Some Elements of Hungarian Origin in *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad (1648)*

Roxana VIERU

*En el presente trabajo nos hemos decantado por estudiar algunos elementos léxicos de procedencia magiar que registra **Noul Testament de la Bălgrad / El Nuevo Testamento de Bălgrad (1648)**. En la primera parte hemos examinado vocablos que ya han caído en desuso en el rumano estándar actual, en la segunda aquellos que se siguen utilizando hoy día (en tanto que revestimiento sonoro) pero con significado distinto, y en la tercera hemos analizado estructuras calcadas de los modelos que ofrece el texto magiar empleado para la traducción.*

Palabras clave: Nuevo Testamento, Bălgrad (Alba-Iulia), elementos léxicos magiares, lengua rumana antigua, glosa.

The first Romanian translation of the New Testament illustrates the result of the joint efforts of a group of scholars from the 17-th century. The only name we know is written in *Predoslovie către cetitori*; the person mentioned there is the hieromonk Silivestru from Govora (which means a translator with Wallachian roots). In *Dinamica lexicului românesc*, on page 81, Florica Dimitrescu[1] shows that Silivestru is the one who also signed the *Synaxarion* at the end of the Slavonian *Psalter* printed at the Govora monastery in 1638; he is the one who translated *Evanghelie învățătoare* printed in 1642 and his name is in some kind of connection with the *Psalter* written in 1641. After the hieromonk's death, a group of authors continued his project. According to their statement, they processed the material, improving it, transforming it as they were not pleased with what they had received: „Găsit-am multă lipsă și greșiale în scriptura lui pentru neînțelesul limbiei și cărții grecești" (p. 13)[2]. The prefaces are signed by the Orthodox metropolitan bishop Simion Ștefan, who coordinated the team of translators and who might as well be counted among the members of this team.

If we can trust what is written in the prefaces, the sources of the *New Testament from Bălgrad* / *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* (NTB) are: a Greek text (characterized

[1] Florica Dimitrescu, *Dinamica lexicului românesc*, Editura Logos, Cluj-Napoca, 1994.

[2] *We've found a lot of ideas missing and also a lot of mistakes in his translation due to the misunderstanding of the Greek language and the Greek book* – our translation.

by the subscriber of the prefaces as the most important on the grounds that the Holy Spirit urged the evangelists and the apostles to write in Greek: „duhul sfînt au îndemnat e[va]ng[he]listii și ap[o]s[to]lii a scrie în limbă grecească”[3], p. 13-14), a Latin text and a Slavic text (printed in Russians' country: „țara mosculuí", p. 13). The truth about the translation expands far beyond what is actually asserted as it happened with some other texts (*Palia de la Orăștie* for instance, another text we made researches on, thoroughly). Some extralinguistic coordinates should have been kept hidden so that such books as *Palia de la Orăștie* or *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* could have had a large circulation and a good distribution; this implied that the overwhelming majority of the Orthodox population living in the Romanian Countries should have felt at peace with the text they had for reading. But if we stick things together nowadays (when we can have a larger perspective, unlimited by any constraints, we realize that the work for this translation has been done in a time when the prince of Transylvania was Gheorghe Rákóczi, a well-known promoter of Calvinism, the person to whom the Romanian translation of the New Testament was even dedicated, so it was practically impossible that the text itself wouldn't have suffered any influence from the Calvinist church). So, one of the sources of the Romanian translation must have been a Calvinist text (though the fact could not have been admitted by the authors) written in Hungarian (since the Calvinists, at that time, were only the Hungarians in this area).

The translators of NTB explained in the preface dedicated to the readers that they had tried to use the language that is as close as possible to the elements that are common to all Romanians (living, at that time, in three different countries: Wallachia, Moldavia, Transylvania). As far as the vocabulary is concerned, their desideratum was very close to be fulfilled; but the other levels of the language still betray the belonging of at least some of the translators to a certain part of the country. For instance, the verbal forms *povestuiesc* / *povestuind* and *a scri*[4] are clues enough to establish the small area of Banat as the homeland of (some of) translators.

