

Chapter V

Origin of the Rumanians

1. Linguistic Data

Neo-Latin languages are the outgrowth of homogenous or nearly uniform, Latin which was spoken in the Roman Empire. The following illustrates the chronological development of the Rumanian language:

1st-2 nd to 3rd-4th- centuries	Latin spoken in the period of the empire
4th to 6th century	Eastern Latin
7th to 11th century	Proto- or Common Rumanian
12th to 15th century	Old Rumanian
16th to 20th century	Rumanian

The chronology is, naturally, approximate and characterized by differences of opinion. For instance A. Rosetti tends to place Eastern Latin, i.e., the development of a specific variety of Latin spoken in Italy, Dalmatia, and the Danube Region, in the mid-3rd century. There is no consensus on terminology either. The period of Eastern Latin is, considering the entirety of the Romance languages, the Proto-Romance period. In Hungarian, that becomes confusing, because '*proto-román*' may signify both 'Proto-Romance' and 'Proto-Rumanian'. To circumvent this ambiguity, we will use the designation '*Romanica*' (Romance) instead of '*Neolatin*'.

Protoromance, the basis of the vowel system of the Neo-Latin languages, has a vowel-system which differs from the Latin of the Roman Empire, as follows:

<i>latin</i>	ā	â	ç	î	ô	û		
<i>preromanica</i>	a	ê	e ¹	i	o ²	o ¹	ø	u
			e ¹			o ¹		

What we see here is that instead of the contrast between long and short vowels in Latin, in Protoromance, the open (ê, o²,) and closed (e¹, o¹.) vowels are opposing each other. These changes penetrate Eastern Latin's Eastern Zone; in Rumanian ô and do not merge. Example: *g la* 'throat', Dr. (this abbreviation refers to Danubian Rumanian and not Daco-Rumanian or Northern-Rumanian) Ar., Mr. *gurã*, Istr. *gurê*, but Ital. *gola*, Sp., Port. *gola*. The adopted words - from Latin to Albanian also reflect this format: Lat. *f rca*=villa, Dr. *furcã*, Alb. *furkë*, but Ital. *forca*, etc. In this particular case the Dalmatian language presents a dual profile. Here, the differentiation between ô and as in Rumanian - appears only in the original closed syllable. Lat. *b cca* 'face' Dr. *bucã*, Dalm. *buka*, but Ital. *bocca*, etc. The relationship of this variable system to Latin is as follows:

<i>latin</i>	ā	â	î	ç	î	î	ô	ô	û
<i>preromanica</i>	a	ê	e ¹	á	i		o		u
			e ¹						

Naturally, there are exceptions to the rule: Lat. *aut mnus* - fall; Dr. Ar. Mr. *toamnâ*, Istr. *tomnê*. Historically, this means that the changes in Latin of the 2nd and 3rd centuries have begun to affect that Latin which subsequently became the precursor of Rumanian. The change $\text{ç} > e^1$ preceded the $\text{ô} > o^1$ changes; the former dates back to the 3rd century, the latter to the 4th. In this respect, it is noteworthy that the Latin loanwords in the Albanian language show the same changes as does Rumanian. However, the Rumanian language contains all the changes which occurred in Latin during the 4th-6th centuries, while, for example, in Dalmatian, - *k* - remains, if followed by a long - *e* -. (Lat, *cçna* - 'dinner, feast'; Dr. *cinã*, Dalm. *kaina*; Rum. *c + e, i = ts*). None of this means that Protoromance on the basis of Rumanian did not develop from the Latin spoken in the Empire. J. Herman has provided an explanation of this phenomenon: the $\text{ô} > o^1$ change did not spread Eastward beyond the Western border of Moesia Superior; there are no data indicating this change in the region East of a straight line drawn from Singidunum (Belgrade) towards the south. This shows that the ancestors of the Rumanians and the Albanians must have been living east of this line in the 4th (and 5th-6th) centuries.

In Rumanian, the following phenomena originate from the changes that occurred in the 2nd and 3rd centuries:

- > e^1 : Lat. *magister* > *maester* > Dr. *măiestru* 'master';
- $v > b$: Lat. *alveus* > *albeus* > Dr. *albie* 'trough';
- *ti* + vowel: *t* becomes affricative: Lat. *tertium* > *tersiu*, 'third', Dr. (an) *pãrþ* "2 years back";
- *tl-* > *cl*: Lat. *vetulus* > *veclus* 'old' > Dr. *vechi*;

-*pt-* > *t*: Lat. *septembris* > *setembre* 'September', cf. Lat. *baptizare* 'baptize' > Dr. *boteza*;

- Drop of *-r*, *-s*, and *-t* at words end: Lat. *frater* 'brother', Dr. *frate*

Sound changes by assimilation:

e > *a*: Lat. *passer(e) passar* 'sparrow, bird' > Dr. *pasăre*;

i > *a*: *silvaticus* > *salvaticus*, 'wild' > Dr. *sălbatic*;

o > *e* dissimilation: *rotundus* > *retundus* 'round' > old Dr. *rătund*;

v - disappears between vowels: Lat. *avunculus* > *aunculo* 'uncle' > Dr. *unchi*.

