

Lexical-Semantic Dynamics in Romanian Biblical Versions. Case Study: *The Parable of the Publican and the Pharisee*

Dora VĂETUȘ

*Dans cet article¹, nous nous proposons d'étudier la dynamique lexico-sémantique en visant le processus de traduction et de révision, sur un corpus formé de plusieurs versions bibliques roumaines: notre démarche consiste à comparer huit versions partielles ou intégrales des **Saintes Écritures: l'Évangélaire de Coresi (CORESI 1561), le Nouveau Testament de Bălgrad (NTB 1648), la Bible de Bucarest (BIBLIA 1688), la Vulgate de Blaj (BIBLIA 1760), la Bible de Blaj (BIBLIA 1795), la Bible Cornilescu (BIBLIA 1921), la Bible Radu-Galaction (BIBLIA 1939), la Bible Anania (BIBLIA 2001)**. Notre étude envisage les substitutions lexicales identifiées dans un fragment représentatif de chacune des éditions bibliques énumérées ci-dessus; il s'agit de la **Parabole du publicain et du pharisien** (l'Évangile selon Luc, chapitre 18, versets de 9 à 14). À la fin de notre investigation, une certaine dynamique lexico-sémantique manifestée par des substitutions lexicales sera évidente, mais, à part ces divergences, on rencontrera de nombreuses coïncidences lexicales qui offriront des indices en ce qui concerne la filiation des textes. Nous entreprendrons aussi une recherche comparative, pour relever les correspondances lexico-sémantiques entre la langue roumaine et les langues latine et grecque, impliquées dans le processus de traduction ou de révision.*

Mots-clés: dynamique lexico-sémantique, versions bibliques roumaines, substitutions lexicales.

Theoretical Preliminaries

The dynamics of the language represents, according to DSL, 'the variation of a language both from a diachronic perspective, namely during its evolution from a historical stage to another, but also from the perspective of synchrony, which refers to its manifestations that are synchronically diversified'. Our attention is focused on the dynamics of the language in diachrony, which concerns 'its successive transformations, determined either by the internal evolution, so by the evolution of its

¹ Acknowledgment: *This work was supported by the strategic grant POSDRU/159/1.5/S/140863, Project ID 140863 (2014), co-financed by the European Social Fund within the Sectorial Operational Program Human Resources Development 2007 – 2013.*

own linguistic system, or by external factors, historical or cultural factors, such as: territorial unification or breakdown, contact between languages, whether direct or indirect, the express contribution brought by certain cultural personalities, in the given historical conditions, to the imposition of a linguistic norm' (DSL: 180).

From the numerous aspects of the dynamics of the language, we shall only discuss the lexical-semantic dynamics: it is common knowledge that the vocabulary is the most dynamic part of a language, as it is subjected to certain extra-linguistic influences, thus illustrating the interdependence between language and society. In contemporary Romanian language, a tendency to use newly-coined words excessively, generally, loan-words from American English, with the risk of disregarding the words inherited from Latin or the old loan-words. In contrast to the current tendencies of modernization of Romanian, the current church language is characterized mainly by simplicity, accessibility and conservatism, and this is why the dynamics of the vocabulary does not know the amplitude that is common to other fields.

The lexical dynamics is manifested through the enriching of the vocabulary through internal means (the formation of certain words in Romanian through derivation, compounding, abbreviation) or through external means (borrowing and loan translation). In terms of the sense dynamics, we analyze the means of broadening/extending of sense of certain words or, less often, the restricting of the sense, the complimentary and the pejorative senses respectively, the metaphor, metonymy etc. The semantic evolution is a very complex phenomenon that can be explained by appealing not only to etymology, but also to the referential domain and the functional styles of the language. The dynamics on a lexical and semantic level also entails passages from the active stock of the language to the passive stock (for instance, the case of lexical or semantic archaic words) or the other way round, and stylistic interferences (passing from a style or a stylistic register to another one, terminological specialization or, on the contrary, de-terminologizing words).

The lexical-semantic dynamics of the biblical versions is explained metaphorically by metropolitan bishop Andrei Şaguna in *Preface to the 1856-1858 Bible*: 'our language is a living tree, one that changes constantly all spring long; the old branches, lacking sap, get dry and fall down, new scions come up and grow, the leaf dries up and is shed down, but is soon followed and or decorated by a new one – all that belongs to it changes again and again, and it is only the stalk that always remains the same'.

Corpus

From the Romanian biblical versions, we have selected a number of eight texts that are representative for a comparative analysis of the *Parable of the Publican and the Pharisee*, from *Gospel after Luke*, chapter 18, v.9-14:

- *Coresi's Four Gospels* (CORESI 1561) – the first extant translation of the four *Gospels*; the source of the translation is Church Slavonic;

- *The New Testament From Bălgrad* (NTB 1648) – the first integral translation of the *New Testament* into Romanian language; the source is a 1611 polyglot edition (NTGL 1611, with the text published on three columns: in Greek, in Latin – *Vulgata* and still in Latin – Théodore de Bèze’s version, followed mainly by the new Latin version of Beza; this probably due to the fact that previous translations were used, among which we include CORESI 1561 (see Pavel 2001: 166-171);
- *The Bible from Bucharest* (BIBLIA 1688) – the first integral translation of the *Bible* into Romanian, with *The New Testament* being a revision of NTB 1648;
- *The Vulgata From Blaj* (BIBLIA 1760) – the translation of the *Bible* from the Latin text of the *Vulgata* from the edition entitled *Biblia sacra* printed in Venice in the year of 1690;
- *The Bible From Blaj* (BIBLIA 1795) – the revision of *The Bible From Bucharest* by Samuil Micu; this was the basis of the biblical editions during the 19th century and of the 1914 Synod edition;
- *The Cornilescu Bible* (BIBLIA 1921) – the translation is made by Dumitru Cornilescu from the French version of Louis Segond (Conțac 2011: 121-145);
- *The Radu-Galaction Bible* - the translation is made by priests Vasile Radu and Gala Galaction from the Masoretic text (Kittel edition), confronted with *Septuaginta*, edited by R. Rahlfs (1935) and with the text of A. Merck (Rome, 1935);
- *Biblia Anania* (BIBLIA 2001) – a version proofread according to the *Septuaginta* by metropolitan bishop Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania.

