GENDER ALTERNATIONS WITHIN THE TOPONYMIC PAIR *SODOM* AND *GOMORRAH*

Sabina ROTENȘTEIN
"Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iaşi

Abstract

The article deals with the problem of gender alternations in the case of two biblical toponyms, *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*, which can be frequently found in the same syntagm in the biblical text. Since toponyms do not relate to the animate/inanimate distinction, it is the phonetic aspect to mostly dictate their being included in gender categories. The cultural influences of the time as well as the language of the original text from which the translation was made have imposed non-feminine variants of these toponyms in the old Romanian language and vowel-ending variants) in modern Romanian.

Key words: *gender alternations, biblical toponyms, formal criterion, Sodom, Gomorrah*

Résumé

La présente étude élucide les fluctuations du genre au cas du couple de toponymes bibliques *Sodome et Gomorrhe* qui, souvent, apparaissent dans le texte biblique en tant que constituants d'un seul syntagme solidement coagulé. Puisque nous savons que les toponymes ne participent point à l'universellement connue opposition entre animé et inanimé, c'est donc leur allure phonétique qui, dans la plupart des cas, décidera de leur encadrement dans la catégorie du genre. Les divers courants prédominants dans la culture de chacune des époques traversées comme aussi bien la langue d'origine de la version d'après laquelle la traduction aura été initiée ont fait que des formes toponymiques non féminines vinssent établir leur prédominance en roumain ancien et que, plus tard, en roumain moderne, les mêmes toponymes présentassent des formes vocaliques.

Mots-clés: *fluctuations du genre, toponymes bibliques, critère formel, Sodome, Gomorrhe*

Since it does not relate to the animate/inanimate distinction, as the anthroponyms do, the morphological category of gender, when it deals with toponyms, does not find its correspondent in extra linguistic reality and it only reveals itself within the formal level of the language. In the process of biblical toponymy adaptability to Romanian, it is the phonetic aspect to mostly dictate the inclusion of such toponyms in gender categories. In her study on the proper name grammar, Domnița Tomescu shows that "proper names denoting places group in feminine/ non-feminine gender series according to a strictly formal criterion: name ending" (Tomescu, 1998: 71). The analysis of gender alternations within the toponymic pair *Sodom* and *Gomorrah* will emphasize the specific manner in which place proper names are related to this grammatical category.

Sodom (PSALT. SL.-ROM. 1577, MS. 4389) – *Sodom/ Sodoma* (PO, NTB, MS. 45, BB, VULG. BLAJ, MICU, ȚAGUNA) – *Sodome* (HELIADE) – *Sodoma* (NITZ., BRIT. 1921, CORN. 1921/ 1926, RADU-GAL., B1944, B1968, ANANIA)

Romanian biblical texts therefore present two gender forms: the has a consonant, non-feminine and obsolete ending, *Sodom*, and the latter, *Sodoma*, is a feminine form imposed at the end of the 19th century and early 20th century while completely eliminating the former. In the case of toponyms, the Romanian language specialised several vocalic suffixes for the feminine gender: *-a*, *-ia*, *-ea*. Toponyms like *Golgota*, *Siria*, *Iudeea* are automatically assimilated by the speaker as being feminine. In contrast to it, toponyms with consonant ending like *Sodom* are assimilated to the non-feminine gender and indefinite aspect by speakers. If, in the case of some anthroponyms like *Tamar*, the production of some vowel-ending variant like *Tamara*[1] is motivated by the required correspondence between the form of the name and natural gender, the preference given to one feminine variant of a toponym cannot be justified by its relationship to the extra-linguistic reality. A diachronic outlook on the adjustment of the toponym *Sodom/ Sodoma* to Romanian will certainly clarify the emergence of the feminine form and its being accepted by the onomastic system.

The early biblical texts in Romanian, either written or printed, during the highest possible Slavic influence on church language, are familiar with only one form *Sodom*, *Sodomului*. This is an adaptation of the Slavic etymon *Sodóm´*, including a graphic adjustment as well, while the name preserves the final ´ turned into voiceless ending or assimilated to a short *ŭ* by Romanian. Coresi confirms this form and the manuscript 4389, an integral translation of the Old Testament, according to the original Slavonic text, presents only the variant *Sodom*, *Sodomului*, in all positions. In manuscript 45, a translation of the Greek text of the Septuagint from Frankfurt, the toponym is constantly rendered by the non-feminine form *Sodom*, *Sodomului*, with