Given the circumstances, our preoccupation for an analysis of the Hungarian elements found in the text printed in Alba Iulia (Bălgrad) in the 17-th century is easy to understand. We have identified a number of lexical elements which entered the deep structure[5] of the Romanian language a long time ago, they got fixed there and now they present no interest to linguists whatsoever (we refer to words like *chip, lăcui, hicleșug*[6]). Still, there are some lexemes and phrases of great interest to us: some of them have gone out of use along the centuries and some are still used today on a small, limited area (we shall discuss them in section A), some are used today

[3] *The Holy Spirit prompted / impelled the evangelists and the apostles to write in Greek* – our translation.

[4] The verb is also met, for instance, in a letter written in 1607 by a monk named Lovás – a Jesuit monk living in Banat – and addressed to the Pope.

[5] The syntagm *deep structure* should not be read in chomskian terms.

[6] The phonetic structure of the last two mentioned words has changed – although to a lesser extent – and still, their linguistic identity has been preserved.

with a different meaning (we shall discuss them in section B). A couple of words and phrases have found their place in the text as a result of the impact the Hungarian text must have had (discreet, but still existent) over the translators (we shall discuss those terms / phrases in section C).

A

1. The word *șpan* (< Hun. *ispán*), which means "vicegovernor of a Hungarian county", has been registered by Lajos Tamás in Hungarian texts written in Romanian territories before the year 1500[7]. In the 16-th century, this lexeme specific to the administrative register was also signaled in private documents and in a text specially designed for public attention, *Palia de la Orăștie*. So, it means that the Romanians living in areas with strong Hungarian influence must have been familiarized with the term. It can be read in NTB, in *Predoslovie către măriia sa, craiul Ardealului*: „craiului Ardealului, domnului părții țărîei ungurești și *șpanului* săcuilor"[8]. The authors of MDA sustain that the term was known, some time ago, in Moldavia and Transylvania and that it represents an archaism nowadays.

2. Attested for the first time by Lajos Tamás in a document written in 1432 / 1437[9] and then, some time after that, in the 16-th century, still present in a number of private letters as well as in *Documentele Hurmuzachi* and in the epilogue of Coresi's *Tetraevanghel*[10], the word *chelciug* must have been a constant presence in the vocabulary of many Romanians living in close contact with the Hungarian population (in western Romanian territories). We have noticed the use of this word in NTB in the two prefaces: „că măriia ta cu mult chelșug în toți anii trimiți în țări streine să învețe cu de-adinsul cuvîntul lui Dumnezeu; și iaste început din sfatul și di-ndemnătura și cu *chelșugul* măriei tale" (*Predoslovie către măriia sa, craiul Ardealului*), „acest testament au început a-l izvodi ermonah Silivestru din porunca și *chelșugul* măriei sale" (*Predoslovie către cetitori*). It is also registered in Luke's Gospel 14.28: „că cine dentru voi va vrea să zidească un turn, au nu va șădea mainte să-ș numere *chelșugul*, oare are de-a-l săvîrșirea?". In the same fragment from BB the translator preferred the synonym *cheltuiala*. In the 17-th century, the word was used even in Moldavia by Varlaam in his *Cazanie*, with the same meaning, and in Wallachia, in BB, but now with a different meaning („food") – as Tiktin shows. *Chelciug* is presented by DER and DAR as being archaic, but in MDA only some of its meanings are shown as archaic, for others there's no specification (which means that the word is still in use with these meanings). In one of these cases, the form *chelciug*, meaning "expence", is considered archaic nowadays.

[7] Lajos Tamás, *Ung. El. Rum.* apud B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenţei maghiare...*, p. 233. Here we also found the specification that the word represents an old term (and, consequently, out of use) even in Hungarian.

[8] Prince of Transylvania, Lord of a part of Hungary and leader of the Székely population – our translation.

[9] Lajos Tamás, *Ung. El. Rum.* apud B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenţei maghiare...*, p. 233.

[10] Ov. Densusianu, *ILR2*, p. 343.

