

THE CRITICAL RECEPTION OF THE FRANEKER SEPTUAGINT (1709)

Cercetător științific, dr. Ana CATANĂ-SPENCHIU
Asistent de cercetare, dr. Constantin RĂCHITĂ
Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Iași¹

Abstract: *In general, when discussing vernacular translations of the Bible from the late 18th century, one must bear in mind that they are based on mixed sources and are often dependent on local cultural traditions. The second complete translation of the Bible into Romanian, made in Blaj (1795) by the Greek Catholic Samuil Micu Klein, is no exception to this general rule, which concerns an implicit dialogue between two different traditions: that of the earlier Romanian translations, which the Romanian translator set out to perfect, and that of the Protestant and Catholic editions of the Septuagint, assumed either as authoritative texts or merely as sources of control. We set out to investigate the dialogue between the two traditions, focusing our attention on how the Romanian translator relates to Franeker's Septuagint, one of the sources of the translation, published in 1709 by Lambert Bos. The text set in the Dutch edition itself raises philological issues, intensely discussed in pre-modern Protestant exegesis.*

Keywords: *Samuil Micu, textual criticism, Septuagint, biblical exegesis, biblical translation*

1. Johann Ernst Grabe and the critical reception of Franeker's edition

Each of the phenomena that influenced the trajectory of European biblical philology², particularly during the 17th century, had a greater or lesser contribution to the composition of the Dutch *Septuagint*, edited by Lambert Bos. As professor of Greek at the University of Franeker, Bos decided to correct the basic text of the *Sistine* of 1587³, in accordance with the *Codex Vaticanus*⁴, and to collate into the critical apparatus of his version both variants discovered in the annotations and critical observations made by the editors of the *Sistine*, along with lections found in

¹ “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, Department of Social Sciences and Humanities.

² For this topic, we consulted Hessayon & Keene 2006; Killen, Smith, Willie 2015; Sæbø 2008; van Miert, Nellen and Touber 2017.

³ Compiled by a group of Catholic intellectuals with the intention of reconstructing the original text used in the primary Church, the edition also known by the name *Septuaginta Romana* was authorised by Pope Sixtus V and was for a long time the edition preferred by most biblical scholars. For the history of the publication of the *Sistine*, see Scott Mandelbrote, “When Manuscripts Meet: Editing the Bible in Greek during and after the Council of Trent,” (Blair & Goeing 2016: 251–267). Regarding the mixed character of the Greek texts that make it up, see Felix Albrecht, “The History of Septuagint Studies: Editions of the Septuagint” (Salvesen & Law 2021: 56).

⁴ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, II: “Thus <I>, B<os> L<ambertus>, I am rendering here the authentic text of Codex Vaticanus, in compliance with the Roman edition, a precise <text> amended of all errors.” (*Textum igitur B.L. heic tibi exhibeo purum Codicis Vaticani secundum editionem Romanam, accuratum et a mendis repurgatum*).

other manuscripts and editions⁵. Viewed in the context of that age, the issue raised by Lambert Bos's edition is a matter of usefulness. Why would another edition of the *Septuagint*, based on the text of the *Sistine* and the *Vaticanus* manuscripts, be necessary since biblical criticism in Europe was already copiously dominated by this textual tradition⁶? The answer provided by Lambert Bos, who claimed that his aim was to remove textual transmission errors from the other editions, is different from the one perceived in the reception of the Dutch edition, which saw it as closely linked to the danger posed to the other biblical versions by the preparation of the edition based on Grabe's *Codex Alexandrinus*.

The decision to correct the *Sistine* text came in 1704, two years after Johann Ernst Grabe had begun his work and was collecting subscriptions for the Alexandrine version of the Greek text. In order to consolidate his reputation as a critic, Grabe published in 1705 a famous letter to John Mill, in which he attempted to demonstrate the superiority of the *Alexandrinus* manuscript over the *Vaticanus*, insisting in particular on the different version of the *Book of Judges* (A), compared with the quotations of ancient writers and the versions found in other manuscripts⁷. On the contrary, the prefaces of Lambert Bos's edition argue for the superiority of the *Vaticanus* manuscript, while at the same time making several references to Grabe's erudition (*doctissimum Grabium*), proposing amendments to the *Codex Alexandrinus*, advancing some remarks on the *Octateuch* (1707), the first volume of the *Grabiana* edition, and even taking up, in a sub-chapter, a series of emendations proposed by the English critic to the texts of the new manuscript⁸(LXX-Bos, *Subtexere heic potius quam ad calcem Operis* (...) and LXX-Grabe, vol. I, *Prolegomena*, II, §2.).

⁵ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, II: "For the rest, so that nothing is missing from our new edition, we decided to add the notes of the Roman edition on every page and besides these, all the text variants that we managed to acquire." (*Caeterum ne quid in hac nova nostra editione desideraretur, visum fuit singulis paginis subjicere Scholia Romanae Editionis, et praeter illa omnes variantes Lectiones quotquot conquirere pouterimus*).

⁶ In England alone, in addition to the text of the *Septuagint* in the third column of the London Polyglot (1657), two other editions of the *Sistine* were printed. The first belongs to Roger Daniel (*fl.* 1620–1666) and was printed in London in 1653. A second edition, edited by John Pearson, was printed by John Field in Cambridge in 1665 (reprinted in 1683 by Johann Leusden in Amsterdam).

⁷ See Johann Ernst Grabe, *Epistola ad clarissimum virum, D[omi]nu[m] Joannem Millium*, E Theatro Sheldoniano, Oxford, 1705. The epistolary work, addressed to John Mill, reproduces the title of another scientific work, which Richard Bentley, Mill's disciple, published in 1691. This epistle earned Bentley a reputation as a textual critic, for the contents of the epistle set out with great ingenuity and erudition the date and significance of Johannes Malalas' *Chronology* (*cf.* Fox 1954: 61–62; 64–66). Grabe, as a protégé of John Mill, seems to have followed the same strategy of assertion as Bentley.

