

NOVI TESTAMENT 1563. [NEW TESTAMENT 1563] (Reprint).

Zagreb, Theological Faculty "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," 2008. Pages X+ 950.

Alojz Jembrih. POGOVOR UZ PRETISAK ĆIRILIČKOGA NOVOGA TESTAMENTA [1563.]. [AFTERWORD TO THE REPRINT OF THE CYRILLIC NEW TESTAMENT [1563]].

Zagreb, Theological Faculty "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," 2008. 224 pages.

After the publication of the Glagolitic *New Testament* in 1562/3, printed in Urach (Zagreb, Theological Faculty "Matthias Flacius Illyricus," 2008; see the reviews by S. Jambreč in *Kairos* 2/2007, pp. 361–363 and by R. Knežević in *Biblija danas* 1-2/2008, p. 26–27), the same publisher also issued, in co-operation with the National and University Library of Ljubljana, Slovenia, and under the auspices of UNESCO, the reprint of the Cyrillic version of this original Croatian printing in November, 2008. The chief editor of the project is Dr. Alojz Jembrih who also drafted the Afterword to this reprint. The Afterword, which also contains a summary in English, was printed as a separate booklet which is placed, together with the reprint of the *New Testament*, in a protective hard-cover box. Other contributors to the project were Dr. Lidija Matošević, Dr. Vesna Badurina-Stipčević, Dr. Marina Miladinov, Dr. Mario Grčević, Ruben Knežević and Branka Kosanović. About fifteen other people were involved in different capacities in the successful completion of the project. Text layout was prepared by the Dominis-Aničić office for graphic design, and the books were printed in the Croatian Graphic Institute. The *New Testament* was published with the support of numerous donors, churches, biblical-theological and cultural institutions and individuals.

The original New Testament in Cyrillic was published in 1563 in two volumes (1000 copies of each): *Prvi děl Novoga Teštamenta, va tom su vsi četiri Evangelisti i Apustolska d'jan'ja iz' mnozih' jazikov' v sadašnji opšteni i razumni H'rvatski jazik', po Antonu Dalmatinu i Stipanu Istrijanu, s pomoštu drugih' bratov', verno st'lmačeni, i s ciruličskimi slovi najp'rho sada štampani ... / Drugi děl Novoga Teštamenta, v kom se zađrže Apustolske Epistole ...* However, the Zagreb reprint was published in one volume (in the reprint the original two parts of the *New Testament* are separated and signalled by appropriate pagination), and based on the copy held at the National and University Library in Ljubljana. The few damaged pages from the Ljubljana copy (here marked as [204B-207A]) were replaced by their photocopies from the Öffentliche Bibliothek der Universität Basel. The reprint also contains an "Editorial" (pages 943-946), a note about pagination (p. 947), a transliteration of titles (p. 948) and, as a special appendix, a chart with Cyrillic

characters in the New Testament [1563] and Cyrillic characters in a chart for children [1561].

The script of the New Testament in Cyrillic was originally prepared for publication by Istrians Antun Dalmatin and Stipan Konzul, with their co-workers. It took place immediately after the printing of the New Testament in the Glagolitic script was finished, i.e. in 1563, the same year in which the second part of the Glagolitic version was completed because the translators had always intended for the New Testament “to be published in Glagolitic and Cyrillic signs.” The modern publisher also succeeded in preparing the two reprints in two different scripts for publication in consecutive years (2007 and 2008) which, particularly considering the degree of scholarly expertise, technical demands and financial constraints involved, deserves hearty commendation.

In the *Afterword to the Reprint of the Cyrillic New Testament [1563]*, A. Jembrih offered abbreviated excerpts from some of the texts which had been previously published in his *Afterword to the Reprint of the Glagolitic New Testament [1562/6.]* (2007), but he also added new textual material and addenda relevant to the Cyrillic version as well as to the role of the Cyrillic script on Croatian linguistic field. The contents of the *Afterword* include the following chapters: I – From original impetus and preparations to the Glagolitic and Cyrillic *New Testament [1562/63]* and [1563]; II – *New Testament [1562/63]* and [1563.], the most extensive product of the printing-press in Urach, in Glagolitic and Cyrillic scripts; III – *New Testament [1562/63]* and [1563] in European and national libraries; IV – Sources and literature; V – Appendices (dedications in German and Croatian and forwards by P. Trubar, S. Konzul and A. Dalmatin, the translation from German and transliteration of the Cyrillic text); VI – the Summary of the *Afterword* in English; VII – English translation of the the foreword by Trubar, Konzul and Dalmatin.

A comparison with the *Afterword* to the Glagolitic version to the *Afterword* to the Cyrillic version reveals new sections of text which deal with the specifics of the Cyrillic version of the *New Testament*: Cyrillic test sheets (pp. 44–53), *New Testament [1563]* in Cyrillic script (pp. 73–82), In the footsteps of the Cyrillic characters in the *New Testament [1563]* (pp. 99–115), Glagolitic and Cyrillic scripts, two Croatian alphabets, (pp. 116–126), Is the Cyrillic *New Testament [1563]* printed in the *bosančica?* (pp. 126–129), The distribution of the Glagolitic [1562/63] and Cyrillic *New Testament [1563]* (pp. 129–134).

