

On the graphic adaptation of proper names in the first Romanian translation of the *Septuagint* (Ms. 45)

Ana-Maria Gînsac*

Department of Interdisciplinary Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Str. Lascăr Catargi 54, 700107 Iași, Romania

Article info

History:

Received December 5, 2015

Accepted December 13, 2015

Published February 12, 2016

Key words:

proper names

translation

formal adaptation

Romanian language

Septuagint

Abstract

Among the difficulties that have always challenged the translators of the *Bible* one can mention the adaptation of proper names in each idiom. Certain biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian when the first translations of fragments belonging to the *Old* and the *New Testaments* were performed. However, most biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian for the first time in the translation of the *Septuagint* performed by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) in the second half of the 17th century and preserved in a manuscript copy (the Romanian manuscript no. 45) from the same century. The main source of this translation was an edition of the *Septuagint* issued in Frankfurt in 1597. In accordance with the spirit of literalism in *Bible* translation in that period, the main tendency of translators and reviewers was to preserve, as much as possible, the original form of proper names as they appeared in the source-text, attempting, at the same time, to integrate them in the formal system (graphy, declension) of the Romanian language. Starting from the formal particularities of the names in the source-text, we aim at describing certain aspects related to the graphic principles that the transposition of proper names from the Greek source into Ms. 45 was based upon.

1. Introduction

The transposition of proper names from one language into another can be achieved through a number of main procedures: *translation* (replacing the textual material from the source-language with the textual equivalent in the target language, for example: Gr. Φάραγξ Βότρυος – *Vălea Strugurelui*¹), *transliteration* and *transcription* (the adaptation of a name form in the source-language to the graphic and morphologic system of the target-language)². The study of formal adaptation to the Romanian language system of proper names written in another alphabet (different from the Latin alphabet) supposes two main research directions:

- 1) *graphic adaptation*: the transposition through transliteration (the replacement of each grapheme from a graphic system by another grapheme belonging to a different graphic system) or through phonetic transcription of proper names from one alphabet into the other³;
- 2) *morphologic adaptation*: the participation of proper names in gender, number, case and determination oppositions in the Romanian language (Ichim-Tomescu, 1978, p. 237).

When describing the way Hebrew proper names were adapted in the *Septuagint*, specialists emphasized the diversity of existing transliterations and transcriptions for the denomination of individual realities,

*Email address: anamaria_gansac@gmail.com.

¹For further examples, see Fernández (1977).

²For further meanings of these terms, see Catford (1965, p. 20–69) and Grass (2002, p. 114ff.); for a synthesis of the terms, see Gînsac (2013).

³The terms *transliteration* and *transcription* are defined by Catford (1965, p. 68–69). Emphasizing the two adaptation modalities, Savu (2011, p. 77–80) uses the terms “graphic-phonetic adaptation”.

especially people and places. Such a perspective, applied by Moatti-Fine (1996, p. 69–73) to the study of *Iosua* (Rom. *Iisus Navi*), a book containing extended lists of proper names, indicates that several factors are responsible for the numerous versions of toponyms:

- 1) the difficulty to read and to identify most place names in the Hebrew text;
- 2) the alternation between translation and transliteration in the case of composed descriptive toponyms; sometimes, both forms are present, for example: *φάραγγα Ἀχώρ* – *valea Ahor* (*Ies*, 7, 24)[†];
- 3) the existence of several formal versions of the same name, for example: Hebrew *ʾapēkāh* (“cetatea lui Iuda” [Judah’s fortress]) is transposed in Greek in the form *Phakoua* (*Ies*, 15, 53) in *Codex Vaticanus* or *Aphaka* in *Codex Alexandrinus* (Moatti-Fine, 1996, p. 73); among other aspects, this phenomenon was explained by the existence of several traditions regarding the vocalization of the Hebrew text (Krašovec, 2010, p. 89);
- 4) the coexistence of the Hellenized forms and the forms which were not adapted to the Greek language system; see point 2).

Some biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian when the first translations of fragments belonging to the *Old* and the *New Testaments* were performed: *Evangeliarul slavo-român* (1551–1553), *Palia de la Orăștie* (1581–1582), *Codicele Bratului* (1559–1560), etc. Thus, research regarding *Palia de la Orăștie* (1581–1582), a text comprising the translation from Hungarian and Latin into Romanian of the first two books of the *Pentateuch*, reveal the absence of a unitary system in the transposition of proper names into Romanian, a situation which could be explained by the different degree in which those names were known (the ones that were known and the ones that were often used were used in a unique form), their relevance within the text, the use of multiple sources, the principle of non-altering the source-text by translation, the knowledge of the translation techniques, etc. (Pamfil, 1982; Gafton, 2007).

Most biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian for the first time in the translation of the *Septuagint* performed by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) in the second half of the 17th century and preserved in a manuscript copy (Ms. 45)⁴ at the Romanian Academy Library in Cluj. The main source of this translation was an edition of the *Septuagint* issued in Frankfurt in 1597 (SEPT. 1597)⁵. Besides this edition, a number of other sources⁶ were used, among which an edition of the Greek text printed in London in 1653 (SEPT. 1653), which was used only up to the book *I Paralipomenon*, as shown in the foreword of the manuscript (*Cuvîntu înainte către cititori*, p. 909¹²):

Iară și noi, pre lîngă izvodul lui Necoláie, am mai alăturat și alte izvoade grecești, pren care izvoade fost-au unul carele au fost tipărit la Englitéra, ci și acesta nu să potrivia cu cel de la Frangofort; pentru căci pren bogate locuri adăogea și pren bogate locuri lipsia, nu venia cu cestalt; pentru acêea, lipsele nu s-au socotit, iar adaosele s-au pus, precum vom face doslușirea mai jos cu însemnări. Și așa am venit cu acela izvod pînă la *Paralipomenon dentii*.

[We have added to Necoláie’s text/source some other Greek texts/sources, among which there was one printed in England, which was different from the one printed in Frankfurt; there were, in many instances, differences between them, information that was either missing or fragments where much more was said; the two versions did not match; this is why we did not take the missing parts into account and we added the further information, as we shall explain below in our notes. And we have used that text/source (printed in England) up to the book *Paralipomenon I.*]

[†]See the order of the books in SEPT. 1597 and the abbreviation used for the books of the *New English Translation of the Septuagint* (NETS).

⁴Regarding the paternity of the revised copy of Ms. 45, see Cîndea (1979, p. 106–128), Onu (1984), Andriescu (1988, p. 17–25), and Ursu (2002, p. 7–133).

⁵It refers to the Aldine version, revised according to editions issued in Complutense, Antwerp, Strasbourg, and Rome (Copinger, 2002, p. 94).

⁶Among others, it refers to a Slavonic translation of the *Bible* (OSTR.) and a Latin version (VULG.).

