The Glossing of the Borrowings – an Argument for the Lexical Modernization of Old Literary Romanian

Dora VĂETUȘ

Cet article fait référence à la modernisation lexicale de la langue roumaine littéraire ancienne, ayant comme point de départ l'analyse lexico-sémantique des emprunts présents dans les pairs du type mot glosé/glose dans le texte Noul Testament de la Bălgrad (NTB). On a constaté que, dans le NTB, la plupart des mots glosés par des synonymes ou par une périphrase représentent des néologismes de l'époque, ce qui démontre l'intention des traducteurs, déjà formulée en Predoslovie, de les promouvoir, étant donnée leur circulation internationale. Le grand nombre de néologismes d'origine latine ou d'origine grecque, quelques uns ayant la première attestation en NTB, relève le changement des modèles culturels dans l'écris roumain du milieu du XVII^{ème} siècle par le remplacement des mots d'origine slavonne par des emprunts latins ou grecs à l'influence directe des textes source utilisés. Donc dans les pairs synonymiques du type mot glosé/glose on peut observer l'insertion des néologismes d'origine latine ou grecque spécialement dans le texte et l'insertion de leurs synonymes, la majorité d'origine slavonne, dans la glose, au but de rendre le texte plus accessible aux lecteurs. Au cas où les traducteurs n'ont pas trouvé un synonyme pour les emprunts néologiques d'origine latine ou grecque dans l'ancien roumain littéraire, la glose a été réalisée par périphrase.

Mots-clés: modernisation lexicale, pairs synonymiques, mot glosé/glose.

1. Preliminaries

The New Testament from Bălgrad constitutes a turning point for the history of the old Romanian biblical versions, as it is the first integral translation of *The New Testament* into Romanian, the first attempt to replace the Slavonic cultural model with a new model, a Greek-Latin one, characterized by a Western influence, and, at the same time, the first printed Romanian text that contains marginal glosses. Printed in *Bălgrad* (Alba Iulia) in the year of 1648, at the initiative of Metropolitan bishop Simion Ștefan, the NTB (*New Testament from Bălgrad*) belongs to the cultural context that allowed the appearance of *Catehismul calvinesc* (1642) and of *Psaltirea* (1651).

The Romanian biblical versions from the 16th century represented mainly by the *Psalter* and the *Gospel* prevalently utilized sources in Slavonic, which was at the time the language of religious worship for the Romanian space. *The New*

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

Testament from Bălgrad, even if it marks a break with the biblical tradition existing at that time by resorting to source texts in Greek and Latin also capitalizes on the previous biblical translations. The researchers[2] have proved the fact that the NTB translators utilized certain 16th century biblical versions[1]: *Evangheliarul de la Sibiu* (1551-1553), *Tetraevanghelul lui Coresi* (1560-1561), *Codicele voroneţean* (the decades following the middle of the 16th century) or *Apostolul lui Coresi* (1566).

However, there existed several controversies concerning the basic texts and the control texts used for the NTB, starting from the declarations of the translators from the *Predoslovia către cetitori*[2]. Gabriel Ţepelea (Ţepelea 1970, Ţepelea 1994) maintains that the Greek model has the highest authority, followed by the Latin model (Ieronim's *Vulgata*), with the control texts being represented by a Slavonic text, a text in Hebrew, one in Hungarian and the so-called „întorsura cea de mult" (Coresi's *Praxis*). The same opinion regarding the sources is expressed by Florica Dimitrescu (Dimitrescu 1988).