Lexical-semantic analysis

1. *A grăi/a zice/a spune/a rosti*

DLR indicates the fact that the verb *a zice* [=to say] is also used in an absolute manner to compete with the verb *a spune* [=to tell]. Both of them have in this context the meaning ‘to express by uttering’. Both verbs have a Latin etymon, *dicere* and *exponere* respectively. In the old language *a zice* is more frequent (16th century: 3675, 17th century: 1717, 18th century: 435) compared to *a spune* (16th century: 533, 17th century: 265, 18th century: 77 - see the frequency of words in the vocabulary of old Romanian language – Tudose 1970: 126-148). The frequent use of the verb *a zice* in old Romanian language is confirmed by its presence in all the biblical versions from the old period. It is only the BIBLIA 1921 and BIBLIA 2001 that use the verb *a spune*, which constitutes a simple stylistic processing, meant to avoid the repetition of the verb *a zice*, which is frequent in the text. In CORESI 1561, we also encounter the verb *a grăi* [=to utter], which appears mainly in old and folklore texts, especially in Transylvania. It is a synonym of *a zice*, *a spune*, *a vorbi* [=to talk], *a cuvânta* [=to speak], *a glăsui* [=to utter]. It is a word with a Slav origin (a borrowing from the Serbian *grajati* ‘[=to croak, to caw]’ (DLR). *A rosti* [=to utter] enters the series of synonyms enumerated above. It is derived from the noun *rost* (from the Latin *rostrum* ‘beak’) which keeps in old language the sense ‘mouth’ (DLR). BIBLIA 1939 probably uses it due to stylistic reasons too, in order to avoid the repetition of the verb

a zice. There are no problems of lexical-semantic equaling between the Latin *dico* and the Greek *λέγω* respectively and their correspondents in Romanian.

2. *Pildă/parabolă*

Pildă [=parable], from the Hungarian *pél*, is encountered in all the old editions, while the recent ones witness the neologism *parabolă* [=parable], from the French word *parabole*, the Latin *parabola*. The contextual sense for the two words is ‘allegorical story with a religious content’ (DLR). In old Romanian, the word *pildă* has the following frequency, distributed during centuries, in the corpus analyzed in Tudose 1970: 126-148: 16th century: 170, 17th century: 29, 18th century: 3. We can notice a decrease in its frequency, which implies the competition with another word – *parabolă* [=parable]. *Pildă* has not disappeared from contemporary Romanian, and is still being used in folk language and in church language. *Pildă* and *parabolă* respectively are lexical equivalents for the Greek *παραβολή* and the Latin *parabola*. The differences of translation from the Romanian editions are not due to the utilized sources, but to the evolution of Romanian language. The Greek word *παραβολή* has in NT the meaning of ‘parable, fictional story which conveys a religious or moral teaching (Lidell – Scott). The same sense of ‘parable’ is also kept by the Latin *parabola*.

3. *A se upovăi/a (se) nădăjdui/a se încrede/a avea despre sine încredințarea/a se crede*

A (se) upovăi [=to direct] is a lexical archaic word (if we compare it to contemporary language) that appears only in CORESI 1561 and in the context has the sense ‘to go in the direction of somebody in good faith, to address someone in the hope of achieving help, leniency, shelter’. It is a borrowing from Church Slavonic, its etymon being *upovati/ upŭvati*. The verb *a nădăjdui* [=to hope], which is present in three biblical versions, has the completion *întru (sine)* [=in oneself] and in the context has the meaning of *a upovăi*. The construction *a nădăjdui întru (cineva)* [=to hope in/for somebody] is no longer used today in the standard language, but only in church language. It is a verb formed in Romanian through derivation with the suffix *-ui* from the noun *nădejde* [=hope], which has a Slav origin (Paleoslavonic *nadejda*). BIBLIA 1795 already replaces it with *a se încrede întru sine*, which has the meaning ‘to believe in oneself, to be conscious of one’s worth’. It is formed by derivation with the prefix *în-*, like in other Romance languages, old French *encroire*, Spanish *encreer* ‘to borrow’ (DLR). We notice in this case the tendency to replace the Paleoslavonic/Slavonic terms (see even the word ‘nădejde’) or the words derived from a Slav basis with other words that have a Latin origin, after the Romance model. In BIBLIA 2001 we encounter *a crede* (from inherited Latin word *credere*), in a reflexive use, with the sense ‘to deem, to consider oneself’, which by extension evolved into ‘to have an inflated opinion about oneself, to deem oneself better than one actually is, to be self-conceited, haughty’ (DLR). *A avea (despre sine) încredințarea* [=to have the faith (about oneself)] from BIBLIA 1939 is a paraphrase

that attempts to render the same contextual sense of *a crede* [=to believe]. Greek *πειθω* (at perfect participle active) that has the meaning here ‘to be convinced,’ while the Latin *confido* (*in se*) means ‘to have faith (in oneself)’.

4. *D(i)rept/neprihănit*

Drept [=right(eous)] has in this context the sense ‘who lives and acts according to justice, truth, kind-heartedness, the good; honest, righteous, proper’, even ‘innocent, free of sins’ (DLR). It is inherited from Latin *directus*, but here it is an equivalent of the sense of Latin *iustus* and of Greek *δίκαιος*. Probably because of the polysemy of the adjective *drept* [=just] or the influence of the source, BIBLIA 1921 prefers the word *neprihănit* [=chaste] ‘free of stain, free of sin, free of guilt’, a word derived from *prihană* ‘a guilt with a moral nature, a deed that trespasses the moral and makes a man sinful’, a loan-word from Ukrainian *prigana*, Polish *przygana* (DLR).

