

THE LONG REFORMATION AT THE MICRO LEVEL AND FROM A REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE. ON A NEW TEXT OF THE ROMANIAN REFORMATION IN THE HAȚEG REGION

KATALIN LUFFY*

Abstract The study examines the issue of the long Reformation in a manuscript that originated in the late 17th century, the first decades of the 18th century. The manuscript is the product of the Reformation in Romania, whose linguistic and regional peculiarities are at least as important as its lay and occasional nature: we have not discovered another source that documents communal but not ecclesiastical, individual, but not solitary religious piety. We hereby undertake the micro-level analysis of this document.

Keywords Long Reformation, Reformation of the Romanians, the Hațeg region, manuscripts, translation, cultural transfer.

I. Introduction

In the case of the Romanian Reformation, two phenomena, often running/acting in parallel, must be taken into account. One, aimed at the internal renewal of the Eastern Orthodox Church, named by Ana Dumitran “the Reformed [Eastern Orthodox] Church” (*biserica ortodoxă reformată*), is a phenomenon particular to Transylvania; in this case, from the point of view of book culture, we refer to Simion Ștefan’s translation of the New Testament, or to Ioan Zoba’s volumes, who worked in Vințu de Jos. The other, the body of texts, largely left in manuscript, written for the community of practitioners of the Romanian-language Reformed (Calvinist) denomination.¹ I relate to the latter topic by presenting a specific set of texts from the manuscripts related to the Reformation of Romanians in the Hațeg region. The opportunity to publish the manuscript was provided by the Lendület (Momentul) Programme of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences as part of the project entitled

* *The Lucian Blaga Central University Library of Cluj-Napoca.* katalin.luffy@bcucluj.ro.

DOI: 10.26424/philobib.2020.25.2.03

¹A similar view of the two interpretations of Romanian Reformation is represented by Előd Sándor Ősz, see *A román nyelvű református liturgikus kéziratokról*. [On the Reformed liturgical manuscripts in Romanian]. Manuscript.

Long Reformation in Eastern Europe (1520–1800), while the concept of the project encouraged further examination of the manuscript. In the publication of the manuscript,² the most important task was to localize and date the codex, to separate the group of texts, as well as to explore the source of the ecclesiastical and popular texts of the codex. I aim here to interpret the relationship between the manuscript and mediality, its connections to the Transylvanian regional Reformations, and its interpretation as a phenomenon of religious and cultural transfer. The timeframe and interpretation framework offered by the concept of the Long Reformation,³ in the case of this manuscript, provides an insight into one of the regional (micro-)histories of the Transylvanian Reformation, thus we can consider our manuscript as a relevant example of the Transylvanian pluralism of Reformation(s).⁴

II. Historiographical considerations / historical contexts

We use this pluralism in several senses: on the one hand, we mean by it the fragmentation of Romanian Reformation, its periods, its differences by region, but we also mean the pluralism of linguistic forms, the often-multiple linguistic transfers of Reformed text, i.e., the interpreting operations within the acts of translation. This is a case of multiple transfer, as we shall also see instances of texts translated from German into Latin and then transferred to the Hungarian culture, and from there to the Romanian culture. Transfer and pluralism can be the two key words of grasping the Romanian Reformation, representing both procedure, action and its outcome. This, however, can only become visible if we do not interpret the history of Transylvanian Protestantism according to the Western model of confessionalisation, and mark its end in the middle of the 17th century. If we allow a broader time perspective and we do not analyse the different regions as a whole, it becomes clear that the Reformation of the Saxons, Szeklers, Hungarians, and even Romanians did not coincide at all, and it took place as a result and under the influence of different confessionalisation processes, with significantly different timings. Nevertheless, their connection is indisputable, the specific historical and social situation of the four established religions and the emergence of the Eastern Catholic Churches are a

² *Brázovai feljegyzések / Însemnări din Breazova* [Notes from Breazova], sajtó alá rendezte és a bevezető tanulmányt írta / ediție îngrijită și studiu introductiv de Katalin Luffy [redacted by Katalin Luffy, introductory study by Katalin Luffy]. (Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum-Egyesület, 2019) [Cluj-Napoca, Transylvanian Museum Society].

³ See Zsombor Tóth's programmatic study: "Hosszú reformáció Magyarországon és Erdélyben I.: konfessionalizációk és irodalmi kultúrák a kora újkorban (1500–1800) (Módszertani megjegyzések egy folyamatban levő kutatáshoz)" ["Long Reformation in Hungary and Transylvania I.: Confessionalizations and Literary Cultures in the Early Modern Period (1500–1800)"], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 123(2019), 719-739.

⁴See the use of the notion: Tóth, idem, 720.

process of the same long Reformation.”⁵ The extension of the time limits is also a methodological issue, as it allows for a long-term perspective in which the circa 200 years of the fragmented history of the Romanian Reformation can become part of the same narrative, and can be traced along the lines of the text production of the connections between its phases.

It is well known that we can define three phases of the Romanian Reformation, and in the light of recent explorations,⁶ at least four.⁷

⁵ *Ibid.*, 722.

⁶ *A Hunyad-Zárándi Református Egyházmegye Parciális Zsinatainak végzése, 1686–1718, 1810–1815* [The Decrees of the Partial Synods of the Reformed Diocese of Hunyad-Záránd, 1686–1718, 1810–1815], ed. Buzogány Dezső – Ősz Sándor Előd (Kolozsvár, Erdélyi Református Egyházkerület Misztótfalusi Kis Miklós Sajtóközpontja, 2000) (Erdélyi Református Egyháztörténeti Adatok, 4); *A hunyad-zárándi református egyházközségek történeti katasztere: 1686–1807* [The Historical Cadastre of the Reformed Parishes of Hunyad-Záránd: 1686–1807], ed. Buzogány Dezső – Ősz Előd Sándor (Cluj-Napoca, Erdélyi Református Egyházkerület, 2003–2007) (Historical data of the Transylvanian Reformed Church).