Eugen Pavel (Pavel 2001) brings more depth to the problem of the NTB sources, considering that there existed different basic texts for distinct parts of the NTB, since the translation was accomplished by several scholars who took upon themselves the task of translating portions of the text. Thus, the

[1] Florica Dimitrescu (1988: 87-90) considers that „the New Testament benefited for an extensive part of it from a series of models, consisting of texts that had already been translated into Romanian during the previous century and in a smaller number of such cases, of texts that had been translated during the 17th century, all of these being thus 'contemporaneous' texts. Indeed, it is true that almost all the 'skeleton' of the translation is covered by previously translated Romanian texts, their 'shadow' being present everywhere". Eugen Pavel (2001: 175-176) makes a review of the attempts of philologists to identify the Romanian sources of the NTB translation: I. G. Sbiera considers that „întorsura cea de mult" in this respect is the *Codicele Voroneţean*, which could not remain unbeknownst to the team of translators of the NTB; M. Gaster maintains that the Romanian source is represented by Coresi's *Praxis*, an idea that has nevertheless been denied by other researchers; P.V. Haneş and I. Bălan notice the affiliation between Coresi's *Four Gospels* and the corresponding part of the NTB, with N. Cartojan sharing the same opinion.

[2] „This Testament was started to be sourced by Hieromonk Selivestru, at the behest and support of His Highness, and He did as much as He could and it was not long before death befell Him and we, as we stood and considered all this, we found a lot of lapses and mistakes in His scripture owing to his misunderstanding the Greek language and the meaning of the Greek book. This is why we started by initially following on his footsteps and wherever something was not right, we rectified and filled the missing parts, we rectified and corrected as best we could. But there is something that you must know, namely that we did not stop at a single source, and whenever we eventually learned of a multitude of such sources, whether they be Greek, Serbian and Latin, authored by great scholars and accomplished masters of the Greek language, then we read these and pondered upon them; and more so we stuck to the Greek spring and we pondered over Ieronimus' source, who was the first man to translate from Greek language into Latin and we also considered the Slavonic source which translated from Greek into Slavonic and is printed in the country of Russia. And with all this in mind, whoever got in closer contact with the Greek book, we pondered over these men, though we did not stray from the Greek book, knowing full well that the Holy Spirit urged the evangelists and the apostles to write in the Greek language the New Testament, and it was so that the Greek book is the source and spring of all the other books" (NTB: 117).

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

translation of the *Gospels*, done by hieromonk Silvestru, mainly follows the Greek source, having as control texts a Slavonic biblical version and the aforementioned „întorsura cea de mult" of Coresi's, while the *Facts of the Apostles* follow the Latin model, with the encounter with the Greek model being demonstrated by the marginal glosses. Eugen Pavel (2001:166-172) supports the idea (which we also start from in the analysis we propose) that the NTB translation was done by using a polyglot edition from 1611 (NTGL 1611) with the text printed on three columns, which comprise the version in Greek, the version in Latin of Ieronim's *Vulgata* and also the new Latin version of Théodore de Bèze (Beza). Mainly, it was the Latin version of Beza that served as a model, not the Greek or the Latin version of *Vulgata.* The control texts of the NTB translation are: a Slavonic version (the *Bible* from Ostrog, 1581), a Hungarian version (the Calvin *Bible* of Heltai Gáspár, 1562), a German version (Luther's *Bible*) and also earlier Romanian versions. Liana Lupaș (Lupaș 2004) reaches similar conclusions without being aware of Eugen Pavel's research concerning NTB's sources: one source of NTB is represented by the 1580 Beza edition or by a reprinting of this edition, because the Beza editions were held in higher regard at the time and because they were accessible to the scholars from Transylvania. The demonstration is based on the fact that the short abstacts, namely the fragments placed at the beginning of each chapter of the NTB, the so-called „suma capetelor", were translated from Latin, their author being Théodore de Bèze, who was the first to include them in an edition in Latin in the year of 1580.

Alexandru Gafton (2009: 130) opines that the translation of NTB was based on *Vulgata* and there is no way one can uphold the arguments pleading in favor of the Greek source and for the existence of a Slavonic source: the source text proposed is the Latin text, and the control texts are the Greek, the Hungarian and the German text.

