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Abstract

The present paper aims to contribute to researches on old Romanian translations, examined from the perspective of translation studies. In this respect, the pursued objective is to set up a typology of inserts and omissions found in the Romanian translation of the catechism printed in 1648, taking into account the main causes which generated them. Thus, applying the methods and tools characteristic for comparative analysis, we shall present the contexts in which the Romanian translation deviates from one of its sources or from both of them, focusing on the reasons which could have determined the translator’s options to insert or, on the contrary, to omit certain linguistic units. In the text chosen for analysis, the status of inserts and omissions varies from case to case, but, taken all together, they may be grouped into two main classes reflecting two different levels of translation achievement: the level of creation and the level of imitation respectively.

1. Introduction. The sources and the translation theory of the Catechism of 1648

The Calvinist Catechism of Fogarasi István, printed in Alba Iulia in 1648, occupies quite a small place in literature. Although, due to its small size and rather restricted destination, it unquestionably has somewhat less significance, at least compared to the other contemporary works, this very catechism is, nonetheless, of interest in several respects. Beyond the fact that it is closely related to the other Calvinist Romanian texts of the 17th century and, thus, it bears cultural relevance, a however superficial analysis of the catechism’s language reveals us an extremely rich linguistic material—on phonetic, morphological and lexical levels. This issue, however, has been poorly researched until present day, even though such an endeavour could contribute to the configuration of the 17th century old Romanian language, or at any rate, of the dialects spoken in the South-western Transylvanian region which the catechism belongs to.
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1First it comes to the attention of researchers through certain fragments excerpted from the Creed, published by Hasdeu (1879, p. 725–727) and by Gaster (1891, p. 124), a few passages of the catechism being also found in Nădejde (1886, p. 161, 379, 380). Subsequently, the catechism is enlisted in bibliographies of old Romanian texts (BRV I, under 53, p. 160–164), in Romanian-Hungarian bibliographies (BRI, under 167, p. 81) and in bibliographies of old Hungarian texts (RMK I, under 803; RMK II, under 683; Veress, 1910, p. 159; see also RMNY III, under 2212). Beside these inventories, the catechism of Fogarasi is mentioned briefly in volumes dedicated to Romanian language history, to the history of Romanian literature and/or religion, such as: Philippide (1888, p. 51, 75); Sbiera (1897, p. 106); Marienescu (1902, p. 115); Iorga (1904, p. 144–145; 1928, p. 302), etc. Nevertheless, its linguistic valorisation remains still awaited. Real progresses, in this regard, are not made until 1942 when the first and, as far as we know, the only edition of this catechism appears, published by Tamás Lajos. After this edition, the catechism printed in 1648 seems, once again, to be abandoned, except for certain references made in histories of Romanian language and/or literature. Among these we shall mention, for instance, the useful linguistic observations made in Gheție (1975, p. 305–309).

2According to the Preface (p. 5), the catechism’s intended readers are to be found “in these two places, mainly in Lugoj and Caransebeș, [the translation being meant] for the schools of Christian religion, for strengthening the faith of the young students from there” (our translation, cf. Tamás, 1942, p. 44, Rom. version in BRV I, p. 163).

3For instance, the text was printed with Latin letters and Hungarian spelling, which is not completely novel, but “the unitary expression of a literary and religious [i.e. Calvinist] movement” (Pantaleoni, 2007, p. 55) developed in the regions of Banat-Hunedoara between the 16th and 17th centuries.
But beyond its dialectological resourcefulness and potentiality, the catechism printed in 1648 is also remarkable for its richness in material for translation studies. As a matter of fact, a great part of the linguistic peculiarities which characterize this text derive, directly or indirectly, precisely from the fact that it is a translation. Moreover, beside the general issues encountered in case of any translation, this text bears certain specific problems due to the fact that it is the product resulted from the direct translation of a bilingual source-text. We do not intend to insist on the differences between translations based on two or more sources and translations carried out by rendering only one source-text (see also Arvinte & Gafton, 2007, p. 27). We shall remark, however, that, in a case like Fogarasi’s translation, not only the polyvalence of the undertaken endeavour (i.e. the translation act itself, both on the level of the source-text’s comprehension/interpretation and on the level of the target-text’s production) increases, but also the complexity of the end product (i.e. the translated text).

The source-text of Fogarasi’s translation is a Latin-Hungarian version of the Heidelberg catechism. This bilingual version, entitled Catechismus Religionis Christianae, had several editions, like the 1636, 1639, 1643, 1647 editions and other subsequent editions. Fogarasi’s translation is most probably based on the 1643 or on the 1647 edition, less possibly on the 1639 edition (see also 1643, 1647 editions and other subsequent editions. Fogarasi’s translation is most probably based on the 1643 or on the 1647 edition, less possibly on the 1639 edition (see also Tamás, 1942, p. 11, 129). As a matter of fact, the 1639, 1643 and 1647 editions—the latter one being an accurate reprint of the previous editions (cf. RMNY III, under 2167, RMK II, under 672, RMK I, under 790)—are almost identical, which makes the unequivocal identification of the source-edition used by Fogarasi quite difficult4. There are two important evidences which sustain the fact that the Romanian translation was made based on the Latin-Hungarian source-text: a formal evidence regarding text composition, since both the Romanian and the Latin-Hungarian versions contain 77 questions and answers; and a stylistic evidence consisting of numerous Hungarian loanwords, including bookish ones, directly borrowed from the source-text, and of a series of linguistic calques by means of which Fogarasi renders the Hungarian source.

