Reflections on the Hungarian Original's Influence on the Romanian Translation of *Palia De La Orăştie*

Enikő PÁL

Le statut d'originaux hongrois qui étaient à la base de l'ancienne traduction roumaine émerge très particulière dans le contexte de la periode ancienne, d'autant plus que, dans cette période, seulement le grec, le latin et le slave ont été reconnus par l'Eglise comme langage culte.
Parmi les traductions Calvino-roumaines du Banat-Hunedoara on trouve Palia qui est le plus important texte pour l'influence hongroise sur le Roumain; dans ce cas, nous pouvons voire certains conséquences profondes de la source hongroise sur la traduction roumaine.
Comme toute traduction, la transposition du message divin d'une langue à une autre implique l'action successive, parallèle ou combinée de plusieurs systèmes de langage et de pensée. Parfois, les sources utilisées augmentent, autrefois, limitent les possibilités de choix des formes appropriées et les plus près du système linguistique pour le contenu traduit. L'original hongrois a pu fournir aux traducteurs une plus grande liberté dans la traduction que pour ceux qui traduisaient de langues cultes. Mais comme c'était naturel, la traduction roumaine n'a pas réussit à effacer complètement les traces de l'original hongrois dont les empreintes sont partout. Les conséquences les plus évidentes de la traduction sont, bien sûr, les emprunts lexicales du texte source, respectivement les interférences (les calques) lexicaux-grammaticaux qui seront illustrés dans la présente étude.

Mots-clés: traduction, textes religieux, l'influence hongroise, les emprunts, calques linguistiques.

1. Translation of the *Bible* into vernacular languages has been of great importance for each and every Christian nation in order to profess its faith, while in case of certain laguages (such as German, for instance) it has played a major role in establishing its standard variety. Within Romanian cultural and linguistic space, translation of the holy books also contributed to the "nationalization" of the church (Gheție 1974: 26), in other words, it represented the premises and an opportunity to establish Romanian language use in liturgy and in writing

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

practices[1]. Initiated and promoted by Reformation, translation of the sacred books into Romanian in the sixteenth century meant, on the one hand, a battle against Orthodox canons. On the other hand, it was a revolution of the very tradition of these texts' writing since, in this period, Greek, Latin and Old Slavonic were the only languages acknowledged by the Church[2].

Given these circumstances, Hungarian sources of Romanian translations and especially their great amount[3] might appear as a curiosity, not entirely out of the common though[4]. Old Romanian translators often appeal to Hungarian (protestant) versions of the *Bible* which may be explained, on the one hand, by the fact that the great majority of these translations were produced by Calvinism[5],

[1] As a matter of fact, translation and printing of religious books which appeared under the auspices of Lutheranism or Calvinism had other purposes among which the most important being conversion (also with commercial, economic benefits). Their influence with respect to the encouragement of writing in Romanian was, therefore, of secondary importance. Nevertheless, the contribution of Protestantism to claim and, eventually, to establish the national (Romanian) language in church services is undeniable.

[2] It is eloquent, in this regard, the preface of *Palie*, for instance, in which the autors' dissimulation with respect to its sources actually seeks to legitimate the Romanian text. Thus, in their testimony, according to which the book has been "rendered from Jewish and Greek and Serbian languages into Romanian" (my translation), the translators seem to pursue the printing's acknowledgment and acceptance by the church, on the one hand, and by the readers, on the other hand. However, it has been undoubtably demonstrated that those stated in this testimony are not true.

[3] In the sixteenth century, "right after Slavonic, Hungarian language was the second most often recoursed to as source by Romanian translators" (my translation) (Gheție - Mareş 1985: 416).

[4] The choice for one source over another was guided by various factors. For instance, cultural constraints had a great impact on the selection of sources. Adopting a model of *Bible* translation available at the time (Slavonic, Latin, Hungarian, German) was determined, on a restricted level, by the local authority (Gafton 2009a: 3), represented by the dominant confession (orthodox or protestant), and, on a larger level, by the cultural sphere of influence to which the region where the translation had been carried out belonged to. Regarding this latter aspect, in the sixteenth century the Romanian territory was divided into Moldavia and Wallachia, on the one hand, falling under the Eastern (Greek-Slavonic) sphere of influence, and Transylvania, on the other hand, under Western (Latin) influence (*ibidem*, p. 7). Thus, it is quite natural that, unlike the *Bible* translations from Moldavia and Wallachia with Slavonic sources, in the region of Banat-Hunedoara, translators of sacred texts frequently appeal, in different proportions, to Hungarian sources which played the role of an intermediator towards the West.

[5] See *Molitvenic* [The Prayer Book] (1564) whose original is considered to be the Hungarian *Agenda azaz Szentegyházi chelekedetec, Mellyeket követnek közönségesképpen a kereszténi Ministerec és Lelkipásztoroc* [*Agenda i.e. holy deeds of Church which are commonly pursued by Ministers and Pastors,* my translation] (Drăganu 1921-1922: 267). The Romanian book contains whole passages of literal translation from the second edition of Heltai's work (*ibidem*, p. 267) as well as many Hungarian loanwords (*ibidem*, p. 295). For other reflections on its original see also Gheție 1982: 13-15; Gheție – Mareş 1985: 267. Another product of the Romanian Calvinist movement is *Cartea de cîntece* [The Book of Psalms] (1570-1573) in which, like in the model provided by the Hungarian original (as a matter of fact, several Hungarian collections of songs), Romanian writing adopted Hungarian spelling. Additionally, the songs in this book are divided into verses which imitate the quantitative rhythm patterns of the Hungarian models (Gheție – Mareş 1985: 114). For examples of linguistique calques in this text see Ion Gheție, in TEXTE ROM.: 278-

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

also propagated by Hungarians. On the other hand, due to particular historical, political, cultural etc. conditions, in those regions where these translations can be located (in Banat-Hunedoara), Hungarian language enjoyed high prestige which could confer authority to the *Bible* versions written in this vernacular language. In addition, in these regions there existed long term and vivid contacts between Romanians and Hungarians, thereby Hungarian language could have been even more accessible for Romanian translators than the acknowledged worship languages. Hence, in these regions, translation of Hungarian sources or the use of Hungarian models, among others, has been only natural.

Among the Calvinist Romanian translations from Banat-Hunedoara which are based on Hungarian sources there figures the *Palie* which we shall analyze in what follows. Beside its importance for Hungarian influence, our choice of this text has yet another motivation. Although contemporary with other Romanian translations of the sixteenth century (including those with Slavonic originals), this one shows a calitative progress, an improvement with respect not only to the act of translation itself but also to texts written in old Romanian language as such (Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 50). Beginning with this text, Romanian language acquires the premises to become an instrument of culture in the true sense of the word. Some of the difficulties which translators of old Romanian texts had met could have been solved precisely due to the fact that, beside the Latin source, this text has a Hungarian original too, i.e. a vernacular source.

2. Like any other translation, conveying the words of God from one language to another implies a successive, parallel or combinated interaction of several language and thought systems. In some cases, the sources employed may increase the translator's possibilities to choose the appropriate forms which correspond to the content and, in the same time, as close to his own system as possible. Yet in other cases the source may impose certain constraints in the process of translation. In the sixteenth century, the principle of literal translation[6] could also determine translators' options. Since the sacred text could not be altered in the least, translators often remain faithful to the source and show less

279, 314-321. Last but not least, the most important work for Hungarian influence is *Palia de la Orăştie* [The Old Testament from Orăştie] (1581-1582) which, beside a Latin edition of *Vulgata*, follows Heltai's *Pentateuh* (see the demonstration of M. Roques, in the *Preface* of his edition PO 1925: III – LXIII). As a matter of fact, on a lexical level, there can be found certain similarities between *Palia, Cartea de cîntece, Cazania I* [Homiliary the 1st] and *Molitvenic* (Iorga 1904: 75-76; Gheţie - Mareş 1985: 361).

