

Ks. WALDEMAR LINKE CP

## **‘THE SARMATIAN IN LANGUAGES TRAINED’<sup>1</sup>. STANISŁAW GRZEPSKI (1524-1570) AS A RESEARCHER OF THE HEBREW BIBLE AND THE SEPTUAGINT.**

The Polish Renaissance scholar Stanisław Grzepski, born in northern Mazovia (Grzebsk), died in 1570 in Cracow, is known primarily as the author of the first Polish technical book *Geometry, as a science of measuring* published in Cracow in 1565<sup>2</sup>. He is also

---

<sup>1</sup> J. Kochanowski, *Epitaphium Illustrissimi Grepsii*, in: J. Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska*. T. 1, *Imago phototypica-transcriptio. Fototypia-transkrypcja*, Gdańsk, 2008, 702-703. Polish translation by Erazm Lucjan Janiszowski, *kod. Jagiell*. Nr 59 f. 369, see J. Fijałek, *Przekłady pism św. Grzegorza z Nazyanzu w Polsce. Studium o patrystyce naszej*. Part 2, *Polonia Sacra*, 3, 1919, 126-207, particularly pages 128-129, footnote n.1. Polish epitaph of Grzepski published by Julian Krzyżanowski as a Kochanowski's poem (Kochanowski J., *Dzieła polskie*, t. 1, ed. J. Krzyżanowski, Warszawa, 1976, 213) is probably a *spurium*, see J. Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska*. T. 3, Głombiowska Z., *Commentarius. Komentarz*, Gdańsk 2013, 921.

<sup>2</sup> E. Marylski, *Wspomnienia zgonu zasłużonych w narodzie Polaków*. T. 1, Warszawa 1829, 257-258; I. Chodynicki, *Dykeyonarz uczonych Polaków: zawierający krótkie rysy ich życia, szczególne wiadomości o ich pismach, i krytyczny rozbiór ważniejszych dzieł niektórych*. Porządkiem alfabetycznym ułożony. T. 1, Lwów i in. 1833, 187-189; F. Kucharzewski, *Nasza najdawniejsza książka o miernictwie*. Warszawa 1926 (I wyd. Warszawa 1895); T.M. Nowak, *Cztery wieki polskiej książki technicznej 1450-1850*, Warszawa 1961, 29-34; W. Więslaw, *Stanisław Grzepski i jego geometria*, „*Matematyka*” 1996 nr 5, 263-265; B. Orłowski, *Historia techniki polskiej*, Radom 2006, 68-70; Bajerowa I., „Początki polskiego dyskursu naukowego - język

mentioned as a publisher of the works of Gregory of Nazianzus<sup>3</sup> in Greek or the first Polish scholar dealing with Lucian<sup>4</sup>. He gained, however, an all – European fame as a writer of Bible-based work on the weights and measures appearing in the Bible, using the full range of his talents and the knowledge as a numismatist, geometry scientist, and a high-class philologist<sup>5</sup>.

The precursor of the numismatic research at the University of Cracow was Maciej of Miechów (1457-1523), whose continuity in the field of collecting and research was done by Stanisław Grzepski<sup>6</sup>. In addition to the numismatic interests, he expressed the latter philological interests in numismatic issues. He conducted some research on the Hebrew and the Greek texts to discover the real meaning of the terminology used in the various language versions of the biblical text. He undertook a work initiated by Guillaume Budé (1467-1540) in *De asse et partibus eius* (Paris, in folio edition in 1514,

---

dział Marcina Bielskiego i Stanisława Grzepskiego”. *Onomastica Slavogermanica*. 27(2008), 73-79; B. Orłowski, *Polska przygoda z techniką*, Warszawa 2009, 29-30; J. Biniewicz J., „Kiedy poczniez groblą sypać dwułoktową...”, czyli o mierzeniu w pierwszych polskich traktatach mierniczych (*Geometria* Stanisława Grzepskiego i *O sprawie, sypaniu, wymierzaniu i rybieniu stawów* Olbrychta Strumieńskiego), in: *Kultura: pamięć i zapomnienie. Księga poświęcona pamięci Profesora Piotra Kowalskiego*. Jastrzębski B., Konarska K., Lewicki A. (red.), Wrocław 2012, 393-407; W. Wójcik, *Filozofia matematyki Józefa Marii Hoene-Wrońskiego*, „Studia z Filozofii Polskiej” 7(2012), 45-69, sp. 49; T.W. Kośka, *Od Grzepskiego do... ? : 450-lecie wydania pierwszej w języku polskim książki technicznej „Geometria to jest miernicka nauka”*. Łódź 2017; J. Bojko, *Niepozorne źródło Geomatyki: pięć wydań w ciągu 450 lat*, „Przegląd Geodezyjny: czasopismo poświęcone miernictwu i zagadnieniom z nim związanym” 89 (2017) nr 4, 40-42.

<sup>3</sup> J. Fijałek J., op. cit., 127-196; J. Czerniatowicz, C. Mazur, *Recepcja Antyku chrześcijańskiego w Polsce*. (=Materiały bibliograficzne. 1), XV-XVIII w., Part 1, Autorzy i teksty, Lublin, 1978, 50 (n. 303).

<sup>4</sup> J. Czerniejewicz, *Z dziejów grezystyki w Polsce w okresie Odrodzenia* (MDNT 28), Wrocław and others, 1965, 70-72.

<sup>5</sup> R. Juskiewicz, *Stanisław Grzepski i jemu współcześni na Mazowszu*, in: *Ziemia Zawkrzeńska* T. 14, ed. R. Juskiewicz, Mława, 2010, 42.

