

## **Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century**

Prof. Ciprian STREZA\*

### **Abstract:**

In the century of Reformation and in defiance of a decided opposition coming from the Byzantine-Slavic Orthodoxy observed in the Provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Romanians of Transylvania managed to find a way to introduce their national language in the Church, by gradually translating those texts that were vital for the liturgical and spiritual life of a parish. The analysis of the miscellaneous Manuscript 19 from the Library of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu reveals a lot of information about the pioneering work that the priests and hierarchs in Transylvania had to do in order to have the Romanian language introduced in the services of the Church.

### **Keywords:**

Liturgy, Liturgical Tradition, Transylvania, Liturgical Manuscripts, Church in Transylvania

The translation of liturgical texts into the oral languages of various nations has always been a lengthy and difficult process, no matter where or in which century it was endeavoured. The shift from the “sacred” liturgical languages to the worship in the oral language of a people was and still is one of the greatest challenges that the Eastern Orthodox priests are faced with. The inestimable legacy and beauty of the millennial liturgical tradition, bequeathed to forthcoming generations by way of classical languages, has gradually become a burden and a cross too heavy to bear in a world of constant change and transformation,

---

\* PhD. Ciprian Streza, Professor at the “Andrei Şaguna” Orthodox Faculty of Theology, “Lucian Blaga” University of Sibiu, Romania.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

and this fact has given rise to a real liturgical crisis.<sup>1</sup> The importation of the oral Romanian vernacular into the worship language of the Church in Transylvania has a fascinating story. In the Reformation context of the 16th century and in defiance of a decided opposition coming from the Byzantine-Slavic Orthodoxy observed in the Provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Romanians of Transylvania managed to find a way to introduce their national language in the Church, by gradually translating those texts that were vital for the liturgical and spiritual life of a parish.

This enterprise was at first deemed by both Wallachian and Moldavian Romanians as the mother of all heresies. In the end though, it actually proved to have stirred a truly remarkable cultural and religious revolution that was later replicated by the two formerly reluctant provinces. A church reform of like magnitude would be allowed by Catholic Europe only in the 20th century, starting with the second Vatican Council, whereas many other national Orthodox Churches are yet to experience it.<sup>2</sup>

An important step in the spiritual ascent of Romanians in Transylvania is the translation of the Euchologion. The history of introducing the Romanian Euchologion in the services of the Church gives an account of how this reform unfolded in the 16th-17th century Transylvania, and mentions the factors that brought it about and also the missionary impact its implementation had.

### **1. Historical considerations. The Byzantine-Slavonic rite and the Romanian people**

Romanian historiography states that the Romanian people was born Christian, for its ethnogenesis happened within the same time frame that Christianity spread in the Carpathian-Danube-Pontic space. The Getae-Dacian population conquered by the Romans was introduced to Christianity by Latin speaking missionaries coming from south of the Danube. Lots of migratory peoples - Goths, Huns, Gepids, Avars, Slavs - would invade the territory and life of this Dacian-Roman christianized population in the following centuries. The Slavs set their homes north and south of Danube in the 6th century. In the 7th century, another migratory people, the Bulgars came from Volga region and inhabited the area south of

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Schmemmann, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, Crestwood, New York, 1996, pp. 9-28.

<sup>2</sup> Dumitru Vanca, "Considerații teologice, introducere la Molităvnic, Bălgrad 1689-2009 / Theological Considerations, introduction to the Euchologion, Bălgrad 1689-2009", in Ana Dumitran, Alin Gherman, Dumitru Vanca (eds.), *Molităvnic, Bălgrad 1689-2009 / Euchologion, Bălgrad 1689-2009*, Reîntregirea Publishing House, Alba Iulia, 2010, p. 46.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

Danube, but were eventually assimilated by the much more numerous Slavs, who had been there for a longer period of time.<sup>3</sup>

The Bulgars were then christianized by Saints Cyril and Methodius, two monks from Olympos in Bithynia who created the Cyrillic alphabet and translated the first service books from Greek into Slavic. Their successors kept permanent contact with the Byzantine world and culture, and thus they turned this area from south of Danube into a hearth of Slavic culture and civilization. In the 10th century, this Slavonic culture spread out of Bulgaria and into other Slavic countries, in accord with the spirit and tradition of brothers Cyril and Methodius. Among the territories touched by it were Kievan Rus', Serbia and the Romanian Provinces north of the Danube.<sup>4</sup>

On account of archaeological evidence, it is now known for certain that before the Slavs came on the Dacian-Roman territories, the language Romans had used in church was Vulgar Latin.<sup>5</sup> Later, around the 9th and 10th centuries, the Romanians found themselves surrounded only by Slavic peoples. This new ethnic and geographic configuration helped sever their ties both with Rome and Constantinople, so they adopted the Byzantine-Slavic rite and introduced the Slavonic language in the Church services.<sup>6</sup> In Bulgaria, the Slavic Liturgy had already been in use since the end of the 9th century, but the Slavo-Byzantine culture would thrive and reach its peak in terms of expansion only in the 10th century, when it spread from Preslav into the entire Christian East. The Slavonic language reached the Romanian population from within the Carpathian Arch only in the 11th century, at the same time as the Hungarian kingdom started the gradual process of conquering Transylvania.<sup>7</sup>

The Slavonic used by Romanians until the 17th century was not only a liturgical language, but also the official language of the feudal state. All the official documents of the time were written in Slavonic. Just like Mediaeval Latin was used in Catholic countries, or literary Greek and French among the upper-rank classes in the 18th-19th centuries, in the same way Slavonic came to be the spoken language of the court, of urban patricians and of highly cultivated people in the Romanian Provinces, who used it along with their mother tongue.<sup>8</sup> Spoken Slavonic, a combination of church Slavonic with elements from the living Slavic

---

<sup>3</sup> Fr. Prof. Mircea Păcurariu, PhD, *Cultura teologică românească – scurtă prezentare istorică / The Romanian Theological Culture – short historical presentation*, Bucharest, 2011, p. 40.

<sup>4</sup> Idem, *Istoria Bisericii Române / The History of the Romanian Church*, Bucharest, 1994, vol. I, p. 56

<sup>5</sup> Idem, *Cultura teologică... / The Romanian Theological Culture...*, p. 41.

<sup>6</sup> P.P. Panaitescu, *Introducere în istoria culturii românești / Introduction to the history of Romanian culture*, Bucharest, 1969, p. 197.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 201.

<sup>8</sup> Idem, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română / The Beginnings and Victory of Writing in Romanian*, Bucharest, 1965, p. 18

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

language, was taught in royal and monastic schools and was considered the most elevated form of communication in the Mediaeval society.<sup>9</sup>

The Slavo-Romanian language used in Church throughout the Romanian Provinces between the 11th and the 18th centuries is based on Middle Bulgarian, whose characteristics intermingle with those of the Serbo-Croatian dialect, thus proving that the use of this language has been a cultural and not an ethnic phenomenon.<sup>10</sup> This fact was also historically proved right: amid great social and cultural reforms in the 16th-17th centuries, the Romanians found a way to experience the Liturgy and their culture in their own language, almost simultaneously in all three provinces, and to absorb into the spoken language the rich legacy of their millennial Christian tradition.

The profound social transformations going on during the 17th century, the emergence of a new class of boyars, the revival of nationalism and improvement of cultural expectations and intellectual exigencies among local boyars prompted a number of enlightened monks and hierarchs of the Church to start translating the divine service texts into the vernacular language. The use of Slavonic ceased because the priests had only a few Slavonic manuscripts and books to rely on during divine services, and all the typikon related advice they could obtain was coming from older priests. It seems that, up until then, the specific musicality of the foreign language was a perfect fit for a people that had been oppressed and burdened by feudal exploitation, it provided an almost magic atmosphere wherein the peasants could easily find an escape from the dire routine. However, for this new class of boyars, as well as for the intellectuals in Transylvania, the manner in which the divine services were celebrated in the Romanian churches was utterly “scandalous”.<sup>11</sup>

This would be the starting point for the reorganization of the Church throughout the Romanian Provinces, a process that targeted multiple directions and unfolded in many gradual stages, following a logical and practical sequence:

a. First, the church canons had to be translated and edited, in order to put aside any legislative anarchy and set some rules for clergy and laity;

b. Secondly, a series of books containing sermons (Didache) were translated into Romanian and printed, so as the priests could learn the essence of Christian doctrines and convey the correct message to their parishioners;

<sup>9</sup> Idem, “Husitismul și cultura slavă în Moldova / Hussitism and Slavic culture in Moldavia”, *Romanoslavica* X (1964), p. 229-234.

<sup>10</sup> Nicolae Edroiu, *Scrierea chirilică românească / The Romanian Cyrillic writing*, Cluj-Napoca, Mega Publishing House, 2013, p. 32.