The literality of the translation from Ms. 45, which implies a tendency towards the preservation of the original forms from the source-text, the different graphic forms, the coexistence of two different alphabets, as well as the translator's attempt to adapt the biblical onomastics to the Romanian language, are some of the aspects that have contributed to the degree of integration of biblical proper names from Greek into Romanian. Starting from the formal particularities of proper names in the Greek text⁷, we will limit our approach to describing a series of aspects related to the graphic adaptation of proper names in Ms. 45. In literal translation, where the morphological forms of proper names as they appear in the original are often preserved, some specifications regarding the declension of proper names from the Greek source-text (SEPT. 1597) are mandatory for the proper understanding of certain graphic forms as they appear in the Romanian version.

2. Formal particularities of proper names in the *Septuagint*

A general characteristic of the onomastics in the *Septuagint* is the fact that, besides some Hebrew proper names ending in a vowel, usually adapted to the morphological system of the Greek language, there are a high number of proper names ending in a consonant, which are transliterated and consequently not declined in Greek (*Γαλαάδ, Αρφαξάδ, Ἐλείμ, Ἐνώχ, Ἰσραήλ*⁸, etc.).

2.1. Names of people (*anthroponyms*)

- a) Thackeray (1909, p. 161) includes in the category of Hebrew proper names that could be declined in Greek (according to the 1st declension) most masculine personal proper names that end in a vowel (*Ἰονας, Μωυσῆς*⁹, etc.) and a series of female proper names (*Ἄννα, Γοθολία, Ζέλφα, Λεία, Σάρρα, Σουσάννα*, etc.). According to the British philologist, proper names declined according to the 2nd (-ος) and the 3rd (-ης, -ους, etc.) declension are almost non-existent in the *Septuagint*, except for the book 1*Esd*, where they constantly occur (*Δαβίδης, Ἀβραμος*, etc.). In SEPT. 1597, the name *Moise* [Moses] occurs declined in the genitive according to the 3rd declension: gen. *Μωϋσέως* (3*Esd*, 8, 3), *τοῦ Μωϋσέως* (1*Suppl*, 26, 24); in Ms. 45, these forms were transposed as follows: *a lui Moisei*, under the influence of the Slavic form *моѹѣи* (Savu, 2011, p. 119), *al lui Moiseu*, where the Greek ending is adapted.
- b) Theophoric biblical proper names (i.e., which include the name of God, *el*) are usually Hellenized by adding the termination -ίας (genitive in -ου), being declined according to the 1st declension, for example: *Ἀνανίας, Ἀνανίου; Ζαχαρίας, Ζαχαρίου; Σοφονίας, Σοφονίου*, etc. The genitive ending in -α is less frequent: e.g. *Μιχαία, Νεεμία, Ἰωσεία, Σεδεκία* (Thackeray, 1909, p. 161–162). In SEPT. 1597, both genitive terminations of the name *Μιχαίας* may occur—*Μιχαίου* (4*Rgns*, 22, 12) and *Μιχαία* (2*Suppl*, 34, 20)—, transposed differently in Ms. 45: *lui Mihéu* (preserving the form and using the proclitic article for the genitive) and *Mihéii* (adapting the name to the morphological system of the Romanian language by enclitic articulation), respectively.
- c) In the *Septuagint*, as a rule, the names of people ending in -ών, a termination of Hebrew origin (*Ἀαρών, Σαμψών*, etc.), are not declined in Greek. Among these, a special case is represented by the name *Σολομών*, which was transferred from Hebrew into Greek through graphic and phonetic adaptation: *Σαλωμών – Σαλομών – Σολομών*¹⁰. According to SEPT. 1597, the forms of this name are also preserved in Ms. 45, for example: *Salomon* (3*Esd*, 8, 35) – *Solomon* (the prevailing form).

⁷ Regarding the formal particularities of proper names in the *Septuagint*, see Thackeray (1909), Moreno Hernández (1988), Dufour (1990), and Krašovec (2010).

⁸ In SEPT. 1597, the forms that were not declined were used as such for the genitive and dative cases, without being integrated in the Romanian language declension in Ms. 45, for instance: *υἱοὶς Ἰσραήλ* – “fiilor *Israil*” [the sons of Israel] (*Ex*, 6, 6) and *μέσον Ἐλείμ* – “mijlocul *Elim*” [the middle of Elim] (*Ex*, 16, 1); see further examples in Ursu (2002, p. XII). However, their morphological adaptation into Romanian does not make the object of our study.

⁹ In concordance with the present norms, we have written the proper names from SEPT. 1597 with initial capital letter.

¹⁰ For detailed explanations, see Thackeray (1909, p. 162) and Dufour (1990, p. 56).

- d) In **SEPT. 1597**, some anthroponyms have several graphic forms, for example: *Ἀμελσάδ* (*Dan*, 1, 16) / *Ἀμελσάλ* (*Dan*, 1, 11), *Βαανά* (3*Rgns*, 4, 16) / *Βανά* (3*Rgns*, 4, 12), cf. *Amelsad* / *Amelsal*, *Vaaná* / *Vaná* (**Ms. 45**).