⁸ The target of these remarks was the uncritical manner in which the London Polyglot added readings from the *Codex Alexandrinus* in the footer of the column dedicated to the Greek text.

Lambert Bos promises a thorough critical analysis of possible errors made by the translators of the Greek texts⁹ as well as explanations for the large number of variants, produced by the carelessness of later scribes and copyists¹⁰. Although in this approach he acknowledges the importance of the *Alexandrinus* manuscript for textual criticism and even its superiority to the *Codex Vaticanus* in some cases¹¹, the philologists involved in the editing of Grabe's manuscripts frowned upon the Dutch Hellenist's initiative and interpreted it in a competitive key, as an attempt to diminish the impact and authority of the much-awaited English edition. The only critical reactions to the Franeker *Septuagint* come from the prefaces written by Francis Lee and Johann Jakob Breiting, dedicated to Grabe's edition some 11 years apart. Since the critical objections formulated by Breiting are more numerous and go beyond our objective for this research, we will concentrate in what follows only on the critical observations advanced by Francis Lee, which can be found in the first chapter of the preface to the second volume of the *Grabiana Bible*, published in Oxford in 1719.

Francis Lee places the discussion on the Dutch edition and its author within a wider debate on the controversy between the editions based on the two known uncial manuscripts of the time. First, Lee creates a biographical portrait of Lambert Bos, unconfirmed by other sources, from which we learn that he was a native of Nîmes, southern France (*laudatus Lambert Bosius, Natione Gallus, Patria Nemausensis*)¹². After assuring the reader that he had learned the methods of criticism and editing of biblical texts after he travelled to England, Lee argues that the real purpose of Lambert Bos's edition was to counteract Grabe's edition, as he was well aware that the version of the biblical texts in the *Codex Vaticanus* was of lesser value (*quae vilioris etiam pretii esset*) than those in the *Codex Alexandrinus*. Aiming at a strategy that would increase the value of his edition, Bos apparently included comments on the English manuscript in his work strictly in order to undermine public confidence in this source (*ut Alexandrini Codicis fidem deprimeret*). Even in this climate of widespread suspicion, Francis Lee is forced to admit that Bos should be praised for doing this in a manner governed by modesty and erudition, without gratuitous criticism and insults, as well as for the fact that references to Johann Ernst Grabe are characterized by academic courtesy¹³.

⁹ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, I: "Sometimes its authors <i.e. of the Septuagint> make mistakes and translate meaningless words, being misled by the resemblance between many letters." (*Errarunt eius auctores aliquando et sine sensu verterunt voces, in errorem plerumque ducti elementorum affinitate*).

¹⁰ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, I: "Without any doubt, the scribes, because of either their carelessness, negligence or ignorance, misspelled the words, corrupted or omitted them in numerous paragraphs." (*Certum enim est, librariorum multis in locis ex oscitantia & negligentia, aut inscita voces male scripsisse, depravasse aut omisisse*).

¹¹ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, II: "I do not deny, however, that there are some <fragments> in Codex Alexandrinus which are preferable to those in the Roman <manuscript> ." (*Non tamen diffiteor, quaedam esse in Cod. Alex. quae praeferenda sunt Romano*).

¹² LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §1. Later biographical dictionaries and even contemporary sources unanimously support his Dutch origin (see Catană-Spenchiu, Răchită 2022:2).

¹³ LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §1: "This respectable man should, however, be praised for having presented these questionable observations to his reader with erudition and modesty, without distortion and insult; for having frankly admitted that there are some <fragments> in the Codex Alexandrinus which are preferable to those in the <manuscript> from Rome; for having

From the next paragraph we learn that the Dutch edition, frequently called *editio laudata Franequerana*, was highly appreciated by specialists and that in 1709 it was already printed in Belgium (*as Septuaginta Interpretum Editio Franequerana apud Belgas publicari caeperat*) (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, Prolegomena, I, §2). The idea that Lambert Bos took up Grabe's philological observations in order to maximise the impact of his own edition is reiterated throughout the introduction. Grabe's lack of reaction is justified by his death in 1711. Lee expresses his belief that the Oxford editor would have reacted promptly, arguing that the master's philological views and arguments had never been challenged by the scholars of the Republic of Letters.

Drawing on the same contrast between the superiority of one manuscript, Francis Lee criticizes the methodology according to which the Roman Catholic edition of the *Sistine* was compiled. According to philologists of the time, the *Codex Vaticanus* contained numerous interpolations and conjectures made by ignorant copyists. The Roman editors were allegedly unable to distinguish between the authentic lections of the manuscript and those added in time by copyists (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, Prolegomena, I, §3). Unlike the editing methods used for the *Sistine*, the English critics avoided introducing new corrections into their editions based on the *Codex Alexandrinus* that could be confused with the authentic lections of the manuscript. The edition authorized by Pope Sixtus V contains thus countless improper emendations (*novorum hominum correctiones, sicuti fecerunt Romani*), mixed with authentic texts (*cum authentica ipsius Lectione confunderent*) (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, Prolegomena, I, §4). In this context, Lee states that the Franeker edition is more accurate than the *Sistine*, because Lambert Bos would have corrected the text he followed. Most philologists of the time regarded the need for such interventions as mandatory. In editing manuscripts, the textual critic had to be capable to distinguish between the old, preserved lections and the interpolations inserted at various stages of copying the manuscript. However, while previous editions, such as *Complutensiana* or *Aldina*, took too many liberties in correcting the lections (*magna aliquando libertate Editores usos esse non est negandum*) and even inserted various glosses in the established text (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, Prolegomena, I, §5), the Roman edition would allegedly be undermined by the very approval of the Pontiff, which forbade further amendments to the text once it was established by the editors and, consequently, favoured the perpetuation of errors in future editions. This is basically the context in which Francis Lee evaluates the Franeker edition and, despite acknowledging that it is "the most complete" (*commodissima*) edition based on the *Sistine* and making certain concessions to it, criticizes it in accordance with a general judgment, which Protestants imputed to Catholic editions: "Thus, <the text> which is correctly <established> by the Roman edition, is correct here also; that which the Roman edition keeps corrupt, is corrupt here also (however, not always). For in the *Sistine* edition are

elegantly praised his editor, and often addressed him honestly and politely." (*Laudandus tamen est Vir Clariss. quod animadversiones has erudite ac modeste Lectori suo ventilandas, absque calumniis ac vituperiis, proposuerit; quod quaedam esse in Codice Alexandrino quae praeferanda sunt Romano ingenue agnovit; quodque ejus editorem diserte etiam laudaverit, titulusque honorificis saepius illum honeste insigniverit*).