5. *A ocări/a ține în nemică/a defăima/a urgisi/a disprețui/a privi de sus*

A ocări has the sense here, which is obsolete nowadays, ‘to disregard, to despise, to mock, to think little (of)’. The word is a borrowing from Paleoslavonic *ocarati*. The loan translation in the phrase *a ține în nemică* from NTB 1648, which tries to render the same sense as the verb *a ocări* indicates very clearly the source of the translation: the new Latin version translated by Beza present in the polyglot edition NTGL 1611 (where *pro nihilo habebant* corresponds to the Greek *ἐξουθενοῦντας*; cf. Latin *aspernor* with the sense ‘to repel’). *A defăima* [=to libel], used transitively, with the complement indicating people, is obsolete nowadays in literary language. Its meaning is ‘to repel with contempt, admonishment, to despise, to disregard, to demean’. It is inherited from the Latin word **diffamare* (=diffamare). The presence of *a defăima* [=to defame] in BIBLIA 1688 and in BIBLIA 1795 may be proof of the fact that BIBLIA 1795 is a revision of the 1688 BIBLIA. In BIBLIA 1760 *a urgisi* appears, another lexical archaic term in contemporary language, which has the sense ‘to have hostile sentiments (towards somebody), to detest, to show enmity/ill-will to’. It comes from the Neo-Greek *ὀργίζω*. *A disprețui* [=to despise] has the sense ‘to have or manifest contempt to somebody, to disregard somebody, to ignore’. It is derived with the suffix *-ui* from the noun *dispreț* [=contempt] (from the Italian word *disprezzo*, cf. the verb *disprezzare*) (DLR). The neologism *a disprețui*, which eliminated its earlier competitors *a ocări*, *a defăima*, *a urgisi*, is preferred in BIBLIA 1921 and in BIBLIA 2001. BIBLIA 1939 utilizes the phrase *a privi de sus* maybe due to the tendency not to use neologisms in the biblical text.

6. *A se duce/a merge/a intra/a se sui*

A merge [=to go] is accompanied by the local determination *în beseanică* [=to church] and has the meaning ‘to walk by moving from one place to another’. It is inherited from the Latin word *mergere* ‘to submerge’, without keeping its meaning. The verb *a merge* belongs to the fundamental vocabulary of old Romanian, with the frequency: 16th century: 897, 17th century: 562, 18th century: 185 (Tudose 1970: 126-

148), a fact that is confirmed by its presence in three biblical versions from the old period: NTB 1648, BIBLIA 1688 and BIBLIA 1760. *A intra* (*a întra*), which appears in BIBLIA 1795, is less frequent: 16th century: 424, 17th century: 296, 18th century: 78. *A intra*, which also has a Latin origin – *intrare*, has the sense ‘to pass from outside inside, to go from an outdoor place to an enclosed one’. *A se sui*, inherited from the Latin *subire* (DLR) is accompanied by a local determination introduced by the preposition *la*, having the sense ‘to move or to go to a place that is higher (and higher) (compared to a given point of reference or to the place that somebody is situated); to climb’. Its use in BIBLIA 1921 and in BIBLIA 2001 is explained by the fact that the church or the temple are usually built on a higher place (while the corresponding Greek word *ἀναβαίνω* and the Latin word *ascendo* have the sense ‘to climb’). It is possible that in BIBLIA 2001 the reviser kept the variant proposed by BIBLIA 1921 (like in the case of *a disprețui*). *A se duce* [=to go] is a partial synonym of *a merge* and in the context has the sense ‘to start moving in order to arrive somewhere, to leave somebody or something in order to head to a different place’. It is only the verb *a se sui* that is an equivalent of the Greek word *ἀναβαίνω* and the Latin word *ascendo*, while all the other variants only convey the idea of movement.

7. *Beserică/templu*

Biserică has the concrete sense ‘building erected especially for the celebration of a Christian cult, and by extension of any religious cult’. It is inherited from the Latin *basilica* (DLR). The frequency of this word in old language is the following: 16th century: 286, 17th century: 254, 18th century: 50 (Tudose 1970: 126-148). In order to eliminate the confusion linked to the cult, it is replaced in BIBLIA 1921 by *templu* [=temple]. For *templu*, a loan-word from the French *temple*, Latin *templum*, the lexicographical definition is ‘edifice destined to the practice of the religious cult (for some peoples in ancient times, nowadays for the Mosaic believers, Protestants, etc.)’. It is the hypernym for *biserică*, *capîște*, *geamie*, *havră*, *moschee*, *pagodă*, *sinagogă* (DLR). The translation of the Latin *templum* or the Greek word *τὸ ἱερόν* that has the meaning of ‘temple’ by *biserică* in the biblical versions from the old period is a cultural adaptation to the Romanian context (in the context the subject is the Judaic synagogue, although in the interpretation of the parable the place of worship is the Christian one).

8. *Mitar/mitarnic/vameș*

The words *mitarnic* and *mitar* [= publican, tax collector] have the sense ‘person who had a lease on collecting taxes; revenue officer’ the same as the Latin *publicanus* and the Greek *τελώνης*. *Mitar* is a loan-word from the Slavonic *mitarĭ*, while *mitarnic* is a word derived with the suffix *-arnic* from the noun *mită* [=bribe], from the Slavonic *mito*. Both *mitar* and *mitarnic* have become obsolete words, even in church use (which however keeps using the derived word *nemitarnic*). We note that the Slavonic terms appear up to BIBLIA 1688, while in the subsequent versions they are replaced by *vameș* [= publican, tax collector, revenue officer]. *Vameș*, an old

borrowing from the Hungarian *vámos*, has in this context the sense ‘person who collected taxes,’ the same as in the case of the words *mitar* and *mitarnic*. This sense is still kept in church language use, though it may be considered to be a semantic archaic term if we correlate it with the contemporary literary language, in which it carries the meaning ‘clerk whose duty is to control the luggage, merchandise, means of transportation, etc. and to collect the products that pass through the customs’ (DLR).

9. *Deusebi/departe/de departe*

The adverb *osebi* (obsolete) has the sense ‘apart, to one side, separate’, to which DLR adds the variant *deosebi*, which is used in BIBLIA 1688. It comes from the Slavonic word *osobi*. The Slavonic term is only encountered in NTB 1648 and in BIBLIA 1688. *Departe* [=far (away)] has a local sense here, ‘at a great distance from a fixed point’. It is a word formed in Romanian, by compounding, from the words *de* and *parte*. We note the fact that this local determination is not present in all the Romanian biblical versions, and from the sources we studied, it only appears in the Latin version of Beza: *seorsum* ‘separate, apart from’, which demonstrates the correlation between NTB 1648 and NTGL 1611 and the filiation between NTB 1648, BIBLIA 1688 and BIBLIA 1795 (with the last two being revisions). We are surprised by the presence of the local determination in BIBLIA 1760, which is a translation from BIBLIA SACRA 1690 (*Vulgata*), but in the Latin version of the *Vulgata* there is no correspondent for *departe*.