3. There's an interesting word in Luke's Gospel, *șofar*, that has gone out of use because the designated reality disappeared some time ago. The word had a different meaning in each of the Romanian countries: in Wallachia and Moldavia it referred to the nobleman who was leader over all the prince's cooks. In Moldavia, it was also the name given to the leader of a group of noblemen. In Transylvania, *șofar* was an ordinary administrator. The word can be still heard today; it is not used as an element of the literary language, it is uttered only in some regions and with a different meaning than the ones used centuries ago. The origin of the word must be looked for in three different languages (Polish, Hungarian and German), the Hungarian etymon being *sáfár*. Lajos Tamás observed the existence of the Romanian *șafar* in texts written in the 16-th century[11]. Drawing a parallel between NTB and Gáspár Károly's *Bible*, one can easily observe a perfect equivalence between the occurrences of *șafar* in NTB and those of *sáfár* in the Hungarian Bible; a shift from this direction can be noticed in BB, since this text contains in the corresponding fragments another archaic word, *dregător* (nowadays *dregător* is used only in Transylvania, but its meaning there is "administrator"). In order to have a clearer image of this situation, we'll present fragments from the three texts excerpted from the same biblical passages: „oare cine iaste *șofariu* derept și înțelept" (NTB) – „kitsod hív és bölts *sáfár*" (Hun. B.) – „oare cine iaste cel credincios *diregătoriu* al casei și înțelept" (BB) (Luke 12.42); „carele avea *un șofariu*" (NTB) – „kinek vala egy *sáfára*" (Hun. B.) – „carele avea *un diregătoriu* casei" (BB) (Luke 16.1); „că nu vei putea mai mult a fi *șofariu*" (NTB) – „mert nem lehetsz ezután *Sáfár*" (Hun. B.) – „că nu vei putea mai mult a fi *diregătoriu*" (BB) (Luke 16.2); „zise întru sine *șofariul*" (NTB) – „monda pedig magában *a Sáfár*" (Hun. B.) – „și zise întru sine *diregătoriul* casei" (BB) (Luke 16.3). We reinforce the statement that the concrete noun *șofar* was used, at that time, at least in the area where NTB was written and bring a supplementary proof for that: in the same Gospel (Luke 16.3, 16.4), one can read the abstract noun *șofărie*, derived on Romanian grounds (it is obvious, since the components have different origins) from *șofar* (of Hungarian origin) with the suffix *–ie*[12] (of Latin origin). So there is *șofărie* in NTB and *sáfárság* in the Hungarian Bible, but *dregătorie* in BB. (However, the translators of NTB used in another place, once, *dregătorie*, in Luke's Gospel 16.2, the same with the word used by the translators of BB; meanwhile, Gáspár Károly has changed nothing in the lexical structure of his text).

4. The Hungarian noun *örök* generated *uric* in Romanian, a word which is part of what used to be a vast category of the administrative vocabulary, a category which has lost a lot of its elements along the years. This loss is due to the decrease in the number of high-positions (in the leadership of the State) or to a change in the name of these high-positions in different circumstances. The Hungarian word *örök*'s meaning is "heritage", the same with the initial meaning of the Romanian *uric* (in

[11] Lajos Tamás, *Ung. El. Rum.* apud B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenței maghiare...*, p. 236.

[12] G. Pascu considers it of Latino-Balcanic origin (G. Pascu, *Sufixele...,* p. 180), and C. Frâncu sustains that the suffix is of Latin origin (C. Frâncu, *Geneza...*, p. 77).