2.2. Names of places (toponyms) and nations (ethnonyms)

- a) As far as toponyms are concerned, in the *Septuagint* the forms transcribed from Hebrew coexist with the Hellenized ones (see **Thackeray, 1909**, p. 166; **Moatti-Fine, 1996**, p. 71): *Ἐδώμ* – *Ἰδουμαία*, *Συχέμ* – *Σίκιμα*, *Σομορών* / *Σεμερών* – *Σαμαρ(ε)ία*, *Σόρ* – *Τύρος*, *Γαλαάδ* – *Γαλααδίτις*, etc. The Greek translators were actually familiar with the biblical geography, and consequently with the Greek correspondents of the proper names for places and nations, for example: Rom. *Etiopia* for *Cus*, *Capadochia* for *Caftor*, *Gavlon* for *Golan*, *Mesopotamia* and *Siria* for *Aram*. In **Ms. 45**, these are usually preserved as in the Greek source.
- b) As regards proper names ending in *-α*, besides the names of countries declined according to the 1st declension (e.g. *Γάζα*, *Σαμαρεία*) and the names of towns usually declined according to the 2nd declension for neuter nouns in the plural (e.g. *Γάλλαλα*, *-ων*, *-οις*; *Σίκιμα*, *-ων*), in the *Septuagint* there are also indeclinable proper names denominating places, for example: *Φασγά*, *Βετουλουά*, *Βοσορρά*, etc. The same situation occurs for the names ending in *-η*, which occur either inflected (e.g. acc. *Μαμβρήν*, *Νινευήν*), or uninflected (e.g. *Μαμβρή*, *Νινευή*) (**Thackeray, 1909**, p. 162 and 167). The uninflected forms in **SEPT. 1597** are also preserved in **Ms. 45** (e.g. *Fazgá*, *Mamvrí*, *Neneví*, *Vetuluá*). In **SEPT. 1597**, the toponyms ending in *-ων* can be uninflected (e.g. *Κεδρών*, *Ἐρμών*) or inflected (e.g. *Ἀσκάλων*, *-ωνα*), the latter being sometimes transferred in **Ms. 45** together with their Greek desinences: acc. *εἰς Ἀσκάλωνα* – *Ascalona* (*Judg*, 14, 19), but *Ascalon* (*1Makk*, 10, 86).
- c) The proper names in **SEPT. 1597** have doublets (vocalized or non-vocalized forms) of the type: *Μαγεδώ*, *Μαγεδδω* / *Μαγδών*¹¹. These are also transposed in **Ms. 45**: *Magghedó* (*Esa*, 10, 28), *Magheddó* (*4Rgns*, 9, 27) / *Magdon* (*1Rgns*, 14, 2).
- d) Hebrew ethnonyms are either borrowed, in which case the Hebrew ending in *-ī*, *-īth* is preserved, or adapted to the Greek language system, usually with the endings *-αῖος* (designating the member of a tribe) or *-(ε)ίτης* (indicating the inhabitant of a town), for example: *Χανανεί* – *Χανανείτης*, *Χαναναίος*. **Thackeray (1909, p. 171)** argues that the principle behind the choice in this case cannot be determined, indicating at the same time the predominance of the termination *-ίτης*, which would better reflect the Hebrew model in *-īth*. In **Ms. 45**, the suffix *-itean* is predominant, for instance: *Ἀμανίται* – *amanitēni* (*Neb*, 13, 1), *Ἀσκαλωνίται* – *ascalonitēnii* (*1Rgns*, 5, 10), *Κορίται* – *coritēnii* (*1Suppl*, 9, 19), ac. *Κρήτας* – *critēnii* (*Iezek*, 25, 16), gen. *Ἐλαμιτῶν* – *elamitēni* (*Esa*, 11, 11) / *Ἐλαμίται* – *elamīṭii* (*Esd*, 4, 9), *Ἱερουσολυμίται* – *ierusalimitēnii* (*4Makk*, 4, 22), gen. *τῶν Ἰοππιτῶν* – *a iorpitēnilor* (*2Makk*, 12, 7) / *Ἰοππίται* – *iorpīṭii* (*2Makk*, 12, 3), *Ἰσμαηλίται* – *ismailtēnii* (*Ps*, 82, 5), *Ἰσραηλίται* – *israiltēni* (*4Makk*, 18, 1), gen. *Μωαβιτῶν* – *moavitilor* (*Gen*, 19, 37) / *Μωαβίται* – *moavitēnii* (*1Suppl*, 18, 2), *Σαμαρεῖται* – *samaritēnii* (*4Rgns*, 17, 29), *Τρωγλοδύται* – *troglooditēni* (*2Suppl*, 12, 3), etc. Sometimes, the same Greek form of an ethnonym is rendered with both Romanian suffixes, *-iṭi* and *-itean(i)*, for example: “[...] au omorît pre *gavaoniṭi* (acc. *Γάβαωνίτας*). Şi au chemat împăratul David pre *gavaonitēni* (acc. *Γάβαωνίτας*) şi au dzis cătră ei. Şi *gavaoniṭii* (nom. *Γάβαωνίται*) nu-s fiii lui Israil, fără numai den sîngele amorreului [...]” (*2Rgns*, 21, 1–2).
- In **Ms. 45**, some ethnonyms are used to indicate the country. This procedure consists of “using the name of a people, in singular or plural, in order to indicate the country inhabited by that people” (**Arvinte, 1988**, p. 49). Thus, the Greek ethnonyms in accusative singular (*τὸν Χετταῖον*, *τὸν Ἰεβουσαῖον*, *τὸν Ἀμορραῖον*, *Ἀρουκαῖον*, *τὸν Αὐαῖον*, *τὸν Ἐσενναῖον*, *τὸν Ἰεργεσαῖον*, *τὸν Ἀρουαδαῖον*, etc.), that were adapted in **Ms. 45** to the forms *Hetteu*, *Ievuseu*, *Amorreu*, *Arucheu*, *Eveu*, *Esenneu*, *Ghergheseu*, *Arudeu* (*1Suppl*, 1, 14–16: “Şi pre Hetteu şi pre Ievuseu şi pre Amorreu şi pre Ghergheseu şi pre Eveu şi pre

¹¹ See explanations and further examples in **Moreno Hernández (1988, p. 276–277)**.

Arucheu și pre Esenneu pre Arudeu și pre Aamareu”), denominate countries; they are written in Latin with initial capital letter.

3. Graphic particularities of proper names in Ms. 45

Beyond the obvious effort to adapt the proper names from the Frankfurt *Septuagint* (1597) into Ms. 45, we recognize the preference displayed by the Romanian translator / revisers for rendering the original as accurately as possible, as well as their attempt to coherently apply a system of transliteration and transcription from Greek into the Romanian language written in Cyrillic script.

3.1. The preference for rendering the original as accurately as possible

In Ms. 45, the translator generally transposes the proper names from SEPT. 1597 as accurately as possible, sometimes even taking the case endings from Greek into Romanian, for example: a) anthroponyms: *Elivemas* (*Gen*, 36, 41), *Vithelias* (*Neh*, 3, 20), *Adonias* (*3Rgns*, 2, 19), *Ananias* (*4Makk*, 16, 21), *lui Vanéas* (*3Rgns*, 2, 25), *Iósifos*, for *Ἰωσήφος* (*1Makk*, 5, 60), but *Iosif*, for *Ἰωσήφ* (*1Makk*, 2, 53 and *passim*), *Sosipátron* (*2Makk*, 12, 24), *Sosipatros* (*2Makk*, 12, 19), etc.; b) toponyms: *Aradion* (*Gen*, 10, 18), *Vachúros* (*3Esd*, 9, 24), *Diospólis* (*Iezek*, 30, 16), *Tiros* (*3Rgns*, 7, 13), *Sichimon* for *Σικίμων* (*Gen*, 33, 18)¹², etc. Despite the rendition of these names in their Greek declension, we do not believe the translator or the revisers of the text were not familiar with them (Savu, 2011, p. 95); we rather think this is a tendency to preserve the original form.

Certain biblical proper names used at the same time or prior to the first Romanian translations of the texts used in religious service, that is to say texts that were already known (Gafton, 2007, p. 86), are rendered in only one form, while others occur in several versions, which might be explained by the possible discontinuities in the source-text, as well as by the continuous attempt of the translator to adapt the form of these names to the Romanian language system. Thus, the unadapted form often occurs besides the adapted one, as in: *Άλχιμος* – *Alchimos* (*1Makk*, 7, 5), but *Άλχιμος* – *Alchim* (*1Makk*, 7, 21 and *passim*).