<sup>6</sup> M. Mielczarek, *Macieja z Miechowa wiedza o pieniądzu antycznym*. *Notae Numismaticae* 3-4, 1999, 243-250.

more popular edition *in quarto* in Venice 1522)<sup>7</sup>. Grzepski's knowledge of this work is also confirmed beyond *De mutipici siclo et talento*, because in his dedication to Hosius, which precedes the editions of Gregory of Nazianzus, quotes the Latin translation and quotation of that ancient poet and Christian theologian<sup>8</sup>. Although he did not have the text in his own book collection<sup>9</sup>, his knowledge of it is undoubted. The quoted fragment of Christian poetry, however, is not just an occasional borrowing, as we will talk about it later.

The declaration of the debt of gratitude towards Guillaume Budé means not only the assent but also signals a polemical benchmark. The French scholar was one of the philologists of the historical critical thought steam with Lorenzo Valla and Erasmus of Rotterdam<sup>10</sup>. Associated with the court of Louis XII and Francis I he undertook to commission this first diplomatic mission to Rome. While serving in his homeland he was the secretary of the royal family. Francis I entrusted him with the task of organizing the foundations of an institution for the development of the Renaissance culture. He became the father of the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Collège de France. His work *De asse et partibus eius* is today regarded as a 'study of ancient coins of Rome' and an example of Renaissance archeology at the junction of the study of artifacts and the philological examination of ancient texts<sup>11</sup>. However, Erasmus of Rotterdam noted

---

<sup>7</sup> In this article is used later edition Budaeus G., *De asse et partibus eius libri quinque*. Coloniae 1528, except the places with different notification. This choice is imposed by presence of large and exact citations in Grzepski's work from *Breviarium*. This part of Budaeus book is lacking in edition *in folio* printed in Paris in 1514.

<sup>8</sup> J. Fijałek, op. cit., 170-171.

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem, 170, footnote 3; see L. Ajdukiewicz, *Biblioteka Stanisława Grzepskiego. Przegląd Geodezyjny*, 1967, N° 5, (Addition), 16-23.

<sup>10</sup> Kelley D.R., *Oblicza historii. Badanie przeszłości od Herodota do Herdera*. Warszawa, 2010, 225.

<sup>11</sup> Ibidem, 256.

that this work has much broader and not always straightforward purposes<sup>12</sup>.

At the very beginning of the last book of the work of the Parisian scholar<sup>13</sup>, we find a reference to a question that will be the key to understanding of Grzepski's works: the variety of measures. Aristotle wrote that the essence of measure is its unity, but there are metrics – especially bigger, like a stadium or talent – that have variable values. 'The measure is not always one, but there are more.'<sup>14</sup> It is precisely on this idea that the work of the Cracovian Hellenist is based, and that Budaeus is by no means the focal point. He focuses rather on demonstrating that the terminological variety is the unity of the metrological system. That is why Aristotle engages in the question of measure in the context of the unity of being, which he associates indissolubly with its indivisibility. In the end, he tries to prove that St. Paul the Apostle was a true philosopher and expert of heaven (*Uranognomos*). Why did Budaeus attach so much importance to philosophical issues? Because he considered and respected philosophy as a sister of religion<sup>15</sup>. Let us note that it is not connected to theology, the more so it does not make it a servile philosophy, but puts it on equal footing, showing that the Christian religion fits into the older and more common edifice of ancient culture. He tried to show that Christ can be discovered in the form of Mercury<sup>16</sup> or as a twin of Janus<sup>17</sup>. It seems that the key formula is his statement: *Christus verus fuit Hercules*<sup>18</sup>. The quoted fragment from Gregory of Nazianzus was necessary for him to justify his concept of cultural continuity covering pre-Christian antiquity. He saw the unity between

---

<sup>12</sup> McNeil D.O., *Guillaume Budé and Humanism in the Reign of Francis I*. Genève, 1975, 36.

<sup>13</sup> Budaeus G., op. cit., 400. Budaeus wrongly suggests is book IX. It is probably a mistake and not a reference to another division of Aristotle's work.

<sup>14</sup> Aristotle, *Metaphysics* X (1053a).

<sup>15</sup> Budaeus G., op. cit., 636.

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem, 632.

<sup>17</sup> Ibidem, 633.

<sup>18</sup> Ibidem, 664.

the philosophy and the sacrament of salvation, which had their common foundation in Christ<sup>19</sup>. That's why he recognizes the statement *Christus vero sapientia proautor et constitutor*<sup>20</sup>. Unity and unique homogeneity of history allows him to see the Apocalypse of St. John as a commentary to the thread spun by the Parks<sup>21</sup>. Budaeus's antique effort was thus intended to create a concept of Christian humanism in which Christianity is the most perfect expression of wisdom brought about by philosophy. The uniformity of this vision is expressed and described by the unifying measures, according to the concept taken from Aristotle. Earlier, however, he argues in the philological-historical analysis that between the Greek and Roman world there is the same continuity and uniformity expressed by the common metrological system, and only the historical complications are explained by the variety of talent (*telemtum multiplex*) understood as a unit of weight and money at the same time<sup>22</sup>. Budaeus indicates that there was a new and an old talent in the Hebrews, as well as in other nations<sup>23</sup>.

Even more peculiar are his reflections on the continuity of the Greco-Roman-Parisian metrological system, as we find in *De asse*<sup>24</sup> second book. It can be said that the more practical, political aspect of Budaeus's work, is shown. After all he was one of the central figures of French diplomacy in the struggle to capture the emperor's throne for Francis I after the death of Maximilian I of Habsburg.