time, *uric* came to refer to a title deed[13]). The Romanian *uric* was found by Lajos Tamás in written documents dating from 1393[14]. The first of the Romanian texts to contain this word is *Psaltirea Șcheiană*; then we find it in *Palia de la Orăștie*[15]. The observation that the lexeme was used in private as well as in public texts can lead us to the conclusion that it was known by an important number of speakers come from different environments. In the 17-th century it is registered in texts from Moldavia[16] and also in NTB. We drew a parallel between the fragments in NTB where *uric* was attested and the corresponding fragments from BB and we remarked that the translators of NTB used the word of Hungarian origin consistently, while the translators of BB used different terms, of Latin, Serbian or Romanian origin, such as *loc* (< lat. *locus*), *țarină* (< sb. *carina*[17]), *moștenire* (derived from *a moșteni*). So, we can read in Mathew's Gospel 19.29 „și fiecine carele va lăsa ... *uricul* lui" (NTB) – „și tot carele au lăsat... *țarini*" (BB); Mathew 21.38: „veniți să omorîm pre el și să ținem *uricul* lui"(NTB) – „veniți să-l omorîm pre el și să ținem *moștenirea* lui" (BB); Luke 14.18: „*uric* am cumpărat și-mi trebuie să-l văz" (NTB) – „*țarină* am cumpărat și-m trebuie să ies să o văz" (BB); Luke 20.14: „ca să fie al nostru *uricul*" (NTB) – „ca să fie a noastră *moștenirea*" (BB); John 4.5: „aproape de *uricul* care deade Iacov lui Iosif" (NTB) – „aproape de *locul* carele au dat Iacov lui Iosif" (BB). We searched the Hungarian Bible and we have noticed the use of different words in the above-mentioned paragraphs: *jószág* ("estate; possesion, propriety"), *örökseg* ("heritage"), *szántóföld* ("ploughed field"), *major* ("farm"); therefore, the influence of the Hungarian Bible over the Romanian text is out of the question – in other words, the appearance of *uric* in the Romanian text is independent of the Hungarian source. Together with this noun of Hungarian origin, the translators used *uricaș*, a word derived on Romanian grounds from *uric* with the suffix *–aș* (also of Hungarian origin). *Uricaș* is considered obsolete from the point of view of the present stage in the development of the Romanian language; it was used in the past, but not too often (we discovered that texts registered it rarely). We have checked the latter noun in NTB and we have found it in Mathew 21.38: „acesta iaste *uricașul*". Gáspár Károly used *örökos* for this paragraph of the Bible. In BB, the translators preferred *moșteanul* instead. As we corroborate these facts, we can say that it is possible for the noun *uricaș* to have appeared in NTB as a result of the impact the source had on the translators.

[13] DER; I. Gheție, Al. Mareș, *GD*, p. 299.

[14] Lajos Tamás, *Ung. El. Rum.*, apud B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenţei maghiare...*, p. 233.

[15] Ov. Densusianu, *ILR2*, p. 345; Roxana Vieru, *Palia de la Orăștie – studiu lingviustic comparativ* – PhD Thesis .

[16] At page 299 from *GD*, I. Gheție and Al. Mareș asserted that the word was used only in Moldova in the 17-th century.

[17] Al. Ciorănescu indicates the Serbian noun as the etymon, saying that the first meaning of the word was not "cultivated field", as we know it today, but "tribute, tax". A. Scriban admitted three etymons – an Old Slavic one (*carína* "tribute"), a Serbian one (*cárina* "the tribute paid at the customs") and a Ruthenian one (*carina* "cultivated field").

5. An interesting situation is represented by the insertion of the word *tărhat* (< Hun. *terh,* accusative *terhat*[18]) in NTB, in a paragraph from Mathew's Gospel 21.5: „ziceți featei Sionului: «Iaca împăratul tău vine ție blînd și șăzînd spre asin și désupra mînzului, a asiniei învățată supt *tărhat*»". The appearance of *tărhat* in this fragment is surprising since earlier, in the eleventh chapter, the translators opted for a term of Latin origin, *jug* (< Lat. *jugum*) – Mathew 11.29: „luați *giugul* mieu spre voi", Mathew 11.30: „că e *giugul* mieu dulce". In the corresponding paragraphs from BB, we can identify the presence of the word with Latin etymology *jug* („yoke"), used here with a metaphorical meaning. In the Hungarian Bible, the author used *teher*, which is the precise etymon of the Romanian *tărhat*. Although *tar* and *terh* had already been registered in texts since the 15-th century (1407 and 1422), the first text in which *tărhat* was identified is NTB, as Lajos Tamás points out[19]. The authors of MDA specified that some of the meanings of this word have a general, yet non-literary use (among them is the one we are referring to here), while others can be found only in some parts of the country.

B.