The translator of Ms. 45 preserved as faithfully as possible the form of proper names in SEPT. 1597, assuming the inconsistencies of the text, without standardizing the names that had more than one graphic form in the Greek text. For example, the toponym *Βηθσιμώθ* – *Vithsimoth* (*Ies*, 12, 3) also occurs in the form *Βηθσιμούθ* – *Vithsimúth* (*Ies*, 13, 20); the anthroponym *Abimelec*, written *Άχιμελέχ* / *Άχιμέλεχ* / *Άβιμέλεχ*, was transposed as such (*Abimeleh* / *Avimeleh*, with or without the accent) in most cases (58 occurrences), with a few exceptions, probably caused by the negligence of the translator, or the person who made the revision or copy, for example: *Aviméleh* (*1Rgns*, 21, 2), but *Άχιμέλεχ* (SEPT. 1597), *Avimeleh* (*Ps*, 51, in the title), but *Άβιμέλεχ* (SEPT. 1597), transposed into Romanian without accent. In the case of the anthroponym *Abiezer*, in SEPT. 1597 there are three graphic versions, transposed as such in Ms. 45: *Άφιέζερ* – *Afiézer* (*1Suppl*, 11, 28), *Άχιέζερ* – *Abiézer* (*Ies*, 17, 2), *Άβιέζερ* – *Aviézer* (*1Suppl*, 7, 18 and *passim*); under *Judg*, 6, 34, the translator probably renders the name from the gloss in the footnote (*Άβιέζερ*), and not the one in the text (*Άβιάζερ*). However, tendencies towards standardization might occur: *Fud* / *Fudu* – *Φούδ* (*Esa*, 66, 19; *Na*, 3, 9; *Gen*, 10, 6), but *Fud* – *Φούδ* (*1Suppl*, 1, 8), instead of *Futh*. The genitive form *Μωσέως* (*2Suppl*, 23, 18) was graphically transposed in Ms. 45 in the form *lui Moisei*, probably under the influence of either the corresponding footnote in the source (“al. *Μωϋσῆ*”) or the predominant form of the name in the manuscript or in other texts from that period (*Moisi*).

3.2. The attempt to consequently apply a system of transliteration and transcription of proper names from Greek into the Romanian language written in Cyrillic script

A language notes the sounds of another language from the perspective of its own phonetic-graphic correspondences (Agafonov et al., 2006, p. 629). Consequently, the formal adaptation of biblical proper names from the Greek language into Cyrillic Romanian must be discussed from two perspectives: the *translation*

¹²For further examples, see Ursu (2002, p. XIII).

perspective, concerning the transposition of proper names from the Greek language / alphabet (**SEPT. 1597**) into the Romanian language written in the Cyrillic alphabet (**Ms. 45**), and also the *interpretative transcription* from Cyrillic (**Ms. 45**) into Latin script.

a) Initial capital letter

In Romanian, the initial capital letter is the graphic mark of proper names. However, the analysis of the old Romanian biblical texts reveals that the initial capital letter is not necessarily a constant characteristic of proper names (see **PO**, **BB**, **MICU**, etc.). According to the model of the *Septuagint* printed in Frankfurt (1597), proper names are not usually marked by the initial capital letter in **Ms. 45**; the exception is provided by the first two biblical books, *Genesis* and *Exodus*. In some instances, however, even within the same fragment (ex. *Num*, 1, 5–10), the proper names are either marked or unmarked by initial capital letter.

b) The treatment of geminates

With regard to proper names, in **Ms. 45** the author commonly preserves the duplication of the consonants as in the Greek source text, for instance: *Ἀχισαμμαί* – Ἀχῖσαμ^με – *Abisamme* (1Suppl, 2, 32), *Ἀθθάρατης* – Ἀθθάρα^πη – *Aththarátis* (3Esd, 9, 50), *Ἀκκούβ* – Ἀκ^κβ – *Accuv* (Esd, 2, 45), *Καππαδοκία* – Κα^ππαδοκία – *Cappadochia* (*Am*, 9, 7), but *Καππαδοκίας* – Κα^ππαδοκία – *Capadochiia* (*Deut*, 2, 23), *Λύδδα* – Λι^δδα – *Lidda* (1Makk, 11, 34), *Μανασσής* – Μανασ^ση – *Manassi* (1Suppl, 3, 13), but *Μανασσή* – Μανασή – *Manasi* (1Suppl, 5, 18), *Ὀδολλάμ* – Ὀδο^λλαμ – *Odollam* (1Suppl, 11, 15), but *Ὀδολλάμ* – Ὀδο^λλαμ – *Odolam* (2Makk, 12, 38). **Ms. 45** transcribes the aspirated geminate consonant θθ, which in **SEPT. 1597** occurs together with the dissimilated forms (also transposed as such in the Romanian manuscript): *Μαθθανίας* – *Maththanía* (2Suppl, 29, 13), cf. *Ματθανίας* – *Matthanias* (1Suppl, 25, 4).

As far as the source-text is concerned, there are also inconsistencies regarding the transcription of proper names, for example: *Σωσάννα* – Σω^σάνα – *Sosána* (*Sous*, 1, 3), *Ἰνγαννίμ* – Ἰ^νγανίμ – *Inganim* (*Ies*, 19, 21), *Ἀμμάνι* – Ἀμ^μανί – *Ammani* (*Neh*, 3, 2), etc.; also, the group *-mmn-* from the anthroponym *Ammnon* – Ἀμ^μων^ν (2Rgns, 13, 1 and other 14 occurrences in the same book) does not reflect the form of the original name, i.e. *Ἀμνών* (**SEPT. 1597**). These forms cannot be explained through the secondary sources either (**SEPT. 1653**, **OSTR.**, **VULG.**).

c) Breathings

In **Ms. 45**, the smooth breathing ['] is regularly rendered in the orthography of proper names: *Ἀραβία* – Ἀ^ραβία – *Aravía* (1Makk, 11, 16), *Ἰλί* – Ἰ^λί – *Ili* (1Rgns, 1, 9f.), *Ἐλάμ* – Ἐ^λαμ – *Elam* (2Rgns, 10, 16), etc. The rough breathing [ˈ], pronounced in Greek as /h/, is transcribed as smooth breathing in **Ms. 45** in such cases as: *Ἱερουσαλήμ* – Ἱ^ερ^ρουσαλήμ – *Ierusalim* (2Rgns, 10, 14f.), *Ἡλιούπολις* – Ἡ^λιούπολις – *Iliuroleus* (*Ex*, 1, 11), *Ἡλιόδωρος* – Ἡ^λιόδωρος – *Iliodor* (2Makk, 3, 13 and *passim*), *Ἀχεχάρ* – Ἀ^χεχάρ – *Abehar* (*Neh*, 3, 22), etc.

d) Stress

The issue regarding the stress of proper names denominating countries in Romanian was extensively treated by **Arvinte** (2008, p. 110–124). The author has demonstrated, by means of edifying examples, the existence of two ways of placing the stress in proper names of countries ending in *-ia* in the old period of the Romanian language:

- α) when the stress falls on the penultimate syllable (e.g. *Asia*, *Chilichía*, *Machedonia*, *Persía*, *Rusía*, *Siría*), the proper name can be included in the Greek denominative system, which was used in the Romanian language between the 17th century and the beginning of the 19th century, when the circulation of the Greek printings was very well represented in the Romanian countries;
- β) when the stress falls on the ante-penultimate syllable (e.g. *Aravía*, *Capadóchia*, *Gália*, *Grécia*, *Machidónia*, *Tráchia*), this reflects the Latin denomination system of scholarly origin “that was constituted

for longer than four centuries of Romanian culture, nowadays being predominant in the educated language” (Arvinte, 2008, p. 113). In old literary Romanian there used to be a competition between the two modes of placing the stress.

