

Agata Kawecka, Rafał Zarębski (Lodz, Poland)

TRANSLATION ONOMASTICS AND SLAVIC TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE
(Outline)

The issue of *nomina propria* in translations of various types of texts has been of interest to researchers for a long time and with unabated intensity. This phenomenon is linked to a number of important issues in the theory of proper names, mainly concerning the once dogmatic notion of the asemantic nature of this lexical category, which has been significantly modified in recent years. It is now becoming increasingly clear that names can have not only lexical, but also expressive, metaphorical, pragmatic, associative, genetic, structural, etymological, categorical or grammatical meanings (Kaleta 1998). The specificity of the proprial sphere is most clearly demonstrated by Klaas Willems' words: "Proper names are complex signs with specific linguistic, pragmatic, logical, philosophical, semiotic, historical, psychological, social, and juridical properties, and hence represent a vast interdisciplinary field of study" (Willems 2000: 86). Equipped with such a large number of additional symbolic-connotational charges besides the basic denotational function, a proper name, being an element of any text, may pose an extremely difficult challenge in the process of translation into various languages. Thus the set of proper names has many characteristics in common with the *nomina appellativa* sphere, as all the phenomena pertaining to the transformation of the appellative lexis in translation in relation to the source (amplifications, simplifications, univerbalizations, multi-word equivalence) may affect – obviously with varying intensity – the proprial material. This is a problem that was pointed out years ago by Maria Kamińska (Kamińska 1993), who also mentioned the phenomenon of explaining the meanings of names or providing them with additional epithets. The differences in the numerical status of proper names between the original and the target text are a frequent aspect of translations, which can be attributed to a variety of factors (sociological, historical, linguistic, stylistic), as described in more detail by Michel Ballard (Ballard 2001: 40–45).

Nomina propria accumulating linguistic and extra-linguistic information, being a component of translated texts, are the focus of interest of the so-called translational onomastics, understood by Artur Gałkowski as "a branch of onomastics dealing with proper names (...) of one language in the perspective of

their translation or adaptation in other languages” (Gałkowski 2018: 129). It is from the perspective of this sub-discipline of linguistics that we would like to look in this study at the problems concerning the proprial sphere in selected Slavic translations of the Bible¹. Our aim is to indicate the most important research problems that emerge during the examination of proper names on the translation ground.

When approaching this subject, one must always take into account the important intralinguistic and extralinguistic conditions that determine the final form of a given naming unit in a translated text. The first of these is a set of techniques that impact the linguistic presence of a given name in translation. The range of these techniques is vast, as it extends between the zone that includes processes related to preserving the proper name in the translation (this refers to all the transfers – translocations, linguistic adaptations, translations and the use of intra- and extra-textual glosses) and the sphere, in which the name present in the source text is replaced or even omitted (neutralisation may take place here, i.e. the name is replaced by an appellative equivalent; or naturalisation, i.e. the unit is replaced by another equivalent closer to the target culture, ideological adaptation related to providing the name with ideological commentary, etc.) (Sanz Espinar 2006). The boundaries between the above mentioned areas are often blurred, especially in the context of the phenomenon of gradation of propriality saturation of particular names, which has been strongly emphasized for some time. Thus, it is possible to distinguish units of maximum, high, medium, low and minimum degree of propriality, e.g. first names or some geographical names would be at one end of the axis (high degree), while, for example, names of chemical elements or various technical names (chrematonyms in general) would be characterized by minimum propriality (Gałkowski 2018; Wolnicz-Pawłowska 2014). Thus understood, the proper name as situated on different points of the propriality axis; often placed in the vast transition zone between common words and prototypical proper names, it appears as a particularly complex entity, especially in the light of such a specific text as the Bible – saturated with symbolism, characterized by multilingualism, possessing a culture-forming power (Chouraqui 2012: 164), and the object of philological research from ancient times to the present.

As regards the Bible, initially the main focus was on the etymology and morphology of proper names, leading scholars to consider the original languages, especially their grammatical structure, and the semantics and etymology of particular lexical units. With time, researchers turned their attention to translation studies and the language of the first, oldest biblical translations (into Greek and Latin), and finally to translations into national languages. In this field of

¹ The choice of sources is of arbitrary character. They differ in their chronology; mostly we present elderly ones, but we do emphasize modern translations.

translation studies, a wide range of subjects was taken up, from phenomena associated with the mode of translation, through detailed issues of equivalence of forms present in the basis of translation (as is known, translations into national languages are based on various source texts, e.g. Hebrew and Greek original – Textus Receptus, Greek Septuagint (LXX), Latin Vulgate (VG), etc.) and questions related to the description of particular subsystems of the target language to the stylistic and pragmatic aspects of translation. The field of proper names offers possibilities for the study of practically every aspect mentioned here, all the more so if the axis of interest is the translation series (Köller 1992), i.e. a series of translations within one language, produced at different times and dependent on different external conditions. In this paper, by translation series we mean not only the whole of Bible translations within one language, but also more broadly – within the same group of Slavic languages (Western, Eastern, and Southern), and even – within the whole family of Slavic languages. Of course, we are aware that individual series are not identical, as in many instances they are evidently diverse, having been created under different socio-historical conditions and for different purposes, but they also have a number of common features.