In addition to these phonetic changes, also changes in morphology appeared: neutral nouns became masculine, in the 3rd declination the substitution of the nominative singular by the root of the declined forms, connecting adverbs with prepositions etc. These changes of the 2nd and 3rd centuries in the Latin on which Rumanian is based are identical with the changes in the Latin from which the other Romance languages developed.

The changes which occurred in *4th-6th centuries* in Protoromance are more numerous:

The short, stressed Latin *ì* becomes a diphthong. This alteration consistently appears in Rumanian, Dalmatian and certain Rhetoroman dialects; in Spanish, Italian and French, only in open syllables. This is basically not the case in Provancale, Sardinian, Catalan and Portuguese.

Lat. *petra* 'stone', Dr. *piatră* (< *pieatră* < *pietra*), Dalm. *pitra*, Ital. *pietra*, Engad. *peidra*, Friaul *piere*, Fr. *pierre*, Prov. *peira*, Cat. *pedra*, Sp. *piedra*, Port. *pedra*.

Lat. *ferrum* 'iron', Dr. *fier*, Dalm. *fiar*, Ital. *ferro*, Sard *ferru*. Engad. *fier*, Friaul *fir*, Fr. *fer*, Prov.,- Catal. *ferre*, Sp. *hierro*, Port. *ferro*.

The assibilation of *di-* occurred in the 5th century:

Lat. *radius* 'ray' Dr. *razã*, Dalm. *ruoz* 'thunder', Italian *raggio*, Sard *rayu*, Engadin *raz*, Friaul *rai* (but *raza* 'hand of the watch'), O.Fr. *rai*, Sp *rayo* etc. Preceding stressed *o*, *u*, in Rumanian there is no - *z* - but - *đ* -, just as -*ti-* changes to - *è* - in this situation.

The uniform development of Protoromance is characterized by the phonetic formation of *ce*, *ci* (*ke*, *ki*). The palatalization of *ki* + vowel begins in the 2nd and 3rd centuries; it is beginning to be interchanged with the *ti* + vowel-group (which palatalized in the same manner). Palatalization of *ke* was still not generalized by the 5th century. P. Skok's assumption that the palatalization of *k* and *g* in the development of Rumanian would have occurred in the 7th-8th centuries deserves consideration in view of Albanian and Dalmatian usage.

Lat. *civitas* "city", Dr. *cetate*, Dalm. *èituot*, Italian *città*, Engad. *èited*, Fr. *cit *, Prov., Catalan *ciutat*, Sp. *ciudad*, Port. *cidade*, Alb. *qytet*.

Lat. *cera* "wax", Dr. *cerã*, Dalm. *kaira*, Italian *cera*, Sard *kera*, Eng. * aira*, Friauli *sere*, Fr. *cire*, Prov., Catal. Sp., Port. *cera*.

Lat. *crux* "cross", Dr. *cruce*, Dalm. *krauk*, Italian *croce*, Sard *ruge*, Engad. *kruř*, Friauli *kros*, Fr. *croix*, Prov. *crotz*, Cat. *creu*, Alb. *kryk*.

These changes are the same in Rumanian as in Italian and Western Neo-Latin languages. Rumanian parallels Rhetoromance, but is partly different from Dalmatian, and significantly so, when we look at Latin characteristics in Albanian. In Albanian we find a

palatalized -q - (=k') in place of the Latin - ki - (*qytet.* < *civitate*, *shoq* < *socius*), and - ke - is replaced by the unpalatalized - k -. Latin loanwords in Albanian cannot be separated from the same derivation in the Rumanian language; this suggests an early - and short - relationship between the two (4th, 5th cent.) and that this connection must have been intensive.