<sup>11</sup> Paul Brusanowski, “Curentul bisericesc reformator din secolul XVII și începutul românizării cultului BOR / The 17th century reforming trend in the Church and the beginning of the ‘Romanianisation’ of the ROC’s worship”, *Tabor, Romanian Culture and Spirituality Magazine*, I, no. 7, 2007, p. 41.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

c. Thirdly, the typikon related indicia had to be translated in Romanian (whilst leaving the text of prayers and chants in Slavonic), so that the priests could celebrate the divine services correctly and thus avoid the critiques coming from Greek clergy;

d. Fourthly, the liturgical readings (the Epistle and the Gospel readings) were translated in order to have them read in Romanian and therefore understood by all people;

e. Lastly, Slavic was pushed to the side once the key service books such as the Psalter, the Litourgicon and the Euchologion were thoroughly translated and incorporated in the cult.<sup>12</sup>

The way the passage from Slavonic to the Romanian language in the Church was done gave rise to countless debates in amongst Romanian historiographers. There were at least five big differing opinions regarding the introduction of Romanian language in the divine service of the Church in the Romanian Provinces.<sup>13</sup>

The first opinion, also known as the Hussite theory, was enunciated by the great scholar Nicolae Iorga in 1904<sup>14</sup>, and then endorsed by Sextil Pușcariu, I.A. Candrea, N.Drăganu. It stated that Jan Hus's Reform in Bohemia had influenced the introduction of vernacular Romanian in the Church, given that the first translated texts in Romanian, dating back to the 15th-16th centuries: *Codicele Voronețean* (the *Codex of Voroneț*), *Psaltirea Șcheiană* (the *Psalter of Șcheia*), *Psaltirea Voronețeană* (the *Psalter of Voroneț*), *Psaltirea Hurmuzachi* (*Hurmuzachi Psalter*) and *Catehismul Marțian* (the *Marțian Catechism*), were found in Transylvania (Maramureș), the Romanian province that was the closest to Bohemia. The spread of Hussites in Transylvania (and also the fighting scheme of the revolted peasants in Bobâlna) and then in Moldavia (where they played an important role during the reign of Voivode Alexander the Good), especially after Jan Hus was burnt at the stake (1415), as well as their contact with the Catholic population (Hungarians and Transylvanian Saxons), were Iorga's arguments in support of the idea that the Romanians might have started translating religious books into their national language under the influence of the Hussite movement.

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>13</sup> See: P.P. Panaitescu, "Începuturile scrisului în limba română / The beginnings of writing in the Romanian Language", in *Studii și materiale de istorie medie / Studies and Sources of Medieval History*, IV (1960), p. 118-189; Idem, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română. / The Beginnings and Victory of Writing in Romanian*, Publishing House: Academia Romana, Institutul de Istorie "Nicolae Iorga", București, 1965, p. 29-44.

<sup>14</sup> Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria literaturii religioase a românilor până la 1688 / History of the Religious Literature of the Romanians up to 1688*, Bucharest, 1904, p. 19 et seq.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

The following opinion was pencilled by Ovid Densușianu<sup>15</sup> and afterwards advanced by Al. Rosetti<sup>16</sup>. This states that the first texts written in Romanian must be dated after 1530, because they appeared in the context of and inspired by the Lutheran Reformation, and through the Transylvanian Saxons' endorsement of texts printed in the Romanian language.

Another theory on the beginning of writing in the Romanian language belongs to P.P. Panaitescu, who asserted that the first Romanian texts from Maramureș came to light in the heat of the emancipation movement of the local Orthodox Church that was then under the jurisdiction of the Ukrainian Bishop of Muncaci.<sup>17</sup>

The Catholic influence on the beginning of writing in Romanian is yet another theory, one that belongs to I.Bărbulescu, who argued that the Catholic propaganda amongst Romanians had been going on for a longer period of time, with Catholics actually admitting to the appearance of service books in the language of the people.<sup>18</sup>

At the other end of the theory spectrum, opposing the opinions that the birth and evolution of a Romanian cultural phenomenon is due to exogenous influences, there stands the theory of a domestic origin of the first texts in Romanian, which was formulated by Milan Seșan<sup>19</sup>, Theodor Palade<sup>20</sup>, Ștefan Ciobanu<sup>21</sup> and even by P.P. Panaitescu<sup>22</sup>. According to this theory, the beginning of writing in the Romanian lan-

<sup>15</sup> Ovide Densușianu, *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, Paris, tome I, 1901, p. 15 et seq.

<sup>16</sup> Alexandre Rosetti, *Recherches sur la phonétique du roumain au XVIe siècle*, Paris, 1926, pp. 32-41; See also: Idem, Rosetti, "Cele mai vechi traduceri de cărți religioase. Considerații asupra datării și localizării lor în lumina cercetărilor nouă / The oldest translations of religious books. Considerations on their placement in place and time according to the new research", *Revista istorică română / The Romanian Historical Review*, XVI (1944), pp. 1-14. P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului în limba română / The Beginnings and Victory of Writing in Romanian*, Bucharest, 1965, p. 133.

<sup>17</sup> Al Rosetti, P.P. Panaitescu, Florica Niculescu, Al Piru, "Apariția scrisului în limba română / The emergence of writing in the Romanian Language", p. 288-289.

<sup>18</sup> Ilie Bărbulescu, *Studii privitoare la limba și istoria românilor / Studies on the Romanian language and history*, Bucharest, 1902, p. 15 et seq., Idem, *Curențele culturale la români în perioada slavonismului cultural / Cultural trends in Romania during the cultural Slavonism*, București, 1928, p. 53 et seq.

<sup>19</sup> Milan Seșan, "Originea și timpul primelor traduceri românești ale sf. Scripturi / The origin and date of the first Romanian translations of the Holy Scriptures", 1939, excerpt from *Candela / The Vigil Lamp*, L (1939). Idem, "Introducerea limbii române în biserică / The entrance of Romanian language in the Church", *MA*, I (1957), p. 818-835; Idem, "Introducerea limbii române în biserică / The entrance of Romanian language in the Church", *ST*, 11 (1959), p. 57-60

<sup>20</sup> Theodor Palade, "Când s-a scris întâi românește? / When was the first written account in Romanian?", *The Archive*, XXVI (1915), p. 187 et seq., p. 235 et seq.

<sup>21</sup> Ștefan Ciobanu, "Începuturile scrisului în limba românească / The Beginnings of writing in Romanian", *The Romanian Academy, memoirs of the literary department*, series III, tome X, 1941.

<sup>22</sup> P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului... / The Beginnings and Victory of Writing...*, p. 43 et seq.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

guage and its adoption by the Church are cultural phenomena that ought to be examined in the historical, economic and social context of emancipation of the respective era. Therefore, the introduction of Romanian language in the Church and society happened due to internal factors, i.e. to the religious and cultural needs of the Romanian people. A proof of the validity of this theory might be the fact that the first use of Romanian language in the Wallachian and Moldavian churches at the beginning of the 17th and the 18th centuries was done independently of the Reformation and in conjunction with the Romanianization of the divine services in Transylvania.<sup>23</sup>

None of these opinions can claim to present the whole historical truth about the introduction of the Romanian language in the cult. It is certain that, against all “reservations and doubts”<sup>24</sup> with which some hierarchs approached the nationalization of the divine service, towards the end of the 15th century, Transylvania saw the first texts translated into Romanian, which circulated only in manuscript form until they were printed by Deacon Coresi. *Tetraevanghelul romanesc (The Romanian Tetraevangeliar)* 1561, *Apostolul (The Acts of the Apostles)* 1563, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor și Molițfelnicul (Sermons and Book of Prayers)* 1567, *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* and *Liturghierul (The Litourgicon)* 1570. The existence of some middle-rank social classes among the Transylvanian population first, and then in Moldavia and Wallachia (the small cnezial nobility), and the presence of some sort of Romanian tradesmen and citizens in the cities, who could not always rise up to the level of cultivated oral Slavic or Latin, let alone write in those languages, but who needed to master the science of writing, made it necessary that Romanian be used as common ground across all classes and dimensions of the society.

One may conclude then, that the emergence of a culture written in Romanian is, by all means, an internal phenomenon deeply rooted in the Romanian society as it was at the beginning of the 17th century and in the material, cultural and spiritual needs it was facing at that moment. At the same time, the Romanian cultural history phenomenon was absorbed in the general evolution of the European society, as the larger context showed many other peoples on the continent gradually transitioning from Mediaeval cultural languages to written ones within that time frame.

## 2. Nations and denominations in Mediaeval Transylvania

During the Middle Ages, Transylvania was the home for four nations of different religious affiliations: the Orthodox Romanians, the Lutheran Transylvanian

---

<sup>23</sup> Ion Gheție, Al. Mareș, *Originile scrisului în limba română / The origins of writing in Romanian*, Bucharest, 1985, p. 55.

<sup>24</sup> P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile și biruința scrisului... / The Beginnings and Victory of Writing...*, p. 222.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

Saxons, the Catholic or Calvinist Szeklers, and the part Calvinist, part Unitarian Hungarians. This multi-ethnic and multi-confessional character of the Transylvanian Mediaeval society paved the way for a new political, social and confessional model of cohabitation of radically different populations.<sup>25</sup>

Before the conquest of the Hungarian Kingdom by the Turks, when the Province of Transylvania gained political autonomy after the battles of Mohacs 1526 and Buda 1541, this region had been under the direct supervision of Hungarian kings, who encouraged and sustained a phenomenon of ethnic coagulation in this area, in order to promote the economic, religious and political interests of the dominating nations (Hungarians, Transylvanian Saxons and Szeklers). These three nations would go on and codify a pact of mutual aid (in 1437), the *Unio Trio Nationum* that started as a military and political alliance by which the three “nations” (Hungarian nobility, Transylvanian Saxons and Szeklers) committed to helping one another whenever they would find themselves under attack. This pact would later become the political cornerstone of the Province of Transylvania.<sup>26</sup> Although Romanians represented the majority in Transylvania, being as they were, more numerous than the other three nations, they were acknowledged merely as a “tolerated” nation, and were excluded from having any official representation in the Diet - the legislature of the Province.