As might be expected, the Romanian text does not reproduce exactly and integrally either the Latin or the Hungarian versions. The ways in which the two sources may be employed and combined are much more manifold. Thus, the Romanian translation has sections which are undeniably attributable to either the Hungarian or to the Latin version, but it also has passages which show a compilation of the two models or a release from both of them, the portion in question being constructed independently of the sources, bearing the personal contribution of the translator who, at times, exceeds the very duties of a translator,

---

4 Certain differences may be found regarding the numbering of Bible quotes. For instance, under 12/8, Fogarasi makes reference to Gen. 2. v. 1, whereas the 1639 and 1643 Latin-Hungarian editions make reference to Gen. 2. 17. Similarly, under 12/18, Fogarasi mentions Matt. 6, while the 1639 and 1643 editions recall Matt. 6. 12. In a similar way, under 28/16, the Romanian text records only Act. 2., whereas the 1639 and 1643 register Act. 2. 39. Another example is encountered under 16/3, where the quote is said to be from Act. 4. v. 13, unlike the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian editions in which the quote is apparently from Act. 4. 12. Similar to this is the numbering under 18/20, where the reference is made to Luc. 23. v. 13, while the Latin and Hungarian texts from the 1639 and 1643 editions point to Luc. 23. v. 13. 14. Another difference may be found under 29/12, where Fogarasi notes Matt. 20. v. 26. 27. 1. Cor. 10. v. 16, whereas the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian versions record Matth. 26. v. 26. 27. 1. Cor. 10. 16. Another divergence may be found under 16/19, where the passage brought to the readers’ attention is Rom. 8, while the Latin version in the 1643 edition notes Rom. 8. 34 and the Hungarian one records Rom. 8. 14. Similarly, under 22/18, Fogarasi mentions Matt. 16. v. 19, unlike the 1643 Latin and Hungarian versions which mention Matth. 16. 18. In a similar way, under 39/7, Fogarasi records Prov. 30. v. 9, while the 1639 and 1647 editions register Prov. 30. v. 8. 9. (Latin version) and Prov. 30. 8. 9. (Hungarian version). Likewise, under 39/15, the Romanian text quotes Ephes. 4. v. 24, whereas the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian editions cite Eph. 4. 25. Similarly, under 43/16, Fogarasi quotes Psal. 143, unlike the 1639 and 1643 Latin-Hungarian editions which make reference to Psal. 143. 10. Another difference is found under 45/4, where the Romanian text notes Psal. 143, while the 1639 and 1643 editions record Psal. 143. 10 (Latin version) and Psalm. 143. 10 (Hungarian version). In such cases, however, it is quite difficult to draw unequivocal conclusions, since some of these differences might have been fairly due to the translators’ inattention or possibly to misprints, especially taking into account that the quotes do not make reference to completely different passages and that the small differences which may be observed regard only the numbering of the cited verses. In some cases, the numbers themselves are easily mistakable; in other cases the more concise reference in the Romanian text may also be due to the translator’s deliberate option to omit certain numbers, possibly pursuing text economy. Therefore, we believe that these differences alone can not be regarded as irrefutable evidence to indicate the use of the 1647 edition as source-edition.
in the strict sense of the word.

Despite all the possible solutions potentially offered by the existence of the two sources, taken as a whole, the Romanian text is rendered by the unequal contribution of the two source-texts, the Hungarian model being much more present in the final product of the translation than the Latin one. The fact that Fogarasi employs mainly the Hungarian source may be sustained by several “translation marks”\(^5\), in other words by a series of signs which unquestionably indicate the use of the Hungarian model, since these elements of the Romanian text do not have correspondents in the Latin source, but they render exactly what appears in the Hungarian version. Such translation marks are: the bookish loanwords directly borrowed from the Hungarian source and the loan translations which appear as an immediate reply to the source-text, certain morpho-syntactic patterns which follow the Hungarian model, certain proper names and biblical quotes, as well as the inserts and omissions, the latter ones representing our main concern in what follows.

2. The status of inserts and omissions in Fogarasi’s translation

Following step by step the Romanian translation and the Hungarian version, on the one hand, and the Latin source, on the other hand, we encounter several situations in which Fogarasi inserts into his text or omits from it words, phrases or smaller passages as opposed to one of the source-texts or to both of them. Naturally, the function of these inserts and omissions varies from case to case. Thus, the inserts and omissions executed independently of the source-versions, for instance, may reflect that the Romanian translator assumes, in certain cases, roles which go beyond the translation act, becoming closer to an act of creation. Unlike these, the inserts and omissions carried out by Fogarasi and which are found in one of the source-texts too, but missing from the other one, may function as translation marks. Basically, the difference between these two categories of inserts and omissions refers, in the first case, to a momentary assumption of certain liberties, despite the formal and content restraints imposed by the sources and, in the second case, to the servility towards one of the models.

2.1. Inserts and omissions rendered independently of the sources

On the whole, Fogarasi’s text may be placed somewhere between imitation and creation. On the microstructural level, however, both the former and the latter one may be found and distinguished quite obviously. The cases in which the Romanian translation belongs to the paradigm of creation may be illustrated, among other things, by the inserts and omissions executed independently of both the Hungarian and the Latin source-texts.

2.1.1. Inserts placed independently of the sources

In Fogarasi’s translation, inserts are usually meant to provide clarifications regarding certain meanings encountered in the source-text, some of them being found in the context of certain loanwords of Hungarian origin. This is the case of the underlined (lexical) insert in: “semeliuri sau obraze\(^6\)” (14/12–13\(^6\)), cf. Hung. személyek, cf. Lat. persona. Here the Hungarian loanword of bookish origin semeliuri ‘persons’, borrowed directly from the Hungarian source (cf. Hung. személyek ‘id.’), was probably regarded as being less familiar to the target audience of the catechism, which is why the translator introduces a clarifying passage. In a similar way, the underlined term in: “bătăi sau bintetluială” (12/2), cf. Hung. büntetések, cf. Lat. pœnis, functions as an insert with explicative purposes, but, this time, precisely the Hungarian loanword is the

\(^5\)For the (linguistic) indicators which function as “translation marks”, with a case study on Pului [The Old Testament from Orăştie] see Arvinte & Gafton (2007, p. 52–188).

\(^6\)After each passage quoted here, we indicate in brackets the number of the page and row in which it appears in the catechism. In the edition of Tamás (1942), the pages are not segmented into rows. Thus, the numbering of the rows belongs to us.
one which is meant to clarify the meaning of the Rom. *bătaie* ‘(divine) punishment’, possibly calqued on Hungarian *büntetés* ‘punishment’. Another loan translation of a Hungarian word is explained in the underlined insert in: “a ne ţine sau ne ispăşi” (16/5–6), cf. Hung. *megtartatnunk*, cf. Lat. *servavi*. Here the term of Slavic origin, introduced by Fogarasi, seems to be used as a clarifier to the meaning with which the Romanian verb *a (se) ţine* ‘to be redeemed’ is loaded, as a result of calquing on Hung. *megtart* ‘to keep, to redeem’.