⁷ The first monograph on the Reformation of Romanians: Juhász István, *A reformáció az erdélyi románok között* [Reformation among the Romanians of Transylvania] (Kolozsvár, Grafika, 1940), see also: *Idem*, “Nyugati missziós törekvések a románoknál” [Western missionary aspirations among Romanians], in *Magyarok és románok*, Deér József – Gáldi László (ed.), vol. II. (Bp., Athenaeum, 1944) (A Magyar Történettudományi Intézet Évkönyve) [Yearbook of the Hungarian Institute of Historical Sciences], 251–336. In recent decades, a number of studies and source publications have appeared in print. Our concept was mostly shaped by the following: Sipos Gábor, “A reformáció továbbélése a hátszegi románok között” [The survival of the Reformation among the Romanians of Hațeg], *Europa. Balcanica-Danubiana-Carpathica. Annales* (2/A), (Bp., 1995) 236–243 (republished: *Idem*, *Reformata Transylvanica* (Cluj-Napoca: EME, 2012), 211–221; *Idem*, “Román református eklézsiák oltalomlevele 1700-ból” [Protection letter of Romanian Reformed Parishes from 1700], *Europa. Balcanica-Danubiana Carpathica. Annales*. (2/B), (Bp., 1995), 356–359; *Idem*, “Relațiile Bisericii Reformate ardelene cu Bisericile românești în prima jumătate a secolului XVIII” [The relations of the Transylvanian Reformed Church with the Romanian Churches in the first half of the 18th century], *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica*, 10/II (2006), 11–14; Ősz Sándor Előd, “Felekezeti- és etnikumközi kapcsolatok a 17–18. századi Hunyad-Zárándi Református Egyházmegyében” [Interfaith and interethnic relationships in the Reformed Diocese of Hunyad-Záránd in the 17th and 18th century], *A hunyad-zárándi református egyházközségek...*, [The Historical Cadastre of the Reformed Parishes of Hunyad-Záránd...] 3, 5–24; *Idem*, “Kálvinizmus a periférián” [Calvinism on the peripheries], *Kálvin időszerűsége, Tanulmányok Kálvin János teológiájának maradandó értékéről és magyarországi hatásáról* [Calvin’s timeliness, Studies on the lasting value of John Calvin’s theology and its influence in Hungary], ed. Fazakas Sándor (Bp., Magyarországi Református Egyház, 2009), 263–288, *Idem*, “Auswirkungen des Helvetischen Bekenntnisses auf die Rumänen“, *Calvin und die Reformiertentum in Ungarn und Siebenbürgen. Helvetisches Bekenntnis, Ethnie und Politik vom 16. Jahrhundert bis 1918*, hgg. Márta Fata, Anton Schindling (Münster: Aschendorff, 2010) (Reformationsgeschichtliche Studien und Texte, 155), 111–132; Szegedi Edit,

After the 16th century antecedents – the short-lived Romanian Protestant/Reformed superintendency (1566–1582?) –, in the 17th century its second phase can be linked to the religious policy provisions of Transylvanian princes. This period was a strong period of denominational confessionalisation in Transylvania, and the religious policy provisions also defined the framework of the Romanian diocese and the functioning of its organization.⁸ Part of the largely Romanian population fleeing Caransebeş and moving to the Haţeg region in 1658, before the Turkish invasion, was reformed, while the other part was of the Eastern Orthodox faith. This led to the exponential increase in the number of Reformed Romanians in Haţeg, and the satisfaction of religious needs – from the use of the building of the church, through ecclesiastic life and the demand for religious texts – required the performance of new tasks. After the death of Michael I Apafi, the establishment of the Transylvanian Gubernium, that is, after about 1690, the life of the Principality changed fundamentally: during the Habsburg rule, due to the strong Catholic renewal, the religious union⁹ that took place between 1697 and 1701 generated new denominational debates. The Greek Catholic Church, established by imperial decree, put Romanians at a crossroads: they were in principle free to choose which of the four *recepta religio* (“received religions”) to join. However, there was no doubt that the aim of the imperial religious policy was to direct the Romanian population of Transylvania towards the Catholic religion. Nevertheless, a part of them, the ten Romanian priests in the Haţeg region, who were under the authority of the Transylvanian Bishop, together with their congregations wanted to remain under the Transylvanian Reformed Bishop, even if they knew it would not make their lives easy.¹⁰ By this time, bilingual Reformed congregations already

“Rumänische konfessionelle Identitäten im Fürstentum Siebenbürgen”, *Orthodoxa Confessio? Konfessionsbildung, Konfessionalisierung und ihre Folgen in der östlichen Christenheit Europas*, hgg. von Mihai D. Grigore – Florian Kühner-Wielach, (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 265–291.

⁸The Reformed religion is not a *de iure*, but a *de facto* “state religion” during the time of the Reformed Transylvanian princes, see Szegedi, *idem.*, 291; Buzogány Dezső, “Bethlen Gábor és a vallási türelem” [Gábor (Gabriel) Bethlen and Religious Tolerance], *Studia Doctorum Theologiae Protestantis*, 6(2015), 240.