Thus, considering that we could safely say that the problem of the NTB sources is solved, we can now understand the elements of novelty brought by the printing done in Bălgrad in the Romanian literary language in the middle of the 17th century. Appealing to Latin and Greek sources, due to the desire of joining the Western humanist movement, the NTB constitutes, as we have already stated, the first Romanian biblical version in which the principal Slavonic model is replaced by the Greek–Latin model. In the middle of the 17th century, the language of religious worship continued to be Slavonic for the Romanian space, at a time when hierarchs like Varlaam and Dosoftei were attempting to impose Romanian as a liturgical language. The distancing from Slavonic language is however accomplished only gradually, during the 17th century, which was marked by the appearance of the NTB and of the *Biblia de la București* (1688), biblical versions which, despite not being destined for liturgical use, contributes to the adoption of Romanian as a language of religious worship throughout the Romanian space in the next century. The

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

changing of the cultural models by abandoning the Slavonic model implies, at the same time, the modernization of the Romanian literary language, a process which, on a lexical level, has the special effect of enriching the language by taking in Greek and Latin-Roman borrowings. We witness a lexical dynamics manifesting in the competition between the new Greek-Latin stratum and the earlier Slavonic stratum, with latter being totally substituted in many cases. Elements of (Neo)-Greek, Greek-Latin and Latin-Roman origin are borrowed during the 17th century under the push of humanism and of the Renaissance, in a context in which Moldavia and Wallachia found themselves under the spere of influence of the Neo-Greek language and Transylvania had intense contact with the Western cultural space, which at its turn was under the constant influence of Latin.

As early as appearance of *Predoslovia către cititori* of NTB, we learn that the translators intended to enrich the Romanian literary language by using words that had an international circulation, such as *synagogă*, *poblican* and *gangrenă*: „That is why we would like you to know that certain words were sourced by some people in a specific way, others in a different manner, while we left these words as they were used in the Greek source, seeing that other languages keep them in the same form, for example the words *synagogue* and *poblican* and *gangrene* and precious stones, whose meaning is not known by Romanians, whether they be names of people and of kinds of wood and of attire and many others which are not familiar to Romanian, so tese we left them in the Greek language, because other languages did the same thing" (NTB: 115-116).

Literature studies (Țepelea 1970, 1994; Dimitrescu 1988; Pavel 2001; Gafton 2005; Șesan 1999) have shown that the majority of the glossed words of NTB are neologisms of the time[3] and their glossing is necessary in order to make the text more accessible to the readers. In this article, we support the idea that the glossing of neologisms in the NTB is an argument of the lexical modernization of Romanian literary language from the middle of the 17th century. We must however point out that, from all the types of glosses present in the NTB, it is only the synonymical glosses that are relevant for us[4]. We

[3] Even if the term *neologism* is widely used to designate especially the words borrowed by Romanian language starting with the 18th -19th centuries (recent borrowings), in this article we shall also use this term for borrowings that have been made earlier than that, in previous centuries. By neologisms we mean the *new words* borrowed into Romanian in a cultural manner, as it was reported in the middle of the 17th century. These same words, if they are considered in the context of the current Romanian language, may be considered as archaisms, due to the length of time they were used in literary language.

[4] Florica Dimitrescu (Dimitrescu 1998: 93) considers that the marginal glosses from the NTB are a „proof of the conscious effort done by the translating scholars in order to, on the one hand, enrich the language through neologisms and on the other, to explain them so that everone could understand them. […] They constitute the beginning of a dictionary of synonyms, especially, and of an explanatory dictionary, generally, which also has some etymologies of the Romanian language." (author's underlining, D. V.).

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

illustrate the aforementioned idea by providing numerous examples that contain neologisms of Latin or Greek origin, present in the pairs of the type glossed word/gloss.

