TRACES OF THE HUNGARIAN SOURCE TEXT IN THE *CATECHISM* OF FOGARASI ISTVÁN. LOAN TRANSLATIONS AND HUNGARIAN MORPHOSYNTACTIC PATTERNS

ENIKŐ PÁL[1]

Abstract. The aim of the paper is to investigate the Hungarian influence on the Romanian translation of the Calvinist *Catechism* printed in 1648. The analysed linguistic material therefore focuses on loan translations from Hungarian and on morphosyntactic patterns which betray the Hungarian source of the Romanian text respectively. Some of these calques and/or Hungarian linguistic patterns are due exclusively to the Hungarian source text; others may as well be explained independently of it, given the bilingual status of the translator. It is not inconceivable either that certain "foreign" to Romanian elements might have had a regional usage in the south-western Transylvanian dialects to which the translation belongs or that these patterns could have had a prior tradition in the old Romanian liturgical language of the Calvinist worship. Nevertheless, the majority of the loan translations represent only temporary solutions which do not go beyond the language of the text in question or the regional patois and very few of them have become lasting constituents of the standard variety.

Key words: *translation, linguistic calque, morphosyntactic pattern, Hungarian influence.*

1. INTRODUCTION. THE TRANSLATION OF THE *CATECHISM* PRINTED IN 1648

The Calvinist *Catechism* translated by Fogarasi István and printed in Alba Iulia in 1648 is of great interest for both (Romanian) linguistics and translation studies. On the one hand, the text of the Romanian translation makes available for researchers an extremely rich and interesting linguistic source-material, especially on the lexical level. Thus, for instance, even a superficial reading of the translation of the *Catechism* "reveals to us a genuine appetite for derivatives" (Moldovanu 2007-2008: 54). On the whole, the vocabulary of the Romanian translation makes use of a core terminology which is common for Calvinist religious writings from Banat and south-western Transylvania and which is less likely to be found in other regions or in the products of other religious orientations. The relative linguistic unity of the translations initiated by the Calvinists is reflected,

[1] Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania, Department of Humanities, enikopaldr@gmail.com.

RRL, LXI, 1, p. 79–97, București, 2016

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

among other things, in the more frequent use and larger number of Hungarian loanwords and in the more overwhelming Hungarian influence, in general, on these particular texts.

On the other hand, despite its relatively small size, the *Catechism* printed in 1648 incorporates a series of linguistic facts which are worthy of discussion also in terms of translation studies. Given the fact that its original is a Latin-Hungarian bilingual edition[2], the Romanian translation raises particular issues which are not to be found in the case of a translation based on a single source. It is interesting therefore to observe, for instance, how the Hungarian source alternates with the Latin source in the final product of the translation. The existence of two source texts increases, at least theoretically, the translator's possibilities to use and combine the models. In this respect, a thorough study of the Romanian translation may provide us with useful data regarding the criteria which governed the translator's options, i.e. the reasons which determined, in certain portions of the text, the integral or partial use of a particular source to the detriment of the other or possibly the compilation of both sources or even a digression from both models.

The rendering of content from one language to another is subject to several restrictions: linguistic constraints (regarding the text to be translated and the level of development of both the source language and the target language), human constraints (i.e. the abilities and limits of both the translator and the intended target audience), conceptual limitations etc. Some of these may be explicitly acknowledged by the one who performs the translation; others may escape the control of consciousness. However, regardless of the difficulties involved in the act of translation and no matter how scrupulous the translator is, traces of the source text can not be completely erased.

On the whole, Fogarasi's translation shows an unequal contribution of the two source texts, the Hungarian model being much more evident in the final product (i.e. the Romanian text) than the Latin. Notable instances of the Hungarian source within the Romanian text include: the inserts and omissions compared to the Latin version which Fogarasi carries out following the Hungarian version (see Pál 2015); Hungarian loanwords of bookish origin, borrowed directly from the Hungarian source text; and certain loan translations and morphosyntactic patterns which reflect Hungarian linguistic structures. These function as unequivocal signs of the Hungarian source text's influence on those Romanian fragments in which they are recorded. In addition, certain biblical quotes[3] and

[2] The original of the Romanian translation is the bilingual *Catechismus Religionis Christianae* which had several editions, such as the 1636, 1639, 1643, 1647 editions. Fogarasi's text is most probably based either on the 1643 edition or the 1647 edition, less probably on the 1639 edition (cf. also Tamás 1942: 11, 129). As a matter of fact, the 1639, 1643 and 1647 editions are almost identical – the latter one being a faithful reprint of the former ones (cf. RMNY III, under 2167, RMK II, under 672, RMK I, under 790). Thus, it is difficult to establish precisely the source edition of Fogarasi's translation.

[3] In certain cases, the references to biblical texts inserted into the Romanian translation of the *Catechism* provide us with evidence regarding the use of the Hungarian source in that particular segment of the text. Such an example is found in 15/6 where the Romanian text quotes from ***Heb. 11. v. 3***, just like the Hungarian source does (***Heb. 11. 3***), whereas the Latin version makes reference to ***Heb. 12. 3***. Similarly, in 25/24, the Romanian text refers to ***Philip. 3. v. 21***., just like the Hungarian version (***Phil. 3. 21***), unlike the Latin version which quotes from ***Philipp. 1. 21***. The same phenomenon may be observed in 26/8 where the Romanian translation mentions ***1. Cor. 5. v. 2.,*** like the Hungarian text does (***1. Cor. 5. 2.***), whereas the Latin source mentions ***2. Cro. 5. 2.*** Likewise, in 32/8, Fogarasi records ***2. Petr. 1. v. 10.,*** which appears in the Hungarian text as well (***2. Pet. 1. 10.***),

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

proper names[4] may also be regarded as "translation marks" (Arvinte, Gafton 2007: 52), though the latter provide less certainty. From among the various ways in which the Hungarian source text surfaces amid the Romanian translation, we shall turn our attention in what follows to the loan translations and the morphosyntactic patterns which betray the Hungarian source.

2. LOAN TRANSLATIONS FROM HUNGARIAN

Loan translations from Hungarian constitute a very subtle but remarkably constructive manifestation of Hungarian influence on Fogarasi's *Catechism*. In these cases, a given linguistic unit is created from "Romanian material and Hungarian spirit" ("di

unlike the Latin text which registers ***1. Pet. 1. 10.*** In a similar way, in 36/24, the Romanian text records ***Ier. 5. v. 2***., just like the Hungarian text does (***Jerem. 5. 2***.), while the Latin text notes ***Ierem. 5. 12.*** Another example is found in 38/8 where Fogarasi refers to ***1. Joh. 3. v. 15.,*** just like the Hungarian version does (***1. Joh. 3. 15.***), unlike the Latin version which mentions ***1. Ioh. 3. 16***. Likewise, in 45/17, the Romanian translation quotes from ***1. Cor. 29. v. 11. 12.,*** similarly to the Hungarian text, while the Latin version quotes from ***1. Chron. 28. v. 11. 12.*** Nevertheless, such differences alone can not constitute absolute indexes of the use of one or the other of the two sources. These data must be complemented with the evidence provided by linguistic analysis, properly speaking.

[4] In most cases, biblical proper names are almost formally identical in the Hungarian and Latin versions, so it is quite difficult to determine which of the two sources the translator used when translating these names, especially since the translator could have known some of them even prior to the translation act *per se*. There are, however, a few cases in which the form of the proper name indisputably reflects a Hungarian influence. It is also true that the author had to print his text using a limited range of Hungarian letters which were available for him in the typography of Alba Iulia and, thus, the Romanian text was written according to Hungarian spelling. But there are forms which can not solely be explained by typography, since the printing of certain names would not have raised any difficulty because the letters necessary for Romanian pronounciation existed in the typography. This is the case of the name *Solomon* (king of ancient Israel), written according to Hungarian pronounciation: *Salamon* (8/17). This form is of interest also because neither of the two source texts mentions it, hence the Romanian translation is the only one which provides more detailed description of the books referred to in that particular fragment: "cântecele a lu David, pildele a lu ***Salamon***, ale povestuitorilor, sau ale popilor, cântec al cântecelor" (8/16-20), cf. Lat. "Psalmi. Proverbia. Ecclesiastica. Canticum canticorum", cf. Hung. "Soltárok. Példabeszédek, a' Predikátor, az Énekeknek Éneke". In a similar manner, the names of Matthew, Luke and John the Evangelists are given according to Hungarian pronunciation, being written as: *Mathe, Lukáts* and *János* (8/8, 9, 10), cf. Lat. *Matthei, Lucae, Iohannis*. As a matter of fact, Hungarian pronounciation is recorded in case of other nouns as well. For instance, in order to differentiate in writing between the pair of sounds /s/ - /ʃ/ (i.e. the current letter *ş*), Fogarasi uses the letters *ſz* for the first consonant and *ſ* for the second one. However, on various occasions /s/ is noted in writing by the letter which corresponds to the sound /ʃ/. This is the case of words such as: apo*ſ*tol 'Apostle' (8, 13, 14, 20, 29/15, 37/15) (instead of *apostol*), *ſumma* 'summary',(7/3, 10/16, 13/4) (instead of *suma*), *ſ*acramentum 'sacrament' (26/11-12, 26/18, 27/3, 27/10, 15, 28/21), te*ſ*tamentum 'testament' (7/18, 27/16, 28/22, 30/1), and ver*ſ* 'verse' (8). These may reflect either the individual pronounciation of the author – who might have learnt Latin in Hungarian schools where he acquired this "*pronuntiatio hungarica*" (Moldovanu 2007-2008: 54) – or possibly the way in which these religious words were customarily pronounced within Calvinist communities.