[1] The feminine anthroponym oscillates between consonant and vocalic forms *Thamar/ Thamara*. The text of the *Palia de la Orăştie* presents both forms, *Tamar/ Tamara*, the former is a loanword identical to the Hungarian or Latin etymon, *Thamar*, while the latter reveals a process of adjustment according to Romanian. Two variants also appear in the dative: the former is quoted from *Zise derept aceaia Iuda Tamareei* (Gen., 38: 11), and it is a suffixed definite article attached to the vocalic ending of the name, while the latter, from *Spuseră iară ii Thamar* (Gen., 38: 13), preserves its consonant nominal variant identical to mother texts through the use of the feminine proclitic article *ii*. In Milescu's manuscript 45, it is an exclusively consonant form, *Thamar*, according to the Greek etymon Qavmar, and this is equally true in the dative where the translator uses the proclitic feminine article *ii*: *şi dzise Iuda ii Thamar* (Gen., 38: 11). In the 4389 manuscript, the name variant also ends in a consonant in the nominative-accusative, *Thamar*, according to the Slavic etymon Ѣama$^{r\hat{}}$, but in the genitive-dative, one can find *Thamarei*, with the desinence *-ei* specific to nouns ending in *-a*. Nevertheless the *Bucharest Bible* from 1688 knows both forms of nominative-accusative, *Thamar/ Thamara*, but they have only the feminine desinence *-ii* in oblique cases: *şi zise Iuda Thamarii* (Gen., 38: 11). An exclusively consonant variant, *Thamar*, is to be found in the text of the *Vulgata de la Blaj* where the Latin etymon *Thamar* is a loanword. The form of the name fluctuates in later Romanian biblical editions: *Tamara/ Tamarei* (BRIT. 1911/ 1921); *Tamar/ Tamarei* (CORN. 1921/ 1926); *Tamar/ Tamara/ Tamarei* (RADU-GAL.), but in the genitive-dative, the vowel-ending form to which the desinences *-ei/ -ii* can be added is constantly preferred due to its inflexion coherence. Having been influenced by these oblique forms and even by the existence and frequency of the name in its vocalic version in the Romanian forenames inventory, *Tamara* imposes itself as unique version in some biblical editions, including recent translation of Bartolomeu Anania.

only one exception Ezek., 15: 54, where the version *Sodoma* to be found. The Greek etymon of the name is a pluralia tantum neutral form, *Sovdoma*, *-wn*, which could be easily rendered in Romanian also due to its final ending *-a*, a model to be found in the onomastic system of that time period. Nevertheless, the form *Sodom* is widespread in the handwritten version. The translator's, that is Nicolae Milescu's preference for the current version of that time, already assimilated by church language due to the notoriety of the toponym, could therefore be an explanation of it. At the same time, it was also possible to find the form *Sodom* in manuscript 45 due to the Moldavian proof-reader, possibly Metropolitan Dosoftei, who, according to philologist N.A. Ursu from Iasi, "largely contributed to the improvement of Nicolae Spatarul's translation" (2003: 357-358).

The occurrence of *Sodoma* in Ezek., 16: 54 indicates a loanword by grapho-phonetic adjustment of the Greek *Sovdoma*, *-wn*. In the fragment *şi soru-ta Sodoma şi featele ei să vor aşeza în ce chip era de-nceput*, the required agreement between the proper name and the determined noun *soru-ta* and the lack of frequency of some feminine consonant-ending nouns in Romanian determined the preservation of the form *Sodoma* both in Milescu's translation and its further proofreading, where *-a*, a neutral pluralia tantum Greek desinence, was interpreted as a feminine ending according to the model given by the Romanian onomastic system. The context in which the toponym operates could be advantageous to it, but not much further on, the non-feminine[2] form can be found in a similar context: Ezek., 16: 47 *Viu eu*!, *dzice Adonai Domnul, dă au făcut Sodomul soru-ta aceasta şi featele ei*; Ezek., 16: 48 *Însă această fărădăleage Sodomului surorii tale, mândrie întru sătutare de pâini*; Ezek., 16: 55 *şi dă are fi Sodomul soru-ta întru audzu întru gura ta*. The postposition of the feminine noun *soru-ta*, as well as the exchange of the syntactic relations (the toponym is now self-determining and it has the function of a subject), determined a re-assimilation of the acknowledged form of the name. In the same fragment, the noun *soru-ta* would again appear before the determined toponym, but the form of the proper name is no longer a feminine, but a well-known and consonant version of it, since there had been some huge text interposition: Ezek., 16: 45 *Sora voastră cea mai bătrână, Samariia, ea şi featele ei, ceaea ce lăcuiaşte den stânga ta, şi soru-ta cea mai tânără de tine, lăcuind den dreapta ta, Sodomul, şi featele ei*. *Biblia de la Bucureşti* entirely preserves the forms of the names in manuscript 45, and it always uses the toponym with a consonant ending *Sodom*, with the exception of the occurrence in Ezek., 16: 54 where the feminine *Sodoma* is preserved.

