

REVUE DES ÉTUDES SUD-EST EUROPÉENNES

TOME LX

2022

N^{os} 1–4, Janvier–Décembre

SOMMAIRE / CONTENTS

Between the Imperial Eye and the Local Gaze.

Cartographies of South-Eastern Europe

(Proceedings of the session held at the 12th International Congress
of South-East European Studies, Bucharest, 2–6 September 2019)

Editors: ROBERT BORN and MARIAN COMAN

<i>Foreword</i>	7
TONI VENERI, <i>Between Land and Sea: Cartographic Modernities and the Balkan Peninsula (15th–16th Centuries)</i>	11
ROBERT BORN, <i>Maps and Propaganda. The Example of Transylvania during the Long Turkish War</i>	45
MARIAN COMAN, <i>From Map to Text. The Prose Cartography of an Eighteenth-Century Adventurer</i>	77
ALEXANDRU IONUȚ CRUCERU, <i>The Map of Wallachia Published in Padua in 1700. Production, Content and Early Use</i>	97
SILVIU ANGHEL, <i>The Motley Map: the Game-Changing Effect of Ethnographic Cartography on the Romanian-Russian Negotiations, 1914–1916</i>	125
CEZAR BUTEREZ, <i>Revisiting a National Cartographic Project. The Place Names from the ‘Plan director de tragere’ Map Series (1916–1959)</i>	187

Sortir de la Grande Guerre.

Les sociétés sud-est européennes de 1918 à 1923

(Actes de la session organisée dans le cadre du 12^e Congrès international
d'études sud-est européennes, Bucarest, 2–6 septembre 2019)
Éditeurs : FLORIN ȚURCANU et VOJISLAV PAVLOVIĆ

<i>Introduction</i>	205
CLAUDIU-LUCIAN TOPOR, <i>Repudiated Biographies During the Great War. Some Romanian “Collaborationists” and their Historical Culpability</i>	207
FLORIN ȚURCANU, <i>Expérience du rapatriement et témoignage sur la captivité : la sortie de guerre des prisonniers roumains en Bulgarie (1918–1919)</i>	219
IRINA ACHIM, <i>L'archéologie roumaine à l'épreuve de l'histoire : le cas de Dobroudja pendant et après la Grande Guerre</i>	229
DANIEL CAIN, <i>Citoyenneté, ethnicité et droits politiques dans la Grande Roumanie : le cas de Dobroudja (1919)</i>	245
MORITZ A. SORG, <i>Remains of an Old Order? Monarchy, Internationality and the Legacies of the First World War</i>	267
MARIA ZOUBOULI, <i>Un peintre à la guerre : Paolo Rodocanachi entre 1918 et 1923</i>	291

Varia

JACQUES BOUCHARD, <i>Nicolas Mavrocordatos poète lyrique</i>	299
PATRICE PIPAUD, <i>Le « Lyonnais » sur le Danube : liberté de navigation et opportunisme commercial français (1856–1858)</i>	307

New Research Projects in the Institute for South-East European Studies

<i>Order and Hierarchy in Late Antique and Byzantine Thought</i> , research project funded by UEFISCDI (Marilena Vlad)	333
<i>Praying in Late Byzantium. A Theological and Social Exploration of Philotheos Kokkinos's (Unedited) Euchai Diaphoroi</i> , research project funded by UEFISCDI (Mihail Mitrea)	334

