HUNGARIAN LOANWORDS OF ROMANIAN ORIGIN

ATTILA SZABÓ T.

Babes-Bolyai Tudományegyetem, Kolozsvár-Napoca

I

1. Although the original aim of my account* was to inform Hungarian linguists about an etymological project being carried out at the Hungarian Linguistics Department of Cluj-Kolozsvár University, the need to subject this question to a thorough examination from a new angle seems to be an imperative task for the history of linguistic studies, and may be of interest to a wider readership. Therefore, as a first step, I venture to make some critical remarks on the most outstanding points and achievements in this field, which has been labored for nearly two centuries.

It is fairly well-known that in Hungarian linguistics the study of loanwords has a remarkable past. At around the time when modern linguistics was born, at the turn of the 19th century in a Hungarian context, the linguistic values of loanwords were beginning to be recognized. The earliest study of this kind was the *Debreceni Grammatika* (1795) which, retrograde as it was in its opposition to language reforms, was, nevertheless, a strikingly modern and objective treatise. Unlike books written by early grammarians which are full of naive etymological assumptions, it brings to light the linguistic interrelationships that necessarily result from human and social contacts. Presumably independently of, but simultaneously with, the authors of the *Debreceni Grammatika*, Sámuel Gyarmathi, a pioneer of Hungarian etymological research, while on a study tour in Germany, attempted to trace a long list of common Hungarian words back to German, Italian, Romanian, Slavic, Turkish and other origins, applying for this purpose a new-tangled etymological method. He presented his results first in *Affinitas linguae Hungaricae cum linguis Fennicae originis grammatice demonstrata* (Göttingen, 1799), then in *Vocabularium in quo plurima hungaricis vocibus consona variarum linguarum vocabula* (Béts 1816). In the wake of these earliest developments (i.e. since the mid-19th century) etymological studies appeared, and still appear, to be one of the most effective and successful areas in Hungarian linguistics.[1]

2. In the history of scientific research in the related area it was József Benkő, a polymath from Transylvania, who first pointed to the Romanian origin of some Hungarian dialect words then in use in Transylvania (*bács, berbécs, bosztány, esztena, kukujza, kompona, krinta, pakulár, szkumpia, sztringa,* etc.). In the same treatise, written in the last decade of the 18th century, but which regretfully remains unpublished, he refuted the hypothesis of the Turkic origin of the Hungarian language.[2] Since that time a great many linguists have examined Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin. However, for a long time they were obsessed with little else than the study of contemporary dialectal words which had been collected either by themselves or by fellow linguists. Few of them were familiar with the problems of etymology and with the social implications of borrowing, aiming solely at finding the etymon. Still fewer managed to adopt a historical approach to lexico-geographical problems.

As the study of medieval Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin requires a stance that embraces lexico-historical as well as lexico-geographical aspects, in the following pages we shall ignore the considerable accomplishments of those who, like János Gáspár, József Vass, István Damián, Gyula Márton, János Péntek, István Vöő, limited their efforts to the search for the etymon, and took an almost exclusively descriptive approach. Instead, we shall evaluate the achievements only of those linguists who adopted a lexico-historical method, later to be supplemented with lexico-geographical aspects.

3. The pioneer work in uncovering historical data on medieval Romanian loanwords was done by Antal Edelspacher and Pál Hunfalvy.[3] It should be noted, however, that Edelspacher's method was not consistently etymological, as is shown in his summary on loanwords of Romanian origin. In his wake, a much richer compilation was made by József Szinnyei,[4] in which certain entries were supplemented by etymological references, though the list of words was mostly restricted to dialectal words used in the second half of the 19th century. He obtained the data from F. Páriz Pápai's Latin and Hungarian dictionary editions and other 18th-19th century sources. Whereas Szinnyei's entries can be traced back to certain medieval Romanian vocabulary elements which are put into a historical perspective, in the compilation made by his contemporary, Gergely Moldován,[5] all that reveals an etymological interest is the occasional reference to *Lexicon Budense* (1825).

Basically, György Alexics was the first to be deeply concerned with medieval loanwords of Romanian origin. He relied upon some hitherto neglected sources, while being aware of the achievements of Romanian linguistic etymology. From among his etymological elaborations (valid even today), his minor publications on the loanwords *alacs, ármás, baraboly, borbát, cáp, cápunkurt, góbé, kópé, kurtán, szemény* reveal him as one of the pioneers in the study of loanwords of Romanian origin on the strength of his systematic application of a historical approach.[6] The list of loanwords of Romanian origin set up by Alexics was further enriched by such words as *bráha, dajnál, falcsa, furulya, gyilok, haricska, pópa, poronty, pulya, tretina* and *vakisa*,[7] thanks to the etymological studies of Miklós Putnoky, Gábor Szarvas, Zoltán

Gombocz, Antal Horger and János Melich. In reference to the etymology-specific minor publications of Gombocz and Melich it should be stressed that in both volumes of the *Etymológiai Szótár*, where in their search for the etymon, they gave a fairly comprehensive list of medieval loanwords of Romanian origin, the two authors repeatedly drew attention to etymological as well as historico-geographical points. While acknowledging in passing the merits of our first modern etymological dictionary, we must not forget to mention Géza Bárczi's *Szófejtő Szótár* (1943), which comprised only those loanwords of Romanian origin which turned up in the literary language; thus its vocabulary is far more restricted. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára*, in three volumes (1967–1975), which includes also many dialectal words, provides a uniquely rich collection of Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin with its historical data processing and its historico-geographical approach.