This mode of dividing the Mediaeval Transylvanian society into nations was soon followed by a denominational configuration of the population, a move aimed solely at maintaining that political system in the Province of Transylvania. As a result, a denominational system was created. This arrangement was characteristic for Mediaeval Transylvania - it required and ensured the mutual respect between the three denominations of the Reformation and the Catholicism. “Religious tolerance” in Mediaeval Transylvania was not due to any tolerant spirit Transylvanian ethnicities might have had, but to the extraordinary internal and external contexts during which the Province of Transylvania was founded.<sup>27</sup>

The Diets of Torda in 1550 and 1557 acknowledged and legalized the religious equality and plurality in Transylvania and sketched the desired relationship

<sup>25</sup> Dumitru Vanca, *Paradigme liturgice în sec. 17. Ioan Zoba din Vinț și evoluția liturghiei românești / Liturgical paradigms in the 17th century. Ioan Zoba of Vinț and the evolution of the Romanian liturgy*, Alba Iulia, 2016, p. 21.

<sup>26</sup> D. Prodan, *Supplex Libellus Valachorum. Din istoria formării națiunii române / Supplex Libellus Valachorum. From the history of the formation of the Romanian nation*, the 3rd edition, Bucharest, 1984, pp. 97-101

<sup>27</sup> Paul Brusonowski, “Națiuni și confesiuni în Principatul Transilvaniei în epoca martirilor Brâncoveni / Nations and denominations in the province of Transylvania during the time of the Brâncoveanu family’s martyrdom”, in *Eucharist, Confession, Martyrdom*, Publishing House: Renașterea, Cluj-Napoca, 2014, p. 340.



Prof. Ciprian Streza

between Catholicism and Lutheranism. In order to end the disputes amongst Protestants, another Diet of Torda named Calvinism an accepted religion in 1564, and Unitarianism in 1568 and 1571.<sup>28</sup>

In this denominational *modus vivendi* the Orthodox Church enjoyed a special status - it was merely tolerated, but had all the rights to exercise freely its mission and worship, it was considered neither illicit, nor innovative.<sup>29</sup> However, this multi-ethnic and multi-confessional context did not inspire the Transylvanian political and religious authorities to adopt an attitude of tolerance and acceptance towards the Romanian Orthodox Church. As they were only tolerated, the Romanians in Transylvania had to face many confessional oppressions from the princes or from the leaders of the accepted Churches. Consequently, Romanians were coerced into taking a Calvinist superintendent as the leader of the Orthodox Church in Transylvania between 1566-1577, and whoever refused to subject to this new rule was immediately dispossessed of all their assets.<sup>30</sup> Yet, despite all these tough confessional pressures, the air of Reformation did good to those Transylvanian Romanians who turned the situation in their favour and started working towards a renewal of the liturgical life of the Church, by having the service books translated into Romanian and by laying the foundations for a profound administrative reform.<sup>31</sup>

Therefore, in a Europe that was becoming more and more divided from a religious point of view, where “more and more people were forced to become exiles because of their religious affiliation, Transylvania was - either due to its state politics, or due to certain political weaknesses - a safe haven for five denominations that went on to co-exist within the limits of normalcy. The religious climate here was one of the most tolerable of the age”<sup>32</sup>, and the echoes of Transylvanian tolerance and renewal of the worship would be felt by the other Romanian Provinces as well.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 342.

<sup>29</sup> Idem, “Considerații cu privire la relația dintre Biserica Ortodoxă Română și autoritățile de stat din Principatul autonom al Transilvaniei (1541-1690) / Considerations on the relationship between the Romanian Orthodox Church and the state authorities in the autonomous Province of Transylvania (1541-1690)”, *RT*, 16 (2006), no. 2, p. 122-142.

<sup>30</sup> Ludwig Binder, *Grundlagen und Formen der Toleranz in Sibenburgien bis zu Mitte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Sibenbürgisches Archiv, Band 11), 1976, p.118

<sup>31</sup> Paul Bruszanowski, “Națiuni și confesiuni... / Nations and denominations...”, p. 343.

<sup>32</sup> Ana Dumitran, *Religie ortodoxă - religie reformată. Ipostaze ale identității profesionale a românilor din Transilvania în secolele XVI-XVII / Orthodox religion - reformed religion. Hypostases of the denominational identity of Romanians in Transylvania in the 16th-17th centuries*, Publishing House: Nereamia Napocae -Cristian Matos, Cluj-Napoca, 2004, p. 79.

<sup>33</sup> Dumitru Vanca, *Paradigme liturgice... / Liturgical paradigms...*, p. 29.

### **3. The translation of the Euchologion in Romanian - the stages of a spiritual renewal of the Romanian Orthodox Church between the 16th-18th centuries**

The most important events in the life of a Romanian community in the 16th-18th centuries were closely connected to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, the celebration of the Holy Liturgy and of the Holy Mysteries. For that reason, the main texts that were translated in the language of the people and circulated in manuscript form for a long time were the Gospel Book, the Litourgicon and the Euchologion. The latter was the book best suited to the daily spiritual needs of the people, for within its covers - as Father Ioan Zoba of Vinț, the editor of the Euchologion from Bălgrad 1689 wisely wrote - one can find "man's entire life depicted, from the hour of his birth, to that of his death, and to his burial"<sup>34</sup>.

The first edition of the Euchologion in Greek was printed in Venice in 1526. A few years later, in 1545, the Romanians had their own printed edition of this service book.<sup>35</sup> As it was printed in Slavonic, this *Euchologion* is considerably different from the Greek editions, not only in the way the text reads, but sometimes also in the way it describes how various divine services are to be celebrated. Due not only to the political and historical conditions, but especially to Slavonic cultural influences, the first Romanian editions of the Euchologion follow the Slavonic tradition.<sup>36</sup> The things would change in favour of the Greek tradition though, at the beginning of the 18th century, by the intervention of Anthim the Iberian.

Many of the Slavonic printed editions of the Euchologion have been preserved: one from 1635, printed by Timotei Alexandrovici at Câmpulung<sup>37</sup>, another from 1636 quoted by Nicolae Iorga<sup>38</sup>, another from 1666, which is a compilation of Greek and Slavonic sources<sup>39</sup> and one last edition from 1643 that was printed by Metropolitan Petru Movilă at Kiev.<sup>40</sup>

The transition from the Slavonic to the Romanian Euchologion was made gradually.<sup>41</sup> The priests would recite the prayers they knew by heart, sometimes

<sup>34</sup> Ioan Zoba din Vinț, *Predoslovie la Molitâvnic / Preface to the Euchologion*, Bălgrad, 1689, f. [6r], in: Ana Dumitran, Alin-Mihai Gherman și Dumitru A. Vanca (eds.), *Molitâvnic, Bălgrad, 1689 / Euchologion, Bălgrad 1689*, Alba Iulia 2009, p. 183.

<sup>35</sup> Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia românească veche / Old Romanian Bibliography*, Vol. I (1508-1716), p. 23.

<sup>36</sup> Ioan Floca, "Moliffelnicul ortodox / The Orthodox Euchologion", MA, 6 (1962), no. 1-2, p. 93-115

<sup>37</sup> Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian...*, vol. IV, p. 185.

<sup>38</sup> N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii religioase... / History of the Religious Literature...*, Bucharest, 1904, pp. 62-63.

<sup>39</sup> Ioan Floca, art. cit., p. 97.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>41</sup> This gradual transition towards the introduction of the Romanian language in the Church is tributary also to the opposing views that some hierarchs from the Orthodox Church held against this

Prof. Ciprian Streza

in an approximate Slavonic language, and that was why they resorted to printing service books that also contained typikon directions and other practical guides in Romanian. This is how the two editions of the Slavo-Romanian Euchologion from Buzău came to be printed in 1699<sup>42</sup> and 1701<sup>43</sup>.

As time passed, the number of Romanian and Slavo-Romanian manuscripts grew, and thus the need for a Euchologion printed in Romanian became more and more stringent. The expected event would take place in Transylvania, where the denominational pluralism and the reformatory context of the 16th-17th centuries afforded the printing – by Deacon Coresi – of the most important service books in Romanian: *Evangheliarul (The Gospel Book)* in 1561, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor și Molitfelnicul românesc (Sermons and the Romanian Book of Prayers)* in 1564, *Apostolul (Acts of the Apostles)* in 1566, *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* in 1570 and *Sfânta Liturghie (the Holy Liturgy)* in 1570. Under Lutheran Saxon patronage, Deacon Coresi managed to publish the divine service texts that were most often used in the Church in Transylvania, but the denominational environment in which they materialized did leave small indents on their contents, as they exhibited a series of Protestant elements.