⁹ For a summary of the history of political events from the rich scholarly literature see Trócsányi Zsolt, *Habsburg politika és Habsburg-kormányzat Erdélyben, 1690–1740*, [Habsburg politics and Habsburg government in Transylvania] (Bp.: Akadémiai, 1988), 279–286; Ernst Christoph Suttner, “Die Siebenbürger Kirchenunion an der Wende zum 18. Jahrhundert,” *Annales Universitatis Apulensis. Series Historica*, (2008/12/1) 7–41; a new case study: Szirtes Zsófia, “A románok vallási uniója Rabutin főparancsnok szemével. Nagyszegi, Sztojka és a protestáns elit 1701-ben” [The religious union of the Romanian through commandant Rabutin’s eyes. Nagyszegi, Sztojka and the Protestant elite in 1701], in *Catholice reformare. A katolikus egyház a fejedelemség korában* [Catholice reformare. The Catholic Church in the age of the Principality], ed. Diósi Dávid – Marton József, (Bp.–Cluj-Napoca, 2018), 313–351;

¹⁰ Sipos, *A román református...*, *idem*; Ósz, *Felekezeti...*, *idem*, 6.

existed in the Hațeg region, and we also have information on the common church use of the Reformed and Orthodox congregations.¹¹ We also know of the founding of a new Reformed parish in this region at the beginning of the 18th century; this parish was established in the very area where we localise our manuscript: it happened on the initiative of a few nobles from Densuș, Ciula Mare, Nălațvad și Peșteana, but we lose their traces until 1772.¹² According to the source-edition of Előd Ósz and Dezső Buzogány on the church history of the area, due to the destruction of data, in the Hațeg Basin we no longer have information on Reformed Romanians after 1719; on the other hand in the Zărand Basin new congregations with Romanian-speaking members appear in the 1740s,¹³ and this also confirms the previous assumptions in the scholarly literature according to which after the three traditionally understood stages of Romanian Reformation – the 16th century beginnings followed by the age of the Transylvanian Principality (of course, with its great internal differences and discontinuities), and the period of the religious unions – a fourth stage needs to be taken account, and, according to the sources, this is confirmed by what happened in the Zărand Basin.

III. The characteristics of the text corpus

If we take into account the Reformed texts written in Romanian, that is, only those which were specifically intended to satisfy the religious-liturgical and educational needs of the Reformed Romanians, and we do not consider opuses published in Romanian as a result of the Transylvanian Reformation but priests and adherents of the Eastern Orthodox Church in mind, we can see that a substantially larger portion of these texts are manuscript texts. Several factors could have caused the fact that they remained manuscripts. We have a lot of information about the encouragements to make and print translations for the Romanian population, which is why it may come as a surprise that there are relatively few printed Romanian Reformed texts. We have no room here to address the reasons for this,¹⁴ we shall provide a list of manuscript religious texts.

The first in line is Sándor Gergely Agyagfalvi's hymnal, compiled in Hațeg in 1642, in the time of George I Rákóczi, whose missionary religious policy definitely

¹¹ Sipos, *A reformáció...*, idem; Ósz, *Felekezeti...*, idem 9–13.; Ósz, *Auswirkungen...*, idem, 125.

¹² Sipos, *A reformáció...*, idem, 216; Ósz, *Felekezeti...*, idem, 10.

¹³ Ósz, *Felekezeti...*, idem, 8.

¹⁴ Further information can be found in Levente Nagy's DSc. dissertation, defended in 2019: *A román reformáció, mint magyar-román kulturális transzferjelenség a 16–17. században* [The Romanian Reformation as a phenomenon of Hungarian-Romanian cultural transfer in the 16th and 17th centuries] (Bp., ELTE, 2018), link: <http://real-d.mtak.hu/1095/> (Accessed in September 2020).

left its mark on the history of the Reformation of Romanians.¹⁵ The following is a psalter and hymnal from the 1660s for church and/or school use.¹⁶ This may be related to the growing number of Reformed Romanians in the rural Hațeg area, and thus to the increased demand for bilingual worship. The third one is a fragmentary text: it was probably this period when Mihály Halits senior (1615–1671) noted down the two psalm fragments that survived in his copy of Pál Keresztúri's volume entitled *Csecsemő keresztyén* ['Infant Christian'], published in 1638.¹⁷ Levente Nagy is certain that the highly educated Mihály Halits senior was familiar with the aforementioned hymnal which was noted down around 1660, and copied from this volume in addition to his own translation. The fourth can be dated to the time of the disputes around the *Diploma Leopoldinum*. János Viski, the court priest of the Kendeffi family of Sântămăria-Orlea, compiled a hymnal in 1697.¹⁸ The last item on this list is the hymnal¹⁹ translated/copied in 1703 by István Istvánházi, who worked in Râu de Mori, and thus the volume becomes a relic of the period immediately after the religious union. These manuscripts have several features in common: all of them were written using the Latin alphabet and following the Hungarian orthography, all of them were translated from Hungarian, and all of them were written in the Hunyad-Záránd region, the historical area of the Hunyad-Záránd Reformed Diocese.

If we look at the external features of these manuscripts, their formatting and the way the text is arranged, it can be seen that, apart from the old Halits manuscript, each is a carefully crafted *book*: three of the four manuscripts²⁰ have a title page indicating the place and time of recording, they contain the name of the compiler/translator, they do not have any corrections, and all of the four manuscripts are fair-copy texts without corrections, meaning that they are manuscript books, *manuscript publications*.²¹ These codices did indeed function as

¹⁵ It can be found in the Archive of the Reformed Diocese of the Trans-Tisza Region under the RMK 556 call number.

¹⁶ In the Library of the Cluj-Napoca Branch of the Romanian Academy, call number Ms. R 1813 – the text was published by Daniele Pantaleoni, *Texte românești vechi cu alfabet latin. Psalterium Hungaricum în traducere anonimă din secolul al XVII-lea* [Old Romanian texts written with the Latin Alphabet. Psalterium Hungaricum in an anonymous translation from the 17th century] (Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, 2008).

¹⁷ In the Library of the Protestant Theological Institute of Cluj-Napoca, call number: RMK 257.

¹⁸ In the Library of the Cluj-Napoca Branch of the Romanian Academy, call number Ms. R 1502.

¹⁹ In the Library of the Cluj-Napoca Branch of the Romanian Academy, call number Ms. U 579.

