, καὶ ἠξίωσαν αὐτὸν οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι συγγράψαι περὶ τῆς ἄνω γεννήσεω; οἷα ἀναφανέντων τινῶν αἱρετικῶν ἐν ταῖ; ἡμέραις, ἐκείναις τῶν δγματιζόντων ἄνθρωπον φιλὸν ὑπάρξαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν (*PG*, vol. CXXIII, col. 1135)[24].

In the first one – as far as we know, this omission has never been noticed so far – Theophylact commented on 2 Cor 12, 9 explaining that, as Paul points out, if the power of the Holy Spirit is fully manifested in its «weakness», this should be referred not to the flesh but to the word and the knowledge, which John, a man

---

Cf. L. Demény, D. Simonescu, *Un capitol important din vechea cultură românească (Tetraevanghelul, Sibiu 1546)*, SCDB 1, Supl., 1965, p. 11 and A. Mareş, *Precizări cu privire la traducerea Tetraevanghelului lui Coresi*, SCL 18, 6, 1967, p. 664–665.

[23] Cf. Trg, ff. 290$^R_{13}$–290$^v_3$: и азь въ хⷵа бⷵа блⷢговѣрнïи и бⷢмь хранимïи и самодръжавни господарь Iѡ басараба великыи воевода· и гⷵпднь въсеи земли оугровлахïскои и подоунавïю… възревновахь поспѣшенïемь стⷢго дха и любовïю еже къ бж̑тⷵвнимь и стⷵимь цⷬквамь, написахь сïѫ дше спⷵнѫѧ книгѫ четвороблⷢговѣстïе…

[24] The preface of Theopylact was reproduced, without any omission, not only by Makarije, but also by Coresi and Tudor in Braşov, in 1562, and by Lavrentie in Plumbuita, in 1575 ca. Cf. *Tetraevanghel slavonesc lui Coresi* (Braşov 1562), BAR III 234 272 (cetera: CST), ff. 159$^R_{14-19}$, 159$^v_{1-6}$ and *Tetraevanghel slavonesc lui Lavrentie* or *de la Plumbuita* (1575 ca.), BCU-Cluj BRV 34 (cetera: PST), ff. 149$^v_{12-14}$, 150$^R_{20-25}$.

of humble origins, was lacking. The overzealous Sibian editor may have thought that Theophylact's comment clashed with Luther's doctrine, according to which God's Word (the Gospel) is the supreme symbol and testimony of the Revelation, the only nurturing of the faith (and in the faith, *der Glaube aber ist es*, *wenn er gleich klein und schwach ist*, God reveals Himself in all His power and greatness)[25].

In the second sentence – pointed out by Demény in 1965[26] – the Evangelist was described as a defender of Orthodoxy against heresy (according to Theophylact, at the request of some Orthodox Christians, John meant to confute an heresy that denied the eternal conception of the Christ by attributing Him a solely human nature). In fact, the sentence was omitted together with an entire fragment of the text in which Theophylact referred to the same heresy (Trg, ff. 214^{r}_1–214^{v}_{11}), then replaced by a part of *prědislovie* to the Gospel of Mark, where, in the form of a prophetic vision (cf. Apoc 4, 7 and Ezk 10, 14), Theophylact symbolically described the Four Evangelists (Trg, ff. 83^{v}_{11}–84^{r}_6).

As for the possible Lutheran origin of such omissions, it should be also noticed that they all concern the Gospel of John and the Epistles of Paul, that Luther famously put first in the context of the New Testament[27].

In summary, it can be said with reasonable certainty that the Trg, an *editio princeps* of the Slavonic Tetraevangelion reprinted in the left-hand column of the SRT:

1. is different from the text printed in the CST and the PST[28], but on par with all other sacred texts printed by Makarije in Wallachia,

2. is a clear example of the Middle Bulgarian redaction and Euthymian orthography, with occasional Serbian redactional features[29], and

---

[25] Cf. M. Luther, *Predigt am vierten Sonntage nach Epiphanias*, [in:] *Hauspostille*, vol. II, ed. J.G. Plochmann, Erlangen 1826, p. 47. Cf. also R.H. Bainton, *The Reformation of the 16ᵗʰ Century*, Boston 1952, p. 44–45 (esp. 45: *For him* [Luther] *the ultimate authority was the word of God, by which he meant the self-disclosure of God through the incarnation, the crucifixion, and the resurrection of Christ. This revelation was not restricted in time to the historical life of Jesus, because Christ is eternal and ever at work in the hearts of men, but the supreme manifestation was in flesh. The Bible is the record of this stupendous event*).

[26] Cf. L. Demény, D. Simonescu, *Un capitol important…*, p. 11 and L. Demény, *Evangheliarul slavoromân…*, p. 90.

[27] Cf. R.H. Bainton, *The Reformation…*, p. 45.

[28] Cf. A. Mareş, *Originalele primelor traduceri româneşti ale Tetraevanghelului şi Psaltirii*, [in:] *Scriere şi Cultură Românească Veche*, Bucureşti 2005, p. 261–263 (= *Cele mai vechi texte româneşti. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*, ed. I. Gheţie, Bucureşti 1982, p. 185–187).

[29] P.P. Panaitescu talks about a text "cu foarte rare sîrbisme" [with extremely rare Serbianisms]. Cf. *Liturghierul lui Macarie (1508) şi începuturile tipografiei în ţările române*, [in:] *Contribuţii la istoria culturii româneşti*, Bucureşti 1971, p. 304 (the most recent contributions to the topic are substantially concordant: F. Miklas, *Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512*

3. documents a rather established version of the *Athonite* Slavonic text, dated between the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century (Voskresen-sky's "fourth redaction" of the Slavonic Tetraevangelion), the most faithful to the textual Byzantine tradition, although Nemirovsky discovered in it some original "Wallachian" variants and, for the first time, some Eastern-Slavonic ones, claiming that Makarije should have been *familiar with the Eastern-Slavonic manuscript tradition* (especially the liturgical rubrics of the manuscript source would have been edited, according to Miklas, *von einem nicht-Bulgaren*)[30].

The SST and the SRT also inherited from the Trg the typographic dress, which, in the form of the semi-uncial type and ornamentation, cannot be seen in the Serbian editions of Venetian school but in the Moldavian manuscripts of Bulgar-ian school. Therefore the two Transylvanian Tetraevangelia attest the beginning of an original and partially "native" typographic tradition (note that the Walla-chian manuscripts had been influenced by the Moldo-Bulgarian tradition before the printed books)[31]. It should be reminded, in this regard, that the style of the Moldavian *scriptoria* also influenced the production of Schweipolt Fiol's ephem-eral typography – the first Cyrillic – who was active in Cracow between 1481 and 1492–1493, and which must have come into contact with Moldavia and Tran-sylvania[32].

As an engraver and illuminator of Moldavian descent, Filip developed the characters of the Cyrillic typography of Sibiu partially imitating the ones used by Makarije and possibly being inspired by a direct knowledge of the manuscripts copied in the Moldavian *scriptoria*[33].

Since the paratexts remain the unique *trait d'union* between the Trg and the books already printed by Makarije in Cetinje – as well as the main confirmation

(Einleitung: Sprache), [in:] Trg, p. XIX; Е.Л. Немировский, *Начало книгопечатния в Валахии*, Москва 2008, p. 546–548).

[30] Cf. Д. Иванова, *Търговищкото печатно Евангелие (1512 г.) и старите славянски преводи на Евангелието (с оглед на текстологичната традиция)*, [in:] *Българистични проучвания*, vol. I, Велико Търново 1996, p. 46–57; *Das Tetraevangelium…*, p. XIX, XXXV–XLI; Е.Л. Немировский, *Начало…*, p. 523–524; A. Alberti, *Gli scriptoria moldavi e la tradizione medio-bulgara. Il caso del Vangelo di Elisavetgrad*, [in:] *Linee di confine. Separazione e processi di integrazione nello spazio cultu-rale slavo*, ed. G. Moracci, A. Alberti, Firenze 2013, p. 34, 50.

[31] Cf. L. Demény, *Cartea şi tiparul. Promotori ai legăturilor culturale dintre ţările române în secolul al XVI-lea*, SMIM 6, 1973, p. 92–94; D. Deletant, *A Survey of Rumanian Presses and Printing in the 16th Century*, SEER 53, 131, 1975, p. 162–163.

[32] Cf. L. Demény, *L'imprimerie cyrillique de Macarios de Valaquie*, RRH 7, 3, 1969, p. 557.

[33] Cf. F. Hervay, *L'imprimerie du maître Philippe…*, p. 121, 125–126; L. Demény, *Typographische Kennzeichen der kyrillischen Druckerpresse in Hermannstadt im 16. Jahrhundert*, FVL 19, 1, 1969, p. 29–36; idem, *Evangheliarul slavo-român…*, p. 85–87; E. Turdeanu, *L'activité littéraire en Molda-vie à l'époque de Etiènne le Grand (1457–1504)*, [in:] *Etudes de littérature roumaine et d'écrits slaves et grecs des Principautés roumaines*, Leiden 1985, p. 113–161 (= RER 5/6, 1960, p. 21–66).

that the Montenegrin and the Wallachian Makarije are the same person[34] – the SST colophon itself introduces a new and probably relevant element: Filip dated this printing both in the Latin way, from the Incarnation (ѿмѕ. = 1546), and in the Byzantine way, from the Creation (зн҃д. = 7054), but most of all, he added the Dominical letter (недѣлное слово г҃ = 3), even rarer in the Rumanian editions of the 16th century and clearly Latin too[35].

The presence of two Latin chronological elements among other Byzantine ones is a reflection of the frontier milieu, a Latin-Orthodox blend, where the SST was printed and where Filip "the Moldavian" was educated and/or learned the art of printing. Assuming that Filip was a layman of Lutheran faith, his apprenticeship had to be made rather in a German typography than in an Orthodox monastery, perhaps even in Hermannstadt-Sibiu, where, between 1528 and 1530, the first typography with Latin script in Transylvania had been functioning[36]. From Moldavia, the children of middle-class merchants and artisans – mostly non-native (German, Hungarian, Polish or Czech) – were sent to Transylvania or to their motherland, in order to receive better education or to learn or hone their skills[37].

Furthermore, between the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th there was no documented typographic activity, neither in Moldavia nor in the nearby Maramureş[38], despite a manuscript production, still flourishing and evolving at the time (cf. the *boierească* [noble] edition of the Slavonic Tetravengelion, which appeared in Moldavia at the beginning of the 16th century, less expensive and luxurious than the *domnească* [voivodal, lordly] one)[39].

What remains unknown, however, is in particular the source from where Filip derived the *Littera Dominicalis* for the colophon of his SST, since it cannot be attributed to any of the typographical models most likely to have inspired him (including the Serbian-Venetian)[40].

---

[34] Cf. P. Atanasov, *L'imprimerie en Roumanie…*, p. 124–125; P.P. Panaitescu, *Liturghierul lui Macarie…*, p. 316–319.

[35] Cf. D.P. Bogdan, *Contribuţiuni la bibliografia românească veche. Tipărituri dintre anii 1546–1762 necunoscute la noi*, Bucureşti 1938, p. 6. (Already conclusive about the identification of the "two Makarijes" was Demény in *L'imprimerie cyrillique de Macarios…*, p. 550–551, 560–561).