[6] In case of sixteenth century's translations of religious texts, the principle of literal translation is tightly related to the problem of legitimation. This could also explain why translators tended not to break the limits of religious conservatism even if this resulted in neglecting the requirements of Romanian language and/or the readers. On the other hand, the attempts to solve the incompatibilities between the two language and thought systems were not always successful but sometimes they led to the imitation of the source model. The authors free themselves from the constraints of literal translation in situations in which their concern for readers prevail or in which transmission of a hardly comprehensible content becomes primary (cf. Gafton 2010c: 1).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

interest towards intelligibility or towards the requirements of the Romanian language system. Hungarian sources, on the contrary, could have provided translators a greater freedom in the translation process than other languages of cults used as sources in those times.

3. Nevertheless, the Romanian translation could not erase completely the traces of the Hungarian original whose marks can be found in many passages of the target text. Naturally, the most obvious consequences of translation are the loanwords from the source text, on the one hand, and lexical and grammatical interferences, on the other hand. The latter ones can be traced best in situations in which the replica of a grammatical pattern of the source language breaks an existing pattern of the target language, resulting passages of the original's slavish imitation. Although aware of the constraints imposed by his mother tongue, the translator sometimes has a tendency to extend the liberties offered by the source language onto the target language, in which those would not be allowed.

3.1. Such passages may be regarded as "translation marks"[7], as examples of the Hungarian source's influence. Among these we could mention some discursive elements, loanwords and certain linguistique calques.

3.1.1. The first category includes inserts of expressions used in Hungarian conventional forms of address someone with affection and of interjections such as: *ni* 'hey' or *batăr* 'at least, though': *Ni, batăr, așa să fie cum dzici* 'Behold, I would it might be according to thy word' (*Gen*., 30, 34, cf. *Am bator vgy legyen à mint mondod*); inserts of adjective phrases as marks of affection in direct address: *Ascultă-ne, bun doamne* 'Hear us my (good) lord' (*Gen*., 23, 6, cf. *Halgasmeg münket ió vram*); *drag fiiule* 'my (dear) son' (*Gen*., 43, 29, cf. *Szeretö fiam*), *Drag Doamne* 'my (dear) Lord' (*Gen*., 44, 18, cf. *Szeretö Wram*), *Drag tată!* 'my (dear) father!' (*Gen*., 27, 18, cf. *Szeretö attyam*); or certain patterns of emotional reinforcement, common in Hungarian, such as in: *Bine cunoaștem* 'we (well) know (him)' (*Gen*., 29, 5, cf. *Jol ismeryiuc*). All these obviously follow the Hungarian speech patterns and formulas of discourse construction provided by the source text, preserving including Hungarian word order. Expressing the superlative with the words *prea* 'so, very, really' or *tare* 'strongly, very' also appear in the translation as a result of calques, in: *tare plodit face-voi tine* 'I shall make you very fruitful' (*Gen*., 17, 6), *prea tare voiu înmulți* 'I shall make him (very) fruitful' (*Gen*., 17, 20), *păcatele lor tare se-au îngreoiat* 'their sin so (very) grievous' (*Gen*., 18, 20), *tare se spămîntă și tare tremura* '(Jacob) was greatly

[7] These "marks" undoubtably show that the translation follows the Hungarian source, especially in cases in which these elements of the Romanian text do not have correspondents in the Latin version but reproduce exactly what appears to be in the Hungarian one. For a detailed presentation of these marks see Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 52-188.

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

afraid and (very) distressed' (Gen., 32, 7), the Romanian adverbs corresponding here to Hung. *igen* 'really, indeed, greatly, very'[8].

Same here we could mention certain conjunctions which have the role of providing the discourse's coherence. These represent a means of message construction offered by the Hungarian model, they being used in the target language even with the morphosyntactic value of their Hungarian correspondents, such as: *încă* 'too, as well', in: *Lot încă mearse cu el* 'and Lot (too) went with him' (*Gen*., 12, 4, cf. *Lotthis elmene vele*); *După aceea* 'then' (*Gen*., 8, 19, cf. *Annakutanna*), *Așa* 'thus' (*Gen*., 12, 5, cf. *Eképen*), *În acest chip* 'in this way' (*Gen*., 31, 20, cf. *Ekepen*), *derept acea* 'therefore' (*Gen*., 17, 23, cf. *azokaert*, see also *derept aceaia* 'therefore', *Gen*., 50, 25 or *derept aceasta* 'therefore', *Gen*., 19, 32, cf. *Ezokaert*). Representative of the Hungarian source's influence is the frequent use of the conjunction *iară* 'but, in turn' as well (see also Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 77), which corresponds to Hung. *kedig* 'but, in turn', as in: *Iară aceasta este legătura care voi țineți între mine și între voi* '(In turn) This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you' (*Gen*., 17, 10, cf. *Ez kedig az én Kötesem, mellyet tü meg tarchatoc, én közettem s tü közettetec*); in: *El, iară, zise lor* 'He, in turn, said to them' (*Gen*., 24, 56, cf. *Ö kedig monda*); *Eu, iară, o bucățea de pîine aduce-voiu voao* 'I, but, a morsel of bread will fetch (you)' (*Gen*., 18, 5, cf. *En kedig egy falat kenyeret hozoc tünektec*); *Adunară, iară, într-o grămadă broaștele* 'Piled, but, into heaps the frogs' (*Ex*., 8, 14, cf. *Rakásba gyüytec kedig à békákat*, where the Latin source has the narrative *et* 'and'). In these cases, *iară* 'but, in turn' has a discoursive function rather than a grammatical value just like the Hung. *kedig* 'but, in turn' which resembles a modalizator. In fact, these constructions could have resulted from the overextension of these conjunctions' certain (cvasi) equivalent semantic values in Romanian and Hungarian (such as the adversative or the conclusive values) in situations in which translators found it to be an acceptable procedure. Hungarian influence is obvious whith respect to the use of this conjunction since, in most of the cases, the Latin source does not include any conjunction.

Somewhat similar to the situation above is the sometimes forced use of the adverb *cum* 'as, how, like, (that)' with a conjunction value resembling its formal correspondent, the Hungarian conjunction *hogy* 'that' (see also Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 73). Therefore, *cum* just like its Hungarian correspondent sometimes precedes purpose clauses instead of the characteristic conjunctions *încît / ca…să* 'so that', as in: *Și puse Domnul pre Cain un semn, cum nimea să ni-l ucigă* 'And put the Lord on Cain a mark, (so) that any (who found him) should attack him' (*Gen*., 4, 15, cf. *Es az WR Iegyet vete Cainra, hogy senki azoc közzöl ötet meg ne ölneyé*); *Cine afară am scos ei den țara Eghipetului, cum între ei să lăcuiesc*

[8] The superlative with *igen* 'very, really' has other Romanian correspondents too, as in: *bărbat vîrtos mare* 'the man (Moses) was very great' (*Ex*., 11, 3 – cf. *igen nagy ember* 'very great man', where *igen* is used with the meaning 'very, really, indeed').