4. The successes of the linguists mentioned above should not obscure the true worth of Sándor Takáts's culture historical studies. It was he who managed to insert into the vivid description of the history of Hungarian shepherding[8] an ample group of loanwords of Romanian origin *(berbécs, boér, brindza, cáp, esztena, esztrenga ~ sztronga, kápra, milióra, oszkotár, szkotár, tretina, vátra)*. He registered not only the root words but also their derivatives *(cápocska, oszkotárság ~ szkotárság, sztrongál, sztrongálás, sztrongás)* and even their compounds (*berbécs-bárány, juh-sztronga, kecskecáp, milióra-juh, sztrongahajtó, sztronga-bor, sztronga-juh, tretinapénz, tretina-váltság, vátra-pénz,* etc.). The mere fact that the derivatives and compounds were also mentioned amounted to an almost entirely new approach in Takáts's etymologically oriented study. Moreover, he was the first linguist to pay attention to the social implications and even the geographical limitations of word loaning. Thus it is no exaggeration to ascribe an outstanding significance to his role in the search for medieval Hungarian words of Romanian origin. The opportunities presented by this new way of study were further enhanced by his passionate archival researches. Therefore, besides his merits just mentioned, he may be considered the first scholar not to be content with studying well-known dictionaries, publications and other sources. By his enthusiastic investigation of archival materials, infinitely abundant and more expressive and colourful than any other source, he opened up new areas of reference and research.[9] However, the linguistic value of his historical data is slightly diminished by the fact that his archival notes are transcribed or embedded in his own texts. This practice often creates ambiguity; one cannot decide whether the notes appear in transposition or not, i.e. whether the compound deriving from a Romanian loanword emerges from an archival note or is a derivative or compound created by the author himself.

5. These remarkable achievements are due to Takáts's archival research in the first two decades of our century. Besides him there were no other linguists who delved into the impenetrable paper forests of archives, no one who excelled in putting the material found in the publications into historical perspective. In this 25-year period of diminished Hungarian research, the one notable exception was Nicolae Drăganu, professor of Romanian linguistics at Kolozsvár-Cluj University, who devoted one brief

chapter to medieval Romanian elements in the Hungarian language in a book otherwise concerned with problems of a different nature. From his list of words full of critical remarks and showing a profound knowledge of Hungarian historical and linguistic literature, the words *berbécs, cimbora, domika, fálcsa, ficsor, gárd, gárgya, milióra, nótin, pakulár, szkutár, sztronga,* and *vecsin,* were accepted by later investigations as Romanian loanwords.[10] In addition to indicating their first appearance, Drăganu gave historical and dialectal data concerning the geographical diffusion of the loanword, that is to say, he took into consideration not only etymological but also lexico-geographical facts.

In the light of what has been said, it is all the more noticeable that Géza Blédy, in his study on the Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin[11] fails to indicate their exact dates, and in his otherwise copious vocabulary he makes do with merely registering the century of occurrences, thus ignoring both Takáts and Drăganu in their description of the circumstances of historical, social and lexico-geographical occurrence.[12]

6. For quite a while, the role in this area of research of the great Hungarian Slavist, István Kniezsa, went unnoticed. In his collection of Slavic loanwords, Kniezsa dealt not only with those of definitely Slavic origin, but scrutinized also those words which, initially thought to be Slavic or of Slavic origin, turned out to be non-Slavic. The author was extremely well versed in the literature of Hungarian, Turkic and Indo-European linguistics, and, mainly in the two final parts of his book, he pointed out with varying degrees of certainty that many words which had been considered to be Slavic were in fact of Romanian origin or at least had come into Hungarian through Romanian. By maintaining that these words be listed among the loanwords of Romanian origin, he rejected many deeply rooted assumptions. Kniezsa's study is also significant for the methods it employed.

a) While firmly deliberate and consistent, it sets a good example of how the achievements of the comparative analysis of lexical elements belonging to different cognate languages should be taken into account.

b) Highly familiar with the available historical and linguistic sources, Kniezsa pointed out how historical word references were to be constructed.

c) In his study on lexical elements of possibly Romanian origin, he was the first to apply systematically the historical lexico-geographical approach with its exhaustive and validating force.[13] Kniezsa can thus be regarded as an outstanding linguist for his part in pinpointing some new methodological ways to find interrelationships between Romanian and Hungarian.

