

**„ALEXANDRU IOAN CUZA” UNIVERSITY - IAȘI  
FACULTY OF LETTERS**

**CRISTINA - MARIANA LUNGU (CĂRĂBUȘ)**

***NAMES OF ANIMALS IN ROMANIAN BIBLICAL TRADITION***

Ph. D. thesis

-summary-

Scientific coordinator:

**Prof. univ. dr. EUGEN MUNTEANU**

IAȘI, 2012

## Summary

The work entitled *Names of animals in Romanian biblical tradition* proposes to treat a new subject in the Romanian philological research. It is a diachronic research about names of animals (nouns especially) translated into Romanian, starting from the main editions of the biblical text in the Romanian cultural space (13 Romanian editions) classified in partial editions: *Codicele Voronețean*, *Psaltirea Scheiană*, *Psaltirea Hurmuzachi*, *Psaltirea slavo-română*, from 1577, *Palia de la Orăștie*, from 1581-1582, *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad*, *Psaltirea în versuri*, written by Dosoftei in 1673, *Psaltirea de-nțăles* of Dosoftei, 1680, the manuscripts 45 and 4389 and in whole editions: *Biblia de la București* (1688), *Biblia de la Blaj* (1795) and *Biblia Sinodală* from 1991.

In the beginning of the research, we've started with a few essential questions, which subsequently constituted sections or subsections of the paper:

- *Which names of animals shall meet in Romanian biblical tradition?*
- *Which is the importance of animals in religious life?*
- *Can be structured the denominations for animals in a lexical-semantic field?*
- *How were translated the names of animals in Romanian biblical versions?*

First of all, we turned to this theme, because of the passion for the biblical lexicology area, especially that part based on biblical zoonyms, and secondly, because we have noticed that this sphere is less explored both in the Romanian space, as well as in the European space and even worldwide. Also, another reason would be that we want to improve into the act of correct translation from classical languages (Greek and Latin) of names of animals. Many times, even the translators had problems in identification of the animals and, therefore, they have borrowed them, as such, Greek, Slavonian, Hebrew and Latin terms or they have rendered the names using loan translation.

The main objective of our research is to perform an analysis on several levels (phonetic, grammatical, lexical and, rarely, stylistic), emphasizing the semantic aspects of lexical elements identified in the main editions of the holy text, during the 16<sup>th</sup> - 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. The paper opens with the theory of lexical-semantic field preferred by Eugenio Coseriu, but also with the semic analysis following Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu's model, which refers to the biblical text. We will point out the names of animals coming from several Romanian biblical versions, which will be compared with the source-texts: *Septuagint* and *Vulgate*. We can mention the objectives of this research: the identification and the inventory of names of animals from several Romanian biblical versions, the comparison of animals' names from the Romanian texts with the source-texts: *Septuagint* and *Vulgate*, as well as the lexical-semantic analysis and, seldom, with stylistic and symbolic implications in the field of denominations for animals.

Comparing the successive variants of the biblical text, we can identify some aspects about the language of the sacred text in evolution from the following perspectives: the aspect of semantic innovations, the evolution of these semantic innovations, the presence of the limits between the oral (popular) and the written nature of an innovation, equivalence and identification mode of names for animals, the observation of some subtle meanings and even some modifications of terms or senses in the case of translating some names of animals. Therefore, the comparative analysis of the names for animals in the Romanian biblical text joins the diachronic perspective with the synchronic one for rendering as well the evolution of the lexical-semantic field *animal* into Romanian, from the 16<sup>th</sup> century to nowadays. The doctoral thesis is aiming at getting substantial results obtained from textual comparison of the different biblical versions with those got from dictionaries, zoology works, lexicology and semantics studies and biblical lexicology; it should be considered an useful tool in acquiring knowledge about Romanian biblical tradition.