read some corrupt <passages>, which in this <new edition> are correctly emended”¹⁴. The irony is that Lambert Bos used a similar argument to criticize the negative influence that the text established in the London Polyglot had on subsequent editions based on the same Roman version, especially on the editions compiled by John Pearson (Cambridge, 1665) and Johann Leusden (Amsterdam, 1683): “That the same errors were propagated in its new editions, which today are still used extensively and are in the hands of all (...). For I have found that all those texts omitted from the London edition were omitted in the same manner from both editions”¹⁵.

After bringing a series of textual arguments that point to the improvements Bos makes to the *Sistine* text, Francis Lee formulates his objections to the Franeker edition in a somewhat clearer manner. The fact that the *Sistine* text is not followed indiscriminately in Lambert Bos’s edition (*Romanam in Franequerana non ubique et per omnia esse expressam*) and that the new edition is in accordance with the *Vaticanus* manuscript with regard to more passages than the source text which it follows (*Editionem Franequeranam cum Codice illo in locis quibusdam melius concordare quam ipsam Romanam*) would be praiseworthy, if intentional deviations from the *Sistine* text had been pointed out by the editor (*idque hinc inde sine ulla eius notatione vel observatione*). Moreover, the English critic accuses Lambert Bos of correcting the text selectively, claiming that the Dutch philologist had partially taken up the emendations to the *Sistine* text previously proposed by Grabe. The specific object of these reproaches is represented by the critical observations and proposed emendations that Grabe had formulated in his famous letter to John Mill in 1705. To prove this selective emendation, the English editor provides five further textual arguments, in which he compares Grabe’s proposals with Bos’s decision to ignore them and preserve the Roman *Septuagint* texts in his edition (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §6).

To a large extent, Francis Lee’s criticisms are rather aimed at promoting the *Grabiana* edition and helping to consolidate Joahan Ernst Grabe’s image as an exceptional philologist. In the instances in Lambert Bos corrects the *Sistine* text, his contribution is rendered futile in comparison to Johann Ernst Grabe’s brilliant critical representation: “These and many others were noted by the erudite Grabe four years before the respectable and frequently praised Lambert Bos, for his quinquennial work became public, of course, in the fifth year of this century”¹⁶. When he does not follow the master of textual criticism, Bos is blamed for not doing so, even though he benefited from the valuable critical material Grabe had provided as early as 1705: “I have found no rational explanation as to why he chose to correct a few minor errors in insignificant passages of the *Sistine* edition, while not correcting several such errors in more important

¹⁴ LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §5: *Quae igitur bene habet Romana, bene habet et haec; quae male habet Romana, male (sed non semper tamen) habet et haec. Quia nonnulla in Editione Sistine male leguntur, quae in hac bene emendantur.*

¹⁵ LXX-Bos, *Prolegomena*, II: *Ut errores eosdem propagaverint in novas suas editiones, quae tamen hodie maxime usurpantur, & in manibus omnium sunt (...). Eadem enim omnia quae in Londinensi omissa, in utraque illa editione similiter omissa inveni.*

¹⁶ LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §6: *Haec & plura à Grabio doctissimo observata cum sint, ante quadriennium quam V.Cl. Lambertus Bos, saepe laudatus, opus suum Quinquennale in lucem ediderit, anno nimirum hujus seculi quinto.*

passages”¹⁷. Francis Lee concludes his observations with an elusive explanation with regard to Lambert Bos’s selective criticism, which may as well define the unstable and fortuitous nature of the entire biblical philology of the early 18th century: “He must have had his reasons: <the texts> that seem corrupt to me, or you might not always be so”¹⁸.

Taken as a whole, Francis Lee’s critical reception of the Franeker edition is nowhere near as negative as the incisive critical approaches of other editions from that period. An argument for the respect which the English editor nevertheless shows for the Dutch edition and its author is the fact that Lambert Bos is mentioned for the first time in the honourable company of European scholars who had dealt with the editing of the *Septuagint* texts over the years: Demetrios Doukas of Crete in Spain, Andreas Asolanus in Venice, Antonio Carafa in Italy, Jean Morin in France, Brian Walton and John Pearson in England, Lambert Bos in Frisia (LXX-Grabe, vol. II, Prolegomena, I, §7).

Along the line of research opened by Ioan Chindriș (2000) in particular by Eugen Pavel (2000-2001; 2014; 2016), who argued that one of the sources of the Bible from Blaj was the Dutch edition of the Franeker Septuagint (1709), we have already conducted several investigations concerning the nature of the textual criticism carried out by its author and the issues it raised in the effervescent intellectual context in which it was produced. As in these previous studies we have barely discussed the manner in which Samuil Micu relates to one of his sources, in this study we have aimed at dealing more closely with the role of textual criticism in the Transylvanian intellectual’s translation approach. However, our research is based on a methodology that targets the wider dialogue between two traditions, consolidated in basically the same period, but with different objectives: the tradition of Romanian translations, which Samuil Micu partly recovers, and that of Protestant editions from Lambert Bos’ time, which he followed as a model. In order to properly delimit the research area, so that it becomes verifiable and relevant for establishing the text of a translation, we have constantly tried to consider the manner in which the Romanian translator relates to some of the shortcomings of the Franeker edition, pointed out at the time by one of its critical receptions.