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

'Who brought them out of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them' (*Ex*., 29, 46, cf. *ki hosztam öket Egyiptusnac földéböl, hogy köztetec lakiam*). Hungarian *hogy* 'that' typically precedes direct object clauses and due to the source text's influence its Romanian correspondent *cum* 'that' is enriched with this value as well, as in: *Plăcu lu Moisi cum cu acest om să rămîie într-una* 'Liked Moses that with this man he dwell with (i.e. And Moses was content to dwell with the man)' (*Ex*., 2, 21, cf. *Tetzéc Mosesnec hogy ez emberrel együtt maradna*"); *Și cînd văzu cum că nu poate învince...* 'When (the man) saw that he did not prevail' (*Gen*., 32, 25).

3.1.2. Loanwords, on the other hand, may also be regarded as translation marks although it is not absolutely necessary for them to be actual examples of the source text's influence, since some of these words may precede the translation per se[9]. These lexical elements either close a conceptual gap, or appear as an immediate response to a difficulty in translation, or reflect the translators' deliberate option which is meant to enrich a certain synonymic series, possibly with the purpose to achieve a more refined utterance[10].

Among the Hungarian loanwords of bookish origin which penetrated through and within the Romanian translation we could mention the following: *a aldovani* 'to sacrifice (oneself), to offer (oneself)' (in: *Mielul paștilor noastre Hs. cine derept noi se-au aldovănit* 'Our Paschal Lamb Hs. (i.e. Jesus) who for us sacrificed (himself)', *Ex*., 12 – cf. Hung. *aldosztatot* 'sacrificed (himself)'); *alnic* 'cunning', 'sly', 'deceitful' (in: *Și șarpele era mai alnic de toate jigăniile pămîntului* '(And) the serpent was more cunning than any beast of the field', *Gen*., 3, 1; see also its derivative *alnicie* 'deceitfulness', in: *Răspunseră ... cu alnicie* 'Answered… deceitfully', *Gen*., 34, 13 – cf. Hung. *alnakul* 'deceitfully'); *batăr* (see above); *berc* 'grove', 'copse', 'thicket' (in: *Însă preastoalele acelora zdrobească [!] și bozii lor fringe și bercurele lor taie* 'But ye shall destroy their

[9] Some of these might have belonged either to the translators who were familiar with the Hungarian language or to the region, in general, where Hungarian influence had been quite strong. Sometimes it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the folk or bookish nature of the Hungarian loanwords recorded in the translation since these two types of influences inextricably intermingle.

[10] Borrowing a foreign word occurs most often when in the target language there is a lack of that element and it takes place in order either to close a conceptual gap, or to express a certain nuance of it, in other words when there is a necessity observed by the target language speaker. However, this necessity may not always be a real one (see Gafton 2010b: 79) or, at any rate, it is not always controlled by linguistic reasons only. For instance, the use of *hasnă* 'utility' (< Hung. *haszna* 'utility'), although in Romanian there existed *folos* 'utility', has its explanation beyond the requirements of the Romanian language system because neither did the two concurrent words specialize their meaning, nor did the old Romanian word semantically overload (*ibidem*, p. 79). Nevertheless, the use of *hasnă* 'utility' may not be regarded as superfluous nor parasitic because, at that time and especially in the region where the translation had been made, this word had been in current use, possibly regarded as according to the regional norm. Similarly, in addition to some differences in meaning, by using *besadă* 'word(s), speech, discourse, counsel' (< Hung. *beszéd* 'id.') the translators could have sought to enrich its synonymic series, endowing Romanian language with the necessary means of expression appropriate to religious discourse.

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

altars, break their images, and cut down their groves', *Ex*., 34, 13 – cf. Hung. *Berkeket* 'groves'); *gheman* 'diamond' (in: *În al doilea rînd fie carmel, safir şi gheman* 'And the second row shall be an emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond', *Ex*., 28, 18 – cf. Hung. *Gemāt* 'diamond', cf. Lat. *iaspis*)[11]; *giolgiu* 'linen, shroud, fine cloth' (in: *Fă lor den giolgiu şi cămăşui* 'Make them linen breeches'*, Ex*., 28, 42 – cf. Hung. *gyolch* 'linen'); *jemblă* 'fine meal, white bread' (in: *…grăbeaşte-te şi meastecă trei măsuri de făină de jemble şi coace pîine* 'Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make bread', *Gen*., 18, 6 – cf. Hung. *semlye* 'fine meal', cf. Lat. *similae*); *lepiniu* 'wafer, pita, crumpet' (in: *Pîine adzimă cu oleiu mestecată pogace şi cu uleiu uns lepiniu de adzimă* 'unleavened bread, and cakes unleavened tempered with oil, and wafers unleavened anointed with oil', *Ex*., 29, 2 – cf. Hung. *lepént* 'wafer, crumpet'); *mereu* '(of gold) authentic, pure' (in: *Şi tot acest lucru dentreg şi mereu aur era* 'all of it was one beaten work of pure gold', *Ex*., 37, 22 - cf. Hung. *merö* 'pure'); *naşfă* 'binding', 'ornament (of clothing)', 'jewelry', 'ouch' (in: *Fă şi doo naşfe şi doo lanţure den curat aur* 'And thou shalt make two ouches (and two chains) of (pure) gold'*, Ex.,* 28, 13)[12]; *pint* 'measure for liquids' (in: *şi un pint de uleiu de lemn* 'and an hin of oil olive', *Ex*., 30, 24 – cf. Hung. *Hin*, cf. Lat. *hin*)[13]; *rudă* 'bar' (in: *Şi polei cu aur scîndurile, rudele încă le polei* 'And (he) overlaid the boards with gold, the bars he also gilded', *Ex*., 36, 34 – cf. Hung. *rudakat* 'bars'); *sicluş* 'old Hebrew coin, shekels' (in: *care 10 sicluş de aur cumpăniia* 'of ten shekels weight of gold'*, Gen.,* 24, 22 - cf. Hung. *syclus* 'shekels', cf. Lat. *siclos*); *siriu* 'tool', 'instrument', 'weapon' (in: *Ia, derept acea, siriul tău, cucura, arcul şi pasă la cîmp şi prinde vînat mie* 'Take, therefore, thy weapons, thy quiver and thy bow, and go out to the field, and take me some venison', *Gen*., 27, 3 – cf. Hung. *szerszam* 'weapon', cf. Lat. *arma*); *a sucui* '(get) used to, to accustom' (in: *Cum omul cu priiatnicul său au sucuit a grăi* 'as a man (used to) speaketh unto his friend', *Ex*., 33, 11 – cf. Hung. *szokot* 'used to'); *şinor* 'lace', 'snare', 'string', 'cord' (in: *Şi leagă aceaia cu şinor de mătase galbină* 'And thou shalt bind it with yellow silk lace', *Ex*., 28, 37 – cf. Hung. *sinor* 'lace') and *a văndăgi* 'to precipitate, to (over)throw', 'to besiege' (in: *Şi văndăgindu-i pre ei Domnedzeu înecă-i în mijloc de unde* 'and the Lord overthrew (the Egyptians) in the midst of the sea', *Ex*., 14, 27)[14]. Some of these

[11] See also in: *Carmen, safir şi gheman* 'An emerald, a sapphire, and a diamond'*, Ex.,* 39, 11 – cf. Hung. *Gemant* 'diamond'. The Romanian form could have resulted due to a false association with the Hungarian accusative case desinence *–t* which, therefore, has been omitted.

[12] Its etymon (Hung. *násphát* 'binding', 'ornament (of clothing)', 'jewelry, ouch') does not appear in the same context as the loanword, the former one preceding, in the source text (see in *Gen.,* 24, 22), the latter one which renders here Hung. *boglarokat* 'id.'.