The insertion of a word or phrase into the Romanian translation reflects, on the one hand, the need for providing clarifications, explanations for the meaning of the terms employed by the translator, hence, being probably imposed by certain linguistic reasons, like in the examples given above. On the other hand, however, there are certain cases in which the insertion of additional terms, especially into the contexts in which they appear alongside their synonyms, is not motivated by purely linguistic reasons, since the words which these inserts accompany were perfectly functional and frequently used in the epoch and, therefore, they did not impose the addition of clarifying passages. Such situations are to be found in: “chemi au numești” (17/5), cf. Hung. *nevezed*, cf. Lat. *appellas*; “vestiți sau pomeniți” (30/4–5), cf. Hung. *birdessétek*, cf. Lat. *annuntiate*; “certare sau vraoa a Bisericii Sfinte” (30/24), cf. Hung. *fennyíték*, cf. Lat. *disciplina*; “să nu supere, sau nu dosădescă” (39/3–4), cf. Hung. *meg ne nyomorísa*, cf. Lat. *opprimat*; “Înălța sau Mâria a lui Dumnedzeu din cer” (41/22–23), cf. Hung. *Istennék mennyei felégé*, cf. Lat. *celesti majestate Dei*; “fericăciune sau lauda” (45/23), cf. Hung. *dicsőség*, cf. Lat. *gloria*; “bintetulială de o vreme sau trupească” (12/3) (12/2–5), cf. Hung. *ideig való büntetésekre*, cf. Lat. *temporalibus poenis*. In these cases, it is not excluded that the underlined inserts could (also) reflect the translator’s attempts to nuance the utterance, the alternation of different equivalent lexemes pursuing stylistic purposes too.

The Romanian translation also records inserts which are not necessarily due to purely linguistic reasons, neither do they pursue stylistic purposes, but they rather reflect the translator’s individual option for a more precise or complete utterance. For instance, there is a term introduced by Fogarasi, but absent from the Latin and Hungarian sources, in: “Trei sint in cer... Tatâl, *Fiul*, sau cuvîntul și Duhul Sfînt” (14/15–16), cf. Hung. “Hárman vagynak az égben... az Atya, az Ige, és a’ Szent Lélek”, cf. Lat. “Tres sunt qui in coelo... Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus”. Similarly, at the end of the Creed, Fogarasi inserts the term *amen ‘so be it’* (13/24) which is quite interesting, since this interjection does not appear either in the Latin text or in the Hungarian source in the given passage.

Beside these kinds of insertions, there are certain Hungarian or Latin text fragments incorporated in the Romanian translation, even in cases in which they are not present in the source-versions. These inserts show the translator’s personal contribution. For instance, the Latin formula “Gloria Deo. Venia amem” (48/12–13). It is interesting that Fogarasi does not employ at all the noun *pedeapsă* ‘punishment’ or the verb *a pedepsi* ‘to punish’. Throughout the text he uses its equivalents: the words *bintetulială* ‘punishment’ and *a bintetlui* ‘to punish’, which are of Hungarian origin, and the word *bătaie* ‘punishment’. With the given meaning, the latter one is employed also in the catechism printed in 1656, being recorded in the same context as in Fogarasi’s text: “a păți bătaie și biciu” (Barițiu, 1879, p. 35). The same meaning is recorded for *bătaie* in other contexts too, occurring several times in the catechism of Fogarasi, like in: “nu va lăsa fără bătaie” (34/1–2), cf. Hung. *bintetető*, cf. Lat. *impunitum*, corresponding to the passage: “nu va lăsa... necercati” from the other catechism (Barițiu, 1879, p. 44).
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omnibus vitam, et halitum, et omnia". The same phenomenon is found in: “Cum după această vreacă voi avea fericăciune deplină” (26/6–7), cf. Hung. “Hogy ez élet után teljes és tökéletes boldogságot lészen”, cf. Lat. “Quod post hanc vitam plena perfectaque beatitudine potiari”. Likewise, Fogarasi excludes from his translation a phrase which is present in the source-texts in: “De la răsăritul soarelui lăudat fie Numele Domnului” (42/11–12), cf. Hung. “Napkelettől fogván mind nyugatiglan dicséretes légyen az Vrnak neve”, cf. Lat. “Ab ortu solis usque ad occasum eius sit laudatum nomen Jehova". It would be difficult to state, though, whether these omissions reflect the deliberate assumption of certain liberties or they are simply due to the translator’s inattention.

In certain cases, however, the omission of a passage which is found in the Latin and Hungarian sources makes the Romanian translation rather obscure, like in: “Că pre acela care păcat nu știa prentru noi să fim in el dereptate a lu Dumnedzeu” (23/17–19), cf. Lat. “cum enim, qui non noverat peccatum, propter nos peccatum fecit, ut nos essemus in co justitia Dei”, cf. Hung. “Mert azt a’ ki bűnt nem tudott vala, mi érettünk bűnné tövé, hogy mi lennénk Isten igazságává ő benne”.

2.2. Inserts and omissions as translation marks

Although the Latin text is also present in the final product of the Romanian translation, there are numerous passages in which the Romanian text undoubtedly follows the Hungarian version, either on a formal level or regarding its content. Among the evidence which indicate the influence of the Hungarian source we could (also) mention the inserts and omissions observable in the Romanian translation, on the one hand, and in the Hungarian source-text, on the other hand, especially when these units do not have correspondents in the Latin version. Naturally, the fact that the Romanian text is exclusively or mainly subjected to the Hungarian source-text’s influence may be sustained only in and for that particular passage which records these marks, since, in other passages, the situation could be different.