2. The different approaches between editor and translator: a comparative analysis

The textual arguments that Francis Lee draws comparatively, either from passages discussed at the time or from analyses based on Johann Ernst Grabe’s Alexandrine manuscript texts, represented philological difficulties faced not only by 16th-18th century editors, but also by later translators who had to decide which text to translate. For a better understanding of the critical assessments made of the Franeker edition, one should consider a comparative analysis of the separate editions of the time and also of the manner in which these texts were understood in Protestant exegesis, whose standard and *summa* at the time can be considered John Pearson’s *Critici sacri* (1660), republished in an enlarged edition in Amsterdam (1698), just 6 years before Lambert Bos began work on his new edition. Moreover, in order to understand how Samuil Micu related to the

¹⁷ LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §6: *Nulla mihi sane occurrit ratio, cur pauculas quasdam parvique momenti mendas, quae in Editionem Sixtinam irrepserant, emendaverit, plures tamen, easque majoris momenti, non emendaverit.*

¹⁸ LXX-Grabe, vol. II, *Prolegomena*, I, §6: *Suas fortasse rationes habet ipse: nec mendae sunt semper, quae mihi vel tibi ita esse videntur.*

objections made to the Franeker edition, one should also consider that the Romanian translator had to choose between two editing traditions of the *Septuagint* text: one that was specific to Romanian translatology, based overwhelmingly on the *Aldina* text, followed in the Frankfurt edition (1597), respectively the *Sistine* editing tradition, followed in the new Protestant editions he consulted.

The texts discussed by Francis Lee fall into two distinct series. The first series comprises four textual issues from the books of the prophets (*Hosea* 3:3; *Joel* 2:16; 2:30 and 3:17), in which Lambert Bos's emendation of the *Sistine* text is praised. The second series comprises 5 philological issues, identified by Johan Ernst Grabe in the books of *Kings* (2Kgs 14:17) and *Hosea* (4:6; 12:12; 13:2 and 14:2), which Lambert Bos preserved as they occurred in the canonized edition of *Sistine*. In this article, we will examine only the first four textual issues from the books of the prophets with a permanent comparison to the Bible of Blaj, highlighting Samuil Micu's options, and to the Bible 1688 and the two preliminary manuscripts (Ms.45, Ms.4389).

2.1. *Hosea* 3:3

The text from *Hosea* 3:3 (*And I said to her, "For many days you will sit with me, and you will not play the whore, nor will you be with a man, and I will be with you"* (NETS:783) raised at the time an issue related to the contamination of biblical traditions. Specifically, Francis Lee appreciated that Lambert Bos had removed from the text of his edition the pronoun ἕτερος, from the paragraph that the *Sistine* editors had set οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (lit. "nor will you be *other* man's wife"), arguing that this pronoun is found neither in the *Codex Vaticanus*, nor in the Hebrew text established by the Masoretes. Yet some Greek manuscripts, including the *Codex Alexandrinus*, retain this pronoun, which led to its adoption or omission from the text of the editions:

LXX-Sixt: καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσης, οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σοί. (p. 558).

LXX-Bos: καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσης, οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρὶ, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σοί (p. 1080).

LXX-Grabe, vol. III: καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνεύσης, οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ, κἀγὼ ἐπὶ σοί (n.p.).

An analysis of the Protestant exegesis of the time and of the explanatory notes provided by the critical apparatus of the editions indicates that this philological issue is by no means a new one and that it has been noticed since Antiquity. The first to notice that the pronoun ἕτερος has no equivalent in the Hebrew text was Jerome, in his commentaries on the books of the prophets¹⁹. A great promoter of asceticism at the end of the 4th century, Jerome identified the pronoun ἕτερος among the various variants of the *Septuagint* translations and included it in the translation of the ancient *Vulgate* (*neque eris alteri viro*), perhaps also because the pronoun represented a more precise confirmation of his ascetic ideas, which forbade sexual relations even within marriage.

¹⁹ Jerome, *Comm. in Hoseam*, I, 3, 10: '*alteri*' in Hebrew non habetur, sed simpliciter, '*non eris viro*' (PL 25, 843A).

This could explain his enthusiastic comment on the biblical verse²⁰, perceived in a similar manner by Hugo Grotius, in the sense of an absolute abstinence from legitimate and illegitimate concubinage: *Et illegitimo & legitimo concubitus abstinere debetis* (Pearson 1698: 38). In the note to the text, the *Sistine* editors marked the absence of the pronoun ἑτέρῳ from Hebrew and other manuscripts, acknowledging that Jerome added the pronoun in the Latin translation²¹. In his critical apparatus, Bos states that the text in the *Codex Alexandrinus* contains the lection ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ, which also appears in the *Aldina* version, and that this form was introduced in the *Septuaginta Romana* (*irrepsit etiam in Rom.*). Moreover, he reiterates the observation of the *Sistine* editors, who mentioned the absence of the pronoun in the *Codex Vaticanus* and its addition in the *Vulgate*, even though the pronoun cannot be identified in the Hebrew text (LXX-Bos, 1080, n. 12).

Viewed in this broader context, the appreciation Lambert Bos received for the emendation of the *Sistine* acquires wider objectives. On the one hand, Lee wished to highlight the accuracy with which Grabe marked pronouns in his edition in the manner of Origen, and on the other hand his intention was to indirectly blame Catholic editors for the lack of consistency in dealing with the text of the *Codex Vaticanus*, in their desire to bring it closer to the canonized text of the *Vulgate*. This is evident from the objections Johannes Drusius (1550-1616) had formulated long before. The Protestant philologist noted the problems of interpretation raised by the presence or absence of the pronoun, remarked that many editions do not contain it correctly (*recte*) and stated that the very internal structure of the Hebrew phrase rejects it due to the way it is composed (Pearson 1698: 35). The consequences of this deviation from *Hebraica veritas* are also revealed by the decisions made by other editors of the *Sistine*, whom Lambert Bos consulted. In the Paris *Septuagint* (1628), Jean Morin removed the pronoun and the critical notes associated with the text and blamed the carelessness of the copyists who allegedly inserted it into the manuscripts²². The absence of the pronoun can also be noted from the third column of the London Polyglot, which contained the text of the *Septuagint* (PB-Walton 1653-1658, Vol. 3, 6.).