The main editions of the Euchologion in Romanian will be analysed in the following paragraphs. The goal here is to highlight the stages that the Orthodox Church in the Romanian Provinces went through until the Romanian language was introduced in its liturgical worship.

#### a. Coresi's Romanian Euchologion<sup>44</sup>

In 1567-1568, in the annex to the book *Tâlcul Evangheliilor (Gospel Sermons)*, Coresi printed what he called *Molitfelnic românesc (Book of Prayers or Romanian Euchologion)*, a text that is no more than a religious compromise, i.e. an *ad literam* translation of the Hungarian Calvinistic text pertaining to the *Agenda* of the Hungarian Reformed Church that was published by Héltai Gàspar in

---

renewal, which they saw as a form of Protestant proselytism. Thus, even as far as in 1698, long after the issuance of the first printed books in Romanian, Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem was still urging Metropolitan Atanasie Anghel of Transylvania “to strive and fight for the use Slavonic or Greek with all liturgical readings, and to reprove the use of Romanian or other languages in the worship of the Church”, in Timotei Cipariu, *Principii de limbă și de scriptură / Linguistic and Scriptural Principles*, Blaj, 1856, p. 243.

<sup>42</sup> Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian Bibliography*, vol. IV, p. 377.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 411.

<sup>44</sup> See the critical text in Vladimir Drimba (ed), *Coresi, Tâlcul Evangheliilor și Molitfelnic românesc / Coresi, the interpretation of the Gospels and the Romanian Euchologion*, Bucharest, 1998.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

Cluj, in 1559,<sup>45</sup> whose text Deacon Coresi modified by adding some Orthodox prayers and eliminating the Filioque clause from the Symbol of Faith.<sup>46</sup>

In spite of its title, *Molitvelnic rumânesc (Romanian Euchologion)*, Coresi's compilation cannot be considered a Euchologion in the true sense of the word, and cannot be accepted by the Eastern Orthodox as such. The title of this book is not appropriate, because its contents actually prove it to be a "book of Calvinistic songs and services", where the number of Mysteries is reduced to three (Baptism, Marriage, Eucharist). The end of the book summons various hymns and psalms that were translated from the "Book of Songs" written by Calvinist pastor Szegedy Gergely and printed in 1562. It is supposed that their translator (compiler) in Romanian was the Romanian-Calvinist superintendent Gheorghe de Sângeorz.<sup>47</sup>

The text of the Coresian Euchologion contains but a few prayers and notes on how the divine services should be celebrated. In the beginning, there are nine types of prayers for various purposes (morning and evening prayers, prayers for the forgiveness of sins, prayers before meals, for peace, etc), followed by the rite of Baptism, Marriage, of the Liturgy, of administering the Holy Communion to the sick, then the order of the funeral service, the Vespers and the morning service. The text concludes with chants from Psalms and Gospels.

Apart from its cultural import in the history of the Romanian printing press, the Coresian text bears almost no resemblance to the liturgical rites of the Eastern Orthodox Church.

Contrary to the inter-confessional and composite character of this service book, Coresi's effort remains very valuable<sup>48</sup>, as it demonstrates that the introduction of Romanian into the cult was indeed a complex phenomenon, a spiritual need of the Romanian people that was fulfilled in the inter-confessional and multi-ethnic reformatory context of 16th-17th century Transylvania. In this way, the intention behind the printing of such an admixture of texts is firmly stated in the preface of this book, where Coresi declares: "I have written this Euchologion in Romanian,

<sup>45</sup> Spirodon Căndea, *Diaconul Coresi, simplu tipograf sau și traducător al cărților tipărite de el? / Deacon Coresi - a mere typographer, or was he also a translator of the books he printed?*, The Metropolitanate of Transylvania 3-6 (1962), p. 335.

<sup>46</sup> P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile și biruința... / The Beginnings and Victory...*, p. 154.

<sup>47</sup> Mircea Păcurariu, *Istoria Bisericii Ortodoxe Române / The history of the Romanian Orthodox Church*, p. 481.

<sup>48</sup> P.P. Panaitescu believes that the Euchologion from 1567-1568 covers up a compromise between the political ruling class and Deacon Coresi. "This political ruling class presented Romanians with certain Reformed texts for publication. Romanian editors expurgated the texts; they were unable to refuse them entirely. They did agree on the key point, i.e. the publication of books into the vernacular language, that had always been their goal. But they reaffirm the Orthodox faith by publishing the Nicene Creed..." P.P. Panaitescu, *Începuturile... / The Beginnings...*, p. 154.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

otherwise how could the priest and the people understand what is being said, if said it is in other languages; for even God Himself told the Prophets and the Apostles to speak in the tongue of the people that listen...<sup>49</sup> Before enlisting the contents of his book, the editor writes this exhortation to the clergy of the age: “My fellow priests, may you call upon the name of the Lord with great understanding and reverence, so do not babble, for you shall be punished by the Lord...”<sup>50</sup>

**b. Metropolitan Dosoftei of Moldavia’s *Molitfelnicul de’nțele* (Euchologion for general understanding) 1681**

Chronologically, the next printed Euchologion would be issued only after one hundred years, by the grace and effort of Metropolitan Dosoftei of Moldavia, whose wish was to bring to completion Deacon Coresi’s ambitions and aspirations regarding the renewal of the life of the Church. The printing of the first Romanian books in Moldavia (1681), a territory separated from the reforming Transylvanian context by the Carpathians, reveals the obvious state of facts, i.e. all Romanians desired a better understanding of the divine services and wanted to pray in their mother tongue.

The spiritual ascent of the Moldavian Orthodox Christians towards the introduction of Romanian language in the cult was completed in a few important stages: the issuance of *Psaltirea în versuri* (*the Psalter in verse*) in 1673, *Dumnezeiasca Liturghie* (*the Divine Liturgy*) in 1679, and lastly of *Molitfelnicul* (*the Euchologion*) in 1681. The latter service book, suggestively named by the translator *Molitvănicul den’țăles* (*Euchologion for general understanding*), was published at the printing press in Iași, by the joint effort of Metropolitan Dosoftei and monk Mitrofan and with financial aid from prince Ioan Duca. The book (in quarto), somehow anticipated by the few prayers featured in the Litourgicon printed a few years earlier, has 158 folios covering 43 rites and prayers for various needs. Included here are the rites of several Sacraments (the Engagement and the Matrimony, the Baptism with the Chrismation, The Unction, the Confession and the Eucharist), the Order of the Funeral service, Prayers in Time of Illness or Trouble, Prayers for rain, Prayers at the blessing of the water, Prayers for the purification of certain foods that had become unclean. Beside these rituals, the book also comprises a Homily at a funeral, an Oration belonging to Saint Gregory of Neocaesarea (printed in Greek, Latin and Romanian) and Saint John Chrysostom’s Homily for Holy Thursday.<sup>51</sup>

---

<sup>49</sup> Vladimir Drimba (ed), *Coresi, Tâlcul Evangheliilor și Molitevnicele rumânesce/ Coresi, Gospel Sermons and the Romanian Euchologion*, Bucharest, 1998, p. 189.

<sup>50</sup> *Ibidem*.

<sup>51</sup> Dumitru Vanca, “Considerații teologice... / Theological Considerations...”, p. 48.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

Metropolitan Dosoftei's tremendous effort to enlighten the people by introducing the Romanian language in the Church was a pioneering work. The onset was laborious, for the language and the syntax of the translation still looked and sounded Slavonic, and the text of the Euchologion, full of Moldavianisms as it were, had a unique structure that has never been replicated in any of the subsequent editions of this service book.<sup>52</sup>

Unlike the current canon of the arrangement of prayers, Dosoftei's Euchologion does not begin with the orders of birth and Baptism, but with the Great Blessing of Water (done at the Feast of Epiphany) and with the Lesser Blessing of Water; it also contains some prayers that have not been included in the ensuing editions of the Romanian Euchologions.

In the history of the Romanian printing press, Dosoftei's Euchologion remains an experimental, preliminary edition. In spite of its abstruse language and of the fact that all its subsequent editions would reformulate its contents and reconfigure the prayers, the first edition of the Romanian Euchologion has had a major impact on the promotion and introduction of the Romanian language in the Church.<sup>53</sup>

**c. Euchologion, Bălgrad (Alba Iulia), 1689<sup>54</sup>**

In such a transforming climate as Transylvania was experiencing in the 17th century, with all the Calvinistic confessional pressure put upon the people, the initiative to print the text of the Euchologion in Romanian was taken on by archpriest Ioan Zoba of Vinț, who held a high position in the hierarchy of the Metropolitanate of Transylvania, i.e. he was the notary of the Great Council, with responsibilities equal to those of a vicar bishop.<sup>55</sup> This "priest that was a bit more of a scholar than the others", as Nicolae Iorga deemed him<sup>56</sup>, had a special relationship with Prince Michael Apafi, who elevated him to the rank of nobleman in 1664. His inclination toward Protestantism and his connections to the extant ruling classes in Transylvania generated an open conflict between him and his hierarchs, Metropolitan

<sup>52</sup> Paul Mihail, *Molitfelnicul mitropolitului Dosoftei - Iași 1681 / Metropolitan Dosoftei's Euchologion*, The Metropolitanate of Moldova and Suceava 4-6 (1981), p.320.