[36] Cf. F. Hervay, *L'imprimerie du maître Philippe…*, p. 122 and Z. Jakó, *Szeben latin betűs könyvnyomtatása a XVI. században*, [in:] *Írás köniv értelmiség*, Bukarest 1976, p. 180–183.

[37] Cf. R. Manolescu, *Cultura orăşenească în Moldova…*, p. 49–56.

[38] Cf. L. Demény, *Cartea şi tiparul…*, p. 104.

[39] Cf. M. Székely, I. Biliarsky, *Tetraevanghelul Ieromonahului Macarie din Putna (1529)*, Apu 2, 2013, p. 60.

[40] There is no trace of *nedelnoe slovo* neither in the *colophon* used by Makarije in Cetinje and Tîrgovişte (1494–1495 and 1508–1512), nor in those used by Schweipolt Fiol in Cracow (1491–1493), Theodor Ljubavić in Goražde (1519–1523) and Božidar Vuković in Venice (1519–1521, 1536–1539), cf. Е.Л. Немировский, *Славянские издания кирилловского (церковнославянского) шрифта: 1491–2000. Инвеантарь сохранившихся экземпляров и указатель литературы*, vol. I, *(1491–1550)*, Москва 2009, p. 101, 115–116; *Liturghier slavonesc lui Macarie* (Târgovişte 1508) – BAR II 170567,

As a result, at least two other hypotheses should be taken in consideration:

1. Filip could have been influenced by Latin manuscript practice, which he prob-
ably knew in a country of Latin traditions, maybe in Transylvania, Moldavia
and/or Wallachia[41];

2. the Trg is not the real antigraph of the SST or at least not the only one; in other
words, the apograph derives from another, similar but not identical manuscript
or it is the fruit of a collation with another manuscript, bearer of a Latin influ-
ence (in Transylvania and Moldavia, Catholic, Hussite and Lutheran versions
of the Holy Scriptures were virtually accessible at the time)[42].

Further indications that Filip Maler's education was at least partially western
can be found in his illustrations with anthropomorphic figures of the SST, rarely
found in the Rumanian and Slavic codicological panorama still after the 16th cen-
tury[43]. The style of Filip's engravings – so different from the Byzantine colourful min-
iatures in the Tetraevangelion of Elisavetgrad and Ivan Alexander – seems to betray
the eclecticism of a Latin illustrator, as a Saxon could be[44]. An analogous style can
be found, in fact, in the woodcuts of the *Octoechos* printed in Cracow (1491) by
the German-born Schweipolt Fiol and in the *Pentecostal Triduum* printed by the
Deacon Coresi in Târgoviște (1558), believed to have been illustrated by a Saxon
and/or inspired by Fiol's work[45]. According to Mareș, Filip could have reproduced
his engravings from a printed text of western origin, namely Serbian-Venetian[46].

---

p. 258; *Octoih slavonesc lui Macarie* (Târgoviște 1510) – BAR II 630846, p. 63; И.П. Каратаев, *Опи-
сание славяно-русских книг, напечатанных кирилловскими буквами*, СОРЯС 34, 2, 1883, p. 5,
7, 17–18, 20, 79–80, 87, 94).

[41] Cf. R. Manolescu, *L'écriture latine en Valachie et en Moldavie au Moyen Âge*, RRH 25, 1–2, 1986,
p. 59–68.

[42] Cf. I.-F. Florescu, *Le Tetraévangile de Sibiu (1551–1553). Nouvelles informations sur les sources de
la premičre traduction en roumain des Evangiles*, BJas 1, 2010, p. 40–41, 43.

[43] Cf. L. Demény, *Evangheliarul slavo-român…*, p. 84–85.

[44] The Church Slavonic Tetraevangelion of Elizavetgrad (end of 16th century?), Moldavian, repro-
duces decorative and iconographic apparatus of the Trnovian Ivan Aleksander's Tetraevangelion
(1356), considered in its turn "an *unicum*". In Stephen the Great's Moldavia (1433–1504), however,
the Byzantine-Bulgarian manner of illustrating the Gospels' episodes spread beyond the *scriptoria*,
being itself exposed to other influences. Cf. E. Dragnev, *O capodoperă a miniaturii din Moldova
medievală. Tetraevanghelul de la Elizavetgrad ți manuscrisele grupului Parisinus Græcus 74*, Chișinău
2004, p. 169–180; A. Alberti, *Gli scriptoria moldavi…*, p. 24–25; E. Moussakova, *The Illustra-
ted Slavonic Miscellanies of Damascenes Studite's Thesauros – A New Context for Gospel Illustrations
in the 17th century*, [in:] *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art: Crossing Borders, Exploring Boundaries.
Art Readings. Thematic Peer-reviewed Annual in Art Studies*, vol. I, *Old Art*, ed. E. Mutafov, I. Toth,
София 2017, p. 325–326, 339–340.

[45] Cf. A. Sokolyszyn, *Sweipolt Fiol: The First Slavic Printer of Cyrillic Characters*, ASEER 18, 1, 1959,
p. 90 and V. Molin, *Ilustrația în vechea carte bisericească*, BOR 78, 7–8, 1960, p. 705.

[46] Cf. A. Mareș, [rec.] Demény L., L.A. Demény, *Carte, tipar și societate la Români în secolul al
XVI-lea…*, LR 27, 5, 1988, p. 479–481 (but cf. also Д. Медаковић, *Графика српских штампаних
књига XV–XVII века*, Београд 1958, p. 119).

As a Saxon, Lutheran, and layman, Filip was an exception in the Rumanian typographic panorama of the 16th century, populated mainly by Orthodox clergymen, supposedly consisting – at least in Sibiu and Braşov – of deacons and popes from Şcheii and Răşinari. In Braşov-Kronstadt, Coresi's assistants were local members of the clergy, Şchei or "Wallachian", often employed by the *Stadt-Notar* as *Walachischer Schreiber* or *Stadt-Loguffet*, position rarely held by Saxons or Latins (in Sibiu, Filip and Ioachim Maler – presumably father and son – seem to have been the only Saxons holding it, Filip being perhaps the only one who combined it with that of *Stadt-Typograph*)[47]. Another layman, albeit of Orthodox Serbian origin, was the *Logofet* Dimitrije Ljubavić, son of Đurađ and grandson of Božidar. Dimitrije's typography – active in Târgovişte between 1544 and 1547 – employed *Jerođiakon* Moysi Dečanski[48] and at least two Şchei or Rumanian apprentices, Oprea and Petru, from Şchei (perhaps members of the local Orthodox clergy, instructed at the church school of Sf. Nicolae)[49].

Hieromonk Makarije was also helped by priests – Serbian in Cetinje and, more likely, Şchei in Târgovişte – in an Orthodox milieu (Makarije himself and his assistants would have been Şchei, but educated in a German milieu, perhaps in Cracow, according to Atanasov)[50].

Filip Maler's assistants remain anonymous, and yet had they been Orthodox priests, their names would have been presumably mentioned in the colophon of the SST to increase the authority of the Sibian Tetreavangelion, as a guarantee of its Orthodoxy.

Neither in Moldavia, nor much less in Banat and Transylvania – where the "schismatic" Church was still discriminated – the Lutheran Reformation had reason to encourage its proper faithful to learn Slavonic, if not for practical or contingent purposes (affecting individual Lutherans and/or their communities, never the Reformed Church as a whole)[51]. With this in mind, it is hard to believe that

---

[47] P. Binder, A. Huttmann, *Contribuţii…*, p. 146–149; idem, *Între istorie şi filologie*, I. *Mediul cultural românesc al Braşovului în epoca coresiană*, LR 20, 1, 1971, p. 10–11, 14.

[48] Moysi was native of Budlja; as an assistant of Vuković, Karataev wrongly attributed to him Moldavian origins, the error was amended by Simonescu. Cf. И.П. Каратаев, *Описание славяно-русских книг…*, p. 89; J. Badalić, *Jugoslavica usque ad annum 1600. Bibliographie der südslavischen Frühdrucke*, Aureliae Aquensis 1959, p. 47 (D. Simonescu, *Un Octoih al lui Bojidar Vucovici la noi şi legăturile acestuia cu tipografia românească*, RIR 3, 2/3, 1933, p. 229).

[49] Cf. P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile şi biruinţa scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti 1965, p. 137, 169; P. Atanasov, *L'imprimerie en Roumanie…*, p. 127.

[50] Cf. P. Atanasov, *L'imprimerie en Roumanie…*, p. 125.

[51] Not even among the Latins converted to the Bohemian Reformation the knowledge of the Slavonic language was more than exceptional: the Hussites of Transylvania, Maramureş and Moldavia always used vernacular – Czech, Saxon, Hungarian and perhaps Rumanian – for preaching and cult. Only locally they went far enough to vulgarize single parts of Holy Scriptures and Church books. Cf. J. Macůrek, *Husitství v rumunských zemích*, ČMM 51, 1927, p. 3, 40, 56–58, 77; *Istoria Romîniei*, vol. I, ed. A. Oţetea, M. Berza et al., Bucureşti 1962, p. 702. It does not make the contacts between single Hussites and Orthodoxy less likely, especially in Moldavia and Maramureş (Veress noticed that

the printing of the sacred books in Church Slavonic could have had, for the Lutheran editors of Sibiu, other purposes beyond the commercial ones.

Our current knowledge on the SRT texts describes an environment in which the contribution of Orthodox clergymen was seemingly marginal, to say the least:

1. the Slavonic text is, until proven otherwise, a reprint of the Trg (the edition of the sacred texts in Slavonic at the typography of Sibiu was limited to two faithful reprints of the same text);

2. translation errors present in the Rumanian text reveal that both its translators and final redactors had a flawed understanding of the Slavonic and Rumanian language (it may be presumed that the Sibian typography remained a Latin one converted to Cyrillic to operate in a Rumanian-Orthodox context)[52].

By contrast, there is little doubt that the Rumanian text of the SRT was translated and printed primarily for missionary purposes (notwithstanding the possibility of a final review that would make it better accepted by the Orthodox authorities of the Principalities). The scant circulation of the books printed in Rumanian at Sibiu – relatable to what's left of them today – shows the difference between its reception beyond the Carpathians[53]. Apart from the original sin of being issued by "the Heresy Press", the same flaws of the Rumanian redaction (first of all the Saxon inflection) could have had in this a significant role.

The Rumanian text of the SRT remains the principal source of information not only about Filip Maler and his assistants but also about the border environment in which it was edited and printed. From the archaic and lively Rumanian emerges a clear predominance of the Banat-Hunedorean and Moldavian features over the South-Eastern Transylvanian (i.e. Sibian) and Muntenian ones (Gheție talked about two strata of language, the one Banatean and the other Moldavian)[54].

The unique colouring in the panorama of the first Rumanian translations of the Bible comes from alloglot inflexions – Saxon, Hungarian and Ruthenian – which

---

Németi György, a Hungarian of perhaps Saxon origins, copying the *Huszita Biblia* in Trotuş [1466], abbreviated the *nomina sacra* in the Slavonic-Byzantine and not in the Latin form [e.g.: Is *vs.* Ihs], cf. E. Veress, *Bibliografia Română-Ungară*, vol. III, *Românii în literatura ungară şi Ungurii în literatura română (1839-1878)*, Bucureşti 1935, p. 18).

[52] On both issues, cf. also I.-F. Florescu, *Le Tetraévangile de Sibiu*…, p. 45–47.