Challenged with these differences between the texts of the editions, in this particular case Samuil Micu chose not follow Lambert Bos' edition. His translation reflects the way the text has been received in the Romanian biblical tradition, in which we find, in almost every instance, the translation of the pronoun ἕτερος:

LXX-Frankf: καὶ οὐ μὴ πορνείσης, οὐδὲ μὴ γένη ἀνδρὶ [ἑτέρῳ], καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπὶ σοί (722b).

Ms.45: “și nu curvești, nici să te afli la bărbat [altul] și eu asupra ta” [and you not play the whore, nor will you be with [another] man and I over you].
Ms.4389: “și să nu curvești, nici să îei bărbat, că și eu te voiu aștepta”. [and you will not play the whore, nor will you take man, so I will also wait for you].

²⁰ Jerome, *Comm. in Hoseam*, I, 3, 10: *Hoc est, nec aliis amatoribus turpiter te prostitues, nec mihi, viro a quo conducta es, legitime coniungeris* (PL 25, 843A).

²¹ LXX-Sixt: *In caeteris libris sequitur, ἑτέρῳ. S. Hieronymus. quodq. iungitur in editione vulgata, neq. eris alteri viro. alteri, in Hebraico non habet* (n. β, 558a).

²² LXX-Morin 1628: *quod etiam per typographi incuriam irrepsit in nostram: nam in Vaticano non est* (vol. II, 375).

B 1688: “și să nu curvești, nici să te afli cu alt bărbat, și eu sînt asupra ta”. [and you will not play the whore, nor will you be with another man, and I am over you].

B-Blaj: “și să nu curvești, nici să fii cu alt bărbat, și eu voi fi la tine” (702a). [and you will not play the whore, nor will you be with another man, and I will be at you].

Samuil Micu did nothing but follow the way this text was transmitted in the Romanian biblical tradition, along the lines of the Frankfurt edition of 1597. Ms.45 also retained the square brackets of the term [ἐτέροφ], which generally signal words, phrases or sentences that cannot be identified in all the sources used by the translators and are therefore considered optional. Ms.4389 omitted the term, while the Bucharest Bible (1688) preserved the translation of Ms.45. Even the manuscript translation of the Blaj Bible (Ms.115) records the pronoun and the translation options which remained unchanged in the printed version. Neither do other European editions, mentioned among the sources used by Samuil Micu, retain the pronoun ἕτερος in the Greek text. The polyglot edition of the Hellenist and Hebrew humanist François Vatable (†1547), printed in Geneva in 1586, does not retain the pronoun in the Greek text, but marks the difference between the *alteri*, present in the Latin text of the *Vulgate*, and its absence from the Latin translation of the Hebrew text (B-Vatable: 569). The edition elaborated by Christian Reineccius (Leipzig, 1757) does not retain the pronoun (LXX-Leipzig: 1246) either, providing complete evidence of the fact that the decisions made long before by the Romanian translators who preceded Micu prevailed for him in this particular case.

2.2. Joel 2:16

In the canonized *Sistine* text of Joel 2:16 (*gather the people. / Sanctify an assembly;/ welcome the aged;/ gather the infants sucking the breast. / Let the bridegroom come from his bedroom, / and the bride from her chamber*) (NETS: 802.) a typographical error occurred in relation to the last term of the verse. The genitive noun παστοῦ (“veil”, “canopy”, “bridal chamber”) was misprinted as μαστοῦ (“breast”). Lambert Bos corrected the error in his edition, as it will subsequently be the case with all major Bible editions.

LXX-Sixt: ἐξελθέτω νυμφίος ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ καὶ νύμφη ἐκ τοῦ μαστοῦ_αὐτῆς (572).

LXX-Bos: ἐξελθέτω νυμφίος ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ καὶ νύμφη ἐκ τοῦ παστοῦ_αὐτῆς (1090).

LXX-Grabe, vol. III: ἐξελθάτω νυμφίος ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ, καὶ νύμφη ἐκ τοῦ παστοῦ_αὐτῆς (n.p.).

The error noted in the *Sistine* biblical text was most likely caused by the copying of the manuscript, since the word μαστός (“breast”) occurs in the same verse, which probably caused it to be doubled at the end of the verse. Francis Lee does not miss the opportunity to criticize the editors of the Roman edition. Praising Lambert Bos for noticing the error, he criticizes him for failing to point it out in the critical apparatus or mentioning the change he operated. The discovery was attributed to the philologist Flaminus Nobilius

by both Francis Lee and Jean Morin, who in his edition based on the *Sistine* text corrected the error and mentioned in the critical apparatus²³. Based on the text established in Paris, the third column in Brian Walton's Bible contains the amended text (PB-Walton 1653-1658, Vol. 3, 30).

Lee's objection is far from relevant for Micu's translation, since in the Romanian biblical tradition the correct text was transmitted, derived from the Frankfurt edition²⁴ which presents (except for the spelling) a text identical to that of the Franeker version.

LXX-Frankf: ἐξελθέτω νυμφίος ἐκ τοῦ κοιτῶνος αὐτοῦ, καὶ νύμφη ἐκ τοῦ παστοῦ αὐτῆς (729a).

Ms.45: "iasă mirele dentru așternutul lui și mireasa dentru cămara ei". [Let the bridegroom come from his bedding and the bride from her chamber].

Ms.4389: "să iasă ginerile den cămara sa și nevasta de la așternutul ei". [Let the bridegroom come out of his chamber and the wife from her bedding].

B 1688: "iasă ginere din așternutul lui și nevestă den cămara ei". [Let a bridegroom come out of his bedding and a wife out of her chamber].

B-Blaj: "Să iasă mirele din așternutul său și mireasa din cămara sa!" [Let the bridegroom come out of his bedding and the bride out of her chamber].