²⁰ The manuscript, compiled in the 1660s and perhaps intended for church-school use, is anonymous and it does not include a location (call number Ms. R. 1813).

²¹ See the methodological basis for the concept in Tóth, Zsombor, *A kora újkori könyv antropológiája. Kéziratos irodalmi nyilvánosság Cserei Mihály (1667–1756) írás- és szöveghasználatában* [The Anthropology of the Early Modern Book: Scribal Publicity and Writing Habits in Mihály Cserei's (1667–1756) Oeuvre] (Bp., reciti, 2017) (Irodalomtörténeti füzetek, 178.); Idem, "Kéziratos nyilvánosság a kora újkori magyar nyelvű íráshasználatban:

publications, that is, as a corpus of texts in public circulation, worth and suitable for further copying, similar to the copying of the important opuses published in print; their compiler was *the author*, as it was his text that was read, used and sometimes continued or rewritten. We see this proven in our case as well. Levente Nagy's study convincingly demonstrates the overlaps between the Agyagfalvi hymnal and Viski's volume, and proves that, in addition to his own translations,²² the relevant hymn in the hymnal compiled around 1660 is identical with the one noted down by Mihály Halits senior.²³ István Istvánházi's hymnal is not known in its "original" version, i.e., in Istvánházi's autograph manuscript, but from a copy from 1769. The existence and survival of these manuscripts was thus ensured by a *manuscript publicity*, in which they represented a referential value; simply put: they were used, and they survived through this usage. At the same time, the Agyagfalvi hymnal can be an excellent example of the parallel existence and collective use of texts in print and in manuscript: although it is not possible to know when the manuscript was linked to Alsted's Catechism published in 1639 in Alba Iulia,²⁴ records testify their early collective use, this being most important proof for the fact that the Catechism was used together with the hymnal in a Romanian-language context.²⁵

If we establish the criteria of the manuscript book and scribal publication as established on the basis of the above codices, then the question remains: how does the manuscript of Mihály Halits senior, as a manuscript, fit into this concept. The highly educated Mihály Halits both wrote and read. According to Levente Nagy, the psalm fragment showing a strong resemblance to the text of the anonymous codex could have been memorized by him, and the other psalm could in all likelihood be his translation. These two fragmentary translations show how a text that lives on in a manuscript brings another text to life, that is, it had an audience that it could have inspired. It is clear, then, that the mechanism of life of the somewhat underrated manuscript texts, considered to be in the second line of literature, can be thought of as at least as productive as that of those published in print. Reading and writing, copying and creating (the latter can even be translating) is a common act, not a "private" activity.

The situation is similar with texts belonging to the broad category of *miscellanea*. In addition to family and other personal records, mixed manuscripts containing religious/literary texts can be included in the same circulation, distribution, and production of texts as the ones presented above.

medialitás és kulturális másság. Módszertani megfontolások" [Scribal Publicity in the Early Modern Hungarian Language Writing Habits: Mediality and Cultural Alterity. Methodological Considerations], *Irodalomtörténeti Közlemények* 119 (2015), 625–650.

²² Nagy, *ibid.* 238–239.

²³ *Ibid.* 232–233.

²⁴ *Catechismus religionis christianae*, RMNY 1764.

²⁵ Nagy, *ibid.*, 210–211.

III. 1. An all-encompassing book from the 17th-18th centuries

The next manuscript text of the Romanian Reformation also originates from the Hațeg region, and has recently been discovered, making it the sixth on our list. The manuscript²⁶, which today contains 52 pages, has no binding, some of its stitched pages are missing and it is certainly not complete. This omniarium, containing estate-management records, a plethora of ecclesiastical texts and others classified as belonging to the popular literature, was compiled among the rural nobility, on the estates of the Brázovai family, at the end of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. The localisation and temporal classification were aided by the texts related to estate-management (containing estate censuses of the Brázovai family), but the forms of the writings from different hands clearly show 18th century hands. It is important to point out that the only identifiable writer of the manuscript is Izsák Brázovai, whose wife is remembered as a widow in a court decision issued in 1758.²⁷ In addition to him, in the case of the estate-management records, we can also identify the writing of two hands, while in the case of ecclesiastical and popular texts, three clearly separable hands. In the manuscript we have a single handwriting that also wrote estate notes and ecclesiastical texts: the hand that began the codex also wrote a prayer. Nevertheless, the other hands of the estate records did not write any text that could be classified as ecclesiastical or popular literature. This relatively strong separation of the handwritings depending on the content of the text, which can be observed between estate censuses and ecclesiastical and popular texts, does not work in the same way for ecclesiastical and popular texts. In this case, there is a hand that noted down both ecclesiastical and popular texts. The notary of the estate-related texts could also be a person outside the family, a property supervisor, a steward.

The genesis of the omniarium can probably be explained by practical reasons, and it is not necessarily only related to the Brázovai family, but to the Latzug family as well, who fled the Banate of Severin after 1658 and moved to the Hațeg region, as the first pages of the manuscript contain the estate censuses of

²⁶ Location: Direcția Județeană Hunedoara a Arhivelor Naționale, fond: Societatea de Științe și Arheologie a comitatului Hunedoara. Colecția de documente. Nr. dos. 23 (fără dată). [Hunedoara County Directorate of the National Archives of Romania, the Hunedoara County Society of Sciences and Archaeology. Document Collection. No: 23 (not dated)].

²⁷ *Hotărârea guvernului în procesul Evei Doboli, văduva lui Isac Brazovai pentru diviziune* [The government's decision in the trial of Eva Doboli, Isac Brazovai's widow for division], Sibiu, 19 aprilie 1758. – Arhivele Naționale Deva, Fond: Societatea de Științe și Arheologie a comitatului Hunedoara. Diplome. Pachetul XXXII, Nr. act. 81, anul 1758. [Deva National Library of Romania, The Hunedoara County Society of Sciences and Archaeology. Diplomas. No XXXII, no doc. 82, year: 1758]

Gáspár Latzug.²⁸ However, the records initiated in regionally significant case, in the possession of the Brázovai family it subsequently became a document of family interest, and from then on this manuscript intended to ensure the preservation of memory for other purposes and with a different interest.