This research has been founded on these fundamental methods: observation, inventory of animals' names in the Romanian biblical versions, descriptive method, comparative-historical method and inductive method. I developed the lexical-semantic sphere of zoonyms in Romanian biblical tradition. The research combines the traditional perspective (descriptive-historical) with the structural-functional perspective (analysis of semantic substance of the words which form semantic field *a n i m a l*). In methodological procedure one had in regard several stages of research. The first stage was the identification and then the making of an exhaustive inventory of the words regarding the concept of *a n i m a l*, based on careful reading of the biblical selected texts. Then it followed the stage of creating a linguistic micro-monograph for each term, following the alphabetical order (based on the etymological aspect, attestation in consulted Romanian dictionaries, use in language, senses of words). We considered even the demonstration of paradigmatic relations, especially, the synonymy. As regarding synonymic relations, we noticed that the inherited elements compete with the loans: *aliet - vultur de mare, antilopă - gazelă, arete - berbec, arici - chițoran - hirogrulion, asidă - barză - cocostârc - ibis, asin - măgar - mujdei - mușcoi, aspidă - cherast - năpârcă - șarpe - vasilisc, atachis - hagab - hargol - lăcustă - vruh, babiță - batcă - neiasită - pelican, balaur - crocodil - dragon - leviatan - zmeu, bătlan - erodion - stârc, boaghe - bogză - bufniță - buhă - ciuh - cucuvea - huhurez, brehnace - caie - șorliță, buhai - bivol - taur, cameleon - salamandă - șopârlă, cămilă - dromader, căprioară - cerboaică - ciută, cârtiță - guziu - sobol - șomâc, cârlan - miel - noaten, cârstei - prepeliță, colun - onagru, corlă - coroi - herete - uliu, elefant - pil, ghipă - gripsor - pajăre - vultur, gligan - mascur - mistreț, inorog - unicorn, jder - nevăstuică - steliu, leopard - panteră - pardos, măgarotaur - onochentaur, mâtă - pisică, muscă - mușiță - tăun, nesa - șoim, pasăre - vrabie, păun - thehim, pui de leu - schimen, sirin - șacal.*

Finally, we described the configuration of semantic field for names of animals in time, during different stages of historical developments in Romanian language, to form seven paradigms (*paradigm of domestic animals, paradigm of wild animals, paradigm of birds, paradigm of insects, paradigm of reptiles, paradigm of fish and amphibians and paradigm of fantastic animals*), to determine the meaning contextually through illustrative examples and many frequent problems of translating the zoonyms. Concerning translation, it is necessary to indicate that the biblical zoonyms were, sometimes, identified with difficulty by the translators of the sacred texts, because they didn't describe the same reality. We are referring here to the animals specific to ancient Israel, but even to some fantastic animals (for example: *măgarotaur, țap-cerb, furnicoleu*), which, quite simply, they have been reproduced into Romanian language through loan translation by the translators of the biblical texts. By applying the comparative method to a level of four languages (Romanian, Latin, Greek and, occasionally, Hebrew), we have emphasized the equivalence of semantic spheres, as well as the particular aspects of their Romanian meaning. The present paper, having a practical basis, brings together two main methods of analysis for a precise description of the vocabulary concerning animals specific to biblical tradition, namely: onomasiological analysis (see *Chapter V*) and semic analysis (see *Chapter III*).

The work is structured into five chapters. The *Introduction* shows the objectives and the purposes of the research, establishes the methodological marks, specifies the terminological options, presents the research history of the names of animals in Romanian language and brings up for discussion the importance of animals in human and religious life. The chapter II – *The theoretical distinction concerning the concepts of „semantic field” and „lexical class”* – traces some introductory marks concerning semantics, establishing some fundamental concepts and distinctions of semantics, such as: *lexical-semantic field, lexical class, lexeme, archilexeme, seme, sememe, archisememe* etc. Beginning with the theory of fields in German semantics, we stopped then to structural semantics drawn up by Eugenio Coseriu, which we generally applied to biblical zoonymy, and especially to micro-field of

domestic animals, which subordinates to macro-field *a n i m a l*. The chapter III – *Zoonymic sphere in Romanian biblical tradition. Semic analysis of the lexical-semantic field of names of animals* – presents a study of the micro-fields of names of animals (micro-field of domestic animals, micro-field of wild animals, micro-field of birds, micro-field of insects, micro-field of reptiles, micro-field of fish and amphibians and micro-field of fantastic animals). All these micro-fields subordinate to macro-field *a n i m a l*. The chapter IV – *Problems of translating the names of animals in Romanian biblical tradition* – is based on several fundamental aspects of traductology, in general, and of biblical traductology, in particular, with reference to the translation methods of the zoonymic terms used in the sacred texts (*l o a n*, *l o a n t r a n s l a t i o n* and *g l o s s e s*). The first two processes represent the outcome of interferences between the two languages in contact. The marginal glosses and translation are considered as educational and creative activities, by which is realized the contact between the source-language and the target-language. Through this contact, the language defines its form and content. There are 25 interesting loans (*aliet, asidă, aspidă, atachis, cherast, chitos, erodion, gripă, hameleon, haradrion, hirogrilion, ibis, nesa, onagru, onochentaur, pard, pelican, porfirion, scorpie, skymen, sirin, struț, thehim, vasilisc, vruh*) and 15 loan translations (*alergătura cailor, ceale cu patru picioare, cel de supt jug, cel ce să bate cu șărprii, cu-n-corn, corb de noapte, vultur (aliet) de mare, țap-cerb, cămilopardos, suflet, bunătaie, măgarotaur, furnicoleu, iadă den capre, vițel den boi*). We have also discussed the glossing process, exemplifying and classifying the marginal glosses according to consulted biblical texts. The chapter V – *The lexical inventory in Romanian biblical zoonymy* – clarifies the meaning and the significance of biblical vocabulary, the scientific denomination, the Greek, Latin or, occasionally, Hebrew name.