[13] The term derives from Hung. *pint* 'pinta, mass', MNYSZ < Lat. med. *pinta*; Germ. *Pinte, Pint*; cf. EWUR, p. 613.

[14] The word derives from Hung. *vondogál* 'tracto, wiederholt ziehen', MNYSZ, cf. *ILR, II,* p. 345; cf. Pamfil 1958: 241; EWUR, p. 845; etymology also sustained in Arvinte–Gafton 2007: 390. This loanword might have had a spoken usage in the dialect of Romanians from Banat-Hunedoara since its Hungarian etymon does not appear in the same passage as its Romanian correspondent, the latter

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

words were borrowed from a spoken regional variety of Hungarian language, others are savant neologisms which belong to the Hebrew terminology of the *Bible* and which translators could have borrowed, sometimes without any formal adaptation, directly from the Hungarian text. Their use enriched the old Romanian religious vocabulary with new elements, some of them being preserved in later translations of the *Bible* and/or in works from the next centuries as well[15], thus contributing to the consolidation of old Romanian religious discourse on the one hand, and to the establishment of old Romanian (literary) language, on the other hand. Then again other loanwords, not completely unfamiliar in Romanian but perhaps part of its passive vocabulary, might have been reintroduced and reinforced by the frequent use of their possible etymons in the source text and, last but not least, some others could have gained a wider diffusion in spoken language precisely due to their penetration into religious discourse.

In addition to common names, the number of proper names in Romanian encreases as well, some of the latter ones being obviously influenced by the Hungarian source text. For instance, this is the case of certain anthroponyms which the translators, being preoccupied not to modify the names they might not have been familiar with, borrowed in their Hungarian inflexional forms in which they appear in the source text, such as: *Ananimot, Leabimot, Ludimot* 'Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim' (*Gen*., 10, 13)*,* where *-(o)t* is the Hungarian accusative case desinence (see also Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 89). In other cases, Hungarian influence exerts its power on the target text precisely while translators attempt to avoid Hungarian inflexional forms. Thus, in the passage: *o fântână ce iaste lăngă Saru* 'by the fountain in the way to Shur' (*Gen*., 16, 7), the toponym seems to be due to a false association with the Hungarian accusative case desinence which, therefore, has been omitted although, in this case, the Hungarian correspondent is not an inflexional form *Saru* + *-t* but a compound: *Sar* (cf. Lat. *Sur*) + *ut* 'road' (M Roques, in PO 1925, p. XLIV).

3.1.3. The most remarkable traces of the Hungarian original within the Romanian text are obviously the linguistic calques[16]. These are meant to solve,

---

one translating here the Hungarian expression: *szoritabe öket az WR* 'the Lord (over)threw (…) into' (see the Hebrew: *shook off*).

[15] For instance, Hungarian loanwords like: *alnic* 'cunning', 'sly', *batăr* 'at least, though' (see also *batîr*), *siriu* 'tool, instrument, weapon' (see also *sir*), *a sucui* 'to accustom' are characteristic for Calvinist Romanian texts and they are attested in the seventeenth century too as "regional literary" terms (see DLRLV, s.v.).

[16] Beside the translators' involuntary or deliberate choice determined by merely linguistic constraints, such as their bilingual status, the presence of these calques in the Romanian translation has yet another motivation which explains their great number. Since the words of God could not be altered at all, the most often and widely accepted way of rendering the sacred text was that of a literal translation which obviously led to numerous calques in each and every vernacular language in which the *Bible* had been translated. (Arvinte 2006: 463). Therefore, in the case of PO, a certain calque may be of Hebrew origin but since it has been preserved both in Heltai's version and in the Latin *Vulgata* it is quite difficult to state from which of these latter two it penetrated into the Romanian translation. This might be the case of certain iterative constructions such as: *cu moarte*

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

even if temporarily, a certain conflictual state due to difficulties in translation. Influenced by the Hungarian text sometimes translators translate words and phrases by their Romanian correspondents regardless of the context in which they appear, overtaking a new meaning from the source language onto the Romanian word despite the fact that this may be incomprehensible or, in any case, unnatural for Romanian speakers. These calques not only extend the Romanian words' semantic field but they also nuance and refine the existing means of expression.

3.1.3.1. Most often semantic calques result from an equivalence or a proximity found with respect to the meaning of a Hungarian word used in the source text and its Romanian formal correspondent, the latter one being enriched by the former's meaning. Such semantic congruity between Rom. *putere* 'power, strength' and Hung. *erő* 'power, force' led to the calque in: *cu puterea era luați* (*Gen.,* 21, 25) which translates Hung. *Eröuel elvöttenec* 'had by force (i.e. violently) taken away'. Similarly, Hung. *chapas* 'stroke, blow' is translated by Rom. *izbeală* 'stroke' (*Ex*., 30, 12) which extends its semantic field including the meaning 'disaster, misfortune'[17] found in the Hungarian correspondent. To the same semantic field belongs Rom. *bătaie* 'beat(ing), stroke, fight' which appears in: *Cu o bătaie voiu lovi pre faraon* 'Yet will I bring one *stroke* (i.e. plague) more upon Pharaoh' (*Ex*., 11, 1) and in: *bătaie pierdzătoare* 'pernicious *stroke* (i.e. the plague)' (*Ex*., 12, 13) translating the same Hung. *chapas* 'disaster, calamity'. In a similar situation is the Romanian derivative *călcătură* 'footprint' (*Ex*., 3, 17) which overtakes the meaning 'misfortune', 'misery', 'oppression' found in its Hungarian correspondent *nyomorusag* 'misery' from Heltai's text (see *nyom* 'footprint'+ noun suffix *–sag*). The notion of 'destruction', 'annihilation' is expressed by the verb *a pierde* 'to lose' in: *Domnezeu pierdea pre aceale oraşă* 'God destroyed the cities of the plain' (*Gen*., 19, 29) which is another calque resulted as a consequence of assigning an existing meaning of the Hungarian equivalent *eluesztenye* 'to lose, to destroy' to the Romanian term.

Several calques may be included in the semantic field of conjugal life. For instance, the Romanian verb *a intra* 'to enter' is used with the meaning 'to have

---

veri muri 'by death thou shall die (i.e. thou shalt surely die)' (*Gen*., 2, 17 – cf. Hung. *Halalnac Halaláual halsz* 'by death's death thou shall die'), *cu moartea morţiei veri muri* "by death's death thou shall die (i.e. thou shalt surely die)' (*Gen*., 20, 7 – Hung. *halalnac halalaual halsz* 'id.') or *cu moarte să moară* 'by death to die (i.e. shall be surely put to death)' (*Ex*., 21, 12 – cf. Hung. *halálal halyon* 'id.'). Although the expression belongs to the *Bible* tradition (see also Lat. *morte morieris, morte morietur*), it is not excluded that in the Romanian text it appears due to Hungarian influence especially considering its forms shown above in passages where its Hungarian correspondents occur. In Hungarian this *figura etymologica* is quite old, it appears in *Halotti beszéd és könyörgés* [Funeral Oration and Prayer] (1192-1195) - see „*halalnec halalaal holz*" 'by death's death thou shall die' – and beside religious tradition it has other usages as well functioning as a stereotype in folk literature frequently used in folk tales (see *Magyar Néprajzi Lexicon, II,* s.v. *halálnak halálával halsz (haljon) meg*).