The issue of translation series and the differences and similarities in their area is closely related to the second group of factors (this time extralinguistic) determining the final shape of the proper name in the target (translated) text. These include such issues as the linguistic source of the translation (Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Latin), the translation strategy (literal, free, philological, dynamic translation, etc.), the denominational setting in which and for which the translation was made (Catholic, Protestant, Orthodox, etc.), the attitude to the translation tradition (the use of solutions applied in earlier translations, not only within a particular religious camp, but also outside it; in Slavic translations we can also observe references to translations produced by different language groups, e.g. Polish translations by Szymon Budny feature numerous influences from the circle of *Slavia Orthodoxa*), and finally, geographical conditions related to each translation's language belonging to different groups of Slavic languages. The final linguistic-pragmatic form of a given proper name in a particular biblical translation is a product of intra-linguistic and extra-linguistic factors.

Our research is based on a relatively large, fully representative, corpus of various Slavic translations of the Bible (mainly the more important and well-known ones), which we will not characterize in detail due to the limited space in this paper². The selection is arbitrary, whereby we wanted the broadest possible representation of Slavic languages belonging to the three basic groups (Southern, Eastern and Western) (Łuczak 2014). The translations considered are also diverse in terms of sources (Hebrew and Aramaic text in the case of the *Old Testament* (*OT*), Greek text for the *OT* in connection with the LXX and for the *New*

² See Sources.

Testament (NT), Latin text in the case of translations from the *VG* (cf. *NVG*), the denominational tradition for which they were prepared, related to the Catholic, Protestant and Eastern Orthodox Church, and the translation strategy used³.

Examining biblical *nomina propria* in various translations, we remain within the scope of diachronic linguistics methods (we refer primarily to older texts, although our findings can also be applied to contemporary translations), especially such methods as philological (after all, we are interested in a particular name in the text), contrastive (when we compare the translation equivalents of particular names in various translations), and traductological. It is worth noting here that by equivalence we understand the phenomenon when two elements (source and translation) have the same value or are identical in terms of function and effects of interaction. The relationship of identity can occur between morphological, lexical, syntactic or semantic elements. As a result, the source text is transformed into the target text, and there exists a relationship between these texts that can be called the relationship of equivalence (Osadnik 2010: 86).

We also assume that the analysis of such a large and diverse group of sources should be based on two types of research approaches: a macro strategy, which would involve a global (comprehensive) view of the material within the entire Slavic biblical translation series, and a micro strategy with several stages, which may concern translations within the same language group, the same denominational group, in a narrower sense, a particular language or even a particular translation, and in the most specific sense, even a particular locale within a particular translation. The two views are complementary and may result in a reasonably complete and objective picture of the equivalents of particular names in the excerpted translations, differentiated in formal, semantic and functional terms.

The most common adaptation type used with regard to foreign proper names in the translated text is linguistic adaptation, which concerns specific aspects of the *proprium's* structure (from spelling and phonetics to morphology and syntax) or may take place on various levels altogether, globally, as it were. In the case of such genetically-typologically distant entities as biblical *nomina propria*, adaptation to the target text does not usually take place all at once, but affects only certain aspects of the linguistic structure of a given name. This phenomenon was all the more understandable in relation to the earliest Slavic biblical translations, the authors of which, in a sense, had only just blazed the trail in this field. It is also worth remembering that, firstly, the phenomenon of borrowing is irregular and heterogeneous (not all the elements of the name's structure may be adopted, e.g. the adaptation may occur only at the graphy level), secondly, the process of adopting a given lexical unit (in this case a foreign name) does not always proceed in the

³ On the Bible translations, see selected resources, e.g. Kyas 1997; Алексеев 2008; Naumow 2016; Pietkiewicz 2016.

same way at the level of a text (a translation) and a given borrowing language, and thirdly, the adaptation of a given name within a given translation usually conforms – to a greater or lesser extent – to the grammatical rules of the translation language.

The resulting diversity in terms of Slavic equivalents is evidenced by the vast repertoire of New Testament equivalents of the filiational description: ... *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωσήφ μητέρα* (Gr.), ... *Maria Iacobi et Joseph mater* (Latin) (NA) (Mt 27:56) with a name from family terminology – *matka* (English *mother*):

– Translations from *Slavia Orthodoxa*: *μαρτῆ ἰεβκοβλῆ • ἰ οση ἰ μη* (KZ), *Мария, майка на Иакова и Иосия* (BS), *Мария майка на Якова и на Иосия* (BDR), *Мария, майката на Яков и Йосия* (NZ).

– Western Slavic translations: *maria yacubowa a ozierpowa matye* (D), *Maria Jakubova a Jozefova matě* (O) *Maria Jacobowa y Jozephowa matka* (Sz), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (Mu), *Marya mother of Jacob y Jozeffowa* (L), *Marya mother of Jacob and Josepha* (Brz), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (B), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (Cz), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (marginalia of *Joses*) (W), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (G), *Marya mother of Jacob and Joses* (BT), *Marie, mother of Jacob and Joses* (EK).