It may be astonishing that Budaeus in his philological analyses practically does not use the biblical text. Following in his footsteps, Georgius Agricola (1494-1555)<sup>25</sup> made a clear attempt to establish a relationship between Greek and Latin metrological terms, interested in this as a physician (and thus a user of ancient prescriptions) and

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibidem, 630.

<sup>20</sup> Ibidem, 635.

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, 633.

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, 157.

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, 373.

<sup>24</sup> Ibidem, 124-125, see also 515.

<sup>25</sup> Agricola G., *De mensuris et ponderibus*. Paris, 1533.

because of his technical and mineralogical interests. That is why he did not use biblical material. It was undoubtedly noticed by the contemporary Florentine Giovanni Bernardo Gualandi, who, having referred to the French luminary and called his own work a translation<sup>26</sup>, created a largely original work (he even changed the number of books to six), in which arguments are based on texts extensively quoted from the Bible.

Grzepski joined in the already formed discussion, which was certainly well known to him since he referred to Agricola<sup>27</sup>. He took much from his French predecessor, e.g. the practice of seeking references to contemporary economic and cultural realities. He did this, however, with a completely different goal, which was to better understand the text of the Bible. Like Gualandi, though apart from him and in a different way, he wanted to get closer to the biblical text.

The large (almost ¼ volume) initial part of Grzepski's book is called *Epitome ex libris Budaei de Asse potissimum desumpta*<sup>28</sup>. Despite the title, this is not just a summary of the work of the famous Parisian scholar. It starts with a literal quote from the *Breviarium* that is, from the addition to the original version of the text *De asse* (is present only from 1548), which was to put in order some quite tenebrious dilations. The same is true of a combination of ancient sources illustrating the value of individual quotas<sup>29</sup>. Grzepski immediately notes that Budaeus uses his analogies in his economic and cultural environment to explain the situation in antiquity<sup>30</sup>. Therefore, he quickly comes to the conclusion that the weight of the libra and the marka is not the same everywhere, as illustrated by examples that were rather

---

<sup>26</sup> Gualandi G.B., *Trattato delle monete e valuta loro. Ridotte dal costume antico, all'uso moderno*. Di M. Gulielmo Budeo. Fiorenza 1562.

<sup>27</sup> Grsepstius S., *De multiplicu siclo*.... s. 10.

<sup>28</sup> Ibidem, 17-54. A negligent printer used in even pages the headin *Epitome* untill the page 64. In the corresponding odd pages is used the headin *de asse* (until the page 63), and then from page 66 appears in the odd pages *de siclo* corresponding to *et talento* (in the even pages form 65).

<sup>29</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 26-28.

<sup>30</sup> Ibidem 19 and 21.

unknown to the French (the marka of Cracov, Poznan, Wroclaw, Lublin, Lwow, Mazovian, Prussia). Quoted colloquial term for half of groschen „piorunki”<sup>31</sup> or Calisian’s term for „quadrans vernaculo sermone”: *vierrtel*<sup>32</sup>, which betrays German influence. He also tries to bring the situation of the ancient world closer to the Polish audience, as evidenced by, for example, the remark about the synonymy of the Egyptian talent and native cetnar and the equivalent in the Cracow markas<sup>33</sup>. His references to the local context are not limited to folklore elements, as they also refer to the living intellectual life of Polish magnates, as exemplified by the information exchanged by the experts of the ancient numismatics that took place at the court of Jan Krzysztof Tarnowski (1537-1567) the castellan of Wojnice.

The attention of the reader of Grzepski’s work is drawn to frequent references to Egypt, which are absent from the summary work, and references to sources, such as Klaudius Aelianus<sup>34</sup>. The other thing is that the Cracovian luminar cites the twenty-second book of *Varia Historia*, while we know only thirteen<sup>35</sup> or fourteen<sup>36</sup> of them. But he makes no mistake except that he treats the chapters as books. This is the key text from the first book, chapter twenty-two<sup>37</sup>, in which the author who wrote during the third century BC gives the conversion rate of the Babylonian talent to the Attic mina (1:72). Thus he corrects the information given by Budaeus that the rate was 1:70<sup>38</sup>. This is not just a single alteration of the classic author,

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem, 20. Grzepski is talking about a small coin minted in 1479-1492 by the mint administrated by Piotr of Kurozwęki, coat of arms Poraj.

<sup>32</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 44.

<sup>33</sup> Ibidem, 33.

<sup>34</sup> Ibidem, 22.

<sup>35</sup> Aelianus, *De varia historia libri XIII nunc primum et latinitati donate et in lucem editi*. Transl. J. Vulteius Vetranus, Basileae, 1548.

<sup>36</sup> Cl[audius] Aelianus, *Variae historiae libri XIV*. Ed. J. Scheffer, Argentorati, 1647.

<sup>37</sup> Klaudiusz Elian, *Opowieści rozmaite. Listy wieśniaków*. Transl. M. Borowska, Warszawa, 2005, 41.

<sup>38</sup> Budaeus G., op. cit., 287.

but an attempt to make the system coherent, since Grzepski returns to this information at the end of the unit on Greek coins<sup>39</sup>. He also cites a passage from Xenophon's *Cyrus' Anabasis*<sup>40</sup>, in which, at least according to Grzepski, appears in an anecdotal form, the current rate of exchange of the persian gold daric to the talent (300:1)<sup>41</sup>. Budaeus rarely quoted Xenophon<sup>42</sup>, so he does not refer to this passage. Grzepski needs it<sup>43</sup> because it ties in with the information provided by Joseph Flavius<sup>44</sup> about the relation of the shekel to the Attic drachma (1:4). This information appears in Budaeus, who refers, apart from the text of the Jewish-Roman historian, to Ex 30:13<sup>45</sup>.