2. Glossing neologisms by synonyms in the NTB

2.1. Origin

In the synonymical pairs of the type glossed word/gloss there appear the following neological borrowings, classified according to the etymological criterion (see DLR, MDA):

- borrowings of Greek origin: *arvună* (< *ἀῤῥαβών*), *aspru* (< *ἄσπρον*), *filosof* (< *φιλόσοφος*), *iotă* (< *ἰῶτα*), *litră* (< *λίτρα*), *preazviter* (< *πρεσβύτερος*), *stadie* (< *στάδια,* pl. of *στάδιον*), *statir* (< *στατήρ*);
- borrowings of Latin origin: *publican* (< *publicanus*), *testament* (< *testamentum*);
- borrowings of multiple origin: *episcop* (*episcup*) (< Latin *episcopus*, Greek *ἐπίσκοπος*, Slavonic *jpiskupß*), *ravvi* (< Slavonic *ravvi*, în NTB – from Latin *rabbi*, Greek *ῥαββί*), *sinagogă* (< Latin *synagoga*, Greek *συναγωγή*), *stomah* (< Greek *στομάχι*, Latin *stomachus*, Paleoslavonic *stomaxß*).

2.2. First attestation

The lexicographical analysis of the neological borrowings present in the pairs of the type glossed word/gloss highlighted the problem of dating them:

- certain borrowings are encountered in NTB 1648, even if MDA indicates a first attestation that was subsequent to this date: *filosof* (cf. MDA: Varlaam), *iotă* (cf. MDA: Vlahuţă), *stomah* (cf. MDA: 1652);
- other borrowings present in NTB 1648 were attested, according to MDA, previously: *aspru*, *episcop*, *litră*, *ravvi*;
- according to MDA, the first attestation in NTB 1648 is boasted by the following borrowings: *arvună*, *preazviter*, *publican*, *sinagogă*, *statir*, *testament*.

The neologisms that could have been taken directly from the source text of the translation are: *arvună* (Greek), *iotă* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata, Greek), *preazviter* (Gr.), *publican* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata), *ravvi* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata, Greek), *sinagogă* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata, Greek), *stadie* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata, Greek), *statir* (Latin Beza, Latin Vulgata, Greek), *stomah* (Latin Vulgata, Greek), *testament* (Latin Vulgata).

2.3. Competition of terms

As we read through the synoptic table and take into acount the etymology of the words, we can notice the competition between terms, namely the superposition of the neological borrowings over earlier borrowings from other languages (especially from Slavonic), over words inherited from Latin or over words formed in Romanian (see DLR, MDA).

Thus, the glossing of neological borrowings is achieved through the:

- borrowings from old Slav/Slavonic: *arvună/zălog* (< Slavonic *zalogˆ*); *filosof/vîlhvă* (< Slavonic *vlßxvß*); *iotă/certă* (< Slavonic *çerta*), *slovă* (<

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

Slavonic *slovo*); *preazviter/cîrstnic*, (< Paleoslavonic *krßstъ* „cruce"), *ţîrcovnic* (< Slavonic *crßkovnikß*); *sinagogă/sălbor* (< Slavonic *sßborß, soborß*);

- borrowings from other languages: *litră/font* (< German *Pfund*); *publican/vameş* (< Hungarian *vámos*); *statir/ban, aspru* (< Greek *ἄσπρον*);
- words inherited from Latin: *episcop/preot* (< *praesbiter*); *preazviter/bătrîn* (< *betranus* (*veteranus*)); *sinagogă/besearecă* (< *basilica*); *testament/lege* (< *lex*);
- words formed in Romanian: *publican/mitarnic* (derived from *mită*); *ravvi /învăţător* (derived from *învăţa*); *stadie/alergătură* (derived from *alerga*);
- word from the Thracian-Dacian substratum: *stomah/rînză* (cf. Albanian *rrëndës* „cheag").

