Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, Philologica, 4, 2 (2012) 357-372

Historical, Social and Cultural Setting for Romanian-Hungarian Contacts in 16th-Century Transylvania

Enikő PÁL

Sapientia Hungarian University of Transylvania
Department of Humanities
pottike@yahoo.com

Abstract. All around the world there are different communities or language groups with specific contacts that influence each other's development. Theoretically we might delimitate homogeneous communities, practically, however, these would be only mental constructs as all groups are essentially heterogeneous. Even amongst communities that speak the same language and share the same culture there will be individual differences. One specific type of contact between two nations is that between a minority and the majority. My research focuses on this particular issue, referring to the contacts between Romanians and Hungarians in a peculiar geographical setting: Transylvania. Not only this space but also other factors (i.e. temporal, economic, etc.) play an important role in these contacts. During many centuries Romanians and Hungarians lived in symbiosis, especially in Transylvania, which led to numerous mutual influences: not only social or cultural ones but on linguistic level as well. My paper regards mainly the Hungarian influence on the Transylvanian Romanian society in that period. Thus, we can outline the influence upon the Romanian social system, their lifestyle or confessional / religious orientation, folk art and, generally, upon the Romanian language vocabulary (see the relation between Reformation and the first texts written in Romanian). All these were provided by geographical, historical and political factors that characterised Transylvania in the 16th century.

Keywords: space in ethnic contacts, Transylvania, Romanian-Hungarian symbiosis, cultural influence

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

Space may be regarded as a means of contacts between different communities and languages, it functions as a channel for influences to exert their pressure on these related groups. In terms of linguistic studies, however, it did not enjoy the same consideration as the other dimension: time. Even in dialectology researches[1] – with a long past – there was an obsession towards historicity, taking space as granted. "Space was treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical, the immobile. Time, on the contrary, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic", Foucault declares (quoted in Britain 2003: 603). Although it may seem paradoxical that one of the social categories that has received the least attention of all is space, this is explainable by the long tradition of comparative-historical studies. A change of paradigm took place alongside linguistic geography. Space could no longer be viewed as an empty dimension in which different social groups develop but as a factor that contributes to the construction of the interaction systems. We might differentiate three types of spaces: the Euclidean objective, geometrical, physical space, the social space and the perceived one, which consists of attitudes towards space itself (Britain 2003: 604). Among these we will insist, in what follows, on the illustration of one social space in particular.

My research focuses on the peculiarities of the historical, social and cultural setting for Romanian-Hungarian contacts in the main contact zone that is Transylvania, trying to highlight the consequences of Hungarian influence upon Romanians. As we will see, the distinctive features of these relations are manifold.

1. Theoretical framework of contacts

All around the world between different communities or language groups there exist specific contacts that influence each other's development. Theoretically we might delimitate homogeneous communities, practically, however, these are pure mental constructs as all groups are essentially heterogeneous.[2] Even amongst communities that speak the same language and share the same culture there will be differences among individuals. Moreover, "No two persons – or rather, perhaps, no one person at different times – spoke exactly alike", as Bloomfield (1997: 79) puts it.

This explains the abundance of literature in contact researches. For a better understanding of the phenomena we should first insist on the concept of (linguistic) *community*, which has been defined in various ways. Initially, this notion was described based on linguistic boundaries, i.e., one language – one community, and

[1] For many decades approaches to space in dialectology limited their interest to the description of individual regions that differ from each other, to the drawing of maps that focuses on the delimitation of dialect boundaries without any concern to the interactions between these.

[2] The thesis regarding the homogeneity of communities – supported, among many others, by Chomsky – was denied by André Martinet (see Preface to Weinreich 1974: vii).

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

afterwards it was extended upon the socio-cultural aspects, as "La langue n'existe qu'en vertu de la société, de mème que les sociétés humaines ne sauraient exister sans langage" ("Language exists only by virtue of a society as human societies do not exist but within a language") (Meillet 1937: 18). For Labov, the (linguistic) community is a group of individuals who share a set of common social norms and attitudes towards language. Corder emphasises the importance of the speakers' awareness in sharing the same language. As for Gumperz, a community means a social group engaged in interaction, contact being necessary for it to exist (Duranti 1997).

Another important issue in describing contacts would be the delimitation of community boundaries. The geographical area is one of these. Lack of natural obstacles (such as mountains, seas, rivers, etc.) will naturally lead to contacts (Weinreich 1974: 90). Other criteria that function as boundaries might be ethnicity, culture (including language), religion, race, age, social status, occupation, rural or urban environment. According to Weinreich (1974: 92), for instance, religion is a more powerful impediment than language itself.

As for contact itself, the main factors that lead to their development are migrations, colonisations, wars, the attraction of specific (cultural) centres or cohabitation in the same geographical medium, according to Dauzat (1922: 136). In fact, contacts are the historical product of social forces – G. Sankoff (2003: 639) claims – that take place in situations of social *inequality*.[3] Thus, a specific type of contact is the one between a minority and the majority within the same region.

Therefore, contacts between communities are essentially the meeting of different cultures, language being part of it.[4] They may take the form of cooperation or conflict in accordance to the causes that stay behind them.

In the configuration of the *nature* and *importance* of Romanian-Hungarian contacts we will take into account the following factors: the temporal frame for these contacts – related to the historical background of the two nations; the cultural tendencies of the time, the commercial relationships between them, and, last but not least, some aspects of their language contacts.

There are many differences that naturally appear between the two nations. Among these there appears the geographical area occupied at the beginning of their contacts. Thus, Hungarians settled down on the plains, whereas Romanians inhabited mostly the mountain zones. Their main occupations are also related to this, shepherd's life being characteristic for Romanians, whereas Hungarians dealt with agriculture. Another distinction is based on religion, which is probably the

[3] In the same way, Ch. Bally considers contacts a "battle", i.e. an incomplete concordance between different convictions, tendencies (see Ch. Bally 1926: 30).

[4] "Languages are basically a part of culture, and words cannot be understood correctly apart from the local cultural phenomena for which they are symbols." (E. Nida, in Dell Hymes 1964: 97)

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

most relevant as it determined their cultural orientation, for Hungarians towards the Western civilisation through their Roman-Catholicism and for Romanians towards the Balkans by their Greek-Slav(onic) orthodoxism.[5] As for their languages, it is a well-known fact that they are, typologically and genetically, different.

Nevertheless, their paths were constantly interpenetrated. During their long-term cohabitation, the Romanian-Hungarian contacts showed many faces: mutual support when common interests,[6] relative tolerance towards or fiery battles against each other. These attitudes changed alongside the changing external conditions.

On the other hand, the particular nature of Romanian-Hungarian contacts derives not solely from the differences above but also from some cultural proximities.[7]

Among these similarities Pascu Ştefan places common people's way of life (Romanian, Hungarian but also Saxons of Transylvania) as well as their social-economic situation, which are reflected by some common features of their folk literature.[8] The concept of *Transylvanism* is also due to various similarities existent in the region, independent of ethnicity. Thus, besides geographical proximity there is also a spiritual proximity, which facilitates the diffusion and exchange of influences.

[5] Hence, their religious orientations explain Romanians being reluctant to Western influences. Hungarians, on the other hand, embraced European spiritual tendencies (such as Humanism, Reformation) almost at the same time as they appeared. (Tamás 1944: 338)

[6] Sometimes – when in similar conditions – Romanians and Hungarians fought together to obtain their rights (e.g. not only Romanian serfs were oppressed by the Hungarian nobility but also Hungarian ones); to reach freedom (e.g. common uprisings against the Austrians); for the idea of union (e.g. battles under the flag of Mihai Viteazul / Michael the Brave); emancipation or purely and simply to survive.

[7] An interesting remark by Béla Gunda (1943: 467) states that Transylvanian shepherds – regardless of their ethnicity – that crossed to Wallachia or Moldavia were called *ungureni* (Hungarians), and "those Romanian shepherds who speak both Romanian and Hungarian equally well, would not declare themselves 'Romanians', but simply 'Greek-Catholics'". However idealistic Béla Gunda's statement may appear, it implies the important role of Hungarians, which is in accordance to reality.

[8] "The Romanian, Hungarian and Transylvanian Saxon folk literatures have many common features and related contents because the lives of these common people as well as their socio-economic situation were also common" (Pascu 1983: 126). Regarding some interferences of themes and motifs in Romanian and Hungarian folklore, Păcurariu (1988: 92-98) even suggests a common archaic fund as the explanation for this osmosis of procedures. More likely, however, these interferences are due to mutual interest towards each other's spiritual life, customs, ballads, as a natural consequence of sharing the same region and of permanent contacts.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

2. Historical context – Temporal limits of Romanian-Hungarian contacts

The main historical controversy regarding Romanian-Hungarian relations is that of *jus primi occupantis* (Păcurariu 1983: 65). Centuries of "symbiosis" in the same region naturally led to both of the nations claiming precedence and authority over the territory they have been living on. Romanian works insist on the continuity of Daco-Romanians in this region and try to avoid any kind of external influence which is viewed as a threat to this thesis. Hungarian specialists, on the other hand, offer a "solution" to this problem by re-defining the concept itself. Thus, the idea of continuity in itself is not denied but it is not regarded as a *territorial continuity* – the "nest" of Romanians is not only one, but several, due to continuous migrations, and they cover large distances. In this *mobile continuity* Transylvanian Romanians would be therefore just one halt (Bóna 1989: 167). As a matter of fact, whoever came first is irrelevant from the point of view of contacts as they are established from the moment the other one enters.

The temporal limits of the first contacts are similarly placed in different epochs. The majority of the specialists, however, agree that the beginnings are marked by the 9th century,[9] when the Hungarians settled on the territory of today's Hungary and, especially, the 10th-11th centuries, when they penetrated Crişana, Banat and Transylvania, the latter one being conquered by 1200 (Ivănescu 2000: 438).

Although the *absolute* limits of the beginning of the influences cannot be determined, two different stages might be distinguished: an older one (i.e., the first encounter of these two nations) and a more recent one (when the two got accustomed to each other).

As a matter of fact, a division into periods has been made on linguistic level by Mîndrescu (1892: 13), who distinguishes the age of Hungarian influence on the whole Daco-Romanian dialect, and that of a regional influence unfinished yet. In the same manner, G. Ivănescu (2000: 439) speaks of an older period (its limits being between the 10th–11th centuries, when Hungarians invaded Transylvania, and the 13th–14th centuries of Hungarian domination respectively), the other period being that of Hungarian lexical influence (from the 14th century to the end of the feudal system).

Probably the most striking consequences of Romanian-Hungarian contacts can be noticed from the 14th century – "the golden age" of Hungarian political power placing itself on the third place among European Late Medieval authorities (see the reign of the Anjou kings – Tamás 1944: 342). This contributed to some Western institutions penetrating into Romanian environment much more easily through Hungarian intermediation. Some aspects of knight and court life, of feudal

[9] "Hungarians penetrated their new homeland in 896, through the Valleys of Tisa, Bistrița and Mureş. They will conquer Transylvania later on, in the eleventh century." (Rosetti 1950: 88)

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

order, the organisation of urban life or some of the trades are examples of these Hungarian models borrowed by Romanians.

Romanian historians often lay stress upon the Hungarian oppression they suffered. It might seem paradoxical that for many decades the Romanian population – although numerically surpassed the rest of Transylvanian nations – had been declared only "tolerated" by the three "privileged" ones: the Hungarian nobility, the Saxon patricians and the chieftain of militarised Szeklers (Păcurariu 1988: 66). We have to point out, however, that the Hungarian kingdom created a dispute not only with Romanians but also with the other neighbouring populations. It is true that the conditions Romanian serfs lived in during Hungarian reign were quite hostile but this is also true for Hungarian ones. Furthermore, this explains the "folk solidarity" of the two from time to time, when they united their forces facing a common danger. Common uprisings, the peasants' war led by Dózsa György in 1514 were such occasions that allowed the relations between them to grow deep.

3. Peculiarities of the geographical space of Transylvania

Interethnic relations take place in *contact zones*, i.e., a social space where different human groups, previously separated by geographical or historical conditions, "come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict." (Duranti 2006: 50) The spatial diffusion of these contacts is not hazardous but following some principles, directions. The eastern (Moldavia) and southern (Wallachia) Romanian territories had been dominated for a long time by Slavonic culture, unlike Transylvania, which had been strongly influenced by Hungarian culture (and language). Thus it is easy to assume that Hungarian elements entered the Romanian circuit first in Transylvania and afterwards they reached beyond the (Carpathian) Mountains (Niculescu 2005: 113). Romanian-Hungarian cultural and linguistic contacts in Transylvania have a few distinctive features among which the *Magyarization* [*Hungarianisation*] of a small part of Romanians attracted by material advantages.

The cultural and civilisation landscape of Transylvania distinguishes itself by its complexity – a multiethnic and multilingual area – and other regional properties. Nonetheless, it was not isolated from the other two principalities to which it had been economically, politically or culturally related. Its importance can be described precisely in terms of these relations.

Geographically, Transylvania's surface is considerable – it covers almost half of the country's territory (Pascu 1983: 9) – with a varied natural landscape combining almost all types of relief: mountains, hills, plains, fertile fields and also rich in minerals (ore). This kind of geographical position – a real natural fortress – was favourable not only for strategic functions or providing the inhabitants' living

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

but also for contacts, especially economic ones through the circulation of merchandise.

As for its history, Transylvania had a turbulent past being continuously invaded by migratory populations such as: Visigoths, Huns, Ostrogoths, Gepids, Avars. The continuity of Daco-Romanians, however, was interrupted not only by the Saxon tribes, which invaded in two waves, first in the 6th, then in the 8th century, and which had a great impact on Romanian language and civilisation. A similar effect was produced by Hungarians who, unlike the former, were not assimilated by Romanians. Nonetheless, all these determined, in one way or another, the ethno-genesis of Romanians, which was finished in its essence by the 7th–8th centuries.

On the other hand, Transylvania's troubled history is also due to several inner conflicts, such as uprisings, at Bobâlna, for instance, or battles fought for unity under Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave), for example, – occasions for Romanians and Hungarians to be on the same side. Conflicts between them will develop for reasons of national and religious oppression, especially during Habsburg occupation – Romanians being only tolerated among Hungarians, Saxons and Szeklers and their religion (orthodoxism) not being among the accepted ones. These conditions created a break off in their relations.

On a linguistic level, Transylvania can be outlined as a multilingual area. There was a time when there were three official languages: Romanian, Hungarian and German. Additionally, the influences of Slav(onic) and Latin were also quite strong due to religious conditions.

As mentioned before, Transylvanian people were not isolated but in permanent contacts with the neighbouring principalities sustained by emigrants and also by the policy of Moldavian and Muntenian (Wallachian) voivodes.[10] Emigrations of Transylvanian Romanians were caused by several factors, among which the oppression of the serfs by Hungarian nobility, their vengeance after the falling of uprisings, persecution of the orthodox "heretics" by the Catholic Church. These injustices, exploitations, the unbearable life of the poor, in general, made a part of them emigrate to one of the two principalities – with large territories and small population –, which promised better life conditions and some liberties.

Thus, Hungarian influence left its mark not only on Transylvania but also on Moldavia. The political boundaries of this principality – established in the Middle Ages as Hungarian vassal – had changed many times. Not only once did Hungarian refugees find their home here. Their presence here in the 14th–15th centuries is attested by documents as well as their influence on the organisation of Moldavian

[10] See some of Alexandru Lăpuşneanu's initiatives who thought to free Transylvania with Turkish help or the fortress of Ciceu being protected by Moldavian voivodes (Meteş 1977: 80).

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

urban structure,[11] on the development of trades and professions. In its Golden Ages, Hungarian colonists were given certain privileges, being involved in court life. What is more, for a short period of time Hungarian was the official language of the court (Pozsony 2002: 31). A special case of Romanian-Hungarian contacts in Moldavia is that of the Csango people. Many hypotheses have been made regarding their origin – some of them do not correspond to reality – but I agree with Ferenc Pozsony in that there is more than one stratum in this ethnic group. Its fundamental layer consists of Hungarians from the Carpathian Basin, they settled down in Moldavia during the medieval Hungarian reign as a result of a planned colonisation policy, i.e., for the defence of the eastern boundaries. To this we will add the Hussite refugees in the 15th century and waves of Szeklers from Transylvania.

4. Socio-cultural setting

A first distinction has to be made between direct vs. indirect contact. Sextil Puşcariu (1929-1930: 520-524) claims that Romanians did not get into direct contact with Hungarians from the beginning, but there was a *Slav(onic) zone* between them as a means of intermediation. This contact through Slav(onic) intermedium is sustained (based on linguistic material) also by Petrovici (1948: 188-189), who claims that Romanian-Hungarian direct contacts exist only from the 12th century, which marks the end of the assimilation process of the Slavs in Transylvania. It is true that Romanian contacts with the Slavs preceded those with Hungarians but I do not consider this to be an obstacle in the way of direct contacts.

4.1. The role of commercial relations

It is undeniable that commercial relations are a means of cultural and language contacts between two social groups and that its consequences are beyond being solely economic. The book by Ştefan Meteş, *Relațiile comerciale ale Țerii - Românești cu Ardealul până în veacul al XVIII-lea* [*Commercial relationships between Wallachia and Transylvania till the 18th century*] is precisely about these commercial relations.

We can assume that the Romanians, a nation of mainly shepherds and farmers, provided the neighbouring territories with cattle and their products, respectively with raw products in exchange of handicraft articles. The commercial roads departed from the big Transylvanian Saxon commercial centres (Sibiu,

[11] See references to cities, markets, villages in Moldova with Hungarian population in Pozsony 2002: 25-31.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

Braşov)[12] or Banat and followed the flow of rivers and valleys, crossing the Carpathians. Alongside these roads there were formed markets and halting places as opportunities for vivid contacts, exchange of goods, experiences, knowledge (e.g., professions). Some political issues however would restrain these commercial relations, when roads are shut down.[13]

4.2. The effects of contacts on the way of life

The Hungarian influence during many centuries of cohabitation determined, directly or indirectly, Romanian culture with respect to the way of life, to its social or confessional organisation. "Hungarian influence did not remain on the surface, but it reached the deepest layer of Romanian spirituality", Béla Gunda (1943: 479) states. Thus, he mentions that Transylvanian Romanians – under Hungarian influence – change their religion, turning to Roman Catholicism or Reformation unlike Hungarians in Moldavia, for instance, who even strongly influenced by Romanians, keep their religion despite the orthodox majority (Gunda 1943: 471).[14] Furthermore, Romanians borrow from Hungarians other elements of social life as well, such as the village structure in the plains, some elements from the domains of nourishment[15] or clothing.[16]

4.3. Religious movements and their influence on contacts

In terms of religious life, "Hungarians contributed – directly or indirectly – to the orientation towards the feudal, Catholic, Latin-Italian-German medieval Europe" of Romanians (Niculescu 2005: 126).[17] Religious movements in Transylvania may be discussed related to the appearance of the first printed texts written in Romanian. As a matter of fact, Mihăilă (1984: 53) considers the introduction of typography in Transylvania – which is simultaneous with the advance of new religions – a moment of "synchronisation" with other European states, as it occurs in less than a century after the Gutenberg invention. At the same time, Transylvania thus becomes one of the first typography centres of Eastern Europe. The most important religious movements to be mentioned here are Catholicism, Hussitism and Protestantism (with

[12] For a detailed list of these roads, halts and markets see Meteş 1920: 12-26.
[13] When the two voivodes of these principalities were in conflict, it would affect the economic life through trade (idem. 47).
[14] See also several Hungarian motifs in Romanian churches but not the other way round.
[15] The orientation of Romanians towards Hungarian cuisine (Gunda 1943: 476).
[16] Some elements of Hungarian embroidery or national costume appear on Romanian clothes, especially on those worn by the nobility (Gunda 1943: 477).
[17] Niculescu refers here to the introduction of Catholicism, some administrational aspects and to the Calvinism which are due to Hungarian medium.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

its two orientations: Lutheranism and Calvinism). In their spread among Romanians, Hungarians played a major role. They might also be related to the origins of writing in Romanian (Gheție 1985: 77-89).

Catholicism was first introduced in Transylvania by Hungarians and sometimes imposed by force by the rulers. It also spread to Wallachia and Moldavia – especially when they were under the influence of the Hungarian crown as it was the official religion of the kingdom. Thus, the contribution of Hungarians in adopting this religion is undeniable. However, it did not support the use of Romanian in writing.

Hussitism, on the other hand, encouraged the national language use for religious purposes (although we do not have any documents left attesting this). This religious and socio-cultural movement from the beginning of the 15th century oriented against papacy and German feudal lords was spread among Romanians by Hungarian immigrants who settled, temporarily or definitively, in Moldavia and Transylvania, being persecuted by the Inquisition.

Under the patronage of Transylvanian Lutheranism the first religious texts appear written in Romanian. Most of them are translations for many of which specialists proposed Hungarian originals. Here there are a few examples of these: *Catehismul luteran* [*Lutheran Catechism*] from Sibiu (1544), based on a Hungarian Lutheran text,[18] or Coresi's *Catehismul* [*The Catechism*] (1560), for which a Hungarian source was suggested by Drăganu, Panaitescu, Rosetti and also by Al. Mareş (Gheție and Mareş 1985: 228).

Probably the most substantial influence exerted by Hungarians on Romanian culture and language is with respect to Calvinism. It was mostly present in Banat-Hunedoara, in the 16th century and among its contributions we may place *Cazania I, Molitvenicul* (c. 1567), *Psaltirea* and *Liturghierul* (1570), *Cartea de cântece* [*Song Book*] and the most important of all: *Palia from Orăştie* (1582), the first Romanian translation of the Bible, having a Hungarian model.

Thus, the preoccupation for the use of Romanian in writing – especially using the Latin alphabet (see *Cartea de cântece*) and for the "nationalization"[19] of the church, in general, is mainly due to Reformation. The role of Hungarians in this process was that of an intermedium in the popularisation of the doctrines, offering at the same time a model to follow. They also financially supported the printing of Romanian religious books.

[18] N. Sulică motivates his choice by the fact that "There was no one among the Romanians of the time who would have spoken German sufficiently to translate directly from Luther" (in Gheție and Mareş 1985: 222). This argument, however, seems questionable. At any rate, the problem remains unsolved as long as we do not have the possibility of verifying this theory since no copies of the text survived.

[19] "Nationalization", a term by Gheție (1974: 26), here stays for the imposing of Romanian in liturgy and in writing.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

As far as sixteenth-century Transylvania is concerned, Lutheranism, Calvinism and Unitarianism existed alongside; Catholicism did not disappear either and there were orthodox communities as well.

5. Romanian-Hungarian language contacts

When two languages get in contact they naturally influence each other. Interference and bilingualism are some of the results. In the domain of phonetics, some phonetic changes can be signalled – such as palatalisation of dentals – that might be regarded as a consequence of Hungarian influence. The domain *par excellence* of linguistic interferences is, of course, vocabulary. There are many Hungarian borrowings in Romanian but their influence is not only on the lexical level as they became part of the Romanian linguistic system itself. Regarding these lexical items and their importance we should highlight a few aspects as follows. As known, there is a connection between space and language use. In terms of Hungarian borrowings, we shall differentiate between words that have a spatial distribution on the whole Daco-Romanian dialect and those limited to some particular regions.[20] Furthermore, the closer to the direct contact zone, the more "foreign" words enter the vocabulary, but also the more easily they perish. As we move away to other regions, on the other hand, we find fewer borrowings but these once introduced would be much more resistant as they had gone through a long process of adaptation. Thus, Hungarian borrowings were used as a means of Romanian texts' dating and localisation, although these items might not belong to the region were the texts were written or found later on, but to the region where the writer himself comes from. Either way, dialectal differences of Romanian language based on words of Hungarian origin can be distinguished and, as a matter of fact, this was already pointed out in the 17th century by chroniclers.[21] Furthermore, interesting results may be obtained from toponyms that might stand not only for territorial boundaries but also for temporal delimitation of contacts. However, some of these toponyms are controversial. There are specialists who claim that the names of places or rivers such as Bistrița (Beszterce), Cluj (Kolozsvár), Bălgrad, today Alba Iulia (Fehérvár) were borrowed by Hungarians from the Slavs and by Romanians from the former. This cannot be sustained – as Ivănescu (2000: 438)

[20] For a long time specialists insisted upon the unity of Daco-Romanian dialects claiming that the differences would be insignificant. However, this cannot be sustained because regional distinctive features – especially phonetic ones – are considerable. The truer it is for the 16th century. For the territorial distribution of Hungarian borrowings see Gheție and Mareș 1974.

[21] Such as Simion Ștefan or Ioan Zoba from Vinț. The latter one gives some examples of Hungarian borrowings used regionally accompanied by their synonyms (also in Romanian). Here are a few examples where the first words are of Hungarian origin: "*oca – pricina au adeverința*" [reason]; "*alean - împotrivă*" [against]; "*hasna - folosul*" [use] (Dimitrescu 1973: 49).

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

demonstrates – because, in that case the phonetic adaptation would have resulted in the forms of *Coloşoara, *Feieroara by analogy with Timişoara (Temesvár), Sighişoara (Segesvár), which indeed were established and named by Hungarians. Hence, the explanation for these toponyms is that Hungarians translated into their language the names above, which had already existed in Romanian and Slavonic (Ivănescu 2000: 438). Nevertheless, there are other toponyms for which the Hungarian origin is certain. Between the 11th and 13th centuries Hungarians were the founders of some cities in Banat, Crişana and Transylvania and transmitted their names to the Romanians, such as: Timişoara, Hunedoara, Arad, Oradea, Sătmar, Sighet, Zalău, Sebeş, Odorhei, Sighişoara. Then in the 13th and 14th centuries, penetrating beyond the Carpathian Mountains, they established cities and towns in Oltenia, Wallachia and Moldavia such as: Bacău, Adjud, Suceava – deriving from the name of a Hungarian trade (*szűcs*, i.e., furrier, fur merchant) as many chroniclers stated, – named rivers: Ozana, and mountains: Căliman, Harghita, Hăşmaşii, Ceahlău, Tarcău, Rarău (Ivănescu 2000: 441).[22] In the same period the name of the region Maramureş was also created by the Hungarian reign.

Last but not least, we will mention a few common names as well. These may be grouped in different semantic classes as well as in terms of their connection with the Hungarian economic, social or cultural influences.[23] It is remarkable that many of them deeply penetrated into contemporary Romanian language and its spirituality. It is interesting, for instance, that in contemporary Romanian there is no verb of Latin origin that expresses the notion of "thinking",[24] not even Slavonic ones. Almost all the verbs that mean *to think* are of Hungarian origin: *a (se) gândi*, *a (se) chibzui*. Other examples for Hungarian borrowings which took roots deeply in Romanian[25] and without which everyday communication or even praying[26] would not be the same are: related to the body: *talpă* (<*talp* – sole of the foot), *labă* (<*láb* – paw), *chip* (<*kép* – face, image), some verbs: *a alcătui* (<*alkotni* – to create), *a cheltui* (<*költeni* – to spend money), *a îngădui* (<*engedni* – to allow), *a locui* (<*lakni* – to reside), or other aspects of life: *fel* (<*féle* – manner, way, kind of), *oraş* (<*város* – city), *marfă* (<*marha* – goods), etc. Then again others of this kind could not be eliminated either by their neological "rivals" during the centuries as a sign of their being part of the Romanian mentality – in part because these

[22] For a detailed presentation of Romanian toponyms see Drăganu 1933.
[23] See Niculescu's (2005: 117-124) and Tamás 's (1944: 343-376) classifications.
[24] The verb *a cugeta* (to reflect, to meditate) has a kind of specific value, not a general one.
[25] One indicator for this may be the fact that the word enters Romanian phrases (collocations): *a da în vileag* (to make known), or for the words *seamă, fel*, for instance, there are numerous phrases.
[26] See some versions of the Lord's Prayer (*Tatăl Nostru*) in the Gospel of Matthew: „Şi nu ne duce pe noi în ispită / ci ne mântuieşte de cel rău" – "And lead us not into temptation, / but deliver us from evil". *A mântui* (< Hung. menteni) means *to save, to redeem.* In the literary version there is the form *izbăveşte.*

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

borrowings carry the biblical origin as they were known from religious texts: *a îngădui* (Fr. permite) – to allow, *a făgădui* (Fr. promite) – to promise, *pildă* (Fr. exemplu) – example.

As for bilingualism, I have already mentioned the case of the Csangos but here could be included also groups of immigrants or tradesmen. In the 16th century we might also suppose Romanian-Hungarian bilingualism propagated by the circulation of books (see translations above).

6. Conclusions

On the whole, Romanian-Hungarian contacts during centuries of "symbiosis" are characterised by dualism: sometimes being arms brothers (a kind of "folk solidarity"), other times cooperating by commercial means or being enemies: "Hungarians covetously and antagonistically stood against Romanians", Iorga says (in Meteş 1977: 335). The hostility towards each other becomes more severe especially after 1600 and it will also have ideological consequences.

The historical, social and cultural setting served as support for the configuration of Hungarian influence on Romanians. We might ask then: what is special about it? How does it distinguish from Romanians' contacts with other nations?

Well, first of all, it stands out through its *complexity, length* and *importance* as it has been a long-term contact. This explains researchers' constant preoccupation with this issue and has led to many controversies in different (historical, linguistic) domains.

For a long time, Hungarian influence was regarded as a "national danger" and it was reduced or its importance was denied. Situated beside Slav(onic) influence (also a "foreign" one, as a matter of fact), a compromise was proposed: that of Hungarian influence through *mediation*. Although there are some common aspects,[27] the Hungarian influence is distinct from the Slav(onic) one based on some temporal, geographical and especially circumstantial aspects.

The first one embraced the Transylvanian regions, whereas the latter one exerted more intensely in Moldavia and Wallachia (Gafton 2007: 112). The Slavs' initial (temporal) advantage was counterparted by their gradual assimilation by Romanian communities. On the linguistic level, the Slav(onic) influence was exerted right after the formation of Romanian (or coinciding with its end), whereas the Hungarian one is subsequent.

Hungarian influence was exerted on horizontal level (in the epoch) and on the vertical one too (in evolution). It begins as a regional influence (starting from Transylvania) and it penetrates into the whole Daco-Romanian dialect. Hungarians

[27] See the comparative studies of Pătruț (1958: 63-74); Gafton (2007: 107-130).

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

induced, directly or indirectly, many social and cultural transformations in the Romanian society. Adopting another way of life – renouncing the moving of flocks (especially sheep) in exchange for rearing – is due to Hungarian influence, as Tamás (1944: 366) says; then Hungarians settled in Transylvania influenced the development of the feudal system in the intra-Carpathian basin – according to Horedt (1958: 109) – as the institution of principality was first a Hungarian form of organisation. With respect to the cultural life, the role of Hungarians can be pointed out in promoting Reformation among Romanians, which also contributed to the appearance of the first texts written in Romanian.

References

Britain, David. 2003. Space and spatial diffusion. In Chambers, J. K., Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change,* 603-637. Blackwell Publishing.

Chambers, Jack Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.). 2003. *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change.* Blackwell Publishing - Blackwell Reference Online. 31 December 2007. <http://www.blackwellreference.com/subscriber/book?id=g9781405116923_9781405116923>

Bally, Charles. 1926. *Le langage et la vie*. Paris: Payot.

Bóna István (ed.). 1989. *Erdély rövid története* [*A Short History of Transylvania*]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Dauzat, Albert. 1922. *La géographie linguistique*. Paris.

Dimitrescu, Florica. 1973. *Contribuţii la istoria limbii române vechi* [*Contributions to the history of Old Romanian language*]. Bucureşti: Editura didactică şi pedagogică.

Drăganu, Nicolae. 1933. *Românii în veacurile IX-XIV pe baza toponimiei şi a onomasticei* [*Romanians in the 9-14th Centuries Based on their Toponymy and Onomastics*]. Bucureşti: Imprimeria Naţională.

Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic Anthropology.* Cambridge University Press.

Duranti, Alessandro. 2006. *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Gafton, Alexandru. 2007. Relaţia dintre elementul maghiar şi cel slav în limba română [The Relationship between Hungarian and Slav(onic) Elements in Romanian]. In *Români majoritari / Români minoritari, interferenţe şi coabitări lingvistice, literare şi etnolingvistice*. [*Romanian Majority / Romanian Minority, Linguistic, Literary and Ethnolinguistic Interferences and Cohabitation*]. 107-130. Iaşi: Editura Alfa.

Gheţie, Ion, Alexandru Mareş. 1974. *Graiurile dacoromâne în secolul al XVI-lea* [*Daco-Romanian Dialects in the 16th Century*]. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.

Gheţie, Ion and Alexandru Mareş. 1985. *Originile scrisului în limba română* [*The Origins of Writing in Romanian*]. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

Gheţie, Ion. 1974. *Începuturile scrisului în limba română. Contribuţii filologice şi lingvistice* [*The Beginnings of Writing in Romanian. Philological and linguistic contributions*]. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Gunda, Béla. 1943. *Magyar hatás az erdélyi román népi műveltségre* [*Hungarian Influence on Transylvanian Romanian Folk Culture*]. Kolozsvár: A Magyar Tudományegyetem Néprajzi Intézete.

Horedt, Kurt. 1958. *Contribuţii la istoria Transilvaniei în secolele IV-XIII* [*Contributions to the History of Transylvania in the 4-13th centuries*]. Bucureşti.

Hymes, Dell. 1964. *Language in Culture and Society. A Reader in Linguistics and Anthropology*. New York & London: Harper & Row.

Ivănescu, Gheorghe. 2000. *Istoria limbii române* [*The History of Romanian*]. Iaşi: Editura Junimea.

Meillet, Antoine. 1937. *Introduction a l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*. Paris.

Meteş, Ştefan. 1920. *Relaţiile comerciale ale Ţerii- Româneşti cu Ardealul până în veacul al XVIII-lea* [*Commercial Relations between Valacchia and Transylvania until the 18th Century*]. Sighişoara.

Meteş, Ştefan. 1977. *Emigrări româneşti din Transilvania în secolele XIII-XX (Cercetări de demografie istorică)* [*Emigrations of Transylvanian Romanians in the 13-20th Centuries (Historical Demographic Researches)*]. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Mihăilă, Gheorghe. 1984. Manifestele culturale ale primelor decenii de tipar românesc: de la Coresi la "Palia de la Orăştie" [Cultural manifests of the first decades of Romanian tipography: from Coresi to "Palia from Orăştie"] In *Palia de la Orăştie 1582-1982. Studii şi cercetări de istorie a limbii şi literaturii române* [*Palia from Orăştie 1582-1982. Historical Researches of Romanian Language and Literature*]. 32-67. Bucureşti: Editura Eminescu.

Mîndrescu, Simeon C. 1892. *Elemente ungureşti în limba română* [*Hungarian Elements in Romanian*]. Bucureşti: Tipografia Curţii Regale.

Niculescu, Alexandru. 2005. Romania hungarica – contacte lingvistice şi culturale româno-maghiare [*Romania Hungarica – Romanian-Hungarian Linguistic and Cultural Contacts*]. *Studia Universitatis Petru Maior, Series Philologia* 4: 112-137.

Pascu, Ştefan. 1983. *Ce este Transilvania? Civilizaţia transilvană în cadrul civilizaţiei româneşti* [*What Is Transylvania? Transylvanian Civilisation in the Context of Romanian Civilisation*]. Cluj- Napoca: Editura Dacia.

Păcurariu, Francisc. 1988. *Românii şi maghiarii de-a lungul veacurilor, Paralelisme, interferenţe, convergenţe şi contradicţii în cursul istoriei* [*Romanians and Hungarians during Centuries. Paralelisms, Interferences, Convergences and Contradictions of History*]. Bucureşti: Editura Minerva.

Pătruţ, Ioan. 1958. Contribuţii slave şi maghiare la formarea subdialectelor dacoromâne [Slav(onic) and Hungarian Contributions to the Formation of Daco-Romanian Subdialects]. *CL.* III: 63-74.

Petrovici, Emil. 1948. Note slavo-române III. Sufixul –ui al verbelor de origine maghiară [Slavonic – Romanian Notes III. The –ui Suffix of Romanian Verbs of Hungarian Origin]. *Dacoromania* XI: 188-190.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)

Pozsony Ferenc. 2002. *Ceangăii din Moldova* [*Csangos in Moldova*]. Cluj: Asociația Etnografică Kriza János.

Puşcariu, Sextil. 1929-1930. Dacoromania. 520-524. In Petrovici, E. 1948. *Note slavo-române III. Sufixul –ui al verbelor de origine maghiară* [*Slavonic – Romanian Notes III. The –ui suffix of Romanian Verbs of Hungarian Origin*]. *Dacoromania* XI: 188-190.

Rosetti, Alexandru. 1950. Slavo-romanica. Împrumuturi maghiare prin intermediu slav [Slavo-Romanica. Hungarian Borrowings through Slav(onic) Mediation]. *SCL* I: 88-90.

Sankoff, Gillian. 2003. Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact. In Chambers, Jack, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, 638-668. Blackwell Publishing.

Tamás Lajos. 1944. A rumén nyelv magyar kölcsönszavainak művelődéstörténeti jelentősége [The Cultural Historical Significance of Hungarian Borrowings in Romanian]. In *Magyar kölcsönszavak a ruménban* [*Hungarian Borrowings in Romanian*], 337-378. Évkönyv az 1944-es évre.

Weinreich, Uriel. 1974. *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*. Preface by André Martinet. Haga- Paris: Mouton.

BDD-A7535 © 2012 Scientia Kiadó
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 08:52:18 UTC)