These examples show in a very concrete way what a careful and critical, but also creative reader was Master Stanislaw. This care has a deeper meaning because it prepares the formulation of the thesis that caused the creation of the work. He wants to explain how to reconcile the Hebrew text of Ex 30:13 and its translation in the Septuagint. In Ex 30:13 there is a statement which in *Biblia Hebraica* contains a count of 1 shekel (lq,f.) = 20 gers (hr'GE) and also speaks about ½ shekel. The Septuagint translates ger respectively as obol (ovbolo,j) and shekl as didrachm (di,dracmon). This gives an equation of 1 shekel = 1 didrachma, or ½ shekel = 1 drachma. This is contrary to the findings of Budaeus, who counts a shekel (*siclo*) as equivalent to a tetradrachma (4 drachmas). Grzepski seeks to answer this question not so much in building a unified picture of the ancient world, as in the analysis of the translation practice of the Septuagint, which used to translate the Hebrew shekel by didrachma contrary to the economic practice

---

<sup>39</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 41.

<sup>40</sup> Ksenofont, *Wyprowa Cyrusa* (I,7). Ed. W. Madyda, Warszawa, 2003, 42.

<sup>41</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 35.

<sup>42</sup> For example Budaeus G., op. cit., 3 and 32.

<sup>43</sup> S. Grsepstius, op. cit., 36.

<sup>44</sup> Joseph Flavius, *Antiquitates III,8,2*,(194-195).

<sup>45</sup> Budaeus G., op. cit., 370.



of antiquity. This thesis, *Deo volente*, Grzepski wants to prove<sup>46</sup> and he returns to it at the beginning of a fully independent argument<sup>47</sup>.

In this part of the book, the Cracovian scholar does not refer to biblical texts, but the subject matter already has a clear reference to the biblical text, and specifically to the relationship between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint, but primarily between biblical text and extra-biblical sources. For Budaeus it was obvious that a critical apparatus based on his erudition and scientific acceptance could create an external reference to the biblical text, with which the biblical text should be interpreted, one of the numerous and not the most authoritative of the sources of human knowledge. This way of thinking is also seen in Lorenzo Valla's work *La falsa Donazione di Costantino*<sup>48</sup>, who "expels the *Donation* on several levels of argumentation" and here the Polish researcher, Halina Manikowska, calculates the historical, psychological, legal and ethical-religious inconceivability, lack of confirmation in historical sources, original and stylistic issues<sup>49</sup>. The goal is for Valla to recreate an external context for the text of the state of affairs, which is guided by a clear political goal. Budaeus directs this line of reasoning to the Bible, which is also based on Valla's achievements in the criticism of *The New Testament text (In Novum Testamentum ex diversorum utriusque linguae codicum collatione adnotationes)*<sup>50</sup> developed and disseminated by the work of Erasmus of Rotterdam<sup>51</sup>, but also by the interpretation emphasizing

<sup>46</sup> Grzepski S., op. cit., 40.

<sup>47</sup> Ibidem, 55.

<sup>48</sup> L. Valla, *O rzekomej, sfalszowanej donacji Konstantyna* (=Biblioteka Renesansowa. T 4). Ed. H. Manikowska, transl. K. Kokoszkiewicz, Warszawa, 2015.

<sup>49</sup> H. Manikowska, *Przedmowa*. In: *O rzekomej, sfalszowanej donacji Konstantyna...* 9-43, particularly 33.

<sup>50</sup> This work was unknown to the general public, see Bently J.H., *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance*. Princeton, 1983, 34-35. Erasmus of Rotterdam discovered and used the Valla's manuscripts for his own publication, see d'Onofrio G., *Epoka odrodzenia* (=Historia teologii. T. 3). Kraków, 2008, 369.

<sup>51</sup> Critical edition of New Testament edited by Erasmus of Rotterdam (*Novum Instrumentum*) was published in 1516.

the experiential and volitional element<sup>52</sup>. The biblical text remains a field of philological and ideological dispute, and religion is a matter of its own, drawing inspiration from the wide spectrum of cultural texts in which the Bible does not occupy a privileged place.

The final part of the *epitome* is an alphabetical list of the units of measure, weights, and volume<sup>53</sup> that Budaeus does not have. Moreover, some units are missing, such as *achane* or *acetabulum*. Otherwise, it is with the quasi-measure *brochus*, which Grzepski defines referring to the formulas of Budaeus<sup>54</sup>. Similarly from *cadus seu amphora Attica*<sup>55</sup>, *cotula*<sup>56</sup> or *choenix*<sup>57</sup>. This is an illustration of Grzepski's systematic approach, which was also evident in the attention paid to similar additives in later editions of Budaeus's work. On this, however, the plan of the Mazovian luminary does not end. He clearly signals that he wants to broaden the scope of research conducted by his older and famous predecessor to the *barbaricum* area, both historical and modern, as an equal and hermeneutically fertile area. The polemic with Budaeus is led by Grzepski in a very balanced way: respect for the achievements of his predecessors (because Agricola is also included), but without a complex.

The first book in which Grzepski does not refer to Budaeus as the reference material is entitled *De siclo et talento hebraico*<sup>58</sup>, which is identical with the main issue of the treaty. It begins with a philological remark: *Dicitur autem siclus a verbo schacal*<sup>59</sup>. This way he returns to the exegesis, in which the guiding line is defined by the expression *fd<Qoh; lq,f, (Ex 30:13; 38:26 [LXX 39:2])*. It is important, however, that the extensive Greek passage of Ex 38:25-26 (LXX 39:2-3) is absent

---

<sup>52</sup> J.H. Bently, *Humanists and Holy Writ...*, 62-66.