7. While highly appreciating Kniezsa's contribution to Slavic studies, mention must be made of the Romanist Ferenc Bakos, who has had and—it is to be hoped—will continue to have considerable success in the study of Romanian loanwords. His major work on the Romanian elements of the Hungarian vocabulary—based on his doctoral thesis—appeared too recently to receive here a detailed analysis. His place in the history of studies concerning Hungarian words of Romanian origin will be determined by the value of this contribution, more comprehensive than the numerous studies he had previously published on this topic.[14]

II

1. In the preceding brief survey, considerable accomplishments as well as glaring deficiencies in the field of research we are concerned with have been, so I hope, brought into focus. The attempt to find new methodological approaches is invariably stimulating for all who endeavor to improve their methods and to apply these more systematically in further research work. Given the peculiar situation of Hungarians in Transylvania, a national minority, it is obvious why the Department of Hungarian Linguistics at Cluj-Kolozsvár found it necessary to undertake and to carry on the study, of the lexical elements which Hungarian and Romanian have borrowed from each other. However, the investigation of Romanian words of Hungarian origin belongs primarily to the scope of Romanian linguistics or, more generally, to that of Romanistic studies. This part of the job was done by Lajos Tamás in an excellent etymological study (Etymologisch-historisches Wörterbuch der ungarischen Elemente im Rumänischen. Budapest, 1966.) of the highest standard. In its turn, the staff of our Department of Hungarian Linguistics at Cluj/Kolozsvár found a pressing need for the collection of Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin and their processing in view of new considerations.

Right at the start of the study work itself, it was clear that this manifold project would require much time and energy. It was chiefly for this reason that the department decided to put two departmental groups in charge of the project, each with a different assignment. In 1958, the two groups began their work: one was to study the lexical elements of Romanian origin which came into Hungarian prior to the middle of the last century; the other group was to collect and process those Romanian loanwords which first appeared after the middle of the 19th century.

2. The author of this paper, a member and director of the study group concerned with loanwords of Romanian origin from the first epoch, intends to supply information only about the overall set-up, the aims, the methods and the achievements of his own group. It would hardly be necessary for him to give an account of the other group's activities, since three summaries were published partly by individual authors, partly by joint efforts.[15]

In 1958, when the project was first listed among the assignments of the Department, the idea of a monograph on the subject had not yet been conceived, nor did the actual work begin in that year. As for its commencement, the author of this paper can only repeat, almost word for word, what he said in his first account of the *Erdélyi Magyar Szótörténeti Tár*[16] (Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary). Before 1958, there had been no underlying theoretical concept of what span of time the book should be restricted to. Only during almost twenty years of archival research in Transylvanian Place Name Databank *(Erdélyi Magyar Névtörténeti Adattár)* did it gradually and surreptitiously begin to dawn on us that on the basis of all those expressive and colourful etymological data it would be sensible to construct a Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary and then, parallel with this, to process the medieval Romanian elements of the Hungarian vocabulary. Since the Etymological

Dictionary was to be a dialect dictionary, from the huge archival material—besides thousands of common Hungarian words—we began to copy passages containing words which might originally have counted as common Hungarian words, but which, fossilized in their lexico-geographical forms, were and still are to be regarded as dialect words. We assumed that in turn they could serve as invaluable data for the construction of a historical dialect dictionary. In the collection phase of our work we found hundreds of loanwords of Romanian, Transylvanian Saxon, and Slavic origin, results of the coexistence over several centuries of several peoples. In addition, there were many words which came into Hungarian by the intermediary of these languages but originating from other tongues. Such words occurred in the vocabulary of Transylvanian standard Hungarian and the vernaculars, and some of them are still alive.

3. In these personal remarks I have reached the question of the first steps of the project, those of data collecting and reference use. But before analyzing these stages, let me cast a cursory glance at an organizational problem. It might have appeared reasonable to have performed the whole task by myself. Yet I decided against it, since my own schedule was crammed with all kinds of other plans, and besides, my intention was to refresh the supply of researchers at the Linguistics Department of the Cluj-Kolozsvár University. Single-handed work with all its ramifications would have burdened me with many time-consuming details which do not require any special expertise in solving linguistic problems, but would offer a good opportunity for younger colleagues to gain experience in coming to grips with intricate scientific questions. Moreover, within the framework of team work, data collection and arrangement would be quickened if undergraduate students keen on scientific research work were to be involved in the simple processes of card arrangement and even mere copying. This would have the further advantage of ensuring the future supply of linguists.

These were the causes which, at my suggestion, made the Department opt for team work. In the initial stages of data selecting, reference supplementing and card arranging, the following undergraduates of the Department volunteered to offer their services: Piroska E. Gergely, Ferenc Kósa, Júlia B. Kovács, Zoltán Szabó, Márta Vámszer, István Vöő and János Zsemlyei. This relatively large team was later reduced to five members by the withdrawal of Júlia B. Kovács and István Vöő, followed by Zoltán Szabó in the final period.

4. Right at the start we had to set time and space limitations concerning the dialectal words of Romanian origin to be included in our investigation. We also had to take decisions on the categorical, stylistic, and social scope of our inquiry.