The modification of the tonal system is accompanied by formative changes, as well conjugated verbs which denote continuing action were defined by the application of *habeo*: ... *episcopum* ... *invitatum habes* "You invited the bishop" becomes (Dr.) *ai invitat pe episcop*'. This will be the customary usage in Neo-Latin languages but it should be noted that in Arumun and in Oltenian dialects the plusquamperfectum was retained. Use of the genitive case instead of the dative case becomes frequent: *dedit nomen illorum* "named them" (gave them a name), but the Rumanian language retained the singular dative case in relation to feminine substantives which belong to the 1st and 3rd declinations. Examples of the use of the genitive case instead of the dative appear in the 7th century, it must be noted however, that, on the Balkan Peninsula, this might have occurred earlier, given the Greek influence. The vocabulary also reveals new elements: (*primo vere* > *prima vere*, 'spring', Italian *primavera*, Dr. *primãvarã*). The change of meaning of Lat. *hostis* "enemy", became wide-spread (Dr. *oaste*, Old Italian *oste*, Engad: *oast*, etc. "army". This modification could have occurred only when the forces of the Roman Empire consisted of Barbarians, the former enemy; thus, not prior to the 5th century. E. Löfstedt established that substantiation of altered meaning is on record as of the 6th century. At the same time,

this vocabulary parallels Italian and Rhetoromance (especially Friauli). It suggests that the Latin-speaking groups of the Balkan Peninsula had close contact with Italians until at least 600 AD. Of the Rhetoromance links certain phrases stand out: the preservation of the Lat. *albus* "white", Dr. *alb*, Dalm. *yualb*, Engad. *alf*, Port. *alvo*. Even more so, the permanence of *basilika*, "church", Dr. *bisericã*, Dalm. *basalka*, Engad. *baselgia*, O. venetian *baselega*, Veltellina *bazelga*, "reformed church", Alb. *bazilikë*. During the 6th and 7th centuries this term was replaced by *ecclesia* (*kishë* in Alb.) The retention of *basilika* can be traced to the ecclesiastical Latin of the end of the 4th, beginning of the 5th centuries. On one hand, this portrays the chronology of the relationship of Balkan Romanism to its Western counterpart, on the other hand, it reflects upon the early separation of the ancestors of Albanians and Rumanians. We also find that the close relationship of the antecedents of the Rumanian language with Western Romanica - up to 600 - excludes the possibility of the development of the Rumanian language on former Dacian territory; there was no opportunity for this to happen.

There is a segment in the history of the Rumanian language which is inseparable from Albanian; - we have already seen evidence of this. There is a reciprocity between Albanian and Rumanian: each adopted words from the other but many characteristics of the syntax of the Rumanian language - its so-called 'Balkanism' - are ascribed to Albanian. The tonal system in Rumanian has undergone change vis a vis Latin. A parallel of the modification can be found in the Albanian language.

Unstressed Lat. *a* > Rum. *ã*, Alb. *ë*. These sounds are identical, although, there is a slight variation in their formation (as in Bulg. *ã*). In

all Neo-Latin languages we can observe a variation in unstressed vowel-articulation, especially in Spanish, Portuguese and Southern Italian dialects (although, some of this is present in all languages). Thus, the question arose whether the Rumanian-Albanian variances should be viewed as having developed independently from each other. Our data do not support such a theory.

In both Albanian and Rumanian, this sound (*ã*, *ë*) developed from unstressed *a*:

Lat. *familia* "family" > Dr. *femeie* "woman", Ar. *fāmeae*, Mr. *fumeal'ã*, Alb. *fëmijë*.

Lat. *camisia* "shirt" > Dr. *cāma^oã*, Alb. *këmishë*.

Lat. *parens, parenten* "father"> Dr. *pārinte*, Alb. *përint*.

In Albanian, as well as Rumanian the *a* before nasals (*m*, *n*) becomes *ã*, *ë*:

Lat. *canis* "dog" > Dr. *cîine*, Alb. *qën, qen*

Lat. *sanctus* "holy" > Dr. *sînt, sîn*, Ar. *sînt*, Alb. *shënt, shën*.

In Common Rumanian *î* was a variant of *ã*. In Rumanian and Albanian - under certain circumstances - this sound might develop also from other sounds (*i*, *e*, *o*, *u*).

As seen earlier, both Rumanian and Albanian keep the Latin *i*; in other Neo-Latin languages this became *ô* (with partial exception in Dalmatian: Dr. *furcã*, Alb. *furkë*, "fork"). The consonant combination of *- kt -* and *- ks* is very characteristic in Rumanian. The other Neo-Latin languages show here assimilation (Lat. *lac, lacte* "milk", Italian *latte* (also in Rumanian where *- k -* is part of an unstressed syllable; Lat. *maxilla* "jaw", Dr. *mãsea*); or the change of *- k -* from a tectal into an affricat sound or its loss by way of the *- i -* (Lat. *directus* "straight"

Dalm. *drat*, Fr. *droit*, Port. *dereito*, in Romanian, - *kt* - and - *ks* - give way to - *pt* - and - *ps* -.