[53] It is also true that at least in one case the Rumanian Catechism – presumably the "most Lutheran text" printed in Sibiu – was even requested by a voivode of Wallachia (in 1556, the documents of Braşov register the payment of 12 aspra ½ *pro Catechismo valachico Matheo ferenti a Cibinio*…, recipient Pătraşcu cel Bun [1545–1557]). Cf. P. Binder, A. Huttmann, *Contribuţii*…, p. 165–166.

[54] Cf. I. Gheţie, *Baza dialectală a rômânei literare*, Bucureşti 1975, p. 219–221.

place the Rumanian text of the SRT on the frontier between East and West (certainly Saxon are considered the confusion between articulated and unarticulated forms, the unvoicing of consonants and the epenthetic diphthongs)[55]. Banatisms would apparently derive from the translation, while Moldavisms and Transylvanisms form the redaction for printing, as are the Saxonisms and other alloglotisms, which, however, might derive from both translation and redaction[56]. The translation made in Banat-Hunedoara, or by someone who presumably was from there, would have been collated with Luther's German text and assembled for printing by some Saxons from Moldavia, in the mixed milieu of Sibiu[57].

It has been observed[58] that only if the revisor and/or printer of the Rumanian text of the SRT was a Saxon or a non-native, one could explain:

1. the presence of alloglot features in the orthography, not in the syntax, of the Rumanian text and

2. the fact that the final revisor didn't amend words which he should have been presumably able to identify as atypical or wrong in case he was a mother-tongue Rumanophone.

By choice or necessity, the Lutheran authorities of Sibiu would have entrusted their official translator for the "Wallachian" language with the final revision of the text, despite his Saxon origins and probably the lack of solid priestly background.

In fact, such a peculiar presence of alloglotisms in the text printed at Sibiu suggests that the Lutheran revision was inspired by typographical and/or editorial requirements, mostly already reported by the critics, such as e.g.:

1. transliterating in the Cyrillic script and Rumanian spelling a text originally edited in the Latin script[59] and Hungarian spelling[60], without being – in all likelihood – neither Rumanian nor Hungarian;

---

[55] Cf. A. Mareş, *Evangheliarul din Petersburg…*, p. 86; E. Petrovici, *Observaţii asupra grafiei şi limbii textului românesc al Evangheliarului Slavo-Român de la Sibiu*, [in:] SRT, p. 19 and T. Bodogae, *Şi totuşi prima carte romanească s-a tipărit la Sibiu. Consideraţii despre Evangheliarul slavo-român din 1551–1553*, MArd 17, 1–2, 1972, p. 86. For a more extended list of the alloglotisms containted in the SRT, cf. I. Gheţie, *Consideraţii filologice…*, p. 54, 56, 61–64.

[56] Cf. A. Mareş, *Originalele…*, p. 266.

[57] Cf. I. Gheţie, A. Mareş, *Originile scrisului…*, p. 341.

[58] Cf. A. Mareş, *Observaţii…*, p. 73.

[59] Cf. E. Petrovici, *Observaţii…*, p. 18.

[60] Cf. I. Gheţie, [rec.:] *Evangheliarul…*, p. 84.

2. reorienting a text edited in the Latin milieu toward an Orthodox-Slavonic milieu, that is a Rumanian proto-translation, bearing "Latin" influences (ascribable maybe to Carpatho-Danubian outcomes of the Hussite Reform)[61];

3. assembling a fragmentary and/or incomplete text, perhaps a translation made in haste by different translators, including Rumanians and Saxons (the hypothesis may be compatible with an *ad hoc* translation made for a bilingual edition, just before the printing)[62];

4. collating and harmonizing the original Rumanian translation with Luther's German one and to the parallel Slavonic text (respectively real and fictitious model of the Rumanian text)[63].

The collation with Luther's New Testament – irregular and inaccurate[64] – explains the prominent role of Saxons, at most bilingual, in the editing of the Rumanian text, printed by Filip Maler. One would expect that such a revision had the most sensitive part of the religious vocabulary as its main objective (cf. the heretic translation of "High Priest"), without requiring a perfect knowledge of Rumanian or Slavonic.

There is no doubt that the contribution of a Saxon German-Rumanophone represented the unique alternative to a complex collaboration between Saxons and Rumanians, ignorant of their respective languages (the final result suggests that the second possibility was rejected due to time constraints).

On the other hand, the unfavourable conditions in which Luther's Reformation had to take root – already around 1525–1530 – among Catholic and Orthodox "Wallachians" of the Banat-Hunedoara, suggest that the original translation could have been executed by a "Wallachian", not even a reformed one, maybe, knowing Slavonic but not German, who necessarily didn't base his work on the *Septembertestament* (it's slightly doubtful that his Lutheran commissioners had the integral text of Luther's New Testament)[65]. Under the same, unfavourable,

---

[61] Florescu talks about "un prototype roumain", translated, without doubts, from Church Slavonic [qui] *présentait des concordances textuelles avec les traductions tchèques (notamment 'Bible Olomoucká') et allemandes du XVᵉ siècle.* Cf. I.-F. Florescu, *Le Tetraévangile de Sibiu…*, p. 70–83.

[62] Cf. A. Mareş, *Originalele…*, p. 266; L. Tasmowski, *În ajunul unei ediţii transliterate şi electronice a Evangheliarului bilingv slavo-român de la Sibiu,* [in:] *Per Teresa. Studi e ricerche in ricordo di Teresa Ferro,* vol. II, *Obiettivo Romania,* ed. G. Borghello et al., Udine 2009, p. 334.

[63] Cf. A. Mareş, *Originalele…*, p. 267.

[64] Cf. *Ibidem,* p. 263–265; L. Tasmowski, *În ajunul unei ediţii…*, p. 332–335 and I.-F. Florescu, *Le Tetraévangile de Sibiu…*, p. 47–50.

[65] Cf. P. Binder, *Începuturile Reformei din Transilvania şi Românii din Hunedoara,* LR 20, 3, 1971, p. 273–275; I. Gheţie, *Textele rotacizante şi originile scrisului literar românesc. Chestiuni de metodă,* [in:] *Începuturile scrisului în limba română,* Bucureşti 1974, p. 22–24, 170–171.

conditions the Lutheran Reformation reached Moldavia, where, at that time, «quidam doctor» is said to have translated the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles into Rumanian, bringing his translation directly to Wittenberg (he presumably wanted it to be printed and approved by the supreme Protestant authorities)[66].

The *communis opinio* is that the Rumanian SRT text was translated from Church Slavonic, precisely from the parallel Slavonic text, that is from the Trg via the SST[67]. It cannot be excluded, however, that the translation is not based on the Trg, but on a related text, as for instance its main antigraph, which remains unknown. In that regard, the Trg presents difficulties being *not a simple copy that reproduces the antique manuscripts word by word, but a text in which a significant contribution of its editor (and also the translator) may be noticed*[68].

It has been observed[69] that two untranslated Slavonisms contained in the Rumanian text of the SRT – although the Trg is of Middle Bulgarian redaction – display the acc. -оу/ю of the m. sg. with -*a*-/-*ja*- stem, as is typical of Serbian, Russian and Lithuano-Ruthenian redactions. This redactional feature, though so sporadic, is limited to frozen forms: an apophthegm (38^R_5: сатана сатаноу скоте = сатана сатаноу изгонить [Satan cast out Satan], cf. Mt 12, 26) and a Hebrew toponym difficult to pronounce (77^v_6: Виѳафагыю = Виѳсфагїѫ, [Bethphage], cf. Mt 21, 1). Furthermore, none of the two examples of -оу/ю for -ѫ/іѫ can be found in Trg, only one (сатаноу) in SST (cf. Trg, f. $33^R_{19–20}$; SST, p. 63), which suggests a combination of another antigraph, if not a reflexion of the "workshop" of Filip Maler[70]. The Slavonisms in the Rumanian text have, as a rule, the acc. sg. -ѫ/іѫ and the gen. sg. -ы/іѧ of the masculines and feminines with -*a*-/-*ja*- stem, as is typical of Middle Bulgarian (cf. Іеремїѫ е Іліѫ $58^v_{19–20}$, Виѳанїѫ 79^v_5; Іоаны or Іѡаны 39^v_{14}, 57^v_{10}, Иродїады 49^R_6 and дѕи Захарїѫ 92^v_{11}). In particular, the use of genitive form дѕи Захарїѫ

[66] Cf. Ş. Papacostea, *Moldova în epoca Reformei…*, p. 62–63; A. Rosetti, *Cu privire la datarea primelor traduceri româneşti de cărţi religioase*, LR 7, 2, 1958, p. 20–21 (= *Du nouveau sur la date des premières traductions roumaines de livres religieux*, Rom 80, 317, p. 80–81). Someone identified *doctor ex Walachia, vir canus, qui non germanice sed latine et polonice loquitur* with the same Filip Maler (cf. L. Demény, *Evangheliarul slavo-român…*, p. 97, *contra* I. Gheţie, [rec.:] *Evangheliarul…*, p. 668–669; the latest contribution on the issue and on the role of the Moldavian Saxons in the diffusion of Lutheranism, in P. Philippi, *Ein Moldauer 1532 als Bibelübersetzer?*, [in:] *Land des Segens? Fragen an die Geschichte Siebenbürgens und seiner Sachsen*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2008, p. 105–109 [= ZSL 13, 1, 1990, p. 19–22]).

[67] The first to propose that was Ioan Bogdan at the end of the 19th century (*originalul slav se află în faţa traducerii româneşti*), cf. I. Bogdan, *O Evanghelie slavonă cu traducere română din secolul al XVI-lea*, ConvLit 25, 1, 1891, p. 36, 38.

[68] Cf. Д. Иванова, *Търговищкото…*, p. 46, note 6–7; eadem, *Печатните български книги от XVI век и старата ръкописна традиция*, ТКШ 6, 1999, p. 295–311.

[69] Cf. E. Petrovici, *Observaţii…*, p. 14.

[70] The forms in -ѫ/іѫ (cf. сотона сотонѫ and Витфаѣниѫ) also prevail in the *variæ lectiones* of the most ancient Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospel of Matthew. Cf. *Евангелие от Матфея в славянской традиции*, А.А. Алексеев, А.А. Пичхадзе et al., Санкт-Петербург 2005, p. 67, 110.

lui Zaharïa in the Rumanian text of SRT confirms the tendency to trace the biblical names of the parallel Slavonic text in their original form ([до кървє] Ζαχαρϊѫ) and the Middle-Bulgarian education of the Sibian editor (-ïѧ = -ïѫ [ѧ = ѫ] is typical of Bulgarian Slavonic and of all the «sub-types» of the Rumanian one), but also his Moldavian origin (ѧ = *ĭa* was typical of Russian, Lituano-Ruthenian and Moldavian Slavonics)[71]. It may also be observed that in the Rumanian text of the SRT, ѧ is confused with both ꙗ, ѣ and є/ю, a confusion transmitted, respectively, to the Moldavian and Wallachian «sub-types» from the Russian, Lithuano-Ruthenian, Serbian and, to a lesser extent, Bulgarian Slavonics (e.g.: пїꙗтрѧ 1^{v}_{18}, пїꙗтрѧ 15^{r}_{5} *piĭatra*; свинцѧштє 90^{r}_{19}, свинцѣштє 90^{v}_{4} *svinţĭaşte*; мꙋѧрє 7^{r}_{8}, мꙋєрє 105^{v}_{1} *muĭare/muĭere*)[72].