<sup>53</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 45-54.

<sup>54</sup> Budaeus G., op. cit., 485.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibidem*, 454.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibidem*, 447.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibidem*, 455.

<sup>58</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 55-102.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibidem*, 55.

in Hieronim's version, as referred to by e.g. *Polyglota Complutensis*<sup>60</sup>. This may be the reason for the absence of this passage in Budaeus's proof. Grzepski therefore quotes this text in its entirety and provides his own translation (different from the Latin version of the interlinear translation of *Polyglota*)<sup>61</sup>. This passage is of great importance to him, as he introduces one more relationship between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint. While the first in Ex 38:26 mentions a beka ([q;B]), and the corresponding Septuagint (Ex 39:3) speaks of drachma (dracmh.) and determines the relation between beka/ drachma and siclo / shekl as 2:1. The philological identification between the larger Greek and Hebrew unit opens the way to the drachma in the biblical metrology system. Since the drachma is half a shekel, then the didrachma is the whole shekel, therefore indicating that Ex gives the double rate of the shekel to the drachma: presented by Budaeus on the basis of 30.13 1:4 rate and deduced from 36.26 (LXX 39:3) rate of 1:2.

In Grzepski's research is shown another 1:1<sup>62</sup> ratio of the shekel to the drachma. He deduces it from 1 Macc 10:25-45, which quotes the letter of Demetrius I Soter to the Judaeans, formed in 152 BC. He compares the data in 1 Macc 10:40.42, where the respective amounts of 15000 and 5000 shekels are mentioned, with Joseph Flavius's *Antiquitates*, who as a unit gives drachma without changing the amounts<sup>63</sup>. This is another complication in the image of biblical realities. For us, however, it is important, first and foremost, that in the selection of arguments he reaches the texts that were questioned by the reform movements. He treats this deuterocanonical book as a historical source, compiles it with historical texts, but also applies both 1 Macc and *Antiquitates* to the respective cultural and historical contexts. He differentiates the description *hebraico more* from the way

---

<sup>60</sup> Vetus Testamentum multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum. Et imprimis Pentateuchus Hebraico Greco atque Chaldaico idioma. Adiuncta uniuersae sua Latina interpretation. T. 1, [Alcalá de Henares], [1514], *sub loco* [278].

<sup>61</sup> Grzepski S., op. cit., 56.

<sup>62</sup> Ibidem, 61.

<sup>63</sup> Joseph Flavius, *Antiquitates XIII,2,3(55)*.

it was presented from Demetrius's point of view, a representative of the culture that we would call Hellenistic today but according to the Grzepski words could be named as the Greek one. He explains this situation by referring to the Jewish exegetes (*Rabini testantur*), as the difference between the Hebrew and Greek public shekel<sup>64</sup>, and thus as an objective difference, arising from the multiplicity and specificity of institutions of economic life and culture. We also find similar arguments in relation to 1 Kings (Grzepski 3 Kings) 10:17 and *Antiquitates* VIII, 7,2 (180), although it seems that the text of Joseph Flavius's work, which Grzepski possessed, was incorrect<sup>65</sup>.

Noticing an inconsistency in itself is not an achievement, only its interpretation or explanation can be that. The attitude to the contradictions contained in the text defines the attitude towards the text. Finding the coherence of the text at the price of critically adapting it to the researcher's cohesion rules is a fundamental direction that is linked to historical criticism from its Renaissance origins. It is the weapon that rationalism has opposed to the concordatory approach of understanding the text with those rules of cohesion that come from the historical tradition of the understanding of the text. That is why Grzepski's next step will tell us a lot about his attitude as an interpreter of the biblical text. As we have said, to the Jewish commentators, or to Nicholas of Lira, who introduces him to the circle of Judaic interpretation, and who was above all the way to know the interpretation of Rashi. When he speaks of Rabbi Solomon's opinion and provides it with the *inquit Lyranus*<sup>66</sup>, it indicates what his sources are. They are not surprised, because the Franciscan author of Jewish descent was highly esteemed at the University of Crakow<sup>67</sup>. However, the luminaries of humanism did not value him,

<sup>64</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 62.

<sup>65</sup> Ibidem, 88.

<sup>66</sup> Ibidem, 57-58.

<sup>67</sup> S. Wielgus, *Badania nad Biblią w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, Lublin, 1990, 124-127; S. Wielgus, *Zachodnia i polska nauka średniowieczna – encyklopedycznie*, Płock, 2005, 209.

he even belonged to those to which they referred to with particularly aggressive criticism. Grzepski refers to him and takes very seriously the opinion of Raszi without concealing his direct source. Let us add that Grzepski also spoke about the Byzantine medieval erudite, Joannes Tzetzes (XII c.)<sup>68</sup>.

The thesis of the double mina, sanctuary (*mina sanctuarii*) and colloquial (*mina vulgaris*), of minor value<sup>69</sup>, has become an important reference point for him. A similar distinction between units – but without reference to the continuity of knowledge and medieval authors – was also introduced by Budaeus. We also saw that he did not go beyond the assertion of the diversity of the understanding of the shekel in ancient texts. The Polish researcher showed that he made a distinction based on clearly defined criteria. He distinguishes between Greek, Egyptian and Hebrew units and, within national systems, different types of units. He does so in such a way that his inquiries can be transferred to realities known to the reader. Let us give an example of this reasoning. The Hebrew temple talent is estimated at 232 Polish gold marca (*marcas aurificum nostrorum*), currently in use, or 10 shekels, and the temple shekel is equivalent to 16 Polish half-groschen (*semigrossorum nostrorum*). At the same time, the Attic units are defined on the basis of the Hungarian currency: the mina or attic talent, according to his estimates, is equivalent to 1080 Hungarian *aureus*<sup>70</sup>.