[17] The translator could have found this translation solution not only useful and understandable for Romanian readers but also "enriching for the Romanian literary variety unestablished yet" (my translation) (Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 142).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

sexual intercourse', in: *întră la ea* 'and he went in unto her' (*Gen*., 29, 23, cf. Hung. *Be mene hozzaia*), *Întră ... la Rahila* 'he went in unto Rachel' (*Gen*., 29, 30, cf. Hung. *Bemene*) by overtaking this use of its Hungarian correspondent. The same semantic field is illustrated by calques such as: *a merge lăuntru* 'to come in' (see in: *Lăuntru la ea megînd, întăroşe-o* 'and came in unto her and she conceived by him', *Gen*., 38, 18, cf. Hung. *Be menuen*), *a întra lăuntru* 'to enter' (*Gen*., 38, 8), *a veni lăuntru* 'to come in' (*Gen*., 38, 16), all of these following Hungarian models. The notion 'to get pregnant' is also expressed in the Romanian text by several calques of Hungarian idioms. Among these there figures the verb *a prinde* 'to get'[18], in: *prinse şi născu un fecior* 'the woman conceived, and bare a son' (*Ex*., 2, 1-2, cf. Hung. *fogada* 'to get', 'to receive') and in: *Prinseră-se...oile...şi fătară pistrui* 'and the flocks conceived' (*Gen*., 30, 39, cf. Hung. *fogadanac*). Another verb used with the meaning 'to be born', 'to spawn' is *a (se) ridica* 'to rise', in: *Mulţi oameni crai rădica-se-vor din ea* 'she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall rise from (i.e. be of) her' (*Gen*., 17, 16, cf. Hung. *Tamadnac* 'to rise (from)').

Sometimes word for word translation of Hungarian compounds result periphrastic constructions in Romanian, such as: *fapt de ciudă* '(deed of) miracle' (*Ex*., 4, 8, cf. Hung. *csodatett* 'miraculous deed (i.e. miracle)'), *păstoriu de dobitoace* 'cattle herder (i.e. shepherd)' (*Gen*., 46, 32, cf. Hung. *barom pasztoroc* 'id.'), *ţietori de dobitoace* 'cattle herdsman (i.e. shepherd)' (*Gen*., 46, 34, cf. Hung. *barō tarto* 'id.'), *loc de lăcuită* 'place of residence (i.e possession)' (*Gen*., 47, 11, cf. Hung. *lako helt* 'place of residence'), *tăiatul împregiur* 'circumcision' (*Ex*., 4, 26, cf. Hung. *környülmetelkedesert*), *soţ de căsătorie* 'a spouse to marry (i.e. a man's wife)' (*Gen*., 20, 3, cf. Hung. *hazass tarsa*)[19].

3.1.3.2. The tendency to translate as faithful as possible without omitting a thing sometimes leads to structural calques in Romanian where these forms are discrepant because a compulsory element in Hungarian may have a superfluous or, in any case, unfamiliar and sometimes odd correspondent in Romanian. For instance, some Romanian adverbial phrases imitate the Hungarian pattern of verbal prefixes (see Rom. *afară* = Hung. *ki* 'out', *într-una = öszszue* 'together', *gios = le* 'down', *sus = fel* 'up' etc.), like in: *a aduce afară* 'to get/take out' (cf. *ki-hoz* – in *Ex*., 12, 17), *a (se) aduna într-una* 'to gather, to bring together, to reunite' (cf. *öszszue-gyüjt* – in *Ex*., 4, 29), *a alege afară* 'to separate (out)' (cf. *ki-választ* – in *Ex*., 13, 12), *într-una să se cuvină* 'to match, to fit (together)' (cf. *öszsze–illeni* – in *Ex*., 26, 24), *a goni afară* 'to banish (out)' (cf. *el-bochatani* – in

[18] For other calques with this verb see Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 403-404.

[19] The word *soţ* 'companion, spouse' enters other calques too, such as: *a avea soţ de căsătorie* 'to be a man's wife, to be married' (*Gen*., 20, 3) although this latter one could have been formed independently in different languages (Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 134). On the other hand, it is not excluded either the possibility that the word *soţ* 'fellow, companion' had undergone a semantic evolution. In this case, the etymological value, if not exceeded, at least coexisted with the new one provided by its determinants which could add the missing specification.

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

Ex., 5, 23), *a lăsa afară* 'to release (out) (from prison)' (cf. *ki-bochatac* – in *Gen*., 41, 14), *lepădă gios* 'to undress' (cf. *le-uete* – in *Gen*., 38, 19), *a lua sus (căştiga)* 'to take up (his gain) (i.e. to look upon someone)' (cf. *vel-vōue* – in *Ex*., 2, 25), *a merge afară* 'to get out' (cf. *ki-menni* – in *Gen*., 44, 28), *a merge gios* 'to go (down)' (cf. *le-menni,* in *Gen*., 18, 21: cf. *alá-megyec*), *a merge sus* 'to go (up)' (cf. *menyetek-fel* – in *Gen*., 44, 17), *a prinde lăuntru* (ochii) 'to close (in) (eyes)' (cf. *fogja-be* – in *Gen*., 46, 4), *afară am scos* 'brought out' (cf. *ki-hosztam* – *Ex*., 29, 46), *ştearge afară* 'to blot out' (cf. *töröl-ki* – în *Ex*., 32, 32)[20].

The Romanian text includes many calques produced as a consequence of Hungarian idioms' translation as well. In such cases, the projection of Hungarian phrases consolidated during long periods of time through repeated mental associations results odd word combinations in Romanian because, on the one hand, they appear spontaneously and unexpectedly in Romanian where they were not in use nor familiar. On the other hand, they might appear strange to Romanian speakers because of the different ways of conceptualizing the world and of expressing it through and within language. Here we could mention the following calques: *au căzdut ... greşală* 'fell in … misdemeanor (i.e. to make a mistake; an oversight)' (*Gen*., 43, 12, cf. Hung. *vétség esett* 'fell in misdemeanor', cf. Lat. *errore factum*), *îmbla în negoţ* '(about money) walked in trade (i.e. to circulate)' (*Gen*., 23, 17, cf. Hung. *aruba iár vala* 'to walk in trade', cf. Lat. *monetae publicae*), *îmblară tabăra* 'walked (in) camp (i.e. to camp)' (*Ex*., 19, 2, cf. *tabort iaranac* 'walked (in) camp')[21], *pune hotar* 'set bounds' (*Ex*., 19, 12, cf. *vess határt* 'id.') sau *aruncă hotar* 'set bounds' (*Ex*., 19, 23, cf. *vess hatart* 'id.'), *ţine prins* 'to hold caught (i.e. to detain)' (*Gen*., 43, 14, cf. *fogua tart* 'to hold caught'), *vădzu vis* 'to see (in) dreams' (*Gen*., 41, 22, cf. *álmot latéc* 'id.'), *vedeare de vis* 'dreaming' (*Gen*., 41, 8, cf. *alom latas*)[22].

Word for word translation can be found in case of Hungarian iterative phrases as well, like in: *den rudă în rudă* 'from generation to generation (i.e. throughout

[20] Although, in some cases, the Romanian terms corresponding to the Hungarian particles do not add any specification to the verb they accompany (see *a merge gios* 'to go down' = *a merge* 'to go' vs. *a merge afară* 'to get out' where the adverb specifies another action denoted by another verb *a ieşi* 'to get out'), these calques are not entirely unjustified. The translators who were familiar with Hungarian language might have considered these phrases as a possible way of enriching the Romanian means of expression (Arvinte – Gafton 2007: 135).

[21] This might be the result of a "mechanical equivalence" (Gafton 2009b: 3). Most likely the translator did not understand exactly the meaning of the phrase, hence he equates the Hungarian *jár* 'to wander' with its Romanian correspondent *a îmbla* 'to walk' without taking into account the fact that the verb is only part of an idiom.