With its phonetic "cover" and its initial semantic "core", the word *marhă* stayed for some time in close connection to the Hungarian etymon, *marha*. The form we hear nowadays is the result of hypercorectness, a phenomenon which implies that people transform *h* to *f* consciously because they know they usually commit the mistake (normal in a familiar, unceremonious environment) of palatalizing *f* to *h*. The semantic "slide" from the meaning "oxen, cattle" of the Hungarian term to the meaning "wealth" (as expressed in the number of oxen possessed) of the Romanian word as we find it in old texts and finally to the meaning "goods destined to be exchanged in the free market" represents the transition from individual to general. In other words, it is a semantic expansion. According to Lajos Tamás's dictionary, the word *marha* was first attested in the 16-th century[20] (one can read it in Coresi's Collection of Homilies – *Cazanii* – and in *Palia de la Orăștie*). After a close examination of *Palia de la Orăștie*, we came to the conclusion that the word was handled naturally, that the translators used it easily, because they must have heard the word a lot around them. From this we infer that the Romanian communities from Transylvania and Banat must have known the word really well in the 16-th century. One century after that, the same word was used in the text written in Alba Iulia (Bălgrad) in 1648: „carele deade noao fîntîna aceasta de carea au beut el, și feciorii lui, și *marha* lui" (John, 4.12). Searching the same paragraph in BB, we came across a more common term (used by the Romanians living in all three Romanian Countries): „carele au dat noao fîntîna, și el dentru ea au băut, și fiii lui, și *dobitoacele* lui". In the Hungarian Bible, Gáspár Károly used *barom* "animal": „ki nekünk adia e kutat, mellyböl ivott mind ő, mind az ő fijai, mind *barmai*". This

[18] DER.
[19] Lajos Tamás, *Ung. El. Rum.*, apud B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenţei maghiare...*, p. 233.
[20] *Ibidem*, p. 236.

means that the occurence of *marhă* in NTB is not due to the influence of the Hungarian source.

C

As they try to reveal the biblical text to a large public, the translators confront two problems. One represents the synthesis of the aspects that are inherent to any transposition of some contents from one language to another: first, it is possible that the target language might not have the linguistic form to carry the notions expressed in the source language; second, the polysemy can generate all sorts of misunderstandings (wrong interpretations of a word) – either at the point of encoding or at the point of decoding the message; third, the selection, from a synonymic series, of one element that best fits the context requires refinement and a keen sense of language; and last, but not least, the translator must be familiarized with the knowledge horizon and the way of living of the populations involved, speaking the source language and the target language, in order to manage the notions in an easy and precise manner. Any translation of religious texts implies supplementary difficulties, the greatest of which – in our opinion – is the danger of falling into the trap of mixing up the material with the spiritual aspects of life, a mistake that is very common with this kind of texts.

The purpose of glosses (commentaries) in translations is to ease the understanding of certain linguistic structures or of some wider contexts (with their social determinations and precise coordinates of space and time). The glosses which reflect a synonymic relation with a lexeme or a phrase from the text can stir the interest of any linguist.

For any translation of some religious text, the translators had at their disposal similar texts written in languages considered sacred at that time, maybe some books written in vernacular languages and sometimes even a book containing an older translation, of the same text, in Romanian. In such circumstances, sometimes it happens that the source text(s) exercises (exercise) such an influence over the translators that words or phrases which occur there might appear in the (new) translation as well; such words or phrases may sound unnatural in the target language. After parallel confrontations with other texts, ideas may become clearer – in other cases, the situation might become even worse after such a confrontation – and translators give supplementary information in glosses.

The translators sometimes used neologisms (considered so at that time) and so they felt the need to explain them or to indicate some synonyms. Such terms were definitely used only by cultivated, educated people. Thus, some glosses explain, in common, neutral vocabulary some elevated words that one can read in the (body of the) text[21]: *publican – vameși* (Mathew 5.46) (the latter word, of Hungarian origin, was well-known by all the speakers of Romanian), *publicani – mitarnici* (Mark 2.15, 2.16); *maghii – filosofii* (Mathew 2.7) (both terms are of Greek origin, but it seems

[21] Every first word in each series is the elevated word.

that the latter was considered by the translators to be better known to the public), *maghii – găcitori* (Mathew 2.16); *tetrarha biruitoriu – al patru biruitoriu de lume* (Mathew 14.1); *în corban – în vistiariia besearecii* (Mathew 27.6); *sinagogei – săborului* (Mark 5.22), *sinagogiile – pre unde sînt strînși de ascultă cuvîntul lui* Dumnezău (Mark 13.9); pretor – ce să zice casă de leage (Mark 15.16); *gazofilachiia – vistiiarul besearicii* (Luke 21.1); *isop – trestie* (John 19.29); *ariopag – ariopag iaste casa oraşului unde să strîngea deregătorii* (Acts of the Apostles 17.1); *teatron – ce să zice greceaşte teatron ce e loc de luptă, în mijlocul oraşului unde să strîngea oamenii să vază lucrul de minuni* (Acts of the Apostles 19.29); *preazviteri – cîrstnici au ţîrcovnici* (John's Second Epistle 1.1), *preazviterul – bătrînul* (John's Third Epistle 1.1).