<sup>53</sup> Dumitru Vanca, *Paradigme liturgice... / Liturgical paradigms...*, p. 91.

<sup>54</sup> Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian Bibliography*, vol I, p. 291. See also the critical edition of the text in: Ana Dumitran, Alin Gherman, Dumitru Vanca (eds.), *Molităvnic, Bălgrad 1689-2009 / Euchologion, Bălgrad 1689-2009* Alba Iulia, Publishing House: Reîntregirea, 2010.

<sup>55</sup> Ana Dumitran, "Considerații teologice. Studiu introductiv / Theological considerations. Introductory Study", in: Ana Dumitran, Alin Gherman, Dumitru Vanca (eds.), *Molităvnic... / Euchologion...*, p. 16.

<sup>56</sup> Nicolae Iorga, *Istoria literaturii românești / The History of Romanian Literature*, 2nd edition, vol. I, Bucharest, 1925, p. 391.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

Sava Brancovici and Ioasaf, but it also made him into one of the most influential personalities of the Church in Transylvania and at one point, even a candidate to the Metropolitan see.<sup>57</sup>

But this priest was fuelled by the most sincere wishes to help Transylvanian Romanians attain knowledge and wisdom. He spent the last part of his life printing books in Romanian. Thus, he published five books of crucial import for the triumph of Romanian as the worship language in the Church. Three of these books have a markedly liturgical character: *Ceaslovețul (Small Horologion)* 1686, *Rânduiala Diaconstvelor (Small Hieratikon - which is actually a mini-Litourgicon)* 1687 and *Molitfelnic (Euchologion)* in 1689.

The act of spreading the word of God in Romanian “for the benefit and improvement of our Romanian people”<sup>58</sup> and “for the benefit and understanding of the Orthodox Romanian Church”<sup>59</sup> had always been the desire and spiritual creed of this scholar. In the prefaces to the books he published, he expressed the motivation behind his whole effort to enlighten the Transylvanian people in wordings like: “many people longingly go to church, for they want to hear and receive spiritual comfort, but as they comprehend nothing, they return home unhappy and unfulfilled”<sup>60</sup>, and “as many of the priests do not understand the typika or the orders and rites, they have oftentimes inexpertly celebrated the divine services.”<sup>61</sup>

The Euchologion published by this scholar priest was one of the widest spread and used service books in Transylvania, and played a decisive role in the structure and text of the Romanian Euchologion that would be printed by Metropolitan Anthim the Iberian at Râmnic in 1706.<sup>62</sup> The great number of manuscripts and copies that circulated throughout the entire Transylvanian territory is yet another proof of its particular impact on the life of the Orthodox Church of that time.

---

<sup>57</sup> For further and extensive information on the controverted personality of Ioan Zoba from Vinț, see: Dumitru Vanca, *Paradigme liturgice... / Liturgical paradigms...*, p. 39-56.

<sup>58</sup> *Cărare pre scurt spre fapte bune îndereptătoare / Shortcut to good atoning deeds*, Sas-Sebeș, 1685, la Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian Bibliography*, vol. I, p. 276.

<sup>59</sup> *Rânduiala diaconstvelor / Small Hieratikon*, Alba Iulia, 1687, in Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian...* vol I, p. 280.

<sup>60</sup> *Ceaslovețul / Small Horologion*, Alba Iulia, 1685, in Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / Old Romanian...* vol I, p. 279.

<sup>61</sup> *Molităvnic / Euchologion*, Alba Iulia, 1689, f.[6r], in: Ana Dumitran, Alin Gherman, Dumitru Vanca (eds.), *Molităvnic... / Euchologion...*, p. 180.

<sup>62</sup> On the influence of Zoba’s texts on Anthim the Iberian, visit: Cătălina Velculescu, “Diaconstvele de la Alba Iulia și Liturghierul lui Antim Ivireanul / The Small Hieratikon from Alba Iulia and Anthim the Iberian’s Hieratikon”, *Annuary of the Institute of History A. D. Xenopol*, XLVII (2010), p. 23-31; Mircea Păcurariu, *Tiparul în Biserica Ortodoxă Română / Printing in the Romanian Orthodox Church*, Sibiu, Publishing House: Andreiana, 2016, p. 86; D. Vanca, *Paradigmele... / The Paradigms...*, p.67.

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

The sources that Ioan Zoba employed in his work are not known. The editor states only that his Euchologion “was taken from Slavonic and rendered in Romanian”<sup>63</sup>, without specifying the precise sources of inspiration in its compilation. However, it may be supposed that, due to his position as administrative vicar and secretary of the Council, he travelled throughout the entire territory of Transylvania and managed to gather a series of manuscripts containing translations of various divine services, which he most likely compared, rectified and correlated with the texts already published, in order to produce an entirely novel and unique service book in the Transylvanian ecclesiastical space. Through his efforts, Zoba made a crucial contribution to the standardization and correction of the liturgical rites in Transylvania.<sup>64</sup>

The structure of the Euchologion from Bălgrad. This Euchologion comprises thirty-nine divine services designed for various needs. Among them, there are only five of the seven Holy Mysteries (the Baptism, Chrismation, Confession, Marriage and Unction). It also features a collection of prayers such as: the Great Blessing of the Water at Epiphany, the Christmas Prayer for the spiritual children, the Prayer on St. Peter’s day, St. Athanasios’s question, the Prayer for those who enter a fast, that are to be found only in the Slavic versions, and not in the Greek ones.<sup>65</sup>

The editors of the text of this Euchologion made an interesting discovery, namely that the manuscript initially had 199 folios, with the contents list printed on folio 198 and Ioan Zoba’s postface on folio 199,<sup>66</sup> and then it added four funeral Homilies and two Forgiveness requests for dead people, which made a series of copies of this service book reach a number of 223 folios each. It seems that the said annex was added upon “buyers’ request”, after the book was printed and probably before the folios were bound into a volume.<sup>67</sup> Through the addition of the funeral speeches, Zoba’s Euchologion acquired a new, pastoral-homiletic dimension. This was especially helpful for the Transylvanian priests who cared just as much about owning liturgical texts in Romanian and celebrating the divine services in their mother tongue, as they longed for homiletic samples they could model in their pastoral-missionary work.

The contents of the Euchologion from Bălgrad and a few specific particularities in the celebration of the Holy Mysteries.

<sup>63</sup> *Molităvnic / Euchologion*, Alba Iulia, 1689, f.[6r], in: Ana Dumitran, Alin Gherman, Dumitru Vanca (eds.), *Molităvnic... / Euchologion...*, p. 180.

<sup>64</sup> Dumitru Vanca, “Considerații teologice... / Theological Considerations...”, p. 50

<sup>65</sup> Ioan Floca, art. cit., p. 103.

<sup>66</sup> Dumitru Vanca, “Considerații teologice... / Theological Considerations...”, p. 50.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibidem*.



Prof. Ciprian Streza

The arrangement of the services in the Euchologion is unique and does not follow Dosoftei's. The book starts with the orders of the Holy Mysteries. Therefore, the service of the Holy Baptism is almost identical to the one in the Euchologion that is now used in the Orthodox Church,<sup>68</sup> but for one detail - the wiping of the Holy Myron that was formerly performed on the eighth day after Baptism is now included in the divine service itself.<sup>69</sup> The Mystery of Marriage was a bit different from its current form as well. The prayer that concludes the service of Engagement (Bucharest 2013) is missing from Zoba's Euchologion, and the text of the Epistle reading (I Cor 7, 6-14) differs from the current one in that it emphasizes the indissoluble character of the conjugal union. There is one remarkable particularity in the order of marriage in Transylvania, that is the liturgical kiss shared by the bride and groom<sup>70</sup> and their partaking in the Holy Communion<sup>71</sup>. Just as remarkable a peculiarity is also "Molitva la înfrumusețarea nevestei" (the Prayer at the adorning of the new wife - f.38v), and the absence of the prayer that is customarily read on the eighth day after Marriage, as stipulated in Dos1681, Trg1713 and Buc2013.

There are notable differences between the former and the current Mystery of Confession, too.

The order described there is more complex and thorough compared to that of Trg1713 and to the one in use now. There are more prayers, the pastoral advice is lengthier and more detailed, and the service is enriched with readings from the Psalms (8, 4 and 6), the Epistles (1 Tim. 1, 15-17) and the Gospel (Mt. 9, 9-13).

The service of the Holy Unction is different both from the one in the current Euchologion (Buc2013), and from its contemporary text published by Dosoftei. Although it has a general outline identical to the one in use today, Zoba's text provides a distinct set of prayers and even some different stichera (the ones read after the Prayer for the blessing of the oil). The major distinction though is to be found in the Gospel readings, which are not only completely different, but even contain

---

<sup>68</sup> The last edition of this Euchologion was issued by the Publishing House Editura Institutului biblic și de Misiune al BOR, Bucharest, 2013.

<sup>69</sup> Dumitru Vanca, "Considerații teologice... / Theological Considerations...", p. 52.

<sup>70</sup> "The Deacon: Let us love one another that one mind we may confess. *The faithful say:* Father, Son and Holy Spirit, the Holy Trinity, one in essence and undivided. *And the priest kisses both, and the bride and groom kiss one another, saying:* Here in our midst is Christ, He is with us and always will be." (f. 36 r-v).