Samuil Micu's translation renders the noun παστός by "cămară" ("chamber", "room") from the Romanian tradition, as it was the closest to the option in Ms. 45, which avoids the term "nevestă" ("wife") from the other versions and prefers the term "mireasă" ("bride"), thus preserving the possibility of allegorical interpretation, specific to Christian exegesis. This terminological confusion²⁵ occurs in none of the other possible secondary editions the Greek-Catholic monk might have consulted.

2.3. Joel 2:30

The text from Joel 2:30 (*I will give portents in the sky and on earth: blood and fire and the vapor of smoke*) (NETS: 802.) presented at the time a difference of perception regarding the subject of the text, which led to different lections of the verb in various manuscripts and editions. Francis Lee appreciated that in the Franeker edition the verbal form δώσω, a future indicative in the first person singular, replaced the corrupted verb δώσωσι in the *Sistine* text, which indicates a different understanding of the subject.

LXX-Sixt: καὶ δώσωσι τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· (573).

LXX-Bos: καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ· (1091).

LXX-Grabe, vol. III: καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ·(n.p.)

²³ LXX-Morin, vol. II: *Nam et in Vaticano legitur, παστοῦ, licet per incuriam typographi factum sit, μαστοῦ* (412, n. 6).

²⁴ The notes of the Frankfurt edition already pointed out the copying error found in other editions (LXX-Frankf, 729a, n. 15).

²⁵ See B-Vatable, 586 and LXX-Leipzig, 1257.

The consultation of the Protestant exegesis, collected and edited by John Pearson, indicates that this issue was not at all new. In his philological commentaries, Johannes Drusius pointed out the alleged error of the Rome edition, along with the observation that in the uncial *Alexandrinus* and *Vaticanus* manuscripts the verb also occurs in the plural form δώσουσι. According to Drusius, it was common practice among editors to replace impersonal verbs found in the manuscripts²⁶ with personal forms. Another explanation for the plural forms of the verb is found in Jean Morin, who modified the *Sistine* text in his Paris edition (καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν οὐρανῷ) and regarded the plural form as a typographical error. The difference is pointed out in the critical apparatus notes, attributed to Flaminius Nobilius, where we learn that the correct lection δώσω in the *Codex Vaticanus* became δώσωσι in the editions due to changes made by a typographer²⁷. In fact, the problems concerning the person of the verb derived from the Hebrew tradition, which firmly retained a singular form, whereas the Greek manuscripts displayed wide variations. If we read the whole context, beginning with *Joel* 2:28, we can note that the plural forms seem to reflect the desire of the copyists or editors to render the meaning of the text as a whole and to harmonize it. If in the previous paragraphs the authors of the prophecies are God's inspired intermediaries ("your sons and your daughters shall prophesy"), from *Joel* 2:30 onwards there is a change of person, making God Himself their author ("I will give portents"). However, things stand from a hermeneutical point of view, it is certain that the editions based on the *Sistine* started to render the verb in the singular, as also indicated by the text of Brian Walton's Polyglot (PB-Walton 1653-1658, Vol. 3, 32). Lambert Bos retrieved the corrected text of the *Sistine* without any comment, showing thus a greater concern for other aspects of the verse. He noted in the critical apparatus that in the *Codex Vaticanus* οὐρανῷ is followed by the adverb ἀνω ("up"), while γῆς is followed by κάτω ("down") (LXX-Bos, 1091, n. 81), which are in fact locative adverbs, common for explanatory biblical language, but which were not inserted in the text of his edition. The reasons can be easily guessed. The two previous editions of the *Sistine* did not add them, and Bos decided that they should remain outside the established text.

Samuil Micu's translation is quite interesting in the case of the verse in *Joel* 2:30. This has less to do with the fact that the tradition of Romanian translations reflects both forms of the verb δίδωμι, but rather indicates that the Romanian translator made more radical decisions in this case.

LXX-Frankf: Καὶ δώσουσι τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς- αἶμα,
καὶ πῦρ, καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ·(729)²⁸.

²⁶ *Legitur tamen in R. καὶ δώσωσι & in A. B. καὶ δώσουσι. Quae sic commodè expones, 'dabunt signa', i. 'dabuntur'. Nam usitatum ut verbum personale pro impersonale ponatur* (John Pearson 1698: 202).

²⁷ LXX-Morin, vol. II, 412: *In alijs libris est, καὶ δώσουσι, & dabunt, in quibus etiam antecedit, καὶ προφητεύσουσι, & prophetabunt. In Vaticano est, δώσωσω, sed per iniuriam typographi factum est, δώσωσι.*

²⁸ In the short note 25 of the edition, it is mentioned that the verb δώσω, in the singular, is derived *ex Hebraeo*. This fact is also attested by the *Vulgate* of Jerome, which translates the verb in the singular: *et dabo prodigia in caelo et in terra sanguinem et ignem et vaporem fumi.*

Ms.45: “Și vor da sêmne întru cer și pre pământ, sînge și foc și abur de fum”. [And they will show signs into heaven and on the earth, blood and fire and vapour of smoke].

Ms.4389: “Și voi da minuni în cer și pre pământ, sînge și foc și abur de fum”. [And I will show wonders in the heaven and on the earth, blood and fire and vapour of smoke].

B 1688: “Și vor da sêmne în ceriu și pre pământ, sînge și foc și abur de fum”. [And they will show signs in the heaven and on the earth, blood and fire and vapour of smoke].

B-Blaj: “Și voi da minuni în ceriu, *sus*, și seamne pre pământ, *jos*: sânge și foc și abur de fum” (709). [And I will show wonders in heaven above and signs on the earth beneath, blood and fire and vapour of smoke].

