Inserts and omissions in the Calvinist *Catechism* printed in 1648

Enikő Pál*

Faculty of Economic and Human Sciences, Sapientia University, Piața Libertății 1, 530104 Miercurea Ciuc, Romania

Abstract

The present paper aims to contribute to researches on old Romanian translations, examined from the perspective of translation studies. In this respect, the pursued objective is to set up a typology of inserts and omissions found in the Romanian translation of the catechism printed in 1648, taking into account the main causes which generated them. Thus, applying the methods and tools characteristic for comparative analysis, we shall present the contexts in which the Romanian translation deviates from one of its sources or from both of them, focusing on the reasons which could have determined the translator's options to insert or, on the contrary, to omit certain linguistic units. In the text chosen for analysis, the status of inserts and omissions varies from case to case, but, taken all together, they may be grouped into two main classes reflecting two different levels of translation achievement: the level of *creation* and the level of *imitation* respectively.

1. Introduction. The sources and the translation theory of the *Catechism* of 1648

The Calvinist *Catechism* of Fogarasi István, printed in Alba Iulia in 1648, occupies quite a small place in literature[1]. Although, due to its small size and rather restricted destination[2], it unquestionably has somewhat less significance, at least compared to the other contemporary works, this very catechism is, nonetheless, of interest in several respects. Beyond the fact that it is closely related to the other Calvinist Romanian texts of the 17th century and, thus, it bears cultural relevance[3], a however superficial analysis of the catechism's language reveals us an extremely rich linguistic material—on phonetic, morphological and lexical levels. This issue, however, has been poorly researched until present day, even though such an endeavour could contribute to the configuration of the 17th century old Romanian language, or at any rate, of the dialects spoken in the South-western Transylvanian region which the catechism belongs to.

---

*Email address: *enikopaldr@gmail.com*.

[1]First it comes to the attention of researchers through certain fragments excerpted from the *Creed*, published by Hasdeu (1879, p. 725–727) and by Gaster (1891, p. 124), a few passages of the catechism being also found in Nădejde (1886, p. 161, 379, 380). Subsequently, the catechism is enlisted in bibliographies of old Romanian texts (BRV I, under 53, p. 160–164), in Romanian-Hungarian bibliographies (BRU, under 167, p. 81) and in bibliographies of old Hungarian texts (RMK I, under 803; RMK II, under 683; Veress, 1910, p. 159; see also RMNY III, under 2212). Beside these inventories, the catechism of Fogarasi is mentioned briefly in volumes dedicated to Romanian language history, to the history of Romanian literature and/or religion, such as: Philippide (1888, p. 51, 75); Sbiera (1897, p. 106); Marienescu (1902, p. 115); Iorga (1904, p. 144–145; 1928, p. 302), etc. Nevertheless, its linguistic valorisation remains still awaited. Real progresses, in this regard, are not made until 1942 when the first and, as far as we know, the only edition of this catechism appears, published by Tamás Lajos. After this edition, the catechism printed in 1648 seems, once again, to be abandoned, except for certain references made in histories of Romanian language and/or literature. Among these we shall mention, for instance, the useful linguistic observations made in Gheție (1975, p. 305–309).

[2]According to the *Preface* (p. 5), the catechism's intended readers are to be found "in these two places, mainly in Lugoj and Caransebeș, [the translation being meant] for the schools of Christian religion, for strengthening the faith of the young students from there" (our translation, cf. Tamás, 1942, p. 44, Rom. version in BRV I, p. 163).

[3]For instance, the text was printed with Latin letters and Hungarian spelling, which is not completely novel, but "the unitary expression of a literary and religious [i.e. Calvinist] movement" (Pantaleoni, 2007, p. 55) developed in the regions of Banat-Hunedoara between the 16th and 17th centuries.

But beyond its dialectological resourcefulness and potentiality, the catechism printed in 1648 is also remarkable for its richness in material for translation studies. As a matter of fact, a great part of the linguistic peculiarities which characterize this text derive, directly or indirectly, precisely from the fact that it is a translation. Moreover, beside the general issues encountered in case of any translation, this text bears certain specific problems due to the fact that it is the product resulted from the direct translation of a bilingual source-text. We do not intend to insist on the differences between translations based on two or more sources and translations carried out by rendering only one source-text (see also Arvinte & Gafton, 2007, p. 27). We shall remark, however, that, in a case like Fogarasi's translation, not only the polyvalence of the undertaken endeavour (i.e. the translation act itself, both on the level of the source-text's comprehension/interpretation and on the level of the target-text's production) increases, but also the complexity of the end product (i.e. the translated text).

The source-text of Fogarasi's translation is a Latin-Hungarian version of the Heidelberg catechism. This bilingual version, entitled *Catechismus Religionis Christianæ*, had several editions, like the 1636, 1639, 1643, 1647 editions and other subsequent editions. Fogarasi's translation is most probably based on the 1643 or on the 1647 edition, less possibly on the 1639 edition (see also Tamás, 1942, p. 11, 129). As a matter of fact, the 1639, 1643 and 1647 editions—the latter one being an accurate reprint of the previous editions (cf. RMNY III, under 2167, RMK II, under 672, RMK I, under 790)—are almost identical, which makes the unequivocal identification of the source-edition used by Fogarasi quite difficult[4]. There are two important evidences which sustain the fact that the Romanian translation was made based on the Latin-Hungarian source-text: a formal evidence regarding text composition, since both the Romanian and the Latin-Hungarian versions contain 77 questions and answers; and a stylistic evidence consisting of numerous Hungarian loanwords, including bookish ones, directly borrowed from the source-text, and of a series of linguistic calques by means of which Fogarasi renders the Hungarian source.

As might be expected, the Romanian text does not reproduce exactly and integrally either the Latin or the Hungarian versions. The ways in which the two sources may be employed and combined are much more manifold. Thus, the Romanian translation has sections which are undeniably attributable to either the Hungarian or to the Latin version, but it also has passages which show a compilation of the two models or a release from both of them, the portion in question being constructed independently of the sources, bearing the personal contribution of the translator who, at times, exceeds the very duties of a translator,

---

[4]Certain differences may be found regarding the numbering of *Bible* quotes. For instance, under 12/8, Fogarasi makes reference to **Gen. 2. v. 1**, whereas the 1639 and 1643 Latin-Hungarian editions make reference to **Gen. 2. 17**. Similarly, under 12/18, Fogarasi mentions **Matt. 6**, while the 1639 and 1643 editions recall **Matth. 6. 12**. In a similar way, under 28/16, the Romanian text records only **Act. 2.**, whereas the 1639 and 1643 register **Act. 2. 39**. Another example is encountered under 16/3, where the quote is said to be from **Act. 4. v. 13**, unlike the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian editions in which the quote is apparently from **Act. 4. 12**. Similar to this is the numbering under 18/20, where the reference is made to **Luc. 23. v. 13**, while the Latin and Hungarian texts from the 1639 and 1643 editions point to **Luc. 23. v. 13. 14**. Another difference may be found under 29/12, where Fogarasi notes **Matt. 20. v. 26. 27. 1. Cor. 10. v. 16**, whereas the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian versions record **Matth. 26. v. 26. 27. 1. Cor. 10. 16**. Another divergence may be found under 16/19, where the passage brought to the readers' attention is **Rom. 8**, while the Latin version in the 1643 edition notes **Rom. 8. 34** and the Hungarian one records **Rom. 8. 14**. Similarly, under 22/18, Fogarasi mentions **Matt. 16. v. 19**, unlike the 1643 Latin and Hungarian versions which mention **Matth. 16. 18**. In a similar way, under 39/7, Fogarasi records **Prov. 30. v. 9**, while the 1639 and 1647 editions register **Prov. 30. v. 8. 9.** (Latin version) and **Prov. 30. 8. 9.** (Hungarian version). Likewise, under 39/15, the Romanian text quotes **Ephes. 4. v. 24**, whereas the 1639 and 1647 Latin-Hungarian editions cite **Eph. 4. 25**. Similarly, under 43/16, Fogarasi quotes **Psal. 143**, unlike the 1639 and 1643 Latin-Hungarian editions which make reference to **Psal. 143. 10**. Another difference is found under 45/4, where the Romanian text notes **Psal. 143**, while the 1639 and 1643 editions record **Psal. 143. 10** (Latin version) and **Psalm. 143. 10** (Hungarian version). In such cases, however, it is quite difficult to draw unequivocal conclusions, since some of these differences might have been fairly due to the translators' inattention or possibly to misprints, especially taking into account that the quotes do not make reference to completely different passages and that the small differences which may be observed regard only the numbering of the cited verses. In some cases, the numbers themselves are easily mistakable; in other cases the more concise reference in the Romanian text may also be due to the translator's deliberate option to omit certain numbers, possibly pursuing text economy. Therefore, we believe that these differences alone can not be regarded as irrefutable evidence to indicate the use of the 1647 edition as source-edition.

in the strict sense of the word.

Despite all the possible solutions potentially offered by the existence of the two sources, taken as a whole, the Romanian text is rendered by the unequal contribution of the two source-texts, the Hungarian model being much more present in the final product of the translation than the Latin one. The fact that Fogarasi employs mainly the Hungarian source may be sustained by several "translation marks"[5], in other words by a series of signs which unquestionably indicate the use of the Hungarian model, since these elements of the Romanian text do not have correspondents in the Latin source, but they render exactly what appears in the Hungarian version. Such translation marks are: the bookish loanwords directly borrowed from the Hungarian source and the loan translations which appear as an immediate reply to the source-text, certain morpho-syntactic patterns which follow the Hungarian model, certain proper names and biblical quotes, as well as the inserts and omissions, the latter ones representing our main concern in what follows.

2. The status of inserts and omissions in Fogarasi's translation

Following step by step the Romanian translation and the Hungarian version, on the one hand, and the Latin source, on the other hand, we encounter several situations in which Fogarasi inserts into his text or omits from it words, phrases or smaller passages as opposed to one of the source-texts or to both of them. Naturally, the function of these inserts and omissions varies from case to case. Thus, the inserts and omissions executed independently of the source-versions, for instance, may reflect that the Romanian translator assumes, in certain cases, roles which go beyond the translation act, becoming closer to an *act of creation*. Unlike these, the inserts and omissions carried out by Fogarasi and which are found in one of the source-texts too, but missing from the other one, may function as *translation marks*. Basically, the difference between these two categories of inserts and omissions refers, in the first case, to a momentary assumption of certain liberties, despite the formal and content restraints imposed by the sources and, in the second case, to the servility towards one of the models.

2.1. Inserts and omissions rendered independently of the sources

On the whole, Fogarasi's text may be placed somewhere between imitation and creation. On the microstructural level, however, both the former and the latter one may be found and distinguished quite obviously. The cases in which the Romanian translation belongs to the paradigm of creation may be illustrated, among other things, by the inserts and omissions executed independently of both the Hungarian and the Latin source-texts.

2.1.1. Inserts placed independently of the sources

In Fogarasi's translation, inserts are usually meant to provide clarifications regarding certain meanings encountered in the source-text, some of them being found in the context of certain loanwords of Hungarian origin. This is the case of the underlined (lexical) insert in: "semeliuri *sau obraze*" (14/12–13)[6], cf. Hung. *személyek*, cf. Lat. *personæ*. Here the Hungarian loanword of bookish origin *semeliuri* 'persons', borrowed directly from the Hungarian source (cf. Hung. *személyek* 'id.'), was probably regarded as being less familiar to the target audience of the catechism, which is why the translator introduces a clarifying passage. In a similar way, the underlined term in: "bătăi *sau bintetluială*" (12/2), cf. Hung. *büntetések*, cf. Lat. *pœnis*, functions as an insert with explicative purposes, but, this time, precisely the Hungarian loanword is the

---

[5]For the (linguistic) indicators which function as "translation marks", with a case study on *Palia* [*The Old Testament from Orăștie*] see Arvinte & Gafton (2007, p. 52–188).

[6]After each passage quoted here, we indicate in brackets the number of the page and row in which it appears in the catechism. In the edition of Tamás (1942), the pages are not segmented into rows. Thus, the numbering of the rows belongs to us.

one which is meant to clarify the meaning of the Rom. *bătaie* '(divine) punishment'[7], possibly calqued on Hungarian *büntetés* 'punishment'. Another loan translation of a Hungarian word is explained in the underlined insert in: "a ne ține **sau ne ispăsi**" (16/5–6), cf. Hung. *megtartatnunk*, cf. Lat. *servati*. Here the term of Slavic origin, introduced by Fogarasi, seems to be used as a clarifier to the meaning with which the Romanian verb *a (se) ține* 'to be redeemed' is loaded, as a result of calqueing on Hung. *megtart* 'to keep, to redeem'.

The insertion of a word or phrase into the Romanian translation reflects, on the one hand, the need for providing clarifications, explanations for the meaning of the terms employed by the translator, hence, being probably imposed by certain linguistic reasons, like in the examples given above. On the other hand, however, there are certain cases in which the insertion of additional terms, especially into the contexts in which they appear alongside their synonyms, is not motivated by purely linguistic reasons, since the words which these inserts accompany were perfectly functional and frequently used in the epoch and, therefore, they did not impose the addition of clarifying passages. Such situations are to be found in: "chemi **au numești**" (17/5), cf. Hung. *nevezed*, cf. Lat. *appellas*; "vestiți **sau pomeniți**" (30/4–5), cf. Hung. *hirdessétek*, cf. Lat. *annuntiate*; "certare **sau vrava** a Bisericii Sfinte" (30/24), cf. Hung. *fenyíték*, cf. Lat. *disciplina*; "să nu supere, **sau nu dosădească**" (39/3–4), cf. Hung. *meg ne nyomoritsa*, cf. Lat. *opprimat*; "Înălția **sau Măria** a lu Dumnedzeu din cer" (41/22–23), cf. Hung. *Istennek mennyei felsége*, cf. Lat. *cœlesti majestate Dei*; "fericăciune **sau lauda**" (45/23), cf. Hung. *dicsőség*, cf. Lat. *gloria*; "bintetluială de o vreme **sau trupească**" (12/3) (12/2–5), cf. Hung. *ideig való büntetésekre*, cf. Lat. *temporalibus pœnis*. In these cases, it is not excluded that the underlined inserts could (also) reflect the translator's attempts to nuance the utterance, the alternation of different equivalent lexemes pursuing stylistic purposes too.

The Romanian translation also records inserts which are not necessarily due to purely linguistic reasons, neither do they pursue stylistic purposes, but they rather reflect the translator's individual option for a more precise or complete utterance. For instance, there is a term introduced by Fogarasi, but absent from the Latin and Hungarian sources, in: "Trei sînt în cer… Tatăl, **Fiul**, sau cuvîntul, și Duhul Sfînt" (14/15–16), cf. Hung. "Hárman vagynak az égben… az Atya, az Ige, és a' Szent Lélek", cf. Lat. "Tres sunt qui in cœlo… Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus Sanctus". Similarly, at the end of the *Creed*, Fogarasi inserts the term *amen* 'so be it' (13/24) which is quite interesting, since this interjection does not appear either in the Latin text or in the Hungarian source in the given passage.

Beside these kinds of insertions, there are certain Hungarian or Latin text fragments incorporated in the Romanian translation, even in cases in which they are not present in the source-versions. These inserts show the translator's personal contribution. For instance, the Latin formula "Gloria Deo. Venia Reo", inserted into the end of the catechism (i.e. after the 77 questions and answers), is followed by the Hungarian formula "Dicsőség Istennek. Bocsánat a' bűnösnek" (46/9–10). Additionally, the end formulæ which conclude Fogarasi's translation are rendered in Hungarian: "Vége" (48/11) and in Latin: "Soli gratias tibi, o gratiose Deus" (48/12–13).

2.1.2. Omissions executed independently of the sources

There are also cases in which Fogarasi omits certain words which are present in both the Latin and the Hungarian sources. Such a situation is encountered in: "acel un Dumnedzeu de vecie" (14/13–14), cf. Hung. "amaz egy **igaz** örökké való Isten", cf. Lat. "unus ille **verus** et æternus Deus". In a similar way, the Romanian translator leaves out a term found in the Latin and Hungarian versions in: "El dă tutrora viață și toate" (15/18–19), cf. Hung. "Ő ád mindeneknek életet **és lehelletet** és mindeneket", cf. Lat. "Ipse dat

---

[7]It is interesting that Fogarasi does not employ at all the noun *pedeapsă* 'punishment' or the verb *a pedepsi* 'to punish'. Throughout the text he uses its equivalents: the words *bintetluială* 'punishment' and *a bintetlui* 'to punish', which are of Hungarian origin, and the word *bătaie* 'punishment'. With the given meaning, the latter one is employed also in the catechism printed in 1656, being recorded in the same context as in Fogarasi's text: "a păți **bătae** și biciu" (Barițiu, 1879, p. 35). The same meaning is recorded for *bătaie* in other contexts too, occurring several times in the catechism of Fogarasi, like in: "nu va lăsa fără **bătaie**" (34/1–2), cf. Hung. *büntetés*, cf. Lat. *impunitum*, corresponding to the passage: "nu va lăsa… **necercatŭ**" from the other catechism (Barițiu, 1879, p. 44).

omnibus vitam, et halitum, et omnia". The same phenomenon is found in: "Cum după această vieați voi avea fericăciune deplină" (26/6–7), cf. Hung. "Hogy ez élet után tellyes *és tökélletes* boldogságom lészen", cf. Lat. "Quod post hanc vitam plena *perfectaque* beatitudine potiar". Likewise, Fogarasi excludes from his translation a phrase which is present in the source-texts in: "De la răsăritul soarelui lăudat fie Numele Domnului" (42/11–12), cf. Hung. "Napkelettől fogván *mind nyugatiglan* dicséretes légyen az Vrnak neve", cf. Lat. "Ab ortu solis *usque ad occasum eius* sit laudatum nomen Iehova". It would be difficult to state, though, whether these omissions reflect the deliberate assumption of certain liberties or they are simply due to the translator's inattention.

In certain cases, however, the omission of a passage which is found in the Latin and Hungarian sources makes the Romanian translation rather obscure, like in: "Că pre acela care păcat nu știa prentru noi să fim în el dereptate a lu Dumnedzeu" (23/17–19), cf. Lat. "eum enim, qui non noverat peccatum, *propter nos peccatum fecit*, ut nos essemus in eo justitia Dei", cf. Hung. "Mert azt a' ki bűnt nem tudott vala, *mi érettünk bűnné tövé*, hogy mi lennénk Isten igazságává ő benne".

2.2. Inserts and omissions as translation marks

Although the Latin text is also present in the final product of the Romanian translation, there are numerous passages in which the Romanian text undoubtedly follows the Hungarian version, either on a formal level or regarding its content. Among the evidence which indicate the influence of the Hungarian source we could (also) mention the inserts and omissions observable in the Romanian translation, on the one hand, and in the Hungarian source-text, on the other hand, especially when these units do not have correspondents in the Latin version. Naturally, the fact that the Romanian text is exclusively or mainly subjected to the Hungarian source-text's influence may be sustained only in and for that particular passage which records these marks, since, in other passages, the situation could be different.

2.2.1. The typology of inserts corresponding to the Hungarian source

The status of being inserts, attributed to words, phrases etc. found in the Romanian text, on the one hand, and in the Hungarian source, on the other hand, most certainly derives from the differences between the two source-texts (Hungarian and Latin) of the translation. The Romanian inserts which correspond exactly to the Hungarian model, being absent from the Latin version, play different roles regarding the Romanian text's construction and structuring. Thus, among these inserts, we may distinguish certain classes, such as: affective, discursive, syntactic and lexical-explicative inserts.

2.2.1.1. Affective inserts

In the category of affective inserts we may include those passages which have a rather phatic function and a stylistic role, since they are found mainly in rethorical questions, in hyperbolical formulæ or in iterative constructions which follow the expression pattern and construction model offered by the Hungarian source.

Such an insertion is that of the interrogative adverb *oare* 'really (wondering)' which corresponds to the Hung. *vallyon*, with the same meaning and function, recorded in: "*Oare* de unde izvorăște aceea credință?" (26/14–15), cf. Hung. "Honnan származik *vallyon* az a hit?", cf. Lat. "Unde hæc fides proficiscitur?"; or in: "*Oare* de unde este năravului omenesc atare mare sdrobitură?" (11/6–7), cf. Hung. "Honnan vagyon vallyon az emberi természetnek ilyen nagy romlotsága?", cf. Lat. "Unde existit hæc naturæ humanæ pravitas?". In the latter portion, the influence of the Hungarian source may be sustained also by the presence of the underlined syntagm in: "*atare mare* sdrobitură" which corresponds to the Hungarian formula "*ilyen nagy* romlotsága", both of them incorporating a determiner meant to emphasize and amplify the described phenomenon. Unlike these texts, the Latin version does not record any intensifier term, the situation being described simply by the word *pravitas* 'degradation'.

An intensifier role may be attributed also to the underlined expressions which render the Hungarian model in: "*Numai singur* prin credința a lu Isus Hristos, *în atîta*, cum fără de toată destoinicia a mea, *curat numai* din meserere a lu Dumnedzeu mi se destoinicește mie făcătura de destul cu plin" (23/22 –

24/2), cf. Hung. "*Csak egyedül* a' Jesus Christusban való hit által, *el annyira*, hogy minden én érdemem nélkül, *csupán csak* az Istennek irgalmasságából tulajdoníttassék és ajándékoztassék énnékem.... tökélletes elégtétele", cf. Lat. "Sola fide in Jesum Christum, adeo ut sine ullo meo merito, ex sacra Dei misericordia, perfecta satisfactio... mihi imputetur ac donetur".

The iterative construction is also employed with certain stylistic effects in the warning expressed in: "Din poamele pomului știutului binelui și al răului să nu mănînci că oare în ce zi vei mînca *cu moartea morției vei muri*" (12/8–10), cf. Hung. "Az jónak és gonosznak tudásának fájának gyümölcsében ne egyél, mert valamely napon abban ejéndel *halálnak halálával halsz meg*", cf. Lat. "De fructu arboris scientiæ boni et mali, de isto ne comedas, nam in quo die comederis de eo, utique *moriturus* es". Although the formula itself belongs to a certain *Bible* tradition, first employed in the Hebrew version of the Holy Book and then reproduced in other languages as well (cf. Lat. *morte morieris*, *morte morietur*), its presence in the Romanian text in the passage in which it appears in the Hungarian source, but is absent from the Latin version, is probably due to the influence of the Hungarian source-text.

In a similar way, the underlined iterative constructions built according to the Hungarian model in: "Nu nici dintr-o parte ce mai tare *din zi în zi* datoriile noastre *mărindu-le mărim*" (12/15–17), cf. Hung. "Semmi részből nem: sőt inkább *naprol napra* adósságunkat *öregbitten öregbittyük*", cf. Lat. "Nulla ex parte: quin etiam debitum, in singulos dies, augemus" have a rather stylistic function.

It is not excluded that the passage containing the Lord's Prayer has also been translated according to the Hungarian version, since the Romanian text records an iterative construction also found in the Hungarian source, in: "Că-i a ta împărăţia, puterea, și lauda *pînă-n vecie, veacului*" (41/5–6); or in: "pînă în *vecie de veac*" (45/11), cf. Hung. "Mert tiéd az ország, a' hatalom, és a' dicsőség *mindörökkön örökké*", cf. Lat. "Quia tuum est regnum, et potentia, et gloria *in secula*"[8].

2.2.1.2. Inserts with discursive function

Another category of inserted elements, found in Fogarasi's text, rendering exactly what appears in the Hungarian source, but missing from the Latin version, is represented by those elements which provide and/or strengthen the text's coherence on the discursive level, but which do not have actual syntactic implications. These elements mainly consist of adverbs, but there are a few interjections and adjectives too.

Such a discursive insert may be found in: "în atîta cum *amu* toți în păcat ne prindem și ne naștem" (11/8–10), cf. Hung. "ugy hogy *immár* mindnyájan a' bűnben fogantassunk és születtessünk", cf. Lat. "ita ut omnes in peccato concipiamur et nascamur".

A similar situation is encountered in the case of the interjection's insertion in: "*Iacă* în alnicie m-am prins și muma mea în păcat m-a incălzitu-mă în sgăul său" (11/12–14), cf. Hung. "*Ímé* én álnokságban fogantattam, és az én anyám bűnben melegített engemet az ő méhében", cf. Lat. "Enim iniquitate formatus sum, et in peccato fovit me mater mea". As a matter of fact, the passage may be attributed to the Hungarian source due to other translation marks as well, such as the presence of the Hungarian loanword *alnicie* 'iniquity' (cf. Hung. *álnokság*, cf. Lat. *iniquitate*) and of the Romanian verb *a (se) prinde (în...)* 'to conceive' calqued on Hungarian *fogantat < fog-ni* 'to grasp' (cf. Lat. *formatus sum*) or the presence of the lexeme *zgău* 'womb' (cf. Hung. *méh* 'id.') which does not have any correspondent in the Latin text.

---

[8]In fact, the iterative construction is found in a few other Romanian translations of the prayer as well. Thus, in the 16th century, it is recorded in Luca Stroici's version of the Lord's Prayer (1593): "în veczij vecilor" (Gaster, 1891, p. 39) as well as in another text fragment from *Codicele Todorescu* [*The Todorescu Codex*]: "di veci-/e veculi" și „ve-/cie vécu[lu]i" (Drăganu, 1914, p. 229). Additionally, the formula may be found in the catechism printed in 1656 too: "vécii de vécŭ" (Bariţiu, 1879, p. 48, 49). In case of the latter text, it is not excluded that this construction has been introduced—just like in Fogarasi's text—due to the influence of the Hungarian text, since the catechism printed in 1656 seems to be based on the same Latin-Hungarian version of the catechism as the one printed in 1648 (see also Drăganu, 1922, p. 164; Juhász, 1940, p. 192; Tamás, 1942, p. 10–15, 129, 131). Nevertheless, it is not excluded either that this very formula reflects a somewhat fixed or "canonized" version of the prayer, characteristic for Calvinist worship, in other words, a particular tradition kept in the Calvinist versions of the Lord's Prayer. For the different Romanian versions of this prayer see also (Niculescu, 2006–2007, especially p. 48–72).

On various occasions, Fogarasi's text records the adverb *încă* 'too, also' which corresponds to the adverb *is* 'also, too, yet' from the Hungarian version, without any equivalent in the Latin source. For instance, it is found in: "Cum el în toată vremea vieții lui *încă*, ce mai tare în vremea morții au pățit-o mînia a lu Dumnedzeu prentru păcatele noastre" (18/6–9), cf. Hung. "Hogy ő tellyes életének idejében *is ugyan*, de főképpen halálakor, az Istennek a' mi bűneinkért való haragját meg szenyvedte", cf. Lat. "Eum toto quidem vitæ tempore, præcipue vero in eius extremo, iram Dei adversus peccata nostra sustinuisse", where the formula *ce mai tare* 'but chiefly' also corresponds to the Hung. *de főképpen* 'id.'.

The same adverbial insert appears in: "Căce pui și aceasta *încă* lîngă aceea" (20/1), cf. Hung. "Miért teszed ezt *is* hozzá", cf. Lat. "Cur additur"; "Că ce se pune aceasta *încă* lîngă aceea" (21/3), cf. Hung. "Miért tétetik ez *is* hozzá", cf. Lat. "Cur additur".

Likewise, the adverb is inserted in: "Să toate le-ați face *încă*, carele vouă-s porîncite *încăși* aceea dziceți" (25/13–15), cf. Hung. "Ha mindeneket meg cselekedtétek *is*, a' mellyek nektek parancsoltattanak, *még is* azt mondgyátok", cf. Lat. "Cum feceritis omnia quæ præcepta sunt vobis, dicite". The same adverb appears as in insert in: "Adevăr zic vouă cum orice veți lega pre pămînt îi vor fi legate în cer *încă*, și orice veți dezlega pre pămînt dezlegate vor fi și în cer *încă*" (31/4–7), cf. Hung. "Bizony mondom ti néktek: Hogy valamiket meg köténdetek e' földön, meg lesznek az égben *is* köttetve, és valamiket meg oldozándotok e' földön, meg lesznek oldattatva az égben *is*", cf. Lat. "Amen dico vobis: Quæcunque ligaveritis in terra, erunt ligata in cœlo, et quæcunque solveritis in terra, erunt soluta in cœlo", where the Hungarian source seems to have exerted its influence also on the selection of the preposition in the syntagm: "*pre* pămînt", cf. Hung. "föld*ön*", cf. Lat. "*in* terra".

The adverbial insert has other occurrences too, like in: "Cum noi cu viața necertătoare a noastră pre alții *încă* să dobîndim lu Hristos" (31/20–22), cf. Hung. "hogy a' mi feddhetetlen életünkel egyebeket *is* a' Christusnak meg nyerjünk", cf. Lat. "ut vitæ nostræ integritate alios Christo lucrifaciamus"[9]; "Să cerem mila *încă* a Duhului Sfînt" (40/8), cf. Hung. "a' Szent Léleknek kegyelmét *is* kérjük", cf. Lat. "gratiam Spiritus Sancti imploremus"; "Unde den toate nevoile numai din meserere a lu Dumnedzeu prentru Hristos ne-au slobozitu-ne, căce *dară* trebuiește *încă* a face bine?" (31/12–15), cf. Hung. "Holott minden nyavalyás voltunkbol csak az Istennek irgalmasságával a' Christusért szabadíttattunk légyen meg, miért kell *tehát mégis* jót cselekednünk?", cf. Lat. "Cum ab omnibus miseriis sola Dei misericordia, propter Christum liberati fimus, quid est, cur bona opera facimus?"; "Să iară nu le veți ierta oamenilor păcatele lor, nici Tatăl vostru *încă* den cer nu le va ierta vouă greșelele voastre" (44/14–17), cf. Hung. "Ha pediglen ti meg nem bocsátandgyátok az embereknek az ő bűneiket, a' ti mennyei Atyátok *is* nem fogja meg bocsátani tinektek a' ti vétkeiteket", cf. Lat. "Si autem non dimiseritis hominibus peccata eorum, nec dimittet vobis pater vester peccata vestra".

Another adverbial insert is encountered in: "Domnul omoară și *iarășite* învie, jos pînă la păcură aruncă, și *iarășite* scoate" (20/12–14), cf. Hung. "Az Vr meg öl, és *ismét* meg elevenít, a' pokolig alá vet és *ismét* fel hoz", cf. Lat. "Dominus deducit in inferno, et reducit", where the Romanian translation also renders the Hungarian verbal prefix pattern *alá* 'below, under' *vet* 'throw', cf. Rom. *jos* 'below' *aruncă* 'throw'.

Another adverb inserted according to the Hungarian source is found in: "că dreptăției a lu Dumnedzeu prentru păcatele noastre nici întru-un chip *aimintrilea* destul n-are fi putut face" (19/9–12), cf. Hung. "mert az Isten igazságának semmiképpen a' mi bűneinkért *különben* eleget nem tehetett volna", cf. Lat. "quod justitiæ Dei nullo alio pacto pro nobis peccatis potuit satisfieri". As a matter of fact, this passage bears other translation marks too, such as: the phrase *nici intr-un chip* 'in no way', cf. Hung. *semmiképpen*, cf. Lat. *nullo alio pacto*, or the verb phrase *a face destul* 'to satisfy' which is calqued on Hung. *eleget* 'enough' *tenni* 'to do'.

Another adverb, which functions as an insert, appears in: "Acele ce cu credința dereaptă vom cere de

---

[9]In fact, this passage also includes a loan translation: *necertătoare* 'pure, taintless' which is calqued on Hung. *feddhetetlen* (*meg-fedd-ni* 'to scold' + *–etlen* 'suffixe for negation'), cf. Lat. *integritate*.

la el *cu nemica **mai*** nu va tăgădui de noi” (41/12–14), cf. Hung. “azokat a’ mellyeket igaz hittel ő tőle kérünk *semmivel **inkább*** meg nem tagadja tőlünk”, cf. Lat. “quæ vera fide ab eo petimus, nobis *multo minus* negare”.

Another insert with discursive function is the underlined adjective in: “Nu numai vreo ***atare*** cunoscătură” (24/15), cf. Hung. “Nem csak valami ***olly*** isméret”, cf. Lat. “Est non tantum notitia”; or in: “Cu ***atare*** adaus făgădaş” (29/2–3), cf. “***illyen*** hozzá adatott igérettel”, cf. “addita promissione”.

2.2.1.3. *Syntactic – phrasal inserts: connectors*

Another class of inserts is made up of those connectors which are introduced into the Romanian translation in passages in which the Latin version does not record any connector, but they have correspondents in the Hungarian source. As a matter of fact, these units also function as discursive elements, their delimitation from the previous class being solely based on the fact that, unlike the former category of inserts, these connectors also mark various types of syntactic relations (coordination or subordination) on the level of the sentence or phrase. Here could be included several conjunctions, relative adverbs and pronouns, sometimes employed with the morpho-syntactic values of their Hungarian correspondents, as well as certain prepositional (or adverbial) phrases.

For instance, the adversative conjunction *iară* ‘but’ usually corresponds to the Lat. *autem* and to the Hung. *pedig* ‘but, whereas’, like in: “A doua ***iară*** asemenea este către această” (10/22–23), cf. Hung. “A második ***pedig*** hasonlatos ehhez”, cf. lat “Secundum *autem* simile est huic”. However, there are also cases in which the Latin text does not record any conjunction, whereas the Rom. *iară* corresponds to the Hung. *pedig*, like in: “Care va crede şi se va boteza ispăsi-se va, care ***iară*** nu va crede păgubi-se va” (28/7–9), cf. Hung. “A’ ki hiend és meg keresztelkedéndik üdvözül, a’ ki ***pedig*** nem hiend, el kárhozik”, cf. Lat. “Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit, servabitur, Qui vero non crediderit, condemnabitur”; “A doua tablă ***iară*** cu şase porunci aceea învață” (35/19–20), cf. Hung. “A’ második [tábla] ***pedig*** hat parancsolatokkal azt [adja előnkben]”, cf. Lat. “posterior [tabula], sex præceptis, quæ officia...”. In other cases, the Latin text notes a copulative conjunction and not an adversative one like the Romanian and Hungarian texts do, in: “Sfînt Paul încă numeşte pîinea trupul a lu Hristos, păharul ***iară*** chiuzluitura a sîngelui lui cu noi” (29/9–12), cf. Hung. “Szent Pál Apostol is a’ kenyeret Christus testének, a’ pohárt ***pedig*** az ő vérének velünk való közöltetésének nevezi”, cf. Lat. “Apostolus Paulus panem apellat communionem corporis Christi, *et* poculum communionem sanguinis eius”.

Another connector which renders the Hungarian model is represented by the Romanian phrase *derept însă* ‘but because’ which formally and functionally corresponds to the Hung. *mivel azért* ‘id.’, like in: “Cu cît ***derept însă*** destoinici sîntem spre bătăi sau bintetluială de o vreme sau trupească şi spre bintetluială de vecie dară este vreo cale prin care cu Dumnedzeu să ne putem împăca?” (12/2–5), cf. Hung. “***Mivel azért*** mind ideig s mind penig örökké való büntetésekre méltók vagyunk, vagyoné tehát valami út az mellyen az Istennel meg békéltessünk?”, cf. Lat. “Quoniam igitur temporalibus et æternis pœnis obnoxii sumus, estne via, qua Deo reconciliemur?”. The same connector is employed as an insert in other passages too but, this time, it renders another Hungarian correspondent, like in: “***Derept însă*** acela încă ce va naşte din tine e Sfînt” (17/22 – 18/1–2), cf. Hung. “***Annakokáért*** az is a’ mi te belőled születik a’ Szent”, cf. Lat. “propterea etiam, quod nascetur ex te Sanctum”; “***Derept însă*** uluim în chip de adevăr, cum omul el se îndereptă” (24/10–11), cf. “***Annakokáért*** ezt állattyuk bizonyosképpen, hogy az ember meg igazittatik”, cf. Lat. “Colligimus igitur fide justificari hominem”.

Other similar cases are to be found in passages in which the term *chip* ‘image, face’ is included in different prepositional or adverbial phrases, which render formally (and semantically) equivalent Hungarian constructions. For instance, *nici într-un chip* ‘nowise’ is recoded in: “***Nici într-un chip***: că din nărav sînt plecat spre urăciunea lu Dumnedzeu” (11/2–3), cf. Hung. *semmiképen*, cf. Lat. *minime*; “***Nici într-un chip*** nu-l va lăsa” (11/16), cf. Hung. *Semmiképpen nem*, cf. Lat. *Nequaquam*; “***nici într-un chip*** aimintrilea destul n-are fi putut face” (19/11–12), cf. Hung. *semmiképpen*, cf. Lat. *nullo alio pacto*. The phrase *în ce chip* ‘how’ is noted in: “***În ce chip*** înţelegi aceasta...?” (20/21), cf. Hung. *Miképpen*, cf. Lat.

Quomodo[10]; "*În ce chip* trebuieşte nouă pre noi să ne purtăm către Dumnedzeu?" (35/17–18), cf. Hung. "*miképpen* kellessék minékünk magunkat az Istenhez viselnünk", cf. Lat. "quo pacto nos erga Deum geramus"; "*În ce chip* trebuieşte a cere mila a Duhului Sfînt?" (40/16–17), cf. Hung. "*Miképpen* kell a' Sz. Léleknek kegyelmét... kérnünk?", cf. Lat. "Quomodo gratiam Spiritus Sancti... debemus petere?"; "*in ce chip* îngerii fac în cer" (43/11–12), cf. Hung. "a' *miképpen* az Angyalok az égben cselekszenek", cf. Lat. "quemadmodum faciunt Angeli in cœlo". Another formal equivalence may be observed in case of the underlined phrase in: "Şi *in acest chip* cea Sîmbătă de vecie în această viaţă s-o încep" (37/9–10), cf. Hung. "és *ekképpen* amaz örökké való Szombathot ebben az életben el kezdjem", cf. Lat. "atq. Ita sempiternum Sabbathum in hæc vita exordiar".

Another connector which renders the Hungarian model is recorded in: "*Prentru ce ocă* se chiamă Hristos Fiul unul născut a lui Dumnedzeu?" (16/23–24), cf. Hung. *Miokért*, cf. Lat. *Quam ob causa*; "*Prentru ce ocă* chemi au numeşti pre Hristos Domnul nostru?" (17/5–6), cf. Hung. *Miokért*, cf. Lat. *Qua de causa*; "*Prentru ce ocă* au murit Hristos?" (19/8), cf. Hung. *Miokért*, cf. Lat. *Qua de causa*; see also *prentru ceastă ocă* (19/9), cf. Hung. *ezokáért*, cf. Lat. *propterea*.

We shall note, however, that the use of the connectors mentioned above is not necessarily determined by the Hungarian source only, at least not in all of the cases. There could be invoked, at least theoretically, other reasons too, which could explain their occurrence in Fogarasi's text. Thus, on the one hand, some of these connectors may reflect a prior tradition, these words or phrases being characteristic for Calvinist-Romanian texts in general, which the author could have been familiar with. On the other hand, even those "foreign" syntactic constructions which had been acquired during the translation process per se might have remained dormant in the course of the translation act, so that certain formulæ could have been engraved in the translator's memory who could have used them subsequently, even without his options being directly subjected to the influence of the Hungarian passage. Therefore, the only certainty regarding the use of these connectors in the Romanian text is that these elements co-occur with their formal correspondents in the Hungarian text, whether they have or lack semantic correspondents in the Latin version.

A higher degree of certainty is provided by those connectors which sometimes take over or copy the morpho-syntactic values of their Hungarian correspondents. This is the case of the Romanian relative adverb *cum* 'how', which often corresponds to the Hung. *hogy* 'that', taking over (also) its valencies. Thus, in Hungarian, the conjunction *hogy* 'that' has a neutral value, in the sense that it is not specialized for a certain kind of use pattern, its possibilities of contextualization being almost unlimited, since it may introduce almost any kind of subordinate clause. Unlike this, in Romanian, the relative adverb *cum* 'how' prototypically introduces modal subordinate clauses[11]. Naturally, the Romanian adverb, in its turn, may introduce other types of subordinate clauses too, but, in some cases, it undoubtedly corresponds to the conjunction *hogy*, especially when the Latin text does not record any connector. Hence, Rom. *cum* 'how' renders Hung. *hogy* 'that' in contexts in which it is used with the meaning 'that', introducing direct object clauses, like in: "Ştim *cum* acelora cari îndrăgesc pe Dumnezeu toate sunt spre bine" (9/17–18), cf. Hung. "Tudgyuk *hogy* azoknak akik az Istent szeretik, mindenek javukra vagynak", cf. Lat. "Novimus, iis qui diligunt Deum, omnia simul adjumento esse ad bonum"; "Cred *cum* Tatăl de vecie a Domnului nostru a lu Isus Hristos... mie încă îmi este Tatăl şi Dumnedzeu" (15/1–5), cf. Hung. "Hiszem *hogy* a' mi Urunk Jesus Christusnak örökké való Attya... énnékem is Istenem és Atyám légyen", cf. Lat. "Credo æternum Patrem Domini nostri Jesu Christi... meum quoq, Deum et Patrem meum esse"; "Să ştie *cum* eu sînt

---

[10]In other passages, the formula renders other correspondents from the source-text, like in: "*În ce chip* se împart aceste porînci?" (35/14), cf. Hung. *mimódon*, cf. Lat. *quomodo*. The phrase *cu ce mod* 'how' is employed with the same meaning as the former one, like in: "*cu ce mod* să mă slobod eu din toată nevoia mea" (9/23–24), cf. Hung. *mimódon*, cf. Lat. *quo pacto*, also being noted in contexts in which its Latin equivalent *quomodo* appears (see in 23/20).

[11]Such a situation is encountered in: "şi acum încă aşa mă ţine, *cum* toate să-mi slujească spre ispăsenie-mi" (9/11–13), cf. Hung. "és még most is ugy tart, *hogy* mindenek az én idvösségemre szolgállyanak", cf. Lat. "meque ita conservat, ut omnia saluti meæ servire oporteat", though, in this case, the construction also has the valencies of a consecutive clause. In the given passage, Hungarian influence may also be sustained by the insert of Rom. *încă* 'still', cf. Hung. *még* 'still' and by the syntactic construction: "să-mi slujească *spre* ispăsenie-mi", cf. Hung. "az én idvösségem*re* szolgállyanak".

Domnul carele pre ei sfinţesc" (37/13–14), cf. Hung. "meg tudnák, *hogy* én vagyok az Vr, a' ki őket megszentelem", cf. Lat. "scirent, quod ego Dominus sanctificans eos"; "Un lucru fac *cum* acele ce mi-s după dos să le uit" (42/22–23), cf. Hung. "Egy dolgot cselekszem *hogy* azokat a' mellyek a hátam megett vagynak el felejtvén", cf. Lat. "Unum ago, ea quidem, quæ a tergo sunt, obliviscens". In other cases, the relative adverb *cum* is employed with the meaning 'in order to', introducing purpose clauses, similarly to the Hung. *hogy*, like in: "Hristos odată s-au jertfăluit *cum* păcatele a mulţi să le ia" (16/18–19), cf. Hung. "Christus egyszer megaldoztatott, *hogy* sokaknak bűneiket elvenné", cf. Lat. "Chritus semel oblatus est, ut multorum peccata tolleret"; "Priveghiaţi şi vă rugaţi *cum* în ispită să nu cădeţi" (45/6–7), cf. Hung. "Vigyázzatok és imádkozzatok, *hogy* kisértésben ne essetek", cf. Lat. "Vigilate et orate, ne intrœatis in tentationem"[12].

The relative pronoun *ce* 'what' is employed (also) with the adversative meaning 'but', just like the Hungarian conjunction *de* 'but' is, reproducing, therefore, the Hungarian model, especially in cases in which the Latin version does not record any connector, like in: "Au vom via au vom muri *ce* a Domnului suntem" (9/14–15), cf. Hung. "Akár éllyünk akár hallyunk, *de* az Vréi vagyunk", cf. Lat. "Sive vivimus, sive morimus, Domini sumus". In other contexts, the relative pronoun *ce* 'what' is noted corresponding to another Hungarian semantic equivalent, rendering the same adversative meaning, like in: "Pre Dumnedzeu nicicînd nime n-au văzut, *ce* acel Fiul unul născut care este în sînul Tatălui lui, el ne-au povestit nouă" (16/15–17), cf. Hung. "Az Istent soha senki nem látta *hanem* amaz egygyetlen egy szülött Fia, a' ki az ő Attyának kebelében vagyon, beszéllette meg mi nékünk", cf. Lat. "Deum nemo vidit unquam: unigenitus ille filius, qui est in sinu Patris, ille nobis exposuit". On the other hand, this particular passage seems to render the Hungarian model also regarding its word order (see "nicicînd nime n-au văzut", cf. Hung. "soha senki nem látta") and the expression "Fiul *unul născut*", which perfectly corresponds to the Hungarian construction "*egygyetlen egy szülött* Fia".

The Romanian conjunction *că* is employed with the meaning 'because', in the context in which the Hungarian version records its equivalent connector, unlike the Latin source which does not register any sentence connector, like in: "Nici într-un chip: *că* din nărav plecat sunt spre urăciunea lui Dumnezeu" (11/2–3), cf. Hung. "Semmiképpen nem: *mert* természet szerént hajlandó vagyok az Istennek... gyülölésére", cf. Lat. "Minime. Natura enim propensus sum ad odium Dei". A similar situation is found in: "Pre trei părţi: *că* parte de prima este de pre Tatăl Dumnedzeu" (14/3–4), cf. Hung. "Három részekre: *Mert* az első vagyon az Atya Istenről", cf. Lat. "In tres partes. Prima est de Deo Patre".

Therefore, although the Romanian passages correspond to the Latin version as well, the presence of the connectors noted above within the Romanian translation, in contexts in which they have correspondents in the Hungarian source, but not in the Latin one, may serve as a translation mark, indicating the influence of the Hungarian source-text or, at any rate, a compilation of the two sources.

2.2.1.4. Lexical inserts

There are several cases in which the presence of a semantically and functionally autonomous lexical element, found in the Romanian translation and corresponding to semantic equivalents in the Hungarian source, serves as translation mark, at least within the given passage, indicating the use of the Hungarian model, all the more so because the Latin version does not record any correspondent lexeme, the wording in the latter one being more concise than in the former one. These lexical or phrasal inserts, introduced independently of the Latin source, usually function as explanatory notes or passages, reflecting, at the same time, the translator's endeavour to be as precise and accurate as possible.

Such lexical inserts may be found, for instance, in passages which list certain holy books, like in: "Despre *ceremoniile* a Leviţenilor" (7/21 – 8/1), cf. Hung. "a' levitai *Ceremoniákrol*", cf. Lat. "Leviteus";

---

[12]Other examples which show that the Rom. *cum* corresponds to the Hung. *hogy* are found in: "Aceasta; *cum* cu trup cu suflet au voi via au voi muri, eu sunt a Domnului vernic al mieu" (9/6–8), cf. Hung. "Ez, *hogy* mind testestől lelkestől, akár élyek, akar hallyak, az én hűséges Uramnak [...] tulajdona vagyok", cf. Lat. "Quod animo pariter et corpore, sive vivam, sive moriar, fidissimi Domini [...] sum proprius"; "*Cum* cu Numele Sfinţiei sale..." (36), cf. Hung. "*Hogy* az ő Szentséges nevével...", cf. Lat. "Ut Sacrosancto ipsus nomine...".

"Despre băgătura de samă a **dihaniei**" (8/2–3), cf. Hung. "a' **népnek** megszámláltatásárol", cf. Lat. "Numeri"; "Despre duplecătură **a legiei**" (8/4–5), cf. Hung. "az **Törvénynek** meg kettőztetéséről", cf. Lat. "Deuteronomium".

Another insert, introduced into the Romanian text due to rendering the construction model offered by the Hungarian source, may be found in: "Cîte **lucruri** trebuieşte ţie să ştii cum cu această veselitură viind, fericată să fie vieaţa ta şi moartea ta?" (9/19–21), cf. Hung. "Hány **dolgot** kell tenéked tudnod, hogy ez vigasztalással élvén, boldogul lehessen életed és halálod?", cf. Lat. "Quot sunt tibi scitu necessariant ista consolatione fruens, beate vivas et moriaris?"[13].

The Latin version is much more concise than the Hungarian one, which seems to have been followed by the Romanian translator in: "Ne învaţă pre noi pre aceea **Domnul** Hristos într-o summă la **Sfînt**[ul] Mathe [Matei] în douăzeci şi două **de părţi**" (10/15–17), cf. Hung. "Megtanít minket arra Christus **Urunk** egy summában **Sz.** Mathénak 22 **részében**", cf. Lat. "Id nos docet Christus Summatim Matth. 22".

Another insert may be observed in: "De lipsă este, cum au noi **îns** să facem destul, au prin altul" (12/6–7), cf. Hung. "Szükség, hogy vagy mi **magunk** tegyünk eleget, vagy más által", cf. Lat. "Necesse est vel per nos, vel per alium satisfaciamus".

Other lexical inserts are found in: "**Mai mult** nu sînteţi slugi ce feţi" (15/7–8), cf. Hung. "Nem vagytok **többé** szolgák, hanem fiak", cf. Lat. "Non estis servi, sed filii"; "Ce crezi cînd **aceea** dzici..." (17/12, 18/4), cf. Hung. "Mit hiszesz mikor **azt** mondod...", cf. Lat. "Quid credis cum dicis..."; "Atunci va zice Craiul acelora cari de **mîna** dreaptă vor fi" (21/16–17), cf. Hung. "Akkoron modngya a' Király azoknak a' kik job **keze** felől lesznek", cf. Lat. "Tum dicet Rex iis, qui ad dextra ipsius erunt"; "Cum toţi vernicii îs chiuz şi **partnici** a lu Hristos" (23/1–2), cf. Hung. "Hogy minden hivek a' Christusnak ... közösi és **részesi** légyenek", cf. Lat. "Quod singuli credentes Christi... communionem habeant"; "Toatele dereptăţile noastre îs ca cîrpă necurată **a muierii**" (25/6–7), cf. Hung. "Minden mi igazságink ollyanok mint a' havas **aszony** állatnak tisztátalan ruhája", cf. Lat. "Omnes nostræ justitiæ sicut panniculus abjectissimus"; "Care (Hristos) schimba va trupurile smerite a noastre cum cu **asemenea formă** să fie către trupul fericat a lui" (25/24 – 26/3), cf. Hung. "A' ki (a' Christus) által változtattya az mi alázatos testünket, hogy **hasonló formáju** legyen az ő dicsőséges testéhez", cf. Lat. "Qui (Christus) transfigurabit corpus nostrum humile, ut conforme fiat ejus corpori glorioso"; "Aşa cureţi cum să luaţi **dobînda**" (40/13–14), cf. Hung. "Vgy fussatok hogy **a' jutalmat** el vehessétek", cf. Lat. "Sic currite, ut comprehendatis"; "Fie voia ta: cum în cer aşa **aici** pre pămînt **încă**" (40/22–23, 43/6–7), cf. Hung. "Légyen a' te akaratod, miképpen a' menyben azonképpen **itt** e' földön **is**", cf. Lat. "Fiat voluntas tua, quemadmodum in cœlo, sic etiam in terra"; "Dă-ne nouă toate ce mi-s de lipsă **pre hrana** acestei vieţi" (43/21–22), cf. Hung. "Szolgáltass ki minékünk mindeneket, valamellyek ez életnek **tápláltatására** szükségesek", cf. Lat. "Suppedita nobis omnia, quæ ad hanc vitam sunt necessaria". In these cases, the Latin version is usually more concise than the Hungarian source, which offers more explanatory elements (e.g. synonyms) or is more explicit and which is obviously preferred by the Romanian translator too.

In another case, the Romanian wording is as concise as the one in the Latin text, but it includes an element which indicates the use of the Hungarian source (too), like in: "înaintea dregătorului **de afară**" (18/16), cf. Hung. "**külső** polgári társaságbéli bíró előtt", cf. Lat. "coram judice politico".

An other additive note is found in the passage in which the Latin text does not record any correspondent detail, unlike the Hungarian source and the Romanian text, in: "Iacă Vergură va prinde în sgăul său, şi va naşte un făt, şi-l va chema acela Immanuel **aceea e aceea Dumnedzeu cu noi**" (12/24–26), cf. Hung. "Ímé egy szűz fogad az ő méhében és szül fiat és nevezed azt Immánuelnek, **velőnk Istennek**", cf. Lat. "Ecce virgo concipier, et pariet filium, et vocabis nomen eius Immanuel"[14]

---

[13]As a matter of fact, this portion also includes two calques based on Hungarian model: a formal calque: *veselitură* 'consolation', cf. Hung. *vigasztal–* 'to make happy (to console)' *–ás* 'noun suffix'; and a semantic calque: *a via* 'to (make) use (of), to take advantage', 'to employ', cf. Hung. *élni* 'to live', *élni valamivel* 'to make use of'.

[14]In fact, the formula *aceea e aceea* 'that is, in other words' is calqued on the Hung. *az az* 'id.', but, in this portion, the Romanian translator employs it independently of the source-text. Nevertheless, on various occasions, this calque is noted in

Similarly, unlike the brevity of the Latin text, the Romanian wording is as detailed and explicit as the Hungarian source, in: "Că pre noi din toate păcatele noastre ne slobozeşte *şi ne ispăseşte*" (15/25 – 16/1), cf. Hung. "Mert minket minden bűneinkből meg szabadít *és üdvözít*", cf. Lat. "Quia nos salvat ab omnibus peccatis nostris"; "Oarecine numele lui de-a-fietele îl va pomeni *au îl va numi*" (34/2–4), cf. Hung. "a' ki az ő nevét hijában említi, *vagy nevezi*", cf. Lat. "qui nomen eius vane usurpaverit"; "De pre rugăciune *au rugare*" (40/15), cf. Hung. "Az imádságrol, *avagy könyörgésről*", cf. Lat. "De Precatione"; "şi cum eu încă acelui şirag sunt o parte vie, *şi fi voi pînă în vecie*" (22/16–17), cf. Hung. "és hogy én is annak a' seregnek egygyik élő tagja vagyok, *és lészek mind örökké*", cf. Lat. "meque vivum huius cœtus membrum esse, et mansurum".

An interesting situation represents the presence of the determiner *sfînt* 'saint', found quite consistently in the Romanian translation and which is also noted in the Hungarian version, but not in the Latin source, like in: "Patru Evangheliomuri: *Sfînt*[ul] Mate[i], *Sfînt*[ul] Marc[u], *Sfînt*[ul] Luca şi *Sfînt*[ul] Ioan" (8/7–10), cf. Hung. "Négy Evangeliomok. *Sz.* Mattheé, *Sz.* Marké, *Sz.* Lukácsé és *Sz.* Jánosé", cf. Lat. "Quatuor Evangelia. Matthæi, Marci, Lucæ, Iohannis"[15]; "carele *Sfînt* Paul Apostol din trei Evangeliştii, din *Sfînt* Matei, *Sfînt* Marc, şi din *Sfînt* Luca aşa citeşte" (29/14–17), cf. Hung. "*Szent* Pál Apostol a' három Evangelistákbol, *Szent* Mathébol, *Szent* Markbol, és *Szent* Lukácsbol így olvas", cf. Lat. "Quam Apostolus Paulus ex tribus Evangelistis, Matthæo, Marco, et Luca sic recitat"; "Cărţi a lu Sfînt Paul Apostol" (8/13–14), cf. Hung. "A *Sz.* Pal Apostol levelei", cf. Lat. "Epistolæ Pauli Apostoli" etc. Unlike the previous cases, however, these inserts are less representative, since they may reflect (also) a certain prior custom of the author or, possibly, a certain kind of standard variety of rendering these contexts.

2.2.2. *Omissions as translation marks*

Compared to the inserts, the amount of omissions observable in Fogarasi's text is less and they usually function as translation marks, indicating the use of the Hungarian source, since the status of *omission* from the Romanian and Hungarian texts may be established compared to its *presence* in the Latin version. In other words, the omission of a word or phrase from the Romanian translation, but which is found in the Latin text, may reflect the influence of the Hungarian model, since that very word or phrase does not appear in the Hungarian text either. Such an example is found in: "Veniţi toţi la mine cari v-aţi ostenit" (10/1–2), cf. Hung. "Jöjjetek én hozzám mindnyájan, akik megfáradtatok", cf. Lat. "Venire ad me omnes, qui fatigati estis *et onerati*".

Similarly, the Latin version includes portions which are not found either in the Hungarian source or in the Romanian translation, which may be regarded as a sign of the Hungarian text's use in that particular passage, like in: "Ce era neputere Legiei Dumnedzeu trimise Fiul său prentru păcat, cum îndereptăciunea Legiei în noi să se umple" (12/11–13), cf. Hung. "A' mi az Törvénynek lehetetlen vala, az Isten az ő Fiát el bocsátá az bűnért, hogy a Törvénynek amaz jussa, avagy meg igazítása mi bennünk bé tellyesednék", cf. Lat. "Qui legis erat impotentia, Deus suo *ipsius* Filio misso, pro peccato, *condemnavit peccatum in carne*, ut jus ilud legis compleatur in nobis".

Both semantically and in terms of its brevity, the Romanian translation renders the Hungarian passage in: "Care (Isus Hristos) este pus nouă de la Dumnedzeu *mîndrie* şi *descumpărăciune*" (16/13–14), cf. Hung. "A' ki (a' Jesus Christus) tétetett mi nekünk az Istentől *böltseséggé és váltsággá*", cf. Lat. "Qui (Christus Iesus) factus est nobis *sapientia* a Deo, justitiaque *et sanctificatio, et redemptio*".

A similar situation is found in: "Căce au păţit Hristos: *Supt* Pontius Pilatus?" (18/13–14), cf. Hung. "Miért szenvedett a' Christus Pontius Pilatus *alatt*?", cf. Lat. "Cur Christus *sub judice* Pontio Pilato passus est?".

---

the same context as its Hungarian formal equivalent *az az* 'that is', (also) corresponding to the Lat. *hoc est*.

[15] On the other hand, the Romanian fragment records the Hungarian pronunciation of the term *evangheliom* 'gospel' (instead of *evanghelie*) and of the proper names Luke and John (cf. Rom. Luca and Ioan) which are written as *Lukáts* and *János* in the Romanian text, just like in the Hungarian source.

Likewise, the passage is more detailed in the Latin version than in the Hungarian source, which omits certain portions, just like the Romanian translation does, in: "El (Mesia) au răbdat dureri prentru hicleniile noastre" (20/10–11), cf. Hung. "Ő (Messias) fájdalommal illettete a' mi álnokságinkért", cf. Lat. "Ipse (Messias) dolore ***afficitur a defectionibus nostris***, atteritur ab iniquitatibus nostris".

3. Conclusions

Taken all together, the inserts recorded in the Calvinist *Catechism* printed in 1648, as well as the omissions executed by Fogarasi reflect a certain translation "theory" of the Romanian translator, his conception of the translation act, in general, and of the functionality and availability of the two sources employed by him, in particular. In this respect, it may be observed that, on several occasions, the Hungarian source enjoys priority over the Latin text, being predominantly, if not exclusively, used in certain passages of the Romanian translation. The Latin version, on the other hand, seems to play a secondary function, being chiefly used as a subsidiary source and, perhaps, as a control or reference-text. As a matter of fact, such a hierarchy regarding the use of the two sources may be sustained on the macrostructural level of the whole translation too, provided that the evidence given by the inserts and omissions corroborate other translation marks, such as the bookish loanwords borrowed directly from the Hungarian source-text, the calques and other smaller or larger constructions which copy Hungarian morpho-syntactic patterns. The predilection for the Hungarian source may (also) be explained by the fact that Hungarian language was perhaps more accessible to the translator than Latin, which he could have mastered but superficially.

The status of inserts and omissions varies from case to case in Fogarasi's text. The units included in or omitted from the Romanian translation play different roles, but, overall, they may be grouped into two main classes, reflecting two different levels of accomplishment. Thus, some of them represent mainly immediate solutions which fall within the realm of *imitation*, since they are produced as a result of certain constraints imposed by the Hungarian source-text. Others may be included in the realm of *creation* since they appear independently of both sources, as a result of the translator's personal intervention. Both the former and the latter ones might have aimed, on the one hand, at comprehension, the translator taking into account, first and foremost, the reader he addressed his text to, and, on the other hand, at enriching and nuancing the utterance, in accordance with the addresser's and the addressee's level of competence, as well as with the availability of old Romanian language. Additionally, some of these inserts and/or omissions reflect a deliberate option of the author, while others may be attributed to "slips", in other words, to causes which are not entirely controlled by consciousness or which are possibly due to the bilingual status of the translator.

Certainly, the main cause of the majority of the inserts and omissions encountered in Fogarasi's text is the differences between the two sources employed, i.e. between the Hungarian and Latin texts. It is interesting, however, that Fogarasi's translation does not record inserts which render exclusively the Latin source, in the sense that they would not be found in the Hungarian version, or omissions which are determined exclusively by the Latin text, in the sense that the Hungarian version would include something more than the Latin and Romanian texts. In each case, the inserts and omissions are either independent of both of the sources or determined by the Hungarian source.

The findings of the present case study could be made use of from a diachronic perspective too, examining the prior and/or subsequent Romanian translations of the Heidelberg catechism, which have led to the relatively standard Romanian version thereof. Additionally, the comparative analysis of the Calvinist catechisms printed in 1648 and 1656 respectively would be of great interest, since both Romanian translations are based on the same Latin-Hungarian version of the Heidelberg catechism. Such a study could provide us more information about the criteria which governed the options of those who translated the catechisms in question and, at the same time, it could offer data regarding the reasons which determined the integral or partial use of a certain source.

Bibliography

A. Text editions

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

Catechismus Az az; A' kereʃztyéni Valláʃnak és Hûtnek Rövid kérdésekben és feleletekben foglaltatot ʃzentirásbeli bizonyʃágokval meg erósittetet ʃummája avagy veleje. Mellyet Deák és magyar nyelvbóI Oláh-nyelvre forditot. Fogarasi Istvan. Lugoʃi már az igaʃʃágot rész szerint meg-iʃmet Olah Magyar Eccleʃiának lelki Páʃztora. [...] Feiervarat Nyomtattatott. Braʃʃai Major Márton áltai 1648. Esztendőben // Catechismus / Aceea e aceea; Summa sau Măduva a uluitei și a credinţei creștinești, cuprinsă în întrebări, și răspunsuri scurte; și cu adevărături din scriptura svăntă. Catechiʃmus Latino, Ungarico, Walchicus Translatus opera ac Studio Stephani Fogaraʃi Symmiʃtae Oppidi Lugas, Anno 1647 die 18, Decembri [...], în ediţia: Tamás, L. (1942). *Fogarasi István kátéja. Fejezet a bánsági és hunyadmegyei ruménség művelődéstörténetéből*, Minerva Irodalmi és Nyomdai Műintézet, Kolozsvár, p. 43–65.

Catechismus Religionis Christianae compendiosè propositus, & sacrarum literarum testimoniis confirmatus. Ex ore infantium et lactentium disposuisti laudem. Psal. 8.3. Matth. 21.16. Albæ Jvliæ. M. DC: XXXXIII [1643] // Catechismus Az az; A' keresztyeni vallásnak és hütnek rövid kérdésekben és feleletekben foglaltatott, szent irásbéli bizonyságokkal megh erössittett summája, avagy veleje. A' még szólni nem tudó és csecsszopo gyermecskéknek szájokbol rendelted véghez vinni a' te dicseretedet. Psal. 8.3. Matt. 21.16. Fejér Váratt. M. DC. XXXXIII. [1643], în ediţia princeps din Biblioteca Muzeului Ardelean (Erdélyi Múzeum Könyvtára) [online]. Vezi și ediţiile: *Catechismus Religionis Christianae...* M.DC.XLVII [1647] și *Catechismus Religionis Christianae...* M.DC.XXXIX [1639].

Gaster, M. (1891). *Chrestomatie română. Texte tipărite și manuscrise [sec. XVI-XIX], dialectale și populare*, cu o introducere, gramatică și un glosar româno-francez de M. Gaster, vol. I, *Introducere, gramatică, texte [1550–1710]*, Lepizig–Bucurescĭ.

Hasdeu, B. P. (1879). *Cuvente den bătrăni, vol. II, Cărţile poporane ale Românilor în secolul XVI în legătură cu literatura poporană cea nescrisă*, București.

B. Bibliographies of old texts

BRV I = Bianu, I. & Hodoș, N. (1903). *Bibliografia românéscă veche 1508–1830*, tomul I, 1508-1716, Ediţiunea Academiei Române, Bucuresci, 1903.

BRU = Veress, A. (1931). *Bibliografia română-ungară*, volumul I, *Românii în literatura ungară și ungurii în literatura română (1473–1780)*, București, 1931.

Veress, E. (1910). *Erdélyi régi oláh könyvek 1544–1711* (10 szövegképpel), în „Erdélyi Múzeum", an V, 1910, vol. XXVII, p. 142–176.

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

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

RMNY III = Heltai, J., Holl, B., Pavercsik, I. & Vásárhelyi, J. (2000). *Régi magyarországi nyomtatványok 1636–1655*, vol. III, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest.

C. References

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

Drăganu, N. (1914). *Două manuscripte vechi. Codicele Todorescu și Codicele Marţian*, București.

Drăganu, N. (1922). *Cea mai veche carte rákóczyană*, în „Anuarul Institutului de Istorie Naţională", I, 1921–1922, Cluj, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Ardealul".

Gheţie, I. (1975). *Baza dialectală a limbii române literare*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Română, București.

Iorga, N. (1904). *Istoria literaturii religioase a românilor pînă la 1688*, București.

Iorga, N. (1928). *Istoria Bisericii românești și a vieţii religioase a românilor*, ed. a II-a, revăzută și adăugită, vol. I, Editura Ministeriului de Culte, București.

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

Marienescu, M. (1902). *Luteranismul, calvinismul și introducerea limbii române în bisericile din Ardeal*, în „Analele Academiei Române", seria II, tom. XXIV, Memoriile Secţiunii Istorice, București, p. 165–190.

Nădejde, I. (1886). *Introducere în istoria limbii și literaturii române*, Iași.

Niculescu, Al. (2006–2007). *Tatăl nostru*, în „Dacoromania", serie nouă, XI-XII, p. 17–75, Cluj-Napoca.

Pantaleoni, D. (2007). *Observaţii asupra textelor românești vechi cu alfabet latin (1570–1703)*, în „Philologica Jassyensia", an III, nr. 1, p. 39–56.

Philippide, A. (1888). *Introducere în Istoria limbei și Literaturei romîne*, Iași.

Sbiera, I. G. (1897). *Mișcări culturale și literare la românii din stânga Dunării în răstimpul de la 1504–1714*, Cernăuţi.