The Rumano-Cyrillic *scripta* of the SRT registers also numerous cases of ъı (ы) for (ï)и in the inflection of the m. pl. n.-acc., both articled (cf. -ъı for -їи, in гꙋбавъı 27^{r}_{17} and 32^{r}_{3}, волнавъı 19^{v}_{1}, ватръный 111^{r}_{2}, спины 42^{r}_{4}, оугръкъı 43^{r}_{4}) and bare (cf. -ъı for -и, in апльı 59^{v}_{6}, вєкъı 47^{v}_{2}), and in other cases, where ъı was read undoubtedly as *i* and not *ă* or *â/î* (cf. овьıдить-алıь 33^{r}_{15}, осєбъı 18^{v}_{22}, оуны 117^{r}_{5}, вєчыѫ 79^{v}_{22}, въıѧ 82^{r}_{4}). This use of ъı – an "orthographic Slavonism" not rare in the Rumanian and Slavo-Rumanian texts of the 16th century – indicates that who translated and redacted the Rumanian text of the SRT had learned Cyrillic in Serbian or, more likely, Bulgarian, but not Russian or Ruthenian environment (but cf. Psl. ъı = r. *y*, Ucr. *y/i*), which could also mean Wallachian or Moldavian[73]. Due to the influence of Lituano-Ruthenian and Russian Slavonic, started in the 15th century, the Rumanisms contained in Moldo-Slavonic documents often assign to *yeryi* the value of a central vowel – confusing it with ѫ and ъ, not with и – and the same situation occurs later, in the Moldavian *scriptæ* of Rumanian[74]. Moreover, the influence of the Euthymian tradition on the Moldavian *scriptoria* prevents us from drawing a frontier line based on the Middle Bulgarian and "southern" use of the ъı, placing the redaction of the SRT on either side of it[75].

Compared to the orthography, the mould of the Slavonic lexicon of the Rumanian text gets even more complicated, with terms ascribable to different Slavonics

---

[71] Cf. L. Djamo-Diaconiță, *Redacțiile slavonei*, [in:] *Slava veche şi slavona românească*, ed. P. Olteanu, Bucureşti 1975, p. 245, 253, 263.

[72] Cf. *Ibidem*, p. 267.

[73] Cf. I. Bărbulescu, *Fonetica alfabetului chirilic în textele române din vécul XVI şi XVII în legătură cu monumentele paleo-, sîrbo-, bulgaro-, ruso- şi româno-slave*, Bucuresci 1904, p. 345–363.

[74] About the use of ъı (ы) in the Rumanian environment, cf. L. Djamo-Diaconiță, *Limba documentelor slavo-române emise în Țara Românească în sec. XIV şi XV*, Bucureşti 1971, p. 73–74 and G. Mihăilă, *Grafia cuvintelor româneşti*, [in:] *Dicţionar al limbii române vechi. Sfârşitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI*, Bucureşti 1974, p. 187.

[75] The same use of ъı can be found in the Rumanian Tetraevangelion of Coresi, edited with the contribution of Şchei belonging to the Orthodox Transylvanian low clergy. Cf. *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi (Braşov 1560–1561), comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Măniceşti (1574)*, ed. F. Dimitrescu, Bucureşti 1963 (cetera: CRT), p. 32, 40, 58, 60, 61, 76, 85, 124, 127, 136, 167.

and uses of Slavonic but, above all, common to Slavonic and emerging vernaculars (Slavic and naturally Rumanian).

The Rumanian text of the SRT contains a significant number of erudite Slavonisms, which cannot be found either in the Slavonic parallel text of the SRT, the SST, the Trg, or in the oldest Church Slavonic tradition of the Gospel of Matthew (with the exception of a handful of versions from the Eastern-Slavonic area, cf. EMST). These are crude or little acclimated loans, ascribable not only to ecclesiastical (if not properly biblical)[76] lexicon but also to the chancery one or to both[77]. The most characterizing are common Slavonisms – in some cases, rather words from Slavic vernaculars – with an equally low level of Rumanian acclimation, whose origins are yet to be studied in detail[78].

See the list of salient cases, with a description of influences (Slavic and non-Slavic) that they might have been exposed to and a comparison to the most relevant versions of the Gospel of Matthew, provided below[79]:

1. тоꙗгь *taĭag* 'stick' 27ᵛ₈ *hap.* – Mt 10, 10

   SRT-Sl, CST жеѕль; EMST жъѕлъ; CRT тоꙗгь; Sept *Stecken*; Ment *Rŭte*; Ol *holi*; etym.: Ch. Sl. тоꙗга, -ъ – cf. Bg. *тояг(а)*[80];

   It is clearly a Bulgarism – of even Proto-Bulgarian origins – but with a certain literary tradition in Church Slavonic sources also of Eastern-Slavonic redaction. It displays a peculiar case of *akan'e* (*o > a*) maybe Ruthenian, Russian or dialectal Bulgarian (in Bulgarian, this phenomenon is limited to the most conservative dialects, such as dialect of Rodopi or of Şchei in Transylvania)[81].

---

[76] Cf. ᲂазима 'azzimo' – (parallel Slavonic text) опрѣснъкь; влъꙗдикъ, пискᲂпь, митрополить 'high priest' – архїереи; дᲂховникь 'Pharisee' – фарїсеи; дверъ 'door (veil of the temple)' – опона; прѣстоль 'altar, throne' – ѡлтарь; спъсенїе 'sweet, gentle (used as an adj.)' – благо.

[77] Cf. чїнь 'order, kind' – пꙋль; даждє 'duty' – киносъ; слова 'letter' – iѡта; титла 'sign' – чрьта; ватахь 'dignitary, bailiff (centurion)' – сътникь; снѣмь, съборь (съборелє) 'synagogue, sanhedrim ' – съньмище, съньмь.

[78] Cf. Г.П. Клепикова, *Наблюдения над лексикой румынских переводов славяно-румынских текстов конфессионального характера (XVI–XVII вв.)*, [in:] *Folia Slavistica Рале Михайловне Цейтлин*, ed. А.Ф. Журавлев, Москва 2000, p. 59–60.

[79] In addition to the Slavonic parallel text (SRT-sl), the Rumanian SRT text will be compared to other 8 versions of the Gospel of Matthew, 3 of which have never been mentioned sofar: Paleoslavic tradition of the Gospel of Matthew, *Septembertestament* of Luther (1522), *Mentelin Bibel* (1466) and Czech *Olomoucká Bible* (1417). Cf. M. Luther, *Die Septemberbibel. Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther*, Berlin 1883 (cetera: Sept); *Die erste deutsche Bibel*, vol. I, *Evangelien*, ed. W. Kurrelmeyer, Tübingen 1904 (cetera: Ment); *Olomoucká Bible*, SVKOl M III1/II (cetera: Ol). For the Greek and Latin text of the NT, cf. https://www.academic-bible.com/en/home [1 III 2019].

[80] Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum. Emendatum Auctum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865, p. 998; *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae. Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnskeho*, vol. XLIII, Praha 1990, p. 479; Н. Геровъ, *Рѣчник на блъгарскый языкъ*, vol. V, Пловдивъ 1904, p. 349.

[81] Cf. В.И. Георгиев, *Русское аканье и его отношение к системе фонем праславянского языка*, ВЯ 12, 2, 1963, p. 26–27 (F. Miklośich, *Die Sprache der Bulgaren in Siebenbürgen*, DKAW.PhH 7, 1856, p. 23, 36).

2. **зъдѹхь** *zăduh* 'scorching heat' 74ᵛ₂₀ *hap.* – Mt 20, 12

SRT-Sl, CST варь; EMST варъ; CRT зѫдоѵхь; Sept *Hytze*; Ment *Hitze*; Ol *horko*; etym.: Bg. *задух(а)*; – cf. Ch. Sl. зѹдоѵхнѫти сѧ; Rum. *zăduf* (*zăduh*)⁸²;

Maybe originally a "living" Bulgarism. Not attested in Paleoslavic, it cannot be, however, classified as a literary Slavonism. It shows a typical sign of Rumanian acclimation such as closing a pretonic -ѧ- in -ъ- (Rum. *ă* < Bulg. *a*, cf. Bulg. *за-*) but also a dialect -доуфъ rebuilt over more literary and "more Bulgarian" -доухъ⁸³.

3. **дѹховничи** *duhovnici* 'Pharisees (priests)' 25ᵛ₂₂, 69ᵛ₁₄… – Mt 9, 34; 19, 3 and *passim*

SRT-Sl фарїсєнє; EMST фарисѣи; CRT фарисєи; Sept, Ment *Pharifeer*; Ol *dhucownyczi*;

etym.: Ch. Sl. доѵховьникъ – cf. Pol. *duchownych* and C. *duchovník* 'Pharisee, religious (Latin priest)'⁸⁴;

The attestation of доѵховьникь can be found in Church Slavonic at least from the 14ᵗʰ century in Serbian area, in the 15ᵗʰ in Lithuano-Ruthenian and Russian areas, with the meaning of 'theologian' («veniæ divinæ interpres»⁸⁵) and 'priest, parish priest'⁸⁵, more than enough to make the SRT use of the word "heretic" with the meaning of "Pharisee" (see above). It remains probable, however, that the this last – with which Slavo-Rumanian voice has never been attested⁸⁶ – derives from the contribution of Polish and, above all, Czech, where the word is recorded in several sources of the same centuries, meaning not only 'interpreter of the Mosaic Law, Pharisee, Hebraic priest', but 'Latin priest' too.

4. **гривнє** *grivne* 'talents, silver coins', 67ᵛ₁₇ *hap.* – Mt 18, 24

SRT-Sl, TCS таланть; EMST таланътъ 'talents'; CRT соми 'sommi'; Sept, Ment *Pfundt* 'talents (value of equivalent weight in silver or gold')'; Ol *záwazzij* [cf. *závažie*];

---

⁸² Н. Геровъ, *Рѣчник…*, vol. II, Пловдивъ 1897, p. 68; *Старобългарски речник*, vol. I, София 1999, p. 515; DEXonline: *zăduf (zăduh)*, https://dexonline.ro/definitie/zaduh [14 I 2019].

⁸³ Cf. E. Petrovici, *Note slavo-romône III*, D 11, 1948, p. 192; G. Mihăilă, *Împrumuturi vechi sud-slave în limba romînă. Studiu lexico-semantic*, Bucureşti 1960, p. 106.

⁸⁴ Cf. *Vokabulář webový*: *duchovník*, http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx [13 I 2019]; *IBL Słownik Polszczyzny XVI wieku*: *duchownik*, https://spxvi.edu.pl/indeks/haslo/50 060 [20 I 2019]; *Słownik staropolski*, ed. S. Urbańczyk, vol. II.3, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 1957, p. 219; P. Skok, *La terminologie chrétienne en slave: l'église, les prêtres et les fidèles*, RES 7, 3, 1927, p. 189.

⁸⁵ Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon…*, p. 182; Ђ. Даничиѣ, *Рјечник из књижевних старина српских*, vol. I, Биоград 1863–1864, p. 318–319; *Словник Староукраїнської Мови XIV–XV ст.*, vol. I, Київ 1971, p. 332; *Гістарычны Слоўнік Беларускай Мовы*, vol. IX, Минск 1989, p. 107 and *Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв.*, ed. В.В. Виноградов et al., vol. IV, Москва 1977, p. 381–382.