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

materia rumena e spirito magiaro", Tagliavini 1928: 29)[5]. There are numerous passages in which the Romanian translation evidently follows the Hungarian version, taking over or simply imitating specific elements of the latter's linguistic system, which therefore results in just as many formulae (lexemes, syntagmas or syntactic patterns) that are foreign to the Romanian language[6]. There are cases, though, in which the disguise is so felicitous that the foreign garment almost unnoticeably fits the target language system.

2.1. Types of loan translation

The loan translations registered in Fogarasi's text are either produced as a result of a semantic transfer or they are created as a consequence of reproducing the way in which the Hungarian source language organises its linguistic material, although the latter does not exclude the former. Therefore, the loan translations from Hungarian which are recorded in the *Catechism* (1648) may be grouped into two main classes: *calques of the signified* and *calques of the signifier*, depending on which component of the linguistic sign appears to be predominantly involved in the process of loan translation. Although this kind of classification may be criticized for being less specific, since it denotes the "genus proximus" rather than the "diferentia specifica", in the sense that it lacks the terminological nuances found in the recent literature (cf. Hristea 1997: 10–29; Stanciu-Istrate 2006: 64–131; Munteanu 2008: 272–340[7]), we have preferred this kind of approach to the more

[5] Early researches have also noticed the fact that loan translation involves the intertwinement of two different linguistic systems: "Il y a autres emprunts qui supposent une pénétration intime de deux systèmes linguistiques. Ce sont les faits de calques" (Vendryes 1921: 341). Thus, the coexistence of a foreign structure and the linguistic elements of the language in which imitation is produced places the loan translation phenomenon at the intersection of internal and external means of enriching the language's vocabulary (cf. Stanciu-Istrate 2006: 12, 14).

[6] As a matter of fact, certain researchers explain the great number of "foreign elements" in the language of Fogarasi's text by the fact that the author might have been "a native Hungarian speaker who, even though knew Romanian well, could not speak or write as an authentic Romanian speaker" (Juhász 1940: 192). D. Moldovanu considers, however, that this hypothesis is not valid since "the dogmatic issues within the *Catechismus* requested great effort from the translator who sometimes was forced to resort to calques in order to transplant a specialized terminology to Romanian language. [...] The great amount of derivatives and new lexical items formed by conversion denotes, however, an in-depth knowledge of the Romanian language systems's potentialities which he exploits with the boldness of a native speaker. On the other hand, a Hungarian preacher would have not felt the urge to translate into Romanian [...] it is obvious that he responded to the requests of his Romanian believers. But these Romanians, from old Calvinist fiefs, have been in the process of Magyarization and they understood somewhat the language of the privileged class. While addressing to them, the preacher took into account their language knowledge level, allowing himself to use at times Hungarian words [...]" (Moldovanu 2007–2008: 63).

[7] The author introduces a series of nuances regarding these notions. Thus, within the categories of "lexical calques of the signified" (cf. *calc lexical de semnificat*) and "lexical calques of the signifier" (cf. *calc lexical de expresie*) he establishes certain subcategories too, according to "formal criteria (i.e. the morphological class the given lexeme belongs to)" and to "semantic-functional criteria (i.e. the precise method of calquing)" (p. 281). For instance, he differentiates between three calques of the signified types: calques "resulted from confusion" (p. 224), "resulted from mechanical equivalence" (p. 226) and "resulted from substitution" (p. 227). The calques of the

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

cataloguing ones since it has the advantage of precisely and unambiguously denoting the described phenomena. Besides the principle of economy, our choice is motivated by another reason too; the consideration that the traditional demarcation between *semantic calque* and *structural calque* (cf. *calques sémantiques* vs. *calques structurels*, Buchi 2001: 384, 387; *calc lexical de structură morfematică* vs. *calc lexical de structură semantică,* Hristea 1997, Stanciu-Istrate 2006) may seem ineffective because it induces the illusion that only the first case would represent a calque based on meaning. Yet, basically, even in the case in which the imitation concerns the structure of a particular linguistic unit, what was in fact intended, must had been the rendering of a certain meaning. Therefore, the various specific examples may present overlaps between the different categories based on the dominant mechanism involved in the loan translation. On the other hand, certain formulae which appear to be calqued on Hungarian, in their turn, originate from the Hebrew version of the *Bible* and hence they have correspondents in several other vernacular languages as well. Nevertheless, in case of Fogarasi's text, not the primary but the immediate source is our main interest and that is indisputably the Hungarian text. Additionally, in our classification of the loan translations found in the Romanian catechism we also took into account whether the imitation of the Hungarian model takes place at the level of lexemes, compounds, phrases etc. Thus, certain subclasses and discussion of these are to be found within the two main classes proposed by us.

2.1.1. *Calques of the signified*

Generally, the transfer of a signified from one language to another takes place in situations in which the semantic system of the target language lacks the given meaning and especially if the lexicalization of a concept raises difficulties. Fogarasi's text presents, however, many cases in which the calque of a signified[8] does not necessarily correspond to an actual need in terms of a linguistic constraint. Sometimes copying the meaning of a Hungarian word and transferring it to a more or less semantically equivalent Romanian term could have been the simplest way for the bilingual translator to translate a particular word. Following the Hungarian model, sometimes Fogarasi translates words and phrases with their usual Romanian correspondents without taking into account the context in which they appear. Thus, he puts into circulation a Romanian word enriched with a new meaning, taken over from the source language, despite the fact that it might be unintelligible or in any case unnatural for Romanian speakers. These calques of the signified are found, quite strongly marked, on the level of lexemes, which may be illustrated by the following examples:

---

signifier, in their turn, are distinguished in different classes based on the "formal criteria, i.e. the class of derivatives or compounds to which the model linguistic unit belongs to" (p. 295) and within each type there is also a "distinction based on the morphological class". Additionally, the author also mentions a class represented by "synthetic semantic calques" (p. 289).

[8] Several authors regard *lexical calques of the signified* as being *semantic loans* (see Weinreich 1974: 48). For conceptual delimitation between *calque* and *borrowing* see also Vaimberg (1975: 435–437).

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

– ***căzătură*** ‘fall (in sin)’[9], in: “Din ***căzătura*** lui Adam şi Evei în atâta cum amu toţi în păcat ne prindem şi ne naştem” (11/8-10), cf. Hung. *esésekből* ‘fall (noun)’, cf. Hung. *bűnbeesés* (*bűn(be)* ‘(in) sin’ *esés* ‘fall’);

– ***creangă*** ‘branch’, ‘domain, article’, in: “decum ***crengile*** Credului a apostolilor într-o summă ne învaţă” (13/3-4), cf. Hung. *ágazat* (< *ág* ‘branch’), cf. Lat. *articuli*; “Ce veselitură iei din această ***creangă***?” (26/4), cf. Hung. *ágazatbol,* cf. Lat. *ex articule*;

– ***a (se) deschide*** ‘to reveal (oneself)’, in: “cum acolo pre sine ***să deschidză*** a fi capul Bisericii sfinte a sale” (21/6-7), cf. Hung. *(magát) kinyílvánítani*, cf. Lat. *declaret*;

– ***domolitor*** ‘redeeming, expiatory’, in the syntagm Rom. *jertfă domolitoare,* in: “Dumnedzeu au orânduit cum să fie ***jirtve domolitoare*** în sângele lui prin credinţă” (24/8-9), cf. Hung. *engesztelő áldozat*, cf. Lat. *placamentum*;

– ***duplecătură*** ‘duplication’, in: “Despre ***duplecătură*** a legiei” (8/4), cf. Hung. *megkettőztetés* (*meg-* ‘verbal prefix’ *kettő* ‘two’ *-z-* ‘verbal suffix’ *-tet-* ‘factitive suffix’ *-és* ‘noun suffix’);

– ***întăritură*** ‘reinforcement, confirmation’, in: “şi tărime pre ***întăritură***” (46/3), cf. Hung. *megerősítettés* (< *erős* ‘strong, firm’, *megerősít* ‘to make firm’);

– ***a întoarce*** ‘to dedicate, to devote, to assign’, in: “şi cum daruri au luat de la Dumnedzeu acele tuturora trebueşte ***să întoarcă*** pre ispăsenie” (23/3-5), cf. Hung. *idvősségekre fordítaniok* (*fordítani* ‘to turn’, *valamire fordítani* ‘to devote, to assign’), cf. Lat. *salutem conferre*;

– ***măduvă*** ‘summary, synopsis’, ‘quintessence’, in: “Summa sau ***măduva*** a uluitei şi a credinţei creştineşti” (7/3-4), cf. Hung. *veleje* ‘marrow’, ‘essence’, cf. Lat. *compendiose*;

– ***născut***, in the syntagm Rom. *unul născut* ‘single-born (i.e. only son)’, in: “acel Fiul ***unul născut***” (16/16), “Fiul ***unul născut*** a lui Dumnedzeu” (16/23-24), cf. Hung. *egygyetlen egy szülött* (*egygyetlen* ‘single’ *egy* ‘one’ *szülött* ‘born’), cf. Lat. *unigenitus*;

– ***necertătoare*** ‘pure, taintless, righteous’, in: “în viaţa ***necertătoare***” (30/15), “cu viaţa ***necertătoare***” (31/20), cf. Hung. *feddhetetlen* (*meg-fedd-ni* ‘to scold, to argue’ + *-etlen* ‘negative suffix’), cf. Lat. *integritate*;

