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 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.
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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,
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 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 Phil. 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.),
proper names 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 in Fagarasi’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 Fagarasi refers to 1. Joh. 3. v. 15., just like the Hungarian version does (1. Joh. 3. 15.), unlike the Latin version which mentions 1. Joh. 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.

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 pronunciation existed in the typography. This is the case of the name Solomon (king of ancient Israel), written according to Hungarian pronunciation: 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 lui David, pîldele a lui Salamon, ale povestitorilor, sau ale popilor, cântece al cântecelor” (8/16-20). cf. Lat. “Psalmi. Proverbia. Ecclesiastica. Canticum cantorum”, cf. Hung. “Soltárók. Pêldabeszédek, a’ Predikátör, az Ênêeknêk Ênêke”. 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 Jânos (8/8, 9, 10), cf. Lat. Matthei, Lucae, Iohannis. As a matter of fact, Hungarian pronunciation is recorded in case of other nouns as well. For instance, in order to differentiate in writing between the pair of sounds /sl - /ʃ/ (i.e. the current letter ʃ), Fagarasi uses the letters ʃ for the first consonant and f for the second one. However, on various occasions /ʃ/ is noted in writing by the letter which corresponds to the sound /ʃ/. This is the case of words such as: apofol ‘Apostol’ (8, 13, 14, 20, 29/15, 37/15) (instead of apostol), fuma ‘summary’ (7/3, 10/16, 13/4) (instead of sumo), /ʃarmentum ‘sacrament’ (26/11-12, 26/18, 27/3, 27/10, 15, 28/21), teʃamentum ‘testament’ (7/18, 27/16, 28/22, 30/1), and verʃ ‘verse’ (8). These may reflect either the individual pronunciation 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.
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. 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 “differentia 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), we have preferred this kind of approach to the more ...
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; cale lexical de structură morfemică vs. cale 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 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: 425–437).
– a (se) deschide ‘to reveal (oneself)’, in: “cum acolo pre sine să deschidă a fi capul Bisericii sfinte a sale” (21/6-7), cf. Hung. (magă) kinyilvántani, cf. Lat. declarit;
– a întoarce ‘to dedicate, to devote, to assign’, in: “și cum daruri au luat de la Dumnedzeu acele tuturora trebue să întoarcă pre șpăsevenie” (23/3-5), cf. Hung. idvősségekre fordítaniok (fordítani ‘to turn’, valanire fordítani ‘to devote, to assign’), cf. Lat. salatem conferre;
– născut, in the syntagm Rom. unul născut ‘single-born (i.e. only son)’, in: “acel Fiul unul născut a lui Dumnedzeu” (16/23-24), cf. Hung. egygyetlen egy szülött (egygyetlen ‘single’ egy ‘one’ szülött ‘born’), cf. Lat. unigenitus;
– a (se) pîne 1. ‘to belong to’, ‘to owe’, cf. Hung. tartozni ‘to hold (on to sth.)’, in: “mă pîn lui Dumnezeu” (9/25), cf. Hung. tartozzam, cf. Lat. debeam; “ne-am pînul a

9 The noun Rom. căzătură ‘fall (in sin)’ is recorded in the Catechism printed in 1656 too (Barițiu 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 -ni, which shows continuity) develops the meaning of its verbal root tart (valamere) ‘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.

- unăciune ‘communion’11, in: “unăciunea Sfinţilor” (13/22, 22/23), cf. Hung. eggyesség (egy ‘one’), cf. Lat. communio(nem);

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:

- adevărată ‘testimony, evidence’, in the expression a face adevărată ‘to testify, to show the evidence (of sth.)’, in: “Trei sînt în cer, cări fac adevărată” (14/15-16), cf. Hung. bizonságot tésznek (cf. bizonságot ‘testimony, evidence’ tenni ‘to make’), cf. Lat. testantur;
- întrâmbător12 ‘intercessor, go-between’, in: “Dară ce întrâmbător trebuiește să căutam [...]?” (12/19), cf. Hung. közben járó (közben ‘between’ járó ‘walker, the one who goes’), cf. Lat. Mediator; “Cine e iară întrâmbător?” (13/1); “Unul este întrâmbătorul între Dumnedzeu, și între oamenii” (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 (Bariu 1879: 40). In the 17th century, this term was spread in Moldavia, Crișana and south-western Transylvania (cf. DLRV, s.v. uniciune).
12 This kind of word formation (see also the verb a întrâmbla, the noun întrâmblare) 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. înpâcătâtoriu (Bariu 1879: 35, 36).
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. Teluș și Părțile Creștinești a Înviățării” (9/1-3), “Immanuel aceea e aceea Dumnedzeu cu noi” (12/25-26), “Fiul lu Dumnedzeu Isus aceea-i aceea Ispășitor sau slobozitor” (15/23-24), “Hristos aceea e aceea Uns” (16/8), “la cine era puterea morții, aceea-i aceea, pre Dracul” (19/15), “cări pre sine ispitesc, aceea e aceea, care cu adevăr se călău” (30/9-10); “armele împășenei, aceea e aceea, cuvântul lu Dumnedzeu” (32/20-21), cf. Hung. az az, cf. Lat. hoc est; “îndereptiți în har, aceea e aceea din mila a lu Dumnedzeu” (24/4-6), cf. Hung. az az, cf. Lat. id est; “Vină împărăția ta. Aceea e aceea: Dă-ne […] să tocim” (42/16-18), the formula being repeated, then, while explaining the subsequent verses of the Lord’s Prayer (43/8, 20; 44/6,21);

- **băgătură de samâ** ‘counting, taking into account’, in: “Despre băgătură de samâ a dihaniei” (8/2-3), cf. Hung. számhabvétele ‘counting’ (szám ‘number’ vétele ‘taking’);

- **chip** ‘as it appears to be, in the manner that…, in the form of’, in the syntagmas: in chip de adevăr ‘certainly’ (24/10), cf. Hung. bizonyosképen ‘id.’; in chip tare ‘firmly’ (24/16), cf. Hung. erőskepen, cf. Lat. firmiter; in chip de afară ‘outwardly’ (27/20), cf. Hung. külöképen, 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; in ce chip ‘how, in what manner’ (20/21, 35/14, 35/17, 40/16, 43/11, 45/9), cf. Hung. miképen, cf. Lat. quo modo, quo pacto, quemadmodum; in acest chip ‘this way’ (37/9), cf. Hung. ekképen, cf. Lat. ita;

---

13 The term was created by Fogarasi. In the catechism printed in 1656 (Barițiu 1879) this word has other equivalences: Rom. veselie (p. 34, 41), Rom. mândătuare (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. maradt- ‘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 Vergină va prinde în sânul său, și va naște un Făt, și-l va chema acela Immanuel aceea e aceea Dumnedzeu cu noi” (12/24-26), cf. Hung. “Ime egy szűz fogad az ō méhében és szűl friat és nevedez azt Immánumelné, velőn̈k Istennek”, cf. Lat. “Ecce virgo concipiet, et pariet filium, et vocabis nomen eius Immanuel”.
Traces of the Hungarian Source Text in the Catechism


- (a) **duce in vig** ‘to bring something to an end, to carry out’, in: “ai orândit a duce in vig Lauda ta” (7/14), cf. Hung. véghesz vinni ‘id,’ (végh ‘end’ vinni ‘to bring’);¹⁷

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

- **făcătură de destul** ‘satisfaction’, in: “prentru făcătură de destul a lui Hristos” (23/10-11), “mi se destoinicește mă făcătură de destul” (24/1-2), cf. Hung. élégtétel ‘satisfaction’ (élég ‘enough’ tétel ‘doing’), cf. Lat. satisfactionem (cf. also Tamás 1942: 87);

- **purătură de grijă** ‘caretaking, providence’, in: “Ce este purătură de grijă a lui Dumnezeu?” (15/10), cf. Hung. gondviselés ‘caretaking’ (gond ‘care’ viselés ‘taking’)¹⁹, cf. Lat. providentia (cf. also Tamás 1942: 108);

- **stătură de băsău** ‘revenge taking’, in: “pofta a stăturiei de băsău” (38/5-6), cf. Hung. boszúállás ‘revenge taking’ (boszút ‘revenge’ állni ‘taking’), cf. Lat. vindictae;


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

- **sugător de fâte** ‘breast sucker, nursling’, in: “Den gurile Porobociilor mici, și sugători de fâte” (7/12-13), cf. Hung. csecsszopó ‘nursling’ (csec ‘breast’ szopó ‘sucker’) (cf. also Tamás 1942: 113). This compound might have appeared as less common to Fogoarasi since he also gives its explanation: “sugători de fâte (cari încă nu știu grăli)”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: mulțimiță, mulțămiare (Barițiu 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 in 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: socotintia (Barițiu 1879: 37).

