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Abstract

The new edition of the *Evangelium* printed in Snagov, in 1697 (*e* 1697) is distinguished from the previous ones by two aspects: a) structure of the text – because the accuracy of the biblical references in relation to the moments of the church year is restored and ensured, thus making the correlation between the liturgical book of ecclesiastical use and the archetype-text, the *New Testament*, divided into chapters; b) linguistic option of the editor, which specifically and consistently aims at the regime of verbal tenses, i.e., the change of the forms of the simple perfect of the basic edition (*e* 1693) into forms of compound perfect.

Typographical and linguistic differences identified between *e* 1697 (Bucharest), *e* 1697 (Iași) and *e* 1697 (Vienna), of the eleven copies of the book, preserved to this day, indicate the unfolding of some stages in the realization of the edition, a complex and nonlinear editorial and typographical behaviour.

1. *E* 1697

The princely printing house installed in Snagov produced in 1697 five books, one of which was in the Romanian language. Its full title is *Sf[î]nta și dumnezeiasca Evanghelie, cu voia prea luminatului și înălțatului D[o]mn și oblăduitoru a toată Țara Rumânească, Io Constandin B. Voevod și cu porunca purtătorului Pravoslaviei prea sf[î]nțitul Chir Theodosie, Mitropolitul a toatei Țări Rumânești și exarhu plaiurilor*. Acum a doa oară tipărită și diortosită, mai cu multă nevoință, în sf[î]nta Mănăstire în Sneagov, la anul de la spăsenia lumii 1697, de smeritul întru iermonahi Anthim Ivireanul (I) (cf. *BRV I*, p. 343–344).

The specification regarding the order of this book in a number of similar typographical appearances probably refers to the first book with Romanian text that Antim Ivireanul worked on, as a printer: *Evanghelia greco-română* [the Greek-Romanian Gospel] published in 1693 in Bucharest, by the efforts of Șerban Greceanu and Athanasie Moldoveanul.

Actually, in order to produce *Evangelia* of 1697, Antim Ivireanul could have used, as a basic-text, one of the two previous versions: the one from 1682, which, in terms of structure, departs from the Slavonic model of the tetraevangelium from the previous century, being conceived, according to its preface, “precum umbă cea elinească și întru toate asemene, după orînduiala Besearecii Răsăritului” [“as the Greek one goes, and in all likeness, according to the order of the Church of the East”] (*e* 1682, [III’]) and the bilingual one from 1693, which resumes, on the Romanian column, the previous text, keeping its organization. Since Antim Ivireanul himself had taken part in the making of the 1693 edition, one can safely assume that Antim used it in the making of the new version of 1697, operating, as the title suggests, some revisions; however, the collation of the three editions reveals situations and differences that can be explained only by the return of the diortositor / printer to the older text, from 1682.
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2. Emendations

The correctness alluded to in the title of the 1697 book concerned two aspects: a) the structure of the content and b) the linguistic form.

In the first regard, a), the differences between E 1697 and E 1693 (and E 1682) are, most of the time, of detail, restoring and ensuring the accuracy of the respective moment of the church year and the accuracy of the biblical references. Distinctly from previous achievements1, in E 1697 the correlation is made between the liturgical book of church use and the text-archetype, the New Testament, divided into chapters:

“Cade-se a ști că la E[va]ng[he]lia aceasta nu s-au pus zacealele pre cum au fost întâi, ce capetele: pentru ca să poată afla fieștece mai lesne ce i-ar trebui la Tetravgel. Și pre unde iaste steaoa aceasta [ ], să nu gîndească neștine că s-au pus în toate locuri pentru soroacă de sâvîrșit, ce pentru unirea stihurilor den Tetravgel.” (E 1697, [III]1).

Rarely, the reference to the biblical text is wrong: in “Luni, a doaoasprăze săptămînă după Rusalii, de la Matthei, cap. 1” (E 1697, 43), the biblical pericope used is, in fact, from Mark (1, 9–15)—a mistake compared to previous versions E 1693 (94) and E 1682 (41).

A major correction compared to the 1693 edition is the completion of the text with the evangelical fragments corresponding to Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of the seventeenth week after Pentecost of the church year: in E 1693, “Duminica a 16” [the 16th Sunday] is immediately followed by “Sîmbătă a 17” [the 17th Saturday] (116); in E 1682, the omission does not exist (51–52). It seems that Antim returns to the original source when some need arises.