The equivalents within the examined description differ not only in terms of alphabet and phonetics (often similar, but nevertheless different across languages), e.g., *Maria – Marya – Мария, Yacub – Jakob – Jakub – Иаков – Яков, Ozierp – Jozef – Joseph – Йосия – Иосия*, but also the morphological form, e.g. *Maria – Marie, Jakubowa – Jakuba – Иакова, Jozefowa – Jozefa – Иосия*, syntactical form regarding the order of individual elements of the description, e.g. *Maria Yakubova a Yosefowa matě – Marya matka Yakubova y Yosefowa*, and finally the lexical aspect. In some translations, the name Yosef alternates with the variant Joses, which is due to differences that already existed in the source texts.

The cited set of translation equivalents of just one biblical nomination shows how complex the issue is on onomastic grounds. It is worth adding that the translator, deciding to use a given name, proposes it, so to speak, in a finite form, which can be modified only in another translation. On the other hand, the phenomenon of a foreign unit entering a given language – unlike in the case of a text – has a more processual, dynamic character⁴. Initially, it usually functions as a foreign-language citation, which only with time undergoes (or not) a gradual adaptation. Moreover, differences in the adaptation of particular names may result from the specific nature of Slavic languages (e.g. languages with name inflection vs. languages without name inflection), as well as from the related writing tradition (different graphic systems). We must keep all these conditions in mind when describing biblical names in Slavic translations.

⁴ Of course, it should be remembered that a significant part of biblical *nomina propria* goes beyond translations and functions on the ground of individual languages, cf. appellativized names such as *hiobor judasz* used in Polish.

Adaptation of a foreign name to a target text is tantamount to the phenomenon of transfer (translocation) of a given unit without any formal changes on the basis of quotation. It is worth considering whether such a phenomenon as full translocation from a text to a foreign language text exists at all. After all, even if the graphic and morphological forms are identical, differences may occur on the level of phonetics. It happens that the same form of a given name in two different languages sounds differently, which is determined by prosodic factors. Thus translocation can be understood as a preliminary stage of linguistic adaptation or a completely different way of approximating a foreign name. Taking into account the complexity of the phenomenon, it is our opinion that the processes in question (translocation and adaptation) are different not only in the formal, but also in the functional aspect. For, as Michel Ballard argues, proper names in the form transferred without signs of assimilation, remaining in the source language circle, exhibit zero degree of translation of the signifying element (in reference to de Saussure's concept), while adaptation processes pertaining to a given name already concern a different plane, as they enter the area of linguistic contacts. Thus, these two groups of phenomena should not be treated equally (Ballard 2001: 18–30).

In Artur Gałkowski's classification, translocated names are identified with forms that are quoted (copied or, in his terminology, borrowed) while retaining their original sound. The scholar, applying the terms *transliteration* and *translocation* to them, includes two types of phenomena: 1) transliteration in the same alphabet, e.g. Polish *Szekspir* (*Shakespeare*), and 2) transliteration in a different alphabet, e.g. Cyrillic > Latin⁵ (Gałkowski 2018). A narrow understanding of name transfer is provided by Gemma Sanz Espinar, who distinguishes between simple name transfer, e.g. French *Serge* > Spanish *Serge*, and spelling adaptation (understood as *transliteration* as well as *transcription*), e.g. French *Hassan* > Spanish *Hasán* (Sanz Espinar 2006). In Ballard's concept (Ballard 2001: 27–28) cited above, translocation is a phenomenon different from transcription and transliteration, which the researcher applies to translations between languages using different alphabets. This practice has its repercussions also on the Slavic material. It is worth realizing that extralinguistic conditions (the type of sources, the geographical-cultural affiliation of a given language to a relevant circle, etc.) generate the following types of dependencies in this area:

– in all Slavic translations from Semitic and Greek sources, the complete transfer of the name (without signs of morphological adaptation) must be done by transliteration or transcription (1), since in such situations there is always a change of alphabet, e.g. Mt 23:37: Ἰερῶλημъ, ἰερῶλημъ (BO), Lc 13:34: Ἰερῶλημъ, ἰερῶλημъ (BO), Io 5:1: вѣ іеросолиѣмъ (EM), Semitic source – *Edem* (Gn 2:10, 4:16) (BC, BD), *Eden* (B, HG),

⁵ Eg. Ukrainian *Mazena* > intern. *Mazepa*;

– a full translocation may only concern translations in languages using the Latin alphabet based on the Latin VG (2), e.g., Mt 23:37: *Jeruzalem, Jeruzalem* (W, Wu), although in this case adaptations may also have been made, as evidenced by the use of the letter *z* in place of the Latin grapheme *s* in some Polish and Czech translations.

In the light of the presented conditions we understand the *translocation* of names broadly, i.e. in both the first (1) and the second (2) case, although we are aware how complex this phenomenon is and how many factors it depends on. What is particularly important, the translocated name remains in the fullest way a manifestation of the original, becoming a bridge between the translated and the source text. Michel Ballard stresses that the protection of a proper name demonstrated by its more or less faithful transfer into translation makes it a kind of ethnolinguistic indicator, which not only evokes local color, but also acts as a marker of higher or lower degree of appropriateness between the name and its equivalent (Ballard 2001: 203). The name transferred as a component of the target text still, based on phonetic expression, refers to the original connotations that accompanied it in the original text.