The Old Latin Bible was not fully ignored by the Romanian translators during this time period, but translations based on it did not enjoy the same popularity. In *Palia de la Orăştie*, out of the twenty occurrences verified for the concerned toponym, seventeen use the form *Sodom* and only three seem to be derived from the Magyar (*Sodoma*ig, *Sodoma*ba) or the Latin etymon. The text of the Latin *Vulgate Bible* presents two variants of the toponym: a neutral pluralia tantum version *Sodoma*,

[2] In the same place, the text of the manuscript 4389, based on the original Slavic document, *Biblia de la Ostrog*, uses the consonant version in both situations *şi soru-ta, Sodomul, şi featele lui se vor asăza* (Ezek., 16: 55) or *Că nu va fi Sodomul soru-ta auzit* (Ezek., 16: 56). This situation makes us believe that the form *Sodoma* in the manuscript 45 is not determined that much by the influence of the context, but it is rather a result of a spontaneous adjustment from Greek.

-orum, and a singular feminine version *Sodoma, -ae*. The Romanian form of the toponym in *Palia* is therefore, in three of the cases, a phonetic adaptation of the nominative case of the etymons, while in the rest of the situations it is an adjustment of the already acknowledged version of the biblical toponym *Sodom*, *Sodomului*[3]. However the text of the *Palia* was not used for the production of the *Bucharest Bible* by Șerban Cantacuzino and it remains relatively isolated in time. On the other hand, the text of the *Noul Testament of Bălgrad* was almost entirely assimilated by editors in Bucharest, and their toponymic versions could therefore have been better known by by means of the Bucharest edition. *Noul Testament*, similarly to other writings, prefers the consonant-ending form but it though makes one exception in Luke, 17: 29 where a feminine version is used. Nevertheless this form would be later replaced by the Bucharest proof-readers who would use only the non-feminine version *Sodom*, *Sodomului*, (with the above-mentioned exception derived from the manuscript 45) and only for the purpose of complying with custom and achieving the unity of the text at this level as well. The consonant form is mostly accepted and used in the 16th and 17th centuries, while the feminine version appears, but sporadically and is generated by spontaneous adaptation of the etymon and remains isolated within the occurrence system of the biblical toponym.

The toponym, due to circumstances which had made it famous, might have had an enlarged circulation in the epoch since it developed a powerful lexical component and became a common name. DLR (2010: s.v.) certifies attests the existence of the neutral term *sodom* with its plural *sodoame*, *sodomuri* and their versions *sudúm* (non-standard) and *sudóm* (regional), meaning "destruction, obliteration" (obsolete, regional), "crowd" (non-standard), "suffering, magic spell" (regional, in southern Transylvania), "deluge" in Bukovina and north-eastern Oltenia, "crumbled land, steep cliff" in Muntenia and Oltenia. The lexical family of the term, although it is not very rich, stands for an argument of frequency and it includes the verb "a sodomi" with its meanings "to kick the bucket" (non-standard), "to commit suicide", (western Muntenia) "to make someone suffer", "to curse", (Moldova) "to eat greedily", (Banat) "to make soiled", with their derivatives *sodomire*, *sodomit* and their nouns *sodomlean*, *sodomleancă*, *sodomnean*, *sodomneancă*, as well as the adjective *sodomlenesc*, and this was certified by DLR in the title words. Not even today has the late version *Sodoma* become a denomination[4] but nevertheless it generated some derivation such as *sodomesc*, *-ească*, or *sodomic*, *-ică* when it deals with "something related to Sodom, or referring to Sodom", and it was certified by DLR.

The situation changes in the centuries to come as texts show it. Between 1760 and 1761 a Bible of the Romanian Church united with Rome was translated by Pavel Petru Aron who would consequently choose the Vulgate Bible to be the original text

---

[3] "Reliance of the *Palia* on the Magyar *Bible* is beyond any doubt and so is the use of the *Vulgate Bible*. The Slavic words in the text do not necessarily lead to the conclusion that a Slavic source was equally used. They might be derived from the Church terminology of that time period" (Gheție-Mareș, 1985, p. 362).

[4] Forms like *o Sodomă* are to be found today in printed or literary communication on the border line between antonomasia as a rhetorical device and lexicalisation (Leroy, 2004: 20). The close connection of the name with the initial referent and the preservation of the capital letter as a sign of this relation are marks of the incomplete character of the antonomasia, despite the accumulation of the figurative semantic values which makes possible the use of the name with indefinite article.