<sup>71</sup> "And then the priest raises the Presanctified Gifts and exclaims: Let us attend. The Presanctified Holy Things are for the holy. *The faithful say:* One is holy, One is Lord, Jesus Christ, to the glory of God the Father. Amen. *And the priest imparts the Holy Eucharist to the bride and groom. And, should there be no liturgy celebrated, he has them taste from the glass prepared according to the local customs.*" (f. 37 r).

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

an alternative group of pericopes, especially chosen for women. It is interesting that the text of the service does not contain the “Opening Blessing”<sup>72</sup>.

This edition of the Euchologion remains isolated from all the ensuing versions of this service book. Zoba’s Euchologion belongs to a tradition of Slavonic manuscripts that were taken on and translated in a unique and ingenious manner in Transylvania between the 16th-17th centuries. Manuscript 19 from the Library of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu is part of the same tradition. This was written in 1647, respectively 1683, and is very similar to Zoba’s Euchologion.

**d. Anthem the Iberian’s Euchologion, Râmnic 1706**

This Euchologion was printed at Râmnicu Vâlcea, “by Mihai Iştvanovici Subdeacon and typographer, and through the effort and financial support of God loving Esquire Anthem the Iberian, Bishop of Râmnic.” The uniqueness of this service book and the novelty it brought into the liturgical life of the Romanian Orthodox Church, in the 18th century, lie in the Greek sources that were employed when the service texts contained within were translated. Furthermore, its importance is given also by the fact that it serves as foundation for all the Romanian subsequent editions of the Euchologion, which simply replicate it and sometimes supplement its contents with certain extracts from Slavic versions or from Romanian editions that observe the Slavic tradition.

Anthem the Iberian’s edition includes the thirty-nine services and prayers for various needs, and the rich and carefully selected contents are detailed in the foreword, where the great Metropolitan and translator of this Euchologion writes: “we observed the Greek Euchologion printed by Nicolae Glychi in the year 1629, and then added some of our own into the translation every here and there, only when ability, knowledge and liturgical appropriateness allowed it”<sup>73</sup>. The same foreword mentions how the translator respected faithfully and completely the Greek sources: “we did not add the service celebrated when the sick are given the Communion, as we find the Slavonic Euchologions did, for there are no such services presented in the Greek ones...”<sup>74</sup> Here, he is most likely writing about the Slavo-Romanian editions from Buzău (1699 and 1701), which contain this specific service.

<sup>72</sup> Zoba’s Euchologion features three prayers before Confession, one of them being for the spiritual father, and four prayers after Confession. Only one of the above mentioned prayers is found in the current order for the Mystery of Confession. („O God our Saviour, Who by Thy Prophet Nathan...”), D. Vanca, “Considerații... / Theological Considerations...”, p. 53.

<sup>73</sup> Dumitru Vanca, “Rânduiala Tainei ‘Sfântului Maslu’ în secolul XVII în Transilvania. Considerații pe marginea Molitfelnicului de la Bălgrad 1689 / The Order of the Holy Unction in 18th century Transylvania. Notes on the Euchologion from Bălgrad 1689”, *Annales Universitatis Apulensis*. [Series theologica], IV (2004), p.82-124.

<sup>74</sup> Ioan Bianu, Nerva Hodoș, *Bibliografia... / The Bibliography...*, vol. IV, p. 220.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

The Euchologion printed at Râmnic in 1706 is much richer in content than the Slavic ones, and that is why it was replicated by all the subsequent editors of this service book.<sup>75</sup>

In comparison to the Slavo-Romanian editions from Buzău and the edition from Bălgrad (1689) that follow the Slavic tradition, Anthim the Iberian's text comprises a series of novel and unique elements that had never been seen in the Romanian language ever before. These are: Prayer at the cutting of the hair; Chapters at the second wedding, by Nikifor, Patriarch of Tsargrad; The order of the Great Blessing of Water; The service for the unclean vessel; The service for the unclean tongue; The service for entering a new house; Prayer for those who repent of their sins; Prayer in case of weaknesses; Services done for blessing the fields, vines or gardens, whenever the hens and other animals spoil them; Prayer for the sick man (who cannot sleep); Zlataost's Sermon on the Holy Thursday; Prayer, namely exorcisms of St. Basil the Great for those who are afflicted by the devil; Prayer for Lytia; Prayer at times of deadly dangers, i.e. at times of plague and famine; Prayer for the blessing of meats; Service for those who leave the true faith and then return, and the Service for cases of illness when the priest makes the sign of the cross with the holy Spear.

As far as typika is concerned, it is safe to say that there are some possible Slavic influences there as well. This can be noticed during the service of Engagement, for instance. Anthim the Iberian had his attention focused on the local tradition, which he respected and kept so as to cater more fully to the pastoral needs of the priests.

All that the other editions of the Euchologion, which were printed at Târgoviște in 1713; Bucharest in 1729; Râmnic in 1730, 1747, 1758, 1768, 1782, 1793; Bucharest 1741, 1764, 1794; Buzău 1747; Iași 1749, 1764, 1785; Blaj 1784, do nothing more than take the structure of Anthim the Iberian's Euchologion and add some contents to it. The edition from Blaj is in accordance with the Slavonic arrangement and with the one from Bălgrad.

The conclusion that can be drawn after the analysis of the main Romanian editions of the Euchologion is that the act of translating this service book is strongly affected by a tendency to upgrade the contents of the Euchologion with services taken either from the Slavonic tradition, or from the Greek. Consequently, the Romanian editions emerged as specific and unique productions that harmoniously incorporated both traditions, so as to serve any and all pastoral-missionary needs of the Church at that time.

---

<sup>75</sup> *Ibidem.*

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

**e. Manuscript 19 Miscellaneous from the Library of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu, the pioneering work of priest Mihai and Deacon Lazăr of Brad.**

The Library of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu offers a series of liturgical manuscripts dating back to the 17th-19th centuries, which were found in the private funds and collections of parish churches and monasteries in Transylvania. As the home of a metropolitan see and of the oldest theological academy in Romania, the city of Sibiu has convened in itself all the spiritual and cultural preoccupations of the Romanians in Transylvania.

In general, these liturgical manuscripts were written on thick sheets of paper, either with Cyrillic letters, which imitate typographic letters that make reading and usage easier, or with cursive letters, or simply by hand. Some of them contain notes of the author or the scribe, which helped establish the exact date the writing was done, and some others have been dated on the basis of the writing style and language employed. These manuscripts circulated throughout the entire Transylvania. They were written by Transylvanian scribes in monasteries and sketes and most often in parish churches, for there were no schools providing formal training for calligraphers.<sup>76</sup>

At first, the urge to bring the Romanian language into the services of the Church, as well as people's desire to pray in their mother tongue in Transylvania in the 17th-18th centuries, generated a series of miscellaneous manuscripts that contained only those liturgical services and texts that the scribes considered were necessary for the liturgical life of a parochial community.

Such a composite document is manuscript 19, compiled and written by priest Mihai and Deacon Lazăr of Brad in 1647, respectively 1683<sup>77</sup> on sheets of paper measuring 197x150 mm. The folios of this service book were later bound in wooden covers and strapped in leather. It has 199 numbered folios, but its end is missing. The first part (ff. 1-149) is written in letters imitating typographic alphabet, in black and red ink, 17-18 rows on a page. The second part (ff. 150-199) is written by Deacon Lazăr in very small letters, in black and red ink, 18 rows on a page. The two parts differ in linguistic register as well, the language used in the first part is neater, the terms more carefully chosen.

True to its nature, the miscellaneous manuscript comprises in its first part a small Octoechos (ff. 1-121) and the Holy Passions service (ff. 121-149), and in

<sup>76</sup> Ioan Floca, art. cit., p. 104.

<sup>77</sup> A general presentation of all the manuscripts in the old book fund of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu can be found in: Fr. Liviu Streza, "Manuscrise liturgice românești în Biblioteca Arhiepiscopiei Sibiului / Old Romanian liturgical manuscripts in the Library of Sibiu Archbishopric", MA 18 (1974), no. 4-6, p. 233-249.

Prof. Ciprian Streza

its second part, the service of the Holy Unction (ff. 150-163) and the service of the Holy Liturgy (ff. 164-199). It is clear that the two scribes focused the translation of divine service texts on the pastoral needs of the time. Therefore, this manuscript contains a lot of helpful information for those who seek to decipher the manner in which Slavonic was replaced by Romanian in the worship of the Church. The precise dating of its actual writing period (1647 and respectively, 1683) places this cretomacy of liturgical texts very close to the printing date of the Euchologion from Bălgrad (1689) with which it has a great many similarities, as it will further be proved. The connection between the two liturgical texts can be established by analysing the order of the Holy Unction service that can be found both in Manuscript 19 and in the Euchologion from Bălgrad. Even at first reading it becomes evident that the text printed by father Ioan Zoba of Vinț is linguistically much more elevated, refined and embellished than the manuscript text processed by father Mihai and Deacon Lazăr of Brad. Hypothetically speaking, the editors of the Euchologion from Bălgrad actually had Manuscript 19 or one of its copies in their hands and used it. Hence, a comparative analysis might point out the manner in which the liturgical texts were reformulated and reorganized in the process of replacing Slavonic in the cult.