10. *Doamne/Dumnezeule*

The word *Domn* [=Master], inherited from Latin *dominus* ‘master’ (often articulated, behaving as a proper name, with the Vocative form *Doamne*), has in monotheist religions the sense ‘supreme, eternal being, primordial transcendent cause, fundamental principle of existence and of universal order, creator and judge of the world who, in Christianity, is three-fold in the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; Dumnezeu [=God]’. It often appears as an epithet given by Christians to Jesus Christ. *Dumnezeu*, inherited from Latin *Dom(i)ne Deus* (Vocative) has in DLR the same definition that we showed above for *Domn* (V. *Doamne*) and, by extension, in Christianity, also refers to Jesus Christ. The Latin correspondent *Deus* and the Greek correspondent *θεός* have the sense ‘Dumnezeu’.

11. *A da laudă/a da har/a mulțumi*

The verb *a mulțumi* [=to thank] is derived from the greeting formula (*la*) *mulți ani* and in the context has the sense ‘to express (by words) one’s gratitude or satisfaction for a gift’ (DLR). It is encountered in all the biblical versions we studied, with the exception of the first two: CORESI 1561 uses the translation *a da laudă* [=to give praise], which is probably a loan translation under the influence of the Slavonic source, and the NTB 1648, as a consequence of the influence of the source, the loan

translation *a da har* from the Latin *gratias agere*, with the sense ‘to thank’ (the same as the Greek *εὐχαριστῶ*). *Har* here has the sense ‘thanks to, by grace of, by virtue of’.

12. *Răpitor/jefuitor/hrăpăreț*

Jefuitor [=plundering], an adjective also used as a noun, has the sense ‘(one) who plunders, plunderer’, and, by extension ‘avaricious, predatory’ (translating the Slavonic *histniku*). The verb *a jefui* [=to plunder] (DLR) from which the word is derived with the suffix *-tor* has in Moldavia the variants *jăfui*, *jăhui* and id derived, at its turn, from the word *jaf* (*jah*) or is borrowed from the Ruthenian *zekuvati*, *zakuvati* ‘to plunder’ (cf. Hungarian *zsákolni* ‘a jefui’). In the regional variant *jăhuitor* is encountered in NTB 1648 and in BIBLIA 1688, while the literary variant *jefuitor* appears in BIBLIA 1795. The adjective *răpitor*, used also as a noun, has the sense ‘(person) who unjustly takes somebody else’s good, who plunders somebody else, who usurps someone else’s right’. It is a word derived with the suffix *-tor* from the verb *a răpi* [=to rob, to carry off/away], inherited from the Latin word *rapire* (*rapere*) (DLR). It is interesting that this word appears in three biblical versions between which there is no affiliation or genealogy and which belong to different periods – CORESI 1561, BIBLIA 1795 and BIBLIA 2001. The word *hrăpitor* is an old variant for *răpitor*, just like *a hrăpi* is related to *a răpi*. The presence of *hrăpitor* in BIBLIA 1921 is probably motivated by the stylistic intention to use archaic words. *Hrăpăreț*, a word derived with the suffix *-ăreț* from the verb *a hrăpi*, has the sense ‘who tries by any means to get rich; greedy for wealth, rapacious’ (DEX). We consider that it is used in BIBLIA 1921 with the same stylistic intentions, because it is more suggestive. The Greek word *ῥπαξ*, like the Latin word *rapax* (Beza), has the sense ‘rapacious’, and the Latin *raptor* (Vulgata) would be translated more readily by ‘*răpitor*’. The correlation with the correspondents from Latin and Greek do not indicate differences between the Romanian versions as regards the utilized sources.

13. *Curvar/preacurvar/necredincios în căsătorie/adulter*

Curvar [=lewd, libertine, debauched (person)] has the meaning ‘one who is debauched, dissolute, licentious’ (DLR). It is a word that is encountered especially in old language, although it still survives, albeit it is to be avoided in literary language. Regarding its etymology, DLR indicates that the word is formed by derivation from *curvă* [=whore] with the suffix *-ar* or that it is a borrowing from old Paleoslavonic *kurivari*. *Preacurvar* has the sense ‘who engages in adultery; who is extremely debauched, dissolute’. Even if we correlate it with the current literary language, the word is a lexical archaic term, the proof being that it is replaced by *adulter* [=adultery] in BIBLIA 2001, it can still be encountered in church language nowadays. It is formed by compounding *prea* and *curvar*, according to the Slavonic model *prealiubodeai*. The word *adulter*, a neologism from French *adultère*, Latin *adulterium*, has, as an adjective, the sense, when it refers to spouses, ‘who has violated the conjugal fidelity’ (DEX). The paraphrase *necredincios în căsătorie* [=unfaithful in marriage] from BIBLIA 1939 illustrates the sense of *adulter*, probably

in order to avoid the utilization of the neologism in the biblical text. The Latin word *adulter* (*Vulgata*) has the sense ‘adultery’, while *moechus* (Beza), corresponding to the Greek *μοιχός*, means ‘adulterous, debauched’.

14. *A zeacea/zeciuală*

The ordinal numeral *a zeacea* [=the tenth] (cf. Latin *decima*) is used with the ellipsis of the determined noun *parte*, in an archaic construction that is nowadays absent even in church language use. We note its replacement in the versions subsequent to BIBLIA 1688 with the noun *zeciuală* [=tithe], which is a word derived with the suffix *-eală* from the verb *a zeciu* [=to levy tithe on] (cf. Greek *ἀποδεκατῶ*), with the sense ‘contribution (in nature or in money) that amounted to the tenth part of the products one had; quitrent’.

15. *A căștiga/a avea/a birui/din toate veniturile mele/a agonisi*

A căștiga [=to earn] has in this the sense ‘to acquire through work, toil, sustained activity’ (cf. Greek *κτῶμαι*) and its complement usually is *averea* [=wealth] or *pâinea cea de toate zilele* [=the daily bread]. The word is inherited from the Latin *castigare* ‘to scold, to punish, to contain, to gather’. It appears in three versions: CORESI 1561, BIBLIA 1688 and BIBLIA 2001, with the latter two being correlated with the Greek source. *A avea* [=to have], a word inherited from the Latin *habere*, has here a specialized sense, namely ‘to possess (money, wealth, estates, etc.)’, being the semantic correspondent to the Latin *possidere*. It appears in NTB 1648 and in BIBLIA 1760, as an influence of the Latin source of the translation. *A birui* [=to conquer] with the sense ‘to own riches, to be wealthy’ is a word borrowed from Hungarian, its etymon being the Hungarian word *birni*. Its presence in BIBLIA 1795 is explained by the fact that it is a regional term (common in the region of Ardeal) that is used in literary language. The paraphrase *din toate veniturile mele* [=from all my income] from BIBLIA 1921 is probably also an influence of the French source. *Venit* [=income] has here the sense ‘totality of financial or material means resulted from the running of a property; material or financial means that come from a certain source’ (DLR). *A agonisi* [=to acquire], used in BIBLIA 1939 with the contextual sense ‘to acquire, to obtain, to earn something hard, by toil,’ is a borrowing from Middle Greek *ἀγωνίζομαι* (aor. *ἀγωνίσσα*) ‘to fight’ (DLR) and is an equivalent of the sense of the Greek word *κτῶμαι*.

16. *A ucide/a (se) bate*

A ucide [=to kill] appears only in CORESI 1561 and has the sense, an obsolete and regional one, of ‘to beat harshly, to hit hard’ (DLR). The word is inherited from the Latin *occidere*. Probably due to the evolution of the language, it is replaced in the other versions by *a bate* [=to beat], from the Latin *battere* (*battuere*) with the sense ‘to heat repeatedly’ (DLR). The Latin *percutio*, *caedo* and the Greek word *τύπτω* have the same sense: ‘to hit’.

17. *A fi milostiv/a ierta/a avea milă*

A ierta [=to forgive] only appears in BIBLIA 1688 and has in this context a specialized sense, namely that of ‘not to punish, to absolve from punishing for the sin, guilt or mistake of someone’, as God is the one who forgives. The word is inherited from the folk Latin word *libertare* ‘to free,’ a word that is derived from *libertus* ‘freed from slavery’ (DLR). (*A fi*) *milostiv*, in contrast to *a ierta*, appears less frequently in contemporary Romanian, although it is still used in church language. We can notice its presence in six of the eight Romanian biblical versions we researched. *Milostiv*, from the Slavonic *milostivŭ*, has the sense ‘full of pity for the troubles or misfortunes of somebody, compassionate, forgiving’. (DLR) specifies that in religious concepts it refers to the divine forces ‘who give man good will and help’ (like in the case of the Latin adjective *propitius* and the Latin verb *placo* and its Greek correspondent *ἰλάσκομαι*). *Milostiv* also appears with the role of a noun, as an epithet given to God. *A avea milă* [=to show mercy] appears only in BIBLIA 1921. *Milă* [=mercy, pity, forgiveness], from the Paleoslavonic word *milŭ*, has, in religious concepts, the sense ‘good will and help that are given by God to man; Godly gift, divine grace’ (DLR).

18. *Dereptat/(mai) îndreptat/socotit neprihănit*

Îndreptat, which has as variants the words *dereptat*, *îndereptat*, *îndireptat* has here the sense ‘just, honest; one who has found the right path’, being the participle of the verb *a îndrepta* [=to straighten] which means ‘to change for the better’ (cf. the Latin adjective *iustificatus* and the Greek verb *δικαίωω*). *A îndrepta* comes from the folk Latin word **derecto*, *-are* (from **derectus* = *directus* ‘just’) and is derived subsequently with the prefix *în-*. The paraphrase *socotit neprihănit* [=deemed immaculate] from BIBLIA 1921 illustrates the idea of lack of a guilt ‘of a moral nature, one that encroaches upon moral and makes a man sinful’. *Îndreptătit* [=justified], which appears in BIBLIA 2001 and has the contextual sense ‘just, justified’, is also a participial adjective from the verb *a îndreptăți*, with the sense ‘to give justification to somebody (for a guilt brought before somebody), to declare someone as innocent’. The verb *a îndreptăți* is derived with the prefix *în-* from *dreptate* [=justice] (DLR).

19. *A descinde/a (se) pogorî, a se coborî*

A descinde [=to descend], borrowed from the Latin word *descendere*, which is present in CORESI 1561 in the old inherited form *deștînse*, has in this context the sense ‘to descend’. The inherited form was replaced due to the evolution of the language (though the neologism *a descinde* is still in use). *A pogorî* is derived from the adverb *pogor*, which comes from the Paleoslavonic word *pogorŭ*, which means ‘downwards’. The form *coborî* [=to descend], which is more recent, appears only in BIBLIA 2001 and is formed by metathesis from the word *a pogorî*. *A coborî* is often in opposition to *a urca* [=to climb] and means ‘to head towards the valley (from the mountain), to go downwards (from a higher place), to climb down, to descend’ (DA). The Latin word *descendo* and the Greek word *καταβαίνω* have the same sense.

20. *A (se) pleca/a (se) smeri*

The verb *a (se) pleca*, inherited from the Latin word *plicare*, is used twice in the text in the first three biblical versions we studied. *A pleca*₁, (cf Greek *ταπεινώω* ‘to humiliate’, Latin *deprimo* ‘to lay down,’ *humilio* ‘to humiliate, to demean’) is a factitive transitive verb used in the passive voice (with *se* as a mark) corresponding to the Greek *ταπεινωθήσεται* and the Latin *deprimetur/ humiliabitur*) and has the contextual sense of ‘to subject, to make somebody have a humble, pious attitude in front of divinity, to subdue oneself’. *A se pleca*₂ is the same verb used in the reflexive voice (corresponding to the Greek *ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν* and the Latin *se deprimi/ se humiliat*) and has the contextual sense of ‘to subdue oneself to the precepts of Christian faith, to the authority of God, to have a humble attitude in front of divinity’. It may be said to be a semantic archaic word, if we correlate it with contemporary Romanian literary language use. Even in church language use, it is replaced by the verb *a se smeri* and in fact we notice that it among the compared editions, it appears only in BIBLIA 1688. The same semantic nuances are also obtained by switching the grammatical voices in the case of the verb *a (se) smeri*. *A smeri*₁ is transitive and has the sense, obsolete nowadays, of ‘to humiliate.’ It is used in the text in the passive voice (*va fi smerit*) [=will be humiliated] and in some versions it has the mark *se (smeri-se-va)* [=will humiliate oneself]. *A se smeri*₂ in the reflexive voice means ‘to subdue oneself to the precepts of Christian faith, to the authority of God, to have a humble attitude in front of divinity; to abase oneself’. In spite of the fact that it is a Slavonic word (from *sŭmĕriti*) it has survived until today both in standard and in church language.

Conclusions

In some cases, we note the presence of lexical coincidences in successive versions of the *Bible*: a word that has not been replaced at all, resisting during several centuries. The stability of a word is usually proof of its framing within the basic vocabulary of the language and an index concerning the genealogy of texts. The lexical substitutions from the biblical versions we researched have different explanations, and it can be quite difficult to distinguish between different types of lexical substitutions.

Some lexical substitutions occur due to the use of different sources: the Slavonic, Greek or Latin sources were regularly used as basic texts, while other texts from these sacred languages and vernacular languages were also used as control texts. In this respect, the identification of the sources of the Romanian biblical versions and their use (only of the Latin and Greek sources) was an initial stage of our approach.

In the contact between the Romanian language, as target-language, and a source-language, usually a sacred language, we notice the differences between the two linguistic systems, including on a lexical-semantic level. At the beginnings of our literary language, Latin and Greek were at a stage of development that was far more advanced than Romanian because their literary tradition was longer. The Romanian

literary language and the Christian religious terminology were just emerging and in the process of being formed and at the same time had to deal with the problem that the vocabulary had no words to designate referents that were unknown in the Romanian space – elements of culture and civilization from another space – this aspect, namely the shortcomings that are characteristic of the Romanian language is often referred to in the prefaces of old religious books. That is why in the early translations there appeared the need for borrowings and loan-translations. This is also an explanation for the principle for the literal rendering, which is predominant in the first translations from the sacred languages into the vernacular languages. But the literal rendering character, beyond its just character, had the disadvantage that it often led to ambiguity or obscurity, making the Romanian text hard to understand for the reader. In the passage from the principle of literal to the literary translation, there appears another type of lexical substitution: instead of the borrowings, of the linguistic loan-translations or of the literal paraphrases there appear cultural adaptations, lexical creations or functional equivalents in later biblical versions.

At a lexical-semantic level, the contact between two languages raises difficulties especially regarding the semantic values. If the denotation is simpler to transpose in the target-language, the connotation, achieved through metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, etc. implies an increased effort on the part of the translator. The semantic evolution of a word from the source-language often differs from the semantic evolution of its correspondent in the target-language.

Other lexical substitutions are owed to the dynamics of the language in diachrony and to the change of literary norm. It is difficult to notice the lexical-semantic dynamics for a period that is so distant from contemporary Romanian language, because the dictionaries do not offer in all the cases real information about the first attestation of a word (admission of a neologism into the language), while the passing of a word from the active stock to the passive stock (as a lexical or semantic archaic word) is all but impossible to date. We have also tried to follow the diatopic distribution of words and the admission of certain regional terms into the literary language. We have also attempted to reconstitute the information on the diastratic and the diaphasic distribution of words in Romanian.

Other substitutions are achieved by partial synonymy and are explained by the options that Romanian offers to translators. The stylistic processing of the revisers is based on the partial synonymy.

Abbreviations and bibliography

Sources:

BIBLIA 1688 = *Biblia adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului și Noului Testament*, tipărită întâia oară la 1688 în timpul lui Șerban Vodă Cantacuzino Domnul Țării Românești, retipărită după 300 de ani în facsimil și transcriere cu aprobarea Sfântului Sinod și cu binecuvântarea Prea Fericitului Părinte Teoctist Patriarhul Bisericii Ortodoxe Române [=The Bible namely the Godly Scripture of the Old and the New Testament, printed for the first time in 1688 during the reign of Șerban Vodă Cantacuzino Ruler of Wallachia, re-printed after 300 years in facsimile and

- transcription with the approval of the Holy Synod and with the blessing of Holy Father Teoctist Patriarch of the Romanian Orthodox Church], București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al BOR, 1988
- BIBLIA 1760 = *Biblia Vulgata*, Blaj, 1760-1761, Cuvânt înainte de Eugen Simion [=Foreword by Eugen Simion], București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005
- BIBLIA 1795 = *Biblia de la Blaj*, 1795, Ediție jubiliară, cu binecuvântarea Î. P. S. Lucian Mureșan mitropolitul Bisericii Române Unite [The Bible From Blaj, 1795, Anniversary Edition, with the blessing of the Holy Lucian Mureșan, Metropolitan Bishop of the United Romanian Church], Roma, 2000
- BIBLIA 1921 = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură*, Traducerea Dumitru Cornilescu, Ediție de studiu Thompson, Oradea, Editura Universității Emanuel, [2002]
- BIBLIA 1939 = *Biblia adică Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului și a Noului Testament*, tradusă după originale ebraice și grecești de preoții profesori Vasile Radu și Gala Galaction din înalta inițiativă a Majestății Sale Regelui Carol II [=The Bible namely the Godly Scripture of the Old and the New Testament, translated from the Hebrew and Greek originals by the priest professors Vasile Radu and Gala Galaction by the lofty initiative of His Majesty King Carol II], București, Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă „Regele Carol II”
- BIBLIA 2001 = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptura*, Ediție Jubiliară a Sfântului Sinod (...), redactată și adnotată de Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania [The Bible or the Holy Scripture, Anniversary Edition of the Holy Synod (...), written and annotated by Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania], București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române
- BIBLIA SACRA 1690 = *Biblia sacra Vulgatae Editionis*, Veneția, 1690
- CORESI 1561 = *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi: Brașov, 1560-1561* comparat cu Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăcești, 1574, ediție alcătuită de Florica Dimitrescu [The Four Gospels Printed By Coresi: Brașov, 1560-1561, Compared to Radu de la Mănăcești's Gospel], București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1963
- NTB 1648 = *Noul Testament*, tipărit pentru prima dată în limba română la 1648 de către Simion Ștefan, mitropolitul Transilvaniei, reeditat după 340 de ani din inițiativa și purtarea de grijă a Prea Sfințitului Emilian, Episcopul Alba Iuliei [=The New Testament, printed for the first time in Romanian in 1648 by Simion Ștefan, Metropolitan Bishop of Transylvania, re-edited after 340 years due to the initiative and care of the Holy Father Emilian, Bishop of Alba Iulia], Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe a Alba Iuliei, 1988
- NTGL 1611 = *Novum Iesu Christi Testamentum Graece et Latine: Theodoro Beza interprete. Cum duplici interpretatione*, Geneva, Apud Samuelem Crispinum, MDCXI

Dictionaries:

- DA = *Dicționarul limbii române*, București, 1913-1949
- DEX = *Dicționar explicativ al limbii române*, Ediția a doua, Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București, 2009
- DLR = *Dicționarul limbii române* (serie nouă), București, 1965 și urm.
- DSL = Angela Bidu Vrânceanu *et alii*, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, București, Editura Nemira, 2005
- GAFFIOT = Félix Gaffiot, *Dictionnaire latin français*, Paris, Hachette, 1934

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

Studies and articles:

- Anania 2009 = Bartolomeu Valeriu Anania, „Biblia lui Șerban, monument de limbă teologică și literară românească” [=Șerban’s Bible, A Monument of Romanian Theological and Literary Language], în *TDR 2009*, p. 25-36
- Andriescu 1988 = Al. Andriescu, „Locul Bibliei de la București în istoria culturii, literaturii și limbii române literare” [=The Place of the Bible From Bucharest in the History of Romanian Culture, Literature and Literary Language], în *MLD*, Pars I. *Genesis*, p. 7-45
- Chindriș 2000 = Ioan Chindriș, „Secolele Bibliei de la Blaj” [=The Centuries of The Bible From Blaj], în *BIBLIA 1795*, p. 1-68
- Chindriș 2005 = Ioan Chindriș, „Testamentul lui Petru Pavel Aron” [=Petru Pavel Aron’s Testament], în *BIBLIA 1760*, p. XI-LXXVIII
- Chițimia 1988 = I. C. Chițimia, „Un monument de valoare literară perenă: *Biblia lui Șerban Cantacuzino (1688)*” (postfață) [=A Monument of Perennial Literary Value: *Șerban Cantacuzino’s Bible (1688)*], în *BIBLIA 1688*: 978
- Chivu 1997 = Gheorghe Chivu, *Civilizație și cultură. Considerații asupra limbajului bisericesc actual* [=Civilization and Culture. Arguments About Contemporary Church Language], București, Editura Academiei Române
- Chivu 2012 = Gheorghe Chivu, „Les écrits religieux, une composante définitoire de la culture roumaine ancienne” [=Religious Writings, A Defining Component of Old Romanian Culture], în *TDR 2012*, p. 19-35
- Coțac 2011 = Emanuel Coțac, „Influența versiunii Segond asupra versiunii Cornilescu 1921” [=The Influence of The Segond Version On the Colrmilescu Version], în *Munteanu 2011*, p. 121-145
- Coteanu – Wald 1970 = I. Coteanu, Lucia Wald (coord.), *Sistemele limbii* [=The Systems of the Language], Republicii Socialiste România
- Dimitrescu 1973 = Florica Dimitrescu, *Contribuții la istoria limbii române vechi* [=Contributions to the History of Old Romanian Language], București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică
- Dimitrescu 1988 = Florica Dimitrescu, „Importanța lingvistică a Noului Testament de la Bălgrad”, în *NTB 1648* [=The Linguistic Importance of the New Testament From Bălgrad, in *Introductory Study* for NTB 1648], p. 77-96
- Dimitrescu 1994 = Florica Dimitrescu, *Dinamica lexicului românesc* [=Dynamics of the Romanian Vocabulary], București, Editura Logos
- Gafton 2005 = Alexandru Gafton, *După Luther. Traducerea vechilor texte biblice* [=After Luther. The Translation of Old Biblical Texts], Iași, Editura Universității «Alexandru Ioan Cuza»
- Lupaș 2004 = Liana Lupaș, „Suma capetelor și sursele Noului Testament de la Bălgrad” [=The Sum of Heads and the Sources of the New Testament from Bălgrad], în *Wald - Georgescu 2004*, p. 246-256
- MLD = *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688*, pars I. *Genesis*, pars II. *Exodus*, pars III. *Leviticus*, pars IV. *Numeri*, pars V. *Deuteronomium*, pars VI. *Iosue. Judicum. Ruth*, pars VII. *Regnum I. Regnum II*, pars IX. *Paralipomeni I. Paralipomeni*

- II*, pars XI. *Liber Psalorum*, editori coordonatori: Al. Andriescu, Vasile Arvinte, Paul Miron, Eugen Munteanu, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 1988-2011
- Munteanu 2008 = Eugen Munteanu, *Lexicologie biblică românească* [=Romanian Biblical Lexicology], București, Humanitas
- Munteanu 2011 = Eugen Munteanu (coord.), *Receptarea Sfintei Scripturi: între filologie, hermeneutică și traductologie* [=The Reception of the Holy Scripture: Between Philology, Hermeneutics and Translation Science], *Lucrările Simpozionului Național „Explorări în tradiția biblică românească și europeană”*, Iași, 28-29 octombrie 2010, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”
- Pavel 2000 = Eugen Pavel, „Un monument de limbă literară: Biblia lui Samuil Micu”, în *BIBLIA 1795* [=‘A Monument of Literary Language: Samuil Micu’s Bible’ in *BIBLIA 1795*], p. 1-22
- Pavel 2001 = Eugen Pavel, *Carte și tipar la Bălgrad (1567-1702)* [=Book and Printing in *Bălgrad*], Cluj-Napoca, Editura Clusium
- Tudose 1970 = Claudia Tudose, „Vocabularul fundamental al limbii române vechi” [=Fundamental Vocabulary of Old Romanian Language], în *COTEANU - WALD 1970*: 119-164
- Wald – Georgescu 2004 = Lucia Wald, Theodor Georgescu (ed.), *In memoriam I. Fischer*, București, Humanitas

Online resources:

- NTG = *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. E. Nestle, K. Aland, B. Aland, ediția nr. 27, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1993, pe site-ul <http://www.academic-bible.com>
- TDR 2009 = *Text și discurs religios*, *Lucrările Conferinței Naționale ”Text și discurs religios”*. Iași, 5-6 decembrie 2008, ediția I, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Ioan Milică, Iași, Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, pe site-ul <http://www.cntdr.ro>
- TDR 2010 = *Text și discurs religios*, *Lucrările Conferinței Naționale ”Text și discurs religios”*. Iași, 13-14 noiembrie 2009, ediția a II-a, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Ioan Milică, Iași, Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, pe site-ul <http://www.cntdr.ro>
- TDR 2011 = *Text și discurs religios*, *Lucrările Conferinței Naționale ”Text și discurs religios”*. Iași, 12-13 noiembrie 2010, ediția a III-a, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Ioan Milică, Iași, Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, pe site-ul <http://www.cntdr.ro>
- TDR 2012 = *Text și discurs religios*, *Lucrările Conferinței Naționale ”Text și discurs religios”*. Iași, 10-12 noiembrie 2011, ediția a IV-a, ed. Alexandru Gafton, Sorin Guia, Ioan Milică, Iași, Editura Universității ”Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, pe site-ul <http://www.cntdr.ro>
- VULGATA = *Biblia Sacra Vulgata*, ed. R. Weber, R. Gryson, editio quinta, Stuttgart, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007, pe site-ul <http://www.academic-bible.com>

Annex 1: Synoptic table

Nr. crt.	Cap., v.	CORESII 1561	NTB 1648	BIBLIA 1688	BIBLIA 1760	BIBLIA 1795	BIBLIA 1921	BIBLIA 1939	BIBLIA 2001
1.	18, 9	<i>zise</i>	<i>zise</i>	<i>zise</i>	<i>au zis</i>	<i>au zis</i>	<i>a spus</i>	<i>a rostit</i>	<i>a spus</i>
	18,14	<i>grăiesc</i>	<i>zic</i>	<i>zic</i>	<i>zic</i>	<i>zic</i>	<i>vă spun</i>	<i>zic</i>	<i>vă spun Eu</i>
2.	18, 9	<i>pilda</i>	<i>pilda</i>	<i>pilda</i>	<i>pilda</i>	<i>pilda</i>	<i>pilda</i>	<i>parabola</i>	<i>parabola</i>
3.	18, 9	<i>se upovăia</i>	<i>să nădăjduia</i>	<i>să nădejduia</i>	<i>nădăjduia</i>	<i>să încredea</i>	<i>se încredeau</i>	<i>aveau despre sine încredințarea</i>	<i>se credeau</i>
4.	18, 9	<i>derepți</i>	<i>derepți</i>	<i>direpți</i>	<i>drepți</i>	<i>drepți</i>	<i>neprihăniți</i>	<i>drepți</i>	<i>drepți</i>
5.	18, 9	<i>ocărâia</i>	<i>îi ținea în nemică</i>	<i>defăima</i>	<i>urjisiia</i>	<i>defăima</i>	<i>disprețuia</i>	<i>priveau de sus</i>	<i>disprețuia</i>
6.	18,10	<i>duseră-se</i>	<i>mearsără</i>	<i>mearsără</i>	<i>au mers</i>	<i>au intrat</i>	<i>s'au suit</i>	<i>s'au dus</i>	<i>s'au suit</i>
7.	18,10	<i>besearecă</i>	<i>besearecă</i>	<i>în besearecă</i>	<i>în besearecă</i>	<i>în besearecă</i>	<i>la Templu</i>	<i>în templu</i>	<i>la templu</i>
8.	18,10	<i>mitar</i>	<i>mitarnic</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>
	18,11	<i>mitarnic</i>	<i>mitarnic</i>	<i>mitarnic</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameș</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameș</i>
	18,13	<i>mitarnicul</i>	<i>mitarnicul</i>	<i>mitarnicul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>	<i>vameșul</i>
9.	18,11	<i>așa</i>	<i>deusebi</i>	<i>deusebi</i>	<i>departe</i>	<i>de departe</i>	-	-	-
10.	18,11	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>
	18,13	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Doamne</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>	<i>Dumnezeule</i>
11.	18,11	<i>laudă ție dau</i>	<i>har Ție dau</i>	<i>mulțămescu-Ți</i>	<i>mulțămescu-Ți</i>	<i>mulțemescu-Ți</i>	<i>Îți mulțămesc</i>	<i>îți mulțamesc</i>	<i>mulțamescu-Ți</i>
12.	18,11	<i>răpitori</i>	<i>jăhuitori</i>	<i>jăhuitori</i>	<i>răpitori</i>	<i>jefuitori</i>	<i>hrăpăreți</i>	<i>hrăpitori</i>	<i>răpitori</i>
13.	18,11	<i>curvari</i>	<i>curvari</i>	<i>preacurvari</i>	<i>preacurvari</i>	<i>preacurvari</i>	<i>preacurvari</i>	<i>necredincioși în căsătorie</i>	<i>adulteri</i>
14.	18,12	<i>a zeacea</i>	<i>a zeacea</i>	<i>a zeacea</i>	<i>zăciuiale</i>	<i>zeciuială</i>	<i>zeciuială</i>	<i>zeciuială</i>	<i>zeciuială</i>
15.	18,12	<i>câștiga</i>	<i>am</i>	<i>cîștig</i>	<i>am</i>	<i>biruiesc</i>	<i>din toate veniturile mele</i>	<i>agonisesc</i>	<i>câștig</i>
16.	18,13	<i>ucidea</i>	<i>bătea</i>	<i>bătea</i>	<i>bătea</i>	<i>bătea</i>	<i>se bătea</i>	<i>bătea</i>	<i>bătea</i>
17.	18,13	<i>milostiv fii mie</i>	<i>fii milostiv mie</i>	<i>iartă mie</i>	<i>milostiv fii mie</i>	<i>fii milostiv mie</i>	<i>ai milă de mine</i>	<i>fii milostiv mie</i>	<i>milostiv fii mie</i>
18.	18,14	<i>dereptat</i>	<i>mai îndereptat</i>	<i>mai îndireptat</i>	<i>îndreptat</i>	<i>mai îndreptat</i>	<i>socotit neprihănit</i>	<i>mai îndreptat</i>	<i>mai îndreptățit</i>
19.	18,14	<i>deștinse</i>	<i>pogori</i>	<i>pogori</i>	<i>s-au pogorât</i>	<i>s-au pogorât</i>	<i>s'a pogorît</i>	<i>s'a pogorît</i>	<i>s'a coborât</i>
20.	18,14	<i>pleacă-se</i>	<i>pleca-să-va</i>	<i>pleca-să-va</i>	<i>smeri-să-va</i>	<i>smeri-se-va</i>	<i>va fi smerit</i>	<i>se va smeri</i>	<i>va fi smerit</i>
	18,14	<i>pleca-te-veri</i>	<i>să pleacă</i>	<i>să pleacă pre sine</i>	<i>să smerește</i>	<i>să smerește</i>	<i>se smerește</i>	<i>se smerește</i>	<i>se smerește pre sine</i>