For the 178 terms concerning names of animals and for the 33 generic terms, we identified four criteria of classification. The first one is the *e t y m o l o g i c a l c r i t e r i o n* (inherited words, of Latin origin - 62 lexemes: *albină, arete, arici, armăsar, asin, berbec, bou, broască, cal, capră, car(iu), căprioară, câine, cerb, corb, cuc, făptură, fiară, fiiță, furnică, găină, ied, iepure, junc, lăcustă, leu, lup, mascur, miel, mistreț, muscă, noaten, oaie, oară, pasăre, păduche, păun, pescar, pește, porc, porumb, potârniche, pui, scroafă, șarpe, șoarece, taur, tăun, turmă, turturea, tânțar, urs, vacă, vier, vierme, viespe, viperă, vită, vițel, viu, vulpe, vultur*; indigenous words – 11 lexemes: *balaur, barză, ciută, măgar, mânăz, năpârcă, pupăză, șopârlă, țap, vătui, viedzure*; borrowed words – of Slavic / old Slavic origin – 36 lexemes: *babiță, batcă, bătlan, bivoli, buhai, cârd, cârstei, cârtiță, cireadă, cocor, cocoș, colun, dihanie, dihor, dobitoc, gadină, gândac, gânțanie, inorog, jder, jiganie, jivină, lebădă, liliac, molie, mușiță, neiasită, pajăre, păianjen, prepeliță, scorpie, sobol, stârc, vrabie, zimbru, zmeu*, words of Greek origin – 13 lexemes: *aspidă, cămilă, cămilopardos, chit(os), erodiu, gripsor,omidă, onagru, onochentavru, pardos, schimen, vasilisc, vruh*, words of Hungarian origin – 7 lexemes: *boaghe, ciurdă, coroi, guz(iu), marfă, șoim, uliu*, words of French origin – 9 lexemes: *animal, antilopă, dragon, dromader, elefant, gazelă, insectă, panteră, șacal*, words of Turkish origin – 2 lexemes: *catâr, pil*, words of German origin – 1 lexeme: *cârlan*, words with multiple etymology – 11 lexemes: *caie, cameleon, crocodil, hipopotam, ibis, leopard, leviatan, pelican, salamandră, struț, unicorn*; words born on Romanian territory / with onomatopoeic origin – 30 lexemes: *bufniță, buhă, cărăbuș, cioară, ciuh, cocostârc, cucuvea, fățătoare, gligan, huhurez, înaripată, încălecătoriu, înjugătoriu, junghetură, junghier, lipitoare, mătă, mâșcoi, mulgătoare, nevăstuică, pisică, rânduică, șobolan, târâtoare, telegar, trăgător, uligaie, vietate, viețuitoare, zburătoare*; words of probable / unknown origin – 9 lexemes: *bogză, brehnace; chițoran, corlă, herete, maimuță, melc, șomac, șorliță*).

Another *c r i t e r i o n* is that of *f i r s t c e r t i f i c a t e* (words belonging to the 13<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> centuries, certified words for the first time in the biblical text – 57 lexemes: *albină, aspidă, babiță, brehnace, caie, cal, cărăbuș, cârd, cârstei, chit, chițoran, ciuh, ciurdă, dihanie, dobitoc, elefant,*

*erodion, făptură, fătătoare, fiară, gadină, gândac, inorog, încălecătoriu, jiganie, jivină, junc, lăcustă, mâșcoi, molie, mulgătoare, muscă, mușită, năpârcă,omidă, onagru, pasăre, păduche, păianjen, pește, prepeliță, schimen, șorliță, târătoare, trăgător, turturea, vasilisc, vier, vierme, viespe, viețuitoare, viperă, vită, viu, vruh, vultur, zburătoare*, words that are not certified in the Romanian dictionaries – 19 lexemes: *aliet, asidă, atachis, cherast, fasec, furnicoleu, ghipă, hagab, haradrion, hargol, hirogrilion, măgarotaur, mujdei, nesa, porfirion, sirin, solam, steliu, thehim*).