while separating it from the Greek tradition of the Orthodox. The forms of the toponym are predominantly those already acknowledged in the past centuries *Sodom – Sodomului*, and this is due to its notoriety and desire of the translators to preserve the Oriental onomastic custom[5]. The feminine version has been though more widely used, since both the nominative *Sodoma*, and oblique forms like *Sodomii* have been certified. The Development of the feminine paradigm indicates the even low frequency of use of the toponym *Sodoma*, determined by the Latin original and the environment given by the Church united with Rome and according to which translation had been made. At the end of the 18th century, Micu's edition certifies that both forms are present in language use. Having been also edited within the environment given by the Blaj United Church, the Bible is, according with Ioan Chindriş (2001: 238-239), a new translation after an edition of Septuagint published in Franeker in 1709 based on the Vatican manuscript known as Codex Vaticanus. Al. Andriescu shows that Micu's edition is a processing of *Biblia de la Bucureşti* from 1688, "with changes imposed by the literary Romanian language for more than a century" (1988: 36).The feminine form of the toponym becomes here dominant. Nevertheless a certain differentiation between the selection of nominative-accusative forms and oblique cases is to be noticed. The non-feminine form constantly loses ground but the nominative-accusative form is the first to be affected by it. The oblique form of the toponym *Sodomului* has even greater stability than the nominative-accusative form and it keeps being used even after the latter had already been removed from texts and probably from usage. The Şaguna edition only certifies the feminine version in the nominative-accusative, but it preserves both forms in oblique cases: *Sodomului*, *Sodomei*, *Sodomii*. The modern form, *Sodomei*, currently used in literary language as well, with a desinence specific to the feminine oblique form *-e* tends to replace that with the desinence *-i*, *Sodomii*, which is only used by vulgar, non-literary language.

Hence in the 18th and 19th centuries, the form *Sodom*, although it had been properly established by the influence of the Slavic texts on the Church language, begins to compete with the feminine version *Sodoma*. Some influence of the Latin original texts could now be brought into discussion and possible phonetic adaptation of the Greek etymon: *Sovdoma*, *-wn*, suggested by frequent occurrence of the feminine in texts of Orthodox rites, could now be considered. The feminine form was felt like a singular by the Romanian system and it developed itself an inflexion to come in agreement with this new grammatical content in the target language. By the end of the 19th century already, the feminine version imposed itself and it has been

[5] According to Ion Chindriş' findings (Chindriş, Iacob, 2007: 145), the translation of the *Blaj Vulgate Bible* was made after the 1690 Latin version of Venice which would observe the pattern authorized by the Trident Synod of the Catholic Church and would differ from the Septuagint as far as the number of Biblical books was concerned. However Petru Pavel Aron, while trying to establish a connection bridge between the Catholic dogma and the Eastern side of the Church of the united, also included *Prayer of Manasseh*, 3 *Ezra*, 4 *Ezra* among the canonical books, which had been removed by the Catholic trident pattern (ibidem). The interweaving of Western Church doctrine with Eastern confessional custom in the same cultural achievement can also be easily seen within onomastics: although the original is in Latin, proper names are either rendered in the form already established by previous Greek-Slavic tradition, or in an adapted version according to the typology of assimilation of onomastic forms from Slavic and Greek, which had been used as sacred languages by the Orthodox Church.

mentioned unaltered ever since, as texts confirm it. The weak point of the inflexion of the toponym *Sodom* seems to have been the nominative-accusative form. Preference for the version *Sodoma* could be motivated by a better functional inclusion in the onomastic system of the Romanian language. Although it has an etymological *-a*, *Sodoma* properly integrates itself to a well-defined Romanian pattern made up of proper names created by articulation (see type *luncă-Lunca*) and it generates more viable and functional proper nouns. The toponym *Sodoma* preserves its initial form in all contexts, including those requiring articulation, while the consonant version needs permanent adaptation to syntactic context by determination. The persistence of the genitive-dative form, *Sodomului*, also indicates that the nominative-accusative form was the weak point of inflexion where the linguistic change had occurred. The new version, (having been) also imposed by the influence of the secular language, had created its own genitive-dative inflexion which succeeded in definitively eliminating the former version.

The *Bible* published in Paris by Heliade Rădulescu, who wanted to renew traditional biblical language by setting it free from Slavonic loans and by adaptation of Latin writing and style, suggests a pluralia tantum form taken from the source language with both the morphological and grapho-phonetic aspect of the etymon. The suggested version had nevertheless remained isolated within the history of the Romanian forms of this etymon. Starting from the Greek word *Sovdoma*, *-wn*, Heliade created a Romanian version *Sodome*(*le*), *Sodomelor*, but its has few chances to impose itself since the influence of his edition is poorly related to the Romanian church tradition and it lacks the semantic motivation of the plural form[6]. The Hebrew etymon also knows two forms סדמ/ סדמח but our translations of the Masoretic text render the version *Sodoma* which had already begun to impose itself in the Romanian church text.

This same alternation between feminine and non-feminine is also to be found in the toponym *Gomor-Gomora*:

Gomor (NTB, MS. 4389, BB) – *Gomor/ Gomora* (PO, MICU) – *Gomora/ Gomorra/ Gomor/ Gomorrul* (MS. 45) – *Gomor/ Gomorr/ Gomora* (VULG. BLAJ) – *Gomorra* (ŞAGUNA) – *Gomorrha* (HELIADE) – *Gomora/ Gomorra* (BRIT. 1921) – *Gomora* (NITZ., CORN. 1921/ 1926, RADU-GAL., B1944, B1968, ANANIA)