[22] These constructions serve as models for Romanian language opening it "the way to enrich its [Romanian's] means of expression" from which the norm could make, then, its choice (Gafton 2012: 208). Some of these might reflect the Hebrew tradition of the *Bible* (see also: *lăsă... somn pre (Adam)* '(God) caused a deep sleep to fall upon (Adam)', *Gen*., 2, 21, cf. Hung. *Almot bochata* 'to make (someone) fall asleep', cf. Lat. *inmisit... soporem in Adam*). Nevertheless, in PO, these might be regarded as being influenced by the Hungarian source text since it is the one which conveys them also being the primary source for the Romanian translators.

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

their generations)' (*Ex*., 30, 21, cf. Hung. *nemzetségrül nemzetségre* 'from generation to generation', cf. Lat. *semini eius per succesiones*); or in: *făgăduită făgădui* 'vowed a vow' (*Gen*., 28, 20, cf. Hung. *fogadast fogada* 'vowed a vow', cf. Lat. *vovit etiam votum*)[23].

3.1.3.3. Structural calques may also be found in the domain of morphology where these aim especially the verbs' class. There are some cases in which the Romanian verbal inflexion almost slavishly imitates the Hungarian inflexion. Thus some Romanian verbs seem to have adopted the case assignment patterns of their Hungarian correspondents, though not completely strange in Romanian either. For instance, in the passage: *se vor da cătră vrăjmaşii noştri* 'they join also unto our enemies' (*Ex*., 1, 10), the verb in accusative meaning 'to betray', 'to take the enemy's side', translates the Hungarian accusative pattern *a mi ellensegeinkhoz adnaia magát*. Similarly, less common in Romanian is the verb *a strica* 'to damage' followed by a dative as in: *să stric voao* 'to hurt you' (*Gen*., 31, 29, cf. Hung. *hogy arthatnèc tünektec*). Same here we could mention other examples too in which the accusative use of a verb, altough not incompatible in Romanian either, seems to have been governed by Hungarian influence as in: *giurase…pre feciorii* 'he had … sworn the children' (*Ex*., 13, 19), which translates the Hungarian factitive: *esköte...fiait; izbîndi-voiu pre ei* '(my hand) shall destroy them' (*Ex*., 15, 9) follows the Hungarian: *Ki töltem boszszumat raytoc*; or *Năvăleascâ pre ei frică* 'Fear (and dread) shall fall upon them' (*Ex*., 15, 16), correspondent of a Hungarian idiom: *Bochass félelmet reaioc*.

3.1.3.4. In many occasions, the Romanian text adopts Hungarian word order. For instance, characteristic for Hungarian language is the relatively fixed word order of a noun preceded by its modifier which sometimes is kept in the Romanian translation too. In other cases, the translation keeps the word order regarding the verb and its arguments found in the source text. Here are a few examples of these two cases: *în mare bucurie va fi* 'in great joy he will be (i.e. he will be glad in his heart) ', cf. *nagy örembe leszen* (*Ex*., 4, 14); *de bună mirosealâ* 'of good smell', cf. *ió illatú* (*Ex*., 25, 23); *în tabără lăcuiia* 'in camp (they) dwelt (i.e. in Hazezontamar they dwelt)', cf. *Tamarba laknac vala* (*Gen*., 14, 7)[24]; *gios nu vom mearge* 'down (unto) we shall not go', cf. *alá nem megyünc* (*Gen*., 44); *luaţi sus pre tată vostru* 'take up your father', cf. *vegyetek fel a tü attyatokat*

[23] As a matter of fact, iterative constructions are characteristic for *Bible* translations, many of them being translated word for word from the Hebrew original and preserved in later versions of the *Bible* too. In these constructions reduplication is meant to express the intensity of an action or of an attribute, the supreme quality of a virtue or of an object (Munteanu 2008: 72). But this state of affairs does not reduce in the least the Hungarian version's contribution with respect to the passages above, which may be sustained, in the first case, by the absence of a repetitive structure from the Latin text and, in the second case, by the presence of the Hungarian loanword.

[24] The phrase *în tabără* 'in camp' instead of *în Tamar* 'in Hazezontamar', as it would have been the correct translation (cf. Lat. *qui habitabant in Asasonthamar*) may be due, according to M. Roques, to a subsequent correction which no longer reported to the original text (in PO 1925, p. XLV).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

(*Gen*., 45); *mierse sus dereptu aceia Iosif* ‘went up therefore Ioseph’, cf. *Felmene ezokaert Ioseph* (*Gen*., 50); *cui tine uraște* ‘whom you hate’, cf. *a ki tégedet gyülöl* (*Ex*., 23)[25]; *cine pre noi den Egiptu afară aduse* ‘who us up out of the land of Egypt brought’, cf. *ki münket Egiptus földeböl kihozot* (*Ex*., 32); *Bine iaste mie lucrul* ‘Well it goes my (every)thing (i.e. Happy am I)’, cf. *Iol vagyon dolgom* (*Gen*., 30, 13); *Cu obrazul pre pământ plecă* ‘facing the gorund he fell’, cf. *Artzel a földre borula* (*Gen*., 19, 11).

Hungarian source’s presence is prominently marked within the target text in the following passages as well: *Și tare pre bărbat Lot năvăliră* ‘And strongly upon the man Lot attacked (i.e they pressed sore upon the man, even Lot)’ (*Gen*., 19, 9, cf. *Es erössen rea tudulanac a Firfiura Lothra*); or in: *Cine pre noi den Eghipet afară aduse* ‘Who us out of Egypt brought (i.e. the man that brought us up out of the land of Egypt)’ (*Ex*., 32, 1, cf. *ki münket Egiptusföldeböl kihozot*). In the passage: *Cine va vărsa sînge de om, aceluia sîngele prin omul să se vearse* ‘Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed’ (*Gen*., 9, 6, cf. *Aki Ember vért ont: Annac vere Ember által ontassec ki*), preserving the Hungarian word order also leads to an unusual juxtaposition of two Romanian inflexional forms *aceluia sîngele* ‘whose blood’ which makes the Romanian passage less clear. A similar case could be found in: *Că acestora era cu Avraam legătură* ‘That their was with Abram covenant (i.e. and these were confederate with Abram)’ (*Gen*., 14, 13, cf. *Ezeknec Abrammal Kötésec vala*) where the Romanian inflection *acestora* ‘their’ translates the Hungarian dative *ezeknec* ‘their’. In the same way, Hungarian word order is kept in: *Legătură puse Domnul cu Avraam* ‘Covenant made the Lord with Abram’ (*Gen*., 15, 18, cf. *Kötest tön az WR Abrammal*), where *legătură* ‘relation, connection’ is a semantic calque of the Hungarian word *Kötest* ‘alliance, covenant’. The passage: *Care se-au ție arătat* ‘that unto thee appeared’ (*Gen*., 35, 1) translates word for word the Hungarian *a ki teneked meg ielenéc*, with the dative placed before the verb (unlike the Latin order: *qui apparuit tibi*). Hungarian word order may also be found in: *Spuse Faraon lu Iosif visul dzicînd* ‘Told Pharaoh unto Ioseph his dream saying’ (*Gen*., 41, 17) which corresponds to the Hungarian passage: *Meg beszelle Pharao Iosephnec (az álmot moduan*), entailing some morphological adjustments, such as the use of the imperfective aspect[26] following the Hungarian gerund *moduan* ‘saying’ instead of the Latin perfective *narravit ergo ille quod viderat*. The Hungarian text’s internal organization of the linguistic material within a unitary sequence is also reflected in: *(fură...) și trîmbiteei foarte mare glas și toată dihania cutremurase în tabără* ‘and the trumpet’s exceeding loud voice; so that all the people trembled in the camp’ (*Ex*., 19, 16) which translates *es kürtnec igen*

[25] Recorded by I. Popovici among “the forms which are foreign to Romanian language system” and which prove the existence of a Hungarian source (Popovici 1979: 276).