As far as time was concerned, the upper limit was definitely laid down, as the title of the project suggested, by the middle of the last century, with the lower limit left (inevitably) open, since obviously enough it could not be fixed until the earliest data had emerged in the collecting phase. Likewise, it would have been absurd to set regional, lexico-geographical limits to our interest in the collecting and later in the data processing phase. As the small team were undertaking the task of an extensive etymological summary, the regional restriction of etymological data from ancient

Transylvanian sources was out of the question. We could not but take into account every kind of data, from every Hungarian-speaking area. Nor could we impose restrictions on either the research or the data processing phase in terms of stylistic and social varieties; spoken and written standard language, official and literary registers, vernaculars as well as the language of diplomacy or social interaction—all words of Romanian origin had to be taken into account.

It was only in matters of lexical categories that data collecting and processing were to be checked. Although the Transylvanian Place Name Collection *(Erdélyi Helynév-történeti Adattár)* with its 600,000–700,000 entries offered thousands of references to Hungarian place names of Romanian origin, there were two reasons for not including these lexical categories in our work.

a) The study of common nouns vs. proper nouns raises divergent linguistic problems and, in its turn, requires divergent methods.

b) To register all Hungarian place names of Romanian origin to be found in the Transylvanian Place Name Collection would have increased enormously the amount of data, the time needed for this processing and the length of the book. The team could not have coped with a task of such proportions for lack of time and printing capacity.

In view of the limitations on lexical categories, the vocabulary frames were established as follows:

a) the collection would only comprise common nouns of medieval Romanian origin;

b) proper nouns of Romanian origin would be represented only by those which derived from common names of Romanian origin, if the bearers of the names were unequivocally Hungarian;

c) similarly, only those place names would be entered and processed which dated back to common names of Romanian origin.

5. As I have already mentioned, (part II, paragraph 2, above) the idea of studying medieval loanwords of Romanian origin first occurred to me when I first encountered the richness of Transylvanian dialectal word-stock while collecting data for the Transylvanian Place Name Collection and the Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary. The question of the sources which supplied the data for our work is inevitably linked with the inception of the idea to prepare it.

a) The most important source right at the beginning was the card material available from the two above-mentioned individual projects. However, one trouble was that the cards from the Transylvanian Place Name Collection, owing to the different nature of the project, could not have been used in the form they had originally been collected, when constructing the data stock of the vocabulary of Romanian origin. Therefore, on the basis of the coordinator's pencil marks and under the supervision of colleagues in charge of the seminar classes, the students registered and arranged the cards of the place name collection appropriately according to changed needs. This data collecting phase took about one to two years' work.

The cards of the Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary suited our purposes both in their format and content. However, it was extremely time-consuming to find the references hidden on the several hundred thousand cards and to arrange them by the entries. This job, which required much more expertise, was done by the Department staff and, under their guidance, by the students of the linguistics seminars.[17]

b) Because our long-forgotten data had all been collected in the archives of Transylvania, we felt it necessary to complement them with material culled from sources outside Transylvania. However, on account of manpower limitations and other constraints we were in no position to launch a complementary research in the archives likely to supply such data. One way which lay open for us was through access to data available in historical and etymological publications, *belles-lettres* and dictionaries. Owing to the thorough card-indexing of the sources assigned by the coordinator, my colleagues managed to increase the number of data in the collection considerably. Thus, when the data processing phase began in around 1960, there were about 15,000—16,000 entries to work with, collected by the editors.

6. Since the operational phases of data collecting mentioned above, and the editing itself, turned out to be far more time-consuming than expected, what had been scheduled for the six years between 1958—1964 in fact took a further two years. In 1966 the project reached a stage when it seemed timely and necessary to give an account of the advance and achievements of the project as vell as to publish a number of sample entries from the data collection.[18] In the following two years, between 1966 and 1968, the collection of the material and the etymological notes to the entries were completed, and so were the evaluating studies summarizing many aspects of the collection. Thus, as early as 1968 the corpus of the book had been prepared in manuscript form and another four summaries had been typed. However, there were two reasons why the full preparation for publication was held up for 15 years. One was that from January 1966, the entire energy and time of the project coordinator were absorbed by the editing of the first volume of the Etymological Dictionary. Shortly afterwards four members of the project—Piroska B. Gergely, Ferenc Kósa, Márta Vámszer and János Zsemlyei—joined the editorial board of the Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary in order to speed up the editing of the second and further volumes. This task required total dedication, and it necessarily pushed the matter of the project into the background. The second factor that hindered our progress was the continual discouragement we felt at the lack of printing capacity. Around 1966 and for the following 15 years there seemed little hope of getting a book into print which was going to be lengthy but unlikely to sell well. The prospects remained grim until Géza Domokos, the director of Kriterion Publishing House, decided to insert our book in the publisher's plans. His willingness gave the small team fresh impetus. Now it was hoped that the full manuscript, after a touch of supplementing, editing and a few technical refinements, will soon be placed on the publisher's desk ready to be sent to the printer's.

7. Our team set to work with the intention of, on the one hand, presenting a data collection of Hungarian words of medieval Romanian origin on as extensive a basis as

possible; while on the other hand making up for the deficiencies and gaps which had appeared until then.