– ***a odihni*** ‘to appease’, in: “şi eu ***voi odihni*** pre voi” (10/2), cf. Hung. *megnyugotlak,* cf. Lat. *refocillabo*;

– ***a (se) prinde*** ‘to conceive’, in: “în păcat ***ne prindem*** şi ne naştem” (11/9-10), cf. Hung. *fogantassunk* (*fogan* ‘to conceive’, passive form of the verb *fog* ‘to catch’), cf. Lat. *concipiamur*; “în alnicie ***m-am prins***” (11/12), cf. Hung. *fogantattam,* cf. Lat. *formatus sum*; “***se prinse*** de Duhul Sfânt” (13/13, 17/13), cf. Hung. *fogantaték,* cf. Lat. *conceptus est*;

– ***a (se) ţine*** 1. ‘to belong to’, ‘to owe’, cf. Hung. *tartozni* ‘to hold (on to sth.)’[10], in: “***mă ţin*** lui Dumnezeu” (9/25), cf. Hung. *tartozzam,* cf. Lat. *debeam*; “**ne-*am ţinut*** a

[9] The noun Rom. *căzătură* ‘fall (in sin)’ is recorded in the *Catechism* printed in 1656 too (Bariţiu 1879: 35), which is based on the same bilingual version as Fogarasi’s catechism, and it is also found in the works of Agyagfalvi and Viski (cf. Tamás 1942: 78), although here its appearance may also be explained by the filiation of these texts. DLR does not register this meaning.

[10] The verb Hung. *tartoz-ni* ‘to belong to’ (< *tart* ‘to hold’ + verbal suffix *–z,* which shows continuity) develops the meaning of its verbal root *tart (valamerre)* ‘to tend (towards)’. Thus, the meaning ‘belonging’ has been derived from the meaning ‘tending towards (someone/something)’ which has been so intensified that the start point merged with the end point, becoming one with it.

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

face" (25/16), cf. Hung. *tartoztunk*, cf. Lat. *debuimus*; "ei încă ***se ţin*** de legătura" (28/12-13), cf. Hung. *tartoznak*, cf. Lat. *pertineant*; "cu ce ***ne ţinem*** prietnicului nostru" (35/20-21), cf. Hung. *tartozzunk*, cf. Lat. *debeamus*; şi 2. 'to (be) redeem(ed)', cf. Hung. *megtart* 'to keep (in life)', 'to redeem', in: "alt nume prin care ar trebui ***a ne ţine*** sau ne ispăsi" (16/5-6), cf. Hung. *megtartatnunk*, cf. Lat. *servati*;

– ***unăciune*** 'communion'[11], in: "***unăciunea*** Sfinţilor" (13/22, 22/23), cf. Hung. *egygyesség* (*egy* 'one'), cf. Lat. *communio(nem)*;

– ***a via*** 'to make use (of sth.), to benefit', 'to use, to employ', in: "cu această veselitură ***viind***" (9/20), cf. Hung. *élvén* (*élni* 'to live', *élni valamivel* 'to profit (from sth.)'), cf. Lat. *fruens*; "cu Numele Sfinţiei sale... cu mare cinste şi biciluială ***să viem***" (36/20-22), cf. Hung. *éllyünk,* cf. Lat. *utamur*.

2.1.2. *Calques of the signifier*

During translation, the translator does not always turn to the more convenient practice of borrowing *mot-à-mot* certain linguistic structures nor does he render a content by solely searching for equivalences or correspondences, but he often copies only the structure, the internal organization of a word or a larger linguistic unit, which leads to an "indirect or disguised loan" (Hristea 1968: 146), which is of course more difficult to observe. The calques of the signifier therefore mostly refer to the manner in which the message to be translated into Romanian is organized rather than to the rendering of a specific meaning, though conveying the global meaning of a larger or smaller linguistic unit is not negligible in this case either.

2.1.2.1. Some of these calques mainly concern the level of lexemes, in which case the translator imitates the word formation process (i.e. derivation) found in the Hungarian model, as in the examples below:

– ***adevărătură*** 'testimony, evidence', in the expression *a face adevărătură* 'to testify, to show the evidence (of sth.)', in: "Trei sînt în cer, cari *fac* ***adevărătură***" (14/15-16), cf. Hung. *bizonyságot tésznek* (cf. *bizonyságot* 'testimony, evidence' *tenni* 'to make'), cf. Lat. *testantur*;

– ***întrâmblător***[12] 'intercessor, go-between', in: "Dară ce ***întrâmblător*** trebuieşte să căutăm [...]?" (12/19), cf. Hung. *közben járó* (*közben* 'between' *járó* 'walker, the one who goes'), cf. Lat. *Mediator*; "Cine e iară ***întrâmblător****?*" (13/1); "Unul este ***întrâmblătorul*** între Dumnedzeu, şi între oameni" (13/5-6);

The verb Hung. *tart* also has the meaning 'to hold, to keep' which could have influenced the translator's choice for the Romanian correspondent.

[11] See also Rom. *uniciune* in the Calvinist *Catechism* printed in 1656 (Bariţiu 1879: 40). In the 17th century, this term was spread in Moldavia, Crişana and south-western Transylvania (cf. DLRLV, s.v. *uniciune*).

[12] This kind of word formation (see also the verb *a întrîmbla,* the noun *întrîmblare*) is frequently found in Calvinist Romanian texts (see also in the works of Agyagfalvi, Viski; see also Rom. *Entremblu* 'Intercedo', *Entremblare* 'Intercessio', *Entrembletor* 'Intercessor', in DVL, cf. Tamás 1942: 94). In the *Catechism* printed in 1656 we find another correspondent: Rom. *înpăcătoriu* (Bariţiu 1879: 35, 36).

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

– ***veselitură***[13] 'consolation', in: "Ce ***veselituri*** ai tu în vieaţa ta şi în moartea ta?" (9/5), cf. Hung. *vigasztaltatás(od)* (< *vigasztal*[14] 'to console' + *-ás* 'noun suffix, equivalent of Rom. *-itură*'), cf. Lat. *consolatio*; "cu această ***veselitură***" (9/20, 20/4); "pre ce ***veselitură*** este" (25/18); "ce ***veselitură*** iei" (26/4), cf. Hung. *vigasztalás(sal)*, cf. Lat. *consolatione*;

– ***vietură*** 'use, employment', in: "***vietură*** cu sacramentumuri" (26/18), cf. Hung. *élés* (*él* 'to live' + suffix *-és,* in the expression Hung. *valamivel való élés* 'to make use (of sth.), to profit (from sth.)'), cf. Lat. *usum*; "***vietură*** rea cu darurile a lu Dumnedzeu" (39/1), cf. Hung. "Isten ajándékival való gonoszul *élést*", cf. Lat. "divinorum donorum abusum" (cf. also Tamás 1942: 121).

2.1.2.2. More numerous are those cases in which loan translation concerns Hungarian compounds, as in the examples below:

– ***aceea e aceea*** 'that is to say', cf. Hung. *az az* 'that is, in other words' (*az* 'that'), in: "Catechismus ***Aceea e aceea***: Summa sau măduva a uluitei" (7/1-3), "Catechismus. ***Aceea e aceea***. Ţelul şi Părţile Creştineşti a Învăţăturii" (9/1-3), "Immanuel ***aceea e aceea*** Dumnedzeu cu noi" (12/25-26)[15], "Fiul lu Dumnedzeu Isus ***aceea-i aceea*** Ispăsitor sau slobozitor" (15/23-24), "Hristos ***aceea e aceea*** Uns" (16/8), "la cine era puterea morţii, ***aceea-i aceea,*** pre Dracul" (19/15), "cari pre sine ispitesc, ***aceea e aceea***, care cu adevăr se căiesc" (30/9-10); "armele ispăseniei, ***aceea e aceea,*** cuvântul lu Dumnedzeu" (32/20-21), cf. Hung. *az az,* cf. Lat. *hoc est*; "îndereptaţi în har, ***aceea e aceea*** din mila a lu Dumnedzeu" (24/4-6), cf. Hung. *az az*, cf. Lat. *id est*; "Vină împărăţia ta. ***Aceea e aceea:*** Dă-ne [...] să tocmim" (42/16-18), the formula being repeted, then, while explaining the subsequent verses of the Lord's Prayer (43/8, 20; 44/6, 21);

– ***băgătură de samă*** 'counting, taking into account', in: "Despre ***băgătura de samă*** a dihaniei" (8/2-3), cf. Hung. *számbavétel* 'counting' (*szám* 'number' *vétel* 'taking');

– ***chip*** 'as it appears to be, in the manner that..., in the form of', in the syntagmas: *în chip de adevăr* 'certainly' (24/10), cf. Hung. *bizonyosképen* 'id.'; *în chip tare* 'firmly' (24/16), cf. Hung. *erősképen*, cf. Lat. *firmiter*; *în chip de afară* 'outwardly' (27/20), cf. Hung. *külsőképpen*, cf. Lat. *extrinsecus*; and in prepositional and adverbial phrases, such as: *nici într-un chip* 'nowise' (11/2, 11/16, 19/11), cf. Hung. *semmiképen,* cf. Lat. *minime, nullo alio pacto*; *în ce chip* 'how, in what manner' (20/21, 35/14, 35/17, 40/16, 43/11, 45/9), cf. Hung. *miképen,* cf. Lat. *quomodo, quo pacto, quemadmodum; în acest chip* 'this way' (37/9), cf. Hung. *ekképpen,* cf. Lat. *ita*;

[13] The term was created by Fogarasi. In the catechism printed in 1656 (Bariţiu 1879) this word has other equivalences: Rom. *veselie* (p. 34, 41), Rom. *măngăĭare* (p. 34) and Rom. *bucurie* (p. 39).