The stress is generally not marked in the case of proper names containing superscript letters, as in: *Ἐνώμ* – *ἐνω^μ* – *Enom* (*Ies*, 18, 16), *Βιθαεμεκ* – *βιθαεμε^κ* (*Ies*, 19, 27), *Θεμανων* – *θεμανω^ν* (*1Suppl*, 1, 45), *Τελμων* – *τε^λμω^ν* (*1Suppl*, 9, 17), *Ναββαβδιων* – *να^ββα^βδιω^ν* – *Navvavdion* (*1Suppl*, 5, 19).

The position of the stress on the last vowel of proper names in Greek (–*ιά*), especially in the long lists of names (genealogies), could be explained by the fact that these names were not adapted to the Greek language system (nominative in –*ιας*, genitive in –*ία*), but they were just transliterated from Hebrew (–*ιά*): *Samá* (*1Suppl*, 8, 13), *Iesfá* (*1Suppl*, 8, 16), *Vareá* (*1Suppl*, 8, 21), *Adriá* (*1Suppl*, 8, 22), *Veriá* (*1Suppl*, 23, 11), etc. Thackeray (1909, p. 162) explains this phenomenon by other additions to the genealogic lists—i.e., proper names from other sources in which the names were not declined; evidence in this respect could be provided by the proper names marked in some editions between square brackets, as in: *Καὶ ἰεσφάν, καὶ ἀβέρ, καὶ ἐλιήλ [καὶ ἀδριά]*. Being uninflected in Greek, the names ending in –(ε)ιού were transposed as such in Ms. 45, for example: *Avidiú* (*Avd*), *Iliú* (*3Rgns*, *4Rgns*).

Sometimes, although present in the source-text, the stress is not marked in Ms. 45: *Ierusalim* / *Ierusalím*, *Iothor* / *Ióthor*, *Iamna* / *Iamná*, *Ionathan* / *Ionáthan*, etc. In other cases, there are double-stress forms, as in: gen. *Ἠλιούπολις* (*Gen*, 41, 50 and 46, 20), Gr. *Ἡλιουπόλεως*, cf. *Iliupólii* (*Gen*, 41, 45). This phenomenon could be explained by the fact that the proper name is a composed descriptive proper name: *Ἡλίου πόλις*. An error made by the person who translated or copied the text might explain a form such as *Ecvatáná* (*2Makk*, 9, 3), cf. Gr. *Εκβάτανα*.

The stress placed on the final vowels (*Mamvri* / *Mamvrí*, *Sichima* / *Sichimá*, etc.) comes from the Greek source-text, where it marks an uninflected proper name form (see *supra*, 2.2.b.).

e) Inexact transpositions from Greek into Romanian

In Ms. 45, some proper names do not reflect the forms in the source-text. These inconsistencies can be placed in the transcription errors category, as in the following examples: *Βαβυλώνα* – *Vavilor* (*Ier*, 50, 11), *Ἀσσούρ* – *Assus* (*Iezek*, 32, 29), *Βαχβουκκία* – *Vacvuchía* (*Neh*, 12, 9 and 25), *Ἐνώμ* – *Enom* (*Ies*, 18, 16), *Βεσελεήλ* – *Veseliil* (*Ex*, 38, 22), *Ἄγγιθ* – *Angheth* (*3Rgns*, 2, 13), *Ἰεθράν* – *Iethran* (*1Suppl*, 1, 41), *Ναασσών* – *Naason* (*1Suppl*, 2, 11).

As we are dealing with a manuscript, some proper names (wrongly transposed or recreated according to other editions) are corrected in the text according to SEPT. 1597, above the line, or inside the line, by giving the entire version between square brackets¹³, as in the case of *Vethará[va]* (*Ies*, 15, 6), or *[Si]hem* (*Ies*, 17, 2). Others are corrected on the side of the text, for example: for *Sovothé* (*2Rgns*, 21, 18) the correction χ (*h*) is indicated on the side of the text, above the letter ϑ (*th*), pointing to the form *Sovohé*, cf. Gr. *Σοβοχαί* (SEPT. 1597).

Sporadically, in Ms. 45, some prepositions left untranslated in Romanian were attached to the proper name: the form *ἐ^κβεθλωμων^ν* (*3Esd*, 5, 31) renders the Greek sequence *ἐκ Βεθλωμών* (“from Vethlomon”), an error which is signalled on the side of the text by a red sign [~], which marks the separate translation of the Greek preposition, i.e. *den* [from].

f) The system of transliteration and transcription of proper names from Greek (SEPT. 1597) into Romanian (Ms. 45)

Starting from a proper names index of Ms. 45, Table 1 indicates the specific rules for the graphic transposition of proper names from Greek into the Romanian language written in both Cyrillic and Latin scripts.

¹³The meaning of these signs is explained in the foreword of the manuscript (*Cuvîntul înainte către cititori*, p. 909): “Iar unde vei vedea acesta semnu cu roșiu [] și la mijloc iarăși cuvinte, să știi că l-am aflat mai mult întru izvodul Englitării” [Where you will see this sign in red [] and in the middle other words, you must know that I found it [i.e. the text/source] in the English source].

| Signs | Specific contexts | Transposition into Romanian | |
|-------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|
| | | <i>Cyrillic script</i> | <i>Latin script</i> |
| α | | α | a |
| | αυ (diphth.) | αφ, αβ | af, av |
| | αι (diphth.) | ε | e |
| | | α, β | é |
| β | | β | v |
| γ | | γ | g |
| | γ + ε, η, ι | γε, γη | ghe, ghi |
| | -γγ- | ηγ, γγ | ng, gg |
| δ | | δ | d |
| ε | | ε | e |
| | ευ (diphth.) | εφ, εβ | ef, ev |
| | ει (diphth.) | η | i |
| ζ | | ζ | z |
| η | | η, [~] | i |
| | | ε | e |
| θ | | θ | th |
| ι | | η | i |
| | ï | ï | i |
| κ | | κ | c |
| | κ + ε, η, ι | κε, κη | che, chi |
| | κ + χ | κ + χ | kh |
| λ | | λ | l |
| μ | | μ | m |
| ν | | η | n |
| | ντ | ηδ | nd |
| ξ | | ξ | x |
| ο | | ο, ω | o |
| | οι (diphth.) | ι | i |
| | ου (diphth.) | υ | u |
| π | | π | p |
| ρ | | ρ | r |
| σ, ς | | σ | s |
| σ | | ζ (rarely) | z |
| τ | | π | t |
| | ντ | ηδ | nd |
| υ | | η | i |
| | ÿ | ογ | i |
| φ | | φ | f |
| χ | | χ | h |
| ψ | | ψ | ps |
| | | σ | s |
| ω | | ω | o |

Table 1: Transliteration and transcription system of proper names from **SEPT. 1597** into **Ms. 45**.