Although our data collection, in view of the etymological references to the vocabulary of Romanian origin, is far richer than those prepared by earlier linguists, we must admit that even in this respect no research can eber be regarded as concluded. The fact of the matter is that the daily study of archival material and other publications invariably has brought, and will continue to bring to light very old and distant data previously unregistered which will allow more specific registration of certain loan words in a lexico-geographical sense.

With this remark I have, in fact, alluded to a potential hidden in the wealthy data collection of the nearly completed book. Suffice it to say, that while collecting data both for the Transylvanian Place Name Collection and the Transylvanian Hungarian Historical Dictionary, after initial hesitation, I found it necessary to register lexico-geographically every single reference. Consequently, in the corpus of the present book the overwhelming majority of the data are regionally fixed and as such can be considered as genuine historical lexico-geographical data. Thus, compared to some vague attempts by earlier linguists, our data collection offers a great opportunity to provide a systematic use of the lexico-geographical approach. One can see the possibilities offered by our fairly abundant collection by reading through the many etymological studies concerning the history of words such as *berbécs, esztena, esztronga* ~ *sztronga, kalács* ~ *kalák, kaláka, kaluger* ~ *kalugyer, orda, tretina* ~ *tretyina* and *zsentice.* Even more instructive are the lexico-geographical map sheets *(alakor, baraboly, mióra, pakulár, szokmány)* and a summary map sheet.[19] Furthermore, the cards utilized by the two etymological publications with the enclosed map sheets[20] which refer to Hungarian *bongor* vs. Romanian *bungur* borrowed from Transylvanian Saxon, reveal the possibility of registering and illustrating on a map this threefold Hungarian-Romanian-Saxon language interrelationship.

8. In an attempt to overcome the lack of interest in social implications manifest in the work of earlier linguists, in the course of our archival work we registered on our cards the names of the witnesses, editors, correspondents and informants. We often added to this information their social position as well as their age. Our assumption was that it did make a difference whether the loanword was uttered by a peasant or farmer, or whether it appears in a file prepared by someone on a certain level of the hierarchy of land or economic management. In correspondence, too, social and stylistic usage varies according to whether or not the author were from the privileged classes—princes, aristocrats, councellors, and diplomats. The social formalities, phrases and expressions reveal to an extent the social divisions. Their verbal behaviour reflects a kind of social restraint, distinguishing itself from that of the intellectuals as handed down to us in letters, reports, accounts and other documents. All this justifies the technique we applied in data collecting, whereby the social position and, wherever possible, even the age of the interviewer were indicated. In order to give emphasis to the social implications involved, quotations were not cut unduly short and were occasionally supplemented with footnotes.

9. It is a well-known fact that the loan words of Romanian origin can be divided into two groups of unequal size: (a) those words which turn up with more or less frequency and vitality also in the vocabulary of the Hungarian literary language; (b) those words which occur only within regional limits. A few of these can be found also in the regional standard language, but most of them appear merely in the vernacular.

The number of loanwords of Romanian origin in the first group is extremely small. (Bárczi's examples are only *alakor*—of hitherto unknown origin—, *cimbora, ficsor ~ ficsur, poronty* and perhaps *pulya.*)[21] To this category may belong the words *cigány, kalugyer* and *cserge* borrowed directly from Romanian, or *berbécs, esztena ~ sztina* and some others, all technical terms used in ethnography, as well as a few more belonging to the vocabulary of shepherding.[22]

In our data collection most of the historical references to the regional standard language, or to the incomparably richer dialect vocabulary subsisting in the vernaculars, date from far earlier ages than those taken from 18—19th century dictionaries and glossaries. Thus, our work attempts to satisfy a long-felt need in this respect.

During the editing phase of the data collection, the attention of the project team—and that of some outsiders too—was drawn to certain aspects of source analysis which had not at all or only partly been utilized. This justified the introduction of loanwords of Romanian origin from, among others, the Gyöngyös Dictionary Fragments, the works and dictionaries of Transylvanian memoir-writers, and those of Ábrahám Barcsay, Dávid Baróti Szabó, József Gvadányi, Sámuel Gyarmathi, Ferenc Pápai Páriz and others. These words are to be found in literary language, but exist for the most part in dialectal environments.[23]

10. In the course of the archival research work and the later additional collecting phase, and even more so, while editing the data collection and evaluating the references, it struck us that certain categories of Romanian loanwords had been completely left out of consideration by previous researchers, who had in any case showed very little interest in historical implications. Most blatant were the deficiencies in the historical lexical elements of ecclesiastic life, the offices of Romanian voivode courts and military life. These gaps are all the more conspicuous since the Byzantine-Orthodox orientation of Romanian ecclesiastical and court life as well as the character of state life and military organization differed considerably from their Western counterparts, and thus brought into being a specialized Romanian vocabulary in the related fields. Certain elements of this vocabulary, through peacetime and wartime military communication, penetrated into Hungarian, where they showed varying vitality. For example, in the vocabulary of ecclesiastical life: besides words of literary value in Hungarian, such as *beszerika ~ biszerika* (1648), *kaluger ~ kalugyer* (1566), and *pópa* (1566), our book includes such loanwords of ancient usage as *monaszter ~ monasztéria* (1572), *protopop* (1568) and *deák ~ deják* (1639), not to mention others of less frequent usage dating from the beginning of the 18th century and concerning church institutions and ecclesiastical life. But even from among these, *kaluger* and *pópa* were known to have dated from the 18th century. Oddly enough,

not even Blédy's dictionary, the most comprehensive of its kind, gives historical references.