We do not discuss the estate-related texts in the following, but will take a closer look at the most exciting texts in the manuscript, the products of ecclesiastical and popular literature.

These texts were not fair copies, but occasionally noted down, and may have been motivated by their functionality. It is not a fair copy manuscript, prepared for publication: it contains occasional entries, “things worth preserving, remembering”, and this is true not only in the case of estate-related texts, but also in the case of other types of texts in the manuscript: the texts with a spiritual function are not noted one after the other, separately from the estate-related entries; their record was defined by occasionality. While the language of the estate-related texts is basically Hungarian (place and border names occur in Romanian), ecclesiastical and popular texts alternate in Romanian and Hungarian. We are also confronted with a confusing diversity of genres: prayers, religious contemplations, religious teachings, sermon excerpts together with/among ancient proverbs, calendar poems, prescriptions, prognosticons alternate in two languages.

III. 2. Micro-level textology: prayer, contemplations, religious teaching, sermon and popular texts in the omniarium

By text type, we can summarise the manuscript texts as follows:²⁹

III. 2. 1. It contains nine prayers and two liturgical texts (Credo, Ten Commandments); eight of the nine prayers are almost all complete, in the case of a prayer, however, only the title can be deciphered. Six of these are Romanian, three are Hungarian. With one exception, the sources of all of the prayers could be identified. The source of one of the prayers entitled *Rugetsunye pentru reminyerá*

²⁸ Documents relating to the Brázovai family from the archives of the former Hunedoara County Historical, Archaeological and Natural Science Society, now preserved in the Deva National Archives, can provide important data for the family history of the Brázovai family. For the history of the Latzug family in the 16-17th century see Ligia Boldea, “Date asupra patrimoniului funciar al familiei Lățug de Delinești (secolele XVI-XVII)” [Data on the land patrimony of the Lățug de Delinești family (the 16th and 17th centuries)], in *Vocația istoriei. Studii în memoria profesorului Nicolae Bocșan* [The vocation of history. Studies in memory of Professor Nicolae Bocșan], redacted by Ligia Boldea, Rudolf Gräf (Cluj-Napoca: Mega, 2017), 69-79.

²⁹ I will not cite the texts here. They can be read together with their sources in the publication of the text (Luffy, idem). The page numbers are the page numbers of the manuscript as well as those of the sources used for identification.

rodiluj, can be found in Péter Debreczeni's prayer and contemplation book, entitled *Tizenkét idvösséges elmékedések*³⁰: *Könyörgés, hogy az mi földi gyümölcinc meg tartasanac* [Prayer that our earthly fruit should be kept.].³¹ Although Kegel's volume was also translated by the Lutheran István Deselvits in this period,³² it becomes clear from a comparison of the texts that the translator from Breazova used one of the editions of the Reformed author's volume. There are two more prayers in the manuscript copied from Kegel's Hungarian translator's volume, Péter Debreczeni: The one entitled *Az mi ellenséginkért avagy azokért, akik minékünk gonosz akaróink* [For our enemies or for those who are our ill-wishers]³³ is complete, while the text entitled *Hogy az Christus seberől emlekezett hathato orvoság minden mi háboru probaink ellen* [That remembering Christ's wounds is a powerful medicine against all of our enmities and trials]³⁴ contains only the title in full, the rest is only fragmentary. The other five Romanian prayers, *Rugetsunye en vreme gje szetsete*³⁵ (*Szárazságnak idejére való Imadság*) [Prayer for the time of drought], *Rugetsunje pentru pekát*³⁶ (*Bűnbotsánatért való Poenitentia tartó ember Imadság*) [Prayer of man holding penitence for sin], *Reggeli ének* [Morning song], *Reggeli ének* [Morning song],³⁷ come from the very frequently used, very popular prayer book, published several times, entitled *Mennyei Tárház kulcsa*³⁸ [Key to the heavenly treasury],

³⁰ The first edition of Péter Debreczeni's Reformed translation: Leiden, Wilhelmus Christianus, 1637 (RMNy, 1678), and we know about six subsequent publications: Levoča, Lőrinc Brever, 1638 (RMNy 1730), Bardejov, Jakab Klősz, 1639 (RMNy 1755), Levoča, Brever, 1668 (RMK I. 1064); Levoča, Brever, 1672 (RMK I. add. page 1337a), Levoča, Brever, 1685 (RMK I. add. page 1339a); Levoča, 1704 (no copy available, RMK I. 1694).

³¹ The prayer in the codex: [27^v-28^v]. When specifying source texts, I indicate the data of the edition I used for identification. Debreceni (Levoča: Brever, 1685), 444–445.

³² István Deselvits's translation was published twice: Levoča, Lőrinc Brever, 1639 (RMNy 1772), Ulm, Johann Görlin, 1653 (RMNy 2497).

³³ [29^v-30^v]; Debreczeni, idem, 392–393.

³⁴ [23^v]; Debreczeni, idem, 310–312.

³⁵ [30^v-31^r]; Szatmárnémeti Mihály, *Mennyei Tárház Kulcsa* [Key to the Heavenly Treasury] (Cluj: Veresegyházi, 1673), 106–110.

³⁶ [31^v-32^v]; Szatmárnémeti, idem, 78–78.

³⁷ In the case of the prayer entitled *Reggeli ének* [Morning song] on page no 50^v as well as the text entitled *Reggeli könyörgés* [Morning prayer], preserved on a separate page which used to belong to the codex, but is now kept in a separate file (call number: ANR DJ Hunedoara, Fond Societatea de Istorie si Arheologie a Comitatului Hunedoara, nr. dosar 20, fără dată), only the title is Hungarian, both of them are rhyming prayers translated to Romanian.