The table above allows us to make a few remarks regarding the transposition of Greek proper names into Cyrillic Romanian, as well as their transcription in the Latin alphabet. Thus, as far as *Greek consonants* are concerned, there are no major difficulties regarding their transposition from the Greek into the Cyrillic alphabet. There are, however, a few exceptions:

- α) the double consonant ψ is transliterated in **Ms. 45** through the Cyrillic letter Ψ , transcribed in the Latin alphabet by *ps*: $\Psi\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\phi\alpha\nu\eta\chi$ – $\Psi\omega^{\hat{}}\tau\omicron^{\hat{}}\phi\alpha\nu\eta\chi$ – *Psontomfanih* (*Gen*, 41, 45), $\Lambda\alpha\mu\psi\omicron\upsilon\rho$ – $\lambda\alpha^{\hat{}}\Psi^{\delta\rho}$ – *Lampsur* (1*Rgns*, 27, 8), $\Sigma\alpha\mu\psi\acute{\alpha}$ – $\sigma\alpha^{\hat{}}\Psi^{\acute{\alpha}}$ – *Sampsá* (*Esd*, 4, 8). Sometimes, although occurring in **SEPT. 1597**, the double consonant ψ is not rendered in **Ms. 45**, for example: $\Sigma\alpha\mu\psi\alpha\acute{\iota}$ – $\sigma\alpha^{\hat{}}\sigma\acute{\alpha}$ – *Samsé* (*Esd*, 4, 17 and 23);
- β) the velar geminate consonant $-\gamma\gamma-$ is transcribed in **Ms. 45** by the consonant group $\eta\Gamma$ (*ng*): Ἄγγαι – $\alpha^{\hat{}}\eta\acute{\epsilon}$ – *Anghé* (*Gen*, 13, 3), Ἄγγιθ – $\alpha^{\hat{}}\eta\theta$ – *Anghith* (1*Suppl*, 3, 2), Ἀμαγγαρί – $\alpha^{\hat{}}\mu\alpha^{\hat{}}\eta\Gamma\alpha\acute{\rho}\eta$ – *Amangari* (1*Rgns*, 20, 20). Sometimes, the geminate $-\gamma\gamma-$ is only transliterated ($\Gamma\Gamma$, *gg*), as in: Ἄγγαι – $\alpha\eta^{\hat{}}\acute{\alpha}$ (*Esa*, 10, 28–29);
- γ) the consonantal group $-\nu\tau-$ is transcribed in **Ms. 45** by $\eta\Delta$ (*nd*), as in: Ἀντίοχος – $\alpha^{\hat{}}\eta\Delta\acute{\iota}\omega\chi$ – *Andioh* (*Gen*, 39, 1);
- δ) rarely, instead of the consonant σ (σ), **Ms. 45** renders \mathfrak{z} (*z*), which indicates voicing the Greek consonant σ in Romanian, as in: $\tau\tilde{\omega}^{\hat{}}\text{Ἐσδρα}$ – $\tilde{\epsilon}\mathfrak{z}\Delta\eta\eta$ – *Ézdrii* (only two occurrences out of 56), cf. Ἐσδρικήμ – $\tilde{\epsilon}^{\hat{}}\mathfrak{z}\Delta\eta\eta\kappa\alpha^{\hat{}}\mu$ – *Eszdricam* (1*Suppl*, 3, 22).

As far as *Greek vowels* are concerned, they are transposed into the Cyrillic alphabet in several ways:

- α) the Greek vowel ϵ is transposed in **Ms. 45** as follows:
 - by the letter ϵ (*e*), as in: Ἐκβάτανα – $\epsilon^{\hat{}}\nu\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\eta\alpha^{\hat{}}\nu\alpha$ – *Ecvatána* (2*Makk*, 9, 3), Ζοροβάβελ – $\mathfrak{z}\omicron\mathfrak{r}\omega\nu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon^{\hat{}}$ – *Zorovavel* (*Zach*, 4, 6), βοκχέ – $\nu\omega\chi\acute{\epsilon}$ – *Vokhé* (1*Suppl*, 6, 5);
 - rarely, by the letters \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{k} , as in: Βεδλεέμ – $\nu\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{l}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon^{\hat{}}$ / $\nu\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{l}\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon^{\hat{}}$ (*Judg*, 17, 8–9);
- β) the long Greek vowel η is rendered in **Ms. 45** as follows:
 - by the letter η (*i*), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ἡλιόδωρος – $\eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\delta\omega\rho\eta$ – *Iliódor* (2*Makk*, 3, 13), Ἥγγανίμ – $\eta^{\hat{}}\eta\Gamma\alpha\eta\eta\mu$ – *Inganim* (*Ies*, 19, 21), Γηφάρ – $\eta\Gamma\eta\phi\alpha^{\rho}$ – *Ghifar* (*Esa*, 60, 6), Δανιήλ – $\delta\alpha\eta\eta\eta\lambda$ – *Daniil* (1*Makk*, 2, 60), Μανασσή – $\mu\alpha\eta\alpha\sigma\acute{\eta}$ – *Manasí* (1*Suppl*, 5, 18);
 - rarely, by the sign $\bar{\ } (i)$, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ρεηλά – $\rho\bar{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}$ – *Reilá* (1*Suppl*, 2, 15);
 - rarely, by the letter ϵ (*e*): Ἡσαῦ – $\eta\sigma\alpha\bar{\nu}$ – *Esav* (*Num*, 24, 18);
- γ) the Greek vowel ι is rendered in **Ms. 45** in two ways. In Greek, when ι is preceded by a vowel with which it does not form a diphthong, it is written as $\bar{\iota}$, being transcribed in **Ms. 45** as follows:
 - by the letter $\bar{\iota}$ (*i*), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Αἰά – $\alpha\bar{\iota}\acute{\alpha}$ – *Aiá* (1*Suppl*, 1, 40), Ἀβεσσαῖ – $\alpha\bar{\nu}\epsilon^{\hat{}}\sigma\alpha\bar{\iota}$ – *Avessai* (1*Suppl*, 2, 16), Βανεί – $\nu\alpha\eta\bar{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}$ – *Vaneí* (*Esd*, 10, 34), Γαῖ – $\eta\Gamma\alpha\bar{\iota}$ – *Gai* (4*Rgns*, 9, 27);
 - rarely, by the sign $\bar{\ } (i)$, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Καῖναν – $\kappa\alpha\bar{\iota}\eta\eta\eta\alpha^{\hat{}}$ – *Cainán* (1*Suppl*, 1, 2);
- δ) the short Greek vowel \omicron is rendered in **Ms. 45** by the Cyrillic letters \omicron or ω , although there is no firm rule that would impose one of these two letters: Καππαδοκία – $\kappa\alpha^{\hat{}}\eta\mu\alpha\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ – *Cappadochía* (*Am*, 9, 7), but Καππαδοκίας – $\kappa\alpha\eta\mu\alpha\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$ – *Capadochíia* (*Deut*, 2, 23), Ὀδολλάμ – $\omicron\delta\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu$ – *Odollam* (1*Suppl*, 11, 15), but Ὀδολλάμ – $\omega\delta\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu$ – *Odolam* (2*Makk*, 12, 38);
- ε) the short Greek vowel υ is transcribed in **Ms. 45**, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, by the letters η and ι (*i*): Ἀσσυρίας – $\alpha\sigma\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ – *Assiriia* (4*Makk*, 13, 9), Τύρος – $\tau\eta\eta\eta\eta\eta$ – *Tiros* (3*Rgns*, 9, 12), Λύδδα – $\lambda\eta\eta\delta\alpha$ – *Lidda* (1*Makk*, 11, 34). In Greek, whenever the vowel υ is preceded by another vowel with which it does not form a diphthong, it is noted $\bar{\upsilon}$, being transcribed in **Ms. 45** by the sign $\bar{\ } (i)$: Μωϋσέως – $\mu\omega\bar{\upsilon}\sigma\epsilon^{\hat{}}$ – *Moiseu* (1*Suppl*, 26, 24); in some cases it seems to be taken as such from Greek: Ἰωῦάν – $\iota\omega\bar{\upsilon}\acute{\alpha}\eta$ – *Ioián* (1*Suppl*, 1, 5), but Ἰωῦάν – $\iota\omega\bar{\upsilon}\acute{\alpha}\eta$ – *Ioián* (1*Suppl*, 1, 7).