We note the fact that the neologisms from the examples above are placed in the text, not in the gloss. And it is also very rarely that neologisms appear in the gloss: *mag/filosof*; *mîndru/filosof*; *lege/ testament* şi *preut/episcup*. In our opinion, the gloss represents a text of secondary importance compared to the glossed word, because without wanting to diminish its role, the gloss might as well be absent. The preferential placing of the neologisms in the text is explained by the intention of the NTB translators to promote them, as is also stated in the *Predoslovia către cititori*. Thus, in the glosses we prodominantly encounter words that are considered as more widely used, and are therefore more accessible.

2.4. Viability

The Romanian language nowadays still uses the following words: *arvună*, *episcop*, *filosof*, *iotă*, *ravvi* (in the form *rabin*), *sinagogă*, *stomah* (in the form *stomac*), *testament*.

We have included in the synoptic table the lexical correspondences from *Biblia de la Bucureşti* (B 1688), in order to check the relationship of filiation between the two biblical versions[5], but also the extent to which the neologisms proposed by NTB were still extant. We illustrate the lexical coincidences between NTB şi B 1688: *arvună/zălog* – B 1688: *arvună*; *episcop/preot* – B 1688: *episcop*; *iotă/certă, slovă* – B 1688: *iotă*; *litră/font* – B 1688: *litră*; *publican/vameş* – B 1688: *vameş*; *ravvi/învăţător* – B 1688: *Ravvi*; *sinagogă/sălbor* – B 1688: *sinagog*; *stadie/alergătură* – B 1688: *stadie*; *statir/ban, aspru* – B 1688: *statir*; *stomah/rînză* – B 1688: *stomah*; *testament/lege* – B 1688: *lege*; *lege/testament* – B 1688: *lege*. In some cases the options for translation comparing NTB and B 1688 are different: *mag/filosof*,

[5] There exists a hypothesis that the *New Testament* from B 1688 represents a revision of the text of the edition from Bălgrad din 1648 (Gafton 2002; Gafton 2009: 128). Cf. Munteanu 2012: 167: Eugen Munteanu considers that the revising of the *New Testament from Bălgrad* was probably made with the help of the *New Testament* which appeared in 1682 in Bucharest with a vew to editing the *Bible from Bucharest*. The *Gospel* from 1682, which appeared under the patronage of Şerban Cantacuzino, is followed in 1683 by *Apostle*.

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

mîndru/filosof – cf. B 1688: *vrăjitor*; *preazviter/cîrstnic, ţîrcovnic* – cf. B 1688: *cel mai bătrîn*; *preazviter/bătrîn* – cf. B 1688: *cel mai bătrîn*; *publican/mitarnic* – cf. B 1688: *vameş*; *sinagogă/besearecă* – cf. BB: *adunare*.

Thus, from the neologisms of that time promoted by NTB, B 1688 only accepts the following words: *arvună*, *episcop*, *iotă*, *litră*, *ravvi*, *sinagogă* (*sinagog*), *stadie*, *statir*, *stomah*.

2.5. Problems of semantics

The glossing of the neologisms from NTB raises certain problems of semantics, such as the existence of a relationship of synonymy, whether it be authentic synonymy or at least a partial one. A synonymical pair encountered at the very beginning of the *Gospel according to Mathew* is *filosof – mag – mîndru – vîlhvă – gîcitor*. We notice especially the range that extends to five terms which have a relationship od synonymy. We do not consider as lacking in significance the play of the appearance of neologisms either in the text or in the gloss and less so the order in which these glosses are encountered in a relatively small portion of text: *filosof/vîlhvă* (Foreword to Mathew), *mîndru/filosof* (Mathew 2: 1), *mag/filosof* (Mathew 2: 7), *mag/gîcitor* (Mathew 2: 16). Even if the semantic evolution of these words leads to the disappearance of the relationship of synonymy with the passage of time, in the contexts that we have used as examples, the meaning on which the synonymy is done is that one which refers to „the three Wise Men from the East" (DLR). In the recent biblical versions the term *mag* remains, with a contextual meaning that is specific to church language, although in standard Romanian language the term is encountered with the sense „wizard, magician".