³⁸ First edition: Cluj-Napoca, Veresegyházi Szentyel M., 1673 (RMK I, 1149); Cluj, Veresegyházi Szentyel M., 1676 (RMK I, 1194) Levoča, Brever S., 1679 (RMK I, 1239); Cluj, Veresegyházi Szentyel M., 1681 (RMK I, 1262); Debrecen, Töltési I., 1685 (RMK I, 1332); Cluj, Veresegyházi Szentyel M., 1702 (RMK I. 1588b); Debrecen, Vincze Gy., 1703 (RMK I, 1666); Levoča, 1706 – RMK I, 1716; Bardejov, 1708 – RMK I, 1743. The RMK (Old Hungarian Library) does not include

written by the very prolific and one of the most read authors of his time, Mihály Sztarmárnémeti, the dean of the Kolozs-Kalota Diocese from 1681. The source of the Hungarian language *Könyörgés* [Prayer]³⁹ could not be found, and our search in the prayer books of the period would be in vain, as these were intended for the “community”, presenting an example of personal prayers of the faithful outside liturgy. This very beautiful prayer, however, is not said by the congregation, but by the preacher: Turning to Jesus, he asks that the listeners be moved by what he says, and prays for the opening of their hearts.

It can also be seen from the titles of the prayers listed here that the manuscript contains prayers for both private piety and community devotion, and from the thematic point of view it can be divided into everyday prayers, that is, ordinary ones, or prayers for “special” times (the latter includes prayers against droughts and prayers for our enemies, although that these could also have been texts of personal piety). None of the prayers belong to the ones said at the administration of sacraments, before (or after) going to church, at funerals etc., therefore, at occasions which would relate exclusively to pastoral duties, and thus these prayers were written down for lay use. The only exception is the prayer in Hungarian written on separate pages. However, this text cannot only be tied to the pastoral duty, but can be also understood as a prayer of a person who could have completed college education (a court teacher, a steward) as the leader of house devotions.⁴⁰

III. 2. 2. Seven separate texts (excerpts) can be considered religious contemplations, these survived in nine text fragments: after finding the source texts, it became clear which fragments belonged together. In all probability, there was also a period when the estate-related and ecclesiastical texts were written down in parallel, as the manuscript has several pages on which both types of texts are alternatively present.⁴¹ Due to the fragmentation and the confusion caused by the non-adjacent parts of the text, the number of contemplative texts can only be determined with some uncertainty, and we have not been able to fully explore their sources. Their language is alternating in this case as well: three Hungarian and seven Romanian texts, among which we also find one that continues the Romanian translation by copying the Hungarian text. One Romanian and one Hungarian text fragment could not be identified. The sources of contemplative texts are also

the 1696 (RMK I, add. page. 1488b), the 1699 (RMK I., add. page 1541a), the 1702 (RMK I, add. page 1650a) editions from Cluj.

³⁹ On the pages belonging to the codex but kept in separate files, see footnote 37!

⁴⁰“The books of prayers were written primarily for the private use of the laity, and certain prayer books (especially sung prayers even as hymnals) could have been used during liturgical and para-liturgical occasions, such as house worship.” FAZAKAS, *idem*, 15.

⁴¹ 22^v, 24^r, 26^v, 30^r, 49^r.

diverse. Among these we meet the author who also appears in the case of the prayers: an excerpt of a few lines was copied from Péter Debreczeni's volume, the fragment starting with *Mi képpen nyerhetni meg a mennyeknek országát?*⁴² [How to win the Kingdom of Heaven?] Nevertheless, the same copying hand is also familiar with the "handbook" of pious practice written by Pál Medgyesi, perhaps the most important Hungarian Puritan author of the period, and translated some of it into Romanian: The Hungarian title of the text *Mint szabja az kegyes ember magára az edig hallott és olvasott Istene és maga esmeretétt halladék nélkül* [How the pious person makes without delay his own the knowledge of God and of himself that he has heard about and read],⁴³ is followed (after the insertion of a short estate-related record) by the Romanian-language fragment; at the same time, from the same volume, he chose to translate the fragment entitled *Despre omul tsel nye neszkut gje nou si pegubit, gjeszpre kinurillje luj tselje ku njevoj* [About the troubles of the man who is not born again and about the anguish of the one in need].⁴⁴ In the case of the Medgyesi translations, we need to highlight the linguistic performance of the translator from Breazova: he managed to translate the Hungarian text rich in images, parables and metaphors of the Puritan author without losing its strength, and while he did not try to find his own voice, the Romanian language version became a text that strongly encourages piety.

The longest continuous ecclesiastical text of the manuscript is *Dje [s]pre krutsá száu Ameritsunyá fiilor luj Dumnyeszéu káre pátu en tottye Dszillyelje*,⁴⁵ and this fragment opening up mystical depths discusses the everyday bearing of the cross of God's children. The original of the text is Martin Moller's *Manuale ad Praeparationem ad Mortem* (first edition: 1593), which was translated into Romanian based on Boldizsár Zólyomi Perina's Hungarian language translation by the Breazova translator, who after translating the text into Romanian, copied longer parts from the same volume.

Unfortunately, the source of a very exciting contemplative passage could not be found. The fragment entitled ⁴⁶ *Dgyeszpre dtzua dsudgyetzuduj de pe urme*⁴⁷ is exciting because it seems to evoke a different world compared to the fragments

⁴² [28^v]; Debreczeni, idem, 431–342.

⁴³ [26^v–27^v]; in the 1677 Cluj-Napoca edition of the *Praxis*: 154–156.

⁴⁴ [28^v–39^r]; the title of the Hungarian fragment: *Az újjá nem született, és el kárhozandó embernek nyavalyás állapottjáról* [On the miserable condition of the damned man who is not born again], idem, 67–68.