[14] The origin of the Hungarian word must be sought in the archaic form (which has now disappeared) *vigaszik* 'to be cured'. The form *vigasztal* is a derivative from the root *vig* 'merry' to which three verbal suffixes are attached: the iterative suffix *–sz*, the factitive suffix *–t* (resulting the archaic form *vigaszt*, cf. also Hung. *marad-* 'to stay' + *-t*: *maraszt* 'to make somebody to stay') and, finally, the iterative suffix *–al* (cf. also Hung. *marasztal*). The form *vigasz* 'consolation' is the result of a subsequent back-formation (cf. Totfalusi, s.v.).

[15] As a matter of fact, this explicative note represents an insert compared to the Latin version but it is found in the Hungarian source, in: "Iacă Vergură va prinde în sgăul său, şi va naşte un făt, şi-l va chema acela Immanuel ***aceea e aceea Dumnedzeu cu noi***" (12/24-26), cf. Hung. "Ímé egy szűz fogad az ő méhében és szül fiat és nevezed azt Immánuelnek, ***velőnk Istennek***", cf. Lat. "Ecce virgo concipier, et pariet filium, et vocabis nomen eius Immanuel".

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

– ***dădătură de har***[16] ‘thanksgiving, gratitude’, in: “cu ce ***dădătură de har*** mă ţin lui Dumnezeu pentru această slobozitură” (9/25-27), cf. Hung. *hálaadás* ‘thanksgiving’ (*hála* ‘thanks, gratitude’ *adás* ‘to give’), cf. Lat. *gratiam*; “de pre ***dădătură de har*** către Dumnedzeu” (31/10), cf. Hung. *hálaadoságárol,* cf. Lat. *gratitudine*; “***dădătură de har*** după mâncare” (47/4), cf. Hung. *hálaadás*, cf. lat *gratiarum actio*;

– ***(a) duce în vig*** ‘to bring something to an end, to carry out’, in: “ai orândit ***a duce în vig*** Lauda ta” (7/14), cf. Hung. *véghez vinni* ‘id.’ (*vég* ‘end’ *vinni* ‘to bring’)[17];

– ***(a) face destul*** ‘to satisfy’, ‘to meet the expectations, to correspond to’, in: “De lipsă este, cum au noi îns ***să facem destul***, au prin altul” (12/6-7), cf. Hung. *tegyünk eleget* (expr. *eleget* ‘enough’ *tenni* ‘to do’), cf. Lat. *satisfaciamus*; “Putea vom ***face destul*** prin noi îns?” (12/14), cf. *Eleget tehetünké,* cf. Lat. *satisfacere*; “prin care ***destul să facem***” (12/19), cf. Hung. *eleget tegyünk*[18]; “***destul*** n-are fi putut ***face***” (19/12), cf. Hung. *eleget nem tehetett volna*, cf. Lat. *potuit satisfieri* (cf. also Tamás 1942: 87);

– ***făcătură de destul*** ‘satisfaction’, in: “prentru ***făcătură de destul*** a lu Hristos” (23/10-11), “mi se destoiniceşte mie ***făcătura de destul***” (24/1-2), cf. Hung. *elégtétel* ‘satisfaction’ (*elég* ‘enough’ *tétel* ‘doing’), cf. Lat. *satisfactionem* (cf. also Tamás 1942: 87);

– ***purtătură de grijă*** ‘caretaking, providence’, in: “Ce este ***purtătura de grijă*** a lu Dumnedzeu?” (15/10), cf. Hung. *gondviselés* ‘caretaking’ (*gond* ‘care’ *viselés* ‘taking’)[19], cf. Lat. *providentia* (cf. also Tamás 1942: 108);

– ***stătătură de băsău*** ‘revenge taking’, in: “pofta a ***stătăturiei de băsău***” (38/5-6), cf. Hung. *bosszúállás* ‘revenge taking’ (*bosszút* ‘revenge’ *állni* ‘taking’), cf. Lat. *vindictae*;

– ***stător de băsău*** ‘revenge taker, avenger’, cf. Hung. *bosszúálló*, in: “*tare* ***stător de băsău*”** (33/16), cf. Hung. “*erős* boszszuskodo”, cf. Lat. “*fortis* zelotes”;

– ***stană de piatră*** ‘rock stone’, in: “Prin această ***stană de piatră*** eu voi clădi Biserica Sfântă a mea” (22/18-19), cf. Hung. *kőszikla* (*kő* ‘rock’ *szikla* ‘stone’), cf. Lat. *petra*;

– ***sugător de ţâţe*** ‘breast sucker, nursling’, in: “Den gurile Porobocilor mici, şi ***sugători de ţâţe***” (7/12-13), cf. Hung. *csecsszopó* ‘nursling’ (*csecs* ‘breast’ *szopó* ‘sucker’) (cf. also Tamás 1942: 113). This compound might have appeared as less common to Fogarasi since he also gives its explanation: “***sugători de ţâte*** (cari încă nu ştiu grăi)”[20] ‘breast suckers (those who do not know to speak yet)’;

---

[16] In the correspondent passage of the *Catechism* printed in 1656, there are other equivalences: *mulţămită, mulţĭamire* (Bariţiu 1879: 34, 43). The lexical formation Rom. *dădătură de har* is also noted in Agyagfalvi’s work (cf. Tamás 1942: 82).

[17] In old Romanian language, the Hungarian borrowing *vig* (< Hung. *vég* ‘end’) is recorded mainly with the meaning ‘cloth, roll of fabric’ and it has several semantic nuances developed from this nucleus (see Pál 2014: 508-509). The etymological meaning of the Hungarian word, i.e. ‘end’, has been noted in old Romanian texts too, but its usage is rather occasional. It is also used in the expression Rom. *a duce în vig* ‘to bring to an end’, which is recorded in other texts of the time too (see DLRLV, s.v.).

[18] In this passage, the Latin version is much more concise than the Hungarian one and it does not record any term which would correspond to the expression calqued on Hungarian.

[19] In the corresponding passage of the *Catechism* printed in 1656 we find another term: *socotintĭa* (Bariţiu 1879: 37).

[20] Similarly, the expression Rom. *poroboci mici de ţâţă* ‘small children, nursling’ (28/10) could be the result of a loan translation from Hungarian, cf. Hung. *csecsemő gyermecskék,* cf. Lat. *infantes.*

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

– ***tăietură împrejur*** ‘circumcision’, in: “Luat-au semnul a ***tăieturii împrejur***” (27/8-9), cf. Hung. *környül metélkedésnek* (*körül* ‘around’ *metélni* ‘to cut’), cf. Lat. *Circumcitionis*.

2.1.2.3. We could classify separately those situations in which the source language possesses a word class which does not exist in the target language and thus the rendering of the precise meaning involves recourse to other linguistic means which are characteristic of the target language system. This is the case with the Hungarian verbal prefixes (*igekötők*)[21] which represent an autonomous part of speech in the Hungarian language but which are attached to the verb, forming one single analysable linguistic unit (i.e. a compound). These meanings conveyed by prefixes in Hungarian are most frequently rendered into Romanian by means of adverbs or prepositions. However, this kind of translation technique is sometimes applied in cases where the addition of such an element would be superfluous in Romanian or, in any event, it would be strange for the spirit of the Romanian language. These situations may be illustrated by the following examples:

– ***(a) ciopli afară*** ‘to carve, to form’, cf. Hung. *ki* ‘out’ *formálni* ‘to carve, to form’, in: “Cum pre Dumnedzeu... ***afară să nu cioplim***, nici aimintre să nu-l cinstim, ce numai decum el au porâncit în cuvântul lui” (36/8-12), cf. Hung. “Hogy az Istent… *ki ne formállyuk,* sem valami egyéb módon ne tisztellyük, hanem csak a’ mint az ő igéjében parancsolta”, cf. Lat. “Ne Deum... exprimamus, neve ulla alia rations eum colamus, quam in verbo suo praecepit”;

– ***(a) da înainte***, cf. Hung. *elő* ‘forward’ *adni* ‘to give’, in: “Tabla de prima cu patru porânci, aceea ne ***dă*** nouă ***înainte***” (35/16-17), cf. Hung. *adja előnkben,* cf. Lat. *tradit*; in: “Ce ne ***dă*** nouă ***înainte*** Dumnedzeu în a Cincea Poruncă?” (37/18-19), cf. Hung. *mit ad nékünk előnkben,* cf. Lat. *Quid nobis injungit*;

– ***(a) (se) da la...*** ‘to add’, cf. Hung. *hozzá* ‘to (prep.)’ *adni* ‘to give’, in: “Căce ***se dă la*** aceea aceasta încă” (41/20), cf. Hung. “Miért *adatik hozzá* ez is”, cf. Lat. *Cur additur*;

– ***(a) înţelege una cu...*** ‘to agree with’, in: “***una înţeleg cu*** acele toate” (24/16-17), cf. Hung. “*egygyet értek* mind azokkal” (*egyet* ‘one’ *érteni* ‘to understand’ *valamivel* ‘with sth.’), cf. Lat. *assentior omnibus*;