⁸⁶ In Rumanian, *duhovnic* is attested since the 17ᵗʰ century with the meaning of 'confessor'. Cf. H. Tiktin, *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. II, Cluj-Napoca 2003 [1911], p. 116; *Dicţionarul Limbii Române*, s.n., vol. I.6, Bucureşti 2009, p. 982–984; I. Popinceanu, *Religion, Glaube und Aberglaube in der Rumänischen Sprache*, Nürneberg 1964, p. 151.

etym.: Ch. Sl. грывьна – cf. Pol. *grzywna* and C. *grivna*, *hrzyvna*[87];

Densusianu records it in the 16th century as «ancienne monnaie (marc)»[88]. In Rumanian, гривнъ entered by means of Moldo-Slavonic, where it was firstly attested in 1408 (the first time in Wallacho-Slavonic not earlier than 1544)[89], but it derives from грив(ь)на (грывьна), that is Lithuano--Ruthenian and Russian Slavonic[90], if not directly from Polish or Czech vernacular (the Polish grzywna was the most familiar among Rumanians, especially in Moldavia)[91].

5. мѣзка *măzca* 'sap' 97ʀ₁ *hap.* – Mt 24, 32

SRT-Sl, CST вѣіа; EMST вѣѣ; CRT стеблеле *steblele*; Sept *Tzweyg*; Ment *Aʃʃt*; Ol *vietew*;

etim.: Bulg. мъзга (cf. Sl. eccl. мѣзга; r. мпьзга; Ser. мезг[р]а; Pol. *miazga*) and Rum. *mâzcă*[92];

It is the Bulgarian form of Ch. Sl. мѣзга 'juice, sap', with Saxon unvoicement of the velar (-*g*- > -*k*-). In the Rumanian text of the SRT, the word "branch" is missing (cf. GNT UBS₅ κλάδος, Vulg *ramus*). The sentence «when the branch [of the fig-tree] becomes tender» was curiously replaced in Rumanian by къндь ва фи мѣзка ѫнтиирѹще «cândŭ va fi măzca întinireaşte» [when the sap will make it tender (the fig-tree)], which does not match neither with the Slavonic parallel text, nor with any other version of the Gospel of Matthew likely to have influenced the Rumanian version of the SRT[93]. Only in Sept the branch of the fig-tree "becomes succulent" («wenn ʃeyn

---

[87] Cf. *Словник Староукраїнської…*, vol. I, p. 262; *Гістарычны Слоўнік Беларускай…*, vol. VII, Минск 1986, p. 159; И.И. Срезневский, *Матералы для Словаря древне-русскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ*, vol. I, С.-Петербургъ 1893, p. 590; F. Sławski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, pars 4, Kraków 1955, p. 374–375; *Słownik staropolski…*, vol. II.7, p. 517–520; *Vokabulář webový: grivna (hrzyvna)* [14 I 2019].

[88] O. Densusianu, *Opere*, vol. II, *Lingvistica: Histoire de la langue roumaine*, Bucureşti 1975 [1938], p. 809.

[89] Cf. G. Bolocan, *Dicţionarul elementelor româneşti din documentele slavoromâne, 1374–1600*, Bucureşti 1981, p. 98; *Dicţionarul Limbii Române*, vol. II.1, ed. S. Puşcariu, Bucureşti 1934, p. 314–315.

[90] Actually, the Sl. eccl. грив(ь)на was attested from the beginning of the 11th century in sources of Russian-Kevian and Czech-Moravian redaction (the latter [i.e. Gregory the Great's *XL Homiliæ in Evangelia*] were originated in the Bohemian area, but are preserved in Russian copies from the 13th and 14th centuries, cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon…*, p. 143; *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae…*, vol. VIII, Praha 1964, p. 434 and И.И. Срезневский, *Матералы…*, vol. I, p. 589–591).

[91] Cf. A. Mareş, *Echivalările* Talantului *în textele româneşti din secolele al XVI-lea şi al XVII-lea*, LR 49, 3, 2000, p. 483–484.

[92] Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon…*, p. 123–124; *Български етимологичен речник*, vol. IV, ed. В.И. Георгиев, София 1995, p. 379; *Dicţionarul Limbii Române*, s.n., vol. XVII.6, Bucureşti 1968, p. 735–736.

[93] Compare the first Paleoslavic redaction of Mt 24, 32 (егда ѹже вѣѣ еіа вждеть млада) with the Czech version of *Olomoucká Bible* («když již *vietew* jeho miekká»), the Hungarian version of the so-called *Huszita Biblia* (1425 ca.), copied in Moldavia in 1466 («mikor ő *ága* meggyermekdedölend») and the Polish version of Murzynowski (1551), inspired by the Lutheran tradition («Gdy by już *gałąź* jéj zstała się młodocianą»). The word "branch" is written in italics in every quotation. Cf. Ol, f. 182ᵛᴮ₄₇; *A Müncheni kódex (1466). A négy Evangélium szövege és szótára [Huszita Biblia]*, ed. G. Décsi, T. Szabó, Békéscsaba 1985, p. 87; *Evangelia Svvieta pana Iesusa Christusa Vedle Mathæuʃza Svietego z Greckiego Iezyka na Polski przelozona [przez S. Murzynowskiego]…*, w Krolewcu Pruʃkim 1551, f. 94ᵛ₂₋₃.

tzweyg itzt fafftig wirt»)[94]. The Lutheran text remains, indeed, the only comparable to the Sibian as for the translation of Mt 24, 32[95].

6. лѹновнїѧ *lunovnïa* o -*ïe*, 'epileptics, somnambulists (lunatics)' 3$^v_{22}$ *hap.* – Mt 4, 24 SRT-Sl мѣсѧчныѫ (SST, Trg [CST] мѣсѧчныѧ); EMST мѣсѧчьнъіѩ (Čud лѹнствѹющаѩ); CRT дръчици пре лѹни *drăciți pre luni* 'possessed at every new moon'; Sept, Ment *Monſuchtigen*; Ol *namieſiecznyki*;

etym.: Ch. Sl. лѹновнъіи? (лѹновьнъ, лѹнавъ) – cf. Ch. Sl. лѹн(ств)овати сѧ 'suffer from lunatism (somnambulism or epilepsy)', лѹнствѹющий (лѹнѹющий сѧ) 'lunatic, possessed, epileptic', лѹновеникю 'menses'; Pol. *lunatyk* 'lunatic, epileptic'[96];

It's clearly a calque after the Ch. Sl. лѹновнъіѩ, the pl. acc. of an adj. лѹновнъіи and pronominal form of лѹновьнъ (Rum. **lunovnŭ*). Interestingly, the Sibian revision seems to have overlooked this word, though it's perfectly Slavic: 1. The suffix -ïѧ *-ïe* for Rumanian m. pl. acc. suggests a typographical error, though it is but a slight adjustment of the Church Slavonic adjectival suffix (with ъі > ï); 2. The suffix -овьнъ, among the most productive in Slavonic, is rare in Ancient Rumanian (we only find it in the adj. слоновнъ *slonovnŭ* 'ivory' < слоновьнъ, an "exotic" Slavonism, in the late 16th century)[97]; 3. The same stem *luna-* is, in fact, no less Slavic than Latin[98]. In the

---

[94] Sept, p. 20 (cf. also *Biblia: das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch auffs New zugericht. D. Mart. Luth.… Gedrückt zu Wittemberg: Hans Lufft, 1541 [cetera: Lut]), f. 259$^v_{43}$.

[95] Luther's Bible registers an adj. *safftig* only in Mt 24, 32, the corresponding noun *Saft* 'sap (vital = lymph [also fig.])' in different settings and, especially, in Lc 8, 6 (in the *Parable of a sower* [cf. Mt 13, 5]: *und ettlichs* [ſamen] *fiel auff den fels und da es aufgieng verdorret es darumb das nicht faſft hatte…*). *Saft* appears, however, more often in the sermons of Luther and, above all, in the locution *Saft und Kraft* 'quinta essentia (fünfte Wesen)', where the fig-tree is explicitly identified with the Holy Scriptures made fruitful thanks to the incarnation of the Word. Cf. M. Luther, *Saemmtliche Werke*, vol. X, *Kirchenpostille*, ed. G. Plochmann, Erlangen 1827, p. 78; *DWB*: http://www.woerterbuch-netz.de/DWB?lemma=saft [25 II 2019]; Sept, p. 42 (Lut, f. 231$^r_{16}$).

[96] Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon*…, p. 344; П.Д. Филкова, *Старобългаризми и църковнославянизми в лексике русского литературного языка. Учебный словарь*, vol. II, София 1986, p. 591 and *Словарь русского языка*…, vol. VIII, Москва 1981, p. 306; *IBL Słownik Polszczyzny XVI wieku*: *lunatyk*, https://spxvi.edu.pl/indeks/haslo/62 455 [20 I 2019]; about the Czech tradition, http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz/hledani.aspx [28 II 2019].

[97] More specifically, слѡновнилѡр *slonovnilor* [made of ivory], in several versions of Sal 44, 9. Cf. *Psaltirea Şcheiană comparată cu celelalte psaltiri din sec. XVI şi XVII traduse din slavoneşte*, vol. II, *Textul şi glosarele*, ed. I.-A. Candrea, Bucureşti 1916, p. 87; O. Densusianu, *Opere*, vol. II…, p. 826 (the suff. -овьнъ is attested at least 22 times in the Paleoslavic canon, cf. Z. Ribarova, *Indexy k staroslověnskému slovníku*, Praha 2003, p. 168).

[98] It is believed that Sl. **luná-* and Lat. *lūna-* (proto-it. **louksnā-*) are independent outcomes of the proto- i.e. **louk-s-neh$_2$* 'luminous, resplendent'. Naturally, that does not affect the possibility of a reciprocal influence between the outcomes of the two stems in contact areas. Cf. H. Mihăescu, *La romanité dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*, Bucureşti 1993, p. 451–453; *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд*, ed. О.П. Трубачев, vol. XVI, Москва 1990, p. 173–174; M. De Vaan, *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden–Boston 2008, p. 352; R. Derksen, *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexi-*

Coresian *corpus*, a popular belief that associated epilepsy with lunatism led to various termino-logical outcomes, but no exact equivalent of "lunatic"[99]. The only relatable word in Rumanian seems to be *lunovníe* until the second quarter of the 17th century, when лȢнави *lunavi* and лȢнате-чи *lunateci* appeared in ecclesiastical sources[100]. Unlike *lunovnŭ, *lunav* and *lunatec* already were Rumanian, at least virtually: 1. since they already used suffixes which were productive in Ancient Rumanian[101]; 2. *lunatec* is considered to be an inherited Latinism (cf. *zănatec* < lat. *dianaticus* 'in-sane [due to the influence of Diana i.e. of the Moon]', therefore 'possessed, enchanted by a *zână*', cf. Rum. *zână* 'fairy' < Lat. *Diana*)[102]. It's a fact that *lunav* and *lunatec* are attested in Rumanian only after лоунавъ and лоунатикъ (cf. also лю-) are in late Church Slavonic, respectively of south-ern and eastern redaction[103]. Emblematic is the case of *lunatec*, which will enter the literary Ru-manian language at its early stage thanks to the influence of educated Latin[104], directly or via Ruthenian[105] and/or Polish[106]. We can suppose that about a century before, *lunovnŭ had been

---

con, Leiden–Boston 2008, p. 291 (about the influence of other similar suffixes in the Slavic area, cf. also Л.В. Куркина, *Славянские этимологии (*luna, *lun'a, *setъnъjь и *sotiti, *stopъnъkъ, *telm-, *tolm-, *tъlm-, *trek-, *trok-, *trak-, *tronъka, *zobъlь)*, [in:] Этимология 1983, ed. О.Н. Трубачев, Москва 1985, p. 20–21).