#### *1. The introductory part. The Canon*

The introductory part of the service is more superficially done in Ms19 and slightly differently from Blg1689. Ms19 contains an older, inchoate translation of the Holy Unction service, which was most likely done using a Slavonic source text, as it can be inferred from the numerous Slavonic expressions that were not translated but kept unaltered in the text. The ample typikon related indicia in Blg1689, which require that seven priests gather in the house or in the church and put some wheat into a bowl, that they bring seven straws of basil tied in cotton for the anointing of the sick person, then place the Gospel Book on the analogion in the middle of the church or the house, then hand out candles to all that are present, are extremely sketchy in Ms19, which sums up the whole service in these words: “You shall gather seven priests, and have them take their liturgical vestments. Let them put on their vestments, and the oldest of them take the censer and begin” (f. 150).

It is interesting to note that both liturgical texts contain many Slavonic expressions. The introductory prayers, the priest’s blessings and generally the most usual expressions have been preserved unaltered in Slavonic, which proves that the translators wanted to preserve a live connection with the preceding liturgical tradition. The introduction of the mother tongue in the worship of the Church was a process that came to its completion in stages. As time went by, the Slavonic elements were slowly eliminated from the cult. Thus, Ms19 comprises an older

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

version of the text, with more Slavonisms in it and with a sentence syntax much more cumbersome than that of the Blg1689 text.

The service begins with the small blessing in both manuscripts, but after the introductory prayers, the text from Blg1689 follows with the Troparion *God is the Lord*, just like during the Matins service, which strengthens the conviction that, in the early days, this canon was part of the Matins preceding the Eucharistic Liturgy on the occasion when the Holy Unction was celebrated. In Ms19, the service of the Holy Unction starts straight with the canon stripped of the irmoi of all its nine odes. In this manuscript, the text of the canon is at a much more archaic linguistic level than the one in Blg1689, with intricate and hard to follow sentences. Without doubt, the Ms19 text is an older translation of a Slavonic text, a translation that the editors of the Euchologion from Bălgrad borrowed and then improved by a parallel analysis with other manuscripts of Greek and Russian extraction.

In Blg1689, each of the canon's odes ends with the chant of the katavasia "Deliver Your servant from sickness, o merciful God, for we all flee to You, our compassionate and victorious Saviour, our Lord, Jesus Christ." [Blg1689, f.55r]. The odes of the canon in Ms19 are rendered in a free translation, of an approximate accuracy, full of archaisms, regionalisms, titles and diminutives, which shows the great amount of freedom the translator and even the scribe took with the document when they compiled this collection of liturgical texts. Therefore, while in Blg1689, the Mother of God is called "Virgin", in Ms19 she is "Maiden" (f. 153v), and the titles, "All-good", "All-merciful" addressed to the Saviour are rendered in Ms19 with the expressions, "Thou, Who hath a kind heart", "Thou, Who art most-sweet", "Thou, sweet Lord." (f. 151v, f. 151, f. 152v.)

This freedom in translation that involves a great range of terms shows that, during the 17th century, in Transylvania there was no such thing as censorship or proofreading work that would have regulated somehow the semantic field for those who translated and transcribed liturgical texts. The Romanians in Transylvania were going through difficult situations both politically and in the Church. That might explain, at least in part, their freedom to improvise translations during that time.

The Canon in Ms19 is much shorter. Having little or no space at his disposal - for the aim was to arrange a collection of liturgical texts, and all the orders of divine services had to be worded in a compact and synthetic manner - the scribe chose not to include the irmoi of the nine odes or the kontakion after ode 6, (f.154) and to render the litanies only synthetically (f. 157v.).

*2. The actual office of the Holy Unction*

In both manuscripts, the Mystery of Holy Unction begins with the Great Litany without the Opening Blessing, which indicates that both started with the

Prof. Ciprian Streza

same source text and worked independently on it. Worth mentioning is the fact that in 13th century manuscripts like Sinai 973, Great Lavra 189, Sinai 960, the Holy Unction is incorporated in the Vespers-Matins-Liturgy cycle of services.<sup>78</sup> Starting with the 14th century, only the Matins stayed united with the Unction, and the separation of the Holy Mystery of Unction from the Liturgy led to the introduction of the Opening Blessing “Blessed is the Kingdom...” into the office of the Mystery, but this does not function as a general rule, because there are still some Greek editions of the Euchologion that do not contain this blessing<sup>79</sup>, just like the texts in the Ms 19 and Blg1689 manuscripts.

In the same style, both manuscripts leave out the making of the sign of the cross over the oil, an act performed during the prayer for the blessing of the oil, as it was probably assumed that the consecration took place as a direct result of the invocation, with no need of a *signum efficace*. The blessing of the oil is then followed by eight stichera dedicated to the Theotokos, chanted in the ascending order of the tones. These are different than the current ten stichera, some of which are now dedicated to Saint Apostle James, Saint Nicholas, Saint Panteleimon, etc. The fact that Ms19 kept the sticheron of tone 2 in its original Slavonic form is significant, for it proves that this manuscript was born in the initial pioneering stages of the introduction of the Romanian language in the worship of the Church in Transylvania. The Blg1689 manuscript, however, has the entire set of stichera and the whole liturgical text in Romanian, which hints to a more advanced stage in the process of Romanianization of the Orthodox cult in Transylvania.

The system of biblical readings in the two liturgical texts is unique and unmistakably distinct from the one in use at present, and that is why it is a matter of great interest for the liturgical research.<sup>80</sup> In Blg1689, the pericopes were introduced by the exclamation “For Holy art Thou...”, followed by the paschal troparion “As many as have been baptised into Christ...”, an arrangement that Ms19 does not mention. It seems that Blg1689 took shape after the processing of the same text that served as source for Ms19 as well, but it also seems that the Blg1689 utilized other additional sources too, most likely of Slavic origin, from

---

<sup>78</sup> See folios 149 and 173.

<sup>79</sup> Elias Mélias, “Le sacrament de l’onction des malades dans son développement historique et quelques considérations sur la pratique actuelle”, in vol. *La maladie e la morte du chrétien dans la liturgie. Conférences Saint-Serge; XXPsemani-ne d’étude liturgiques*, Paris, 1974; Edizioni Liturgiche, Roma, 1975, p. 222.

<sup>80</sup> Petru Pruteanu, *Sfântul Maslu și alte slujbe de vindecare. Istorie și actualitate / The Holy Unction and other healing services. History and present*, Publishing House: Sophia, Bucharest, 2016, p. 46 et seq. The author emphasizes that even the Euchologion that is now used by the Greek Church, *Evhologion to Mega* (p. 265), does not include any kind of blessing at the beginning of the Holy Unction proper. (p. 49)

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

whence these particularly unique elements could have been taken. The chanted Troparion, “As many as have been baptised into Christ...” is another testimony of the former connection that was between the Mystery of Holy Unction and the Liturgy, a connection that is equally referred to in the oldest liturgical manuscripts describing the office of this holy Mystery.<sup>81</sup>

The Scripture readings are identical in both manuscripts, but for one technical difference - Ms19 mentions only their scriptural references, while Blg1689 prints their whole biblical text. These pericopes are nonetheless much different from the ones in the Euchologion used by the Romanian Orthodox Church at present. Thus, the Prokeimenon and the Sticheron are different for the first, the second and the fourth readings. Likewise, the fifth, the sixth and the seventh Epistle readings differ as well. Great dissimilarities can be found in the Gospel readings, too. In that respect, the arrangements in Ms19 and Blg1689 contain the traditional pericopes followed by an additional one especially signalled as being “for women”.

The table below shows a synthetic comparison between the Scripture reading system in Ms19, Blg1689 and that existent in the Euchologion currently used by the ROC (Buc. 2013):

		Ms 19, Blg1689	Buch. (2013)
1.	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 40, 4 Ps. 40, 3	Ps. 32, 21 Ps. 32.1
	The Apostle	James 5.10-16	James 5.10-16
	The Gospel	Jn. 5.1-15	Lk. 10, 25-37
		Mt. 10,1, 5-8 (for women)	
2.	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 4,1 Ps. 4, 2	Ps. 117,14 Ps. 117.18
	The Apostle	Rom. 15.1-7	Rom. 15.1-7
	The Gospel	Lk. 19.1-10	Lk. 19.1-10
		Mark 6, 7-13 (for women)	
3.	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 26,1 Ps. 26, 2	Ps. 26,1 Ps. 26, 2
	The Apostle	I Cor. 12, 27-31; 13,1-8	I Cor. 12, 27-31; 13,1-8
	The Gospel	Mt. 10,1, 5-8	Mt. 10.1, 5-8
		Lk. 9,1-6 (for women)	
4.	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 4, 3 Ps. 4.1	Ps. 103, 3 Ps. 103.1

<sup>81</sup> See: D. Vanca, *Paradigme liturgice... / Liturgical paradigms...*, pp. 173-174.