The quoted material shows what goals Grzepski set himself and what measures he would use to achieve that goal. His intention was to introduce the reader to the peculiarities of the biblical world. By contrasting with the complex realities of the present, he showed that the past is not, in spite of the often assumed renaissance vision, a unified and perfect world, but the key to understanding it is the sensitivity to the context of the witness we examine. This hermeneutic approach to reality was unknown to most of Grzepski's contemporaries, but it

<sup>68</sup> Grsepstius S., op. cit., 83.

<sup>69</sup> Ibidem, 58.

<sup>70</sup> Ibidem, 60.

turned out to be very fruitful, as it led to the findings of the scientific world.

The progress of knowledge was considered only possible when the continuity of the scientific tradition was preserved. He did not recognize the caesura that would insist on starting the building new knowledge from a zero point. It questions the cultural reset that most scholars of the sixteenth century ordered with contempt for the earlier knowledge, as *the fruit of the poisoned tree*. But he was also not a defender of old science, closed to a new era. His reasoning was based on the heritage of tradition, but to develop it he used the latest philological tools and the current methodological tools. Historical critique in his execution is no less rigorous than in Valli or Budaeus, but is based on a positive approach to sources as the medium of information. He describes himself as an explorer in the world of the texts examined, not above him. Therefore he avoids the fever of correcting the texts that characterizes the Renaissance scholars. That is why he probably did not get involved in such a fashionable and highly publicized „critique” or criticism of the text. His attitude to this field of knowledge is well illustrated by the analysis he makes in relation to Judges 17:4<sup>71</sup>. He notes a more comprehensive version of this text, as given by *Polyglota Complutensis*<sup>72</sup>. This is a text extended compared to the *Hebrew Bible* and the *Vulgate*. Grzepski quotes the difference, but by noting it, does not insist on the necessity of emendation.

He set himself the goal of making the biblical text more understandable to the reader, closer to him, and more vocal. Grzepski's intention was primarily directed at the reading of the biblical text. He did not amplify the confusion of the reformist discussions with his findings, because he was clearly disgusted with his contacts with various centers of religious thought. He explained the intricacies of the biblical text and did not use it to propagate his own ideas of reform. He has not become a swordsman of Counter-Reformation,

<sup>71</sup> Ibidem, 86.

<sup>72</sup> *Polyglota Complutensis*.... T. 2, *sub loco* [98].

despite close contacts with its greatest followers in Poland: Hozjusz and Kromer. He understood Rationalism in theology as an impartial search for reason with the forces of the human mind. However, the managed to avoid the temptation to place his research above the revealed text.

### Summary

Stanisław Grzepski (1524-1570) an outstanding classic and biblical philologist, the first Greek permanent lecturer of this language at the Krakow Academy. He combined philological interests with the passion of numismatist-collector and researcher of biblical antiquities. The fruit of his erudite knowledge in this area was published in the printing house of Krzysztof Plantin in Antwerp in 1568, the work of *De multiplici siclo et talento hebraico*. The Cracow scholar in the subtitle referred to Guillaume's Budé earlier work *De asse et partibus eius*. Despite the fact that Grzepski presents himself to the reader as the author of a summary of the extensive work of a French scholar and diplomat, he created a work independent and in many places polemic with the findings of the famous predecessor. The article shows the character and significance of the work of Stanisław Grzepski, which has become a part of European science for over 200 years as a textbook of numismatics and biblical archeology.

**Keywords:** Stanisław Grzepski, Guillaume Budé, Academy of Kraków, biblical, metrology, numismatic, biblical archeology, Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, humanism

### **„Sarmata w językach ćwiczony”. Stanisław Grzepski (1524-1570) jako badacz Biblii Hebrajskiej i Septuaginty jako badacz Biblii Hebrajskiej i Septuaginty Streszczenie**

Stanisław Grzepski (1524-1570) wybitnym grezystą i pierwszym stałym wykładowcą tego języka w Akademii Krakowskiej. Łączył on zainteresowania filologiczne z pasją numizmatyka-kolekcjonera oraz badacza starożytności biblijnych. Owocem jego erudycyjnej wiedzy w tym zakresie było wydane w drukarni Krzysztofa Plantina w Antwerpii w 1568 r. dzieło *De multiplici siclo et talento*

*hebraico*. Krakowski uczoney w podtytule powołał się na wcześniejszą pracę Guillaume'a Budé *De asse et partibus eius*. Pomimo tego, że Grzepski przedstawia się czytelnikowi jako autor streszczenia obszernej pracy francuskiego uczonego i dyplomaty, stworzył dzieło samodzielne i w wielu miejscach polemiczne względem ustaleń sławnego poprzednika. Artykuł ukazuje charakter i znaczenie dzieła Stanisława Grzepskiego, które zadomowiło się w nauce europejskiej na ponad 200 lat jako podręcznik numizmatyki i archeologii biblijnej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Stanisław Grzepski, Guillaume Budé, Akademia Krakowska, metrologia biblijna, numizmatyka, archeologia biblijna, Septuaginta, Biblia Hebrajska, humanizm

