

Culture language and foreign names adaptation during the pre-modern Romanian

Ana-Maria Gînsac, Mădălina Ungureanu   *

*Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University,
Str. Lascăr Catargi 54, 700107 Iași, Romania*

Article info

History:

Received October 27, 2020

Accepted November 5, 2020

Published December 27, 2020

Key words:

language contact

onomastics

toponymy

translation

Abstract

Translation is an act of “negotiation” between two or more cultural systems and languages, being mediated by a translator and carrying both the traces of the mediator and those of the translation context. We aim at investigating the impact of culture languages on foreign names translation into Romanian at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next. We consider several types of situations. Sometimes, the culture language is also the expression of the reference universe of names, even if they occur in texts whose sources were written in other languages than the respective culture language; in this case, the language of the source text plays the role of an intermediary. In some other instances, the culture language plays the role of a model that determines the name form in the target language, without being directly involved in the act of translation. Translators from the pre-modern stage of Romanian have often substituted the forms from different vernacular languages such as German, French or Italian by a variant received under the influence of a specific culture language, i.e. Greek or Latin.

1. Preliminaries

Outlining the current practice of geographical names translation, Neumark (1988, p. 216) recommends checking them in the latest atlas. As for Romanian, the recommendation provided by DOOM² (p. LII–LIII) is to reproduce precisely their graphic form and phonetic pronunciation in their original languages. However, applying this norm usually causes misinterpretation at the level of recognition and pronunciation. The challenges are even more significant when we refer to the translation of names before the modern stage of a language. In this regard, the pre-modern Romanian characterizes by the lack of translation standards, to which is added the asymmetry of the linguistic systems (at graphic, phonetic, morphological and syntactic level) that come into contact. Along with the socio-cultural circumstances in the Romanian Principalities at the end of the eighteenth century, these determinants provided the translators with a significant number of translation possibilities. They used these various possibilities rather unsystematically, resulting in various denominations and forms of the same name, both from one translator to the other and within the same text.

Translation is an act of mediation between two or more languages, as well as between the two cultural systems, a process of mediation that the translator performs based on an act of interpretation (Venuti, 1995, p. 17: „Translation is a process by which the chain of signifiers that constitutes the source-language text is replaced by a chain of signifiers in the target language which the translator provides on the strength of an interpretation”). Therefore, the text bears the mark of the mediator. Whereas nowadays one can speak of the translator’s invisibility, as the translated text seems to be more an original one rather than a translation (Venuti, 1995, p. 1–2), in the past, the translator’s imprint over choosing a particular form or strategy in translation was more evident.

*Email addresses: anamaria.gansac@gmail.com (AMG), madandronic@gmail.com (MU).

Sandnes (2016, p. 541–550) claims that three factors determine the changes of names when two languages come into contact, therefore also in the process of translation: a) the socio-cultural characteristics, b) the languages that come into contact, c) the speakers (in the case of translations, the translators-mediators). In other words, translations carry not only the imprint of the languages that come into contact but also that of the environment of the intermediation process (Zauberga, 2006, p. 150). As far as the languages that come into contact are concerned, the degree of linguistic prescriptivism of the target language and the ideological substratum underlying it have a significant role. For instance, speaking about the contemporary Lithuanian, Zauberga (2006, p. 144) describes it as being conservative and characterized by purism, whereas official linguistics is reluctant when it comes to linguistic change and any other influence, assuming that the languages with a higher number of speakers and greater prestige, such as English and Russian, endanger Lithuanian. This attitude determines choices in adopting name translation strategies, with a bias on transcription rather than on transfer. Another factor is the relations between these languages. The prestige of a language—and a culture—determines translation strategies which are closer to literalism, in the sense of a higher conformism at both the meaning and the writing level, resulting in the “foreignization” of the target text: “When a culture is accorded prestige, there tend to be many literalist translations from it” (Pym, 2006, p. 10). Applying this principle to names translation would imply that the prestige of a language at some point determines translation strategies that result in a strong mark of that language over the name form in the target language.

2. Factors influencing the foreign names adaptation into pre-modern Romanian

At the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next, under the influence of the Western Enlightenment, an extensive process of secularization of the written culture and modernization of the language began in the Romanian Principalities, mainly through translations from various Western languages. This “transition” between old and modern literary Romanian (Gheție, 1982, p. 65) was called the “pre-modern era” (Piru, 1970, p. 5). This modernization was due to the multiculturalism within the Romanian Principalities at the time, a result of the contact with the neighbouring empires, the Habsburg Empire, the Russian Empire and especially the Ottoman Empire (Corbea-Hoișie & Dima, 2014, p. 8–11; see also Ursu & Ursu, 2004, p. 10–14). In this period, the multiculturalism impacts translation on several levels: a) the level of the translator’s formation; b) the level of the languages coming into contact in translation and consequently the level of the linguistic and cultural systems between which meaning and form „are negotiated” (in the specific case of names); c) the level of the dominant influences in the translator’s everyday life. Most translations produced at that time target original texts written in Western languages which were accessed through a third language, usually through Greek (see the typology proposed by Dima & Dima, 2016, p. 12–13). Therefore, while translation involves a negotiation between two cultures and their languages, things are far more complicated in the case of pre-modern Romanian translation, since they are often “second-hand translations”, “translations of translations” (Aixela, 1996, p. 52). Hence, in the translations we are analysing, the equation does not involve only two languages—the language of the source text and that of the target text—it involves also the languages known, spoken by the translator or the culture languages used on his territory of origin. Faced with a graphic sequence that is new to him (especially since most names are also exonyms in their source language), the translator does not follow the orthographic conventions of the translated text language but relates them to a third language (cf. „assimilazione indiretta”, Schweickard, 1992, p. 127). This third language is often the dominant culture language in the translator’s region of origin.

In our understanding, the *culture language* is that language that carries cultural content, and not *written language* or *literary language*:

“O chestiune ce trebuie avută în vedere atunci când ne ocupăm de modernizarea limbii române literare este aceea a înrîuririi exercitate în cursul timpului de unele limbi de cultură, dominante

într-o epocă sau alta” [One of the issues that should be considered when speaking about the modernization of literary Romanian is the influence that certain culture languages, dominant at one point in history, had upon it] (ILRLEV, p. 41);

“alfabetul chirilic românesc este, cu foarte puține deosebiri, alfabetul limbii slavone care a funcționat ca limbă de cultură (a bisericii, a cancelariei domnești etc.) în arealul ortodox dominat de limbile slave sudice sau răsăritene, într-un mod perfect asemănător și simetric cu rolul jucat de limba latină și de alfabetul latin în țările catolice din apusul, centrul și nordul Europei” [The Romanian Cyrillic alphabet is, with very few exceptions, the alphabet of the Slavonic language that functioned as culture language (of the church and the princely chancery) in the Orthodox territory dominated by the Southern or Eastern Slavonic languages in the very same manner in which Latin and the Latin alphabet were dominant in the Catholic countries in the Western, Central and Northern parts of Europe] (Boerescu, 2014, p. 104).

During the transition between the old and modern Romanian, Greek functioned as the culture language in Moldavia and Wallachia. Gáldi (1939, p. 127–128) speaks about the Romanian-Greek (i.e. Neo-Greek) “bilingualism” that was specific to the cultivated people. Moreover, Arvinte (2006, p. 97) remarked that bilingualism was specific only to the dominant class “to which most of the scholars of the time also belonged”, mostly since the Greeks “played a significant part in the religious and cultural life of the Romanian Principalities” (Arvinte, 2006, p. 102). Latin and German, which were languages of administration in the Habsburg Empire, coexisted in Transylvania, and the educated people spoke them. Nevertheless, Ivănescu (2000, p. 631) remarks that in the pre-modern period, up to 1830, literary Romanian was influenced more by Greek, Russian and German than by Latin and the Neo-Latin languages: “ea avea un caracter vădit oriental sau germano-oriental, și anume: grecesc, rusesc și turcesc în Principate, german și latino-maghiar peste munți” [it had an obvious Eastern or Eastern-Germanic character, namely: Greek, Russian and Turkish in the Principalities, German and Latin-Hungarian across the mountains]. Therefore, some neologisms of Romance origin mediated by these languages “au căpătat nu numai un aspect fonetic grec, rusesc sau germano-maghiar, dar și sufixe care nu se găseau în limba de origine și n-ar fi avut rost să apară în românește” [acquired not only a Greek, Russian or German-Hungarian phonetic shape, but also suffixes that missed in the source language and should not have appeared in Romanian] (Ivănescu, 2000, p. 638).

As far as the names from RENAME¹ are concerned, the culture languages (Latin, German, and especially Greek) acted as an intermediary between the source text language and Romanian, imposing pronunciations, providing solutions for the interpretation of some spellings or even forms that some names had at the time. The corpus contains texts² translated from Greek, German, French, Italian and Russian. In some instances, translators used intermediate translations. *Cat. rom.* is such a translation: originally written in Italian, the work—a synthesis of English and German authors through French versions (Camară, 2017, p. 28)—was initially translated into Greek, and from Greek into Romanian. Following the translation strategies described in Gînsac *et al.* (2017), we consider two types of situations: those in which Greek is also the language of the original translation, to trace its impact on names adaptation into Romanian, and those in which culture languages mediate the linguistic negotiation, without being involved as part (source language – target language) in translation.

¹The corpus contains foreign names and their forms within twelve texts translated into Romanian from various modern languages between 1780 and 1830, as well as their correspondents in the source texts.

²For the description of the texts and their sources, see Camară (2017, p. 15–60).

3. Marks of the culture languages' influence upon foreign names adaptation into pre-modern Romanian

3.1. Translators of *Cat. rom.* and *Dom. rom.*³, texts with Greek sources, used transcription as a strategy of adapting opaque names. The Reuchlinian pronunciation of Greek used at that time was preferred to the classic one, for example: **αβ** or **αυ** /av/ for **αυ**, **εβ** / **εφ** /εv/, /ef/ for **ευ**, **ι** /i/ for **ει**, **ι** /i/ for **η**, **ηδ** /nd/ for **ντ** (1). This principle of spelling was applied to all kind of names, being them Greek-culture related, having a tradition in Romania or first-time encountered names:

- (1) Αὔγουστον (*Cat. gr.* 181) – **Αβγδσπτ** (*Cat. rom.* 57^v), but also **Αυτδστ** (*Cat. rom.* 73^v)
 ὁ Αὔγουστος (*Dom. gr.* III, 162) – **Αβγδστ** (*Dom. rom.* IV, 30)
 τῆς Εὐρώπης (*Dom. gr.* I, 3) – ale **Εβρώπει** (*Dom. rom.* I, 5)
 τοῦ Εὐχερίου⁴ (*Dom. gr.* I, 177) – **Εφχέριε** (*Dom. rom.* III, 5)
 Σιβηρίαν (*Cat. gr.* 151) – **Сивиріа** (*Cat. rom.* 50^v)
 Ἐλεῖμ (*Dom. gr.* I, 8) – **Ελίμ** (*Dom. rom.* I, 12)
 Κωνσταντῖνος (*Cat. gr.* 12) – **Кωσπλῆδιντ** (*Cat. rom.* 6^v).

The place names denominating Western realities were often adapted through a third language, and this caused a different Romanian form as compared to the one in the source language, particularly when several intermediaries were involved (2). A few examples:

- (2) ΗΑΓΑ (top.): Ἁἴαν (*Cat. gr.* 185) – **αἴα** (*Cat. rom.* 58^v), cf. *Haja* (*Cat. it.* 131), cf. also *Haag* (*Rum. rom.* 88) – *Haag* (*Rum. germ.* 95);
 ΑΝΙΟΥ (top.): τῆς Ἀγοῦ (*Dom. gr.* III, 136) – **Αινδλδι** (*Dom. rom.* IV, 8)
 (JAMES) ΒΟΤΗWELL (anthrop.): ὁ Κόμης Βοθβήλ (*Dom. gr.* III, 159) – Cont **Βοτβίλ** (*Dom. rom.* IV, 28).

Some translators opt for transliteration as translation strategy, but this leads to forms that do not embody the pronunciation they have in the source language (3a); this practice is combined in some texts (3b) with the transcription of the Greek pronunciation (γγ – **ηη** /ng/), resulting in hybrid forms (γγ – **ηη** /ng/):

- (3a) ANKERSTEIN (anthrop.):
 Ἀγκερστῆιν (*Cat. gr.* 229) – **Αγκερσπεν** (*Cat. rom.* 78^v), cf. *Ancherstein* (*Cat. it.* 158);
 (3b) ARHANGHELSK (top.):
 τὸν Ἀρχάγγελον (*Cat. gr.* 141) – **Αρχανγγελ** (*Cat. rom.* 47^r), but
 τὸν Ἀρχάγγελον (*Cat. gr.* 181) – **Αρχανγγελ** (*Cat. rom.* 57^v).

3.2. The model of Greek pronunciation will extend in texts translated following a Latin-script source. The treatment of **b** is interesting in this respect. As a rule, its transcription follows the Neo-Greek pronunciation (**β** /v/), even in the names that were exonyms in relation to the Greek language. *Dom. rom.*, translated from Greek, contains many such examples (4a). However, in *Cat. rom.* there are few exceptions, namely names of people of German origin, especially the ones ending in *-burg* and *-berg* (4b):

- (4a) Ἀλβίων (*Dom. gr.* III, 131) – **Αλβίων** (*Dom. rom.* IV, 3)
 Βονιφάτιος (*Dom. gr.* II, 185) – **Βονιφάτιε** (*Dom. rom.* III, 16)
 τὴν Βαλτικὴν Θάλασσαν (*Cat. gr.* 276) – marea **Βαλδίη** (*Cat. rom.* 101^r)
 Σοβίεσκης (*Cat. gr.* 58) – **Совієскій** (*Cat. rom.* 24^v)
 Στέφανος ὁ Βαττῶρης (*Cat. gr.* 16) – **Стефанῆ Βαῆποριε** (*Cat. rom.* 8^r);

³Both are translated by clergymen who, due to the nature of their studies, had a substantial knowledge of Greek.

⁴*Eucherius* (anthrop.), son of the Roman general Stilicon Flavius.

- (4b) Σταρεμβέργας (*Cat. gr.* 143) – Стáρε^вβε^ргъ (*Cat. rom.* 47^v), cf. *Staremburg* (*Cat. it.* 105)
 Σκουλεμβούργου (*Cat. gr.* 237) – Скδλε^мв^ргъ (*Cat. rom.* 82^v).

Moreover, as far as the treatment of *b* is concerned, among the texts translated following a Latin-script source only *Rum. rom.* faithfully follows its source. This translation was printed in Buda, outside the Greek language influence. The other texts contain exceptions. In *Flo. rom.*, some toponyms' traditional pronunciation was with *v* long before this stage: Θύβι for *tebani* (II, 47), Ἰράβια for *Arabia* (II, 100), Ἰβίρια for *Iberia* (II, 102); however, there is no occurrence, for example, of **Tivru* (for *Tibru*). In *Buf. rom.*, a text strongly influenced by its Italian source, *b* is transliterated as *в* (for example, *Тевé*, p. 16), with few exceptions, for example *Визάντιе*, a place name belonging to the Greek culture⁵, and *Вретáниe*, both received through the Greek language. *Визάντιе* occurs both in a translated fragment (*Buf. rom.* 14) and in a short explanatory fragment with no correspondent in the Italian text: “Ἐπιγραφή, care mai dintîi să chiama *Vizántie*” [Constantinople, which was at first called *Vizántie*] (*Buf. rom.*, p. 14), which represents the translator's append to the text (he renders it orthographically through its familiar pronunciation). The translator of *Cam. rom.* frequently transliterates *b* as *в*; only in the case of the first name of the Spanish explorer Bartolomeu Dias, he replaces the new pronunciation, specific to the German language, with the biblical Greek-Slavonic pronunciation, which was prevalent at that time (*Bartholomäus Cam. germ.* 152 – *Вардоломѣй Cam. rom.* 92). *Mil. rom.* also comprises several names written according to their Neo-Greek pronunciation, although its source does not contain evidence in this respect; examples include *Vizantia* (Indice, XXI), *Thévi*, *Theváida*, *Livia* (Indice, XXII). Nevertheless, the Neo-Greek pronunciation alternates with the Western one, for example, *Thebi* (*Mil. rom.* 432, marginal note) and *Thévi* (see *supra*). A translator's note emphasizes the “conflict” between the two models of writing: “Pe *thevi* sau *thebani* îi părăsesc grecii” (p. 419). More such examples occur in *Dor. rom.* (5), the translation from French made by archimandrite Gherasim, an expert in the Greek language:

- (5) *de l'Arabie* (*Dor. fr.* 12) – ἰράβιε^м (*Dor. rom.* I, 5^r)
Isabelle (*Dor. fr.* 14) – ἰζавéла (*Dor. rom.* I, 7^r)
Amabli (*Dor. fr.* 9) – ἰма^млй (*Dor. rom.* I, 3^r)
Sébastien Cabot (*Dor. fr.* 283) – сева́стиe κάβω^т (*Dor. rom.* II, 15^v), but
Barthelemi Colomb (*Dor. fr.* 13) – вa^рпeлe^м κολδm^в (*Dor. rom.* I, 6^v), etc.

The trend was, therefore, excluding spirantization and following the Western Latin model. Exceptions refer mostly to the realities belonging to the Greek or Western cultures, respectively names that had entered the Romanian language earlier, through the Greek-Slavonic path.

3.3. The examples below (6) show that translators usually adopt either the version already existing in Romanian or the one received through the Greek language (as shown by phonetic traits like *av* for *au*, *h* for *ch*, *nd* for *nt*, etc.) even when they meet names with well-known referents within the texts translated from Latin-scripted sources; foreign family names are usually adapted through either transliteration or the transcription of the pronunciation from the translated source:

- (6) *Augusto* (*Buf. it.* 372) – ἰвгδeтъ (*Buf. rom.* 18)
Augusta (*Buf. it.* 183) – ἰвгдeтa (*Buf. rom.* 89)
Christophe Colomb (*Dor. fr.* 13) – Χριστόφο^с Колδm^в (*Dor. rom.* I, 6^r)
*Garcilasso*⁷ (*Dor. fr.* 319) – Γαρциλά^с (*Dor. rom.* II, 43^r), but гa^рсилáсw (II, 42^r)

⁵On the other hand, although quite comparable from a formal viewpoint, the toponym *Βιζαντιόνηκ* (*Buf. rom.* 103, cf. *It. Besanzone*, Fr. *Besançon*) is written with *b*. Moreover, the form *Βρετανηκ* occurs in *Buf. rom.* (in the final index, on p. 194) noted as a new form for *Vretanie* (cf. *Bretagne*, *Britania*, in *Buf. fr.* 396). This example points to the fact that the use of *v* seems to be the translator's conscious and conservative choice.

⁶We have always preserved the original writing from original, i.e. without capital initials.

⁷Inca Garcilaso de la Vega, Spanish chronicler (1539–1616).

Vincent (*Dor.fr.* 311, 383) – Βικένδιε (*Dor.rom.* II, 35^v), dar Βικένπιε (II, 87^r), etc.

As for the adaptation of place names, although the translators probably come across some of these forms for the first time, they choose to interpret them not according to the orthographic norms of its French-language source, but according to a better-known language, either Latin or Greek; therefore, *Pichincha*⁸ (*Dor.fr.* 279) is adapted as Πιχίνχα (*Dor.rom.* II, 12^v); *Paucartambo*⁹ (*Dor.fr.* 320) becomes Πα^κκαρτάμβω (*Dor.rom.* II, 43^r); *Salente* (*Flo.fr.* II, 108, 114) is adapted as Γαλλάνδιε (*Flo.rom.* II, 80), but Γαλλάνφια (II, 85); *Quito*¹⁰ (*Dor.fr.* 280), as Κίτω (*Dor.rom.* II, 13^r), etc.

The confrontation between the source text model and another cultural-linguistic model is reflected within the same text. Only the influence of the translator's culture could explain the situation from *Flo.rom.*, a text translated from French; the Greek names of Gods and mythological figures substitute the Latin names, as in the following examples: *Jupiter* (*Flo.fr.* I, 29) – Ζεύς (*Flo.rom.* I, 20), *Hercule* (*Flo.fr.* I, 51) – Ἡρακλῆς (I, 38), *Minerve* (*Flo.fr.* I, 52) – Μηνιά (I, 39), *Ulysse* (*Flo.fr.* I, 52) – Ἰδὺς Ἐδισένης (I, 39), *Mars* (I, 170) – Ἰρίς (I, 134), *Venus* (II, 64) – Ἥφροδίτη (II, 47), *Vulcain* (*Flo. fr.* II, 217) – Ἥφестος (II, 164)¹¹.

Within translations with a German source, when transcribing names belonging to the ancient culture, translators reproduce the late Latin pronunciation, also adopted within the German schools. This practice was extended to the Western culture names, resembling the principle discussed in the case of the Greek influence. When coming across a new form, the *Mil.rom.* translator interprets it according to his linguistic knowledge (7a); some forms alternate with the local ones, as in the case of *Típria* – *Chíprul*. Moreover, the translator, who knew both German and Latin, interferes in translation and explicitly notes that a particular name can have different pronunciations (7b):

- (7a) *Cicero* (*Mil.germ.* 294) – Ціцерон (*Mil.rom.* 431)
Mycenä (*Mil.germ.* 152) – Мицѐне (*Mil.rom.* 204)
Polinyces (*Mil.germ.* 149) – Полиніцес (*Mil.rom.* 201)
Cyrus (*Mil.germ.* 294) – Цірѐс (*Mil.rom.* 282)
Cypern (*Mil.germ.* 297, 235) – Ціпріа (*Mil.rom.* 435), but Кіпрѐл (229);
- (7b) *Athos* (*Mil.germ.* 202) – „Ἄτος sau Ἄδος” (*Mil.rom.* 284)
 „des Cäsars” (*Mil.germ.* 5) – „lui Цесар sau Кесар” (*Mil.rom.* 4)
Cypern (*Mil.germ.* 282) – „Кіпрѐс sau Ціпрѐл” (*Mil.rom.* 412)
Hipparchus (*Mil.germ.* 193) – „Хипархѐс sau Ἰπάρχ” (*Mil.rom.* 270)
Scyros (*Mil.germ.* 282) – „Сцирѐс sau Гкірѐс” (*Mil.rom.* 412), etc.

In *Cam.rom.*, this type of pronunciation is extended to names from remote and therefore less familiar geographical areas (8a), with few exceptions (8b):

- (8a) GUANAHANI (top.): *Guakanahari* (*Cam.germ.* 155) – Гваканахари (*Cam.rom.* 95)
 AGUADO (anthrop.): *Aguado* (*Cam.germ.* 167) – Гвадо (*Cam.rom.* 104);
- (8b) GADELUPA (top.): *Guadalupe* (*Cam.germ.* 133) – Куаделупе¹² (*Cam.rom.* 78);
 ANTIGUA (top.): *Antigua* (*Cam.germ.* 133) – Антиква (*Cam.rom.* 78).

3.4. Throughout the pre-modern stage of Romanian, the stress pattern of foreign names tends to display variations from one text to the other or even within the same text. Considering the stressing of country names ending in *-(i)ia*, *Arvinte* (2008, p. 99–113) has shown that both the Latin and the Greek stressing

⁸The name of a province in Ecuador.

⁹Town in Peru.

¹⁰Town in Ecuador.

¹¹On the adaptation of Greek-Latin names into Romanian, see *Costa* (1958) and *Creția* (1958).

¹²Written in Latin alphabet.

patterns applied to these names can be traced back to old Romanian and that using a particular pattern depended upon the cultural background of each author or translator. He also adds that in the pre-modern period, despite the strong influence of the Greek culture upon the Romanian Principalities, the Latin pattern prevailed.

The grouping of pre-modern Romanian translations into two categories, according to the source language, showed that the Greek stress pattern does not necessarily prevail in the texts translated from Greek. In *Dom. rom.*, the Latin pattern and the Greek pattern alternate, for instance: (a) *Ispánia* (III, 8), *Itália* (III, 12 et passim), *Vréschia* (III, 21), *Visénsia* (III, 21), *Dalmátia* (III, 38), *Lucánia* (III, 43), *Venétia* (III, 51), *Bélghia* (III, 69), *Ungária* (III, 69), *Sardínia*, *Córsica* (III, 71), *Saxónia*, *Frangónia* (III, 77); (b) *Galía* (III, 8 et passim), *Gasconía* (III, 12), *Liguria* (III, 21 et passim), *Pavía* (III, 21 etc.), *Scantinavía* (III, 24), *Sichelía* (III, 25, 29 et passim), *Lucanía* (III, 27), *Velghia* (III, 29), *Campanía* (III, 35), *Sardínia* (III, 51), *Lombardía* (III, 55), *Voemía* (III, 76); *Țárigrad* (III, 14), but *Țarigrád* (III, 33); anthroponyms: *Máxim* (III, 22, 23), but *Maxím* (III, 8); *Plachídia* (III, 12, 22, 23), dar *Plachidía* (III, 17, 27) etc. There are no criteria to determine the prevalence of one stress pattern or the other in a particular context. Nevertheless, the Western names are frequently stressed according to the Latin pattern, but not in all texts translated in this period. On the other hand, not even the names of Eastern origin are exclusively stressed according to the Greek pattern (9b), as some of them follow the Latin model (9a):

- (9a) τῆς Ἀραβίας (*Dom. gr.* I, 9) – а Ἄράβιϊ (*Dom. rom.* I, 13)
 Ἀρμενίας (*Dom. gr.* I, 11) – Ἄρμένιϊα (*Dom. rom.* I, 16)
 Ἀσσυρία (*Dom. gr.* I, 9) – Ἀσίρϊα (*Dom. rom.* I, 13)
 τὴν Καππαδοκίαν (*Dom. gr.* I, 150) – Καπαδόκϊα (*Dom. rom.* I, 173)
 Μεσοποταμίας (*Dom. gr.* I, 7, 8) – Μεσοποτáμϊα (*Dom. rom.* I, 11, 12, 13)
 Περσία (*Dom. gr.* I, 9) – Πέρσϊα (*Dom. rom.* I, 13)
 τὴν Βιθυνίαν (*Dom. gr.* I, 155) – лa Вѣдѣнѣиα (*Dom. rom.* I, 180), etc.;
- (9b) Συρία (*Dom. gr.* I, 9) – Συρία (*Dom. rom.* I, 13)
 τὴν Παμφλαγονίαν (*Dom. gr.* I, 150) – Παμφλαγονία (*Dom. rom.* I, 173)
 Βιθυνία (*Dom. gr.* I, 154) – Вѣдѣнѣиα (*Dom. rom.* I, 179), etc.

The Latin pattern of stressing is exclusive in *Buf. rom.*, *Cam. rom.*, *Mil. rom.* and *Rum. rom.*, even in the case of names originating from the Greek culture, for instance: *Novérghie* (*Buf. rom.*, Cuprins), *Ethiópia* (*Cam. rom.* 10), *Itália* (*Cam. rom.* 5), *Fríghia* (*Mil. rom.* XXII), *Sírĩa* (*Mil. rom.* XXII), *Fenítia* (*Mil. rom.* XXII), *Aústrĩa* (*Rum. rom.* 67), *Dalmátia* (*Rum. rom.* 67), *Finlándia* (*Rum. rom.* 43), *Fránția* (*Rum. rom.* 74). In *Flo. rom.*, a translation made in Moldavia¹³, the Greek and Latin stress patterns coexist, with some bias towards the last one: *Arávieï* (II, 100), *Itálieï* (II, 18), *Pérsia* (II, 91), but *Perséï* (II, 91), etc.

The comparison strengthens the conclusion of Arvinte (2008, p. 110–119) regarding the prevalence of the Latin stress pattern within the pre-modern Romanian texts. However, we should point out that this fact should not necessarily be attributed to the influence of the Transylvanian School (Arvinte, 2008, p. 118), since the Latin pattern was also dominant in the texts translated in Moldavia.

4. Conclusions

In the pre-modern stage of Romanian, translators were influenced by the culture languages of their time. They did not reproduce by transcription the pronunciation of the names in translation but substituted them with a variant that they perceived as familiar. This version, as phonetics indicates, was received through either Greek or Latin. When transcribing “exotic” foreign names (i.e. remote from the European geographical space or probably not translated into Romanian before), which, given their novelty, did not have a Romanian equivalent, translators did not reproduce their pronunciation from the source language.

¹³*Flo. rom.* is the translation of Alecu Beldiman, published in Buda.

Instead, they transcribed them according to the pronunciation that their graphic form would have had in another language, usually Greek. Given the lack of criteria, foreign names adapted following the source text and those imposed by the prestige of the culture languages often alternated.

Bibliography

A. Sources

- Buf.fr.* = *Géographie universelle*, exposée dans les différentes méthodes qui peuvent abrégier l'étude et faciliter l'usage de cette science [...] Par le P. Buffier, de la Compagnie de Jesus. Dizieme édition. Paris, Chez Pierre-François Giffart, 1759.
- Buf.it.* = [Claude Buffier], *Geografia universale* del P<adre> Buffier, Edizione prima Romana aumentata, corretta e ridotta in miglior forma, con un nuovo *Trattato della Sfera e d'una Dissertazione sopra l'origine e progresso della Geografia*, dal P<adre> Francesco Jacquier, in Roma, a spese di Venanzio Monaldini, mercante di Libri, 1775.
- Buf.rom.* = [Claude Buffier], *De obște gheografie* pe limba moldovenească, scoasă de pe Geografie lui Búfiér după orînduiala care acum mai pre urmă s-au așăzat în Académie de la Parízi, acum întii tipăitã în zilele Prealuminatului și Preainălțatului Domnului nostru Alexandru Ioan Calimah V<oie>vod, cu blagoslovenia și cu toată cheltuiala Preaosfințitului Mitropolit a toată Moldáviia, Kirío Kir Iácov, întru a Preosfinției sale Tipografie, s-au tipărit de ierodiacon Gherásim și de Pável Petrov tipografi, în Sf<î>nta Mitropolie în Iași, avgust 22, 1795.
- Cam.germ.* = [Joachim Heinrich Campe], *Kolumbus oder die Entdeckung von Westindien. Ein angenehmes und nützliches Lesebuch für Kinder und junge Leute*, von J.H. Campe, mit allerhochst gnädigst Kayserl. Privilegio, Tübingen, bey Wilh. Heinr. Schramm und Joh. Friedr. Balz., 1782.
- Cam.rom.* = [Joachim Heinrich Campe], *Descoperirea Americii. O carte foarte folositoare*, alcătuită de Ioánn Háinrih Cámpe, acum întiiu de un iubitoriu de neamul românesc pre românie tãlmăcită și dată afară la lumină, tomul I, cu 4 figuri, cu toată cheltuiala lui Nicóla Nicoláu din Brașov, dată în tipariu la Buda, Crăiasca Tipografie a Universitatii din Péshta, 1816.
- Cat.gr.* = [Antonio Catiforo], *Βίος Πέτρου του Μεγάλου* [...], 'Εν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Σάντου Πέκωρα, Veneția, 1737.
- Cat.it.* = [Antonio Catiforo], *Vita di Pietro il Grande, imperador della Russia, estratta da varie Memorie pubblicate in Francia e in Olanda*, Venezia, Apresso Francesco Pitteri, in Merceria all'Insegna della Fortuna Trionfante, 1736.
- Cat.rom.* = [Antonio Catiforo], *Istoria rușilor și viața Marelui Petru, monarhul rușilor*, Brașov, 1788 [Ms. 3161, Biblioteca Academiei Române, f.1–186].
- Dom.gr.* = [Louis Domairon], *Δομαιρών Επιτομή Ιστορίας Γενικής* [...], 'Εν Βιέννη τῆς Ἀυστρίας, ἐν τῇ Τυπογραφίᾳ Σχράεμβλ., vol. I–III, 1812.
- Dom.rom.* = [Louis Domairon], *Prescurtarea istorii universale*, Priveleghiata Tipografie din București, București, vol. I–II (1826), vol. III–IV (1827).
- Dor.fr.* = [André Guillaume Contant d'Orville], *Histoire des différents peuples du monde, contenant les cérémonies religieuses et civiles, l'origine des religions, leurs Sectes & Superstitions, & les Mœurs & Usages de chaque Nation*, dédiée à monseigneur le Duc de Vrilliere, ministre et secrétaire d'état par M. Contant Dorville, tome cinquième, à Paris, chez Herissant le Fils Libraire, 1771.
- Dor.rom.* = [André Guillaume Contant d'Orville], *Istoria Americăi, cuprinzind un perilipsis a aflării ei, țerimóniile bisericesti și politicești* [...], acum întii tãlmăcite în dialectul moldovenesc, prin ostineala smeritului Gherasim, arhimandrit Mitropoliei Iașului, Iași, tomul I (1800), tomul 2 (1795) [în ms. rom. IV-17 BCU-Iași].
- Flo.fr.* = [Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian], *Numa Pompilius, second Roi de Rome*, par M. de Florian, Capitaine de dragons et Gentilhomme de S.A.S.Mgr le Duc de Penthièvre, de l'Académie de Madrid, à Paris, de l'Imprimerie de Didot l'Aîné, seconde édition, tome I–II, 1786.
- Flo.rom.* = [Jean-Pierre Claris de Florian], *Istoriia lui Numa Pompilie, al doilea craiu al Romii*, tãlmăcită din limba franțuzească de dumnealui postelnicul Alexándru Beldiman și dată și în tipariu [...] în zilele Prealuminatului și Preainălțatului nostru Domn al Moldaviei, Mihaíl Grigoriú Suțul Voievod, întru al doilea an a domniei Înălțimii sale, la anul 1820.
- Mil.fr.* = [Claude François Xavier Millot], *Éléments d'histoire générale*, première partie: *Histoire ancienne*, par M. l'Abbé Millot de l'Académie Française, & des Académies de Lyon & Nancy, tome premier, Nouvelle édition augmentée, à Paris, Chez Durand neveu, 1790.
- Mil.germ.* = [Claude François Xavier Millot], Des Herrn Abt <Claude> Millot, Mitglieds der Akademie zu Lyon, *Universal-historie alter, mittler und neuer Zeiten*, aus dem Französischen, mit den Zusätzen von Wilhelm Ernst Christiani, königlich Dänischen wirklichen Justiz – Rath und ordentlichen Professor der Weltweisheit, Beredtsamkeit und Geschichte, wie auch Bibliothekar der königlichen Universität zu Kiel, Erster Band, Bey Franz Haas Buchhändler, Wien, 1794.
- Mil.rom.* = [Claude Millot], *Istorie universală, ádecă de obște*, care cuprinde în sine întâmplările veacurilor vechi, întocmită prin signior Milot, commembru Académii Fríncești din Lyon, iară acum întia dată tãlmăcită în limba românească, tomul I, în Búda s-au tipărit, în Crăiasca Tipografie Orientalicească a Universitatii Péshtii, 1800.
- Rum.germ.* = [Johann Daniel Friedrich Rumpf], *Alexander I, Kaiser von Russland. Ein Regierungs- und Charaktergemälde*, von I.D.F. Rumpf, Königl. Preuss. expedir. Secretär bei der Abgaben-Direction in Berlin, bei G. Hayn, mit dem Bildniss des Kaisers, 1814.

Rum. rom. = [Johann Daniel Friedrich Rumpf], *Arătarea stăpînirii și a caracterului lui Alexandru I, împăratul a toată Róssia*, întocmită prin I.D.F. Rumpf, Crăiescul Praisesc a Direcției din Berlin Secretar-Expeditor și Mărireii Sale celui pre dreptate și moștenitoriu Craiu al Borúsiei Frídrih Vîlhelm III închinată, iară acum întîiu pre Românie prefăcută și tipărită la Buda, în Crăiasca Tipografie a Universității Ungăriei, 1815.

B. References

- Aixela, J.-Fr. (1996). *Culture Specific Items in Translation*, in R. Alvarez, M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (ed.), *Translation, Power, Subversion*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, p. 52–78.
- Arvinte, V. (2006). *Studii de istorie a limbii române*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, Iași.
- Arvinte, V. (2008). *Român, românesc, România. Studiu filologic*, ediția a III-a, Casa Editorială Demiurg, Iași.
- Boerescu, P. (2014). *Din istoria scrierii românești*, Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Camară, I. (2017). *Catiforo, Viața Marelui Petru (Iași, 1788)*, in *Gînsac et al.*, 2017, p. 27–29.
- Corbea-Hoișie, A. & Dima, E. (2016). *Începutul modernizării culturii române și racordarea la Occident prin traduceri*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, Iași.
- Costa, T. (1958). *Numele proprii latinești în românește*, in “Limba română”, VII (4), p. 70–77.
- Creția, P. (1958). *Numele proprii grecești în românește*, in “Limba română”, VII (2), p. 54–59.
- Dima, E. & Dima, G.-E. (2016). *Traducătorii români și traducerile laice din secolul al XVIII-lea*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, Iași.
- DOOM² = Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, *DOOM. Dicționarul ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române*, ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, București, 2005.
- Gáldi, L. (1939). *Les mots d'origine néo-grecque en roumain à l'époque des Phanariotes* (Magyar-Görög tanulmányok, 9), Pázmány Péter, Budapest.
- Gheție, I. (1982). *Introducere în studiul limbii române literare*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București.
- Gînsac A.-M. et al. (2017). *Practici de traducere a numelor proprii în scrisul românesc premodern (1780–1830)*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, Iași.
- ILRLEV = *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca veche (1532–1780)*, Ion Gheție (coord.), Editura Academiei Române, București.
- Ivănescu, G. (2000). *Istoria limbii române*, ediția a II-a, Junimea, Iași.
- Neumark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*, Prentice Hall International, New York – London – Toronto – Sydney – Tokio.
- Piru, Al. (1970). *Istoria literaturii române, II. Epoca premodernă*, Editura didactică și pedagogică, București.
- Pym, A. (2006). *On the Social and the Cultural in Translation Studies*, in A. Pym, M. Shlessinger, Z. Jettmarová (eds), *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, p. 1–26, [Crossref](#).
- Sandnes, B. (2016). *Names and Language Contact*, in C. Hough, D. Izdebska (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Names and Naming*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, p. 541–553, [Crossref](#).
- Schweickard, W. (1992). *Le modalità di integrazione dei nomi proprii stranieri in italiano*, in “Nouvelle revue d'onomastique”, 19–20, p. 127–134, [Crossref](#).
- Ursu, N.-A. & Ursu, D. (2004). *Împrumutul lexical în procesul modernizării limbii române literare, I. Studiu lingvistic și de istorie culturală*, Editura Cronica, Iași.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, Routledge, London – New York.
- Zauberger, I. (2006). *Translation as a Discursive Import: Changes in the Transfer of Proper Nouns in Latvian*, in A. Pym, M. Shlessinger, Z. Jettmarová (eds), *Sociocultural Aspects of Translating and Interpreting*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam – Philadelphia, p. 143–150, [Crossref](#).