[99] It is not irrelevant that the CRT restricts the meaning of "lunatic" to "possessed" (cf. дрꙋчици пре лꙋни *drăciți pre luni*). Coresi's *Cazanie II* (1581) – an homiletic text – renders, by apparently current Old Rumanian words, as "lunaticism" (лоунїе *lunïe*, боалꙗ денъ лоунꙗ *boală den lună* 'moon sick-ness') as the verb "to suffer from…" (сє лоунѣще *se luneaște*, сє лꙋнїꙗ *se luniïa*, 3rd sg. ind. pres. and impf., vb. *a se luni* 'to suffer from lunatism'; ꙟ лꙋнꙗ ноаꙋ дрꙋчѣще *î[n] lună noao drăceaște* 3rd sg. ind. pres., vb. *a drăci în lună nouă* 'to display possession at the new moon'). Cf. CRT, p. 43 [f. 6ᵛ₅]; *Carte cu învățătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textu*, ed. S. Puşcariu, A. Procopovici, Bucureşti 1914, p. 271, 273–276 (CR XVI V 1 BNR, ff. 69ᴿ–71ᴿ).

[100] Respectively, *Lunav* in Metropolitan Varlaam's *Cazanie* (1643) and *lunatec* in the *Nou Testament de la Bălgrad* (1648). Cf. Varlaam, *Cazanie 1643*, ed. J. Byck, Bucureşti 1966, p. 153 (CR-XVII-V-2 BNR, f. 220ᴿ₅); *Noul Testament sau Înpăcarea, sau Leagea Noao a lui Iisus Hristos…*, Bălgrad [Alba Iulia] 1648 (cetera: NTB), f. 6ᴿ₂₈.

[101] Not only does -*atec* < Lat. -*aticus* belong to the oldest Latin base (with [ě] < [ĭ]), but -*av* < Psl. -авъ – being also attested in Arumanian – can be dated back before the early 12th century. Cf. G. Pascu, *Sufixele româneşti*, Bucureşti 1916, p. 99–103, 281–292.

[102] Cf. H. Mihăescu, *La romanité…*, p. 178, 451 (B.-P. Haşdeu, *Eymologicum magnum Romanić*, vol. I.2, Bucuresci 1887, p. 2046–2049).

[103] In fact, Ch. Sl. лоунавъ is so late and scarcely attested – it was recorded only by Miklošič, in Serbi-an 16th century sources – that we can realistically suppose it reflected in Varlaam an older Southern-Slavonic and Rumanian use.

[104] From the NTB to the *Biblie de la Blaj* (1795), through the *Biblie de la Bucureşti* (1688) and An-tim Ivireanu's *Nou Testament* (1703), all Rumanian versions of Mt 4, 24 – originally based on the *Vulgata* – contain *lunateci*. Cf. *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură…*, Bucureşti 1688, p. 753; *Noul Testament acum î(n)tăi tipărit…*, Bucureşti 1703, f. 3ᵛ₄; *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură…*, Blaj 1795, p. 4ᴮ₄₄.

[105] Pamvo Berinda (1627) translated the Ch. Sl. лꙋнацïй сꙗ with Rut. люнатїкь, which Mardarie Cozianul (1649) translated in turn with Rum. лꙋнатекь. Cf. П. Беринда, *Лексіконъ славеноросскїй и именъ Тълкованїе*, Київ 1961, p. 59; Mardarie Cozianul, *Lexicon slavo-românesc şi tâlcuirea numelor din 1649*, ed. G. Crețu, Bucuresci 1900, p. 167.

[106] Pol. *lunatyk*, attested since 1528, appears in the first versions of the Gospel of Matthew – translated and printed by two Lutherans, Murzynowski and Jan Seklucjan (1551 and 1553) – and in 9 out of 10 Polish versions appeared between 1551 and 1599 (only in the Calvinist version of the *Biblia Brzeska*

considered an erudite approximation to the terms in use for "lunatic (epileptic)". Nonetheless, it was such an unusual Slavonism that who had translated and revised the Rumanian text of the SRT inflected it, mechanically, as it was Slavonic[107]. The reasons of this choice could be two: 1. more vernacular alternatives such as *drăciţi* (*pre luni*) or *zănateci* would have caused a redundancy with ценѫць де драчь *ţenuţĭ de dracĭ* (cf. бѣсныⲭ 'possessed, seized by demons'), which preceded *lunovnïe* in the same list of infirms[108]; 2. *lunatecĭ* was likely to sound too "Latin" (i.e. Western Christian), attracting on the text suspicions of heterodoxy (whence the choice of this uncommon but formerly "Slavonizing" translation).

The Slav(on)isms found in the Rumanian text of the SRT seem to reflect an area of transition and overlapping between the diverse *Slavias* as well as between *Slavia* and *Romània* (the crossing of all the mentioned influences being the most original trait of what – reducing in scale, and using very *lato sensu*, the key-concept of *Slavia orthodoxa* – we can call *Slavia valachica* [i.e. *Rumanian Slavia*]).

The Old Rumanian of the SRT reflects, however, another boundary, apparently not less labile of the geographical one and wholly internal to *Slavia Orthodoxa*, between two different spheres of use of the Slavonic language: the one cultivated, only primarily ecclesiastical and strongly ingrained in the Euthymian tradition, the other semi-cultivated, more immediately linked to the practical uses (chancery, private, but also literary-popular) and open, therefore, to a κοινή of vernacular languages which varied, partially, according to the zone (Dobrev[109] compared this difference to that between *sanscrit* and *pracrits*, and assigned the Slavonics in use in the Peri-Danubian and Transylvanian areas a paradigmatic role).

Evidently, a "multiple boundary" which crosses the SRT unites the two texts, Slavonic and Rumanian, rather than divides them, fixing them – not only metaphorically, as a whole – to an extraordinary crossroad of different epochs and influences.

[1556] *miesięcznik* appears). At the end of the 16th century, Jakub Wujek's Catholic version (1593 and 1599) still glossed *lunatyki* with *miesiączciki*, in the translation of Mt 4, 24 («lunátykowie ſą co káduk miewáią» [lunatics are those who suffer from falling sickness]). Cf. Polish versions of the Gospel at https://ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/teksty?y=all&g=1&c=4&v=24 [29 I 2019]; the note in *Nowy Testament Pana Naszego Jesusa Chrystusa Znowu z łacińskiego y z greckiego na polskie wiernie i szczyrze przełożony… przez D. Jakuba Wuyka*, Kraków 1593, p. 15 and 1599, p. 14.

[107] Realistically, ⲗꙋновнïꙗ *lunovnïe* presupposes a nominative form *ⲗꙋновнïй *lunovnïi*, an adjustment to the Middle Bulgarian spelling of the literary ⲗоуновнꙑй. It can be assumed that the Rumanian pl. acc. ⲗꙋновнꙑ(и) or ⲗꙋновн(ï)и *lunovnïi* may have been confused with the homonymous and virtually homophone sg. acc. pronominal Slavonic form, wrongly amended by the Sibian revisor, since the sentence required the pl. -ꙑⲙꙗ/-ïꙗ.

[108] It is worth noticing that in the CRT it does not occur, because the sentence was translated in a different way: «şi aduseră lui toţi bolnavïi de toate boale şi de chinure ţinuţi şi *drăciţi pre luni*…» (cf. SRT-Rum: «şă aducea lui toţi bolnavi în multe chipure bòlele şă cu chinure *ţenuţĭ de dracĭ* şă *lunovnïe*…» [и привєдошѫ ємꙋ въсѣ болѧщѧѫ различним нє<д>ѫгꙑ и стрⷭ҇тьⲙи одр<жи>ⲙïѫ и бѣсныⲭ и <мѣ>сѧчныⲭ]).

[109] Cf. И. Добрев, *XIV век – Класицизъм или пракрити?*, [in:] *Преводи през XIV столетие на Балканите. Доклади от международната конференция. София, 26–28 юни 2003*, ed. Л. Тасева et al., София 2004, p. 17–19.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

A Müncheni kódex (1466). A négy Evangélium szövege és szótára [*Huszita Biblia*], ed. G. Décsi, T. Szabó, Békéscsaba 1985.

Acte si fragmente latine romanesci pentru istorï'a Beserecei romane mai alesu unite, edite si adnotate, ed. T. Cipariu, Blasiu 1855.

Berinda P., *Leksikon" slavenorosskij i imen" tl"kovanïe*, Kyïv 1961 [1627].

Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură…, Blaj 1795.

Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură…, București 1688.

Biblia: das ist die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch auffs New zugericht. D. Mart. Luth… Gedrückt zu Wittemberg: Hans Lufft, 1541.

Carte cu învăţătură (1581), vol. I, *Textu*, ed. S. Puşcariu, A. Procopovici, Bucureşti 1914 (= CR XVI V 1 BNR).

Codicele Bratul, ed. A. Gafton, Iași 2003 (= http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/txt/text).

Die erste deutsche Bibel, vol. I, *Evangelien*, ed. W. Kurrelmeyer, Tübingen 1904.

Evangelia Svvieta pana Iesusa Christusa Vedle Mathæuſza Svietego z Greckiego Iezyka na Polski przelozona [przez S. Murzynowskiego]…, w Krolewcu Pruſkim 1551.

Evangelie ot Matfeja v slavjanskoj tradicii, ed. A.A. Alekseev, A.A. Pičchadze et al., Sankt-Peterburg 2005.

Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551–1553), ed. E. Petrovici, L. Demény, Bucureşti 1971.

Liturghier slavonesc lui Macarie, Târgovişte 1508 – BAR II 170567.

Luther M., *Predigt am vierten Sonntage nach Epiphanias*, [in:] *Hauspostille*, vol. II, ed. J.G. Plochmann, Erlangen 1826.

Luther M., *Saemmtliche Werke*, vol. X, *Kirchenpostille*, ed. G. Plochmann, Erlangen 1827.

Luther M., *Die Septemberbibel. Das Neue Testament deutsch von Martin Luther*, Berlin 1883.

Mardarie Cozianul, *Lexicon slavo-românesc şi tâlcuirea numelor din 1649*, ed. G. Creţu, Bucuresci 1900.

Noul Testament acum î(n)tăi tipărit…, București 1703.

Noul Testament sau Înpăcarea, sau Leagea Noao a lui Iisus Hristos…, Bălgrad [Alba Iulia] 1648.

Nowy Testament Pana Naszego Jesusa Chrystusa Znowu z łacińskiego y z greckiego na polskie wiernie i szczyrze przełożony… przez D. Jakuba Wuyka, Kraków 1593.

Octoih slavonesc lui Macarie, Târgovişte 1510 – BAR II 630846.

Olomoucká Bible, SVKOl M III1/II.

Psaltirea Şcheiană comparată cu celelalte psaltiri din sec. XVI şi XVII traduse din slavoneşte, vol. II, *Textul şi glosarele*, ed. I.-A. Candrea, Bucureşti 1916.

Ribarova Z., *Indexy k staroslověnskému slovníku*, Praha 2003.

Szesnastowieczne przekłady Ewangelii: https://ewangelie.uw.edu.pl/teksty?y=all&g=1&c=4&v=24

Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der 1te kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck. Faksimile-Ausgabe, ed. H. Miklas et al., Padeborn–München–Wien–Zürich 1999.