At the opposite pole of translocation we would indicate the phenomenon of translating proper names in the translated text, which is associated with the characteristic for the Bible symbolic load of many *nomina propria* and the phenomenon of their etymologization already in the original text, cf. numerous biblical theophoric names, e.g. *Elimelek* ‘my God is king’, *Ezechiel* ‘Yahweh has strengthened’, *Izajasz* ‘may God save you’ (see Odelain, Séguineau 1978; Fernández Marcos 1977; Tov 2015). It is worth remembering, however, that this practice often requires observation and knowledge of broader biblical contexts, e.g. *Gdy przyszli na miejsce zwane Golgotą, to znaczy Miejscem Czaszki, dali Mu pić wino zaprawione goryczką* (BT) (Greek *Καὶ ἐλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Γολγοθᾶ, ὃ ἐστὶν Κρανίου Τόπος λεγόμενος, ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς μεμιγμένον· καὶ γευσάμενος οὐκ ἠθέλησεν πιεῖν*, Latin. *Et venerunt in locum, qui dicitur Golgotha, quod est Calvariae locus, et dederunt ei vinum bibere cum felle mixtum; et cum gustasset, noluit bibere*) (Mt 27:33–34). In such cases, it is the original itself that dictates to the translators the strategy of reaching for semantic equivalence (Зарембски 2016).

The problem is sometimes more complex in the case of multi-level translations of certain units, as illustrated by the scheme: name in its Semitic form in BH → continuation of the name in LXX → Latin semantic equivalent in VG. This type of situation can be observed with regard to the Semitic name *Gan Eden* (BH), in Greek rendered as *Εδεμ* (LXX), and continued in the Latin version as *paradisus voluptatis, locus voluptatis, Eden* (VG) (Ausloos 2017). Translations based on the original text tend to be consistent and quite regularly use the translocated form *Eden* (Brz, G, KR, EK, JR, BT), while translations based on the VG translate (more or less consistently) the Latin form, e.g. *ray rojkojzy// myaſto*

roſkoſzy (BZ, Wu), *raj rozkoſi*// *miesto rozkoſi* (O), ραν πιτσια (BO), ραν κοχανηα// з места кохання (FS)⁶ (Kawecka, Zarębski 2016).

It also happens that the name is translated only on the basis of a given translation, regardless of the basis of the translation, e.g. Greek Aramaic *Aceldamach* → Greek Ἄγρος αἵματος, Latin *ager Sanguinis* → *Rola Krwie* (Mu, Sz, L, Brz, Cz, W, Wu, G)// *Pole Krwie* (B) (Mt 27:8; Acts 1:19), ... τὸν ἄγρον τοῦ κεραμέως, Latin ... *ex illis agrum Figuli* → *Rola Garncarska* (Sz, L, Cz)// *Rola Garncarzowa* (Mu, W, Wu, G)// *Rola Zduna* (Brz)// *Pole Garncarskie* (B) (Mt 27:7)⁷. As the above example shows, some units are characterized by a broad variety of translation equivalents even within translations into the same language. Variation in the area of onymy in biblical translation is a multifaceted and very extensive phenomenon. The first, basic level of variants is associated with the omissions that occurred in the source texts, both between the Greek and Latin versions, and within a single text (Greek or Latin). Different traditions, copyist's errors, free practices in the area of transliteration and transcription are only some of the reasons for the alternations (Krašovec 2007: 108–257)⁸. The richness of these variants is even greater the greater the symbolic-connotational and metaphorical entanglements of a given name. This situation can be observed in relation to the biblical naming unit *Szeol* (Greek ᾄδης, θάνατος – 2 Sam 22:6; Prov 23:14; Isa 28:15; Latin *infernus*) marked by a high degree of polysemy (Кавецка, Зарембски 2018), e.g.

– West Slavic translations: a) Polish: *grob* (L, Brz, B, G), *dół* (Brz, B, G), *przepaść* (Brz, G), *otchłań* (B, Wu), *iama* (B), *piekło* (BZ, L, Brz, G), *niskość* (Brz), *spodnia* (B), *zaguba* (Wu), *ziemia* (G), *zatrącenie* (B), *strącenie* (L), *zginienie* (Brz), etc.; b) Czech translations: *peklo* (KR), *hrob* (KR), *jáma* (KR), *propast* (KR), *bolesti smrtelné* (KR), *bolesti hrobu* (KR), *ústa hrobové* (KR), *cesty pekelné* (KR), *místo mlčení* (KR), etc.

– East and South Slavic translations: ады (BO), ад (BC, BS), гроб (BC, BD), преисподняя (SR), преизподнята (BS), пакао (BD), могила (SR), трухлење (BD), погнбелъ (BO), въ земан (BO), болѣзни адовы (BO), Адови болести (BC), Болови гробни (BD), вериги адови (BS), Болѣзни адовы (BO), болести паклене (BD), цепи ада (SR), землята на забравянето (BC), мястото на тлението (BS), место тления (SR), местото на мълчанието (BC), бѣды адовы (BO), муки адские (SR), адски мъки (BS), адови утеснания (BC), јади паклени (BD).