²⁰ Similarly, the expression Rom. poroboci mici de tâpă ‘small children, nursling’ (28/10) could be the result of a loan translation from Hungarian, cf. Hung. csecsszonym gyermekek, cf. Lat. infantes.
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) cioplí afará ‘to carve, to form’, cf. Hung. ki ‘out’ formálni ‘to carve, to form’, in: “Cum pre Dumnedzeu... afará sá nu cioplím. nici aímintro sá nu-l cinstim, ce numai decem el au porâncit în cuvântul lui” (36/8-12), cf. Hung. “Hogy az Istent... ki ne formállyuk, sem valami egyéb módon ne tiszteletük, hanem csak a’ mint az ő igéjében paransolta”, cf. Lat. “Ne Deum... exprimamus, neve ulla alia rations eum colamus, quam in verbo suo praeceptit”;


- (a) înțelege una cu... ‘to agree with’, in: “una înțeleg cu acele toate” (24/16-17), cf. Hung. “egygyet étrek mind azokkáll” (egyet ‘one’ értem ‘to understand’ valamivel ‘with sth.’), cf. Lat. assentior omnibus;


\(^{21}\) 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. kívigye – kívye ‘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.


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
distinguish the accusative case of the direct object\textsuperscript{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 \textit{pe} ‘on’ is employed “with actual meaning [i.e. as a semantically
autonomous lexeme] and not with the grammatical value of indicating the accusative”
(Pușcăriu 1921–1922: 575). Obviously, the preposition \textit{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” (Pușcăriu 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’\textsuperscript{23}, ‘towards, to’\textsuperscript{24}, ‘against’\textsuperscript{25}, ‘through’, ‘in’, etc.

Despite this semantic diversity virtually included in the nucleus meaning
‘location’ of the preposition \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{pre}. In such cases, the Romanian preposition
\textit{pre} ‘on’ most often corresponds to its semantically and formally equivalent Hungarian
suffix \textit{-al-re} ‘on’ which is required by the regime of the Hungarian verb. Such examples
are to be found in the following passages: “\textit{Pre} câte părți se împarte acest Apostoliților?” (14/1-2), cf. Hung. “Hány részekre osztatik az Apostoli Credo?”, cf. Lat. “\textit{In}
quot partes distribuitur hoc Symbolum?”; “Duhul Sfânt \textit{va descâlceca pre} ține’” (17/20-21),

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{pre} is conditioned by
the type of construction found in the Slavonic original” (ibidem, p. 111). In fact, the presence or
absence of \textit{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 \textit{pre} ‘on’ is
rather due to the fact that in the 16\textsuperscript{th} and early 17\textsuperscript{th} 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 Pușcăriu 1921–1922).

\textsuperscript{23} In Romanian, the preposition \textit{pre} brings to mind the idea of “position above something”
(Pușcăriu 1940: 38). “The preposition \textit{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” (Pușcăriu 1921–1922: 579). “When we are dealing with a more distant position
above somebody or something, the preposition \textit{pre} corresponds to \textit{înseste} [‘over, across’] or
\textit{înseasupra} [‘above’] (ibidem, p. 579).

\textsuperscript{24} “When it is about an act of moving downwards, \textit{pre} often rivals \textit{spre} [‘towards’] […]
Thus, \textit{pre} is sometimes synonymous with the prepositions which indicate the directions \textit{spre}
[‘towards’], \textit{înseasupra} [‘on, at, above’] and \textit{în} [‘to’]” (Pușcăriu 1921–1922: 579).

\textsuperscript{25} “In old Romanian language, the verbs which denote a hostile attitude towards someone
were used with the prepositions \textit{spre} or \textit{pre} which often have the meaning \textit{‘against’}, \textit{in opposition to}” (Pușcăriu 1921–1922: 575).
3.2. The text of the *Catechism* also exhibits other syntactic constructions which are less compatible with the Romanian language structure. The most evident indices 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.


Another example is given by the conjunction Rom. dереpt insâ ‘but because’ which corresponds to the Hung. mivel azért ‘id.’, like in the passage: “Cu cât dереpt insâ destoinică sintem spre bătăii sau bintetiuială de o vreme sau trupească și spre bintetiuială de vecie” (12/2-5), cf. Hung. “Mivel azért mind ideig s mind penig öröké valo bintetésekére méltók vagyunk”, cf. Lat. “Quonium igitur temporabilus et aeternis poenis obnoxii sumus”; in other passages it corresponds to another semantically and functionally equivalent Hungarian conjunction: “Dереpt insâ acela încă ce va naşte din tine e Sfânt” (17/22-18/1-2), cf. Hung. “Annakokâért az is a’ mi te belôled születik a’ Szent”, cf. Lat. “properterea etiam, quod nascetur ex te Sanctum”; “Dереpt insâ ului în chip de adevăr, cum omul el se înderępâta” (24/10-11), cf. “Annakokâért etz állattyuk bizonyosképpen, hogy az ember meg igazítatkát”, cf. Lat. “Colligimus igitur fide justificari hominem”.


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 sulfet au voi via au voi muri, eu sînt a Domnului vernic al meu” (9/6-8), cf. Hung. “Ez, hogy mind testestô lelkestô, akár elyék, akar hallyak, az én hûšéges Úramnak [...] tulajdona vagyok”, cf. Lat. “Quod animo pariter et
corpore, sive vivam, sive moriar, fidissimi Domini [...] sum proprius”; “Stim cum acelora
cari întrăgăesc pe Dumnezeu toate sînt spre bine” (9/17-18), cf. Hung. “Tudyuk hogy
azoknak akik az Istent szeretik, mindenek javukra vagynak”, cf. Lat. “Novimus, iis qui
diligunt Deum, omnem simul adjumento esse ad bonum”; “Cred cum Tatâl de vecie a
Domnului nostru a lu Isus Hrisostos... mie încă îmi este Tatâl și Dumnezeu” (15/1-5), cf.
acele ce mi-s după dos să le uît” (42/22-23), cf. Hung. “Egy dolgot cselekszems hogy azokat
a’ mellyek a hâtam megett vagynak el felejtvén”, cf. Lat. “Unum ago, ea quidem, quae a
tergo sunt, obliviscens”. Similarly, Rom. cum ‘how’ also introduces purpose clauses, as a
result of imitating the Hungarian model, as per the following examples: “Hristos odată s-au
jertăluit cum păcatea a mulți să le ia” (16/18-19), cf. Hung. “Christus egyszer
gemáldoztatott, hogy sokaknak bűnükkel elvennő”, cf. Lat. “Christus semel oblatus est, ut
tmultorum peccata tollerent”; “Priveghi și vă rugați cum în ispită să nu cădeți” (45/6-7), cf. Hung. “Vigyázzatok és imádkozzatok, hogy kisérőtben 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 simtem” (9/14-15), cf. Hung. “Akár ellyünk akár
hallyunk, de az Vrēi vagyunk”, cf. Lat. “ضبط vivimus, sive morimus, Domini sumus”. The
same adversative meaning is noted in: “Pre Dumnezeu niciând nime n-au văzut, ce acel
Fiul unul născut care este în sânul Tatâlui lui, el ne-au povestit nouă” (16/15-17), cf.
Hung. “Az Istent soha senki nem lătâ hanem amaz egygetetn egy szlûtt Fia, a’ ki az ă
Atyânak kebelében vagyon, beszéllette meg mi nêkünk”, 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. “niciând nime n-au văzut”, cf. Hung. “soha senki nem lătâ”) and
regarding the formula “Fiul unul născut” ‘only Son’ which perfectly matches the
Hungarian expression “eggygeten egy szlûtt 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 nara v plecat
természet szerént hajlândo vagyok az Istennék... gyûlölésére”, cf. Lat. “Minime. Natura enim
propensus sum ad odium Dei”; “Pre trei pârți: că parte de prima este de pre Tatâl
Dumnezeu” (14/3-4), cf. Hung. “Hârom részekre: Mert az elsô vagyon az Atya Istenrîl”,
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: “neminc de lucr împântesc”


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 de prima a Testamentului Nou care aceea învață și pecetluieste, cum eu cu sângele, și cu sufletul a lu Hristos tocmai așa cu adevăr m-am curățitu-mă, ca când în chip de afară cu apă de Sluga
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

Barițiu, G., 1879, *Catechismul calvinesc impusu clerului și poporului românescu sub domnia principilor Georgiu Rákóczi I. și II., transcris cu litera latine după ediționea II tipărită în anul 1656, inscisciu de una escursiune istorica și de unu glosariu de Georgiu Baritiu, Sibiu.*


See also the editions: Catechismus Religionis Christianae... M.DC.XLVI [1647] and Catechismus Religionis Christianae... M.DC.XXXXIX [1639].
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