Tetraevanghel slavonesc, Sibiu 1546, BAR II 630838.

Tetraevanghel slavonesc lui Coresi, Braşov 1562, BAR III 234272.

Tetraevanghel slavonesc lui Lavrentie, Plumbuita 1575 ca., BCU-Cluj BRV 34.

Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi (Braşov 1560–1561), comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănicești (1574), ed. F. Dimitrescu, Bucureşti 1963.

Varlaam, *Cazanie 1643*, ed. J. Byck, Bucureşti 1966 (= CR-XVII-V-2 BNR).

Lexicons and Dictionaries

Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik, vol. I–VIII, ed. V.I. Georgiev, Sofija 1971–2017.

Bolocan G., *Dicţionarul elementelor româneşti din documentele slavoromâne, 1374–1600*, Bucureşti 1981.

Daničić Đ., *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih*, vol. I–III, Biograd 1863–1864.

De Vaan M., *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden–Boston 2008.

Derksen R., *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden–Boston 2008.

DEXOnline: https://dexonline.ro (= *Dicţionar Explicativ al Limbii Române (DEX)*, Bucureşti 1996).

Dicţionarul Limbii Române (DA), vol. I–III, ed. S. Puşcariu, Bucureşti 1913–1940.

Dicţionarul Limbii Române (DLR), s.n., vol. I–XIV, Bucureşti 1965–2000.

DWB: http://www.woerterbuchnetz.de

Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskich jazykov. Praslavjanskij leksičeskij fond, ed. O.P. Trubačev, vol. I–XLI, Moskva 1974–2018.

Filkova P.D., *Starobolgarizmy i cerkovnoslavjanizmy v leksike russkogo literaturnogo jazyka. Učebnyj slovar'*, vol. I–III, Sofija 1986.

Gerov N., *Rěčnik na blăgarskyj jazyk*, vol. I–V, Plovdiv 1895–1904.

Gistaryčny Sloŭnik Belaruskaj Movy, vol. I–XX, Minsk 1982–2002.

Haşdeu B.-P., *Eymologicum magnum Romaniæ*, vol. I–IV, Bucuresci 1887–1898.

IBL Słownik Polszczyzny XVI wieku: https://spxvi.edu.pl

Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenicae. Slovník Jazyka Staroslověnskeho, vol. I–LII, Praha 1958–1997.

Mihăilă G., *Dicţionar al limbii române vechi. Sfârşitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI*, Bucureşti 1974.

Miklosich F., *Lexicon Linguae Palaeoslovenico-Graeco-Latinum. Emendatum Auctum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865.

Popinceanu I., *Religion, Glaube und Aberglaube in der Rumänischen Sprache*, Nürneberg 1964.

Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv., ed. V.V. Vinogradov et al., vol. I–XXX, Moskva 1975–2015.

Slovnik Staroukraïnskoï Movi XIV–XV st., vol. I–II, Kyïv 1971–1978.

Sławski F., *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, pars 1–5, Kraków 1952–1982.

Słownik staropolski, ed. S. Urbańczyk, vol. I–XI, Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa 1953–2002.

Sreznevskij I.I., *Materialy dlja Slovarja drevne-russkago jazyka po pis'mennym" pamjatnikam"*, vol. I–III, S.-Peterburg 1893–1912.

Starobălgarski Rečnik, vol. I, Sofija 1999.

Tiktin H., *Rumänisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*, vol. I–III, Cluj-Napoca 2003–2005 [1895–1925].

Vokabulář webový: http://vokabular.ujc.cas.cz.

Secondary Literature

Alberti A., *Gli scriptoria moldavi e la tradizione medio-bulgara. Il caso del Vangelo di Elisavetgrad*, [in:] *Linee di confine. Separazione e processi di integrazione nello spazio culturale slavo*, ed. G. Moracci, A. Alberti, Firenze 2013, p. 15–61.

Alzati C., *Terra romena tra Oriente e Occidente. Chiese ed etnie nel tardo '500*, Milano 1981.

Atanasov P., *L'imprimerie en Roumanie et les bulgares de Braşov au XVIe s.* (*La collaboration culturelle bulgaro-roumaine au XVIe s.*), "Études balkaniques. Revue trimestrielle publiée par l'Institut d'études balkaniques près l'Académie bulgare des sciences" 6, 1967, p. 123–139.

Badalić J., *Jugoslavica usque ad annum 1600. Bibliographie der südslavischen Frühdrucke*, Aureliae Aquensis 1959.

Bainton R.H., *The Reformation of the 16th Century*, Boston 1952.

Bărbulescu I., *Fonetica alfabetului chirilic în textele române din vécul XVI şi XVII în legătură cu monumentele paleo-, sîrbo-, bulgaro-, ruso- şi romîno-slave*, Bucuresci 1904.

Binder P., *Începuturile Reformei din Transilvania şi Românii din Hunedoara*, "Limba Română" 20, 3, 1971, p. 273–276.

Binder P., Huttmann A., *Contribuţii la biografie lui Filip Moldoveanul, primul tipograf român. Evoluţia vieţii culturale româneşti la Sibiu în epoca umanistă*, "Limbă şi Literatură" 16, 1968, p. 145–174.

Binder P., Huttmann A., *Între istorie şi filologie, I. Mediul cultural românesc al Braşovului în epoca coresiană*, "Limba Română" 20, 1, 1971, p. 3–20.

Bodogae T., *Şi totuşi prima carte romanească s-a tipărit la Sibiu. Consideraţii despre Evangheliarul slavo-román din 1551–1553*, "Mitropolia Ardealului" 17, 1–2, 1972, p. 82–89.

Bogdan D.P., *Contribuţiuni la bibliografia românească veche. Tipărituri dintre anii 1546–1762 necunoscute la noi*, Bucureşti 1938.

Bogdan I., *O Evanghelie slavonă cu traducere română din secolul al XVI-lea*, "Convorbiri literare" 25, 1, 1891, p. 33–40.

Deletant D., *A Survey of Rumanian Presses and Printing in the 16th Century*, "The Slavonic and East European Review" 53, 131, 1975, p. 161–174.

Demény L., *Cartea şi tiparul. Promotori ai legăturilor culturale dintre ţările române în secolul al XVI-lea*, "Studii şi Materiale de Istorie Medie" 6, 1973, p. 91–109.

Demény L., *L'imprimerie cyrillique de Macarios de Valaquie*, "Revue Roumaine d'Histoire" 7, 3, 1969, p. 549–574.

Demény L., *O tipăritură slavo-română precoresiană*, "Studii Revistă de Istorie" 18, 5, 1965, p. 1001–1038.

Demény L., *Typographische Kennzeichen der kyrillischen Druckerpresse in Hermannstadt im 16. Jahrhundert*, "Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde" 19, 1, 1969, p. 25–36.

Demény L., Simonescu D., *Un capitol important din vechea cultură românească (Tetraevanghelul, Sibiu 1546)*, "Studii şi Cercetări de Documentare şi Bibliologie" 1, Supl., 1965, p. 1–18.

Densusianu O., *Opere*, vol. II, *Lingvistica: Histoire de la langue roumaine*, Bucureşti 1975 [1938].

Djamo-Diaconiţă L., *Limba documentelor slavo-române emise în Ţara Românească în sec. XIV şi XV*, Bucureşti 1971.

Djamo-Diaconiţă L., *Redacţiile slavonei*, [in:] *Slava veche şi slavona românească*, ed. P. Olteanu, Bucureşti 1975.

Dobrev I., *XIV vek – Klasicizăm ili prakriti?*, [in:] *Prevodite prez XIV stoletie na Balkanite. Dokladi na meždunarodnata konferencija. Sofija, 26–28 juni 2003*, ed. L. Taseva et al., Sofija 2004, p. 17–26.

Dragnev E., *O capodoperă a miniaturii din Moldova medievală. Tetraevanghelul de la Elizavetgrad și manuscrisele grupului Parisinus Grccus 74*, Chișinău 2004.

Florescu I.-F., *Le Tetraévangile de Sibiu (1551–1553). Nouvelles informations sur les sources de la première traduction en roumain des Evangiles*, "Biblicum Jassyense. Romanian Journal for Biblical Philology and Hermeneutcs" 1, 2010, p. 48–89.

Georgiev V.I., *Russkoe akan'e i ego otnošenie k sisteme fonem praslavjanskogo jazyka*, "Вопросы языкознания" / "Voprosy jazykoznanija" 12, 2, 1963, p. 20–29.

Gherman A.M., *Lexic românesc în documente transilvănene. Socotelile orașelor Brașov și Sibiu*, "Dacoromania" [s.n.] 13, 1, 2008, p. 57–74.

Gheţie I., *Baza dialectală a românei literare*, București 1975.

Gheţie I., *Considerații filologice asupra Evangheliarului din Petersburg*, "Studii și Cercetări de Lingvistică" 17, 1, 1966, p. 47–79.

Gheţie I., *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu și textele românești cu litere latine și ortografie maghiară*, "Limba Română" 28, 2, 1979.

Gheţie I., *Textele rotacizante și originile scrisului literar românesc. Chestiuni de metodă*, [in:] *Începuturile scrisului în limba română*, București 1974, p. 44–97.

Gheţie I., [rec.:] *Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu 1551–1553…* – "Studii și Cercetări de Lingvistică" 23, 6, 1972, p. 664–670.

Gheţie I., Mareş A., *Originile scrisului In limba română*, București 1985.

Hervay F., *L'imprimerie du maître Philippe de Nagyszeben et les premiers livres en langue roumaine*, "Magyar Könyvszemle" 81, 2, 1965, p. 119–127.

Hurdubeţiu I., Originea Scheilor și răspîndirea lor pe teritoriul carpato-dunărean, "Studii și articole de istorie" 14, 1969, p. 195–205.

Iorga N., *Cinci comunicări la Academia Română*, III, *Tipărituri românești necunoscute*, "Revista istorică" 17, 1–3, 1931, p. 25–26.

Ivanova D., *Pečatnite bălgarski knigi ot XVI vek i starata răkopisna tradicija*, "Търновска книжовна школа" / "Tărnovska knižovna škola" 6, 1999, p. 295–311.

Ivanova D., *Tărgoviškoto pečatno Evangelie (1512 g.) i starite slavjanskite prevodi na Evangelieto (s ogled na tekstologičnata tradicija)*, [in:] *Bălgaristični proučvanija*, vol. I, Veliko Tărnovo 1996, p. 45–60.

Jakó Z., *Szeben latin betűs könyvnyomtatása a XVI. században*, [in:] *Írás köniv értelmiség*, Bukarest 1976.

Karataev I.P., *Opisanie slavjano-russkich knig, napečatannych kirillovskimi bukvami*, "Сборник Отделения русского языка и словесности Академии наук" / "Sbornik Otdelenija russkogo jazyka i slovesnosti Akademii nauk" 34, 2, 1883.

Klepikova G.P., *Nabljudenija nad leksikoj rumynskich perevodov slavjano-rumynskich tekstov konfessional'nogo charaktera (XVI–XVII vv.)*, [in:] *Folia Slavistica Rale Michajlovne Cejtlin*, ed. A.F. Žuravliev, Moskva 2000, p. 53–60.