The transposition of certain *diphthongs* from Greek into Cyrillic Romanian raises a number of issues:

α) the Greek diphthong *αι* is transcribed in **Ms. 45** as follows:

- by the letter **ε** (*e*), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: *Αιλάμ* – **ελα^m** – *Elam* (2*Rgns*, 10, 16), *Ευαῖον* – **έβε^s** – *Eveu* (1*Suppl*, 1, 15), *Βαραῖά* – **βαρεά** – *Vareá* (1*Suppl*, 8, 21);
- by the letter **ⲁ**: *Σαββαταῖος* – **σα^bβαπιάω^s** – *Savvatéos* (*Neh*, 11, 16), *Ἀδαία* – **ἀδάα** – *Adéa* (2*Suppl*, 23, 1), but *Ἀδαῖά* – **ἀδεά** – *Adeá* (1*Suppl*, 8, 21), cf. *Ἀθαῖά* – **ἀθάα** – *Athéa* (*Neh*, 11, 4), *Μερζελλαί* – **με^rζε^lλά** – *Merzellé* (*Esd*, 2, 61), *Βερζελλαί* – **βε^rζελά** – *Verzellé* (*Neh*, 7, 63). We have transcribed the Cyrillic letter **ⲁ** by the sign **é**, as it is the equivalent of the Greek diphthong *αι*, pronounced /e/, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation;

β) the Greek diphthong *αυ* is transcribed in **Ms. 45**, alternately, by **ⲁϕ** or **ⲁβ** (*af*, *av*), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: *Ἰσαῦ* – **ἰσα^f** – *lui Isaf* (1*Makk*, 5, 3), but *Ἰσαῦ* – **ἰσα^b** – *Isav* (1*Makk*, 5, 65); *Ἀνάν* – **ⲁⁿⲛⲁⁿ** – *Avnan* (1*Suppl*, 2, 3), *Ναζαῦ* – **ⲛⲁⲗⲁ^f** – *Nazaf* (*Gen*, 22, 22). In the case of the name *Isaf* (1*Makk*, 5, 3), a marginal note/gloss indicates the pronunciation /v/ instead of /f/;

γ) the Greek diphthong *ει* is transcribed in **Ms. 45**, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, by the letters **ⲓ** or **ⲓ̇** (*i*): *Ἀφείρ* – **ⲁϕⲓ^r** – *Afir* (*Gen*, 25, 4), *Λαφειδώδ* – **ⲁϕⲓⲁ^w** – *Lafidóth* (*Judg*, 4, 4), *Ἰαβεῖς* – **ⲓⲁβⲓ^c** – *Iavis* (1*Suppl*, 10, 11), *Σαμάρεια* – **ⲥⲁⲙⲁ^rⲓⲁ** – *Samária* (2*Suppl*, 28, 15);

δ) whenever followed by a consonant, the Greek group of vowels *ευ* is transcribed in **Ms. 45** according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, as follows:

- by **ⲉϕ** (*ef*): *Εὐπάτωρ* – **ε^fπάτω^r** – *Efpátor* (1*Makk*, 6, 17), *Εὐφράτου* – **ε^fφράτ** – *Efráth* (*Deut*, 11, 24);
- by **ⲉβ** (*ev*): *Εὐπάτωρ* – **ε^bπάτω^r** – *Evpátor* (2*Makk*, 10, 10), *Εὐπόλεμον* – **ε^bπώλε^m** – *Evpólem* (1*Makk*, 8, 17), *Εὐμενεῖ* – **ε^bμενί** – *lui Evmeni* (1*Makk*, 8, 8). Whenever the group *ευ* is followed by a vowel, it is transliterated as *ev*: *Ευαῖον* – **έβε^s** – *Eveu* (1*Suppl*, 1, 15), *Εὐἰλάτ* – **ε^bβιλⲁ^t** – *Evilat* (*Gen*, 2, 11).

The Greek endings *-αῖος* and *-αῖον* are transcribed in **Ms. 45** by the group **εδ** (*eu*): *Ἀχραδαῖος* – *Ahratheu* (*Preamble to Esth*, 13), *Ἀχραδαῖον* – *Arhatheu* (*Preamble to Est*, 14), etc.

4. Conclusions

The graphic form of proper names in **Ms. 45**, with some minor exceptions (transliteration / transcription errors, certain cases of standardization, etc.), their form in the main source-text, the *Septuagint* printed in Frankfurt (1597); the secondary sources were not considered in this respect. Some forms are corrected in the text according to the London version (1653) of the Greek text, used by the reviser of the translation provided by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) up to the book *1 Paralipomenon*.