Comptes rendus

- Dicționarul limbii române* (DLR), t. I, litera A, fasc. 1, *A-Abzițui* (Cătălina Vătășescu); Nicolae SARAMANDU, *Limba română. Originile / La langue roumaine. Les origines* (Cătălina Vătășescu); Cătălina VĂTĂȘESCU (ed.), *New Perspectives on Balkan Linguistics / Nouvelles perspectives sur la linguistique balkanique* (Mihail-George Hâncu); Lora TASEVA, Roland MARTI (eds.), *Translations of Patristic Literature in South-Eastern Europe* (Mihail-George Hâncu); Maria CIOATĂ, Anissava MILTENOVA, Emanuela TIMOTIN (eds.), *Biblical Apocrypha in South-Eastern Europe and Related Areas* (Mihail-George Hâncu); Ivan BILIARSKY, *Defending the True Faith in the Twilight of the Empire. The Palaeologian Synodicon for the Sunday of Orthodoxy in Its Slavic Translation* (Mihail-George Hâncu); Ivan BILIARSKY, Mihail MITREA, Andrei TIMOTIN (eds.), *Religious Rhetoric of Power in Byzantium and South-Eastern Europe* (Mircea Duluș); Sandra ORIGONE, *Le signore del mare. Una storia del Mediterraneo medievale* (Alessandro Flavio Dumitrașcu); Niccolò FATTORI, *Migration and Community in the Early Modern Mediterranean. The Greeks of Ancona, 1510–1595* (Alessandro Flavio Dumitrașcu); Joseph NASRALLAH, Rachid HADDAD, *Histoire du mouvement littéraire dans l'Église melchite du V^e au XIX^e siècle. Contribution à l'étude de la littérature arabe chrétienne*, t. VI (Ioana Feodorov); Constantin A. PANCHENKO, *Orthodoxy and Islam in the Middle East. The Seventh to the Sixteenth Century* (Nicholas Bishara); Felicia ROȘU (ed.), *Slavery in the Black Sea Region, c. 900–1900: Forms of Unfreedom at the Intersection of Christianity and Islam* (Radu Dipratu); Thomas de WAAL, *The Caucasus. An Introduction* (David Neagu); Gabriel MARTINEZ-GROS, *De l'autre côté des croisades. L'Islam entre croisés et Mongols* (David Neagu); Radu DIPRATU, *Regulating Non-Muslim Communities in the Seventeenth-Century Ottoman Empire. Catholics and Capitulations* (Viorel Panaite); Orlin SABEV, *Waiting for Mütteferrika. Glimpses of Ottoman Print Culture* (Ioana Feodorov); Vassili GRIGOROVITCH-BARSKI, *Pérégrinations (1723–1747)*, traduit du russe par Myriam Odaysky (Ioana Feodorov); Πασχάλης Μ. ΚΙΤΡΟΜΗΛΙΔΗΣ, *Θρησκεία και πολιτική στον Ορθόδοξο κόσμο. Το Οικουμενικό Πατριαρχείο και οι προκλήσεις της νεωτερικότητας* (Mihai Țipău); *Abrégé des principes de la grammaire française. Scurtare începăturilor grăitoarei francezești. O piesă insolită la dosarul francofiliei și francofoniei românești*. éd. LIA BRAD CHISACOF (Ileana Mihăilă); Ștefan PETRESCU, *Correspondenții români de presă și publicațiile emigrației balcanice (1877–1916)* (Elena Siupiur); Alberto BASCIANI e Egidio IVETIC, *Italia e Balcani. Storia di una prossimità* (Stelu Șerban); Annemarie SORESCU-MARINKOVIĆ et al., *The Romance-Speaking Balkans. Language and the Politics of Identity* (Stelu Șerban) 337

In memoriam

- † Grigore Brâncuș (1929–2022) 387
 † Constantin Iordan (1946–2021) 390
Vie scientifique 391
Livres reçus 403

several successful sections in the Congress of 2019. This publication will doubtlessly be attractive to linguists interested in the Balkan languages, given the variety and quality of its constituents, which cover the main fields of modern linguistics, while also keeping maintaining its readers' awareness towards the works of linguists from previous generations.

Mihail-George Hâncu

Lora TASEVA, Roland MARTI (eds.), *Translations of Patristic Literature in South-Eastern Europe. Proceedings of the session held at the 12th International Congress of South-East European Studies (Bucharest, 2–6 September 2019)*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes, vol. 14, Brăila, Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăilei „Carol I”, 2020, 344 p.

This volume is another part of the series of proceedings of the sessions held at the 12th International Congress of South-East European Studies, all of which have been published within the larger series of the “Bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes” (henceforth BIESEE). As pointed out by the editors in the *Foreword*, the present volume does not only include extended versions of the papers read at the congress, but also contributions by invited authors who could not be present at the scholarly meeting in 2019.

The opening article is penned by Aneta Dimitrova (“Saint Kliment Ohridski” University of Sofia), who discusses the Old Church Slavonic translations of the *Homily on Repentance, Continence, and Virginity* and their Greek sources. This lengthy text, which was written in Greek around the year 500, is either anonymous or attributed to Saint John Chrysostom in manuscripts, while modern scholars have suggested that it may be attributed to John the Faster (although this theory has also been disputed). The *Homily* was nevertheless very popular, and it was translated into Old Church Slavonic during the reign of Tsar Symeon in the early 10th century as a part of the *Zlatostruy* collection, which included Chrysostomian and pseudo-Chrysostomian homilies. Its tradition in the Old Slavonic milieu poses difficulties to modern researchers, since a disarrangement of the final folios led to what the author calls a “false” ending, borrowed from another homily in this collection, and it was this feature that pervaded the entire subsequent manuscript tradition of the text. The initial translation was however better conserved in homiliaries, eventually making it back to a single *Zlatostruy* codex from the Hilandar monastery.