[26] Hungarian deverbative suffixes *-ván, -vén* carry the meaning ‘continuously’, ‘without any interruption’. The verbs to which these are attached to form a distinct morphological class in Hungarian, namely *határozói igenév*, which relatively corresponds to Romanian *gerund*.

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

nagy zöndülése: Es mind az egesz nép meg rettene a taborba. Some of the passages are even more extensive, such as: *Îmblară tabăra acolo împrotiva muntelui // Şi Moisi iară sus mearse pre munte cătră Domnedzeu* 'and there (Israel) camped before the mount. // And Moses went up unto God' (*Ex*., 19, 2-3, cf. *Es tabort iaranac ot à hegy ellenébe // es Moses felméne az Istenhöz*)[27]; *Căndu-ţi va fi lucrul bine şi fă milă cu mine* 'When it shall be well with thee, and have mercy on me (i. e. shew kindness)' (*Gen*., 40, 14, cf. *Mikor* 'when' *ióI* 'well' *leszē* 'shall be' *dolgod* 'with thee' and *tegy* 'have' *irgalmassagot* 'mercy' *velem* 'on me'). Often it is difficult, if not unintelligible, for Romanian speakers to understand such linguistic constructions, as it happens in: *Prădatu-m-aţi de cătră feciorii mei* 'Me have ye bereaved of my children' (*Gen*., 42, 36, cf. *Meg fosztatoc* 'to bereave' *az én gyermekimtöl* 'of my children'). Another example is in: (*Iosif aduse lăuntru şi pre tată-său) şi-l stătu pre el înaintea lu faraon* '(And Joseph brought in Jacob his father), and set him before Pharaoh' (*Gen*., 47, 7, cf. *es alatta Pharao eleibe*). Although similar to the Latin version as well, the passage: *protivitoriu va fi aleaneşului tău şi turburătoriu cui tine turbură* 'I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto thine adversaries' (*Ex*., 23, 22, cf. mgh. *ellensége leszec à te ellensegidnec, es à téged haborgatoknac haborgatoia*) follows the Hungarian source rather than the Latin one which may be sustained by the choice for the words *protivitoriu* 'enemy' and *aleaneş* 'adversary' (cf. Lat.: *inimicus ero inimicis tuis*) or that for *turburătoriu* 'perturber' which is closer to Hung. *haborgatoia* 'perturber'.

3.2. The Hungarian source text may exercise its influence on the Romanian translation in terms of formal adjustments too. A formal approximation to the Hungarian model might be observed, for instance, in the case of words with *-us*/*-uş*, *-os*/*-oş* ending which denote either nations (*Amorreoşilor*, in *Gen*. 15, 16; *Heteuş*, in *Gen*. 23, 10) or common nouns (see *sicluş* 'old Hebrew coin') and which reflect the process of Latin words' transcription in Hungarian language (cf. also *teteluş* 'rank')[28]. Such forms could have entered the Romanian text directly from the Hungarian original in which the Latin terms had already undergone a phonetic treatment or they could have been taken from the Latin source, these forms being subsequently altered by the translators familiar with the Hungarian transcription (M. Roques, in PO 1925, p. XXXVII).

In other situations, the Hungarian text might have contributed, in a way or another, to the translators' selection of certain lexemes over others. In other words, sometimes the use of some particular words, either of Latin origin or borrowed from a language (most often Slavonic) which is also the source of its Hungarian loan counterpart, might have been influenced by the occurrence of the

[27] See also Popovici 1979: 276.

[28] As a matter of fact, throughout the Middle Ages several Latin words, especially those related to the domain of officiality, to political life or to diplomatic relations, such as: *cancelarie* 'chancelerry', *gobărnator* 'governer', *secretariu* 'secretary' etc., penetrated Romanian language through Hungarian mediation (O. Densusianu, in *ILR, II*, p. 352).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

latter one in the Hungarian text. This might be the case of *formă* 'form', of Latin origin both in Hungarian and in Romanian, which appears in the phrase: *în formă de migdeale* 'in form of almonds (i.e. made like unto almonds)' precisely under the influence of the Hungarian source (see *Ex*., 25, 34, cf. *mondolaformara*), since in every occasion the Latin version presents another word in this phrase: *in nucis modum.* Similarly, the option for the word *zălog* 'pawn' (< Sl. *zalogŭ*), in: *Dă-mi dară ceva zălog* 'Give me but some pawn' (*Ex*., 38, 17) might have been favoured by the presence of its Hungarian counterpart *zalagot* 'pawn' in Heltai's text. In the same way, *medelniță* 'vessel' in: *Feace și ... medelnițele... toate aceastea de arame le feace* 'all the vessels thereof made he of brass' (*Ex*. 38, 3) might have been selected under the influence of the Hungarian model: *medentze* 'vessel'. In addition, whenever the term *păharnic* 'butler' appears (*Gen*., 40, 1, 2, 5, 21), it has its Hungarian correspondent (even its possible etymon[29]) *poharnok* 'butler' in the same passage of the text. The co-occurence with *pogacha* 'dough' from the Hungarian source (*Ex*., 12, 39) might have favoured the choice for Rom. *pogaci* 'dough' in that particular passage, otherwise rendered by Rom. *pîine* 'bread' (*Gen*., 18, 6). Hungarian influence (even Hungarian etymology) may also be accepted in the case of *tabără* 'camp' (< Hung. *tábor* 'camp', cf. Lat. *castris, loco castrorum,* in *Ex*., 19, 16, 17), frequently used in the translation including in various Hungarian idioms which are calqued in the target text, such as in: *îmblară tabăra* '(they) camped' (*Ex*., 19, 2). Dictionaries usually record a Polish etymology for *comornic* 'pantryman' (see CADE, s.v. *comornic*1) but in: *Putifar, comornicul lu Faraon* 'Potiphar, the pantryman of Pharaoh (i.e an officer of Pharaoh's and captain of the guard)' (*Gen*., 37, 36) this loanword might have been chosen under the influence of its Hungarian correspondent *komornik* 'pantryman' (cf. Lat.: *eunucho*).

Conclusions

1. The translators' option to resort, on various occasions, to Hungarian sources, suspending for the time being the other versions available, shows, on the one hand, that the Hungarian model has been regarded as useful and understandable both to those who translated it and to the readers addressed to. The Hungarian source might have provided, here and there, a deeper understanding of the sacred text and, at the same time, an appropriate form to express what was understood.

[29] Most often the term in question has been explained by an old Slavonic etymon (see CADE, in SD it is considered to have entered Romanian language through Bulgarian and Serbian influence). But there is nothing against neither for it to be of Hungarian origin, at least in the region where the translation have been made (Rom. *păhar-nic* < Hung. *pohár-nok* 'butler, pantryman', possibly accompanied by a replacement of the Hungarian suffix *–nok* with a Romanian form *–nic* found more suitable, cf. Hung. *álnok* > Rom. *alnic* 'cunning') nor for it to be a Romanian derivative from Rom. *păhar* 'glass' (< Hung. *pohár* 'glass', otherwise accepted as a possible etymon).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

2. By searching for the best translation solutions, translators might have pursued not only to enrich the Romanian language, not mature enough[30] to render, at all steps, the conceptual construct of the *Bible*'s complexity, but also to create the necessary means to express those conceptual forms and contents of the sacred text, thus providing Romanian language the prerequisites for it to become an instrument of culture in the true sense of the word[31]. Therefore, as a whole, the Hungarian original stands for Romanian translators as a source and model[32] for establishing and consolidating the written liturgical tradition, mediated also by Slavonic culture, as well as for establishing the old Romanian standard language.