The first occurrences of the name derived from the Slavic loan *Gomórß* do not certify, in the Romanian texts of the 16th century, any but the form *Gomor* (*gomór´*), with a voiceless ´ or short *ŭ*. Under the same Slavic influence is the manuscript 4389, translated in 17th century, where, after the Slavic Ostrog Bible, only the non-feminine *Gomor-Gomorului* version is to be found. Nevertheless, both forms are to be found in *Palia de la Orăştie*, in the nominative-accusative case, in balanced proportions, but the consonant form in the genitive-dative is dominant (out of four occurrences, three are *Gomorului*). Although the Latin and Magyar original texts include only the forms in *-a* (Lat. *Gomorrhae* and Mag. *Gomorra*nac), the Romanian text contains only one attempt to adapt a feminine form to the genitive: *rădicară oaste spre Bera*, *craiul*

[6] Similarly to other languages, Romanian knows a series of pluralia tantum toponyms, diachronically or synchronically motivated by a plurality of the referent. But, when the plural of the referent is no longer considered as such by the community of speakers, the tendency is to create a parallel form of singular.

Sodomului, spre Birsa, craiul Gomorăei, in contrast with the neutral form *Sodomului*. For the rest of it, translators would choose the same gender in both cases in almost similar syntagmas: *Sodoma-Gomora*, *Sodom-Gomor* or *Sodomului-Gomorului*. The already established form of the toponym prevailed despite the original texts which would only include the version in *-a*. The Greek etymon, similarly to the Latin etymon *Gomorrha, -ae*, is also feminine *Govmor*rJa, -a"*, and it is also indicated by the Romanian texts like, for example, in Ms. 45, where the feminine version *Gomora* appears together with the version *Gomorul*. Being well familiarised with the Greek language, Nicolae Milescu correctly adapts the Greek etymon and renders it by a feminine version in the nominative-accusative case while noting or not the geminate *Gomora/ Gomorra* and in several versions of the genitive *Gomorii/ Gomorrăi/ Gomorei/ Gomorrei* intended to find and establish the inflexion of name in Romanian. If, in the case of the nominative, the desinences of the Greek forms *Gomorei* and *Sodomei* could be almost similar, despite their difference in gender and number, the the dative-genitive inflexion plainly differentiates the toponyms according to their gender[7]. Yet, adaptations in Ms. 45 are still inconsistent enough, both in the nominative and oblique cases. Although in the Greek text, the two toponyms, after the conjunction *w&"*, had been identically processed, in Romanian, the treatment was different in the case of the latter: *Gomorului*, in the former situation, but *Gomora*, in the latter case.

Is. 1: 9 *KaiV ei* mhV kuveco" *SabbawVq e*zkatevlipen hJmi~n spevrma, wJ" sovdoma a]n e*qguhvqhmu, kaiV wJ" govmor*rJa ai] wJmoiwvqhmu*. (SEPT. FRANKF.)

Is. 1: 9 *şi de nu Domnul Savvaot ar fi lăsat noao sămânță ca Sodomul cândai ne-am fi făcut, şi ca Gomorul ne-am fi asămănat*. (MS 45)

To be compared to:

Sof. 2: 9 *DiaV tou~to zw~ e*gw, levgei kuvrio" tw'n duwavmewn o& qeoV" i*srahVl, diovti mwaVb w&" sodoma e]stai, kaiV ui&oiV a*mmwVn w&" govmor*r&a* (SEPT. FRANKF.)

Sof. 2: 9 *Pentru aceaea "Viu eu!", zice Domnul puterilor, Dumnezdăul lui Israil, pentru că Moav ca Sodomul va fi, şi fiii Ammon ca Gomorra* (MS 45).

The oblique forms reveal a similar situation:

Gen. 14: 2 *BallaV basîlevw" Sodovmwn, kaiV mhV BarsaV basilevw" Gomovr*r&a"* (SEPT. VEN.)[8]

Gen. 14: 8 *BasileuV" Sodovmwn, kaiV basileuV" Gomovr*r&a"* (SEPT. VEN.)

Gen. 14: 10 *BasileuV" Sodovmwn, kaiV basileuV" Gomovr*r&a"* (SEPT. VEN.)

Gen. 14: 11 *i$ppon pa~san Sodovmwn kai V Gomovr*r&a"* (SEPT. VEN.)

To be compared to:

Gen. 14: 2 *Vala, împăratul Sodomului, şi cu Varsa, împăratul Gomorei* (MS. 45)

Gen. 14: 8 *împăratul Sodomului şi împăratul Gomorrului* (MS. 45)

Gen. 14: 10 *împăratul Sodomului şi împăratul Gomorului* (MS. 45)

Gen. 14: 11 *călărimea toată a Sodomului şi a Gomorului* (MS. 45)

---

[7] It should also be mentioned that the toponym *Gomora* gets a plural form and it is highly similar to the plural *Sovdoma, -wn* which had been attested by the New Testament.

[8] Because of the incomplete text of the Frankfurt Bible which was the source of the Romanian translation from Ms. 45, I have consulted, in the absence of documents, the Venetian Bible from 1687.