2.2.1. The typology of inserts corresponding to the Hungarian source

The status of being inserts, attributed to words, phrases etc. found in the Romanian text, on the one hand, and in the Hungarian source, on the other hand, most certainly derives from the differences between the two source-texts (Hungarian and Latin) of the translation. The Romanian inserts which correspond exactly to the Hungarian model, being absent from the Latin version, play different roles regarding the Romanian text’s construction and structuring. Thus, among these inserts, we may distinguish certain classes, such as: affective, discursive, syntactic and lexical-explicative inserts.

2.2.1.1. Affective inserts

In the category of affective inserts we may include those passages which have a rather phatic function and a stylistic role, since they are found mainly in rhetorical questions, in hyperbolical formulae or in iterative constructions which follow the expression pattern and construction model offered by the Hungarian source.

Such an insertion is that of the interrogative adverb oare ‘really (wondering)’ which corresponds to the Hung. vallyon, with the same meaning and function, recorded in: “Oare de unde izvorăște aceea credință?” (26/14–15), cf. Hung. “Honnan származik vallyon az a hit?”, cf. Lat. “Unde hace fides proficiscitur?”; or in: “Oare de unde este năravului omenesc atare mare sdrobotură?” (11/6–7), cf. Hung. “Honnan vagyon vallyon az emberi természetnek ilyen nagy romlottsága?”, cf. Lat. “Unde existit hæc naturæ humanæ pravitas?”. In the latter portion, the influence of the Hungarian source may be sustained also by the presence of the underlined syntagm in: “atare mare sdrobotură” which corresponds to the Hungarian formula “ilyen nagy romlottsága”, both of them incorporating a determiner meant to emphasize and amplify the described phenomenon. Unlike these texts, the Latin version does not record any intensifier term, the situation being described simply by the word pravitas ‘degradation’.

An intensifier role may be attributed also to the underlined expressions which render the Hungarian model in: “Numai singur prin credința a lu Isus Hristos, in atită, cum fără de toată destoinicia a mea, curat numai din mesere a lu Dumnedzeu mi se destoiniceste mie făcutura de destul cu plin” (23/22 –
24/2), cf. Hung. “Csak egyedül a’ Jesus Christusban való hit által, el amnyira, hogy minden én érdemem nélkül, csupán csak az Istennek igalmaságából tulajdonítassék és ajándékoztassék énnekem... tökéletes elégtétele”, cf. Lat. “Sola fide in Jesum Christum, adeo ut sine ullo meo merito, ex sacra Dei misericordia, perfecta satisfactio... mihi imputetur ac donecetur”.

The iterative construction is also employed with certain stylistic effects in the text expressed in: “Din poamele pomului știutului binelu și al răului să nu măinici că oare în ce zi vei mînca cu mortea morției vei muri” (12/8–10), cf. Hung. “Az jónak és gnosznak tudásának fájának gyümölcsében ne egyel, mert valamely napon abban ejendel halálnak halálával halasz meg”, cf. Lat. “De fructu arboris scientiae boni et mali, de isto ne comedas, nam in quo die comederis de eo, utique morturus es”. Although the formula itself belongs to a certain Bible tradition, first employed in the Hebrew version of the Holy Book and then reproduced in other languages as well (cf. Lat. morte morieris, morte morietur), its presence in the Romanian text in the passage in which it appears in the Hungarian source, but is absent from the Latin version, is probably due to the influence of the Hungarian source-text.

In a similar way, the underlined iterative constructions built according to the Hungarian model in: “Nu nici dintr-o parte ce mai tare din zi în zi datoriile noastre mărindu-le mărim” (12/15–17), cf. Hung. “Semmi részből nem: sőt inkább naprol napra adosságunkat öregbidden öregbittyük”, cf. Lat. “Nulla ex parte: quin etiam debitum, in singulos dies, augemus” have a rather stylistic function.

It is not excluded that the passage containing the Lord’s Prayer has also been translated according to the Hungarian version, since the Romanian text records an iterative construction also found in the Hungarian source, in: “Că-i a ta împărăția, puterea, și lauda pină în vecie, veacului” (41/5–6); or in: “pină în vecie de veac” (45/11), cf. Hung. “Mert tiéd az ország, a’ hatalom, és a’ dicsőség mindörökkön örök”, cf. Lat. “Quia tuum est regnum, et potentia, et gloria in secula”8.

2.2.1.2. Inserts with discursive function

Another category of inserted elements, found in Fogarasi’s text, rendering exactly what appears in the Hungarian source, but missing from the Latin version, is represented by those elements which provide and/or strengthen the text’s coherence on the discursive level, but which do not have actual syntactic implications. These elements mainly consist of adverbs, but there are a few interjections and adjectives too.

Such a discursive insert may be found in: “in atita cum anu toţi în păcat ne prindem și ne naştem” (11/8–10), cf. Hung. “ugy hogy immár mindnyaján a’ bűnben fogantassunk és születtessünk”, cf. Lat. “ita ut omnes in peccato concipiamur et nascamur”.

A similar situation is encountered in the case of the interjection’s insertion in: “Lucă in alnicie m-am prins și muma mea în păcat m-a incălțitum-mă în gșul său” (11/12–14), cf. Hung. “Ifmé én álnokságban fogantattam, és az én anyám bűnben melegített engem az ő méhében”, cf. Lat. “Enim iniquitate formatum sum, et in peccato foveit me matrem meam”. As a matter of fact, the passage may be attributed to the Hungarian source due to other translation marks as well, such as the presence of the Hungarian loanword alnicie ‘iniquity’ (cf. Hung. álnoját, cf. Lat. iniquitate) and of the Romanian verb a (se) prinde (in...) ‘to conceive’ calqued on Hungarian fogantat < fog-ni ‘to grasp’ (cf. Lat. formatum sum) or the presence of the lexeme zgău ‘womb’ (cf. Hung. meb ‘id.’) which does not have any correspondent in the Latin text.