	The Apostle	2 Cor. 6,16-18; 7,1	2 Cor. 6,16-18; 7,1
	The Gospel	Mark 6, 7-13 Mt. 9,18-26 (for women)	Mt. 8.14-23
5	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 11, 7 Ps. 11.1	Ps. 11, 7 Ps. 11.1
	The Apostle	Gal. 2.16-20	2 Cor. 1, 8-11
	The Gospel	Jn. 14, 28-31; 15,1-7 Mark 5, 24-34 (for women)	Mt. 25.1-13
6	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 50,1,11	Ps. 50, 1.11
	The Apostle	Col. 3.12-16	Gal.5, 22-26; 6,1-2
	The Gospel	Lk. 7, 36-47 Lk. 8, 41-56 (for women)	Mt. 20, 21-28
7	The Prokeimenon and the Sticheron	Ps. 6.1-2	Ps. 6.1-2
	The Apostle	Eph. 6.10-17	I Thess .5, 14-23
	The Gospel	Mt. 6,14-21 Mt. 8,14-23 (for women)	Mt. 9,9 9-13

The Scripture readings in Ms19 and Blg1689 are mostly the ones mentioned in older codices from the 13th-15th centuries, such as: Codex Sinaiticus Gr. 965, Sinaiticus Gr. 985, Athens Nat Lib 662, Cutl 491, Pantokr 149, Lavra 189, Dionys 450, Iviron 780.

It is interesting to learn how the Reformation infused climate in 17th century Transylvania allowed for the coexistence of this old euchological tradition and the desire to renew the cult by its adoption of the national language and the addition of some new biblical pericopes, much needed in the pastoral missionary work. Hence, next to the classic readings from the old manuscripts, other new scriptural pericopes were chosen - although at times clumsily so - from among those that wrote about women being healed. These pericopes were dedicated to women. Since there were not enough accounts of women being healed in the New Testament to cover the number of Gospel readings needed, the first three pericopes dedicated to women: Mt. 10,1, 5-8, Mk. 6, 7-13, Lk. 9,1-6 are nothing more than three parallel narrations of how Jesus sent out the Holy Apostles on their tentative mission. These pericopes were taken from the old euchological Byzantine tradition of the manuscripts mentioned above, yet they contained no reference to the healing of any woman. Only the last four Gospel readings talk about the miracles performed by the Saviour for women, like the one who was bleeding profusely [the 4th and 5th Gospel reading, Mt 9, 18-26; Mk

*Worship and Liturgical Reform in the Orthodox Church of Transylvania in the 17th century*

5, 24-34], or the sinful woman who anointed the Saviour's feet with myrrh [6th Gospel reading, Lk 7, 36-47] or Saint Apostle Peter's mother-in-law [7th Gospel reading, Mt 8, 14-23].

The Transylvanians' knack for improvising their worship is quite evident, although they always proceeded with caution in that direction, for they always kept it within the boundaries established by the preceding euchological tradition. These scriptural doublets, whose definite goal was to inspire those who took part in the Mystery of the Holy Unction, were ingeniously created.

The table above makes it quite obvious that the current system of biblical readings used by the Romanian Orthodox Church nowadays does not correspond completely with that of the old Byzantine manuscripts, or with that of the Euchologies from the 17th-18th centuries. This may be accounted for by the fact that the clergy were inspired by their own pastoral-missionary concerns to work constantly on adapting the cult to the spiritual needs of the faithful.

The seven prayers from Ms19 and Blg1689 are identical, but the registers they were written in are worlds apart. In Ms19, sentences are often incoherent, full of syntactical disagreements and sprinkled with regionalisms, archaisms and expressions intentionally left untranslated from Slavonic, whereas in Blg1689, the text of the prayers is very stylized and refined, which means that the translation process had involved other euchological sources.

In this respect, Blg1689 has each prayer end with the exclamation "Hear us, o Lord! Hear us, o Saviour! Hear us, o Holy One!". This formula cannot be found in any of the other Euchologies that were printed in Romanian, which makes it most likely that its origins were in the other Slavonic or Greek sources the authors had consulted. As for the Prayer at the anointing of the sick, "O holy Father, Physician of souls and bodies...", it is identical in Ms19 and Blg1689, but it differs from the one in Buc2013 by an impressive adage of the list of saints remembered in it.

Both in Ms19 and in Blg1689, the anointing of the sick is accompanied by a short blessing, "The help comes from the Lord, Who made heaven and earth.", and the Mystery of Holy Unction ends in the exact same way as it does today, with the stichera from the Lesser Blessing of the Water, a small litany and the Dismissal. Being a miscellaneous book as it is, Ms19 ends with a few brief clues as to who the authors of that compilation of liturgical texts were: "This book that (h)as the title *holy Unction* was written by me, deacon Lazar of Brad. You rev(erend) fathers and deacon(s) read it, straight(en) it and forgiv(e), for it was not written by an angel, but by a sinful hand. Rojdest(v)o H(risto)vo 1683, mes(e)ta sep(temnie) 23 zil(e)"

### Conclusions

1. In the century of Reformation and in defiance of a decided opposition coming from the Byzantine-Slavic Orthodoxy observed in the Provinces of Wallachia and Moldavia, the Romanians of Transylvania managed to find a way to introduce their national language in the Church, by gradually translating those texts that were vital for the liturgical and spiritual life of a parish. Up until the 17th century, liturgical texts were all written in Slavonic, because the geopolitical situation the Romanian Provinces were in during the 10th-11th centuries compelled the Orthodox Church to adopt the Byzantine-Slavic rite, a move that implanted the Slavonic language into the liturgical worship and into the administrative apparatus of the feudal state.

2. The introduction of Romanian into the worship of the Church was the expression of a profound aspiration and also of a material, cultural and spiritual need of the Romanian people from all three provinces. The one person who succeeded in materializing the Romanians' desire to have a culture and a worship in their own mother tongue was Deacon Coresi. Against all "reservations and doubts" with which some hierarchs approached the nationalization of the divine services, he managed to print the most important service books in the Romanian language: *Tetraevanghelul romanesc (The Romanian Tetraevangeliar)* 1561, *Apostolul (The Acts of the Apostles)* 1563, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor și Molitfelnicul (Sermons and Book of Prayers)* 1567, *Psaltirea (The Psalter)* and *Liturgierul (The Litourgicon)* 1570.

3. The introduction of the Romanian language into the worship of the Church was done gradually. The first to be translated into the national tongue were church canons and canonical regulations, books of sermons, followed afterwards by typikon related indicia, and then by Scriptural readings (Epistle and Gospel). Eventually, Slavic was pushed to the side once the key service books such as the Psalter, the Litourgicon and the Euchologion were thoroughly translated and incorporated into the cult.

4. The Euchologion, the most utilized service book in the Orthodox Church, started being used two decades after its first edition that was printed in Venice in 1526. Its various editions were: a Slavonic version, which was considerably different from the Greek editions not only in the choice of text, but also sometimes in the way it described how various divine services were to be celebrated; a Slavo-Romanian version, which had the Typika printed in Romanian; and lastly, a Romanian version, which started as a compilation of manuscripts of Slavonic and Greek extraction, and then, through the grace and effort of metropolitan Anthim the Iberian, it developed into a faithful rendition of the Greek Euchologion text.

5. The Euchologion from Bălgrad 1689, one of the widest spread and used service books in Transylvania, had a great influence on the structure and text of the Romanian Euchologion that would be printed by Metropolitan Anthim the Iberian at Râmnic in 1706. The Blg1689 edition remains unique and isolated from all the ensuing versions of this service book. In his Euchologion, father Zoba of Vinț skilfully combined and adapted to the local liturgical tradition a series of Slavonic manuscripts that up until then had been known through their more or less successful translations, which were circulating throughout Transylvania in the 16th-17th centuries.

6. The miscellaneous Manuscript 19 from the Library of the Theological Faculty in Sibiu comprises a lot of information about the pioneering work that the priests and hierarchs in Transylvania had to do in order to have the Romanian language introduced in the services of the Church. The precise dating of its actual writing period (1647 and respectively, 1683) places this cretomacy of liturgical texts very close to the printing date of the Euchologion from Bălgrad (1689) with which it has a great many similarities, as well as differences. A comparative analysis of the order of the Holy Unction service in the two books reveals the fact that Ms19 comprises an older version of the text, with more Slavonisms in it and with a sentence syntax much more cumbersome than that of the Blg1689 text.

7. The text of Ms19 talks about the freedom in translation that the priests and hierarchs in 17th-18th century Transylvania enjoyed, for there was no censorship or proofreading work to regulate somehow the semantic field for those who translated and transcribed liturgical texts. The Romanians in Transylvania were going through difficult times both politically and within the Church. That might explain, at least in part, their freedom to improvise translations during that time. In this respect, the system of biblical readings from Ms19 and Blg1689 contain the traditional pericopes followed by an additional one especially signalled as being “for women”.

8. The Reformation infused climate in 17th century Transylvania allowed for the coexistence of the old euchological tradition of the old manuscripts with the desire to renew the cult by introducing the national language in the liturgical life of the Church and by adding some new biblical pericopes, much needed for the pastoral missionary work. The Transylvanians’ knack for improvising their worship is quite evident, yet they always proceeded with caution in that direction, for they always kept it within the boundaries established by the preceding euchological tradition. These scriptural doublets, whose definite goal was to inspire those who took part in the Mystery of the Holy Unction, were ingeniously created.