It is only in the first case, Gen., 14:2, that the concerned toponym is feminine and singular like in Greek. In all the other three situations, the non-feminine version is used both for the first and second name: *Sodomului*, *Gomorului*. This mixture of forms, difficult to explain by the original only, could be justified by the concrete history of the Romanian manuscript. The consonant forms of the toponym are widespread in religious texts which had been usually written according to Slavic texts and, given the above mentioned situation of *Sodomei*, they could have been imposed by the preference of the translator Milescu or of the Moldavian proof-reader. Therefore, in Gen. 14: 2, the form of *Gomorei* remains in the feminine, probably in agreement with Milescu's adaptation from Greek, while the version *Gomorului* in all other three situations is derived from Slavic and imposed by the onomastic custom of the epoch.

The relatively heteroclitic feature of adaptations in that time period was solved by *Biblia de la Bucureşti*, a cultural achievement with a tremendous impact on further Romanian biblical texts. *Biblia de la Bucureşti* decided for the non-feminine version and this option was based on the Ms. 45 and *Noul Testament de la Bălgrad* where the toponym *Gomorului* is to be found. This choice synthesises the general tendency of the 16th and 17th centuries when the forms *Gomor*, *Gomorului* were dominant. The feminine versions, either derived from Latin/ Magyar, like in *Palia de la Orăştie*, a text which had been greatly isolated, or from Greek, like in Ms. 45, which had not been transmitted further by the *Bucharest Bible*, had not the chance to impose themselves.

This situation in the above- mentioned examples was to be changed in the two centuries to come. In the *Biblia de la Blaj* there is a competition between the feminine/ non-feminine forms: the non-feminine dominates in the nominative-accusative, while, in the genitive-dative, several attempts to stabilise the feminine form (*Gomorrei*, *Gomorii*, *Gomorrii*) have been noticed. The Latin etymon *Gomorrha*, *-ae* of the original text could have determined the quite frequent occurrence of the feminine version like in the case of *Sodomei*. Nevertheless there are still some differences. The feminine forms of *Gomorei* are to be found either alone, without being accompanied by the toponym with which they had formed an extremely frequent and stable pair in biblical texts, or following the feminine form of *Sodomei*. For example, the feminine is dominant when the toponym is found alone like in the following syntagms: *împăratul Gomorrii* (Gen., 14: 2), *împăratul Gomorii* (Gen., 14: 8), *împăratul... Gomorrei* (Gen., 14: 10), *averea... Gomorrei* (Gen., 14: 11), where the pressure of the original text is quite obvious, but the consonant form of the genitive re-enters the usage whenever the toponym follows the similar form *Sodomului*: *strâgarea Sodomului şi a Gomorului* (Gen., 18: 20) or *viia Sodomului... şi oşteazele Gomorului* (Deut., 32: 32). The feminine is also to be found whenever the first element of the toponymic pair is in the feminine as well, like in: *pănă la Sodoma şi Gomora* (Gen., 10: 19), but it disappears in situations like: *au mistuit Domnul Sodomul şi Gomorul* (Gen., 13: 10). On the other hand, when the other toponym *Sodom/ Sodoma* is to be found alone, both versions are met but the non-feminine version prevails despite the Latin feminine etymon ended in *-a*: *şi au venit doi îngeri în Sodom* (Gen., 19: 1) or *păcatul său ca Sodoma l-au vestit* (Is., 3: 9). These occurrences show some influence of the form of the first toponym, *Sodom/ Sodoma*, which was better known and more frequent than the second one. Even the lexicalisation of *Sodom*, a noun with an impressive number of meanings, unlike

Gomor which had not been certified as a common noun, is shown to be more widespread and this could determine preponderance over the form of the less known toponym. Some less usual forms such as *Gomorr* (Gen., 19: 28) could be explained by this influence. The form can be found after the toponym *Sodom*, according to the above-mentioned pattern but it has a graphic peculiarity: final double *r*. Since the consonant form, derived from Slavic and known during that time period, had never had a geminate, since *Biblia de la Blaj* has no longer this distinctive feature, it could be explained by a cumulated action of two factors: on the one hand, the first toponym of the pair, with a consonant ending, had a powerful influence at that time, and, on the other hand, it is about the pressure of the Latin original which had a geminate, but in the feminine: *Gomorra*, *-ae*. This combination of factors resulted in a final double *r*, like a simple graphic mark of the relation to the original. The Micu and Şaguna Bibles certify attest more and more the feminine form *Gomora*: it dominates in all cases and especially in the nominative-accusative in Micu's version while in Şaguna's version it is only *Gomora* to be found, but, in oblique cases, the version *Gomorului* dominates. The feminine *Gomora* imposes itself according to almost the same rhythm and manner especially in the nominative-accusative like *Sodoma*. The analysis of the two toponyms leads us to the conclusion that the form *Gomora* neither influenced nor helped in imposing the feminine *Sodoma*, but its becoming available was rather hindered by the influence of the older form *Sodomului*. The large number of feminine occurrences of *Gomorei*, in the absence of its partner within the toponimic pair, could stimulate it to impose faster than *Sodomei*, but the notoriety of the latter had hindered the availability of the feminine in the other case.