8In fact, the iterative construction is found in a few other Romanian translations of the prayer as well. Thus, in the 16th century, it is recorded in Luca Stroeic’s version of the Lord’s Prayer (1593): “in veczij vecilor” (Gaster, 1891, p. 39) as well as in another text fragment from Codicele Todorescu [The Todorescu Codex]: “di veci-/e vecului” and “e veci/e vecul” (Drăganu, 1914, p. 229). Additionally, the formula may be found in the catechism printed in 1656 too: “vecii de veci” (Barițiu, 1879, p. 48, 49). In case of the latter text, it is not excluded that this construction has been introduced—just like in Fogarasi’s text—due to the influence of the Hungarian text, since the catechism printed in 1656 seems to be based on the same Latin-Hungarian version of the catechism as the one printed in 1648 (see also Drăganu, 1922, p. 164; Julian, 1940, p. 192; Tamás, 1942, p. 10–15, 129, 131). Nevertheless, it is not excluded either that this very formula reflects a somewhat fixed or “canonized” version of the prayer, characteristic for Calvinist worship, in other words, a particular tradition kept in the Calvinist versions of the Lord’s Prayer. For the different Romanian versions of this prayer see also (Niculescu, 2006–2007, especially p. 48–72).
On various occasions, Fogarasi’s text records the adverb *încă* ‘too, also’ which corresponds to the Hungarian adverb *is* ‘also, too, yet’ from the Hungarian version, without any equivalent in the Latin source. For instance, it is found in: “Cum el în toată vremea vieții lui *încă*, ce mai tare în vremea morții au pățit-o minia a lu Dumnedzeu pentru păcatele noastre” (18/6–9), cf. Hung. “Hogy ő teljes életének idejében *is ugyan*, de főképpen halálakor, az Istennek a mi bűneinkért való haragját meg szenyedte”, cf. Lat. “Eum toto quidem vitae tempore, praecipue vero in eius extremo, iram Dei adversus peccata nostra sustinuisse”, where the formula *ce mai tare* ‘but chiefly’ also corresponds to the Hung. *de főképpen* ‘id.’.


The adverbial insert has other occurrences too, like in: “Cum noi cu viata necertătoare a noastră pre altii *încă* să dobîndim lu Hristos” (31/20–22), cf. Hung. “hogy a’ mi feddhetetlen életünkel egyebeket *is* a’ Christusnak meg nyerjünk”, cf. Lat. “ut vita nostræ integritate alios Christo lucifaciamus”; “*Să cerem mila* *încă* a Dumnedzeu prentru păcatele noastre nici într-un chip *într-un* destul n-are fi putut face” (19/9–12), cf. Hung. “*necertătoare* which is calqued on Hung. *feddhetetlen* ‘pure, taintless’ which is calqued on Hung. fedhbetetlen (meg-fedd-n’ to scold’ + –etlen ‘suffixe for negation’), cf. Lat. *integritate*.


Another adverb inserted according to the Hungarian source is found in: “că dreptăției a lu Dumnedzeu prentru păcatele noastre nici într-un chip *amintrilea* destul n-are fi putut face” (19/9–12), cf. Hung. “mert az Isten igazságának semmiképpen a’ mi bűneinkért *különben* eleget nem tehetett volna”, cf. Lat. “quod justitiæ Dei nullo alio pacto pro nobis peccatis potuit satisfieri”. As a matter of fact, this passage bears other translation marks too, such as: the phrase *nici într-un chip* ‘in no way’, cf. Hung. *semmiképpen*, cf. Lat. *nullo alio pacto*, or the verb phrase *a face destul* ‘to satisfy’ which is calqued on Hung. *eleget* ‘enough’ *tenni* ‘to do’.

Another adverb, which functions as an insert, appears in: “Acele ce cu credința dereaptă vom cere de

2.2.1.3. Syntactic – phrasal inserts: connectors

Another class of inserts is made up of those connectors which are introduced into the Romanian translation in passages in which the Latin version does not record any connector, but they have correspondents in the Hungarian source. As a matter of fact, these units also function as discursive elements, their delimitation from the previous class being solely based on the fact that, unlike the former category of inserts, these connectors also mark various types of syntactic relations (coordination or subordination) on the level of the sentence or phrase. Here could be included several conjunctions, relative adverbs and pronouns, sometimes employed with the morpho-syntactic values of their Hungarian correspondents, as well as certain prepositional (or adverbial) phrases.

For instance, the adversative conjunction iară ‘but’ usually corresponds to the Lat. autem and to the Hung. pedig ‘but, whereas’, like in: “A doua iară asemenea este către această” (10/22–23), cf. Hung. “A második pedig hasonlatos chíhez”, cf. lat “Secundum autem simile est huic”. However, there are also cases in which the Latin text does not record any conjunction, whereas the Rom. iară corresponds to the Hung. pedig, like in: “Care va crede și se va boteza ispăși-se va, care iară nu va crede păgubi-se va” (28/7–9), cf. Hung. “A’ ki hiend és meg keresztelkedéndik üdvözül, a’ ki pedig nem hiend, el kárhozik”, cf. Lat. “Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, Qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur”; “A doua tablă iară cu șase porunci aceea învață” (35/19–20), cf. Hung. “A’ második [tábla] pedig hat parancsolokkal azt [adja előnkben]”, cf. Lat. “posterior [tabula], sex præceptis, quæ officia...”. In other cases, the Latin text notes a copulative conjunction and not an adversative one like the Romanian and Hungarian texts do, in: “Sfînt Paul încă numește pîinea trupul a lu Hristos, păharul iară chiuzluitura a sîngelui lui cu noi” (29/9–12), cf. Hung. “Szent Pál Apostol is a’ kenyeret Christus testének, a’ pohárt pedig az ő vérének velünk való közöltetésének nevezi”, cf. Lat. “Apostolus Paulus panem apellat communionem corporis Christi, et polum communionem sanguinis eius.”

Another connector which renders the Hungarian model is represented by the Romanian phrase derept insă ‘but because’ which formally and functionally corresponds to the Romanian piedig ‘id., like in: “Cu cît derept insă destoinici sîntem spre bătăi sau bintetluială de o vreme sau trupească și spre bintetluială de vecie dară este vreo cale prin care cu Dumnedzeu să ne putem împăca?” (12/2–5), cf. Hung. “Mivel azért mind ideig s mind penig örökké való büntetésekre méltók vagyunk, vagyoné tehát valami út az mellyen az Istennel meg békéltessünk?”, cf. Lat. “Quoniam igitur temporalibus et æternis pœnis obnoxii sumus, estne via, qua Deo reconciliemur?”. The same connector is employed as an insert in other passages too but, this time, it renders another Hungarian correspondent, like in: “Derept insă acela încă ce va naște din tine e Sfîn” (17/22 – 18/1–2), cf. Hung. “Annakókáért ez is a’ mi te belőled születik a’ Szent”, cf. Lat. “proptereaetiam, quod nascetur ex te Sanctum”; “Derept insă uluimînchipdeadevăr,cumomulescîndereptă” (24/10–11), cf. “Annakókáért ezt állattyuk bizonyosképpen, hogy az ember meg igaztattatik”, cf. Lat. “Colligimus igitur fide justificari hominem”.