### Literature

- Agricola G., *De mensuris et ponderibus*, Parisiis 1533.
- Aelianus, *De varia historia libri XIII nunc primum et latinitati donate et in lucem editi*, przekł. J. Vulteius Vetranus, Basileae 1548.
- Aelianus Cl[audius], *Variae historiae libri XIV*, wyd. J. Scheffer, Argentorati 1647.
- Bajerowa I., „Początki polskiego dyskursu naukowego - język dzieł Marcina Bielskiego i Stanisława Grzepskiego”. *Onomastica Slavogermanica*. 27(2008), 73-79.
- Barycz H., *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego w epoce humanizmu*, Kraków 1935.
- Barycz H., „Stanisław Grzepski – człowiek i dzieło”. w: tenże, *Z epoki renesansu, reformacji i baroku. Prądy – idee – ludzie – książki*, Warszawa 1971, s. 530-587.
- Barycz H., „Grzepski Stanisław”. *PSB* t. 9, s. 99-102.
- Bently J.H., *Humanists and Holy Writ. New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance*, Princeton 1983.
- Biniwicz J., „Kiedy poczniez groblą sypać dwułoktową...? czyli o mierzeniu w pierwszych polskich traktatach mierniczych (*Geometria* Stanisława Grzepskiego i *O sprawie, sypaniu, wymierzaniu i rybieniu stawów* Olbrychta Strumieńskiego). W: *Kultura: pamięć i zapomnienie. Księga poświęcona pamięci Profesora Piotra Kowalskiego*. Jastrzębski B., Konarska K., Lewicki A. (red.), Wrocław 2012, s. 393-407.
- Bojko J., „Niepozorne źródło Geomatyki : pięć wydań w ciągu 450 lat”. *Przegląd Geodezyjny: czasopismo poświęcone miernictwu i zagadnieniom z nim związanym*. 89 (2017), nr 4, 40-42.
- Brożek J., *Wybór pism*, opr. H. Barycz, t. 1-2, Warszawa 1956.



- Budaei Gulielmi, *De asse et partibus eius libri quinque*, Coloniae 1528.
- Chodynicki I., *Dykcyonarz uczonych Polaków: zawierający krótkie rysy ich życia, szczególne wiadomości o ich pismach, i krytyczny rozbiór ważniejszych dzieł niektórych. Porządkiem alfabetycznym ułożony*. T. 1, Lwów i in. 1833, s. 187-189.
- Czerniatowicz J., *Z dziejów grezystyki w Polsce w okresie Odrodzenia* (MDNT 28), Wrocław i in. 1965.
- Czerniatowicz J., *Książka grecka średniowieczna i renesansowa*, Wrocław 1976.
- Czerniatowicz J., Mazur C., *Recepcja Antyku chrześcijańskiego w Polsce. Materiały bibliograficzne, 1, XV-XVIII w., cz. 1, Autorzy i teksty*, Lublin 1978.
- Dymek B., „Stanisław Grzepski z Poborza – wybitny uczonek epoki Renesansu”. *Rocznik Mazowiecki* 22(2010), s. 115-129.
- d’Onorfio G., *Historia teologii*, t. 3, *Epoka odrodzenia*, Kraków 2008.
- Fijałek J., „Przekłady pism św. Grzegorza z Nazyanzu w Polsce. Studium o patrystyce naszej”. *Polonia Sacra* 3(1919), s. 126-207.
- Gaj B.M., „Greek culture and language in the history of Central and Eastern Europe (Germany, Poland, Silesia). Woman in Greek poetry written by Silesians in the 17<sup>th</sup> century”. *Religious and Sacred Poetry An International Quarterly of Religion, Culture and Education* 1(2013), nr 2, s. 57-66.
- Głombiowska Z., *Commentarius. Komentarz*, Gdańsk 2013 (=J. Kochanowski, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska*, cz. 3).
- Grabowski A., *Starożytności historyczne polskie czyli pisma i pamiątki do dziejów dawnej Polski*, t. 1, Kraków 1840, 457-467.
- Grsepstius S., *Duo poemata Gregorii Nazianzeni Theologi, alterum de virtute hominis; alterum de vitae itineribus et vanitatae rerum huius seculi, Scholis explicata*, Kraków 1565.
- Grsepstius S., *Geometria, to jest miernicka nauka, po polsku krótko napisana z greckich i łacińskich ksiąg*, Kraków 1566.
- Grsepstius S., *De multiplici siclo et talento Hebraico. Item, De mensuris Hebraicis, tam aridorum quam liquidorum*, Antverpiae 1568 (reprint London 2015).
- [Grsepstius S.], *Opusculorum quae ad historiam ac philologiam sacram spectant*, red. T.T. Cursius, t. 2, Rotterdami 1693, s. 304-458.
- Grsepstius S., *Thesaurus Antiquitatum Sacrorum*, red. B. Ugolino, t. 28, Venetiis 1765, kol. DLXXXV-DCXC.
- Gualandi G.B., *Trattato delle monete e valuta loro. Ridotte dal costume antico, all’uso modern. Di M. Gulielmo Budeo*, Fiorenza 1562.
- Hajdukiewicz L., „Biblioteka Stanisława Grzepskiego”. *Przegląd Geodezyjny* 1967, nr 5, dodatek, s. 16-23.