Alessandro Maria Bruni's (Ca' Foscari University of Venice) presentation of his critical edition of the Old Slavonic translation of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Oration 44* is the only text in this volume that is written in Russian. The Slavonic text of Gregory of Nazianzus' *Orations* was conserved in two compilations, one containing thirteen orations, which was conserved in only one late 11th-century East Slavic manuscript, the other containing sixteen, which, by contrast, survived in 150 manuscripts (dated between the 14th and the 18th centuries), both East Slavic and South Slavic, and is known as “the liturgical collection of Gregory of Nazianzus”. His study is accompanied by the aforementioned critical edition of this Patristic text, which also features a critical apparatus, thus providing this volume with further value.

Thomas Daiber (University of Giessen) focuses on a passage of the *Vita Cyrilli* that had been previously considered corrupted or even untranslatable, namely the debate between Cyril and his Jewish interlocutors during the former's mission to the Khazars, which is the most extensively narrated episode in the *Vita Cyrilli*. The polemic that the author of this article discusses in more detail is concerned with whether it is the Jews or the Christians who are descendants of a blessed Biblical patriarch and may therefore be considered to be a part of a blessed people, which in turn ties – albeit topically – to the matter of circumcision. The author notes that the passage is difficult to understand not so much due to theological subtlety, but due to the precondition that the “Esau problem” (i.e. that Esau, the “morally depraved Christian patriarch”, could not be considered pleasant to God if he did not accept circumcision, even though it was the sole token for a believer at the time) has to be

inferred. Concerning the use of the word *притѣча*, the Slavonic equivalent of *παραβολή*, usually translated as “example”, to introduce the exchange of arguments between Cyril and the Jewish interlocutors in X: 75–81, the author suggests that it might be related to the *Septuaginta*, where *притѣча/παραβολή* is not so much connected with a textual narrative form (like a parabola) but is more concerned with sentential analogies. As a result, the Jewish interlocutors should be perceived as attempting to make a contrastive analogy between circumcised and uncircumcised Abrahamites, meaning that the arguments, although speculative, were fully comprehensible.

Lara Sels (Catholic University of Leuven) discusses the matter of editing the Pseudo-Athanasian *Quaestiones ad Antiochum ducem*, in which she approaches the complex Slavonic tradition bottom-up, starting with solid partial editions for those textual stages that can, indeed, be edited critically as a unified whole, taking into account the Greek text versions involved in their writing and rewriting. As a result, she provides a sample edition of the group II/a versions of questions 39–41 with their matching Greek versions. Per the author’s words, “this contribution is also a plea for separate and more in-depth editions of coherent parts within the QAD tradition”, in order “to do full justice to the multi-layered transmission history of the Slavonic QAD”.

One of the volume’s two editors, Lora Taseva (Institute for Balkan Studies & Center of Thracology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences) provides a thorough analysis of the South Slavic tradition of Proclus of Constantinople’s homily *In transfigurationem Domini* during the Middle Ages. This text entered the Slavic literary milieu as early as the Old Bulgarian era, although the number of variants was the subject of debate between scholars, with Christian Hannick assuming there were four, while Klimentina Ivanova, who had worked on multiple sources, suggested that the fourth variant (present in two manuscripts) belonged to the second Old Bulgarian tradition, bringing the number down to three. The author of this article supports the latter solution and has provided textological arguments, albeit in another publication – as a result, she refers to the three sets of manuscripts as A, B, and C, which coincide with the Cyrillic “a”, “б”, and “в” of Klimentina Ivanova. The author’s comparative analysis focuses on the textual integrity, the grammatical differences, and the lexical differences between the three versions and thus provides further arguments for Klimentina Ivanova’s reasoning that the three Old Slavonic versions of the text were indeed independent translations. To this end, she cites the relative absence of common omissions and additions, the large number of individual lexical variants and, most notably, examples of paronyms and differing semantic interpretations which would have required the individual translators’ direct access to the Greek models. Their Greek models are close to each other in the Greek textual tradition, but they are still distinct from each other (which can, again, be inferred from the individual omissions and additions). On the translation principles and techniques of the three versions, the author argues that version B was more liberal in relation to its original, whereas A and C were more formally precise in their rendering of the Greek text: for instance, B relies more on contextual equivalents and synonyms, unlike A and C, which opt for more literal solutions. Concerning the dating, versions A and B were created in Eastern Bulgaria in the 9th–10th centuries, the former being closer to the Cyrillo-Methodian tradition, the latter to the Preslav tradition. As for version C, the author believes that it was created in Tărnovo, as it has the characteristics of 14th–century translations.