11. Previous investigations paid little attention to loan words taken from the terminology of Romanian aristocracy, voyvode courts, dignitaries and high-ranking state officials. However, from the diplomatic correspondence of Transylvanian princes, Romanian voivodes and the Hungarian royal chancellery as well as from the reports of envoys and spies, and several other documents of the 16—17th century, the following list of loanwords could be drawn up: 1529: *boér ~ bojér* (a) "a dignitary from Moldavia"—(b)"a kind of nobleman from Fogarasföld"; 1559: *visztiernik* "treasurer"; 1563: *vajvode* "voivode"; 1569: *sztolnik* "warden of the king"; 1584: *logofet* "chancellor". If we include partly Hungaricized words, compounds and derivatives of Hungarian and Romanian origin, this list would be greatly expanded: 1559: *fő-ármás;* 1592: *fő-pahárnik;* 1608: *fő-boér;* 1641: *fő-vornik;* 1651: *fő-logofet;* 1657—1658: *fő-visztier;* 1600: *bojérfi;* 1657: *bojér-falu;* 1696: *bojér-mente;* 1570: *bojéri;* 1641: *bojérocska,* etc.

12. Alexics was the first to study medieval loanwords of Romanian origin concerning military life and institutions, but he selected only those Hungarian loanwords of Romanian origin and Romanian loan words of Hungarian origin which were to be found in Nicolae Iorga's book on the history of the Romanian army.[24] Among the words belonging to this latter group of 16—17th century reference, he mentions no more than two: *ármás* (1572) (a) "bailiff", (b) "brigand", (c) "highwayman" and *kurtán ~ kurtány* (1657—1658) "miles curiae", both marked with a year reference. (We dated the latter back to 1592.) The compound *ármáskurtán* (1662) "mercenary" and *ármásság* (a) "brigandage", (b) "banditry", can only be found in our reference book, which contains many more entries on military life.

13. The following list contains the Romanian loanwords borrowed by Hungarian up to the end of the medieval period and indicates the dates of their first occurrences. Early 15th century: *katrinca;* 1429: *cserge;* cca. 1450: *alakor;* 1520—1530: *pulya;* 1529: *boér ~ bojér;* 1546: *brindza, orda;* 1549: *zsentice;* mid-16th century: *alacs;* 1554: *esztrenga ~ isztringa;* 1559: *főármás, viszternik;* 1560—1570: *berbécs;* 1564: *fálcsa;* 1565: *bordó ~ burdó;* 1566: *fustély, kaluger ~ kalugyer, pópa;* 1567: *szokmány;* 1569: *bács, brindzatúró, ficsor, sztolnik;* 1570: *poronty;* 1572: *ármás;* 1578: *tretina ~ tretyina;* 1579: *csobán;* 1581: *tretyina-pénz;* 1582: *mióra;* 1583: *esztena ~ isztina ~ sztina;* 1584: *cáp, logofet, posztelnik;* 1585: *domika, esztrenga-bárány, jegumen, kecske-mióra, kozsók, lák, vornik;* 1587: *kápra;* 1588: *baraboly;* 1590: *cimbora;* 1592: *főpáhárnik;* 1594: *tretyina-tehén;* 1596: *cimborasság;* 1598: *kurtán ~ kurtány.* The list amounts to 47 words.

14. In my evaluation of Sándor Takáts's contribution I praised his approach which took into account not only the root words of Romanian origin but also their derivatives and the compounds in which they occur. If the study of these loanwords is based merely on root-words it cannot distinguish between the casual and the permanent, and cannot show the depth and effectiveness of cultural interaction. It goes without saying that, in terms of their linguistic, social and cultural value and