– ***jos*** ‘down’, in verbal phrases, such as: 1. *a lua jos* ‘to take off, to pull down’, cf. Hung. *le* ‘down’ *venni* ‘to take’, in: “***are fi luat jos*** trupul lui Isus” (19/21-22), cf. Hung. *le vötte*, cf. Lat. *accepisset*; 2. *a arunca jos* ‘to throw’, cf. Hung. *alá* ‘down’ *vetni* ‘to throw’, in: “***jos*** până la păcură ***aruncă***” (20/), cf. Hung. *alá vet,* cf. Lat. *deducit in infernum*; 3. *a pune jos* ‘to give up on’, cf. Hung. *le* ‘down’ *tenni* ‘to put’, in: “toată pomana a păcatelor noastre ***au pus***-o ***jos***” (23/11-12), cf. Hung. *le tötte,* cf. Lat. *deposuisse*; “***Punând jos*** minciuna” (39/15), cf. Hung. *Le tévén,* cf. Lat. *Deposito*;

[21] In literature, the Hungarian word class *igekötők* ‘which attach to verbs’ is usually designated by the term Rom. *prefixe verbale* ‘verbal prefix’, though these particles are not exclusively placed before a verb but they may appear also following the verb (see Hung. ***ki****vigyem* – *vigyem* ***ki*** ‘to take **outside’**). A common feature of these Hungarian particles and the Romanian prefixes is their lexical value since both of them form new words changing the meaning of the root to which they are attached to. On the other hand, the association between these Hungarian prefixes and the Romanian adverbs or prepositions is due to the fact that both of them generally indicate the direction of the action expressed by the verb.

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

– ***(a) lăsa înapoi*** ‘to give up’, cf. Hung. *hátra* ‘back’ *hagyni* ‘to leave’, in: “Dă-ne cum noi înşi ***să lăsăm*** voia noastră ***înapoi,*** şi către voia ta să fim gata cu îngăduitură”, cf. Hung. *hátra hagyán,* cf. Lat. *renuntiantes*;

– ***(a) pune lângă*** ‘to add’, in: “Căce ***pui*** şi aceasta încă ***lângă*** aceea” (20/1), cf. Hung. *teszed hozzá* (*hozzátenni* ‘to add’: *hozzá* ‘(next) to’ *tenni* ‘to put’), cf. Lat. *additur*; “Că ce ***se pune*** aceasta încă ***lângă*** aceea” (21/3), cf. Hung. *tétetik hozzá,* cf. Lat. *additur*;

– ***sus*** ‘up’, in verbal phrases, such as: 1. *a (se) lua sus* ‘to take (over)’, cf. Hung. *fel* ‘up’ *venni* ‘to take’, in: “***luaţi sus*** jugul mieu” (10/2-3), cf. Hung. *vegyétek fel,* cf. Lat. *tollite*; “***luă sus*** nărav drept omenesc” (17/18-19), cf. Hung. *vött fel*, cf. Lat. *assumit;* “***s-au luatu-se sus*** în ceruri” (20/24), cf. Hung. *fel vétetett,* cf. Lat. *sublatus est*; “***Luaţi sus*** armele” (32/19-20), cf. Hung. *Vegyétek fel,* cf. Lat. *Recipite*; 2. *a sui sus* ‘to rise’, cf. Hung. *fel* ‘up’ *menni* ‘to go’, in: “***Sui sus*** în ceruri” (20/22), cf. Hung. *fel méne*, cf. Lat. *ascendit;* “***au suit sus*** în cer” (21/5-6), cf. Hung. *ment fel*, cf. Lat. *ascendit*; 3. *a (se) ridica sus* ‘to rise’, cf. Hung. *fel* ‘up’ *emelni* ‘to rise’, in: “Pre vedere a ochilor ***s-au ridicat sus***” (21/1-2), cf. Hung. *fel emelteték,* cf. Lat. *elevatus est*; 4. *a lăsa sus* ‘to rise’, cf. Hung. *fel* ‘up’ *bocsátani* ‘to take’, in: “nu trebuieşte ***a-i lăsa sus*** în cer” (30/17), cf. Hung. *fel bocsátani,* cf. Lat. *admittendi*;

– ***(a) ţine într-una*** ‘to unite, to bind together’, in: “Este tărimea puternică a lu Dumnezeu şi pretutindinile aievea, cu care au rodit cerul şi pământul cu toate roditurile ***într-una***, ca cu o mână le ***ţine*** şi le vodeşte” (15/12-16), cf. Hung. “Az Istennek mindenhato és mindenütt jelen lévő ereje, mellyel a’ mennyet és a’ földet, minden teremtetett állatokkal *egyetemben tartya* és igazgattya”, cf. Lat. “Omnipotens et ubique praesens Dei vis, qua coelum et terram cum omnibus creaturis tanquam manu sustinet ac gubernat”.

3. HUNGARIAN MORPHOSYNTACTIC PATTERNS

Besides the examples discussed above, which concern relatively small linguistic units and/or text fragments, the translation of Fogarasi provides other instances when the Romanian text follows its Hungarian model. Thus, in respect of various morphosyntactic aspects, the Romanian text is composed or structured – in certain portions exclusively, in others partially – based on the Hungarian source text, with possible reference to the Latin version. In what follows, we shall focus on some of these cases, discussing the situation of the preposition *pre* ‘on’ and the problem of certain conjunctions or free connectors and larger linguistic constructions respectively, which show traces of the Hungarian original, sometimes following its word order as well.

3.1. The structural and typological differences between the source language (Hungarian) and the target language (Romanian) may naturally leave their mark on the translation process, whether the translator is aware of them or they are merely “slips” which are not controlled by the language sense of the translator. In this respect, an interesting problem is raised, for instance, by the use of the preposition Rom. *pe* (=*pre*) ‘on’.

In old Romanian language, the preposition *pe* ‘on’ is employed as both a semantically autonomous lexeme and a grammatical particle or formal criterion to

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

distinguish the accusative case of the direct object[22], the latter value being perhaps even developed from the former one. In Fogarasi's text, those situations are of particular interest in which the preposition *pe* 'on' is employed "with actual meaning [i.e. as a semantically autonomous lexeme] and not with the grammatical value of indicating the accusative" (Puşcariu 1921–1922: 575). Obviously, the preposition *pre* 'on' also had values in the old Romanian language other than those in the contemporary language. Thus, in old texts, it is also noted, for instance, as a "preposition of location" (Puşcariu 1921–1922: 567), sometimes required by the prepositional regime of the verb employed, and, as such, it is recorded with the following meanings: 'on, above'[23], 'towards, to'[24], 'against'[25], 'through', 'in', etc.

Despite this semantic diversity virtually included in the nucleus meaning 'location' of the preposition *pre*, the Romanian translation of the catechism notes certain uses which cannot be explained exclusively by the actualization of a more or less common meaning of this semantic nucleus of old Romanian. In other words, there are several instances in Fogarasi's text in which the use of the preposition *pre* 'on' is clearly due to the Hungarian source, since it is noted in contexts which are foreign to the old Romanian language; or at any rate they are less usual, as the verbs they accompany require a prepositional regime other than the one with *pre*. In such cases, the Romanian preposition *pre* 'on' most often corresponds to its semantically and formally equivalent Hungarian suffix *–ra/-re* 'on' which is required by the regime of the Hungarian verb. Such examples are to be found in the following passages: "***Pre*** câte părţi *se împarte* acest Credeu a Apostolilor?" (14/1-2), cf. Hung. "Hány részek***re*** *osztatik* az Apostoli Credo?", cf. Lat. "***In*** quot partes distribuitur hoc Symbolum?"; "Duhul Sfânt *va descăleca* ***pre*** tine" (17/20-21), cf. Hung. "A' Szent Lélek *szál te* ***reád***", cf. Lat. "Spiritus Sanctus supervenier ***in*** te"; "*s-au*

[22] Regarding the old epoch of Romanian language, Al. Rosetti distinguishes two types of usage for this preposition. Thus, in old original Romanian texts, the preposition *pre* indicates the accusative case of nouns or pronouns, binding the verb and its direct object together, "when it [i.e the object] is a proper name denoting a person, a common noun denoting a being or a non-enclitic pronoun" (Rosetti 1931: 111). In translated texts, on the contrary, "the use of *pre* is conditioned by the type of construction found in the Slavonic original" (*ibidem,* p. 111). In fact, the presence or absence of *pre* as a mark of the accusative direct object is not conditioned by a foreign model, at least not necessarily and not in all cases. The oscillation regarding the use of the preposition *pre* 'on' is rather due to the fact that in the 16th and early 17th centuries it was still in the process of generalization, while its value as a grammatical instrument is, in fact, a relatively late innovation of the Romanian language (cf. also Puşcariu 1921–1922).

[23] In Romanian, the preposition *pre* brings to mind the idea of "position above something" (Puşcariu 1940: 38). "The preposition *pre* indicates the position that somebody or something occupies or has immediately above somebody or something else; irrespective of whether we are dealing with a state or a movement" (Puşcariu 1921–1922: 579). "When we are dealing with a more distant position above somebody or something, the preposition *pre* corresponds to «peste» ['over, across'] or «deasupra»" ['above'] (*ibidem,* p. 579).

[24] "When it is about an act of moving downwards, *pre* often rivals *spre* ['towards'] […] Thus, *pre* is sometimes synonymous with the prepositions which indicate the directions «spre» ['towards'], «asupra» ['on, at, above'] and «la» ['to']" (Puşcariu 1921-1922: 579).

[25] "In old Romanian language, the verbs which denote a hostile attitude towards someone were used with the prepositions *spre* or *pre* which often have the meaning «against», «in opposition to»" (Puşcariu 1921–1922: 575).