Ekaterina Dikova (from the same Institute) dedicates her article to the South Slavonic translations *Sermon on the Transfiguration of Christ* ascribed to Saint Ephrem the Syrian and, more precisely, to the matter of how the rhetorical rhythm was rendered. The author concludes first and foremost that “rhythm in rhetorical works was not only translatable but translated”. Secondly, the two Bulgarian translations reveal that the scribes used both similar and different techniques to render rhetorical rhythm, which in turn means that they not only had rhythmic intuition, but also significant rhetorical preparation to render rhythm in their native language. The earlier translation strives for equal *cola* by means of techniques such as using an equal number of accents and syllables or by providing rhyme-like endings that are absent in the Greek original. The later translation is less strict, but instead respects the complicated symmetry and shows a better awareness of rhetorical figures and prescriptions, which may have been related to the requirements of its contemporaneous Byzantine rhetoric. The author notes in the final lines of her contribution that the possible inadequacy of

meaning between a target and a source text should not be instantly classified as a mistake but may indeed have been the result of a conscious choice on the part of the interpreter.

Petra Stankovska (Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana) writes on the Croatian-Glagolitic breviaries from the 13th–15th century, which contained the *Homilies* attributed to Origen and John Chrysostom in the Proper of Season. The author explores the likelihood of the existence of an Old Church Slavonic translation of those texts in the Christian East and examines the method of translating selected lexemes, syntactic constructions or parts of texts in the homilies in question. The following article, penned by Jürgen Fuchsbaauer, refers to extracts of Greek theological literature contained in the Slavonic *Dioptra* (originally composed in 1095 by a Byzantine monk and translated into Middle Bulgarian Church Slavonic around the middle of the 14th century), which acted as the wider Slavonic audience's introduction to the writings of many Church Fathers of Late Antiquity and of notable Byzantine writers like Nicetas Stethatus, whose complete oeuvres had not been translated into Slavonic during the Middle Ages. The author provides a very helpful overview of the authors and titles included in the Slavonic text, also pointing out whether there were other extant translations or whether their authorship was correctly attributed in the *Dioptra*.

Zamfira Mihail's (Institute for South-East European Studies, Romanian Academy) contribution is dedicated to Ephrem the Syrian's *Slovo 50*. As in the cases of other Slavic manuscripts in the Library of the Romanian Academy, the manuscript catalogues often only provided hypotheses concerning their dating, based on the experience of the describers, and while they do mention the identified watermarks, only rarely do they refer to the watermark catalogues. On the other hand, previous attempts to analyse the watermarks in ms. 160 had not been very successful, which is likely why P.P. Panaitescu did not mention them in his description of the manuscript. In the case of ms. 315, where Ephrem's text (placed between f. 222r and 248v) lacked continuity after 229v, the author's comparison with ms. 160 allowed her to identify the missing folio, which had been placed on the current f. 243, most likely as a result of the accidental fall of this folio during the production of the manuscript. As a result of the comparative analysis, the author was able to conclude that the text of the *Slovo 50* in the two manuscripts is identical, but that they were copied independently from one another. Finally, she is able – following her identifying a number of watermarks for the first time – to confirm Ion Radu Mircea's dating of the two manuscripts as being from the 14th century. The study is accompanied by a series of tables containing lexical differences, word order changes, and grammatical changes, by an edition of the texts from the two manuscripts, by the watermarks from ms. 160, and, finally, by two coloured (and high-quality) facsimiles of one folio from each manuscript. These annexes, which span over fifty pages, will doubtlessly add to the value of this contribution in the eyes of its readership.

Małgorzata Skowronek's (Faculty of Philology, University of Łódź) article is dedicated to the Late Medieval Slavic manuscript tradition of the epistles of Church authorities in the anti-Latin polemics, focusing on the ms. sl. 330 from the Library of the Romanian Academy. This codex stems from the last decade of the 15th century and was written in the Serbian (Resavian) orthography in Wallachia, comprising dogmatic and ascetic writings – as was usual for monastic codices – among them being the correspondence between Michael Keroularios, patriarch Peter III of Antioch and Dominic, the bishop of Venice. These letters were, as noted by the author, the answer to the internal problems of the disintegrating Church in the 11th century and allowed for the recognition of the doctrinal and customary threats coming from the West four and five hundred years later, ultimately becoming a “weapon used in the whole Byzantine-Slavic commonwealth”. The appendix consists in an edition of the Slavonic texts of these three epistles on the basis of ms. sl. 330, complete with an *apparatus criticus* containing textual, syntactic and lexical differences, as well as differences in proper names.