Besides gender issues, equally belonging to the previous toponym, *Gomora* also raises the question of graphic accommodation with *r*, *rr* or *rrh*. To Heliade, the forms of the toponyms are: *Gomorrah*, *Gomorrhei*. His version is translated from Greek: *tradusa din hellenesce dupo a quellor septedeci*, and these adaptations are due to the use in the Romanian text of the name transliteration methods from Greek to Latin. Geminate r from Greek has the peculiarity "d'être à la fois aspiré est sourde" (Purnelle, 1996: 149)[9]. His Latin adaptations are (ibidem): *rrh* (scholar writing to perfectly render geminate and voiceless feature of the phoneme), *rh* (simplified geminate), *rr* (most recent and popular writing) and *r* (reduced geminate and lost aspiration). Since Heliade was a scholar with expert knowledge of classical languages and willing to impose a latinised typology for name adaptation, he chose the scholarly form *rrh*, which preserved its geminate and aspired feature. For that reason, the forms to be found in his translation are a strict and scholarly grapho-phonetic adaptation of Greek etymons according to the Latin adaptation typology.

Heliade's notation remains unique (another occurrence is to be found in the British Bible of 1911, probably made from a Hebrew etymon). Adaptations *Gomor* from Slavic know neither aspirates nor geminates, since the etymon itself does not have it. Those derived from the Greek texts (like Milescu's manuscript) preserve aspiration regularly and without any difficulty, since the Cyrillic alphabet gives the possibility to note the aspirate above letter r, even if it does not represent any phonetic

[9] "Dans certains mots, il procède, comme le rho initial de la première catégorie, d'une groupe *sr-* devenu *hr-* puis passé à la géminée par assimilation, sans perte de l'aspiration et du caractère sourd acquis. Il peut également provenir d'un *wr-* par analogie avec le premier group" (Purnelle, 1996, p, 149).

reality but it is a mere graphic adornment. The notation with Latin characters eliminated marked aspiration of the etymon with the above-mentioned exceptions in Heliade's translation. On the other hand, geminates from Greek and Latin etymons were but sporadically noted from the very beginning and when they were noted it was just a graphic mark. Writing the name with a simple *r* was required by the integration of the toponym into the orthographic and phonetic system of the Romanian language.

Conclusions of the diachronic outlook on the toponyms *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*:

1. The first non-feminine forms are graphologically and phonetically adapted according to Slavic etymons and they are dominant in the 16th and 17th centuries.

2. Feminine forms predominantly appear in texts derived from Latin originals and they might also be helped by Greek etymons. In the 17th century and largely in the 18th century as well, a competition of forms was noticed.

3. The first forms to give up the feminine are those in the nominative-accusative.

4. The two toponyms have a similar evolution, but the toponym *Sodoma*, better known and more frequently used, influences the evolution of the toponym *Gomora*.

5. Graphic adaptations of the original which had preserved the geminate and the aspiration in the case of *Gomora* disappeared and the toponym integrated itself within the orthographic and phonetic system of the Romanian language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andriescu, Alexandru, *Locul Bibliei de la Bucureşti în istoria culturii, literaturii şi limbii române literare*, in *Biblia de la Bucureşti* (*1688*), Pars I, *Genesis*, in seria *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum*, Editura Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza", Iaşi, 1988.

Chindriş, Ioan, *Cultură şi societate în contextul Şcolii Ardelene*, Editura CARTIMPEX, Cluj-Napoca, 2001.

Chindriş, Ioan, Iacob, Niculina, *Petru Pavel Aron*, Editura ASTRA, Blaj, 2007.

Gheție, Ion, Mareş, Al., *Originile scrisului în limba română*, Editura Ştiințifică şi Enciclopedică, 1985.

Leroy, Sarah, *De l'identification à la catégorisation. L'antonomase du nom propre en français*, Éditions Peeters, Louvain/ Paris/ Dudley, MA, 2004.

Munteanu, Eugen, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, Bucureşti, Editura Humanitas, 2008.

Purnelle, Gérard, *Les usages des graveurs dans la notation d'upsilon et des phonèmes aspirés*: *le cas des anthroponymes grecs dans les inscriptions latines de Rome*, Librairie DROZ S. A., Genève, 1995.

Tomescu, Domnița, *Gramatica numelor proprii în limba română*, Bucureşti, Editura ALL Educațional, 1998.

Ursu, N.A., *Noi informații privitoare la manuscrisul autograf şi la textul revizuit al Vechiului Testament tradus de Nicolae Spătarul* (*Milescu*) în *Contribuții la istoria culturii româneşti în secolul al XVII-lea. Studii filologice*, Editura Cronica, Iaşi, 2003.