Other similar cases are to be found in passages in which the term chip ‘image, face’ is included in different prepositional or adverbial phrases, which render formally (and semantically) equivalent Hungarian constructions. For instance, nici într-un chip ‘nowise’ is recoded in: “Nicî într-un chip: că din nărav sînt plecat spre urâciunea lu Dumnedzeu” (11/2–3), cf. Hung. semmiképpen, cf. Lat. minime; “Nici într-un chip nu-l va lăsa” (11/16), cf. Hung. Semmiképpen nem, cf. Lat. Nequaquam; “Nici într-un chip aînintrilea destul n-are fi putut face” (19/11–12), cf. Hung. semmiképpen, cf. Lat. nullo alio pacto. The phrase în ce chip ‘how’ is noted in: “În ce chip înțelegi aceasta...?” (20/21), cf. Hung. Miképpen, cf. Lat.


We shall note, however, that the use of the connectors mentioned above is not necessarily determined by the Hungarian source only, at least not in all of the cases. There could be invoked, at least theoretically, other reasons too, which could explain their occurrence in Fogarasi’s text. Thus, on the one hand, some of these connectors may reflect a prior tradition, these words or phrases being characteristic for Calvinist-Romanian texts in general, which the author could have been familiar with. On the other hand, even those “foreign” syntactic constructions which had been acquired during the translation process per se might have remained dormant in the course of the translation act, so that certain formulae could have been engraved in the translator’s memory who could have used them subsequently, even without his options being directly subjected to the influence of the Hungarian passage. Therefore, the only certainty regarding the use of these connectors in the Romanian text is that these elements co-occur with their formal correspondents in the Hungarian text, whether they have or lack semantic correspondents in the Latin version.

A higher degree of certainty is provided by those connectors which sometimes take over or copy the morpho-syntactic values of their Hungarian correspondents. This is the case of the Romanian relative adverb cum ‘how’, which often corresponds to the Hung. hogy ‘that’, taking over (also) its valencies. Thus, in Hungarian, the conjunction hogy ‘that’ has a neutral value, in the sense that it is not specialized for a certain kind of use pattern, its possibilities of contextualization being almost unlimited, since it may introduce almost any kind of subordinate clause. Unlike this, in Romanian, the relative adverb cum ‘how’ prototypically introduces modal subordinate clauses11. Naturally, the Romanian adverb, in its turn, may introduce other types of subordinate clauses too, but, in some cases, it undoubtedly corresponds to the conjunction hogy, especially when the Latin text does not record any connector. Hence, Rom. cum ‘how’ renders Hung. hogy ‘that’ in contexts in which it is used with the meaning ‘that’, introducing direct object clauses, like in: “Știm cum acelora cari îndrăgesc pe Dumnezeu toate sunt spre bine” (9/17–18), cf. Hung. “Tudgyuk hogy azoknak akik az Istent szeretik, mindenek javukra vagyuk”, cf. Lat. “Novimus, iis qui diligunt Deum, omnia simul adjumento esse ad bonum”; “Cred cum Tatâl de vecie a Domnului nostru a lu Isus Hristos... mie încâ îmi este Tatâl și Dumnedzeu” (15/1–5), cf. Hung. “Hiszem hogy a’ mi Urunk Jesus Christusnak örökké való Attya... énnékem is Istenem és Atyám légyen”, cf. Lat. “Credo æternum Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi... meum quoq, Deum et Patrem meum esse”; “Să știe hogy cum aceloracariîndrăgescpeDumneutoatesuntsprebine” (9/17–18), cf. Lat. “Cum acoleracari îndrăgesc pe Dumnezeu toate sunt spre bine” (9/17–18), cf. Lat.

10 In other passages, the formula renders other correspondents from the source-text, like in: “In ce chip se impart acete porinci?” (35/14), cf. Hung. mimódon, cf. Lat. quomodo. The phrase cu ce mod ‘how’ is employed with the same meaning as the former one, like in: “cu ce mod să mă slobod eu din toată nevoia mea” (9/23–24), cf. Hung. mimódon, cf. Lat. quo pacto, also being noted in contexts in which its Latin equivalent quomodo appears (see in 23/20).

11 Such a situation is encountered in: “și acum încă așa mă ține, cum toate să-mi slujească spre ispăsenie-mi” (9/11–13), cf. Hung. “es még most is ugy tart, hogy mindenek az én idvösségemre szolgályanak”, cf. Lat. “meque ita conservat, ut omnia saluti meae servire oporteat”, though, in this case, the construction also has the valencies of a consecutive clause. In the given passage, Hungarian influence may also be sustained by the insert of Rom. încâ ‘still’, cf. Hung. még ‘still’ and by the syntactic construction: “să-mi slujească spre ispăsenie-mi”, cf. Hung. “az én idvösségemre szolgályanak”.


We shall note, however, that the use of the connectors mentioned above is not necessarily determined by the Hungarian source only, at least not in all of the cases. There could be invoked, at least theoretically, other reasons too, which could explain their occurrence in Fogarasi’s text. Thus, on the one hand, some of these connectors may reflect a prior tradition, these words or phrases being characteristic for Calvinist-Romanian texts in general, which the author could have been familiar with. On the other hand, even those “foreign” syntactic constructions which had been acquired during the translation process per se might have remained dormant in the course of the translation act, so that certain formulae could have been engraved in the translator’s memory who could have used them subsequently, even without his options being directly subjected to the influence of the Hungarian passage. Therefore, the only certainty regarding the use of these connectors in the Romanian text is that these elements co-occur with their formal correspondents in the Hungarian text, whether they have or lack semantic correspondents in the Latin version.