Alexandru Mareș (“Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy) provides a survey of the first Romanian translations of patristic writings, divided in five sections. In the first, he refers to the works of Saint John Chrysostom, whose writings were partially translated as early as the 16th century. One interesting point is made about the *Missal*, printed by the deacon Coresi in Brașov in 1570, which contains *Saint John Chrysostom's Liturgy*: according to the author, although the contents of the book are purely Orthodox, the *translation* should be considered the

action of the Calvinist movement in Banat-Hunedoara, aiming to nationalise the religious cult in the Orthodox Church as a first step towards converting Romanians to the official religion of the Transylvanian Principality. The following section is dedicated to the ecclesiastical *Code of Laws* containing canons attributed to Saint Basil the Great and Saint John Nesteutes, which was printed between 1560 and 1562 by a master typographer who might have been someone other than the deacon Coresi. After that, the author refers to the translation of the *Athanasian Creed* which can be found in the *Psalter of Șchei* (1573–1578), whose use of the *filioque* would equally indicate that the translator was a Romanian priest that had converted to the Reformation. The penultimate section is dedicated to the 16th-century translations of two of Saint John Damascene's writings, namely the *An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* and the *Octoechos*. The final patristic writer discussed in this article is Sophronius of Jerusalem, the attributed author of the *Life of Saint Mary of Egypt*. The author concludes that while the *Missal*, the *Octoechos* and the *Athanasian Creed* were translated under the impulse of the Reformation, the others were translated in an Orthodox environment.

The final contribution in this volume belongs to Daniar Mutalâp (from the same Institute), who discusses the structure and composition of a proto-Philokalic Romanian manuscript from 1769, aiming to provide a thorough illustration of the content of the ms. rom. 2597 from the Romanian Academy Library in the larger context of the “pre-existing Philokalic tradition”. This study is, itself, placed in the context of the growing interest in these “proto-Philokalias” in the past few decades, which was a natural development of the focus on the study of the *Philokalia* itself in the 19th and the 20th centuries. This manuscript – the largest proto-Philokalic collection of its time – was copied by the prodigious scribe and Slavonic and Greek translator, Raphael of Hurezi monastery, most probably during his stay at Dragomirna monastery – as to its dating, it is provided in the colophon on fol. 305, which states it was finished on May 4, 1769. The author's description of the manuscript's contents and its comparison to the Greek *Philokalia* reveals that the Romanian manuscript follows a thematic principle, and not a chronological principle. Thus, it mirrors the preferences of the monastic Romanian compilers from the 18th century, as it is a “canon” which is partly indebted to the Slavonic tradition, but equally foreshadows the Greek *Philokalia*, bringing together acknowledged authorities and local contemporary hesychast.

The editors' observation that the twelve papers “present a mosaic of the many and variegated aspects of the influence of patristic literature on the literary development in this region of the Byzantine commonwealth” is beyond doubt a very apt description of its contents. Nonetheless, it is this diversity and the thoroughness of the individual contributions that gives this volume its value, as it will certainly continue to be of great use to current and future researchers.

Mihail-George Hâncu

Maria CIOATĂ, Anissava MILTENOVA, Emanuela TIMOTIN (eds.), *Biblical Apocrypha in South-Eastern Europe and Related Areas. Proceedings of the session held at the 12th International Congress of South-East European Studies (Bucharest, 2–6 September 2019)*, Bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes, vol. 16, Brăila, Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăilei „Carol I”, 2021, 382 p.

This volume is a part of the series of proceedings of the sessions held at the 12th International Congress of South-East European Studies, all of which have been published within the larger series of the “Bibliothèque de l'Institut d'Études Sud-Est Européennes”. As noted by the three editors in the *Introduction*, most of the chapters comprised in the present volume were first presented as papers at a panel entitled “Biblical Apocrypha in South-Eastern Europe. Variation and Transmission from Antiquity to Modern Times” (convened by Anissava Miltenova and Emanuela Timotin). This panel – which was already remarkable by being the first of its kind at a congress of the International Association of South-East European Studies – and the informal discussions that followed it drew attention to many common themes and motifs which united the different papers.