Lat. *pectus* "breast", Dr. *piept*;

Lat. *directus* "straight", Dr. *drept*, Meglenorum. *dirept*;

Lat. *lac, lacte* "milk", Dr. *lapte*;

Lat. *lucta* "fight", Dr. *luptă*, etc.;

Lat. *coxa* "hip", Dr. *coapsă*.

Similar changes occur partly also in Albanian:

Lat. *lucta* "fight", Alb. *luftë*,

Lat. *dictare* "to point", Alb. *dëfton*, Geg. *diftój* "to show", etc.

Lat. *coxa* "hip", Alb. *kofshë, koshë*,

Lat. *laxa* "skin", Alb. *lafshë, lash* (different as per Bariè)

Lat. *mataxa* "raw silk," "string", Alb. *mëndafshë*, etc.

The equivalent of the Rumanian - *pt* - sound group is - *ft* - in Albanian and that of *ps*, - *fs*. This demonstrates that Albanian Latinisms had been dependent on Rumanian. However, these sound groups have also other variants in Albanian:

Lat. *directus* "straight", Alb. *dreite*

Lat. *tractare* "handle", Alb. *traitoj* "to spice"

Lat. *fructus* "fruit", Alb. *fryt* (<*fryit*).

The two alternants in Albanian are said to be the result of tonal and stress-phenomena. Example: Latin - *ct* - (after - *a* - and high vowels) would be - *it* - in Albanian and - *ft* - if the sonant was different. This appears to be implausible if we look at the previous examples of Lat. *mataxa* > Alb. *mëndafshë*; Lat. *fructus* > Alb. *fryt*. H. Bariè

demonstrated that the - *it* - substitutions for - *ct* - are of Dalmatian origin (Lat. *fructus*, Dalm. Veglia *fróit*). However, the situation is more complex in Dalmatian. In the Veglia dialect we find *guapto* in lieu of the Lat. *octo* (D.r. *opt*) and in Raguzan there is *kopsa* for *coxa*. Bariè posits that Dalmatian *guapto* was effected by *sapto* 'seven' and that the Raguzan *kopsa* was borrowed from Rumanian. We concur with the latter assumption (in Dalmatian we would expect **kuapsa*) but his explanation of *guapto* does not fit. If the sound changes *ct.* > *xt.* > *-it* (*i* with a [^] under it) existed in early Dalmatian, then the equivalent of the Latin *octo* should look like **yuito* in Dalmatian. Yet, this development would differ so greatly from the developmental links in *septem* > *sapto* that we must exclude the existence of an analogous process. Yet, Bariè does draw some noteworthy conclusions which would suggest a transitional dialect between the earliest Dalmatian and Rumanian languages during the Pre- or Proto-Romance period. While we have no substantiating data about its phonemics, we can hypothesize that the Latin - *ct* - and - *ks* evolved in disparate ways. We should not assume that the Roman influence has two strata in Albanian with one of these dating back to an earlier Albanian-Protoromance symbiosis, and the other to a later period during which there was contact with the Romanism which existed along the shores of the Adriatic. In Albanian one cannot make a chronological differentiation between the two strata. A more likely explanation would posit that those who spoke early Albanian lived with early Rumanian speakers or with those who spoke the assumed extinct transitional dialect. This would point to a Protoromance which preceded Rumanian and which was more distant from its Dalmatian version.

Latin - *lv* - and - *rv* - undergo similar changes in Rumanian and Albanian. (Lat. *salvare* 'to save, to rescue' Alb. *shëlbuem*; Lat. *silvaticus* "wild game", Dr. *sălbatic*; Lat. *servire* "to serve", Ar. *°erbi*, Alb. *shërbenj*). Other similarities between the two languages include the *n>r* alternation (rhotacism): Lat. *minutus* "minute", Dr. *mărunt*, but Ar. *minut*, Southern Alb. Tosk *zëri* "sound" but Albanian *geg zani*, etc.) Rhotacism was widespread in Danubian Rumanian (today only among the *Mob*-es); [Rumanians living in the Munji Apuseni - Transylvanian Alps - transl.) and exists also in Istrorumanian. In Albanian, it occurs only in its Southern dialect. We have no obvious explanation for this phenomenon, but it does point to a connection between the ancestors of Danubian Rumanians and the Istrorumanians with the forebears of Albanians who spoke a southern, i.e. Tosk, dialect. It is certain that in both cases, we have to do with two different *n* - sounds.