⁶ We are aware that – even though there is a wide scope of equivalents – we took into account only a couple of them, originating the chosen translations.

⁷ See also село скъдѣльничково// село крѣвѣ (KZ).

⁸ The author also compiles onymic material from many different language translations of the Bible.

The observation of the body of equivalents of certain units convinces us that the name is not always translated (also within the translations of one language), which is the result of individual decisions of the translator, and often also related to the adopted translation strategy. This practice concerns both units symbolically charged, e.g. *raj rozkofzy* (Gn 2:28, 2:15, 3:23, 3:24)// *myasto rozkofzy* (Gn 2:10) (BZ, Wu), *raj rozkoši* (Gn 2:28, 2:15, 3:23, 3:24)// *miesto rozkoši* (Gn 2:10) (O), *raj rozkoše* (VA), ραη κοχαηηα (Gn 2:28, 2:15, 3:23, 3:24) (FS)// з места кохаηηα (Gn 2:10) (FS) next to *Eden* (Gn 4:16) (VA, L, Wu)// €Δ€МS (FS), as well as *nomina propria*, which are not so charged, e.g. ... z *Dziesiqci Miast* (Mu, Sz, B, G), z *Desieti měst* (O) – z, *od Dekapolu* (Wu), *Dekapola* (Mu – margin gloss), *Dekapoli* (Brz), *Dekapolej* (Cz, W), z *dekapoli* (D), z *Krainy Dekapolskiey* (L) (Greek και Δεκαπόλεως, Latin *Decapoli*) (Mt 4:25). It should be mentioned, moreover, that variants of the type: translated name – translocated (or partially adapted) name also occur frequently within the same text, e.g., *raj rozkoše* (VA) – *Eden* (VA), ραη κοχαηηα – €Δ€МS (FS), z *Dziesiqci Miast* – z *Dekapola* (Mu). These types of cases are best evidence of how fluid the boundary is between the various techniques of approximating biblical names in the Slavic translation series⁹. In the end, we must keep in mind that at the root of every proper name – not only biblical – there is an appellative lexis, which usually can be translated, though it is not always necessary. Given the variety of translators' approaches to a particular name already in the earliest translations, it is not surprising that different practices in this regard were applied in individual Slavic translations, which took as their basis different types of sources depending on a number of extra-linguistic conditions. The phenomenon of reaching for a translational semantic equivalent for a particular *nomen proprium*, using its semantic potential, brings it closer to the class of *nomina appellativa*.

Genetically foreign proper names in a translated text constitute a kind of bridge between different linguistic realities and, with regard to biblical translations, very distant realities. They belong to that part of different linguistic and cultural systems which, although affected in translation by various adaptation practices, is common and most resistant to translation. Foreign *nomina propria* also constitute the set of lexis that, in the target language, or rather, the target environment and culture, is closest to the original, and furthest from the final product, the translation. A foreign proper name in a translated text evokes the reality of the source language not only through its meaning (etymological, symbolic, allusive, metaphorical), but also immerses the recipient in the environment of the original through the sound and graphic aspects as well (Ballard 2001: 37). The analysis of the extent of translational equivalence in relation to the class of

⁹ We realize that the situation may look similar in translation series on the ground of non-Slavic languages.

nomina propria on the ground of Slavic biblical translations proves that there is a great need for appropriate research tools and this type of linguistic analysis, which takes into account the specificity of this type of names, as well as the texts of which they are a part. It seems justified to situate the study of this part of biblical lexis, which – due to symbolic and cultural conditions – often oscillates in the transition zone between *nomina propria* and *nomina appellativa*, within translation onomastics. By profiling the study of the biblical onymic aspect in the Slavic translation series (or individual series within specific languages) based on the type of technique that determines the final form of the name in the target text (from full translocation to complete translation) on the one hand, and in relation to the type of extralinguistic conditions (type of sources, confessional circle, translation strategy) on the other, we can see not only the complexity of the issue, but also indicate a map of common places between individual translations within the same language and different languages. Consequently this makes it possible – assuming, of course, numerous distinctions – to speak of a Slavic biblical translation continuum.

SOURCES

- B Biblia to iest księgi Starego y Nowego Przymierza znowu z ięzyka ebreyskiego, greckiego y lacińskiego na polski przełożone, Nieśwież; Zasław, 1572, drukowano w drukarni y nakładem [...] M. Kawieczynskiego (...) a skończono za [...] staraniem [...] y nakładow dołożeniem [...] Hektora y [...] Albrychta Kawieczynskich: przez Daniela drukarza z Łęczyce (<https://polona.pl/item/biblia-to-iest-ksiegi-starego-y-nowego-przymierza-znowu-z-iezyka-ebreyskiego-grecckiego,ODIxNDcwODg/6/#info:metadata>, access 10.08.2021).
- BC Библия, сиреч Священото писание на Вехтий и Новий завет. Вярно и точно преведено от първообразното. Цариград, 1871 (<http://biblia.bg/index.php?k=30&g=1&tr2=1>, access 10.08.2021).
- BD Biblija ili Sveto pismo Staroga i Novoga zavjeta (<http://www.pouke.org/svetopismo/>, access 10.08.2021).
- BDR Библия, или Священото Писание на Стария и Новия Заветъ. Верно и точно преведена от оригинала. Библейско дружество, 1999.
- BH Biblia hebrajska (<http://tanach.leszek-kwiatkowski.eu/>, access 10.08.2021).
- BO Библия сиречь книги Ветхаго и Новаго завѣта на языкѣ словенскѣ. Острог, 1581 (http://serwer1363362.home.pl/edziedzictwo/book_museum/Biblia%20Ostrogska/, access 10.08.2021).