significance, there is a tremendous difference between unrelated, solitary root-words and other loanwords constantly ramifying and proliferating. Nevertheless, let us take some examples. E.g. *jegumen* (1585) "Greek Orthodox monastery abbot" and *kaluger* ~ *kalugyer* (1566) from the same period are obviously to be judged differently, since the former is clearly sterile, whereas the latter can be recorded in our collection together with its derivatives *kalugereskedik* (1747), *kalugyereskedik* (1775), *kalugyerség* (1749), and its compounds *kalugyer-gárgyán* (1749) and *tanító-kalugyer* (1774). Another loanword of Romanian origin with an even richer family tree could be *berbécs* (1560/1570). Its vitality needs no further justification in view of the historical references on hundreds of cards or its use in various present-day dialects. Nevertheless, the list below will be outstanding proof of the dialectal turnover value and significance of this loanword: (1) "ram": *berbécsecske* (1629), *berbécsbárány* (1631), *berbécsbőr* (1660), *berbécsbőrbunda* (1795), *berbécsbőrirha* (1688), *berbécscímer* (cca. 1715), *berbécsgyapjú* (1686), *berbécshús* (1629), *berbécsjuh* (1696), *berbécskirlán* (1782), *berbécs-legeltetés* (1688), *berbécsmióra* (1743), *berbécspásztor* (1688), *berbécspecse-nye* (1715), *berbécstök* (1730), *berkeberbécs* (1794), *dézsmaberbécs* (1732), *diszke-berbécs* 1627), *fiaberbécs* (1728), *kosberbécs* (1800), *mióraberbécs* (1818), *nótin-berbécs* (1690), *nótin-berkeberbécs* (1775); (2) "pile driver ram": *berbécs* (1813), *fa-berbécs* (1821), *gyalog-faberbécs* (1852), *kézi faberbécs* (1824), *vas-berbécs* (1818).

Before concluding this account, let us shed some light on the life and social implications of loan words of Romanian origin. From the point of view of social usage and the naturalization or extinction, they can be placed into two categories. (a) Words originating in the court life of Romanian voivodes and in the circles of state management and superior church organizations emerge nowhere except in the narrow circle of Transylvanian princes, in the diplomatic documentation of international relations, in the official correspondence of the privileged and that of the officials and intellectuals in their service, and in the private correspondence of these social classes. (b) Because of the direct, everyday linguistic interchange between Hungarians and Romanians, originally it was among the peasants and the provincial nobility with a similar life style that several words or Romanian origin took root in the language of agriculture, everyday life, meals, clothing, superstition, medical care and witchcraft. This opened the gate to the spread of these words, through the local administration and the land management of princes, landowners and noblemen, up to the privileged in government administration, top offices and literary circles. Trade between villages and towns, weekly and regional fairs and other public gatherings gradually provided an opportunity for the loanwords of Romanian origin widely used in villages, to spread to the towns.

However, these two groups of words differ considerably according to whether they were used in the period of Transylvanian dynasties or later. The loanwords in the first group did not exist outside diplomatic and personal correspondence and the direct social interaction of Transylvanian princes, Moldavian and Wallachian voivodes, and they abruptly ceased to be used when, because of the expansion of the Hapsburg empire in Transylvania from the late 17th century, diplomatic contact had been

completely cut off. After that the loanwords in the first group disappeared, showing that language is the most sensitive instrument to react to the changes in state law, social, economic and cultural life.

In contrast, the words of plebeian origin in the second group, after cropping up in Hungarian during early medieval period, not only managed to take root and survive, but, as we pointed out earlier, many of them also developed a more or less rich stock of derivatives.

Having unduly taxed my readers' patience, let me put a quick end to this report. But before doing so, I have to apologize for the inability of our small team to complete the monograph on schedule. The delay was caused by the unexpectedly time-consuming hard work involved and the editing of the Etymological Dictionary. Undoubtedly, by virtue of its historical lexico-geographical character, based on archive-data collecting, our book could have supplied plenty of references for other ventures working along similar historical lexico-geographical lines. It could even have offered a reliable background to the other project of the Department, involved in collecting the loanwords of Romanian origin in the last hundred years. It is no exaggeration to say that the publication of our collection as well as that of the volumes of the Etymological Dictionary will significantly modify any critical approach to earlier etymological studies.

Notes

1. Cf. a brief summary of this and of its causes in Kniezsa 1955, I/1. 3.
2. Cf. Mikó 1867, 320–329, and Éder 1978, 35, 112, 179–280.
3. Cf. brief references to Edelspacher's (1876) *bojár* and *orbonás:* Magyar Nyelvőr VII (1878) 241–242, and to Hunfalvy's *cimbora* and *kaláka,* Nyelvtudományi Közlemények XIV (1878) 306–308.
4. Szinnyei 1893–1894.
5. Moldován 1899.
6. For further information cf. Szabó T. 1970, 159–161.
7. Szabó T. 1970, 159–161, 167.
8. Takáts 1915, II, 259–354.
9. For further information see Szabó T. 1970, 161–163.
10. Drăganu 1933, 582–586. See my summarizing remarks Szabó T. 1962a.
11. Blédy 1942.
12. On Blédy see Köpeczi 1942; Bárczi 1958, 119; Szabó T. 1972, 99; Szabó T. 1979. 3 sqq.
13. See Szabó T. 1970, 16 and in greater detail Szabó T. 1966.
14. Bakos 1982 with further references.
15. Cf. Márton 1966 (without references) and, under the same title but with references Márton 1972. Also: Márton–Vöő–Péntek 1977.
16. Cf. Szabó T. 1956, and 1972, 383.
17. More details about this are given in Szabó T. 1972, 414–415.
18. Cf. B. Gergely–Kósa–Zsemlyei 1966.
19. Cf. Szabó T. 1970, 183–184, 236–258; Szabó T. 1971, 198–274; Szabó T. 1968; Szabó T. 1962b, especially the summarizing tenth map.
20. Szabó T. 1971, 179–197.