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

judecat ***pre*** moarte" (18/16-17), cf. Hung. "halál***ra*** *ítéltetvén*", cf. Lat. *damnatus*; "Cum blesteama ce *era* ***pre*** mine să ia sine" (19/1-2), cf. Hung. "Hogy az átkot a' melly én ***rajtam*** *vala* magára venné", cf. Lat. "Ut maledictionem, quae ***mihi*** incumbebat, in se reciperer"; "*pogorî* ***pre*** păcură" (20/2), cf. Hung. "*szálla* pokol***ra***", cf. Lat. "*descendit ad* infernos"; "Care ***pre*** moarte *s-au dat* prentru păcatele noastre" (20/18-19), cf. Hung. "Ki halál***ra*** *adattatott* a' mi bűneinkért", cf. Lat. "Qui *traditus* est ***in*** mortem propter offensas nostras"; "Cum Hristos ***pre*** *vederea Apostolilor* s-au luatu-se sus în ceruri" (20/23-24), cf. Hung. "Hogy a' Christus *az Apostoloknak láttok****ra*** a' mennyekben fel vétetett", cf. Lat. "*Quo*d aspicientibus discipulis Christus in coelum sublatus est"; "***Pre*** *vedere a ochilor* s-au ridicat sus" (21/1-2), cf. Hung. "Az ő *szemek láttá****ra*** fel emelteték", cf. Lat. "Aspicientibus iliis elevatus est"; "*au ales* sie ***pre*** vieaţa de vecie" (22/14), cf. Hung. "örök élet***re*** *választott*", cf. Lat. "ad vitam aeternam electum"; "***Pre*** ce veseliturâ-ţi *este* ţie sculătura trupului?" (25/18-19), cf. Hung. "Micsoda vigasztaltatásod***ra*** *vagyon* tenéked a testnek feltámadása?", cf. Lat. "Quid te consolatur Resurrectio carnis?"; "aceasta *faceţi* ***pre*** pomana mea" (29/22-23), cf. Hung. "ezt *tegyétek* az én emlékezetem***re***", cf. Lat. "hoc facite ***in*** mei recordationem"; "şi *vor fi* numai ***pre*** lauda numelui lui" (32/16-17), cf. Hung. "és csak az ő nevének dicsőségé***re*** *vitetnek*", cf. Lat. "et ad eius solius gloriam referentur"; "Toate le *faceţi* ***pre*** lauda a lu Dumnedzeu" (32/21-22), cf. Hung. "Mindeneket az Isten dicsőségé***re*** *művellyetek*", cf. Lat. "Omnia ad gloriam Dei facite"; "Cum să cunoaştem cât este de mare *plecarea* a năravurilor noastre ***pre*** păcat" (40/4-6), cf. Hung. "Hogy meg ismerjük melly igen nagy *hajlandosága* légyen a' mi természetünknek a' vétkezés***re***", cf. Lat. "Ut agnoscamus, quanta sit naturae nostrae ad peccandum propensio"; "cum din zi în zi, tot mai *să ne înnoim* ***pre*** obrazul a lu Dumnedzeu" (40/9-10), cf. Hung. "hogy naprol napra mind inkább inkább *meg ujjittassunk* az Istennek ábrázatyá***ra***, cf. Lat. "quo in dies magis ac magis ad imaginem Dei renovemur"; "toată lauda *să-ţi toarne* ***pre*** Numele tău" (45/15-16), cf. Hung. "minden dicsőség a te neved***re*** *térjen*", cf. Lat. "ad nomen tuum omnis gloria redeat".

3.2. The text of the *Catechism* also exhibits other syntactic constructions which are less compatible with the Romanian language structure. The most evident indeces of the Hungarian influence on Romanian syntactic patterns are perhaps the ones regarding the class of conjunctions, sometimes used as discoursive elements. These connectors betray their Hungarian source, especially in cases in which the Latin text does not employ any conjunction and in which the connector used in the Romanian text takes over the morphosyntactic value of its Hungarian correspondent too.

Such a conjunction is the Rom. *iară* 'but, in turn' which usually corresponds to the Lat. *autem*, just like in: "A doua ***iară*** asemenea este către această" (10/22-23), cf. Hung. "A második ***pedig*** hasonlatos ehhez", cf. lat "Secundum ***autem*** simile est huic". Nevertheless, there are several cases in which the Latin text does not note any conjunction, while Rom. *iară* 'but, in turn' corresponds to the Hung. *pedig* 'but, in turn', like in the following examples: "Care va crede şi se va boteza ispăsi-se va, care ***iară*** nu va crede păgubi-se va" (28/7-9), cf. Hung. "A' ki hiend és meg keresztelkedéndik üdvözül, a' ki ***pedig*** nem hiend, el kárhozik", cf. Lat. "Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, servabitur, Qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur"; "Sfânt Paul încă numeşte pâinea trupul a lu Hristos, păharul ***iară*** chiuzluitura a sângelui lui cu noi" (29/9-12), cf. Hung. "Szent Pál Apostol is a' kenyeret Christus testének, a' pohárt ***pedig*** az ő vérének velünk való közöltetésének

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

nevezi", cf. Lat. "Apostolus Paulus panem apellat communionem corporis Christi, et poculum communionem sanguinis eius"; "A doua tablă ***iară*** cu şase porunci aceea învaţă" (35/19-20), cf. Hung. "A' második [tábla] ***pedig*** hat parancsolatokkal azt [adja előnkben]", cf. Lat. "posterior [tabula], sex praeceptis, quae officia".

Another example is given by the conjunction Rom. *derept însă* 'but because' which corresponds to the Hung. *mivel azért* 'id.', like in the passage*:* "Cu cât ***derept însă*** destoinici sîntem spre bătăi sau bintetluială de o vreme sau trupească şi spre bintetluială de vecie" (12/2-5), cf. Hung. "***Mivel azért*** mind ideig s mind penig örökké való büntetésekre méltók vagyunk", cf. Lat. "Quoniam igitur temporalibus et aeternis poenis obnoxii sumus"; in other passages it corresponds to another semantically and functionally equivalent Hungarian conjunction: "***Derept însă*** acela încă ce va naşte din tine e Sfânt" (17/22-18/1-2), cf. Hung. "***Annakokáért*** az is a' mi te belőled születik a' Szent", cf. Lat. "propterea etiam, quod nascetur ex te Sanctum"; "***Derept însă*** uluim în chip de adevăr, cum omul el se îndereptă" (24/10-11), cf. "***Annakokáért*** ezt állattyuk bizonyosképpen, hogy az ember meg igazittatik", cf. Lat. "Colligimus igitur fide justificari hominem".

The prepositional and adverbial phrases which include the term *chip* 'image, aspect' and which are used mainly with discoursive functions are also indicative of Hungarian influence. Thus, Rom. *în ce chip* 'how, in what way' is noted in: "***În ce chip*** înţelegi aceasta" (20/21), cf. Hung. *Miképpen,* cf. Lat. *Quomodo*; "***În ce chip*** se împart aceste porânci?" (35/14), cf. Hung. *mimódon,* cf. Lat. *quomodo*; "***În ce chip*** trebuieşte nouă pre noi să ne purtăm către Dumnedzeu" (35/17-18), cf. Hung. "***miképpen*** kellessék minékünk magunkat az Istenhez viselnünk", cf. Lat. "quo pacto nos erga Deum geramus"; "***În ce chip*** trebuieşte a cere mila a Duhului Sfânt" (40/16-17), cf. Hung. "***Miképpen*** kell a' Sz. Léleknek kegyelmét… kérnünk", cf. Lat. "Quomodo gratiam Spiritus Sancti... debemus petere"; "***în ce chip*** îngerii fac în cer" (43/11-12), cf. Hung. "a' ***miképpen*** az Angyalok az égben cselekszenek", cf. Lat. "quemadmodum faciunt Angeli in coelo". Another conjunction is Rom. *în acest chip* 'this way, thus', noted in: "Şi ***în acest chip*** cea Sâmbătă de vecie în această viaţă s-o încep" (37/9-10), cf. Hung. "és ***ekképpen*** amaz örökké való Szombathot ebben az életben el kezdjem", cf. Lat. "atq. Ita sempiternum Sabbathum in haec vita exordiar". The conjunction Rom. *nici într-un chip* 'in no way' is recorded in: "***Nici într-un chip****:* că din năravu sînt plecat spre urăciunea lu Dumnedzeu" (11/2-3), cf. Hung. *semmiképen,* cf. Lat. *minime*; "***Nici într-un chip*** nu-l va lăsa" (11/16), cf. Hung. *Semmiképpen nem,* cf. Lat. *Nequaquam*; "***nici într-un chip*** aimintrilea destul n-are fi putut face" (19/11-12), cf. Hung. *semmiképpen,* cf. Lat. *nullo alio pacto*.

A further conjunction which renders exactly the Hungarian model is Rom. *prentru ce ocă* 'why, for what cause', noted in: "***Prentru ce ocă*** se chiamă Hristos Fiul unul născut a lui Dumnedzeu?" (16/23-24), cf. Hung. *Miokért,* cf. Lat. *Quam ob causa;* "***Prentru ce ocă*** *che*mi au numeşti pre Hristos Domnul nostru?" (17/5-6), cf. Hung. *Miokért,* cf. Lat. *Qua de causa;* "***Prentru ce ocă*** au murit Hristos" (19/8), cf. Hung. *Miokért,* cf. Lat. *Qua de causa;* "***prentru ceastă ocă***" (19/9), cf. Hung. *ezokáért,* cf. Lat. *propterea*.