- Brz Biblia święta, tho iest, Księgi Starego y Nowego Zakonu, własnie z Zydowskiego, Greckiego, y Łacińskiego, nowo na Polski ięzyk z pilnością y wiernie wyłożone. Wydał Mikołaj Radziwiłł Czarny. Brześć Litewski, 1563. (<https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/publication/edition/2746?id=2746>, access 10.08.2021).
- BS Библия, сиреч книгите на Свещеното писание на Вехтия и Новия Завет (http://www.bgpatriarshia.bg/index.php?file=bible_old_testament.xml, access 10.08.2021).
- BT Pismo Święte Starego i Nowego Testamentu w przekładzie z języków oryginalnych, oprac. Zespół Biblistów Polskich z inicjatywy Benedyktynów Tynieckich. Poznań, 1996.
- BZ Biblia Królowej Zofii (szarospatacka): wraz ze staro-czeskim przekładem Biblii. Wyd. S. Urbańczyk, V. Kyas. Wrocław, 1965–1971.
- Cz Nowy Testament to iest wszystkie pisma Nowego Przymierza z greckiego ięzyka na rzecz polską [...] przełożone, przeł. M. Czechowica. Wyd. A. Rodecki. Raków, 1577. (<https://polona.pl/item/nowy-testament-to-iest-wszystkie-pisma-nowego-przymierza-z-greckiego-iezuka-na-rzecz-NzkzOTQ0MjM/14/#info:metadata>, access 10.08.2021).
- D Bible drážďanská. – In: Staročeská bible drážďanská a olo-moucká. Kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století. I. Evangelia. Wyd. Vladimír Kyas. Praha, 1981.
- EK Český ekumenický překlad: Písmo svaté Starého i Nového Zákona podle ekumenického vydání z r. 1985. Praha, 1987 (<http://www.biblenet.cz/>, access 10.08.2021).
- EM Miklas, H., S. Godorogea, Ch. Hannick (red.). Das Tetraevangelium des Makarije aus dem Jahre 1512. Der erste kirchenslavische Evangeliendruck (= Biblia Slavica. t. IV. cz. 1. Südslavischen Bibeln). Paderborn–München–Wien–Zürich, 1999.
- FS Библия руска, выложена доктором Франциском Скориною из славного града Полоцка, Богу ко чти и людем посполитым к доброму научению. Прага, 1517–1519.
- G Biblia Święta To jest Księgi Starego Y Nowego Przymierza Z Zydowskiego y Greckiego Języka na Polski pilnie y wiernie przetłumaczone. Gdańsk, 1632 (<https://www.dbc.wroc.pl/dlibra/doccontent?id=7945>, access 10.08.2021).
- HG Písmo svaté Starého zákona. Wyd. F. Kotalík, J. Merell. Praha, 1955–1958.
- NZ Новият Завет на нашия Господ Исус Христос. Нов превод от оригинала. Българско библейско дружество, 2005.

- JR Jeruzalemska Bible Pismo Svate Vydane Jeruzalemskou Biblickou Skolou. Praha, 2005 (<http://www.jeruzalemska-bible.cz/>, access 10.08.2021).
- KR Bible svatá aneb všechna svatá písma Starého i Nového Zákona podle posledního vydání kralického z roku 1613 (<http://www.etf.cuni.cz/~rovnanim/bible/k/Mt1.php>, access 10.08.2021).
- KZ Quattuor Evangeliorum Codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc petropolitanus. Characteribus cyrillicis transcriptum notis criticis prolegomensis appendicibus auctum. adiuvante summi ministerii Borussici liberalitate edit V. Jagić. Berolini 1879.
- L Biblia to iest Xięgi Starego y Nowego Zakonu na polski ięzyk z pilnością według łacińskiej Bibliey od Kościoła Krześciańskiego powszechnego przyięty, nowo wyłożona. Wyd. M. Szarffenberg. Kraków, 1561 (<https://polona.pl/item/biblia-to-iest-xiegi-starego-y-nowego-zakonu-na-polski-iezuk-z-pilnoscia-wedlug,MTE2MzMzOTU/2/#info:metadata>, access 10.08.2021) (*Biblia Leopoldy*).
- LXX Septuaginta. Vyd. A. Rahlfs. Vyd. 9. Stuttgart, 1971 (<http://www.ellopos.net/elpenor/physics/septuagint-genesis/41.asp?pg=5>, access 10.08.2021).
- Mu Testament Novvy zvpelny z greckiego ięzyka na polski przelożony i wykładem krotkiem objaśniony [...] przytem przydana iest nauka czytania i pisania ięzyka polskiego [...]. Przeł. S. Murzynowski. Wyd. J. Seklucjan. Królewiec Pruski, 1553 (<https://polona.pl/item/testament-novvy-zvpelny-z-greckiego-iezuka-na-polski-przelozony-i-wykladem-krotkiem,ODY0NzI5ODU/9/#index>, access 10.08.2021).
- NA Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine. Textum Graecum post E. et E. Nestle, communiter ediderunt B. et K. Aland... Stuttgart, 1984 (<https://sites.google.com/site/nestle1904/>, access 10.08.2021).
- NVG Nova Vulgata. Bibliorum Sacrorum Editio (http://www.vatican.va/archive/bible/nova_vulgata/documents/nova-vulgata_index_lt.html, access 10.08.2021).
- O Bible olomoucká. – In: Staročeská bible drážďanská a olomoucká. Kritické vydání nejstaršího českého překladu bible ze 14. století. I. Evangelia. Wydal Vladimír Kyas. Praha, 1981.
- SR Русский синодальный перевод (<https://www.bibleonline.ru/>, access 10.08.2021).
- Sz Nowy Testament polskim ięzykiem wyłożony : według [...] łacinskigo textu od kosciola krzescianskiego przyiętego. Ktemu przyłożono Lekcie y proctwa z Starego Zakonu wzięte, ktore przy ewangeliach bywaią czytane [...]. Wyd. M. Szarfenberger. Kraków, 1556 (<https://polona.pl/item/>