Samuil Micu makes a quite interesting choice regarding the verb, as he does not retrieve the translation option from the 1688 Bible (nor that from Ms. 45), which obviously follows the Frankfurt edition (δόσουσι), but prefers the same translation solution that we identify in Ms.4389 (“I will show wonders”). His decision is probably due to many cases where the verb occurs in the singular in the Greek editions he consulted. In any case, it constitutes a conscious departure from earlier translations. Furthermore, Micu considered the observations in Lambert Bos’s critical apparatus regarding the two locative adverbs accompanying “cerul” (“the heaven”) and “pământul” (“the earth”) in the *Codex Vaticanus*. In the translation, he does not follow the text in Bos’s edition, but only the indications specified in the critical apparatus, perhaps compared with other editions or manuscripts. As one may note, neither the basic text of the Frankfurt edition nor the other Romanian translations reflect the adverbs. The adverbs are also omitted from the other Greek editions that he most probably consulted²⁹. The translation pattern for adverbial forms, also found in the critical apparatus of the Franeker edition is a conscious decision of the translator, which we also identify in the manuscript of the translation (Ms.115) and in other subsequent Romanian translations³⁰. The firmness with which Micu decides to translate the two adverbs may, however, have an additional explanation, which targets a hermeneutic harmonization of the translation. A verse from *Deuteronomy* 4:39 makes God Himself the author of the foreshadowing signs “in the heaven above” and “on the earth beneath” (ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός σου, οὗτος θεὸς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω) (B-Blaj: 162), while another text in *Acts* 2:19 reproduces the quotation from *Joel*, together with the locative adverbs (καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω)³¹.

²⁹ See B-Vatable, 587 and LXX-Leipzig, 1258.

³⁰ Later, the same translation option can be found in a 1747 edition of the Bible (Miniat, Caz, p.19r-19v: “Și voi da minuni în ceriu, *sus*, și sêmne pre pământ, *jos*”; *acc. to* MLD. XVII: 139), in the 1819 translation of the Bible, in that of Philotheus (1874) and in the most recent one, elaborated by Valeriu Anania.

³¹ See ed. Nestle-Aland (28th); *cf.* B-Blaj, *Faptele Apostolilor*, 2:19, p. 109: “Și voi da minuni în ceriu *sus*, și seamne pre pământ *jos*: sânge și foc și abur de fum”.

2.4. *Joel 3:17*

A text of lesser importance, which Francis Lee admits he discusses only to point out to the *Sistine* editors' distancing from the manuscript they followed, is *Joel 3:17* (*And you shall know that I am the Lord your God, who dwells in Zion, in my holy mountain*) (NETS: 803). Lambert Bos corrected the canonized text (Σιών ὄρει ἁγίῳ), in accordance with the *Vaticanus* manuscript, by adding the possessive pronoun μου at the end of the verse.

LXX-Sixt: καὶ ἐπιγνώσεσθε διότι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ κατασκηνῶν ἐν σιων ὄρει ἁγίῳ (573).

LXX-Bos: Καὶ ἐπιγνώσεσθε διότι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, ὁ κατασκηνῶν ἐν Σιών ὄρει ἁγίῳ μου. (1092).

The added pronoun in the Dutch edition occurred in the Hebrew text, in the *Vulgate* (*in monte sancto meo*), in both known uncial manuscripts and in most editions, except for the *Sistine* and Jean Morin's edition³².

The entire Romanian biblical tradition marks the presence of the possessive pronoun in the case of this verse, which does not constitute an unusual case in Samuil Micu's translation either ("muntele cel sfânt al Mieu" ["my holy mountain"]) (B-Blaj: 709).

3. Conclusions

Francis Lee's criticism in the early 18th century reflects, as obviously as possible, the manner in which the text of the *Alexandrinus* manuscript was used against the old edition of the *Sistine*, canonized by Catholics. Francis Lee's aim was not singular. In criticising a small part of the inconsistencies between theory and practice in the Franeker edition, he did not necessarily question Lambert Bos's critical skills, but rather those of the *Sistine* editors. This aspect becomes even more apparent when we note that the observations made by Johannes Ernst Grabe are by no means original, as they largely represent commonplace remarks of the criticism practiced by both Protestant and Catholic philologists over more than a century. A secondary purpose of these criticisms is the recognition of Grabe's status as a text critic and, at the same time, the promotion of the first edition based on the *Codex Alexandrinus* in the Republic of Letters.

As far as Samuil Micu is concerned, we may conclude that his critical judgment is not to be neglected. Even if it is not so manifest, the Greek-Catholic translator's choices oscillate between grammatical logic, the tradition of earlier Romanian translatology and the source editions he consulted. The few examples we have analysed indicate that Micu did not indiscriminately follow a single Greek text that he would translate without extensive philological analysis. A conservative attitude prevails in this process, in which innovative elements are rejected, while translation solutions provided by the Romanian tradition are almost always

³² It is quite difficult to explain the absence of this pronoun from the Paris edition text (1628), given that its critical apparatus comments on the omission: *Ita etiam in Vaticano, & apud S. Hier. licet per incuriam omissum sit, μου* (LXX-Morin, vol. II, 413).

preferred. The criticisms received by the Franeker edition are almost always avoided, not necessarily because they did not exist in other editions, but because they were considered and solved in one way or another by previous editors. When Lambert Bos's critical apparatus seems to have a major influence in the translation, as in the case of the text of *Joel* 2:30, this might be motivated also by other considerations, which point to the old idea of the Scriptures perceived as a whole, as a unit of meaning. Even if the philological issues arising from the textual conflicts of the sources are not discussed and often not even recorded in the manuscript of the Blaj translation, the seemingly inconsistent way in which Samuil Micu opted for one translation solution or another reflects an insightful critical analysis, supported by thorough prior study of the issues raised by the texts. The relationship between the Romanian translation and the Dutch edition is neither preferential nor absolute. As indicated by our analysis which was limited to objections to just one of the sources, the Romanian translation does not necessarily follow the text established by Lambert Bos (especially when it is not confirmed by other editions). A considerably higher value is attributed to the critical evaluation of the texts that are in disagreement, which the Dutch Hellenist carries out, like many others before him, in the critical apparatus of the Franeker edition. Furthermore, in a mixed translation such as the one produced by Samuil Micu, textual criticism is not optional, as we would be tempted to simplify things in the absence of concrete textual evidence, but it represents an obligation, which was obviously fully honoured by the Romanian translator.