Regarding the linguistic form of the text, b), it is noted that the new editor was especially concerned with the regime of verbal tenses. The other changes observed at the grammatical and lexical level do not show, judging by the inconsistency with which they were generally made, a particular concern in the direction of the renewal of language and expression. A major exception is the intervention aimed at changing the forms of the simple perfect from the basic edition (be it in the direction of the renewal of language and expression. A major exception is the intervention aimed at changing the forms of the simple perfect from the basic edition (be it
correlation is made between

---

1For an overview of the history of the Evangelium’s use in the Romanian culture, see Pavel (2012, p. 13–28).

2In the passages presented in parallel, the divergent forms (simple perfect vs. compound perfect, or, more rarely, pluperfect) are written in italics.
noaă, de faci aceastea?”. Răspune  I[su]s și zise lor: „Spargeți beseareca aceasta și în trei zile o voiu rădacă.” Și ziseră jidovii: „În patruzeci și șase de ani să zidi beseareca aceasta și tu în trei zile veai să o răraci?”. Iară El zicea de beseareca trupului său. Deci cînd să sculă den morți ș-au adus aminte ucenicii că aceasta zicea lor și crezură scripturii și cuvîntului carele zise I[su]s.

În vremea aceaia nea doa doaa. De la Ioan. 6 [9] [John, 2]

În vremea aceaia nea doa doaa după Paști, de la Ioann, cap. 2 [4°–5°] [John, 2]
In most of the situations that, in e 1693, present constructions with the simple perfect seen in the above fragments, the verbal form was replaced with a compound perfect—sometimes with the option for another verb: puseră (e 1693, 264) – au aruncat (e 1697, 122°), fu (e 1693, 265) – s-au făcut (e 1697, 122°)—in the process of making the e 1697. The action, with its high degree of consistency, is characteristic of the entire text and makes the narrative sequences of e 1697, unlike e 1693, have the compound perfect as prototyping verbal tense.

The effort to remove the forms of simple perfect is, on the one hand, in accordance with the tendency signaled, in general, for the 17th–18th centuries, of restricting its area of circulation, in the spoken language, to Oltenia, Banat and Crișana; on the other hand, however, it runs counter to the habit of continuing to be used intensively in written texts (Frâncu, 2009, p. 306). The transition from the simple perfect to the compound perfect is not a general and blind rule in the process of editing, as can be seen in two cases present in the excerpted texts, where the simple perfect has been replaced by the pluperfect, for rendering a process located before another process in the past: fu (e 1693, 265) – să făcuse (with a change of number as well, e 1697, 122°), fură (e 1693, 265) – să făcuse (e 1697, 123°). The diversity of linguistic choices regarding the regime of the verbal forms of the past tense, greater than that recorded in the basic edition, emphasizes the different temporal depths of the narrative and of the discursive plans, perceived and controlled by the editor. This is more evident in situations where two forms of simple perfect that are close or in immediate succession have different resolutions in the new edition, according to the chronology of the narrated events:

“văzînd sutașul ce fu, slăvi pre D[u]mnezău” (e 1693, 265) – „văzînd sutașul cealea ce să făcuse, au slăvit pre D[u]mnezău” (e 1697, 123°);

„și toată mulțimea carea venise împreună la privirea aceasta, văzînd cealea ce fură, bătîndu-ș piepturile lor să întoarseră.” (e 1693, 265) – „și tot norodul ce fusese împreună la priveala aceaia, văzînd cealea ce să făcuse, bătîndu-ș piepturile sale, s-au intors.” (e 1697, 123°).

The places where the simple perfect form is preserved are, by comparison, much rarer.

3. Printing variants

That we are faced with a programmed intention to emendate the text in linguistic terms is a fact that is discovered not only after comparing the successive editions of the book, but also in the research of the copies of the 1697 edition, existing today.
There are 11 copies registered in Catalogul colectiv al cărtii vechi românești (see Evanghelie. Snagov, 1697). Of these, we were able to compare in detail three: a copy held by the Library of the Romanian Academy, Bucharest, inv. 467 (further, for the discussion on the linguistic and typographical differences between them, Ev 1697 b); a copy owned by the Library of the Romanian Academy, Iaşi, inv. n.a. (Ev 1697 i); and the copy in the Collection of Old Manuscripts and Prints of the Austrian National Library, inv. 22.C.11 (Ev 1697 v). The three copies are not absolutely identical: there are differences between them of typographical and linguistic nature, that indicate the development of some stages in the realization of the edition. The differences concerning the regime of the verbal tenses, in this case, the emendation of the simple perfect from the basic edition (Ev 1682/1693) are recorded in portions of text printed on 1°âl and 4°âl:

| E 1697 | E 1697 i | E 1697 v/b |
|--------|---------|--------------|
| Și lumina întru întuneearcă | Și lumina întru întuneearcă | Și lumina întru întuneearcă |
| luminează și întuneearcul pre ia nu o caprine. | luminează și întuneearcul nu o caprine. | caprine. |
| (1) | (1')/1 | (1')/1 |
| Că leagea prin Moisii fu dată, iară darul pre [Iv] s u [Hristos] ʃu. | Că leagea prin Moisii au fost dată, iară darul și adevarul prin [Iv] s H[risto]ʃu. | Că leagea prin Moisii au fost dată, iară darul și adevarul prin [Iv] s H[risto]ʃu. |
| (2) | (1')/1 | (1')/1 |
| Și-l întrebară: „Dară Cine ești? Au doară tu ești ilie?” | Și-l întrebară: „Cine ești? Au doară tu ești ilie?” | Și-l întrebară: „Cine ești? Au doară tu ești ilie?” |
| Deci ziseră lui: „Cine ești?” | Deci ziseră lui: „Cine ești?” | Deci au zis lui: „Cine ești?” |
| (3) | (1')/2 | (1')/2 |
| Deci cind să sculă din morți ș-au adus aminte ucenicii lui că aceasta zicea lor și crezușă scripturii și cuvântului carele zisease [Iv] s. | Deci cind să sculă den morți ș-au adus aminte ucenicii că aceasta zicea lor și crezușă scripturii și cuvântului carele zisease [Iv] s. | Deci cind să sculă den morți ș-au adus aminte uc[e]nicii că aceasta zicea lor și au crezut scripturii și cuvântului carele zisease [Iv] s. |
| (3°/2–4°1) | (3°/2–4°1) | (3°/2–4°1) |
| Și să bucurasă uc[e]nicii văzând pre D[o]mnul | Și să bucurasă ucenicii văzând pre Domnul | Și s-au bucurat ucenicii văzând pre Domnul |
| (8) | (4°/2) | (4°/2) |
| Iară Thoma, unul din cei doisprăzeace, care să chiamă Geamân, nu era cu ei cind veni [Iv] s. | Iară Thoma, unul den cei doisprăzeace, care să chiamă Geamân, nu era cu ei cind veni | Iară Thoma, unul den cei doisprăzeace, care să chiamă Geamân, nu era cu ei cind au venit |
| (8) | (4°/1) | (4°/1) |
| Iară el zise lor: „De ne voiou vedea...” | Iară el zise lor: „De ne voiou vedea...” | Iară el le-au zis lor: „De ne voiou vedea...” |
| (8) | (4°/1) | (4°/1) |
| Zise lui [Iv] s: „Deaca mă văzuși, crezuși...” | Zise lui [Iv] s: „Deaca mă văzuși, crezuși...” | Zis-au lui [Iv] s: „Deaca mă văzuși, Thomo, crezuși...” |
| (9) | (4°/1) | (4°/1) |
| În vremea aceaia nuntă să făcă în Cana Galileii | În vremea aceaia nuntă să făcă în Cana Galileii | În vremea aceaia nuntă s-au făcut |
| (9) | (4°/2) | (4°/2) |
| Și-l aduseră | Și-l aduseră | Și s-au adus |
| (9) | (4°/2) | (4°/2) |
| după ce gustă nunul apa ce să făcuse vin | după ce au gustat nunul apa ce să făcuse vin | după ce au gustat nunul apa ce să făcuse vin |
| (9) | (4°/2) | (4°/2) |

Belonging to the edition E 1697, the copy E 1697 i records, as we have indicated above, the strong tendency to emend the forms in the paradigm of the verbal past; but it presents a number of simple perfect forms that do not appear in the E 1697 v and E 1697 b, but which correspond to the forms of the base edition at the places concerned. It is possible that, working on the text, the editor / printer has made a first wave of changes, printing accordingly the typographic sheet, with a text shape visible in E 1697 i; to a reassessment of what had been done until then, probably under the influence of a clearer and clearer conviction regarding the justice of this emendatory practice, the editor returns to the text, corrects it additionally (or reconstructs the page) and reprints accordingly the typographic sheet, with a form of the text visible in the E 1697 v and E 1697 b; and then continues in a manner that, until the end, satisfies him in terms of
the linguistic aspect, not coming to the text for corrections on the printing sheets that come to constitute
the rest of the book.