We found one special kind of glosses in NTB. The authors of this translation declared that they wanted to keep their text apart from the regional or temporal variations of the Romanian language. They said their goal was to keep the language to what was common to contemporary speakers of Romanian. Since they were conscious of the regional or archaic character of a word or phrase, NTB's authors considered that it was appropriate to resort to glosses in order to make the translation understood by any of the possible readers. That's why one can find in NTB synonymic doublets like *hrăborim – smerim* (John's Epistle 3.19).

Under these circumstances, the way back (namely from common to regional – there are some phrases in the text that are explained in the glosses by means of regional terms) is strange. In the Acts of the Apostles 27.10, the term of Slavic origin *povară* (*povarăei*), generally known by the Romanian speakers of that time, is explained in a gloss by means of another word, this time of Hungarian origin – known by fewer people.

As we mentain the same direction of our discourse, we can draw attention over some phrases that somehow copy the structure of the phrases in Hungarian.

In Mathew's Gospel 24.17, one can read the following fragment: „Și carele e în pod, să nu pogoară să ia ceva den casa lui." Although very well known in the entire territory inhabited by Romanians, the word *pod* ("garret") was explained in a gloss like this: *casă de sus* ("house from upstairs"). Obviously, the phrase which doesn't make sense in the context (in some other context it may have a certain meaning, but different than the one intended here) is opened to question. As we searched different versions of Vulgata, we observed that the paragraph is written like this: „et qui in *tecto* non descendat tollere aliquid de domo sua", where *tecta* designates the same reality as the one designated by means of the Romanian *pod*. In BB, the authors used the same word as in NTB, in the body of the text. In the Hungarian Bible, Gáspár Károly wrote: „a ki *felső házában* leszen"; since *ház* means "house" (thus *házában* means "in the house") and *felső* means "superior", "somewhere up", we understand that the authors of NTB made the translation of each and every component of the Hungarian structure (that is natural for this language, but so unnatural for Romanian).

The Hungarian translator of the New Testament[22] understood only that he had to express the idea of "the superior part of a house" – though Hungarian has a perfect equivalent for the idea expressed in Romanian by *podul casei*, and that is by means of the word *padlás* or the phrase *a ház padlása*. In NTB, in Luke's Gospel 17.31, we found „carele va fi în *pod*" – without any further comments – a fragment that is the same with the one found in BB. In the Hungarian Bible, in the same paragraph we could read „*a háznak felette*", where *felette* adv. "above". So it seems that the translators of NTB were not entirely influenced by the Hungarian text.

The term sechera occurs in Luke's Gospel 1.15, in „că va fi mare înaintea Domnului şi vin şi *sechera* nu va bea". The same formulation can be found in *BB*. Analyzing what happens with the Latin Bible, we identify the following expression: „erit enim magnus coram Domino et vinum et *sicera* non bibet". In the New Testament written in Greek there is also sivkera (!estai gaVr mevga" e*nwvpion Kurivou, kaiV oi`non kaiV sivkera). Thus, we can easily notice that the Romanian translation is oriented towards the Latin and the Greek texts. But we also compared the fragment with the marginal commentary (the gloss) in NTB, where *sechera* is explained as *beutură de beţie*. This analytical structure sends us again to the Hungarian text. Indeed, the corresponding fragment from the Hungarian Bible contains the phrase *részegitő italt*, in which case *italt* (*italt* is an accusative form) designates the notion of "drink", and *részegitő* means "producing dizziness, intoxicating" (*reszegség* "drunkenness, intoxication").