A higher degree of certainty is provided by those connectors which sometimes take over or copy the morpho-syntactic values of their Hungarian correspondents. This is the case of the Romanian relative adverb cum ‘how’, which often corresponds to the Hung. hogy ‘that’, taking over (also) its valencies. Thus, in Hungarian, the conjunction hogy ‘that’ has a neutral value, in the sense that it is not specialized for a certain kind of use pattern, its possibilities of contextualization being almost unlimited, since it may introduce almost any kind of subordinate clause. Unlike this, in Romanian, the relative adverb cum ‘how’ prototypically introduces modal subordinate clauses11. Naturally, the Romanian adverb, in its turn, may introduce other types of subordinate clauses too, but, in some cases, it undoubtedly corresponds to the conjunction hogy, especially when the Latin text does not record any connector. Hence, Rom. cum ‘how’ renders Hung. hogy ‘that’ in contexts in which it is used with the meaning ‘that’, introducing direct object clauses, like in: “Știm cum acelora cari îndrăgesc pe Dumnezeu toate sunt spre bine” (9/17–18), cf. Hung. “Tudgyuk hogy azoknak akik az Istent szeretik, mindenek javukra vagyuk”, cf. Lat. “Novimus, iis qui diligunt Deum, omnia simul adjumento esse ad bonum”; “Cred cum Tatâl de vecie a Domnului nostru a lu Isus Hristos... mie încâ îmi este Tatâl și Dumnedzeu” (15/1–5), cf. Hung. “Hiszem hogy a’ mi Urunk Jesus Christusnak örökké való Attya... énnékem is Istenem és Atyám légyen”, cf. Lat. “Credo æternum Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi... meum quoq, Deum et Patrem meum esse”; “Să știe cum eu sînt...

The relative pronoun ce ‘what’ is employed (also) with the adversative meaning ‘but’, just like the Hungarian conjunction de ‘but’ is, reproducing, therefore, the Hungarian model, especially in cases in which the Latin version does not record any connector, like in: “Au vom via au vom muri ce a Domnului suntem” (9/14–15), cf. Hung. “Akár éllyünk akár hallyunk, de az Vrēi vagyunk”, cf. Lat. “Sive vivimus, sive morimus, Domini sumus”. In other contexts, the relative pronoun ce ‘what’ is noted corresponding to another Hungarian semantic equivalent, rendering the same adversative meaning, like in: “Pre Dumnedzeu nicicînd nime n-au văzut, ce acel Fiul unul născut care este în sinul Tatâlui lui, el ne-au povestuit nouă” (16/15–17), cf. Hung. “Az Istent soha senki nem látta hanem amaz egygyetelen egy szülött Fia, a’ ki az ő Attyának kebelében vagyon, beszéllette meg mi nékünk”, cf. Lat. “Deum nemo vidit unquam: unigenitus ille filius, qui est in sinu Patris, ille nobis exposuit”. On the other hand, this particular passage seems to render the Hungarian model also regarding its word order (see “nicicînd nime n-au văzut”, cf. Hung. “soha senki nem láttá’) and the expression “Fiul unul născut”, which perfectly corresponds to the Hungarian construction “egygyetelen egy szülött Fia”.


Therefore, although the Romanian passages correspond to the Latin version as well, the presence of the connectors noted above within the Romanian translation, in contexts in which they have correspondents in the Hungarian source, but not in the Latin one, may serve as a translation mark, indicating the influence of the Hungarian source-text or, at any rate, a compilation of the two sources.

2.2.1.4. Lexical inserts

There are several cases in which the presence of a semantically and functionally autonomous lexical element, found in the Romanian translation and corresponding to semantic equivalents in the Hungarian source, serves as translation mark, at least within the given passage, indicating the use of the Hungarian model, all the more so because the Latin version does not record any correspondent lexeme, the wording in the latter one being more concise than in the former one. These lexical or phrasal inserts, introduced independently of the Latin source, usually function as explanatory notes or passages, reflecting, at the same time, the translator’s endeavour to be as precise and accurate as possible.

Such lexical inserts may be found, for instance, in passages which list certain holy books, like in: “Despre ceremoniile a Levițenilor” (7/21 – 8/1), cf. Hung. “a’levitai Ceremoniákrol”, cf. Lat. “Leviteus”;

12 Other examples which show that the Rom. cum corresponds to the Hung. hogy are found in: “Aceasta; cum cu trup cu suflet au voi via au voi muri, eu sunt a Domnului vernic al mieu” (9/6–8), cf. Hung. “Ez, hogy mind testestől lelkestől, akár élyek, akar hallyak, az én hűséges Uramnak […] tulajdona vagyok”, cf. Lat. “Quod animo pariter et corpore, sive vivam, sive moriar, fidissimi Domini […] sum proprius”; “Cum cu Numele Sfinției sale…” (36), cf. Hung. “Hogy az ő Szentséges nevével…”, cf. Lat. “Ut Sacrosancto ipsus nomine….”

Another insert, introduced into the Romanian text due to rendering the construction model offered by the Hungarian source, may be found in: “Cite lucruri trebuieşte tie să ştiu cum cu această veselitură viind, fericată să fie vieca ta şi moartea ta?” (9/19–21), cf. Hung. “Hány dolgot kell tenéked tudnod, hogy ez vigasztalással élven, boldogul lehessen életed és halálod?”, cf. Lat. “Quot sunt tibi scitu necessariant ista consolatione fruens, beate vivas et moriaris?”

The Latin version is much more concise than the Hungarian one, which seems to have been followed by the Romanian translator in: “Ne învaţă pre noi pre aceea Domnul Hristos într-o summă la Sfinţul [ul] Mathe [Matei] în douăceci şi două de părţi” (10/15–17), cf. Hung. “Megtanít minket arra Christus Urunk egy summában Sz. Mathénak 22 részében”, cf. Lat. “Id nos docet Christus Summatim Matth. 22.”