- nowy-testament-polskim-iezykiem-wylozony-wedlug-lacinskiego-textu-od-kosciola,Njk1MjY3MzU/6/#info:metad ata, access 10.08.2021).
- VA BJBLJ Česká | to gest | Swaté Pjsmo | Podlé Starožitného | a Obecného Latinského | od Wsseobecné Cýrkwe Swaté Ržjmské potvrzeného a vžjwaného Přel'oženj [...] W Starém Měště Pražském | w Kollegi Sw. Kljmenta Towaryšstwa P. Gežjsse | skrze Joachyma Jana Kamenického | Faktora | Léta M. DCC. XV. [= 2. díl] Prorokowé A Knihy Machabeyský. Nákladem Dědictwj Swatého Wáclawa | [...]|| Léta 1712. [= 3. díl] Druhý djl Biblj totižto Nowý Zákon Podlé 110starého obecného Latinského textu, od samospasytedlné Ržjmské Katoljké Cýrkwe schwáleného, a až posawad wtěč Cýrkwi vžjwaného [...]|| Léta Páně 1677 [...] [= 3. díl, NZ]. Zkoumané exempláře: VKOL III 32.052. Knihopis 1111.1, 1111.2, 1111.3 (*Bible svatováclavská*).
- VG Biblia Sacra Vulgata (<http://www.drbo.org/lvb/>, access 10.08.2021).
- W Nowy Testament Pana naszego Iesvsa Christvsa, znowu z lacińskiego y z gr[a]eckiego na polskie wiernie [...] przełożony y argumentami abo summariuszami každych ksiąg y rozdziałow y annotacyami [...] objašniony (...) [...] Przez D. Jakuba Wuyka [...]. Wyd. A. Piotrkowczyk. Kraków, 1593 (<https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/publication/edition/46959?id=46959&from=&dirids=1>, access 10.08.2021).
- Wu Biblia to iest Księgi Starego y Nowego Testamentv: wedłg łacinskiego przekładu starego, w kościele powszechnym przyietego, na polski ięzyk z nowu z pilnością przełożone (...) przez D. Iakuba Wujka. Kraków, 1599 (<https://www.wbc.poznan.pl/dlibra/publication/edition/9662?id=9662&from=&dirids=1>, access 10.08.2021).

LITERATURE

- Ausloos 2017 A u s l o o s, H. “Garden in Eden” or “Paradise of Delight”? *The Septuagint’s rendering of* $\alpha\gamma\eta$ *in the Book of Genesis.* – Acta Theologica, 37 (2017), № 1, p. 6–17.
- Ballard 2001 B a l l a r d, M. *Le nom propre en traduction.* Paris, 2001.
- Chouraqui 2012 C h o u r a q u i, A. *Czasy biblijne.* Warszawa, 2012.
- Fernández Marcos 1977 F e r n á n d e z M a r c o s, N. *Nombres propios y etimologias populares en la Septuaginta.* – Sefarad, 37 (1977), № 1–2, p. 239–259.
- Gałkowski 2018 G a ł k o w s k i, A. *Onomastyka translatoryczna a translatoryka onomastyczna.* – In: Onomastyka – neohumanistyka – nauki społeczne. Red. U. Bijak, H. Górny, M. Magda-Czekaj. Kraków, 2018, p. 129–138.