The relative adverb Rom. *cum* 'how' often translates the Hung. *hogy* 'that', taking over the morphosyntactic values of the latter one. Thus, Rom. *cum* 'how' introduces direct object clauses, just like its Hungarian formal correspondent does, as in the following examples: "Aceasta; ***cum*** cu trup cu suflet au voi via au voi muri, eu sînt a Domnului vernic al mieu" (9/6-8), cf. Hung. "Ez, ***hogy*** mind testestől lelkestől, akár élyek, akar hallyak, az én hűséges Uramnak [...] tulajdona vagyok", cf. Lat. "Quod animo pariter et

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

corpore, sive vivam, sive moriar, fidissimi Domini [...] sum proprius"; "Ştim ***cum*** acelora cari îndrăgesc pe Dumnezeu toate sînt spre bine" (9/17-18), cf. Hung. "Tudgyuk ***hogy*** azoknak akik az Istent szeretik, mindenek javukra vagynak", cf. Lat. "Novimus, iis qui diligunt Deum, omnia simul adjumento esse ad bonum"; "Cred ***cum*** Tatăl de vecie a Domnului nostru a lu Isus Hristos... mie încă îmi este Tatăl şi Dumnedzeu" (15/1-5), cf. Hung. "Hiszem ***hogy*** a' mi Urunk Jesus Christusnak örökké való Attya… énnékem is Istenem és Atyám légyen", cf. Lat. "Credo aeternum Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi... meum quoq, Deum et Patrem meum esse"; "Să ştie ***cum*** eu sînt Domnul carele pre ei sfinţesc" (37/13-14), cf. Hung. "meg tudnák, ***hogy*** én vagyok az Vr, a' ki őket megszentelem", cf. Lat. "scirent, quod ego Dominus sanctificans eos"; "Un lucru fac ***cum*** acele ce mi-s după dos să le uit" (42/22-23), cf. Hung. "Egy dolgot cselekszem ***hogy*** azokat a' mellyek a hátam megett vagynak el felejtvén", cf. Lat. "Unum ago, ea quidem, quae a tergo sunt, obliviscens". Similarily, Rom. *cum* 'how' also introduces purpose clauses, as a result of imitating the Hungarian model, as per the following examples: "Hristos odată s-au jertfăluit ***cum*** păcatele a mulţi să le ia" (16/18-19), cf. Hung. "Christus egyszer megaldoztatott, ***hogy*** sokaknak bűneiket elvenné", cf. Lat. "Christus semel oblatus est, ut multorum peccata tolleret"; "Priveghiaţi şi vă rugaţi ***cum*** *în ispită să nu cădeţi*" (45/6-7), cf. Hung. "Vigyázzatok és imádkozzatok, ***hogy*** *kisértésben ne essetek*", cf. Lat. "Vigilate et orate, *ne introeatis in tentationem*".

The relative pronoun Rom. *ce* 'what' is also employed with the meaning 'but', corresponding to the Hungarian conjunction *de* 'but', thus imitating the Hungarian model, especially in cases in which the Latin version does not record any conjunction, as in: "Au vom via au vom muri ***ce*** a Domnului sîntem" (9/14-15), cf. Hung. "Akár éllyünk akár hallyunk, ***de*** az Vréi vagyunk", cf. Lat. "Sive vivimus, sive morimus, Domini sumus". The same adversative meaning is noted in: "Pre Dumnedzeu nicicând nime n-au văzut, ***ce*** acel Fiul unul născut care este în sânul Tatălui lui, el ne-au povestuit nouă" (16/15-17), cf. Hung. "Az Istent soha senki nem látta ***hanem*** amaz egygyetlen egy szülött Fia, a' ki az ő Attyának kebelében vagyon, beszéllette meg mi nékünk", cf. Lat. "Deum nemo vidit unquam: unigenitus ille filius, qui est in sinu Patris, ille nobis exposuit". As a matter of fact, this latter passage bears the influence of the Hungarian source also in terms of word order (see Rom. "nicicând nime n-au văzut", cf. Hung. "soha senki nem látta") and regarding the formula "Fiul ***unul născut***" 'only Son' which perfectly matches the Hungarian expression "***egygyetlen egy szülött*** Fia" 'only Son'.

The conjunction Rom. *că* 'that' is employed with the meaning 'because' in contexts in which the Hungarian version records its equivalent conjunction, unlike the Latin text which does not note any connector, e.g.: "Nici într-un chip: ***că*** din năravplecat sînt spre urăciunea lui Dumnezeu" (11/2-3), cf. Hung. "Semmiképpen nem: ***mert*** természet szerént hajlandó vagyok az Istennek… gyülölésére", cf. Lat. "Minime. Natura enim propensus sum ad odium Dei"; "Pre trei părţi: ***că*** parte de prima este de pre Tatăl Dumnedzeu" (14/3-4), cf. Hung. "Három részekre: ***Mert*** az első vagyon az Atya Istenről", cf. Lat. "In tres partes. Prima est de Deo Patre".

3.3. We can also see evidence of the Hungarian model's imitation in cases of the literal translation of certain smaller or larger linguistic units or text passages, sometimes keeping the Hungarian word order as well. Examples include: "nemica de lucru pământesc" (41/23-24), cf. Hung. "semmi földi dolgot", cf. Lat. "quippiam terrenum"; "Cinci cărţi

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

scrise pe versuri" (8/14-15), cf. Hung. "öt versekre iratott könyvek", cf. Lat. "Quinq libri poëtici"; "Cred ***într-un*** Dumnedzeu" (13/9), cf. Hung. "Hiszek ***egy*** Istenben", cf. Lat. "Credo in Deum"; "într-unul Fiul născut al său" (13/11-12), cf. Hung. "ő egygyetlen egy szülött Fiában", cf. Lat. "Filium eius unigenitum".

Sometimes, instead of the more concise wording of the Latin text, the translator opts for a word-for-word translation of the more detailed passage in the Hungarian version, as in the following examples: "Că ***numai el singur*** este năray Fiul lu Dumnedzeu" (16/25-17/1), cf. Hung. "Mert ***csak ő egyedül*** az Istennek természet szerént való Fia", cf. Lat. "Quia solus est naturalis Dei Filius"; **"**Şi pre el l-au pus capul Bisericiei sfînte" (21/11), cf. Hung. "és ötet tötte az Anya Szent Egyháznak fejévé", cf. Lat. "eumque constituit caput Ecclesiae"; "Cum cu Tatăl de vecie, şi cu Fiul, este Un, Derept, De vecie Dumnedzeu" (21/23-22/1), cf. Hung. "Hogy az örökké való Atyával és Fiúval, egy igaz örökké való Isten légyen", cf. Lat. "Quod sit verus et aeternus Deus cum aeterno Patre et Filio"; "Cum cu Numele Sfinţiei sale ***aimintre nu, ce numai*** cu mare cinste şi biciluială să viem" (36/20-22), cf. Hung. "Hogy az ő szentséges nevével ***különben nem, hanem csak*** nagy tisztelettel és böcsülettel éllyünk", cf. Lat. "Ut sacrosanctio ipsius nomine non nisi summa cum religione ac veneratione utamur"; On the whole, the following fragment also seems to follow the Hungarian model, keeping its word order too: "Că Dumnedzeu în cuvântul său ***aşa*** a ivit pre sine, cum aceşti trei ***unul de altul*** să fie semeliuri sau obraze osebite, acel un Dumnedzeu de vecie" (14/10-14), cf. Hung. "Mert az Isten az ő igéjében ***így*** jelentette ki magát, hogy a' három ***egymástól*** megkülönböztetett személyek legyenek amaz egy igaz örökké való Isten", cf. Lat. "Quia Deus *ita se in* suo verbo *patefecit,* quod tres hae distinctae personae *sint unus ille verus et aeternus Deus*".

3.4. There are also cases in which the imitation of the Hungarian model covers larger text fragments. Thus, for instance, the Romanian title, translated by Fogarasi, follows step by step the Hungarian version of the title which appears in the Latin-Hungarian catechism: "Catechismus Aceea e aceea: Summa sau măduva a uluitei şi a credinţei creştineşti, cuprinsă în întrebări, şi răspunsuri scurte; şi cu adevărături den scriptura sfântă întărită [...] Den gurile Porobocilor mici, şi sugători de ţâţe, (cari încă nu ştiu grăi) ai orândit a duce în vig Lauda ta. Psal. 8. v. 3. Mat. 21. v. 16." (7/1-7, 12-15), cf. Hung. "Catechismus Az az: A' keresztyéni Vallásnak és Hütnek rövid kérdésekben és feleletekben foglaltatott, szent írásbeli bizonyságokkal meg erősíttetett summája, avagy veleje. A' még szólni nem tudó és csecsszopo gyermecskéknek szájokbol rendelted véghez vinni á te dicséretedet. Psal. 8. 3. Matt. 21. 16." (2/1-15), cf. Lat. "Catechismus Religionis Christianae compendiose propositus et sacrarum literarum testimoniis confirmatus. Ex ore infantium et lactentium disposuisti laudem. Psal. 8. 3. Matth. 21. 16." (1/1-11). Similarly, the title which precedes the 77 questions of the catechism also renders the Hungarian title, since the Latin one is much more concise: "Catechismus. Aceea e aceea. Ţelul şi Părţile Creştineşti a Învăţăturii scurte şi a credinţei" (9/1-4), cf. Hung. "Az Keresztyéni Hütre valo rövid tanításnak Célja és Részei", cf. Lat. "Catechismi sacri Scopus et Partes".