5 HS

21. Cf. Bárczi 1958, 120–121, and also some of my own remarks in Szabó T. 1971, 178–179.
22. Cf. Földes 1961, 674 sqq.
23. Cf. Péntek 1967, Szabó 1965a, Szabó 1965b, Szabó T. 1970, 196–235, etc.
24. Iorga 1910.

Bibliography

Bakos Ferenc (1982) *A magyar szókészlet román elemeinek története.* Budapest.
Bárczi Géza (1958) *A magyar szókincs eredete.* Budapest.
Blédy, Géza (1942) *Influenţa limbii romȃne asupra limbii maghiare.* Sibiu.
Drăganu, Nicolae (1933) *Romȃnii i veacurile IX–XIV pe baza toponimiei şi a onomasticei.* Bucureşti.
Edelspacher Antal (1876) Rumun elemek a magyar nyelvben. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények* XII, 87–116.
Éder Zoltán (1978) *Benkő József nyelvészeti munkássága és az Erdélyi Magyar Nyelvművelő Társaság.* Budapest.
Földes, László ed. (1961) *Viehzucht und Hirtenleben in Ostmitteleuropa.* Budapest.
B. Gergely Piroska–Kósa Ferenc–Zsemlyei János (1966) „A magyar nyelv feudalizmuskori román kölcsönszavai" című szótörténeti monográfia szerkesztése. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* X. 93–110.
Iorga, Nicolae (1910) *Istoria armatei romȃneşti.* Vălenii de Munte.
Kniezsa István (1955) *A magyar nyelv szláv jövevényszavai.* I–II. Budapest.
Köpeczi, Béla (1942) Zur Frage der rumänischen Lehnwörter im Ungarischen. *Archivum Europae Centro-Orientalis* VIII. (Issues 3–4, offprint).
Márton Gyula (1966) *A moldvai csángó nyelvjárás román kölcsönszavai.* (Nyelvtudományi Értekezések 66.) Budapest.
Márton Gyula (1972) *A moldvai csángó nyelvjárás román kölcsönszavai.* Bukarest.
Márton Gyula–Vöő István–Péntek János (1977) *A magyar nyelvjárások román kölcsönszavai.* Bukarest.
Mikó Imre (1867) *Benkő József élete és munkái.* Pest.
Moldován Gergely (1899) Alsófehérvármegye román népe. In: *Alsófehér vármegye monográfiája.* I/2. Nagyenyed, 723–1049.
Péntek János (1967) Román eredetű elemek Gvadányi munkáiban. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* XI. 13–23.
Szabó Zoltán (1965a) Román eredetű elemek Barcsay Ábrahám költői nyelvében. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* IX. 149–154.
Szabó Zoltán (1965b) A gyöngyösi latin-magyar szótártöredék román eredetű szavai. *Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományi Közlemények* IX. 293–295.
Szabó T. Attila (1956) Az erdélyi magyar oklevél-szótár műhely-kérdései. In: *Emlékkönyv Pais Dezső hetvenedik születésnapjára.* Szerkesztette: Bárczi Géza–Benkő Loránd. Budapest, 69–77.
Szabó T. Attila (1962a) Eredmények és hiányosságok a magyar szókincs román eredetű, feudalizmuskori elemeinek vizsgálatában. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai–Series Philologia–fasciculus* 1. 19–34.
Szabó T. Attila (1962b) Előzetes jegyzetek román eredetű kölcsönszavaink középmagyarkori rétegéhez. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai–Series Philologia–fasciculus* 2. 13–29 + 10 térkép.
Szabó T. Attila (1966) A propos des mots d'origine roumaine dans le vocabulaire hongrois à l'époque du féodalisme. *Studia Slavica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* XII. 389–396.
Szabó T. Attila (1968) Az esztena és a sztronga ~ esztrenga a XVI–XIX. századi erdélyi oklevelekben. *Műveltség és Hagyomány* X. 153–159.

Szabó T. Attila (1970) *Anyanyelvünk életéből.* Bukarest.
Szabó T. Attila (1971) *A szó és az ember.* Bukarest.
Szabó T. Attila (1972) *Nyelv és múlt.* Bukarest.
Szabó T. Attila (1979) Az erdélyi magyar nyelvtudomány kérdései. *A Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Nyelv- és Irodalomtudományok Osztályának Közleményei* XXXI, 3–29.
Szinnyei József (1893–1894) A magyar nyelvben átvett oláh szavak. *Magyar Nyelvőr* XXII. 23–30, 71–75, 111–117, 168–173, 207–212, 247–250, 294–297, 337–340, 387–392, 436–440, 490–493, 536–539; XXIII. 5–9, 56–60, 99–104, 151–155, 199–201, 247–250, 296–299, 349–352, 390–393, 438–442, 481–491, 529–535.
Takáts Sándor (1915) *Rajzok a török világból.* I–II. Budapest,