- Kaleta 1998 K a l e t a, Z. *Teoria nazw własnych*. – In: Polskie nazwy własne. Encyklopedia. Red. E. Rzetelska-Feleszko. Warszawa–Kraków, 1998, p. 15–36.
- Kamińska 1993 K a m i ń s k a, M. *Onomastyka biblijna tekstów przekładowych jako problem badawczy*. – In: Onomastyka literacka. Red. M. Biolik. Olsztyn, 1993, p. 321–328.
- Kawecka, Zarębski 2016 K a w e c k a, A., R. Z a r ę b s k i. *Linguistic Equivalence of the Hebrew term Eden in Slavic translations of the Bible*. – *Studia Ceranea*, 6 (2016), p. 43–60.
- Köller 1992 K ö l l e r, W. *Einführung in die Übersetzungswissenschaft*. Heidelberg–Wiesbaden, 1992.
- Krašovec 2007 K r a š o v e c, J. *Svetopisemska lastna imena. Fonetika, etimologija, prevajanje in transliteriranje. Biblical proper names. Phonetics, etymology, translation and transliteration*. Ljubljana, 2007.
- Kyas 1997 K y a s, V. *Česká bible v dějinách národního písemnictví*. Praha, 1997.
- Łuczak 2014 Ł u c z a k, A. *Najstarsze słowiańskie przekłady Biblii w niemieckiej serii „Biblia Slavica“*. – *Nauka*, 2014, № 2, p. 135–150.
- Naumow 2016 N a u m o w, A. *Biblia w kulturze Rusi polsko-litewskiej w XVI wieku*. – *Slavia Meridionalis*, 16 (2016), p. 32–51.
- Odelain, Séguineau 1978 O d e l a i n, O., R. S é g u i n e a u. *Dictionnaire des noms propres de la Bible*. Paris, 1978.
- Osadnik 2010 O s a d n i k, W. *Teoria wielosystemowa i rodzaje ekwiwalencji w przekładzie*. Katowice, 2010.
- Pietkiewicz 2016 P i e t k i e w i c z, R. *Biblia Polonorum. Historia Biblii w języku polskim*. T. 1. *Od początku do 1638 roku*. Poznań, 2016.
- Sanz Espinar 2006 S a n z E s p i n a r, G. *La traduction des noms propres (français – espagnol)*. – In: *Linguistique plurielle: Valencia*, 25, 26 et 27 Octobre 2006. Coord. por J. P. Martínez, M-E. J. Domingo, F. O. Cazevieille, G. P. Martínez, M. L. Santiago, I. T. Vallés; Br. Lépinette (dir. congr.), B. Gómez Angel (dir. congr.). Vol. 2. *Comunications*. Valencia, 2006, p. 475–486 (<https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=4031567>, access 10.08.2021).
- Tov 2015 T o v, E. *Personal Names in the Septuagint of Isaiah*. – In: *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, Septuagint. Collected Essays*. Vol. 3 (= *Vetus Testamentum, Supplements*, Vol. 167). Brill, 2015, p. 413–428.
- Willems 2000 W i l l e m s, K. *Form, meaning, and reference in natural language. A phenomenological account of proper names*. – *Onoma*, 35 (2000), p. 85–119.
- Wolnicz-Pawłowska 2014 W o l n i c z - P a w ł o w s k a, E. *Nazwy własne w przekładzie. Zarys problematyki*. – *Poznańskie Spotkania Językoznawcze*, 27 (2014), p. 201–214.

- Алексеев 2008 А л е к с е е в, А. А. *Библия в богослужении: Византийско-славянский лекционарий*. Санкт-Петербург, 2008 [Alekseev, A. A. *Bibliia v bogosluzhenii. Vizantiiskoslavianskii leksionarii*. Sankt-Peterburg, 2008].
- Зарембски 2016 З а р е м б с к и, Р. *Перевод библейских собственных имен в старых польских переводах Библии как исследовательская проблема (на примере нескольких ветхозаветных имен)*. – В: 100 години кирилometodievistika в България. Идентифициране на еврейски и християнски модели в литературата (= Кирило-Методиевски студии. Кн. 25). София, 2016, с. 395–404 [Zarembski, R. *Perevod bibleiskikh sobstvennykh imen v starykh pol'skikh perevodakh Biblii kak issledovatel'skaia problema (na primere neskol'kikh vethozavetnykh imen)*. – V: 100 godini kirilometodievistika v Balgaria. Identifitsirane na evreyski i hristiyanski modeli v literaturata (= Kirilo-Methodievski studii. Kn. 25). Sofia, 2016, s. 395–404].
- Кавецка, Зарембски 2018 К а в е ц к а, А., Р. З а р е м б с к и. *Езикови еквиваленти на староеврейската дума (шеол) в избрани славянски преводи на Библията*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 42 (2018), № 1, с. 117–135 [Kavetska, A., Zarembski, R. *Ezikovi ekvivalenti na staroevreyskata дума (sheol) v izbrani slavyanski prevodi na Bibliyata*. – *Palaeobulgarica*, 42 (2018), № 1, с. 117–135].

TRANSLATION ONOMASTICS AND SLAVIC TRANSLATIONS OF THE BIBLE

(Outline)

(Summary)

The paper refers to a question of translation equivalents of some proper names, e.g. *Eden, Decapolis*, in some of the Slavonic translations of the *Bible* – differing as to their sources, language, translation strategies, confessional circumstances and translation tradition. It is proven, that the process of translating the names may consist of several levels, and the repertoire of translation equivalents depends on both the name's etymology and semantic and symbolic connotations this name evokes. A great number of Biblical names oscillates in a transition zone between proper names and common words.

Keywords: Slavonic translations of the Bible; proper name; translation of proper names; translation equivalent.

*Agata Kawecka, Rafał Zarebski,
University of Lodz*