The main source-text displays, in turn, numerous inconsistencies regarding the form of proper names, mainly caused by the literal translation practice, which has generally imposed the preservation of the Hebrew form of proper names and only sporadically allowed their adaptation to the morphological system of the Greek language. In **Ms. 45**, some anomalous forms from the source-text (multiple graphic versions of the same name and different denomination modalities of the same individual) are preserved. The attempts to standardize certain forms as well as the transcription errors from the Greek into the Cyrillic alphabet are rare. Moreover, beyond the existence of several Cyrillic signs used to render the same Greek sign, we can still emphasize the translator's / reviser's attempt to consequently apply a set of transliteration and transcription norms in the proper names transposition from the Greek into the Romanian language (according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation). The systematic study of the integration of Greek biblical proper names into the Romanian declension will complete the perspective upon the formal specificity of proper names in the first Romanian translation of the *Septuagint* (**Ms. 45**).

Bibliography

A. Sources

- BA = *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, VI. *Jésus (Josué)*, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1996.
- BB = *Biblia 1688*, text stabilit și îngrijire editorială de Vasile Arvinte și Ioan Caproșu, volum întocmit de Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproșu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manca, N. A. Ursu, vol. I–II, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 2001 (I), 2002 (II).
- MICU = *Biblia, adevă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a legii vechi și a ceii noao, toate care s-au tălmăcit de pre limba elinească pre înțelesul limbii românești* [*Biblia de la Blaj – 1795*, Ediție jubiliară în reproducere anastatică și transcriere interpretativă, coord. Ioan Chindriș și Eugen Pavel, Roma, 2000], Blaj, 1795.
- MLD = *Biblia de la București (1688)*, în seria *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Pars I. Genesis*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 1988; *Pars XXI. Machabeorum I, Machabeorum II, Machabeorum III*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 2015.
- Ms. 45 = Biblioteca Filialei Cluj a Academiei Române, fondul Blaj, *Manuscrisul românesc nr. 45* [c. 1683–1686].
- NETS = *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*, as published by Oxford University Press in 2009, including corrections and emendations made in the second printing (2009) and corrections and emendations made in June 2014, Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright (ed.), New York – Oxford, [online].
- OSTR. = *Библия сирекъ книги Ветхого и Новаго Завета по языкоу словенскоу* [...], Ostrog, 1581.
- PO = *Palia de la Orăștie: 1581–1582*, text, facsimile, indice și ediție îngrijită de Viorica Pamfil, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1968.
- SEPT. 1597 = *Τῆς Θείας Γραφῆς, Παλαιάς Δηλαδῆ καὶ Νέας Διαθήκης ἀπάντα. Divina Scriptura nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece* [...], Frankofurti ad Moenum, apud Andreae Wecheli haeredes, 1597.
- SEPT. 1653 = *Ἡ Παλαια Διαθηκη κατα τους ἑβδουμηκοντα. Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum*, iuxta Exemplar Vaticanum Romae editum, Accuratissime [...], Londini, Excudebat Rogerus Daniel [...], MDCLIII.
- VULG. = *Biblia ad vetustissima exemplaria castigata* [...], Antverpiæ, Ex officina Christophori Plantini, MDLXV.

B. References

- Agafonov, C., Grass, T., Maurel, D., Rossi-Gensane, N. & Savary, A. (2006). *La traduction multilingue des noms propres dans PROLEX*, in “Meta: journal des traducteurs”, LI (4), p. 622–636, [CrossRef](#).
- Andriescu, Al. (1988). *Locul Bibliei de la București în istoria culturii, literaturii și limbii române literare*, in *MLD, Pars I. Genesis*, Iași, p. 7–45.
- Arvinte, V. (1988). *Studiu lingvistic asupra primei cărți (Facerea) din Biblia de la București (1688), în comparație cu Ms. 45 și Ms. 4389*, in *MLD, Pars I. Genesis*, p. 47–105.
- Arvinte, V. (2008). *Român, românesc, România. Studiu filologic*, ediția a III-a (definitivă), Casa Editorială „Demiurg”, Iași.
- Ballard, M. (2004). *Le nom propre en traduction*, in “Babel”, vol. 39, issue 4, p. 194–213, [CrossRef](#).
- Catford, J.-C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation. An Essay in Applied Linguistics*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Cândea, V. (1979). *Rațiunea dominantă. Contribuții la istoria umanismului românesc*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca.
- Copinger, W.-A. (2002). *The Bible and its Transmission. Being an Historical and Bibliographical View of the Hebrew and Greek Texts* [...], Martino Publishing, Mansfield Centre [prima ediție: Londra, 1897].
- Dufour, J.-P. (1990). *La Transcription des noms propres dans la Bible anglaise avec références faites à la Bible dite «Version Autorisée» (1611)*, in Yannick Le Boulcaut (ed.), “Onomastique biblique: des richesses de la Bible hébraïque aux usages en langues modernes. Actes du Colloque des 4 et 5 novembre 1988”, Université catholique de l'Ouest, Angers, p. 55–61.
- Fernández, M.-N. (1977). *Nombres propios y etimologías populares en la Septuaginta*, in “Sefarad”, XXXVII, p. 239–260.
- Gafton, Al. (2007). *Palia de la Orăștie ca traducere*, în Alexandru Gafton, Vasile Arvinte, *Palia de la Orăștie (1582)*, II. *Studii*, Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, p. 81–91.
- Gînsac, A.-M. (2013). *Teonimie românească. Concept, metodă, probleme*, Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași.
- Grass, T. (2002). *Quoi! Vous voulez traduire «Goethe»? – Essai sur la traduction des noms propres allemand-français*, Peter Lang, Berne.
- Ichim-Tomescu, D. (1978). *Observații asupra adaptării morfologice a toponimelor străine în limba română*, in “Limba română”, XXVII, issue 3, p. 237–242.
- Krašovec, J. (2010). *The Transformation of Biblical Proper Names*, T&T Clark International, New York – London.
- Moatti-Fine, J. (1996). *Les noms de lieux dans Jésus (Josué)*, in BA, vol. VI, p. 69–89.
- Moreno Hernández, A. (1988). *El tratamiento de los nombres propios en los textos de Vetus Latina (I y II Samuel)*, in “Emerita. Revista de lingüística y filología clásica”, LXI, fasc. 2, p. 271–287.
- Onu, L. (1984). *Concordanțele lingvistice sau capcanele stabilirii paternității unui text. Probleme de metodă*, in “Limba română”, XXXIII, issue 2, p. 119–132.
- Pamfil, V. (1982). *Toponime în Palia de la Orăștie*, in “Studii de onomastică”, issue 3, p. 202–222.
- Rosetti, Al. (1968). *Istoria limbii române de la origini pînă în secolul al XVII-lea*, Editura pentru Literatură, București.

- Savu, S.N. (2011). *Numele propriu în textul biblic românesc. Studiu asupra procesului de adaptare formală*, Universitatea "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iași (PhD thesis).
- Ștef, A.-F. (1996). *Manual de greacă veche*, Humanitas, București.
- Thackeray, H.-J. (1909). *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, vol. I, Georg Olms Verlag, New York, p. 160–172.
- Ursu, N.-A. (2002). *Noi informații privitoare la manuscrisul autograf și la textul revizuit al **Vechiului Testament** tradus de Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu)*, in **BB**, p. I–LIV.