- Hajdukiewicz L., *Historia nauki polskiej*, red. B. Suchodolski, t. 6, *Indeks biograficzny t. 1-2 Historii nauki polskiej*, b.m. [Wrocław], b.r. [1974].
- Hirsch J.Ch., *Bibliotheca numismatica exhibens cathalogum auctorum qui de re monetaria et numis tam antiquis quam recentioribus scripsere collecta et indice rerum instructa*, Norinbergae 1760.
- Juszkiewicz R., „Stanisław Grzępski i jemu współcześni na Mazowszu”. w: *Ziemia Zawkrzeńska* t. 14, red. R. Juszkiewicz, Mława 2010, s. 24-42.
- Kelley D.R., *Oblicza historii. Badanie przeszłości od Herodota do Herdera*, Warszawa 2010.
- Klaudiusz Elian, *Opowieści rozmaite. Listy wieśniaków*, przekł. M. Borowska, Warszawa 2005.
- Kochanowski J., „Epitaphium Illustrissimi Grepsii”. w: tenże, *Carmina Latina. Poezja łacińska*, cz. 1, Imago phototypica-transcriptio. Fototypia-transkrypcja, Gdańsk 2008, s. s. 702-703.
- Kośka T.W., *Od Grzępskiego do... ? : 450-lecie wydania pierwszej w języku polskim książki technicznej „Geometria to jest miernicka nauka”*.. Łódź 2017.
- Kravtsov S.R., „Juan Bautista Villalpando and Sacred Architecture in Seventeenth Century”. *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 64(2005), nr 3, s. 312-339.
- Krowicki S.L., „Stanisław Grzępski – uczonec niezwykły”. *PHOśw* 54(2011), nr 1-2(211-212), s. 135-140.
- Ksenofont, *Wyprawa Cyrusa* (1,7), opr. W. Madyda, Warszawa 2003.
- Kucharzewski F. *Nasza najdawniejsza książka o miernictwie*. Warszawa 1926 (I wyd. Warszawa 1895).
- Manikowska H., „Przedmowa”. w: *O rzekomej, sfalszowanej donacji Konstatntyna* (Biblioteka Renesansowa 4), opr. H. Manikowska, tłum. K. Kokoszkiewicz, Warszawa 2015, s. 9-43.
- Marylski E., *Wspomnienia zgonu zasłużonych w narodzie Polaków*. T. 1, Warszawa 1829, s. 257-258.
- McNeil D.O., *Guillaume Budé and Humanism in the Reign of Francis I*, Genève 1975.
- Merczyng H., *Szymon Budny jako krytyk tekstów biblijnych*, Kraków 1913.
- Mielczarek M., „Macieja z Miechowa wiedza o pieniądzu antycznym”. *Notae Numismaticae* 3-4(1999), 243-250.
- Morawski K., *Historia Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*, t. 2. Średnie wieki i odrodzenie, Kraków 1900.
- Nowak T.M., *Cztery wieki polskiej książki technicznej 1450-1850*, Warszawa 1961.
- Orłowski B., *Historia techniki polskiej*, Radom 2006.
- Orłowski B., *Polska przygoda z techniką*, Warszawa 2009.

- Pawlak W., „*Barbara quae fuerant regna latina fiunt*. Polsko-niemieckie związki kulturalne XVI-XVIII wieku w perspektywie neolatynistyki”. w: *Wśród krajów Północy. Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej wobec narodów germańskich, słowiańskich i naddunajskich: mapa spotkań, przestrzenie dialogu*, t. 1 (Kultura Pierwszej Rzeczypospolitej w dialogu z Europą. Hermeneutyka wartości 1), red. M. Hanusiewicz-Lavallee, Warszawa 2015, s. 320-364.
- Pazyra S., *Najstarszy opis Mazowsza Jędrzeja Święcickiego*, przekład i opracowanie H. Pazyrzyna, Warszawa 1974.
- Plezia M., *Z dziejów filologii klasycznej w Polsce*, Warszawa 1993.
- Portii Leonardus de, *De sestertio, talentis, pecuniis, ponderibus, mensuris, stipendis militaribus*, Roma 1524..
- Prado H., Villalpandus J.B., *In Ezechielem explanations et apparatus Urbis ac Templi Hierosolymitani*, t. 3, *Apparatus Urbis ac Templi Hierosolymitani*, Romae 1604.
- Smereka W., „Bibliistyka polska (wiek XVI-XVIII)”. w: *Dzieje teologii katolickiej w Polsce*, red. M. Rechowicz, t. 2, *Od odrodzenia do oświecenia*, cz. 1, *Teologia humanistyczna*, Lublin 1975, s. 221-266.
- Starovolscius S., *Scriptorum Polonicorum 'EKATONTAS seu centum illustrium Poloniae scriptorum elogia et vitae*, Fr[an]coforti 1625.
- Swiecicki A., *Topographia sive Masoviae descriptio*, Varsaviae 1634.
- Valla L., *O rzekomej, sfalszowanej donacji Konstatntyna* (Biblioteka Renesansowa 4), opr. H. Manikowska, tłum. K. Kokoszkiewicz, Warszawa 2015.
- Vetus Testamentum multiplici lingua nunc primo impressum. Et imprimis Pentateuchus Hebraico Greco atque Chaldaico idiomata. Adiuncta uniuersae sua Latina interpretatione*, t. 1, b.m. [Alcalá de Henares], b.r. [1514].
- Więśław W., „Stanisław Grzepski i jego geometria”. *Matematyka* 1996, nr 5, 263-265.
- Wielgus S., *Badania nad Biblią w starożytności i w średniowieczu*, Lublin 1990.
- Wielgus S., *Zachodnia i polska nauka średniowieczna – encyklopedycznie*, Płock 2005.
- Wójcik W. „Filozofia matematyki Józefa Marii Hoene-Wrońskiego”. *Studia z Filozofii Polskiej* 7(2012), s. 45-69, sp. 49.
- Wyczawski H.E., „Grzepski (Grepscius) Stanisław h. Świnka”. w: *Słownik Polskich Teologów Katolickich*, red. H.E. Wyczawski, t. 1, Warszawa 1981, s. 606-607.
- Thülem[emarius] H.G., *De variis siclis et talentis Hebraeorum ut & de eorundem, rerum tam aridarum quam liquidorum libri II. Quibus praemittitur Epitome de ponderibus et mensuris maximam partem ex Guilielmi Budei de asse libris excerpta*, Erfurti 1676.