Other linguistic differences in corresponding places, which contrast E 1697 1 with “the group” E 1697 V and B, are:

| E 1693 | E 1697 1 | E 1697 V/B |
|--------|----------|-----------|
| intru una de simbete (2) | intru una din simbete (1^v/1) | intru una de simbete (1^v/1) |
| Primiți D[u]h Sf[i]nt (2) | Primiți D[u]hul Sf[i]nt (1^v/1) | Luați D[u]hul Sf[i]nt (1r/1) |
| De nu voi vedea în mânile lui ranele piroanelor și să puiu deagetul mieu în ranele piroanelor (2) | De nu voi vedea în mânile lui ranele piroanelor și de nu voi băga deagetul mieu în ranele piroanelor (1^v/1) | De nu voi vedea în mânile lui ranele cuielor și de nu voi băga deagetul mieu în ranele cuielor (1^v/1) |
| Pre D[u]mezău nime nu l-au văzut (2) | Pre D[u]mezău nime nu l-au văzut (1^v/2) | Pre D[u]mezău nimenea nu l-au văzut (1^v/2) |
| arătă lor mîinele și coasta lui (8) | le-au arătat lor mîinele și coasta sa (4^v/2) | le-au arătat lor mîinele și coasta sa (4^v/2) |
| Luați D[u]b Sf[i]nt (8) | Luați D[u]b Sf[i]nt (4^v/1) | Luați D[u]b Sf[i]nt (4^v/1) |
| De nu voi vedea în mîinele lui ranele (8) | De nu voi vedea în mîinele lui ranele (4^v/1) | De nu voi vedea în mîinele lui ranele (4^v/1) |
| vezi mîinele meale (9) | vezi mîinele meale (4^v/1) | vezi mîinele meale (4^v/1) |
| Deaca mă văzuși, / / crezuși (9) | Deaca mă văzuși, / / crezuși (4^v/1) | Deaca mă văzuși, Thomo, crezuși (4^v/1) |
| au făcut l[su] și alte seamne multe înaintea ucenicilor lui (9) | au făcut l[su] și alte seamne multe înaintea ucenicilor lui (4^v/1) | au făcut l[su] și alte seamne multe înaintea ucenicilor săi (4^v/1) |
| care nu s-au scris în cartea aceasta (9) | care nu s-au scris în cartea aceasta (4^v/1) | carele nu s-au scris în cartea aceasta (4^v/1) |
| sfirșindu-se vinul (9) | sfirșindu-se vinul (4^v/2) | sfirșindu-se vinul (4^v/2) |

These phonetic and grammatical differences are accompanied on the same sheets by smaller changes, of a
typographical and graphic nature, without repercussions at other language levels:

a) the use of a different model of letter:

| E 1697 1 | E 1697 V/B |
|----------|-----------|
| (1^v/1, r.1) | (1^v/1, r.1) |
| (4^v/1, r.8) | (4^v/1, r.8) |
| (4^v/2, r.20) | (4^v/2, r.20) |

b) the use of a different letter (or a diacritical sign) but with the same phonetic value:

| E 1697 1 | E 1697 V/B |
|----------|-----------|
| (1^v/2, r.33) | (1^v/2, r.33) |
| (4^v/2, r.10) | (4^v/2, r.10) |
| (4^v/2, r.15) | (4^v/2, r.15) |

---

3Several times, the forms we refer to here can be found in the previously edited versions of the book. However, some (din, 1^v/1; sfirșindu-se, 4^v/2) represents emendations to E 1693 and/or E 1682. The fact that these emendations no longer appear in E 1697 V and B does not necessarily mean a proper return of the new editor to the model E 1693 or E 1682, during the resumption of work on the first typographical sheets, but it can be a simple (re)evaluation of the expression under influences that have nothing to do with the authority of the basic edition.

4Here, and below, we give only a few examples from each category detected; the noted differences concern absolutely corresponding typographical places.
c) whole word vs. shorthand/letter written above the row:

| E 1697 I       | E 1697 V/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (1′/2, r.20)   | (1′/2, r.20) |
| (4′/2, r.26)   | (4′/2, r.26) |

d) different typographical organization of the row:

| E 1697 I       | E 1697 V/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (4′/2, r.10–11)| (4′/2, r.10–11) |

c) differences in the involvement of diacritic signs and/or graphic signs without phonetic value:

| E 1697 I       | E 1697 V/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (1′/1, r.7)    | (1′/1, r.7) |
| (1′/1, r.19)   | (1′/1, r.19) |

Finally, in the binding of the book are used all the typographical versions of the text, which determines the production and putting into circulation of distinct copies.