⁴⁵ [33^r–37^v]

⁴⁶ I indicate here that the identification of the short Hungarian-language fragment entitled *Maga meg esmeretire vallo hasznos regullák* [43^{r-v}] is yet to be carried out.

⁴⁷ [44^v–46^r], [50^v] – the fragments that can be found in two different locations of the codex are certainly part of the same text.

presented above: its powerful naturalism, its eschatological vision does not exclude a Catholic or even Eastern Orthodox source.

III. 2. 3. We identified one religious teaching in Hungarian in the manuscript, whose source is the book of Imre Pápai Páriz, another Puritan author, Michael I Apafi's instructor. The volume is entitled the *Keskeny Út* [Narrow road],⁴⁸ it was first published in Utrecht in 1647 and then lived on to see ten more editions.

III. 2. 4. We assigned four fragments to the group of texts belonging to the genre of the sermon, all written in Hungarian: one's source could not be identified,⁴⁹ while three fragments were copied by one of the writers of the manuscript from three different sermons published in a book of sermons on psalms,⁵⁰ by Mihály Tofaeus, Michael I Apafi's court chaplain, the Bishop of Transylvania. The texts rich in parables, of high encyclopaedic value, can also be understood as religious readings, and this representative volume could easily find its way to the Reformed population living in the Hațeg region.

III. 2. 5. Texts classified as non-ecclesiastical texts are very diverse in terms of content. Some of them can be classified as belonging to popular culture, such as the calendar poems for the months or Prognosticons (three poems, one of them without an identified source⁵¹), and perhaps the verses written around the coats-of-arms of people⁵² can be considered a calendar poem (similar enumerations occur in 17th century calendars). Both identified calendar poems are copied from Miklós Misztótfalusi Kis's print for the year 1702, published in Cluj.⁵³ The only Latin texts in

⁴⁸ PÁPAI PÁRIZ Imre, *Keskeny út, melyet az embernek elmejébe ütköző haboru gondolatoknak köreiből es sok féle kételkedeseknek sürüjéből a mennyire lehetett, ki irtott Papai Pariz Imre*, Utrecht, Johannes Noortdyck, 1647 (RMNy, 2196), 16–18, 24–26. – [39^r–40^v]

⁴⁹ [24^v–25^r]: The fragment entitled *Joszágos Csellekedett* [A good deed].

⁵⁰ Tofaeus's sermons were not recorded by him, but by his scribes noted them down by ear, and thus this volume also carries the peculiarities of oral sermons: *Szent Soltárok Resolutioja* [The resolution of the Holy Psalms] (Cluj, Veresegyházi Szentyei M., 1683) (RMK I, 1302); [22^r] Isa: 22: v. 20. 21. Starting with *Egy lator vén róka istentellen emberül van emlékezet* [Recollections of an old, wicked, godless man]: Szent Soltárok..., 774–775.; [23^r] *Az Soltárnak versei szerint megtanulhattuk ezeket az dolgokat* [We can learn these things from the verses of the Psalm]. – idem: 128–129; [51v] *A' Tudomány részei szerint megtanulhatunk ilyen három dolgokat* [We can learn these three things from the parts of Wisdom]: – idem: 69.

⁵¹ Entitled *Prognosticon perpetua* on pages [46^v–47^r].

⁵² *Az töröknek czimere a hold* on page [21^v], 11 rows noted down one next to each other.

⁵³ *Uj és ó Kalendárium Cristus Urunk születése után való 1702 Esztendőre*, Melly Magyar Országgra, Erdélyre, és egyéb Tartományokra-is alkalmaztatott Neubárt János astrologus által [New and Old Calendar for the year 1702 after the birth of our Jesus Christ, applied to Hungary, Transylvania and other Provinces by the astrologer János Neubárt] (Cluj,

the manuscript are quotations from Ovid, Ovid is quoted partly in Latin and partly in Hungarian.⁵⁴ These quotes are maxims about true friendship, perseverance, he could have collected them from anywhere, from school textbooks to any collection of quotes. The same category of popular texts includes the Romanian-language zodiac and a list of prescriptions started in Hungarian (“*orvoság aki meg nem tarthattja hugját*” [‘medicine for those who cannot keep their urine’]), but continued in Romanian, a collection of texts useful in everyday life. He notes down two recommendations for urinary incontinence, one for nosebleeds, one for menstruation, there are prescriptions against fleas, helping the healing of wounds, and finally, a rather strange procedure on how to determine whether a woman with a terminal illness is still alive or not. Such prescriptions can be found in both herbariums and calendars, perhaps the scribe from Breazova used such publications, nevertheless, he could have also relied on his own experience or on common wisdom.

The zodiac or the prescriptions also fall into this category.

One of the most exciting lay texts in the manuscript is the Romanian-language zodiac. It “stands out” from the rest of the texts in every way. In the text tradition containing Hungarian-language prognostications, such texts are not known in the 16th and 17th centuries. It is safe to say that its source was not a printed book but a text circulated in manuscript, that spread and survived in handwriting despite the strong protests of the Greek Orthodox Church. Unfortunately, the zodiac starting with *Mensis Septembris*⁵⁵ contains only five months, and they are not in a sequential order: we have September, August, April, May, and February, and their texts are not complete within one given month. According to the genre, they should encompass the predictions about the character, illnesses, marriage/marriages and lifespans of the children born in that particular month, separately for boys and girls; however, our manuscript contains only “prognostications” referring to boys in the case April, May, August and September, while in the case of the month February copied on page 45³, only the parts referring to girls were included. Thus, out of the different genres of astronomical predictions, the scribe from Breazova used the so-called *rojdenic*⁵⁶ subtype in his book. Such a text is known today from the manuscript

Misztótfalusi Kis Miklós, 1701) (RMK I, 1655). (Identification by Judit P. Vászárhelyi and her team, to whom I hereby express my gratitude for their help.) – [43^v–44^r], [47^v–48^r]

⁵⁴ He quotes Ovid in Latin and Hungarian on page [25^v], in Hungarian on page [50^r].