In addition to the insights gained from archival material (Tübingen and elsewhere) and from existing literature about the *New Testament* in Cyrillic script published in Urach (Schnurrer, Rupel, Benz and others), in the *Afterword*, A. Jembrih highlights details which have still not been adequately treated. Thus, for example, in the section about the Cyrillic test sheets, Jembrih rightly stresses

that the so-called probni otisak from 1564 (its facsimile is reproduced on p. 50) actually does not represent a test sheet but a key for reading Latin script. Indeed, the Cyrillic *New Testament* was the last Urach publication in the Cyrillic script, subsequently there would have been no need whatsoever for new test sheets.

As concerns the distribution of the Urach publications in the Cyrillic script, Jembrih does not unreservedly subscribe to the view of G. Stöckl who opines that the books printed in the Glagolitic script were intended for the linguistic area connected with Catholicism, and the books printed in the Cyrillic script intended for those Christians who were connected with Orthodoxy (p. 80). Thus Jembrih leaves the solution of this puzzle to the linguists and adduces information about the distribution of the books in Cyrillic script in Hungary and Erdelj, information which does not support Stöckl's hypothesis.

The section entitled "In the Footsteps of the Cyrillic Characters in the *New Testament*" examines prints which were used in Urach for the production of Cyrillic characters. Although there are indications that Konzul and Dalmatin used Russian and Venetian print as their models, they must not have followed them slavishly since the Cyrillic characters from Urach reveal numerous traits not shared with these characters. Jembrih elaborates this point through a detailed analysis of individual characters. His conclusion, echoing an opinion already expressed in literature (Plavšić), is that this is a specific, expertly manufactured and simplified version of the Cyrillic script (a predecessor to the reformed Russian Cyrillic script which emerged in the 18th century). Jembrih proposes that it should appropriately be called "Konzul's and Dalmatin's Croatian-Urach Cyrillic script" (p. 108).

From this discussion follows the next section, "Glagolitic and Cyrillic Scripts: Two Croatian Alphabets." It highlights the co-existence and usage of the Glagolitic and Cyrillic scripts in Croatian lands over the period of several centuries, and the fact that the Croatian Glagolitic thinkers used both scripts. The author reproduces excerpts from literary sources (Fučić, Milčetić and others) with concrete examples of the inter-penetration of these two most ancient Croatian historic scripts. In answering the question whether the Cyrillic *New Testament* was printed in the *bosančica*, i.e. the kind of Cyrillic script used by M. Divković, P. Posilović and S. Margitić, Jembrih gives an adamant negative reply based on the comparison of concrete texts. Although certain indications might point to the influence of the Venetian and Russian variants of the Cyrillic script, Jembrih nevertheless declares that a thorough search for the prints of Konzul's and Dalmatin's Cyrillic characters still needs to be undertaken.

As regards the unique traits of the Cyrillic text of the *New Testament* vis-a-vis the Glagolitic text of the *New Testament*, that is, the distinguishing linguistic traits in the Urach translation of the *New Testament*, Jembrih rightly observes

(Afterword, p. 82) that only the publication of the Urach reprints of the New Testament in both alphabets will make a thorough theological and philological research into the Urach New Testaments possible. The earlier comparisons of the Glagolitic and Cyrillic texts of the translation of the New Testament, conducted primarily as isolated “case studies” by V. Jagić and F. Kidrič (comp. Afterword, p. 96), were terse and led to the claims that they are “one and the same, just a bit different.” However, Jembrih produces parallel renderings of the New Testament translations of John 1:1-14 and demonstrates that the differences are not so insignificant. The source of linguistic differences between the Glagolitic and Cyrillic texts are explained in different ways: in part they are ascribed to the editorial interventions of the two *uskok* “clergy,” Matija Popović and Ivan Maleševac, or to the impact of linguistic variants (the tendency towards archaic renderings) borrowed from the books which they brought to Urach and probably left there (comp. Afterword, pp. 60-61). Bučar, on the other hand, suggests that the Church-Slavonic influence in the Cyrillic New Testament might be the consequence of Dalmatin’s redaction (Afterword, p. 81-82). In any case, these differences must have supported the desire of the Urach translators for a super-regional distribution of their translation of the Bible, in keeping with their evangelizing missionary endeavor which should have enabled the “penetration of the true faith all the way to Constantinople” (Afterword, p. 10). The publication of the reprints of both Urach New Testaments will now certainly make their inter-textual examination possible, which will throw light on the significance, distribution and frequency of these linguistic, and possibly of grammatical-syntactical differences, related to the details of Bible translation and theology.

The publication of the reprint of the Cyrillic New Testament from 1563, in addition to the already published reprint of the New Testament from 1562/63 – especially in the “year of the Bible” which marks the fortieth anniversary of the publication of the Zagreb Bible – completes the principal project of the publication of reprints of the original prints of the Croatian New Testament. Further, taking the publication of the reprint of the Urach translation of *Prophets* from 1564 (Boris Arapović, ed., University of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina, reprint 2002) into account, all hitherto known Protestant translations of the Bible printed in Urach are thus completed at the same time. This has not only enriched the Croatian linguistic heritage and the history of Bible translation, but by becoming accessible to scholars, students and a wider readership, these works may finally take their rightful place as unavoidable factors within the totality of the Croatian cultural and religious identity.

Ruben Knežević
Translated by Davorin Peterlin