A larger fragment is found in 27/15-22 too, where the Romanian text sequentially follows the Hungarian version, including passages which appear only in the latter, some of them being even calqued on Hungarian model: "Este Sacramentum sau semn sfânt de prima a Testamentumului Nou care aceea învaţă şi pecetluieşte, cum eu cu sângele, şi cu sufletul a lu Hristos tocmai aşa cu adevăr m-am curăţitu-mă, ca când în chip de afară cu apă de Sluga

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

Bisericii Sfînte m-am spălatu-mă", cf. Hung. "Az Uj Testamentomnak első Sacramentoma, melly azt tanittya és meg pecsétli, hogy én a' Christusnak vérével és lelkével az én bűneimtől szintén olly bizonyosson meg tisztittatom, a' mint külsőképpen a' vizzel az Egyházi szolgától meg mosattatom", cf. Lat. "Est primum Sacramentum novi Testamenti, docens et obsignans, me non minus certo sanguine et Spiritu Christi a peccatis lavari, quam aqua extrinsecus ablutus sum".

4. CONCLUSIONS

The great number of loan translations and Hungarian morphosyntactic patterns found in the text of the *Catechism* printed in 1648 may be due to various factors. On the one hand, no matter how meticulously a translation is carried out, it cannot escape the power of influence exerted by the source text. The traces of the latter may surface amid the translation either deliberately – as a translation option or perhaps as a result of an acknowledged linguistic constraint – or involuntarily – especially due to the bilingual status of the translator who, in certain cases, no longer feels the need to "naturalize" the "foreign" elements. Therefore, some of the loan translations and/or morphosyntactic patterns characteristic of the Hungarian language may be due exclusively to the source text, when the author had to face a (new) meaning for which the easiest solution at his hand was rendering it by means of loan translation. Others may be explained, perhaps, independently of the source text *per se*, by the fact that the translator was well-acquainted with the Hungarian language. Then again others might have had a customary usage in the common language of the region or they might have had a prior usage in the old Romanian language used in the (Calvinist) Church.

On the other hand, we cannot dismiss the possibility that the unequal exploitation of the two source texts in favour of the Hungarian version implicitly reflects a certain translation "theory". According to that, the Hungarian source might have appeared to be more effective and accessible not only to the translator but also to the intended audience.

Despite all the above, the loan translations and foreign (Hungarian) linguistic patterns noted in Fogarasi's text only temporarily resolve the conflicting state in which the translator found himself during translation. Although loan translations can prompt the enrichment of the Romanian language's vocabulary and its lexical creativity, the method of translation by linguistic calques scarcely produces lasting effects in this respect. Most of the loan translations are only temporary solutions which do not exceed the text frame in question or the (south-western Transylvanian) regional patois and very few of them became permanent constituents of the language.

CORPUS

Bariţiu, G., 1879, *Catechismulu calvinescu impusu clerului şi poporului romanescu sub domnia principiloru Georgiu Rákoczy I. şi II., transcrisu cu litere latine după ediţiunea II tipărită în anulu 1656, insocitu de una escursiune istorica şi de unu glosariu de Georgiu Baritiu*, Sibiu.

Catechismus Az az; A' kereſztyéni Valláſnak és Hûtnek Rövid kérdésekben és feleletekben foglaltatot ſzentirásbeli bizonyſágokval meg erósittetet ſummája avagy veleje. Mellyet Deák és magyar nyelvbóI Oláh-nyelvre forditot. Fogarasi Istvan. Lugoſi már az igaſságot rész szerint meg-iſmet Olah Magyar Eccleſiának lelki Páſztora. […] Feiervarat Nyomtattatott. Braſsai Major Márton

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

általi 1648. Esztendőben // Catechismus / Aceea e aceea; Summa sau Măduva a uluitei şi a credinţei creştineşti, cuprinsă în întrebări, şi răspunsuri scurte; şi cu adevărături din scriptura svântă. Catechiſmus Latino, Ungarico, Walchicus Translatus opera ac Studio Stephani Fogaraſi Symmiſtae Oppidi Lugas, Anno 1647 die 18, Decembri [...], in the edition of Tamás Lajos (Tamás 1942: 43–65).

Catechismus Religionis Christianae compendiosè propositus, & sacrarum literarum testimoniis confirmatus. Ex ore infantium et lactentium disposuisti laudem. Psal. 8.3. Matth. 21.16. Albæ Jvliæ. M. DC: XXXXIII [1643] // *Catechismus Az az; A' keresztyeni vallásnak és hütnek rövid kérdésekben és feleletekben foglaltatott, szent irásbéli bizonyságokkal megh erössittetett summája, avagy veleje. A' még szólni nem tudó és csecsszopo gyermecskéknek szájokbol rendelted véghez vinni a' te dicseretedet. Psal. 8.3. Matt. 21.16. Fejér Váratt. M. DC. XXXXIII.* [1643], in the editio princeps of the Transylvanian Museum's Library (Biblioteca Muzeului Ardelean - Erdélyi Múzeum Könyvtára)

(Online: http://documente.bcucluj.ro/web/bibdigit/patrimoniu/BCUCLUJ_FCS_BMV2279.pdf – 20 febr. 2015).

See also the editions: *Catechismus Religionis Christianae...* M.DC.XLVII [1647] and *Catechismus Religionis Christianae...* M.DC.XXXIX [1639]

DVL = *Dictionarium valachico-latinum. Primul dicţionar al limbii române*, introductory study, edition, index and glossary by Gh. Chivu, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2008.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF OLD BOOKS

RMK, I = Szabó Károly, *Régi Magyar Könyvtár. Az 1531–1711. megjelent magyar nyomtatványok könyvészeti kézikönyve*, Budapest, M. Tud. Akadémia, 1879.

RMK, II = Szabó Károly, *Régi Magyar Könyvtár*, vol. II, *Az 1473-tól 1711-ig megjelent nem magyar nyelvû hazai nyomtatványok könyvészeti kézikönyve*, Budapest, M. Tud. Akadémia, 1885.

RMNY, III = Heltai János, Holl Béla, Pavercsik Ilona, P. Vásárhelyi Judit, *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok 1636–1655*, vol. III, Budapest, Akadémiai Kiadó, 2000.

DICTIONARIES

DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, (serie nouă), Bucureşti, 1965 and subsq.

DLRLV = Mariana Costinescu, Magdalena Georgescu, Florentina Zgraon, *Dicţionarul limbii române literare vechi (1640–1780). Termeni regionali*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1987.

Tótfalusi, I., *Magyar etimológiai nagyszótár* [Online: *http://www.szokincshalo.hu/szotar/* - 2 mai 2015].

REFERENCES

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

Buchi, E., 2001, "L'importance des sources textuelles de 16e et 17e siècles pour la lexicologie historique roumaine", *Revue de linguistique romane* (RLiR), Tome 65, Strasbourg, 381–396.

Hristea, Th., 1968, *Probleme de etimologie. Studii. Articole. Note*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică.

Hristea, Th., 1997, "Tipuri de calc în limba română", *Limbă şi literatură,* XLII, vol. III-IV, 10–29.

Juhász, I., 1940, *A reformáció az erdélyi románok között,* Kolozsvár.

Moldovanu, D., 2007-2008, "Psaltirea în versuri a lui Ştefan din Făgăraş (Fogarasi). Comentarii Filologice", *Anuar de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară*, t. XLVII – XLVIII, 29–66.

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)

Munteanu, E., 2008, *Lexicologie biblică românească,* Bucureşti, Humanitas. [Online: *http://www.philippide.ro/persoane/Volume/E.%20Munteanu_Lexicologie%20Biblica.pdf* – 2 mai 2015].
Pál, E., 2014, *Influenţa limbii maghiare asupra limbii române. Perioada veche*, Iaşi, Editura Universităţii "Alexandru Ioan Cuza".
Pál, E., 2015, "Inserturile şi omisiunile în *Catehismul* calvinesc din 1648 / Inserts and omissions in the Calvinist *Catechism* printed in 1648", *Diacronia*, nr. 2, A22 (1-14) (online: *http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/journal/issue/2/A22/ro*).
Puşcariu, S., 1921-1922, "Despre *pre* la acuzativ", *Dacoromania*, II, 565–581.
Puşcariu, S., 1940, *Limba română,* vol. I. *Privire generală,* Bucureşti.
Rosetti, Al., 1931, *Limba română în secolul al XVI-lea*, Bucureşti, Editura Cartea Românească.
Stanciu-Istrate, Maria, 2006, *Calcul lingvistic în limba română (cu specială referire la scrieri beletristice din secolul al XIX-lea)*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române.
Tagliavini, C., 1928, "L'influsso ungherese sull'antica lessicografia rumena", *Revue des etudes hongroises* (Janvier-Mars), Paris, 1–30.
Tamás, L., 1942, *Fogarasi István kátéja. Fejezet a bánsági és hunyadmegyei ruménség művelődéstörténetéből,* Kolozsvár, Minerva Irodalmi és Nyomdai Műintézet.
Vaimberg, S., 1975, "Calque and Borrowing", *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, XX, 4, 435–437.
Vendryes, J., 1921, *Le Langage,* Paris.
Weinreich, U., 1974, *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems,* with a Preface by André Martinet, Haga-Paris, Mouton.

BDD-A23899 © 2016 Editura Academiei
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:52:56 UTC)