3. Some of the translation solutions which carry the Hungarian source's influence proved to be edifying for the biblical text's crystallization and completion continuing, as a matter of fact, an existing tradition, whereas others are ad hoc, spontaneous and momentary, adopted under the pressure of certain linguistic constraints which did not have lasting repercussions on Romanian language system. It is true that not all of the introduced Hungarian elements close an either conceptual or formal gap nor do they correspond to a real necessity. Nevertheless, the use of those Hungarian loanwords which already had a Romanian correspondent to compete with should not be regarded as superfluous nor parasitic since by these words translators could have intended to enrich and refine Romanian means of expression appropriate for religious discourse.

Abbreviations and bibliography

A. Text editions

PO 1925 = *Palia d'Orăştie 1581-1582, I (...)*, Préface et Livre de la Genèse publiés avec le texte hungrois de Heltai
et une introduction par Mario Roques, Paris, 1925
PO 1968 = *Palia de la Orăştie 1581-1582 [The Old Testament from Orăştie 1581-1582]*, text-facsimile-indice, ediţie îngrijită de Viorica Pamfil, Bucureşti, 1968

[30] According to Al. Gafton, the precarious condition of Romanian language at the time could have been, actually, to its advantage because, being more responsive and more easily modeled, it could reach, thus, a stage of development "in which it became able to render such a complex text" (Gafton 2010a: 3).

[31] In this sense, the translators' greatest difficulty has been "to acquire and create in Romanian culture and language those productive means [of expression] which are necessary to render [the *Bible*'s] forms and contents" rather than understanding the foreign structures or the conceptual content of the sacred texts (Gafton 2009a: 4). Likewise, the source language "has been not only a vehicle for certain contents to be conveyed to Romanian culture by the concrete form of a text, but also a model for Romanian language system to gradually create a variety able to convey itself those contents" (Gafton 2012: 21).

[32] See also Gafton 2009a: 6. The same author rightfully concludes that "at a deeper level, the source text partially becomes the model on which Romanian language establishes its standard variety" (Gafton 2010c: 1).

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

PO 2005 = *Palia de la Orăştie (1582), I., Textul [The Old Testament from Orăştie (1582), I., The Text]*, Text stabilit şi îngrijire editorială de Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu şi Alexandru Gafton, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza," Iaşi, 2005

TEXTE ROM. = *Texte româneşti din secolul al XVI-lea. I. Catehismul lui Coresi. II. Pravila lui Coresi. III Fragmentul Todorescu. IV. Glosele Bogdan. V. Prefeţe şi epiloguri [Romanian Texts from the Sixteenth Century. I. Catechism of Coresi. II. Laws of Coresi. III. Fragment of Todorescu*, i.e. *The Book of Psalms. IV. Glosses of Bogdan. V. Prefaces and Epilogues],* Gheţie, Ion (coord.), Editura Academiei, Bucureşti, 1982

B. References

Arvinte,Vasile 2006: *Studii de istorie a limbii române,* Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"

Arvinte, Vasile, Gafton, Alexandru 2007: *Palia de la Orăştie (1582). II. Studii,* Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"

Drăganu, Nicolae 1921-1922: *Din cel mai vechiu molitvenic românesc,* in „Dacoromania"*,* II, p. 253-326

Gafton, Alexandru 2009a: *Relaţia dintre sursele traducerilor biblice şi concepţia de la baza acestora*, in „Text şi discurs religios", 1/2009, p. 125-134

[Online: *http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/relatiacusursele.tdr1.pdf* - 25 July, 2012]

Gafton, Alexandru 2009b: *Traducerea ca formă de achiziţie a conceptelor şi mentalităţilor*, in „Tabor", III, 2/2009, Cluj, p. 52-57

[Online: *http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/traducerea.tabor.pdf* - 25 July, 2012]

Gafton, Alexandru 2010a: *Biblia de la 1688. Aspecte ale traducerii*, in „Text şi discurs religios", 2/2010, p. 49-72; [Online: *http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/tradbb.tdr2.pdf* - 25 July, 2012]

Gafton, Alexandru 2010b: *Consecinţele profunde ale contactelor lingvistice*, in Gheorghe Chivu, Oana Uţă Bărbulescu (coord.), Studii de limbă română. Omagiu profesorului Grigore Brâncuş, Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, p. 77-100

Gafton, Alexandru 2010c: *Traducerea ca literă şi glosa ca spirit*, in „Tabor", IV, 4/2010, p. 53-61; [Online: *http://media.lit.uaic.ro/gafton/trad-glose.pdf* - 25 July, 2012]

Gafton, Alexandru 2012: *De la traducere la norma literară. Contribuţia traducerii textului biblic la constituirea vechii norme literare*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"

Gheţie, Ion 1974: *Începuturile scrisului în limba română. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.

Gheţie, Ion, Mareş, Alexandru 1985: *Originile scrisului în limba română,* Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică

ILR, II = Densusianu, Ovid 1961: *Istoria limbii române*, ediţie îngrijită şi traducere în limba română de J. Byck, vol. II, *Secolul al XVI-lea,* Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică.

Iorga, Nicolae 1904: *Istoria literaturii religioase a românilor până la 1688,* Bucureşti

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)

Munteanu, Eugen 2008: *Lexicologie biblică românească,* Bucureşti, Humanitas; [Online: *http://www.philippide.ro/persoane/Volume/E.%20Munteanu_ Lexicologie%20Biblica.pdf* – 10 December 2012]

Pamfil, Viorica 1958: *Elemente regionale în lexicul „Paliei de la Orăştie"*, in „Cercetări de lingvistică", III, p. 227–248

Popovici, Iosif 1979: *Scrieri lingvistice,* Timişoara, Editura Facla

Rosetti, Al. 1931: *Limba română în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura „Cartea românească"

C. Dictionaries

CADE = I.-Aurel Candrea, Gheorghe Adamescu, *Dicţionar enciclopedic ilustrat [Illustrated Encyclopedic Dictionary]*, Editura „Cartea Românească," Bucureşti, 1931

EWUR = Tamás Lajos, *Etymologisch-historisches Wörterbuch der ungarischen Elemente im rumänischen*, Budapest, 1966

DLRLV = Mariana Costinescu, Magdalena Georgescu, Florentina Zgraon, *Dicţionarul limbii române literare vechi (1640–1780). Termeni regionali [Old Literary Romanian Language Dictionary (1640-1780). Regional Terms]*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1987

Magyar Néprajzi Lexicon, II [Hungarian Etnographic Lexicon, II], Ortutay, Gyula (ed.), Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest 1977-1982; Online: Hungarológiai Alapkönyvtár: *http://mek.oszk.hu/02100/02115/html/index.html* - 3 January 2013

MNYSZ = Szarvas Gábor, Simonyi Zsigmond, *Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár [Historical Dictionary of Hungarian Language]*, I–III, Budapest, 1890, 1891, 1893

SD = Scriban A., *Dicţionaru limbii româneşti [Dictionary of Romanian Language]*, Iaşi, 1939

BDD-A3920 © 2014 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 19:47:09 UTC)