The fact that the amendments do not concern the entire typographical achievement (they can be observed, regardless of their nature—see also infra—, up to 7′) leads us to consider unfounded the introduction in our discussion, for the edition E 1697, the notions of initial circulation, to which E 1697 I (and, probably, others) would belong, and second circulation, etc., to which other specimens would belong. It is however certain that the objects E 1697 I, E 1697 V and E 1697 B, arising from the entire printing activity, reflect distinct moments in the text editing process.

Those indicated so far place the execution of sheets 1′–v and 4′–v of the copy E 1697 I in the precedence of that of the corresponding sheets of E 1697 V and B. However, the chronological conjecture must be modified for the sheets 2′–v and 3′–v, where the differences put the E 1697 V copy in opposition to the E 1697 I and B copies. Here also, they are rather typographical and graphic:

a) the use of a different model of letter:

| E 1697 V       | E 1697 I/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (2′/1, r.6)    | (2′/1, r.6) |
| (2′/2, r.31)   | (2′/2, r.31) |
| (2′/2, r.4)    | (2′/2, r.4) |

b) the use of a different letter but with the same phonetic value:

| E 1697 V       | E 1697 I/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (2′/1, r.9)    | (2′/1, r.9) |
| (2′/1, r.2)    | (2′/1, r.2) |
| (2′/2, r.14)   | (2′/2, r.14) |
| (2′/1, r.1)    | (2′/1, r.1) |
| (2′/1, r.24)   | (2′/1, r.24) |

c) whole word vs. shorthand/letter written above the row:

| E 1697 V       | E 1697 I/B |
|----------------|------------|
| (2′/1, r.6)    | (2′/1, r.6) |
| (2′/1, r.19)   | (2′/1, r.19) |

\[5\text{The goals envisaged so far regarding the research of the work of Antim Ivireanul (or of some broader issues) have not led to the highlighting, until now, of this fact: see BRV I, loc. cit.; Ștrempel (1997); Chițulescu (2016); etc.}\]
d) different typographical organization of the row:

| E 1697 v | E 1697 I/B |
|----------|-----------|
| (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.23–24) | (3\(^{v}\)/1, r.10–11) |
| (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.23–24) | (3\(^{v}\)/1, r.10–11) |

e) differences in the involvement of diacritic signs and/or graphic signs without phonetic value:

| E 1697 v | E 1697 I/B |
|----------|-----------|
| (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.35) | (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.35) |
| (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.1) | (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.1) |
| (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.17) | (2\(^{v}\)/2, r.17) |

Apart from this type of changes made at a given time, there are also some—much fewer—that concern the actual use of the language at another level, namely different phonetic forms of the same linguistic unit:

| E 1697 v | E 1697 I/B |
|----------|-----------|
| sculîndu-se (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.29) | sculîndu-să (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.29) |
| Isaia (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.6) | Isaia (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.6) |
| luund (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.27) | luînd (2\(^{v}\)/1, r.27) |

Finally, on 7\(^{v}\), three forms place together the E 1697 I and v copies, on the one hand, and the E 1697 b copy, on the other:

| E 1697 I/v | E 1697 b |
|------------|---------|
| vășmînt (7\(^{v}\)/1, r.4) | veșmînt (7\(^{v}\)/1, r.4) |
| nimănui (7\(^{v}\)/1, r.18) | nimunui (7\(^{v}\)/1, r.18) |
| sămn (7\(^{v}\)/2, r.18) | semn (7\(^{v}\)/2, r.18) |

If the observed facts clearly show a process of returning in several stages on the editing of the text, its motivations remain unclear in some of the situations exposed above. In the process of printing the 1697 edition, the sheets 2\(^{v}\)–v and 3\(^{v}\)–v for example are reworked, although the nature and number of the resulting changes do not indicate an orientation determined by the judgment on the linguistic aspect of the text, as it happens—we believe—in the case of changes related to the grammar of the verb.

4. Conclusions

Regardless of the causes of the resumption of work on some portion of the text, the existence of typographical variants, capitalized in the final realization of the Gospel of Snagov, from 1697, highlights a complex and nonlinear editorial and typographical behavior.

The existence of differences between copies, of any type, also means that the results of the research of the text strictly for the purpose of its linguistic description will vary—even if to an extent that can be considered small—depending on the chosen copy (possibly incidentally) as the object of study. On the other hand, however, it is precisely the practice of the repeated embossing of the typographical object in situ that offers the modern linguist the chance to perceive not the language of the text, but the language that writes the text, emanating from someone’s consciousness, which in this way, indirectly, reveals its applied judgment on what is in accordance with the linguistic habits of the era and of the place.
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