ACRONYMS

ANANIA = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură*, Bucureşti, 2001.

B1944 = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură*, după textul grecesc al Septuagintei, [...] cu binecuvântarea Sfântului Sinod, Bucureşti, 1944.

B1968 = *Biblia sau Sfânta scriptură*, tipărită [...] cu aprobarea Sfântului Sinod, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune Ortodoxă al BOR, 1968.

BB = *Biblia ádecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a ceii Vechi şi ale ceii Noao Leage, toate care s-au tălmăcit dupre limba elinească spre înțelegerea limbii rumâneşti, cu porunca preabunului Domn Ioan Şărban Cantacuzino Basarabă Voievod...*, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune Ortodoxă al BOR, 1988.

BRIT. 1911 = *Sfânta Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament.* Tipărită cu spesele Societății de Biblii Britanică şi Străină, Bucureşti, Str. Salcâmilor 2, 1911.

BRIT. 1921 = *Sfânta Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, Bucureşti, Societatea Biblică pentru Britania şi Străinătate, 1921.

CORN.1921 = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, Bucureşti, Societatea Evanghelică Română, 1921.

CORN.1926 = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură a Vechiului şi Noului Testament*, Bucureşti, Societatea Biblică pentru Răspândirea Bibliei în Anglia şi Străinătate, 1926.

DLR = *Dicționarul limbii române*, ediție anastatică după *Dicționarul limbii române* (DA) şi *Dicționarul limbii române* (DLR), vol. XVIII, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2010.

HELIADE = *Biblia Sacra que coprinde Vechiul şi Noul Testament dupŏ quei septedeci, tradusa din hellenesce dupo editia typarita in Athene 1843 sub preveghierea Synodului sacru al Helladei de I. Heliade R., Paris, in typographia lui E. Voitelain et comp...*, Paris, 1859.

MICU = *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Legii Vechi şi a ceii Noao, care s-au tălmăcit de pre limba elinească pre înțălesul limbii rumâneşti* (...), Blaj, 1975

MS. 45 = Biblioteca Filialei Cluj a Academiei Române, fondul Blaj, manuscrisul românesc nr. 45.

MS. 4389 = Biblioteca Academiei Române, manuscrisul românesc nr. 4389.

NITZ. = *Biblia sau Sfânta Scriptură...*, traducere de N. Nitzulescu, 1908.

NTB = *Noul Testament sau Împăcarea cu Leagea noao a lui Iisus Hristos Domnului nostru. Izvodit cu mare socotință, den izvod grecescu şi slovenescu pre limbă rumânească...*, Bălgrad, 1688 [ediție modernă: Editura Episcopiei Ortodoxe Române a Alba Iuliei, 1988].

OSTROG. = *Bibl•, sireç´ Vetxago i Novago Zabeta po •zyu slovensku* (...), Ostrog, 1581.

PO = *Palia de la Orăştie* (*1581-1582*), Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1968.

PSALT. SL.-ROM. 1577 = CORESI, *Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 şi din 1589*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 1976.

RADU-GAL. = *Biblia, adică Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a Vechiului şi a Noului Testament, tradusă după textele originale ebraice şi greceşti de preoții profesori Vasile Radu şi Gala Galaction, din înalta inițiativă a Majestății sale Regelui Carol II*, Bucureşti, Fundația pentru Literatură şi Artă "Regele Carol II", 1938.

SEPT. = *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Edidit Alfred Rahlfs, Stuttgard, 1967.

SEPT. FRANKF. = *Th~" Qeiva" Grafh~" Palaiva" DhladhV kaiV Neva" Diaqhvkh" ajpavnta – Divinae Scripturae nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece, a viro doctissimo recognita et emendata, variisque lectionobus aucta et illustra, Frankofurti ad Moenum, apud Andreae Wecheli haeredes*, 1597.

SEPT. LOND. = *&H PalaiaV Diaqhvkh kataV touV" &Ebdomhvkonta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum* [...], Londini, excudebat Rogerus Daniel, prostat autem venale apud Joannem Martin & Jacobum Allestrye, 1653.

SEPT. VEN. = *&H qeiva GrafhV dhladhV Palaia~" kaiV Neva" Diaqhvkh" a@panta, Divina Scriptura nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia* [...], paraV Nikolavw/ Glukei~ [...], Venetiis MDCLXXXVII.

ŞAGUNA = *Biblia, adecă Dumnezeiasca Scriptură a legii cei vechi şi a cei noao*, tipărită (...) sub privegherea şi cu binecuvântarea excelenței sale, prea sfințitului Domn Andreiu, Baron de Şaguna, Sibiu, 1956-1958.

VULG. = *Bibliorum Sacrorum juxta Vulgatam clementinam nova editio* [...], curavit Aloisius Grammatica, Typis polyglotis Vaticanis, 1929.

VULG. BLAJ = *Biblia Vulgata Blaj 1760-1761*, vol. I-V, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.