A parallel between NTB and BB offers us again the opportunity to check the Hungarian Bible for phrases in order to understand the ideas expressed in the first translation of the New Testament into Romanian and the forms used there. In Luke's Gospel 14.2 we find „un om bolnav de *boala apei*" (NTB) – „un om bolnav de *idropică*" (BB). In the same part, the Latin text registeres „hommo quidam *hydropicus* erat", and the Greek text has the following expression „i*douV a!nqrwpov" ti" h\n *u&drwpikoV'*". The word *vizkórságos* occurs in the Hungarian text (in the phrase *egy vizkórságos ember*), also meaning "hydropsy", but decomposing the word in smaller parts, we realized that the Hungarian term has the following structure: *viz* "water" and *kór* "illness", plus the suffix normally used for abstract nouns *–ság* and the suffix *–os*, used to make adjectivs. Therefore, the text printed in Bucharest (BB) follows the Greek and the Latin texts, while the text printed in Alba-Iulia (NTB) follows the Hungarian Bible.

After such a short study of the vocabulary, we can still say for sure that the Hungarian Bible whose author is Gáspár Károly had a great impact on the translators of the Romanian New Testament printed in Bălgrad (Alba Iulia), no matter whether they wanted to admit it or not.

[22] The New Testament had a Protestant (Calvinist) Hungarian version, an integral translation which was done by Tamás Félegyházy in 1586. Four years later, Gáspár Károly printed the entire Bible, translating the Old Testament again (as some of the books from the Old Testament had already been translated by Gáspár Heltai) and taking the New Testament from Félegyházy, without modifying it.

Bibliography

Sources

Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură..., Bucureşti, 1688 – the original printed edition (biblacad.ro)

Biblia hebraica ex recensione Aug. Hahnii cum Vulgata interpretatione latina, Ern. Bredtii, Lipsae, 1868

Károly, Gáspár, 1840, *Szent Biblia*, Kőszegen, Reichárd Károly Költségével's Betüivel

Noul Testament de la Bălgrad, 1640 – the original printed edition (biblacad.ro)

Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine, Friburgi Brisgoviae Sumptibus Herder, Typographi Editoris Pontificii, 1906

Dictionaries

*** *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române*, volumul I (A-B), Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2012 [= DELR]

*** *Dicţionar maghiar-român*, Editura Carocom, Bucureşti, 2005

*** *Mic dicţionar academic*, (vol. 1-2), Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, Bucureşti, 2010 [= MDA]

Bulgăr, Gheorghe, Constantinescu-Dobridor, Gh., 2007, *Dicţionar de arhaisme şi regionalisme*, Editura Saeculum Vizual, Bucureşti, [vol. I şi II] [= DAR]

Ciorănescu, Alexandru, 2002, *Dicţionarul etimologic al limbii române,* Editura Saeculum I. O., Bucureşti [= DER]

Scriban, August, 1939, *Dicţionaru limbii româneşti*, Institutul de arte grafice „Presa bună", Iaşi

Tiktin, H., 1903, *Dicţionar român-german*, vol. I, Imprimeria Statului, Bucuresci, 1903

Studies and articles

Densusianu, Ovid, 1961, *Istoria limbii române,* vol. II, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti [= Ov. Densusianu, *ILR2*]

Dimitrescu, Florica, 1994, *Dinamica lexicului românesc*, Editura Logos, Cluj-Napoca

Frâncu, Constantin, 1999, *Geneza limbii române şi etnogeneza românilor*, Casa Editorială *Demiurg*, Iaşi [= C. Frâncu, *Geneza...*]

Gheţie, Ion, 1974, *Graiurile daco-române în secolul al XVI-lea*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, Bucureşti [= I. Gheţie, *GD*]

Gheţie, Ion; Teodorescu, Mirela, 1966, *Asupra desinenţei* –u *a pers. 3. pl. a indicativului perfect. Noi contribuţii*, în „Studii şi cercetări lingvistice", XVII, 1966, nr. 2

Kelemen, Bela, 1971, *Cu privire la începuturile influenţei maghiare*, Extras din „Cercetări de lingvistică", XVI, 1971, nr. 2 [= B. Kelemen, *Începuturile influenţei maghiare...*]

Mareş, Al. (coord.), 1994, *Crestomaţia limbii române vechi*, vol. I, Editura Academiei române, Bucureşti

Pascu, G., 1916, *Sufixele româneşti*, Librăriile SOCEC & Co., Bucureşti

Vieru, Roxana, *Palia de la Orăştie* – comparative linguistic study, PhD Thesis