Kurkina L.V., *Slavjanskie ètimologii (*luna, *lun'a, *set'n'j' u *sotiti, *stop'n"k', *telm-, *tolm-, *t"lm-, *trek-, *trok-, *trak-, *tron"ka, *zǫb"l')*, [in:] *Ètimologija 1983*, ed. O.N. Trubačev, Moskva 1985, p. 20–30.

Macůrek J., *Husitství v rumunských zemích*, "Časopis Matice Moravské" 51, 1927, p. 1–98.

Manolescu R., *Cultura orăşenească în Moldova în a doua jumătate a secolului al XV-lea*, [in:] *Cultura moldovenească în timpul lui Ştefan cel Mare*, ed. M. Berza, Bucureşti 1964, p. 47–95.

Manolescu R., *L'écriture latine en Valachie et en Moldavie au Moyen Âge*, "Revue Roumaine d'Histoire" 25, 1–2, 1986, p. 59–68.

Mareş A., *Echivalările Talantului în textele româneşti din secolele al XVI-lea şi al XVII-lea*, "Limba Română" 49, 3, 2000, p. 483–495.

Mareş A., *Evangheliarul din Petersburg, tipărirea unei mai vechi traduceri moldoveneşti*, "Limba Română" 17, 1, 1968, p. 85–87.

Mareş A., *Observaţii cu privire la Evangheliarul din Petersburg*, "Limba Română" 16, 1, 1967, p. 65–75.

Mareş A., *Originalele primelor traduceri româneşti ale Tetraevanghelului şi Psaltirii*, [in:] *Scriere şi Cultură Românească Veche*, Bucureşti 2005, p. 261–263 (= *Cele mai vechi texte româneşti. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*, ed. I. Gheţie, Bucureşti 1982, p. 185–187).

Mareş A., *Precizări cu privire la traducerea Tetraevanghelului lui Coresi*, "Studii şi Cercetări de Lingvistică" 18, 6, 1967, p. 652–657.

Mareş A., [rec.] Demény L., L.A. Demény, *Carte, tipar şi societate la Români în secolul al XVI-lea…*, "Limba Română" 27, 5, 1988, p. 477–481.

Mârza E., *Un fragment din Evangheliarul slavo-român de la Sibiu (1551–1553)*, "Limba Română" 27, 2, 1978, p. 173–175 (= *Explorări bibliografice*, Sibiu 2008, p. 14–16).

Medaković D., *Grafika srpskih štampanih knjga XV–XVII veka*, Beograd 1958.

Mihăescu H., *La romanité dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe*, Bucureşti 1993.

Mihăilă G., *Împrumuturi vechi sud-slave în limba romînă. Studiu lexico-semantic*, Bucureşti 1960.

Mihăilă G., *Primul manuscris românesc pre-coresian datat: Codicele Popii Bratul din Braşov (1559–1560) şi sursele sale*, [in:] *Studii de lingvistică şi filologie*, Timişoara 1981, p. 59–114.

Mihăilă G., *Textele bilingve slavo-române şi unele aspecte ale studiului calcului lingvistic*, [in:] *Contribuţii la istoria culturii şi literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti 1972, p. 231–249.

Miklosich F., *Die Sprache der Bulgaren in Siebenbürgen*, "Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Classe" 7, 1856, p. 105–147.

Miklosich F., *Die Sprache der Bulgaren in Siebenbürgen*, Wien 1856.

Miletič L., *Dako-Românitě i těhnata slavjanska pismenost*, II, *Novi vlaho-bălgarski gramoti ot Brašov*, "Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина" / "Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina" 9, 1896, p. 3–152.

Molin V., *Ilustraţia în vechea carte bisericească*, "Biserica Ortodoxă Română" 78, 7–8, 1960, p. 683–719.

Moussakova E., *The Illustrated Slavonic Miscellanies of Damascenes Studite's Thesauros – A New Context for Gospel Illustrations in the 17th Century*, [in:] *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Art: Crossing Borders, Exploring Boundaries. Art Readings. Thematic Peer-reviewed Annual in Art Studies*, vol. I, *Old Art*, ed. E. Mutafov, I. Toth, Sofija 2017, p. 325–348.

Nemirovskij E.L., *Načalo knigopečatnija v Valachii*, Moskva 2008.

Nemirovskij E.L., *Slavjanskie izdanija kirillovskogo (cerkovnoslavjanskogo) šrifta: 1491–2000. Inventar' sochranivšichsja èkzempljarov i ukazateľ literatury*, vol. I, *(1491–1550)*, Moskva 2009.

Panaitescu P.P., *Începuturile şi biruinţa scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti 1965.

Panaitescu P.P., *Liturghierul lui Macarie (1508) şi începuturile tipografiei în ţările române*, [in:] *Contribuţii la istoria culturii româneşti*, Bucureşti 1971, p. 274–339.

Panaitescu P.P., *Les origines de l'imprimerie en langue roumaine*, "Revue des études sud-est européennes" 6, 1, 1968, p. 23–37.

Papacostea Ş., *Moldova în epoca Reformei. Contribuţie la istoria societăţii moldoveneşti în veacul al XVI-lea*, "Studii Revistă de Istorie" 11, 4, 1958, p. 55–76.

Pascu G., *Sufixele româneşti*, Bucureşti 1916.

Pavel E., *Textul evanghelic în cultura românească*, "Limba Română" 66, 1, 2012, p. 26–35.

Petrovici E., *Note slavo-române III*, "Dacoromania" 11, 1948, p. 184–193.

Philippi P., *Ein Moldauer 1532 als Bibelübersetzer?*, [in:] *Land des Segens? Fragen an die Geschichte Siebenbürgens und seiner Sachsen*, Köln–Weimar–Wien 2008, p. 105–109 (= "Zeitschrift für Siebenbürgische Landeskunde" 13, 1, 1990, p. 19–22).

Rosetti A., *Cu privire la datarea primelor traduceri româneşti de cărţi religioase*, "Limba Română" 7, 2, 1958, p. 20–22 (= *Du nouveau sur la date des premières traductions roumaines de livres religieux*, "Romania. Revue consacrée à l'étude des langues et des littératures romanes" 80, 317, 1959, p. 79–82).

Sârku P., [rec.] *Psaltirea publicată la 1577 de Diaconul Coresi, Reprodusă cu un studiu şi glosar comparativ la B. Petriceicu-Haşdeu* – "Журнал Министерства Народного Просвещения" / "Žurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosveščenija" 228, 1883, p. 319–397.

Simonescu D., *Un Octoih al lui Bojidar Vucovici la noi şi legăturile acestuia cu tipografia românească*, "Revista istorică română" 3, 2–3, 1933, p. 227–233.

Skok P., *La terminologie chrétienne en slave: l'église, les prêtres et les fidèles*, "Revue des études slaves" 7, 3, 1927, p. 177–198.

Sokolyszyn A., *Sweipolt Fiol: The First Slavic Printer of Cyrillic Characters*, "American Slavic and East European Review" 18, 1, 1959, p. 88–94.

Székely M., Biliarsky I., *Tetraevanghelul Ieromonahului Macarie din Putna (1529)*, "Analele Putnei / The Annals of Putna" 2, 2013, p. 51–74.

Tasmowski L., *În ajunul unei ediţii transliterate şi electronice a Evangheliarului bilingv slavo-român de la Sibiu*, [in:] *Per Teresa. Studi e ricerche in ricordo di Teresa Ferro*, vol. II, *Obiettivo Romania*, ed. G. Borghello et al., Udine 2009, p. 327–338.

Turdeanu E., *L'activité littéraire en Moldavie à l'époque de Etiènne le Grand (1457–1504)*, [in:] *Etudes de littérature roumaine et d'écrits slaves et grecs des Principautés roumaines*, Leiden 1985, p. 113–161 (= "Revue des Etudes Roumaines" 5/6, 1960, p. 21–66].

Valmarin L., *La latinità dei rumeni come arma politica dalla Scuola transilvana a oggi*, [in:] *La latinité hier, aujourd'hui, demain, Actes du Congrčs international procurés par Georges et Ilinca Barthouil-Ionesco, Avignon – 10–13 mai 1978*, ed. G. Barthouil, I. Barthouil-Ionesco, Bucarest 1981, p. 401–424.

Veress E., *Bibliografia română-Ungară*, vol. III, *Românii în literatura ungară şi Ungurii în literatura română (1839–1878)*, Bucureşti 1935.

VV. AA., *Istoria Romîniei*, vol. I, ed. A. Oţetea, M. Berza et al., Bucureşti 1962.

Abstract. At least from the 14th to the 17th c. – beyond their Middle Ages until their Early Modern Ages – the Rumanians belonged to the so-called *Slavia Orthodoxa*. Besides the Orthodox faith, they had in common with the Orthodox Slavs the Cyrillic alphabet until the 19th c. and the Church Slavonic, which was the language of the Church, of the Chancery and of the written culture, until the 17th c., although with an increasing competition of the Rumanian *volgare*. The crisis and decline of the Rumanian Slavonism, the rise of the local vernacular, have been related with Heterodox influences penetrated in Banat and Transylvania. Actually, the first Rumanian translations of the Holy Scriptures, in the 16th c., were promoted, if not confessionally inspired, by the Lutheran Reformation recently transplanted in Banat and Transylvania (some scholars incline to a [widely] Hussite origin of these early translations). Not only Banat and Transylvania, but also Moldavia and Wallachia (the Principalities) were crossed by the border between the Latin and the Byzantino-Slavonic world, the *Slavia* and the *Romània*. Influences from the whole *Slavia* – the *Orthodox* and the *Latin Slavia*, the *Southern*, the *Eastern* and the *Western* one – met in the Carpatho-Danubian Space describing what will be derogatively called *Slavia Valachica* (i.e. Rumanian): a kaleidoscope of Slavic influences in Romance milieu. The appearance of Slavo-Rumanian texts, either with alternate or parallel Church Slavonic and Rumanian, revealed that in the middle of the 16th c. the decline of Slavonism had already started. Mostly but not only in the western regions, beyond the Carpathians, which were under Latin rule, the Orthodox ("Schismatic") clergy was less and less confident with the Slavonic. This last still remained the sacred language though largely unintelligible, whilst the vernacular still lacked sacred dignity, besides being suspect to spread Heterodoxy. The *Slavo-Rumanian Tetraevangelion of Sibiu* (1551–1553) is the oldest version of a biblical text in Slavonic and Rumanian and contains the oldest surviving printed text in Rumanian. Apart from evoking icastically – by its two-columns *a fronte* layout – the Slavic-Rumanian linguistic border, this fragment of a Four-Gospels Book (Mt 3, 17 – 27, 55) can be considered in many senses a border text: geographically (the border between East and West), chronologically (the decline of Slavonism and the rise of the Rumanian Vernacular), culturally and confessionally (the border between the Latin [i.e. Catholic then Protestant too] West and the Byzantino-Slavonic East). This paper aims to reconstruct, as far as possible, the complex milieu in which the *Tetraevangelion* was translated, (maybe) redacted and printed, focusing on the Slavonisms in its Rumanian text. A special attention will be paid to any possible interaction between that mainly Latin (Lutheran-Saxon) milieu and the Rumanian Slavonism.

Keywords: Slavo-Rumanian, Sibiu, Lutheranism, Tetraevangelion, Gospel of Matthew, Filip Maler

Giuseppe Stabile

University of Naples "L'Orientale"
Department of Literary, Linguistic and Comparative Studies
via Duomo, 219
80 138 Naples, Italy
gstabile@unior.it