References

Primary Sources

- LXX-Bos = Bos, Lambert, ed. 1709. Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα. *Vetus Testamentum ex versione Septuaginta interpretum, secundum exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum, accuratissime denuo recognitum, una cum scholiis ejusdem editionis, variis manuscriptorum [...]* summa cura edidit Lambertus Bos. Franeker: Franciscus Halma.
- LXX-Grabe = Grabe, Johann Ernst, *et alii*, eds. 1707-1720. Τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα. *Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta interpretes*. Vol. I-IV. Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano.
- LXX-Frankf = Τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς παλαιᾶς δηλαδὴ καὶ νέας διαθήκης, ἅπαντα. 1597. *Divinae Scripturae nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, omnia [...]*. Frankfurt: Apud Wecheli heredes, Claudium Marnium & Ioan Aubrium.
- LXX-Morin = Morin, Jean, ed. 1628. Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα, ἐκδοθεῖσα δι' αὐθεντίας Ξυστοῦ ἐ ἄκρου ἀρχιερέως. *Vetus testamentum, secundum LXX et ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum*. Vol. I-III. Paris: Apud Sebastianum Chapelet.
- LXX-Sixt = Ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα. 1587. *Vetus Testamentum iuxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum*. Roma: Ex Typographia Francisci Zannetti.

- MLD.XVII = *Biblia 1688. Pars 17: Osee, Ioël, Amos, Abdias, Ionas, Michaea* in *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum*, (coord. Eugen Munteanu). Authors of the volume: Ana Catană-Spenchiu, Ana-Maria Gînsac, Eugen Munteanu, Lucia-Gabriela Munteanu, Mădălina Ungureanu. Volume Editor: Mădălina Ungureanu. Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2015.
- B-Vatable = Vatable, François, ed. 1586. *Biblia sacra, Hebraice, Graece, & Latine. Latina interpretatio duplex est, altera vetus, altera noua; cum annotationibus Francisci Vatabli Hebraicae linguae Lutetiae quondam professoris Regij*. Vol. I–II. Geneva: Ex Officina Sanctandreaana.
- B-Blaj = Micu, Samuil. 1795. *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi și a ceii Noao, toate care s au tălmăcit de pre limba elinească pre înțelesul limbii românești, acum întîiu s au tipărit româniște supt stăpînirea preainălțatului împărat a Romanilor Francisc al doilea, cu blagoslovenia mării sale prealuminatului și preasfințitului domnului domn Ioan Bob, vlădica Făgărașului* [The Bible, i.e., the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Laws, translated from Hellenic to Romanian, now published for the first time in Romanian under the rule of the Mighty Roman Emperor Francis the Second, with the blessing of the wise and holy lord Ioan Bob, Bishop of Făgăraș]. Blaj, [Modern Edition: Roma, 2000].
- NETS = Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PB-Walton = Walton, Brian, *et alii*, eds. 1653-1658. *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta*. Vol. I–VI. London: Thomas Roycroft.
- PL 25 = Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed. 1845. *Patrologiae cursus completus [...] Series latina*. Vol. 25. Paris: apud Garnier fratres.
- Grabe, Johann Ernst. 1705. *Epistola ad clarissimum virum, D[omi]nu[m] Joannem Millium*. Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano.
- Nestle, Eberhard, Kurt Aland, *et alii*, eds. 2012. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 28th Edition.
- Pearson, John, ed. 1698. *Criticorum sacrorum sive annotatorum ad Libros Propheticos Veteris Testamenti*. Vol. I-IX. Amsterdam: Henricus & Vidua Theodori Boom.

Secondary Sources

- BLAIR, Ann, and Anja-Silvia GOEING, eds. 2016. *For the Sake of Learning. Essays in Honor of Anthony Grafton*. Scientific and Learned Cultures and Their Institutions. 18/1. Leiden: Brill, vol. I.
- CAMERON, Euan, ed. 2016. *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 3, from 1450 to 1750*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CATANĂ-SPENCHIU, Ana, and Constantin RĂCHITĂ. 2022. The Challenge of Biblical Textual Criticism: The Case of the Dutch Edition of the Septuagint (1709). *Religions*. 13/8: art. no. 708.
- CATANĂ-SPENCHIU, Ana, and Constantin RĂCHITĂ. 2022. The Frenequerana Bible – textus receptus of the Bible from Blaj (1795). *Philologica Jassyensia*. XVIII/ 2 (36): 27–38.
- CHINDRIȘ, Ioan. 2000. *Secolele Bibliei de la Blaj, în Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi și a ceii Noao (...)*, Blaj, 1795 [Roma: 2000].
- FOX, Adam. 1954. *John Mill and Richard Bentley. A Study of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1675-1729*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

- HESSAYON, Ariel, and Nicholas KEENE, eds. 2006. *Scripture and Scholarship in Early Modern England*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- KILLEEN, Kevin, Helen SMITH, and Rachel WILLIE, eds. 2015. *The Oxford Handbook of the Bible in Early Modern England, c. 1530-1700*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- PAVEL, Eugen. 2014. The Slavonic Model *versus* the Latin Model in the Romanian Biblical Texts. *Dacoromania*. New Series. XIX/1: 82–98.
- PAVEL, Eugen. 2016. The Beginnings of Textual Criticism in Old Romanian Writing. *Dacoromania*. New Series. XXI/1: 17–30.
- PAVEL, Eugen. 2000–2001. Biblia lui Samuil Micu (1795). Modele și izvoare [The Bible of Samuil Micu. Models and Sources]. *Dacoromania*. New Series. V–VI: 277–307.
- SALVESEN, Alison G., and Timothy Michael LAW, eds. 2021. *The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- SÆBØ, Magne, ed. 2008. *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation, Volume II, From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- TOUBER, Jetze. 2018. *Spinoza and Biblical Scholarship in the Dutch Republic, 1660–1720*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- VAN MIERT, Dirk, Henk NELLEN, Piet STEENBAKKERS and Jetze TOUBER, eds. 2017. *Scriptural Authority and Biblical Criticism in the Dutch Golden Age: God’s Word Questioned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.