Then the criterion of circulation follows, which includes regional words, popular words, obsolete and regional words, obsolete and popular words, obsolete words, literary words, rare words, relatively recent words in language, words known by the common speaker and words from middle vocabulary. The last of them is the criterion of frequency (words frequently met in the biblical text, for example: *asin, berbec, bou, măgar, miel, oaie, vită* and rarely met words, called *hapax legomena*, for example: *babiță, batcă, bățlan, boaghe, cămilopardos, cărăbuș, chițoran, corlă, cuc, dihor, dromader, guziu, hagab, hargol, jder, lebădă, lipitoare, mâtă, mujdei, neiasită, nesa, pisică, rândunică, salamandră, sobol, solam, steliu, șomâc, telegar, thehim*). With regard to the first reference, we noticed that some of the words have a more recent attestation than that which Tiktin offers: *batcă*, with meaning ‘Pelikan’, certified by Tiktin in 19<sup>th</sup> century, appears in Ms. 45, Lv. 11:16; *boaghe*, with the sense ‘Eule’, certified by TDRG in Dimitrie Cantemir’s text, *Divanul sau gâlceava înțeleptului cu lumea*, is met in Ms. 45, Lv. 11:16; the word *caie*, even if it has like first attestation the text BB 1688, we find it in Ms. 45 and Ms. 4389, Lv. 11:14; the term *brehnace*, which is certified in BB 1688, appears also in Ms. 45, Lv. 11:14, Iov. 15:23; the word *buhă* is mentioned in B 1795, Lv. 11:15, Dt. 14:15, but TDRG certifies it only in 1800, at Ion Budai-Deleanu; the word *corlă* is certified in a note of Samuil Micu in B 1795, Lv. 11:17 (note b), but TDRG certifies it only in 1825; the term *cameleon* is certified in D. Cantemir’s text, *Istoria ieroglifică*, but the term appears with the forms *hameleon* in Ms. 45, Lv. 11:30, direct loan from Greek and also certified by DA, *hamelion* in Ms. 4389, BB 1688, Lv. 11:30 and *hameleii* (Ms. 45, BB 1688, Sof. 2:14); the term *camelopard*, with the form *cămilopardos*, is certified in the biblical text in Ms. 45, Ms. 4389 and BB 1688, Dt. 14:5, but it doesn’t appear in TDRG with this form and DA doesn’t certify it; the term *cărăbuș* mentioned by TDRG in anul 1683, in Dosoftei’s work, *Parimiile de preste an*, appears also in the Metropolitan’s work *Psaltirea de-nțales* (1680), Ps. 104:33; cuvântul *neiasită* isn’t confirmed in TDRG, but only in DLR with the meaning ‘pelican’ (*Pelecanus onocrotalus*), in the biblical text, appearing in PH, Ps. 101:7; the term *pajură* is certified for the first time by TDRG at D. Cantemir, in *Istoria ieroglifică*, but it is recorded also in Ms. 4389, Lv. 11:14. Referring to the accent, some words which are not certified by dictionaries have an unknown accent: *aliet, furnicoleu, ghipă, hagab, hargol, măgarotaur, solam, steliu*.

The present Ph. D. thesis contains some conclusions, a bibliography (sources, dictionaries and secondary literature), a glossary of zoological terms and three annexes: the first one with the abbreviations of the biblical books, the second one which contains images with animals little known to inhabitants of the Romanian space and the third one with the sites which we consulted for images with different species of animals.

Starting from the lexical-semantic analysis and, occasionally, with stylistic, symbolic and cultural implications, we managed to highlight the general structure of the language in relation to its particular structure, as it appears in several biblical versions. The study of common language related to the expressive constitutes an aid for the cultivation of Romanian literary language, by emphasizing the values of the expression, by research of language resources, by exploring the immense treasure of biblical texts, used by the philologists in their pieces of work, on one hand, and the theologians, on the other hand. With regard to the biblical text, the figurative language shows only few meanings and variations, but the comparison between semantic figures prevails; it has usually a simple structure and a clear meaning, even if sometimes the element that mediated the comparative relation is absent.

Among some successive translations of the Bible, it has been noticed an improvement in Romanian literary vocabulary, though at first the translations of holy books were imprinted according to locations where they appeared. The translated texts, therefore, did not use to have a single literary norm, yet they presented two important literary variants for that period of time: one for Nordic type (Moldavian) and one for Southern (Muntenian). The lexis concerning the names of animals isn't unitary due to joining of the two types of regional variants. The translators frequently had difficulties in transposing the names of animals into Romanian, especially the exotic ones, which did not appear in the Romanian language. They have used either literal transposition of them, or their own lexical creations, using frequently artistic processes.

The work is primarily addressed to the researchers, linguists, theologians and zoologists, but also to a wide audience who wish to acquire new information or to consolidate their linguistic knowledge, by initiating in the evolution of the lexis concerning animals, in order to use as properly this vocabulary.