⁵⁵ [42^v–42^v; 45^r]

⁵⁶ Of the astrological-type prognostications, the *rojdenic* is a prophecy based on the month and astrological sign of a person. The other two types are the *gromovnic* and the *trepetic*, the former predicting the future of man and that of the world from lightning, depending on what month, under what zodiac sign these occur; and the latter draws conclusions from man's physiognomy regarding his character and life, as well as his future. On the different versions of prognosticons: Nicolae CARTOJAN, *Cărțile populare în literatura românească* [Popular books

copied by Ioan Românuț around 1620, unfortunately it is not complete either.⁵⁷ Both the Breazova manuscript and Ioan Românuț's copy preserve the prophecy for the boys born in September, and it seems that the two almost literally coincide, so such a *rojdenic* text could have been in front of the copier from Breazova. There is one significant difference between the two: the scribe from Breazova did not preserve the names of the months according to the Byzantine calendar (nor the constellation names used later, from the second half of the 18th century),⁵⁸ a sign that the community in which this manuscript was compiled, did not use the Byzantine calendar, and thus he adapted to his own cultural medium the text which was not used here. The direction of the transfer is different: it does not transmit the products of Protestant culture to its Romanian/Hungarian-speaking community, but brings a text of Slavic origin in a community that follows Calvinist religious beliefs. It is quite obvious that the recording of these zodiac fragments was connected to a given occasion, and that the scribe was, as before, a bilingual person, and was fluent in both Romanian and Hungarian. At the end of the prognostication for the month of August, he writes in Hungarian: "[i]fjabbik Russori Mihály eben az hóben született Augusztusban" [Russori Mihály jr. was born in this month in August]. Certainly, these months could be linked to the birth of the child of a family member or a close acquaintance, or a person with an important position in the area, about whom they wanted to acquire prior "knowledge" in this way as well.

If we merge the zodiac of the Breazova manuscript and Ioan Românuț's manuscript, it will contain eight months, which may be one of the important results of this textual examination. A similar type of text – according to Nicolae Cartoian, the discoverer of Ioan Românuț's text – only survived from the second half of the 18th century.

IV. Summary The micro-level of the Long Reformation: transfer, translation, and mediality

Our manuscript can therefore be classified as miscellanea, since the texts recorded in it were in all likelihood intended for reading before the community; in terms of the broad genres and subject matters of the listed texts, occasion could justify their record, and the production of this corpus of texts was not the work of a single

in Romanian literature], București, Ed. Enciclopedică Română, 1974 (new edition); chapter.: *Literatură astrologică de prevestire* [The literature of astrological predictions], p. 217–229.

⁵⁷ Ioan Românuț's manuscript was preserved in the *Codex Neagoeanus*, published by: Nicolae CARTOIAN, *Cel mai vechiu zodiac românesc: Rujdenița Popei Ion Românuț (1620)* [The Oldest Romanian Zodiac: Parson Ion Românuț's Rujdenița (1620)], Dacoromania. Buletinul "Muzeului Limbei Române, anul V(1927–1928), 584–601.

http://documente.bcuc.ro/web/bibdigit/periodice/dacoromania/pdf/BCUCLUJ_FP_279430_1927-

⁵⁸ See Mihăilescu's related examples: idem, 83–84.

author/translator, but a collective work aimed at offering acceptable texts to the community, thus nurturing communal piety. These are individual and community texts, texts intended for the community based on individual selection; this also shows the religious sensitivity of the period, functioning even as some kind of a measuring device for this sensitivity, as Doru Radoslav put it, a true „*liber laicorum*”.⁵⁹

After the identification of the manuscripts, it became clear from which volumes the scribe/scribes from Breazova translated. The readings of the translators were important works of the 17th century that were related to the important ideological currents of the century. Most of them were texts for the exercise of individual and community piety, for the deepening and strengthening of faith, and in view of the way these were selected, occasionality could have dictated their transfer to Romanian. As we have seen, the transfer took place through several languages: the Latin translation of a German original was translated into Hungarian; using the German original and the Czech version, they translated texts into Hungarian. Nevertheless, we can also see cases of direct transposition: a book translated from English into Hungarian without Latin mediation and of course we have texts originally written in Hungarian. It is not necessary to prove that translation is also an interpretive operation: the same interpretive behaviour is applied in the case of striving for a faithful translation; rendering the exact message in another language is not only an issue of language, as the texts also have to be adapted to the needs, traditions and knowledge of a given community, so that these texts can be considered meaningful texts. Printed text is thus returned to manuscripts, and its altered medium allows for further use and expands its functionality. Nevertheless, it is precisely translation that changed not only the mediality of the texts, but broadened the range of users from the linguistic point of view. The Breazova scribes alternating between Hungarian and Romanian texts, using various sources, show us a captivating example of bilingualism. The ecclesiastical texts seen here invite Romanians and Hungarians into a shared spiritual and cultural space, in which it is not language (not to mention ethnicity) but religion which prevails: it is a particularly rich linguistic and cultural community of the Reformed people in the Hațeg region, and our manuscript is one of the textual remnants of this peculiarly unfolding Reformation of the Romanians.

Acknowledgement: This article has been written with the support of the *MTA BTK Lendület Long Reformation in Eastern Europe (1500-1800) Research Project*.

Translated from Hungarian by Noémi Fazakas.

⁵⁹ For criteria of religious miscellanea see Doru Radosav, *Sentimentul religios la români* [The religious sentiment in Romanians] (Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1997 (Collection Homo Religiosus), with a special regard to 64–68.