Morphology points to yet another area of similarity between Rumanian and Albanian, including syntactic changes. The most conspicuous of these is the postponed article: Dr. *cal* "horse", *calul* "the horse"; *fată* "girl", *fata* "the girl" Alb. *zog* "bird", *zogu* "the bird"; *vajzë*, "girl", *vajza* "the girl". In Bulgarian, this development (*voda* "water", *vodata* "the water") is of later origin. It cannot be found in texts of the 11th century, and becomes widely used only in the 17th century. The postponed article exists in the Scandinavian languages, in Armenian, in North-Russian dialects and in other languages, as well. In Rumanian, it developed from the Vulgar Latin demonstrative pronoun (*homo ille*, etc.), but cannot be separated from Albanian, as

the pronoun-structure is identical in both languages, such as the use of dual articles: Dr. *omul cel bun*, Alb. *njeriu i mirë*, "the good person", etc. The postponed article in Bulgarian can scarcely derive from any other source than Rumanian.

Similarities are also apparent in the objective case of personal pronouns, the indefinite pronoun, as well as in word-formation. The most striking among these pertains to the ordinal numbers between ten and twenty: Dr. *unsprezece*, *doisprezece* "eleven, twelve", etc. Alb. *një-mbë-dhjetë*, *dy-mbë-dhjetë*, 'eleven, twelve' etc. This formative exists in Slavic languages too, but there we do not find an *unus-supra-decem* structure. Rumanian does not follow the Latin formative and must have taken it from a foreign language. This could have been none other than Albanian.

The two languages are also alike in their use of substantive constructions rather than the infinitive. It is particularly important that the meaning of some words of Latin origin underwent the same type of change in Rumanian as in Albanian:

Lat. *conventus* "gathering, meeting"; Dr. *cuvînt*, Alb. *kuvënd* "speech"; -

Lat. *draco* "dragon"; Dr. *drac*, Alb. *dreq* "devil"; -

Lat. *falx* "sickle"; Dr. *falcă*, Alb. *fëlqinë*, "jaw" –

Lat. *horreo* 'I shudder (with horror)'; Dr. *urăsc*, Alb. *urrej* "I hate"; -

Lat. *mergo* "I sink"; Dr. *merg* "I go", Alb. *mërgonj* "I remove";

Lat. *palus*, *paludem*. (*palude*) "swamp"; Dr. *pădure*, Alb. *pyll* forest

Lat. *sella* "chair"; Dr. *°ale* "waist"; Alb. *shalë*, "thigh, leg". –

Lat. *sessus* "session"; Dr. *°es*, Alb. *shesh* "plains"

Lat. *veteranus* "veteran"; Dr. *bãtrîn*, Alb. *vjetër* "old".

The precursor of Albanian (words) was the same Balkan Protoromance from which the Rumanian language originates. On the one hand, we know that the Dalmatian *palus* preserved its original meaning. On the other hand, we have an attestation of the change of meaning of *mergo*: a tomb inscription from Lăžen, Bulgaria reads: *immargeban ... in quartum decimumque annum* 'I went away (I did) at the age of 14'. Thus, these Latin loanwords of Albanian derive from the same language to which we attribute the origins of Rumanian.

There is a singular connection between Dr. *sat* (*fsat* in the 16th cent.) and the Albanian *fshat* 'village'. The word comes from the Lat. *fossatum* "ditch" (original meaning: 'military encampment surrounded by a rampart') but the loss of the vowel in the first syllable indicates an Albanian origin. We might also say it has been re-borrowed from Albanian within the context of the mutual relationship between the two languages.

This close relationship is indicated also by a number of words shared by Rumanian and Albanian, whose origin is not known. There are some 100 of these and the largest group (25) pertains to shepherding. Ten words have to do with nature, ten with animals and 12 with plants. Only four words apply to parts of the body. A few examples:

Alb. *avull*, Dr. *abure* "steam, mist", Alb. *rragalë*, "hut", Dr. *argea* "weaver's room, vault, cellar", Alb. *batsë*, *baç* "head-shepherd"; Dr. *baci*, Alb. *bollë*, "large serpent", *bullar* "water-snake"; Dr. *balaur*

"dragon", Alb. *baigë, bagelë*, "animal droppings"; Dr. *baligã*, Alb. *baltë*, "swamp, clay"; Dr. *baltã*, Alb. *bredh* "pinetree"; Dr. *brad*, Alb. *brushtullë* "burdock"; Dr. *brusture*, Alb. *buzë*, "lip"; Dr. *buzã*, