1. Argument

First of all, a few explanatory comments about the dissertation title are due – *Comparison between the Bible from Bucharest (1688) and the 1975 Revised Version by Samuil Micu. Translation Issues*. It is circulated in specialized literature the fact that Samuil Micu revises the first integral edition of the *Bible* in Romanian, and, at the same time, he re-translates it, starting form the Greek version edited in Franeker *Septuaginta*, and not from the Latin text of the *Vulgata*, the official text of the catholic tradition. Although it belonged to one unit, the text from Blaj will be used for the subsequent editions of the *Bible*: the 1819 version edited at Sankt Peteresburg, the version edited by Filotei, Bishop of Buzău, in 1854-1856, the edition from Sibiu, made by Metropolitan Andrei Şaguna, and even the 1914 edition, which also reproduced the *Bible* form Blaj, but with massive editing.

As my dissertation is mainly of an applied character, specifically through the comparative study of the two Romanian texts of the Bible, my understanding of the translation issues is the ways in which Romanian

translators managed to transfer the biblical message and to overcome the linguistic barriers imposed by the contact between Romanian and classical languages from from which the texts have been translated, and, at the same time, the working techniques used to solve various obstacles of cultural and linguistic nature.

By undertaking the study of the relationship between the two versions of the biblical translation into Romanian, I defined and outlined the profile of the main linguistic concepts that are on the border with the science of translation, a domain based on the textual tradition of the Scripture during different time-contexts, and for each culture separately. By noticing the importance of translations of the sacred text in the cultural history of every people, I considered as justified to make an overview of the evolution of ides about biblical translation, keeping a balance between the two poles: literal and free translation. As one cannot discuss of a translation in the case of the *Bible* from Bucharest (1688) and the *Bible* from Blaj (1795) without making references to the Greek source texts of *Septuaginta* in the Frankfurt 1597 edition, and in the 1709 Franeker edition,

I proceeded to first shortly present the former and latter editions. My purpose is to bring arguments, by means of a comparative study, for the translation strategies that were chosen by the translators of the two biblical texts, and and to point out, by relating to the Greek source-texts, the ways in which they managed to solve translation difficulties. In order to properly approach translation issues of the biblical text, I will specifically take into consideration the lexical level, as it is the most affected by translation, and it is subject to the most relevant changes. Thus, I will synthetize the most important mechanisms of translation identified by comparing the two biblical texts, namely: glossaries, transfer, borrowing, omission and collocating.

2. Dissertation Structure

The paper is made of five chapters, which are structured in units and sub-units, whereby the first part has a predominantly descriptive and theoretical character, followed by a second part that is mainly applied.

The introductory presentation, where the main coordinates of the paper are described, is followed by a theoretical chapter entitled *The Bible and Its Translation*, where I intended to briefly present the Romanian biblical texts that were used in the analysis, as well as the Greek editions which have been used by Samuil Micu and Nicolae Milescu to translate them. In the first part of this chapter, I considered necessary to present the intertextual connections between the partial translations: Ms. 45, Ms. 4389, *New Testament* from Bălgrad (1648), *Tetraevanghelul* from Sibiu (1560) and the integral texts, the *Bible* from Bucharest (1688) and the *Bible* from Blaj (1795), pointing out the converging elements and the filiation connections with other translations and revisions. Also, I considered a description of the source-texts to be of importance: *Septuaginta* in the 1597 Frankfurt edition and the 1709 Franeker edition. The last part of this chapter deals with the portraits of the two translators, Nicolae Milescu and Samuil Micu, with an accent on the context and the causes that led to the initiative of translating the biblical texts outside the Church.

The third chapter, entitled *Biblical Translation Science*, represents a theoretical research where I undertake a critical overview of the theoretical perspectives on translation, starting with the first reflections (Cicero, Ieronim, Martin Luther, Wilhelm von Humboldt) and up to the modern period, by following the evolution of this phenomenon as reflected in the conceptions of reputed translators and theoreticians. As part of this process, I was specifically interested in the translation models proposed by Eugenio Coseriu and Eugene A. Nida. In the second part of this chapter, I narrowed down the domain to translations of the biblical texts, by discussing the importance of identifying the editions and the sources of biblical translations, as well as the advantage that such knowledge brings to critical research in the fields of philology and translations. I also followed the issue of literal translation of the biblical text and I briefly exemplified some translation strategies that have been used by the translators of the studies texts (transfer, borrowing, omission, interpolation, adaptation, paraphrasing).

The fourth chapter, *The Connection Between the Bible from Bucharest (1688) and the Bible from Blaj (1795). Translation Issues*, representing three quarters of the entire dissertation, has an applied character and accounts for a comparative approach of the *Bible* from Bucharest (1688) and the *Bible* from Blaj (1795), constantly related to the Greek source-texts, *Septuaginta* Frankfurt (1597) and *Septuaginta* Franeker (1709). The comparison aims at an overview of translation phenomena, starting with Ms. 45, Ms. 4389, and going through the consecutive translations and revisions that preceded the modern editions of the XXIth century. I focused on practices of literal translation (transfer, borrowing) and on elements that are not specific of the biblical text, but which play an important role in its translation (glossaries, omission, interpolation). The differences in translation that have been recorded represent the main basis for the reflections on translation issues, as well as the common solutions in translation, which I consider necessary in illustrating the translation phenomenon, although the latter have contributed in a lesser degree to my overall argumentation. I divided the chapter dedicated to

translation issues and to the connection between the two biblical texts into four sections with several sub-sections each. This chapter is based on a research studies on transfer practices in the *Bible* from Bucharest (1688), signed by researchers such as Vasile Arvinte, Eugen Munteanu and Ioan-Florin Florescu, who studied the following biblical books: *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numeri*, *Deuteronomium*[1], *I Paralipomenon*[2] and *The Wisdom of Solomon*[3]. They identified the most important cases of translation through transfer. These studies have been highly useful in identifying and comparing the contexts in the Bucharest *Bible* with the corresponding ones in the Blaj *Bible*, and for investigating the degree in which the most difficult translation situations have been

---

[1]I used the introductive linguistic studies dedicated to these biblical books from the series *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum*, Pars I, *Genesis*, Iaşi, 1998, pp. 92-96 ; Pars II, *Exodus*, Iaşi, 1991, pp. 41-47; Pars III, *Leviticus*, Iaşi, 1993, pp. 25-36; Pars IV, *Numeri*, Iaşi, 1994, 28-37; Pars V, *Deuteronomium*, Iaşi, 1997, pp. 41-56, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi.

[2]Ioan-Florin Florescu, *Comentarii*, în *Biblia 1688*, ediţia *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum*, *Biblia 1688*, Pars IX, *Paralipomenon I*, *Paralipomenon II*, „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2011, pp. 144-288.

[3] Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Humanitas, Bucureşti, 2008, pp. 272-360.

similarly or differently solved by the translator fromTransylvania, either through linguistic transfer, or through lexical borrowing or paraphrasing. The analysed examples are commented from a philological perspective, and, at the same time, from a linguistic one. I underlined the common solutions, as well as the different ones for each context, as they are of great importance in identifying the type of relation, be it translation, or revision, which take place at language levels.

Glossaries is another technique used in the translation of the biblical text from 1795 and it has an important role in identifying translation contexts that posed problems to the translator. Taking into account that the annotations made by either the translator from Transylvania, or by the editors of the text from Blaj, are valuable in their content and by their references to other source-texts, I made exhaustive use of the paratextual apparatus represented by the 1631 glossaries. The main research objectives of our study of the Blaj *Bible* are: to provide information regarding the translation methods used by Samuil Micu, to designate the main and the

secondary source-texts for the translation, to identify the role of the annotations for the XVIIIth century Romanian language, to establish the translation strategies involved in the revision process of the Bucharest *Bible* along with glossaries implications. With this in mind, I have chosen to identify, analyse and classify the glossaries of this text. Thus, I have chosen a classification of the Blaj *Bible* glossaries according to references to different texts and according to content.

The issue of omissions and interpolations has often posed certain conditions to translators, and not only. As the translation differences in the Old Testament cannot be exhaustively analysed, I have chosen to present these phenomena in the following books: *Numerile*, *A doua lege*, *Iisus Navi* and *Cartea întâi a Macaveilor*. These books present many differences, but I did not consider necessary to show all examples; instead, I underlined the identified phenomena of translation. I made use of this aspect in the other applied sub-chapters as well, indicating and analysing contexts which contain omissions or interpolations. In this section, as well as in other chapters, I have specifically tried to make a

comparative analysis of the Greek texts, since the differences in translation of the Romanian editions are due to these texts on many occasions.

Another problem that the translators of the old biblical texts encountered, and which I dwell upon in the final part of this chapter, is punctuation transposition. Following this lead, I have made a brief presentation of the punctuation phenomenon in the studied biblical texts, up to the modern period. I made an analysis of the way in which the Cyrillic and Latin texts punctuation signs were interpreted. Since the most differences in punctuation can be found in the studied Greek texts, I deemed suitable a comparative description of the identified issues. I did not plan an exhaustive approach in this case, but rather pointing out and comparatively describing various ways of transposition and semantic interpretation of punctuation signs, under certain circumstances.

The text corpus used for documentation, comparison and highlighting of translation choices consists of: *Septuaginta* edited by Lambert Bos in 1709, and *Septuaginta* edited in Venice, in 1687; *Septuaginta*

edited in Frankfurt, in 1597; *Septuaginta* edited by Alfred Rahlfs; *Vulgata* Clementina edited in 1929, manuscript 45, and manuscript 4389; the *Bible* from Bucharest; the *Bible* from Blaj; *Vulgata* from Blaj, 1760-1761; the edition from Sankt Petersburg in 1819; the edition made by Andrei Şaguna in 1856-1858; the *New Testament* from Bălgrad (1648); *Tetraevanghelul* printed by Coresi (1560); the synod edition from 1914; and other modern editions of the sacred text in Romanian, as well as the *Bible* edited by Bartolomeu Anania and *Septuaginta* edited by Polirom, in 2004, which I have used to clarify or to underline certain linguistic aspects.

3. Conclusions

As a result of studying and of comparative analysing of a considerable number of biblical contexts, the Romanian biblical tradition seems to be a rich domain for research, which has been insufficiently explored, while its provocative calling continuously claims for an unified approach by related disciplines. After a thorough theoretical and applied study of the Romanian biblical tradition, I came to the conclusion that the *Bible* form

Blaj has become a valuable *textus receptus* through the influence that it has exterted on subsequent Romanian biblical editions. Once the translation in the *Bible* form Blaj (1795) had been taken over in the edition from Sankt Petersburg (1819), this text was used on Romanian territory until the XXth century. The majority of analysed cases on lexical level lead to the following conclusion: B1819, edition Şaguna, and B1914 made full use of Samuil Micu's translation. The old translators of the biblical text attended to the model-texts under various degrees of fidelity. This is the case of the Blaj *Bible* translation, which, although made by a Greek-Catholic translator, has managed to assert influence among biblical texts that belong to the orthodox space. After comparison with modern texts - the edition made by Bartolomeu Anania and the NEC edition – I was able to conclude in the case of many important contexts, which I have mentioned in my paper, that the modern translators have tried to offer adequate solutions which would comply with previous literal tradition, by making use of earlier prestige translations. With a wish to realize high standard editions, with a rich paratextual apparatus, they

made use of interpolations, synonyms, paraphrasing, being able to benefit form modern research instruments. Transpozition of the biblical message is a difficult task, limited by the target-language, and these meta-textual elements, which are the glossaries, may replace in many cases an omission, and they offer the translator and the editor an overview of the linguistic phenomenon. The glossaries and the verses discussed in the previous sections reflect Samuil Micu's consistent activity in order to realize a better version compared to the 1688 text, both by using both the borrowing technique and that of transfer, where the former is predominant, as well as by explaining Greek origin terms in annotations. Aware of the eventuality of error or imprecision, and with a wish to accomplish the objective announced in the preface *Cătră cetitoriu*, the scholar relates to the first Romanian translation with great consistency, both explicitly, through the critical apparatus, and implicitly as we can see from the examples chosen for analysis. The function of the footnotes in the paratextual apparatus of the FRANKF. edition, and in that made by Lambert Bos for his edition, represents a starting point in

translation, and a useful, comfortable source of information; even so, B1688 and B1795 do not consider these notes as their main option. I chose in favour of an exhaustive classification of these glossaries, and I pointed out the most important translation situations that were catalogued. Thus, according to content, I identified explicative, completive, guiding types of glossaries, glossaries that include secondary translation versions, and synonym glossaries, and according to references to various texts, I identified: glossaries with references to the Latin text, to various Greek texts, to the Slavic text, glossaries referencing the text of *Parimiilor peste an* from 1683, as well as references to other texts and translators of the biblical text (Ieronim, Sf. Augustin, Sf, Ioan Chrisostom etc.).

I disclosed, through analysis of a considerable number of biblical verses, the connection between the *Bible* form Bucharest and the *Bible* form Blaj, and the modifications prompted by Samuil Micu's translation, as well as the ways in which the translator relates to the 1688 edition. Out of more than 500 compared contexts with their correspondent translation form the Blaj *Bible*,

and by relating to the Greek source-texts, I could conclude on changes in the translation choices in the case of more than 50%, changes that predominantly intervened on lexical level, either by assimilation through a different linguistic transfer, by borrowing, or by other solution. More than 350 analysed contexts, presented in the transfer section, served in highlighting the importance of the 1795 *Bible* as part of the Romanian biblical tradition, and which should be considered *textus receptus* of great value, as it represents the foundation of subsequent translations and editing versions of the *Bible* from Bucharest. I concluded, by constantly relating to the source-texts, that certain differences at the level of Greek texts determined the appearance of certain omissions and interpolations in the Romanian biblical texts. Although the *Bible* form Bucharest has received numerous linguistic and translation research studies, I consider that the most important element of novelty in this particular study resides in the analysis of the connection between the mentioned biblical texts, under a translation perspective.

SELECTIVE BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Sources

B1688 = *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură ale cei vechi şi ale cei noao leage toate care s-au tălmăcit dupre limba elinească spre înţelegerea limbii rumăneşti cu porunca preabunului creştin şi luminatului domn Ioan Şărban Cantacuzinó Basarabă Voievodă...*, tipărită întâia oară în 1688. *Biblia 1688*, text stabilit şi îngrijire editorială de Vasile Arvinte şi Ioan Caproşu (volum întocmit de Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manea), Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2001, vol. II (volum întocmit de Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manea, N. A. Ursu), Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 2002.

B1795 = *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a ceii Noao, care s-au tălmăcit de pre limba elinească pre înţălesul limbii româneşti* (...), Blaj, 1795. *Biblia de la Blaj (1795), Ediţie jubiliară*, cu binecuvântarea Î.P.S. Lucian Mureşan, mitropolitul Bisericii Unite, coordonatorul ediţiei Ioan Chindriş,

Roma, 2000.

FRANKF. = *Τῆς θείᾶ Γραφῆς Παλαίας, δηλαδὴ καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης ἀπάντα – Divinae Scripturae nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece, a viro doctissimo recognita et emendata, variisque lectionibus aucta et illustra, Frankofurti ad Moenum, apud Andreae Wecheli haeredes*, 1597.

SEPT. FRANEK. = *Η ΠΑΛΑΙΑ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΗΚΟΝΤΑ. VETUS TESTAMENTUM EX VERSIONE SEPTUAGINTA INERPRETUM. Secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum, accuratissime denuo recognitum, una cum scholiis ejusdem editionis, variis manuscriptorum codicum veterumque exemplarium lectionibus, nec non fragmentis versionum Aquilae, Symachi Theodothionis. Summa cura edidit Lambertus Bos, L. Gr. in Acad. Franeq. Professor. Franequerae. Excudit Francisus Halma, Illustr. Frisiae Ord. atque eorundem Academiae typogr. ordinar. MDCCIX.*

B. Dictionaries and grammar books

DA = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, tomul I, partea A-B, Bucureşti, 1913; tomul I, partea a II-a, C, Bucureşti, 1940; tomul I, partea a III-a, D-De, Bucureşti, 1949; tomul II, partea I, F-I, Bucureşti, 1934; tomul II, partea a II-a J-Lacustru, Bucureşti, 1937, Ladă-Lepăda, Bucureşti, 1940, Lepăda-Lojniţă, Bucureşti, 1940.

DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, Editura Academiei R.S.R., Bucureşti, 1965 şi urm.

GA = *Gramatica limbii române*, vol al II-lea, Ediţia a II-a revăzută şi adăugită, Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 1966.

GALR = *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. al II-lea, *Enunţul*, Editura Academiei, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu-Iordan–Al. Rosetti", Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 2005.

Liddell-Scott = H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek – English Lexicon*. With a revised Supplement, Clearedon Press, Oxford, 1996.

Lust, Eynikel, Hauspie = Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel,

Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Revised Edition*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 2003.

Taylor = Bernard A. Taylor, *Analytical lexicon to the Septuagint*, Expanded Edition, with Word Definitions by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, Hendrickson Publishers, Deutsche Bibelgeselleschaft United Bible Societies, Stuttgart, Germany, 2003.

C. Literature

Arvinte, Vasile, 2006, *Studii de istorie a limbii române*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi.

Baker, Mona, 1998, *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* Routledge, London & New York.

Brown, Keith, 2006, *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, Second Edition, Elsevier, Amsterdam, Boston.

Buzzetti, Carlo, 1973, *La parola tradotta. Aspetti linguistici, ermeneutici e teologici della traduzione della sacra scrittura*, Morcelliana, Brescia.

Cândea, Virgil, 1979, *Nicolae Milescu şi începuturile*

traducerilor umaniste în limba română, în volumul *Raţiunea dominantă. Contribuţii la istoria umanismului românesc*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, pp. 79-224.

Chindriş, Ioan, 2010, *Crâmpeie din Şcoala Ardeleană*, Editura DACIA XXI, Cluj-Napoca.

Chivu, Gheorghe, 2000, *Evoluţia stilurilor limbii literare*, în vol. *Contribuţii la istoria limbii române literare. Secolul al XVIII lea*, (coord. Ion Gheţie şi Gheorghe Chivu), Editura Clusium, pp. 288-333.

Coseriu, Eugenio, 1985, *Lo erróneo y lo acertado en la teoría de la traducción* în *El hombre y su lenguaje*, Editorial Gredos, primera edítión, diciembre de 1977, reimpresión, marzo de 1985, Los estudios I, II, VIII, X y XI han sido traducidos del alemán, y el estudio n. VI del francés, por Marcos Martínez Hernández. Las traducciones han sido revisadas por el autor espicialmente para esta edítión, Madrid.

Florescu, Ioan-Florin, 2011a, *Literalism şi traducere liberă în tradiţia biblică românească*, teză de doctorat susţinută în 2011 în cadrul Universităţii

„Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi sub coordonarea prof. univ. dr. Eugen Munteanu.

Gafton, Alexandru, 2005, *După Luther. Traducerea vechilor texte biblice*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi.

Iacob, Niculina, 2000, *Biblia de la Blaj (1795) în comparaţie cu Biblia de la Bucureşti (1688)*, *Studiu lingvistic* (teză de doctorat), Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi.

Iorga, Nicolae, 1933, *Istoria literaturii româneşti*, III, Partea întâia (*Generalităţi, Şcoala Ardeleană*), Ediţia a II-a, Revăzută şi larg întregită, Editura Fundaţiei „Regele Ferdinand", Bucureşti.

Loría-Rivel, Gustavo-Adolfo, 2004, *Pentateuhul. Probleme de traducere a textului biblic*, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi.

Munteanu, Eugen, 2008, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Humanitas, Bucureşti.

Nida, Eugene A., 1961, *Bible Translating, An Analysis of Principles and Procedures, with Special Reference to Aboriginal Languages*, First Edition 1961, United Bible Societies, London.

Nunberg, Geoffrey, 1990, *The Linguistics of Punctuation*, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Standford.

Pamfil, Viorica, 1957, *Calcuri româno-maghiare în „Palia de la Orăştie”*, în „Cercetări de lingvistică”, Tomul II, pp. 209-218.

Pavel, Eugen, 2007, *Între filologie şi bibliofilie*, Biblioteca Apostrof, Cluj.

Ursu, N. A., 1962, *Formarea terminologiei ştiinţifice româneşti*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti.