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Abstract

Among the difficulties that have always challenged the translators of the Bible one can mention the adaptation of proper names in each idiom. Certain biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian when the first translations of fragments belonging to the Old and the New Testaments were performed. However, most biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian for the first time in the translation of the Septuagint performed by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) in the second half of the 17th century and preserved in a manuscript copy (the Romanian manuscript no. 45) from the same century. The main source of this translation was an edition of the Septuagint issued in Frankfurt in 1597. In accordance with the spirit of literalism in Bible translation in that period, the main tendency of translators and reviewers was to preserve, as much as possible, the original form of proper names as they appeared in the source-text, attempting, at the same time, to integrate them in the formal system (graphy, declension) of the Romanian language. Starting from the formal particularities of the names in the source-text, we aim at describing certain aspects related to the graphic principles that the transposition of proper names from the Greek source into Ms. 45 was based upon.

1. Introduction

The transposition of proper names from one language into another can be achieved through a number of main procedures: translation (replacing the textual material from the source-language with the textual equivalent in the target language, for example: Gr. Φάραγξ Βότρυος – Valea Strugurelui1), transliteration and transcription (the adaptation of a name form in the source-language to the graphic and morphologic system of the target-language)2. The study of formal adaptation to the Romanian language system of proper names written in another alphabet (different from the Latin alphabet) supposes two main research directions:

1) graphic adaptation: the transposition through transliteration (the replacement of each grapheme from a graphic system by another grapheme belonging to a different graphic system) or through phonetic transcription of proper names from one alphabet into the other3;
2) morphologic adaptation: the participation of proper names in gender, number, case and determination oppositions in the Romanian language (Ichim-Tomescu, 1978, p. 237).

When describing the way Hebrew proper names were adapted in the Septuagint, specialists emphasized the diversity of existing transliterations and transcriptions for the denomination of individual realities,
especially people and places. Such a perspective, applied by Moatti-Fine (1996, p. 69–73) to the study of Iosua (Rom. Ḣissus Navi), a book containing extended lists of proper names, indicates that several factors are responsible for the numerous versions of toponyms:

1) the difficulty to read and to identify most place names in the Hebrew text;
2) the alternation between translation and transliteration in the case of composed descriptive toponyms; sometimes, both forms are present, for example: φάραγγα Ἀχώρ – valea Ahor (Ies, 7, 24);
3) the existence of several formal versions of the same name, for example: Hebrew 'apēkāh (“cetatea lui Iuda” [Judas’ fortress]) is transposed in Greek in the form Phakoua (Ies, 15, 53) in Codex Vaticanus or Aphaka in Codex Alexandrinus (Moatti-Fine, 1996, p. 73); among other aspects, this phenomenon was explained by the existence of several traditions regarding the vocalization of the Hebrew text (Krašovec, 2010, p. 89);
4) the coexistence of the Hellenized forms and the forms which were not adapted to the Greek language system; see point 2).

Some biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian when the first translations of fragments belonging to the Old and the New Testaments were performed: Evangheiul slavo-român (1551–1553), Palia de la Orăștie (1581–1582), Codicele Bratul (1559–1560), etc. Thus, research regarding Palia de la Orăștie (1581–1582), a text comprising the translation from Hungarian and Latin into Romanian of the first two books of the Pentateuch, reveal the absence of a unitary system in the transposition of proper names into Romanian, a situation which could be explained by the different degree in which those names were known (the ones that were known and the ones that were often used were used in a unique form), their relevance within the text, the use of multiple sources, the principle of non-altering the source-text by translation, the knowledge of the translation techniques, etc. (Pamfil, 1982; Gafton, 2007).

Most biblical proper names were adapted into Romanian for the first time in the translation of the Septuagint performed by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) in the second half of the 17th century and preserved in a manuscript copy (Ms. 45) at the Romanian Academy Library in Cluj. The main source of this translation was an edition of the Septuagint issued in Frankfurt in 1597 (SEPT. 1597). Besides this edition, a number of other sources were used, among which an edition of the Greek text printed in London in 1653 (SEPT. 1653), which was used only up to the book I Paralipomenon, as shown in the foreword of the manuscript (Cuvîntu înainte cătră cititori, p. 909):

Iară și noi, pre lingă izvodul lui Necolăie, am mai alăturat și alte izvoade grecești, pren care izvoade fost- au unul carele au fost tipărit la Englitëra, ci și acesta nu să potrivia cu cel de la Frangofort; pentru căci pren bogate locuri adăogea și pren bogate locuri lipsiia, nu venia cu cestalalt; pentru acêea, lipsele nu s-au socotit, iar adaosele s-au pus, precum vom face doslușirea mai jos cu însemnări. Și așa am venit cu acela izvod pină la Paralipómenon dentîi.

[We have added to Necolăie’s text/source some other Greek texts/sources, among which there was one printed in England, which was different from the one printed in Frankfurt; there were, in many instances, differences between them, information that was either missing or fragments where much more was said; the two versions did not match; this is why we did not take the missing parts into account and we explained below in our notes. And we have used that text/source (printed in England) up to the book Paralipómenon I.]

1See the order of the books in SEPT. 1597 and the abbreviation used for the books of the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS).
2Regarding the paternity of the revised copy of Ms. 45, see Cândea (1979, p. 106–128), Onu (1984), Andriescu (1988, p. 17–25), and Ursu (2002, p. 7–133).
3It refers to the Aldine version, revised according to editions issued in Complutense, Antwerp, Strasbourg, and Rome (Copinger, 2002, p. 94).
4Among others, it refers to a Slavonic translation of the Bible (OSTR.) and a Latin version (VULG.).
The literality of the translation from Ms. 45, which implies a tendency towards the preservation of the original forms from the source-text, the different graphic forms, the coexistence of two different alphabets, as well as the translator’s attempt to adapt the biblical onomastics to the Romanian language, are some of the aspects that have contributed to the degree of integration of biblical proper names from Greek into Romanian. Starting from the formal particularities of proper names in the Greek text, we will limit our approach to describing a series of aspects related to the graphic adaptation of proper names in Ms. 45. In literal translation, where the morphological forms of proper names as they appear in the original are often preserved, some specifications regarding the declension of proper names from the Greek source-text (Sept. 1597) are mandatory for the proper understanding of certain graphic forms as they appear in the Romanian version.

2. Formal particularities of proper names in the Septuagint

A general characteristic of the onomastics in the Septuagint is the fact that, besides some Hebrew proper names ending in a vowel, usually adapted to the morphological system of the Greek language, there are a high number of proper names ending in a consonant, which are transliterated and consequently not declined in Greek (Γαλαάδ, Αρφαζάδ, Ἐλείμ, Ἑνώχ, Ἰσραήλ, etc.).

2.1. Names of people (anthroponyms)

a) Thackeray (1909, p. 161) includes in the category of Hebrew proper names that could be declined in Greek (according to the 1st declension) most masculine personal proper names that end in a vowel (Ἰωάννης, Μωυσής, etc.) and a series of female proper names (Ἄννα, Γαβριήλ, Ζήλη, Ασία, Σάρρα, Σοφοκλή, etc.). According to the British philologist, proper names declined according to the 2nd (–ας) and the 3rd (–ης, –ος, etc.) declension are almost non-existent in the Septuagint, except for the book 1 Esd, where they constantly occur (Ἀδύνας, Ἀβραὰμ, etc.). In Sept. 1597, the name Moisei [Moses] occurs declined in the genitive according to the 3rd declension: gen. Μωυσίου (3 Esd, 8, 3), τοῦ Μωυσίου (1 Suppl, 26, 24); in Ms. 45, these forms were transposed as follows: a lui Moisei, under the influence of the Slavic form мо́йчи (Săvu, 2011, p. 119), al lui Moiseu, where the Greek ending is adapted.

b) Theophoric biblical proper names (i.e., which include the name of God, ‘el) are usually Hellenized by adding the termination –ιας (genitive in –ιος), being declined according to the 1st declension, for example: Ἄννα, Ἀννίας, Ἐλίκτυρα, Ζαχαρίας, Ζαχαρίας, Σοφοκλή, Σοφοκλη, etc. The genitive ending in –α is less frequent: e.g. Μιχαήλ, Μιχαήλια, Ιωσία, Ιωσία, Σεδεκία (Thackeray, 1909, p. 161–162). In Sept. 1597, both genitive terminations of the name Михаи́л may occur—Михаи́л (4 Rgns, 22, 12) and Михаи́л (2 Suppl, 34, 20)—, transposed differently in Ms. 45: lui Mihéi, preserving the form and using the proclitic article for the genitive and Mihéii (adapting the name to the morphological system of the Romanian language by enclitic articulation), respectively.

c) In the Septuagint, as a rule, the names of people ending in –ων, a termination of Hebrew origin (הוֹן, סָמַיִם, etc.), are not declined in Greek. Among these, a special case is represented by the name Σαλομών, which was transferred from Hebrew into Greek through graphic and phonetic adaptation: Ἀλλάς – Σαλομών – Ἀλλάς – Σαλομών10. According to Sept. 1597, the forms of this name are also preserved in Ms. 45, for example: Salomon (3 Esd, 8, 35) – Solomon (the prevailing form).

---

8 Regarding the formal particularities of proper names in the Septuagint, see Thackeray (1909), Moreno Hernández (1988), Dufour (1990), and Kroumov (2010).

9 In Sept. 1597, the forms that were not declined were used as such for the genitive and dative cases, without being integrated in the Romanian language declension in Ms. 45, for instance: Χίλου Ἰσραήλ – “filii Israel” [the sons of Israel] (Ex, 6, 6) and μέσον Ἐλιμ – “miilor Elim” [the middle of Elim] (Ex, 16, 1); see further examples in Ursu (2002, p. XII). However, their morphological adaptation into Romanian does not make the object of our study.

10 For detailed explanations, see Thackeray (1909, p. 162) and Dufour (1990, p. 56).
d) In Sept. 1597, some anthroponyms have several graphic forms, for example: Ἀμελσάδ (Dan, 1, 16) / Ἀμηλσάλ (Dan, 1, 11), Βανάκ (3Rgns, 4, 16) / Βανά (3Rgns, 4, 12), cf. Amelsad / Amelsal, Vaná / Vaná (Ms. 45).

2.2. Names of places (toponyms) and nations (ethnonyms)

a) As far as toponyms are concerned, in the Septuagint the forms transcribed from Hebrew coexist with the Hellenized ones (see Thackeray, 1909, p. 166; Moatti-Fine, 1996, p. 71): Ἐδώμ – θυσμαία, Σχέχ – Σίμαρα, Σομρῶν / Σομρῶν – Σμαρ(ε)ία, Σόρ – Τύρος, Τάλαδα – Ταλαδίτις, etc. The Greek translators were actually familiar with the biblical geography, and consequently with the Greek correspondents of the proper names for places and nations, for example: Rom. Ετιούπα για Καστόρ, Γαβλόν, Μεσοποταμία and Σιρία για Αράμ. In Ms. 45, these are usually preserved as in the Greek source.

b) As regards proper names ending in –a, besides the names of countries declined according to the 1st declension (e.g. Τὰ Ζα, Σαμαρσία) and the names of towns usually declined according to the 2nd declension for neuter nouns in the plural (e.g. Ταλάγα, –ων, –ος; Σίμαρα, –ών), in the Septuagint there are also indeclinable proper names denoting places, for example: Φασγά, Βεστολάνυ, Βοσσάρα, etc. The same situation occurs for the names ending in –η, which occur either inflected (e.g. acc. Μαμβρή, Νινεύη), or uninflected (e.g. Μαμβρῆ, Νινεῦθ) (Thackeray, 1909, p. 162 and 167). The uninflected forms in Sept. 1597 are also preserved in Ms. 45 (e.g. Φασγά, Μαμνού, Νενεύ, Βετούλαυ). In Sept. 1597, the toponyms ending in –ων can be uninflected (e.g. Κηδρά, Σηρών) or inflected (e.g. Ασκάλων, –ώνα), the latter being sometimes transferred in Ms. 45 together with their Greek desinences: acc. εἰς Ασκάλωνά – Ασκάλονα (Judg, 14, 19), but Ascalon (1Makk, 10, 86).

c) The proper names in Sept. 1597 have doublets (vocalized or non-vocalized forms) of the type: Μαγγέω, Μαγγέω / Μαγγόνο. These are also transposed in Ms. 45: Magghedó (Esa, 10, 28), Maggedó (4Rgns, 9, 27) / Magdon (1Rgns, 14, 2).

d) Hebrew ethnonyms are either borrowed, in which case the Hebrew ending in –i, –ith is preserved, or adapted to the Greek language system, usually with the endings –αις (designating the member of a tribe) or –(ε)ίτης (indicating the inhabitant of a town), for example: Χαλαάι – Χαλαάιτης, Χαλαάιος. Thackeray (1909, p. 171) argues that the principle behind the choice in this case cannot be determined, indicating at the same time the predominance of the termination –ίτης, which would better reflect the Hebrew model in –ith. In Ms. 45, the suffix –ίτης is predominant, for instance: Αμαουάτις – Αμαουάτιτις (Neh, 13, 1), Ασκάλωτης – Ασκάλωτιτις (1Rgns, 5, 10), Κορίτας – Κορίτιτις (1Suppl, 9, 19), ac. Κορίταις – Κορίταιτις (Iexez, 25, 16), gen. Ελαμιτῶν – Ελαμιτιτῶν (Esa, 11, 11) / Ελαμιτίται – Ελαμιτιτίται (Esd, 4, 9), Ἰσραηλίται – Ἰσραηλίταιτις (4Makk, 4, 22), gen. τῶν Ἰσραηλίτων – οἱ Ἰσραηλίται (2Makk, 12, 7) / Ἰσραηλίται – Ἰσραηλίταιτις (2Makk, 12, 3), Ἰσραηλίτας – Ἰσραηλίταιτης (Ps, 82, 5), Ἰσραηλίτας – Ἰσραηλίταιτης (4Makk, 18, 1), gen. Μαουάτων – Μαουάτωτις (Gen, 19, 37) / Μαουάτιων – Μαουάτιτις (1Suppl, 18, 2), Σαμαρίταις – Σαμαρίταιτις (4Rgns, 17, 29), Τρωγλοδύταις – Τρωγλοδύταιτις (2Suppl, 12, 3), etc. Sometimes, the same Greek form of an ethnonym is rendered with both Romanian suffixes, –iți and –itean(i), for example: “[...] au omorit pre gavaoniții (acc. Țâbaonița). Și au chemat împăratul David pre gavaoniței (acc. Țâbaoniță) și au dzis cătră ei. Și gavaoniții (nom. Țâbaoniță) nu-s fiu lui Israel, fără numai den singelege amoraului [...]” (2Rgns, 21, 1–2).

In Ms. 45, some ethnonyms are used to indicate the country. This procedure consists of “using the name of a people, in singular or plural, in order to indicate the country inhabited by that people” (Arvinte, 1988, p. 49). Thus, the Greek ethnonyms in accusative singular (τὸν Χειτταῖον, τὸν Ἑβουσαῖον, τὸν Λαμβαίαν, Λοουκαῖον, τὸν Αμβαῖον, τὸν Ἐσσαῖον, τὸν Ἑρμών, τὸν Λαμπαδίαν, etc.), that were adapted in Ms. 45 to the forms Hetteu, Ievuseu, Amorreu, Arucheu, Eveu, Esemneu, Gherheseu, Arudeu (1Suppl, 1, 14–16: “Și pre Hetteu și pre Ievuseu și pre Amorreu și pre Gherheseu și pre Eveu și pre

See explanations and further examples in Moreno Hernández (1988, p. 276–277).
3. Graphic particularities of proper names in Ms. 45

Beyond the obvious effort to adapt the proper names from the Frankfurt Septuagint (1597) into Ms. 45, we recognize the preference displayed by the Romanian translator / revisers for rendering the original as accurately as possible, as well as their attempt to coherently apply a system of transliteration and transcription from Greek into the Romanian language written in Cyrillic script.

3.1. The preference for rendering the original as accurately as possible

In Ms. 45, the translator generally transposes the proper names from sept. 1597 as accurately as possible, sometimes even taking the case endings from Greek into Romanian, for example: a) anthroponyms: Eliezer (Gen, 36, 41), Vithellas (Neb, 3, 20), Adonias (3Rgns, 2, 19), Anania (aMakk, 16, 21), lui Vanés (3Rgns, 2, 25), Iasifos, for Iasifos (1Makk, 5, 60), but Iosif, for Iosif (1Makk, 2, 53 and passim), Sosipatra (2Makk, 12, 24), Sosipatros (2Makk, 12, 19), etc.; b) toponyms: Aradion (Gen, 10, 18), Vachüros (3Esd, 9, 24), Diospalis (Iezek, 30, 16), Tirós (3Rgns, 7, 13), Sichimon for Σιχιμών (Gen, 33, 18)12, etc. Despite the rendition of these names in their Greek declension, we do not believe the translator or the revisers of the text were not familiar with them (Savu, 2011, p. 95); we rather think this is a tendency to preserve the original form.

Certain biblical proper names used at the same time or prior to the first Romanian translations of the texts used in religious service, that is to say texts that were already known (Gafton, 2007, p. 86), are rendered in only one form, while others occur in several versions, which might be explained by the possible discontinuities in the source-text, as well as by the continuous attempt of the translator to adapt the form of these names to the Romanian language system. Thus, the unadapted form often occurs besides the adapted one, as in: Ἀχιέζερ – Alchimos (1Makk, 7, 5), but Ἀχιμαζός – Alchim (1Makk, 7, 21 and passim).

The translator of Ms. 45 preserved as faithfully as possible the form of proper names in sept. 1597, assuming the inconsistencies of the text, without standardizing the names that had more than one graphic form in the Greek text. For example, the toponym Βρθσμώθ – Vithsimoth (Ies, 12, 3) also occurs in the form Βρθσμώ – Vithsimoth (Ies, 13, 20); the anthroponym Abimelec, written Ἀχιμέλεχ / Ἀχιμέλεξ / Ἀβιμέλεξ, was transposed as such (Abimelech / Avimelech; with or without the accent) in most cases (58 occurrences), with a few exceptions, probably caused by the negligence of the translator, or the person who made the revision or copy, for example: Avimelech (1Rgns, 21, 2), but Ἀχιμέλεξ (sept. 1597), Avimelech (Ps, 51, in the title), but Ἀβιμέλεξ (sept. 1597), transposed into Romanian without accent. In the case of the anthroponym Abiërzer, in sept. 1597 there are three graphic versions, transposed as such in Ms. 45: Ἀβιεζερ – Abiërzer (1Suppl, 11, 28), Ἀβιεζερ – Abiërzer (Ies, 17, 2), Ἀβιεζερ – Aviërzer (1Suppl, 7, 18 and passim); under Judges, 6, 34, the translator probably renders the name from the gloss in the footnote (Ἀβιεζερ), and not the one in the text (Ἀβιμελεξ). However, tendencies towards standardization might occur: Fud / Fudu – Φοῦδ (Esa, 66, 19; Na, 3, 9; Gen, 10, 6), but Fud – Φοῦδ (1Suppl, 1, 8), instead of Futh. The genitive form Μῶσεῖς (2Suppl, 23, 18) was graphically transposed in Ms. 45 in the form lui Moisei, probably under the influence of either the corresponding footnote in the source (“al. Μωϋσε”; or the predominant form of the name in the manuscript or in other texts from that period (Mois)).

3.2. The attempt to consequently apply a system of transliteration and transcription of proper names from Greek into the Romanian language written in Cyrillic script

A language notes the sounds of another language from the perspective of its own phonetic-graphic correspondences (Agafonov et al., 2006, p. 629). Consequently, the formal adaptation of biblical proper names from the Greek language into Cyrillic Romanian must be discussed from two perspectives: the translation

---

12 For further examples, see Ursu (2002, p. XIII).
perspective, concerning the transposition of proper names from the Greek language / alphabet (Sept. 1597) into the Romanian language written in the Cyrillic alphabet (Ms. 45), and also the interpretative transcription from Cyrillic (Ms. 45) into Latin script.

a) Initial capital letter
In Romanian, the initial capital letter is the graphic mark of proper names. However, the analysis of the old Romanian biblical texts reveals that the initial capital letter is not necessarily a constant characteristic of proper names (see Po, BB, Micu, etc.). According to the model of the Septuagint printed in Frankfurt (1597), proper names are not usually marked by the initial capital letter in Ms. 45; the exception is provided by the first two biblical books, Genesis and Exodus. In some instances, however, even within the same fragment (ex. Num, 1, 5–10), the proper names are either marked or unmarked by initial capital letter.

b) The treatment of geminates
With regard to proper names, in Ms. 45 the author commonly preserves the duplication of the consonants as in the Greek source text, for instance: Ἀχισαμαι – ἀχίσαμαι – Abisamne (1Suppl, 2, 32), Ἀσδάφατς – ἄσδαφατς – ἀσδαφάτης – Aththaratis (3Esd, 9, 50), Ἀξιαῖος – ἀξιαῖος – Accia (Esd, 2, 45), Kappadokia – καππαδοκία – Cappadocia (Am, 9, 7), but Καππαδοκίας – καππαδοκία – Capadocia (Deut, 2, 23), Αύδα – αὐδα – Lida (1Makk, 11, 34), Μανασσῆς – μανάσσης – Manasi (1Suppl, 3, 13), but Μανασση – μανασή – Manasi (1Suppl, 5, 18), Ὀδολλάμ – ὀδολλάμ – Odollam (1Suppl, 11, 15), but Ὀδολλάμ – ὀδολλάμ – Odolam (2Makk, 12, 38). Ms. 45 transcribes the aspirated geminate consonant ḫ, which in Sept. 1597 occurs together with the dissimilated forms (also transposed as such in the Romanian manuscript): Μαθθανίας – Maththania (2Suppl, 29, 13), cf. Μαθθανίας – Matthianias (1Suppl, 25, 4).

As far as the source-text is concerned, there are also inconsistencies regarding the transcription of proper names, for example: Σολόσανα – solosa – Sosãna (Sous, 1, 3), Ἡγγανιή – ἤγγανη – Inganim (Ies, 19, 21), Ἀμανί – ἄμανί – Ammaní (Neh, 3, 2), etc.; also, the groupl –mmt – from the anthroponym Ammon – ἀμοῦν – 2Rgns, 13, 1 and other 14 occurrences in the same book) does not reflect the form of the original name, i.e. Ἱμνών (Sept. 1597). These forms cannot be explained through the secondary sources either (Sept. 1653, Ostr., Vulg.).

c) Breathings
In Ms. 45, the smooth breathing [ʼ] is regularly rendered in the orthography of proper names: Ἄραβια – ἄραβια – Aravia (1Makk, 11, 16), Ἡλιοῦπολις – ἥλιοῦπολις – Helioúpolis (1Rgns, 1, 9f.), Ἀλαμ – ἀλα – Elam (2Rgns, 10, 16), etc. The rough breathing [ʼ], pronounced in Greek as /h/, is transcribed as smooth breathing in Ms. 45 in such cases as: Ἰσραηλίσιμος – Ἰσραηλίσιμος – Jerusalem (2Rgns, 10, 14f.), Ἡλιούπολις – ἥλιουπολίς – Ἱριπόλεως (Ex, 1, 11), Ἡλιόδωρος – ἥλιοδωρός – Iliodor (2Makk, 3, 13 and passim), Ἀχεχάρ – ἀχεχάρ – Acher (Neh, 3, 22), etc.

d) Stress
The issue regarding the stress of proper names denomiating countries in Romanian was extensively treated by Arvinte (2008, p. 110–124). The author has demonstrated, by means of edifying examples, the existence of two ways of placing the stress in proper names of countries ending in –ia in the old period of the Romanian language:

α) when the stress falls on the penultimate syllable (e.g. Asia, Chilichia, Macedonia, Persia, Rusia, Siria), the proper name can be included in the Greek denominative system, which was used in the Romanian language between the 17th century and the beginning of the 19th century, when the circulation of the Greek printings was very well represented in the Romanian countries;

β) when the stress falls on the ante-penultimate syllable (e.g. Aravia, Capadôchia, Gália, Grécia, Machidônia, Trácia), this reflects the Latin denomination system of scholarly origin “that was constituted
for longer than four centuries of Romanian culture, nowadays being predominant in the educated language” (Arvinte, 2008, p. 113). In old literary Romanian there used to be a competition between the two modes of placing the stress.

The stress is generally not marked in the case of proper names containing superscript letters, as in: Ἐννώμ – ἔνωμ (1Es, 18, 16), Vîtham – ὑθαμ (1Es, 19, 27), Thêmanon – ἦμανων (1Suppl, 1, 45), Telmon – μεθεμω (1Suppl, 9, 17), Ἀδριάδων – ἀδραδων (1Suppl, 5, 19).

The position of the stress on the last vowel of proper names in Greek (–ια), especially in the long lists of names (genealogies), could be explained by the fact that these names were not adapted to the Greek language system (nominative in –ια, genitive in –ια), but they were just transliterated from Hebrew (–ια): Samâ (1Suppl, 8, 13), Iesfâ (1Suppl, 8, 16), Vareâ (1Suppl, 8, 21), Adriâ (1Suppl, 8, 22), Veriâ (1Suppl, 23, 11), etc. Thackeray (1909, p. 162) explains this phenomenon by other additions to the genealogic lists—i.e., proper names from other sources in which the names were not declined; evidence in this respect could be provided by the proper names marked in some editions between square brackets, as in: Καὶ ἰεσϑάν, καὶ ἀβὲρ, καὶ ἐλιὴλ [καὶ ἀδρια]. Being uninflected in Greek, the names ending in –(ε)o were transposed as such in Ms. 45, for example: Ανδιν (Ανδ), Iliuí (3Rgs, 4Rgs).

Sometimes, although present in the source-text, the stress is not marked in Ms. 45: Ierusalim / Ierusalim, Iothro / Iothor, Iamna / Iamnâ, Ionathan / Ionâthan, etc. In other cases, there are double-stress forms, as in: gen. Ιλιῷπολι (Gen, 41, 50 and 46, 20), Gr. Ηλιουπόλεως, cf. Ιλιῳπολί (Gen, 41, 45). This phenomenon could be explained by the fact that the proper name is a composed descriptive proper name: Ηλιού πόλεως. An error made by the person who translated or copied the text might explain a form such as Ἐκβάτανα (2Mabk, 9, 3), cf. Gr. Ἐκβάτανα.

The stress placed on the final vowels (Manvri / Manviri, Sichima / Sichimá, etc.) comes from the Greek source-text, where it marks an uninflected proper name form (see supra, 2.2.b.).

c) Inexact transpositions from Greek into Romanian

In Ms. 45, some proper names do not reflect the forms in the source-text. These inconsistencies can be placed in the transcription errors category, as in the following examples: Βαβυλώνα – Vâilor (Ier, 50, 11), Ασσûr – Assûs (Iezek, 32, 29), Βασιλεία – Vâsîlia (Neb, 12, 9 and 25), Ἐννώμ – Ἐνομ (Ies, 18, 16), Βεσλείλ – Veselil (Ex, 38, 22), Ἀγγίθ – Angheth (3Rgs, 2, 13), Ierâon – Ieštîran (1Suppl, 1, 41), Naassôn – Naasson (1Suppl, 2, 11).

As we are dealing with a manuscript, some proper names (wrongly transposed or recreated according to other editions) are corrected in the text according to sept. 1597, above the line, or inside the line, by giving the entire version between square brackets, as in the case of Vethâri [na] (Ies, 15, 6), or [Ș]em (Ies, 17, 2). Others are corrected on the side of the text, for example: for Sovohé (2Rgns, 21, 18) the correction χ (b) is indicated on the side of the text, above the letter χ (ib), pointing to the form Sovohe, cf. Gr. Σοβοχ [SEPT. 1597].

Sporadically, in Ms. 45, some prepositions left untranslated in Romanian were attached to the proper name: the form ἐν Βεθλωμών (3Es, 5, 31) renders the Greek sequence ἐν Βεθλωμῶν (“from Vethlomon”), an error which is signalled on the side of the text by a red sign “[”, which marks the separate transcription of the Greek pessages, i.e. den [from].

f) The system of transliteration and transcription of proper names from Greek (SEPT. 1597) into Romanian (Ms. 45)

Starting from a proper names index of Ms. 45, Table 1 indicates the specific rules for the graphic transcription of proper names from Greek into the Romanian language written in both Cyrillic and Latin scripts.

13The meaning of these signs is explained in the foreword of the manuscript (Cuvintul înainte către cititorii, p. 909): “Iar unde vei vedea acesta semnu cu roșiu [ ] și la mijloc iarăși cuvinte, să știți că l-am aflat mai mult intru izvodul Engleții” [Where you will see this sign in red [ ] and in the middle other words, you must know that I found it [i.e. the text/source] in the English source].
| Signs | Specific contexts | Transposition into Romanian |
|-------|------------------|-----------------------------|
|       | Cyrillic script  | Latin script                |
| α     | a                | a                           |
| αυ (diphth.) | αφ, αβ | αf, αv                      |
| αι (diphth.) | ι | e                           |
| β     | b                | v                           |
| γ     | g                | g                           |
| γ + ε, η, ι | γε, γη | ghe, gbi                    |
| δ     | d                | d                           |
| ε     | e                | e                           |
| ευ (diphth.) | ef, eb | ef, ev                      |
| ει (diphth.) | ι | i                           |
| ζ     | z                | z                           |
| η     | ι, ι            | i, i                        |
| θ     | th               | th                          |
| ι     | i                | i                           |
| ι     | i                | i                           |
| κ     | c                | c                           |
| κ + ε, η, ι | κε, κι | che, chi                    |
| κ + χ | кχ | kh                          |
| ι     | l                | l                           |
| ι     | m                | m                           |
| ν     | n                | n                           |
| ντ    | nd               | nd                          |
| ξ     | x                | x                           |
| ο     | o                | o                           |
| οι (diphth.) | ι | i                           |
| ου (diphth.) | ου | u                           |
| π     | p                | p                           |
| ρ     | r                | r                           |
| σ, ζ  | c                | s                           |
| σ     | z (rarely)      | z                           |
| τ     | t                | t                           |
| ι     | i                | i                           |
| ι     | i                | i                           |
| φ     | φ                | f                           |
| χ     | χ                | b                           |
| ψ     | ψ                | ps                          |
| ω     | ω                | o                           |

Table 1: Transliteration and transcription system of proper names from Sept. 1597 into Ms. 45.
The table above allows us to make a few remarks regarding the transposition of Greek proper names into Cyrillic Romanian, as well as their transcription in the Latin alphabet. Thus, as far as Greek consonants are concerned, there are no major difficulties regarding their transposition from the Greek into the Cyrillic alphabet. There are, however, a few exceptions:

a) the double consonant ψ is transliterated in Ms. 45 through the Cyrillic letter ѵ, transcribed in the Latin alphabet by ps: Ψυτερήνης – ѵытєрєнє – Psalmotanis (Gen, 41, 45), Αψυφός – аъăпăфŏ – Lampson (1Rgs, 27, 8), Σαψία – съăпъє – Sampsi (Esd, 4, 8). Sometimes, although occurring in sept. 1597, the double consonant ψ is not rendered in Ms. 45, for example: Σαψї – съăлъє – Samsé (Esd, 4, 17 and 23);

b) the velar geminate consonant –γγ– is transcribed in Ms. 45 by the consonant г (ng): Αγγεί – гѫгє – Anghe (Gen, 13, 3), Αγγίδ – гѫгидъ – Anghid (1Suppl, 3, 2), Αγγαγεί – гѫгагъє – Amangari (1Rgs, 20, 20). Sometimes, the geminate –γγ– is only transliterated (rr, gg), as in: Αγγεί – аъăгъє – Eszdicam (1Suppl, 3, 22).

c) the consonantal group –ντ– is transcribed in Ms. 45 by ηδ (nd), as in: Αντίόχος – аъăдъє – Andioh (Gen, 39, 1);

d) rarely, instead of the consonant σ (σ), Ms. 45 renders ѵ (z), which indicates voicing the Greek consonant σ in Romanian, as in: τοῦ ᾿Εσδρα – ездръє – Ezdrui (only two occurrences out of 56), cf. Εσδριάμ – еъдриакъє – Ezdricam (1Suppl, 3, 22).

As far as Greek vowels are concerned, they are transposed into the Cyrillic alphabet in several ways:

a) the Greek vowel ε is transcribed in Ms. 45 as follows:

— by the letter e (e), as in: Ῥεὶδορος – еъдъє – Ecvatáno (2Makk, 9, 3), Ζοροβάκσε – зоробвакъє – Zorovavel (Zach, 4, 6), Ἰουσαγεί – иъсъє – Vokhé (1Suppl, 6, 5);

— rarely, by the letters а and й, as in: Βεθλεέμ – въладѣемъ / въладѣєме (Judg, 17, 8–9);

b) the long Greek vowel η is rendered in Ms. 45 as follows:

— by the letter ι (i), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ἰλιόδωρος – иълъдѡровъ – Ilíodor (2Makk, 3, 13), Ἰγγαγεί – иъгагъє – Inganim (Ies, 19, 21), Γηφάρ – гъфъє – Ghifar (Esa, 60, 6), Δανιήλ – дънъє – Daniil (1Makk, 2, 60), Μανασσῆ – мънасе – Manasi (1Suppl, 5, 18);

— rarely, by the sign ι (i), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ρεηδά – ръдâ – Reilá (1Suppl, 2, 15);

— rarely, by the letter е (e): ᾿Ησα – еъса – Esav (Num, 24, 18);

c) the Greek vowel ι is rendered in Ms. 45 in two ways. In Greek, when ι is preceded by a vowel with which it does not form a diphthong, it is written as і, being transcribed in Ms. 45 as follows:

— by the letter τ (t), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ατί – аъă – Ați (1Suppl, 1, 40), Ἀβασσάι – абъсаъє – Avessai (1Suppl, 2, 16), Βανεί – βаъє – Vanei (Esd, 10, 34), Γαί – гаъ – Gai (4Rgs, 9, 27);

— rarely, by the sign ι (i), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Καίναν – каъинъє – Cainán (1Suppl, 1, 2);

d) the short Greek vowel ο is rendered in Ms. 45 by the Cyrillic letters ϑ or ω, although there is no firm rule that would impose one of these two letters: Καππαδοκία – каъпѧдѡкъє – Cappadocbia (Am, 9, 7), but Καππαδοχίας – кѧпѧдѡкъє – Cappadochiâ (Deut, 2, 23), Ὀδωλάμ – одълълаъє – Odollam (1Suppl, 11, 15), but Ôδωλάμ – удълълаъє – Odolam (2Makk, 12, 38);

e) the short Greek vowel υ is transcribed in Ms. 45, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, by the letters η and і (i): Ασσύρια – аъсъє – Assiriа (4Makk, 13, 9), Ῥιὸς – ръи – Tiрос (3Rgs, 9, 12), Ἀσσύρια – аъсъє – Lidda (1Makk, 11, 34). In Greek, whenever the vowel υ is preceded by another vowel with which it does not form a diphthong, it is noted і, being transcribed in Ms. 45 by the sign ι (i): Μυτίστος – мъуъе – Moiseu (1Suppl, 26, 24); in some cases it seems to be taken as such from Greek: Ιωάν – іоъъє – Ioián (1Suppl, 1, 5), but Ιωάν – иъоъъє – Ioián (1Suppl, 1, 7).
The transposition of certain diphthongs from Greek into Cyrillic Romanian raises a number of issues:

a) the Greek diphthong αι is transcribed in Ms. 45 as follows:
   — by the letter е (ë), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Αϊλάμ – еλα” – Elam (2Rgn, 10, 16), Εὐαίον – Ėbe8 – Even (1Suppl, 1, 15), Βασιά – бася – Varia (1Suppl, 8, 21);
   — by the letter а: Σαββαίας – сабваи – Savattiós (Neh, 11, 16), Αβαία – абаиа – Adea (2Suppl, 23, 1), but Αβαία – абаиа – Adea (1Suppl, 8, 21), cf. Αβία – абия – Athia (Neh, 11, 4), Μαρζέλλαι – марзеллаи – Merzellé (Esd, 2, 61), Берзеллай – берзеллай – Verzelé (Neh, 7, 63). We have transcribed the Cyrillic letter а by the sign е, as it is the equivalent of the Greek diphthong αι, pronounced /e/, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation;

β) the Greek diphthong αυ is transcribed in Ms. 45, alternately, by аф or аи (af, ai), according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation: Ησαύ – исаул – Isaf (1Makk, 5, 3), but Ησαύ – исаул – Isav (1Makk, 5, 65); Αβάναυ – аваннау – Avnan (1Suppl, 2, 3), Ναζαyclopedia – назаи – Nazaf (Gen, 22, 22). In the case of the name Isaf (1Makk, 5, 3), a marginal note/gloss indicates the pronunciation /v/ instead of /f/;

γ) the Greek diphthong ει is transcribed in Ms. 45, according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, by the letters ει or ι (i): Αφείρ – афир – Afir (Gen, 25, 4), Αφείροδ – афирод – Adëa (Judg, 4, 4), Ιαβεῖς – иваи – Iavis (1Suppl, 10, 11), Σαββάτια – саббатиа – Samaria (2Suppl, 28, 15);

δ) whenever followed by a consonant, the Greek group of vowels ει is transcribed in Ms. 45 according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation, as follows:
   — by еф (ef): Ευφάτστον – ефатстон – Efástar (1Makk, 6, 17), Ευφάτστον – ефатстон – Efástar (Deut, 11, 24);
   — by еβ (ev): Ευφάτστον – ефатстон – Evástar (2Makk, 10, 10), Ευπόλεμον – еповломон – Evápolemon (1Makk, 8, 17), Ευψεμιο – епсемио – lui Evemieni (1Makk, 8, 8). Whenever the group ει is followed by a vowel, it is transliterated as ev: Ευαίον – ебе8 – Even (1Suppl, 1, 15), Ευλιάτ – елиа – Evilat (Gen, 2, 11).

The Greek endings –αιος and –αιον are transcribed in Ms. 45 by the group е8 (ev): Αχραθαῖος – Ahratheu (Preamble to Esth, 13), Αχραθαῖον – Ahratheu (Preamble to Esth, 14), etc.

4. Conclusions

The graphic form of proper names in Ms. 45, with some minor exceptions (transliteration / transcription errors, certain cases of standardization, etc.), their form in the main source-text, the Septuagint printed in Frankfurt (1597); the secondary sources were not considered in this respect. Some forms are corrected in the text according to the London version (1653) of the Greek text, used by the reviser of the translation provided by Nicolae Spătarul (Milescu) up to the book 1 Paralipomenon.

The main source-text displays, in turn, numerous inconsistencies regarding the form of proper names, mainly caused by the literal translation practice, which has generally imposed the preservation of the Hebrew form of proper names and only sporadically allowed their adaptation to the morphological system of the Greek language. In Ms. 45, some anomalous forms from the source-text (multiple graphic versions of the same name and different denomination modalities of the same individual) are preserved. The attempts to standardize certain forms as well as the transcription errors from the Greek into the Cyrillic alphabet are rare. Moreover, beyond the existence of several Cyrillic signs used to render the same Greek sign, we can still emphasize the translator’s / reviser’s attempt to consequently apply a set of transliteration and transcription norms in the proper names transposition from the Greek into the Romanian language (according to the Reuchlinian pronunciation). The systematic study of the integration of Greek biblical proper names into the Romanian declension will complete the perspective upon the formal specificity of proper names in the first Romanian translation of the Septuagint (Ms. 45).
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