Another insert may be observed in: “Delipsă este, cum au noi ins să facem destul, au prin altul” (12/6–7), cf. Hung. “Szükség, hogy vagy mi magunk tegyünk eleget, vagy más által”, cf. Lat. “Necessae est vel per nos, vel per alium satisfaciamus”.


In another case, the Romanian wording is as concise as the one in the Latin text, but it includes an element which indicates the use of the Hungarian source (too), like in: “înaintea dregătorului de afară” (18/16), cf. Hung. “külső polgári társaságbéli bíró előtt”, cf. Lat. “coram judice politico”.


13 As a matter of fact, this portion also includes two calques based on Hungarian model: a formal calque: veselitură ‘consolation’; and a semantic calque: a via ‘to (make) use of’, to take advantage’, ‘to employ’, cf. Hung. éni ‘to live’, éni valamivel ‘to make use of’.

14 In fact, the formula aceea e aceea ‘that is, in other words’ is calqued on the Hung. az az ‘id’; but, in this portion, the Romanian translator employs it independently of the source-text. Nevertheless, on various occasions, this calque is noted in
Similarly, unlike the brevity of the Latin text, the Romanian wording is as detailed and explicit as the Hungarian source, in: “Că pre noi din toate păcatele noastre ne slobozește și ne ispăsește” (15/25 – 16/1), cf. Hung. “Mert minket minden bűneinkból meg szabadít és útvözözt”, cf. Lat. “Quia nos salvat ab omnibus peccatis nostris”. “Oarecine numele lui de-a-fietele il va pomeni și va ispăsă” (15/25 – 16/1), cf. Hung. “a’ ki az ő nevét hijăban emlti, vagy neeresz”, cf. Lat. “qui nomen eius vane usurpaverit”;


“și cum eu încă acelui șirag sunt o parte vie, și fi voi pînă în vecie” (22/16–17), cf. Hung. “és hogy én is annak a’ seregnek egygyik élő tagja vagyok, és lézek mind örökkel”, cf. Lat. “meque vivum huius cœtus membrum esse, etmansurum”.


Both semantically and in terms of its brevity, the Romanian translation renders the Hungarian passage in: “Că ce au pățit Hristos: Supr Pontius Pilatus?” (18/13–14), cf. Hung. “Miért szenvedett a’ Christus Pontius Pilatus alatt?”, cf. Lat. “Cur Christus sub judice Pontio Pilato passus est?”. The same context as its Hungarian formal equivalent az az ‘that is’, (also) corresponding to the Lat. hoc est.

On the other hand, the Romanian fragment records the Hungarian pronunciation of the term evanghelie ‘gospel’ (instead of evangheliom) and of the proper names Luke and John (cf. Rom. Luca and Ioan) which are written as Lukáts and János in the Romanian text, just like in the Hungarian source.
Likewise, the passage is more detailed in the Latin version than in the Hungarian source, which omits certain portions, just like the Romanian translation does, in: “El (Mesia) au răbdat dureri prentru hicleniile noastre” (20/10–11), cf. Hung. “Ő (Messias) fájdalommal illettette a’ mi álknokságinkért”, cf. Lat. “Ipse (Messias) dolore afficitur a defectionibus nostris, atteritur ab iniquitatibus nostris”.

3. Conclusions

Taken all together, the inserts recorded in the Calvinist Catechism printed in 1648, as well as the omissions executed by Fogarasi reflect a certain translation “theory” of the Romanian translator, his conception of the translation act, in general, and of the functionality and availability of the two sources employed by him, in particular. In this respect, it may be observed that, on several occasions, the Hungarian source enjoys priority over the Latin text, being predominantly, if not exclusively, used in certain passages of the Romanian translation. The Latin version, on the other hand, seems to play a secondary function, being chiefly used as a subsidiary source and, perhaps, as a control or reference-text. As a matter of fact, such a hierarchy regarding the use of the two sources may be sustained on the macrostructural level of the whole translation too, provided that the evidence given by the inserts and omissions corroborate other translation marks, such as the bookish loanwords borrowed directly from the Hungarian source-text, the calques and other smaller or larger constructions which copy Hungarian morpho-syntactic patterns. The predilection for the Hungarian source may (also) be explained by the fact that Hungarian language was perhaps more accessible to the translator than Latin, which he could have mastered but superficially.

The status of inserts and omissions varies from case to case in Fogarasi’s text. The units included in or omitted from the Romanian translation play different roles, but, overall, they may be grouped into two main classes, reflecting two different levels of accomplishment. Thus, some of them represent mainly immediate solutions which fall within the realm of imitation, since they are produced as a result of certain constraints imposed by the Hungarian source-text. Others may be included in the realm of creation since they appear independently of both sources, as a result of the translator’s personal intervention. Both the former and the latter ones might have aimed, on the one hand, at comprehension, the translator taking into account, first and foremost, the reader he addressed his text to, and, on the other hand, at enriching and nuancing the utterance, in accordance with the addresser’s and the addressee’s level of competence, as well as with the availability of old Romanian language. Additionally, some of these inserts and/or omissions reflect a deliberate option of the author, while others may be attributed to “slips”, in other words, to causes which are not entirely controlled by consciousness or which are possibly due to the bilingual status of the translator.

Certainly, the main cause of the majority of the inserts and omissions encountered in Fogarasi’s text is the differences between the two sources employed, i.e. between the Hungarian and Latin texts. It is interesting, however, that Fogarasi’s translation does not record inserts which render exclusively the Latin source, in the sense that they would not be found in the Hungarian version, or omissions which are determined exclusively by the Latin text, in the sense that the Hungarian version would include something more than the Latin and Romanian texts. In each case, the inserts and omissions are either independent of both of the sources or determined by the Hungarian source.

The findings of the present case study could be made use of from a diachronic perspective too, examining the prior and/or subsequent Romanian translations of the Heidelberg catechism, which have led to the relatively standard Romanian version thereof. Additionally, the comparative analysis of the Calvinist catechisms printed in 1648 and 1656 respectively would be of great interest, since both Romanian translations are based on the same Latin-Hungarian version of the Heidelberg catechism. Such a study could provide us more information about the criteria which governed the options of those who translated the catechisms in question and, at the same time, it could offer data regarding the reasons which determined the integral or partial use of a certain source.
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