The Greek borrowing *preazviter* is initially explained by *cîrstnic, ţîrcovnic* (II John 1: 1), and then by *bătrîn* (III John 1: 1), but the relationship of synonymy is at best a relationship of partial synonymy: *preazviter* has the meaning „(honorary) title for a person who belongs to the church clergy; person who belongs to the clergy; (specialized sense) priest"; *cîrstnic* (see *crîsnic*) means „sexton, verger, psalm reader", *ţîrcovnic* – „paracliser; by extension, singer, church deacon", while the word *bătrîn* has in the context the sense of *preazviter*, calqued from Greek (DLR).

Other situations in which a relationship of partial synonymy is encountered (possibly based on hyponymy/hyperonymy) are:

- *statir/ban, aspru* (*statir* „old Greek or Macedonian gold or silver coin, whose value varied between 2 and 20 drachmas"; *ban* „(generically) any coin"; *aspru* „the smallest Turkish coin of old, made of silver, whose value in Wallachia (during the 17th century) equalled the sixth part of a silver potronic and the twelfth part of a silver greenfinch") (DLR);
- *episcop/preot* (*episcop* „high rank in the hierarchy of the Christian church, immediatly inferior to the rank of Metropolitan bishop or the Archbishop; person who owns this rank and who usually leads a diocese"; *preot*

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

– (specialized, in the Christian church) „person from the clergy who officiates the religious service and fulfils all the forms of the Christian cult" (DLR).

Certain neological borrowings present in the synonymical pairs of the type glossed word/gloss, which are still extant in use, have a different sense in the NTB texts compared to the standard variant of the current Romanian language because, with the passage of time, these words have undergone a semantic evolution: *filosof, testament*. Nevertheless most of the neological borrowings of Latin and Greek origin from NTB retain the etymological sense.

3. Conclusions

The first integral translation of *The New Testament* into Romanian contributed to the lexical modernization of old Romanian literary lanuguage through a series of neological borrowings. The predilection of the team of translators of NTB for the borrowings of Latin and Greek origin may be explained by the use of a new Greek-Latin model (NTGL 1611) and is motivated by the intention to join the Western humanist movement. Some words were borrowed, in spite of the fact that Romanian language possessed other words that could express the same meaning. This is generally what happened in the case of the neologisms explained by synonyms, many of which are Slavonic terms, but also by some earlier borrowings from other languages, words inherited from Latin or formed in Romanian. The lexical dynamics implies the superposition of these strata, which gradually leads to a competition of the terms in a process that ended by some these terms being permanently replaced or by a stylistical distribution of these terms. Thus, we witness an enrichment of the means of expression and of the possibility of expressing various nuances, of refining people's expression.

Other borrowed words were necessary, because the old literary Romanian language did not have the capacity to designate certain realities that were foreign to the Romanian space: *ariopag*, *cămilă*, *condrat*, *corvan*, *denar*, *gangrenă*, *gazofilachiia*, *gheenă*, *livertin*, *mamon*, *pretor*, *raha*, *sicheră*, *teatron*, *tetrarha*, *vison*. These words are glossed through paraphrases, which constitutes an attempt to define them in a manner that was accessible to the readers.

Acknowledgment: This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863, Project ID 140863 (2014), co-financed by the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development 2007 – 2013.

Abbreviations and bibliography

Sources:

B 1688 = *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului și Noului Testament*, tipărită întîia oară la 1688 în timpul lui Șerban Vodă Cantacuzino Domnul Țării

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

Românești, retipărită după 300 de ani în facsimil și transcriere cu aprobarea Sfîntului Sinod și cu binecuvîntarea Prea Fericitului Părinte Teoctist Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, București, Editura Institutului Biblic si de Misiune al BOR, 1988

B 1688 (ed. 2001) = *Biblia adică Dumnezeiasca Scriptură ale cei vechi şi ale cei noao leage..., tipărită întîia oară în 1688*, text stabilit şi îngrijire editorială de Vasile Arvinte şi Ioan Caproşu (volum întocmit de Vasile Arvinte, Ioan Caproşu, Alexandru Gafton, Laura Manea), Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2001

Coresi 1561 = *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi: Braşov, 1560-1561* comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănicești, 1574, ediție alcătuită de Florica Dimitrescu, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1963

NTB = *Noul Testament*, tipărit pentru prima dată în limba română la 1648 de către Simion Ştefan, mitropolitul Transilvaniei, reeditat după 340 de ani din iniţiativa şi purtarea de grijă a Prea Sfinţitului Emilian, Episcopul Alba Iuliei, Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe a Alba Iuliei, 1988

NTGL 1611 = *Novum Iesu Christi Testamentum Graece et Latine: Theodoro Beza interprete. Cum duplici interpretatione*, Geneva, Apud Samuelem Crispinum, MDCXI

Dictionaries:

DA = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, Bucureşti, 1913-1949

DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române* (serie nouă), București, 1965 și urm.

DÎLR = Gheorghe Chivu, Emanuela Buză, Alexandra Roman-Moraru, *Dicţionarul împrumuturilor latino-romanice în limba română veche (1421-1760)*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1992

DLITR = Eugen Simion (coord.), *Dicţionarul literaturii române*, vol. I, Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2012

DTR = Mariana Costinescu, Magdalena Georgescu, Florentina Zgraon, *Dicţionarul limbii române literare vechi: 1640-1780. Termeni regionali*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1987

Lewis – Short = Charlton T. Lewis, Charles Short, *A Latin Dictionary*, founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary, Bibleworks edition, 1879

Liddell – Scott = G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon* compiled by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, revised and augmented throughout by sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick Mckenzie (…) Oxford, 1996

MDA = *Micul dicţionar academic*, București, Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2010

Studies and articles:

Coteanu – Wald 1970 = I. Coteanu, Lucia Wald (coord.), *Sistemele limbii*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România

Dimitrescu 1984 = Florica Dimitrescu, „Observații asupra artei cuvîntului în *Palia de la Orăștie*", în PALIA 1984, p. 152-194

Dimitrescu 1988 = Florica Dimitrescu, „Importanța lingvistică a Noului Testament de la Bălgrad", în NTB, p. 77-96

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza"
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

Dimitrescu 1995 = Florica Dimitrescu, *Dinamica lexicului românesc*, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium
Gafton 2002 = Alexandru Gafton, „Relația dintre *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* (1648) și textul corespunzător din *Biblia de la București* (1688), în BIBLIA 1688 (ed. 2001), II, p. LV-LXXXVI
Gafton 2005 = Alexandru Gafton, *După Luther. Traducerea vechilor texte biblice*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Gafton 2009 = Alexandru Gafton, „Relația dintre sursele traducerilor biblice și concepția de la baza acestora”, în TDR 2009, p. 125-134
Gheţie – Chivu 2000 = Ion Gheţie, Gheorghe Chivu (coord.), *Contribuţii la istoria limbii române literare: secolul al XVIII-lea (1688-1780)*, Cluj-Napoca, Clusium
ILRLV = Ion Gheţie (coord.), *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532-1780)*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1997
Lupaș 2004 = Liana Lupaș, „Suma capetelor și sursele Noului Testament de la Bălgrad”, în WALD – GEORGESCU 2004, p. 246-256
Palia 1984 = *Palia de la Orăștie. Studii și cercetări de istorie a limbii și literaturii române*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1984
Pamfil 1984 = Viorica Pamfil, „Contribuții la studiul limbii din Palia de la Orăștie”, în Palia 1984, p. 75-133
Pavel 2001 = Eugen Pavel, *Carte și tipar la Bălgrad (1567-1702)*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Clusium
Șesan 1999 = Dragoș Șesan, *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad (1648): carte de limbă și simțire românească*, teză de doctorat, coord. șt. prof. univ. dr. Dan Horia Mazilu, Universitatea din București, 1999
Tudose 1970 = Claudia Tudose, „Vocabularul fundamental al limbii române vechi”, în Coteanu – Wald 1970, p. 119-164
Țepelea 1970 = Gabriel Țepelea, *Studii de istorie și limbă literară*, București, Editura Minerva
Țepelea 1994 = Gabriel Țepelea, *Pentru o nouă istorie a literaturii și culturii române vechi*, București, Editura Tehnică
Wald – Georgescu 2004 = Lucia Wald, Theodor Georgescu (ed.), *In memoriam I. Fischer*, Bucureşti, Humanitas

Online resources:

TDR 2009 = *Text și discurs religios*, Lucrările Conferinței Naționale ”Text și discurs religios”. Iași, 5-6 decembrie 2008, ediția I, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Ioan Milică, Iași, Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza, pe site-ul http://www.cntdr.ro

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)

Annex: Synoptic table

Glossed word	Gloss	Reference	Lexical corresp. [B 1688	Lexical correspondence NTGL 1611		
				Lat. Beza	Lat. Vulgata	Greek
arvună	*zălog*	II Cor. 1: 22	*arvuna*		*pignus Spiritus*	*τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος*
		II Cor. 5: 5	*arvona Duhului*		*pignus Spiritus*	*τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος*
episcop	*preot*	I Tim. 3: 2	*episcopul*		*episcopum*	*τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*
preut	***episcup***	Tit 1: 7	*episcopul*		*episcopum*	*τὸν ἐπίσκοπον*
filosof	*vîlhvă*	Foreword Mathew				
mag	***filosof***	Mat. 2: 7	*vrăjitorii*	*vocatis magis*	*vocatis magis*	*καλέσας τοὺς μάγους*
mîndru		Mat. 2: 1	*vrăjitorii*	*magi*	*magi*	*μάγοι*
iotă	*cert*ă*, slov*ă	Mat. 5: 18	*iotă*	*iota*	*iota*	*ἰῶτα*
litră	*font*	John 12: 3	*litră*	*accepta libra*	*accepit libram*	*λαβοῦσα λίτραν*
preazviter	*cîrstnic, ţîrcovnic*	II John 1: 1	*cel mai bătrîn*		*senior*	*Ὁ πρεσβύτερος*
	bătrîn	III John 1: 1	*cel mai bătrîn*		*senior*	*Ὁ πρεσβύτερος*
publican	*vameş*	Mat. 5: 46	*vameşii*	*publicani*	*publicani*	*οἱ τελῶναι*
	mitarnic	Mark 2: 15-16	*vameşi*	*publicani*	*publicani*	*οἱ τελῶναι*
ravvi	*învăţător*	Mark 9: 5	*Ravvi*	*rabbi*	*rabbi*	*ῥαββί*
sinagogă	*beseare*c*ă*	Mat. 4: 23	*adunările*	*in synagogis*	*in synagogis*	*ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς*
	săbor	Mark 5: 22	*mai marii sinagogului*	*ex profectis synagogae*	*quidam de archisynagogis*	*εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων*
stadie	*alergătură*	John 11: 18	*stadii*	*stadiis quindecim*	*stadiis quindecim*	*ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε*
statir	*ban,* ***aspru***	Mat. 17: 27	*statir*	*invenies staterem*	*invenies staterem*	*εὑρήσεις στατῆρα*
stomah	*rînză*	I Tim. 5: 23	*pentru stomahul tău*		*propter stomachum tuum*	*διὰ τὸν στόμαχον*
testament	*lege*	Mark 14: 24	*al legii ceii noao*	*novi pacti*	*novi testamenti*	*τῆς διαθήκης*
lege	***testament***	Mat. 26: 28	*al legii noao*	*novi pacti*	*novi testamenti*	*τῆς διαθήκης*

BDD-A19528 © 2015 Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 23:08:55 UTC)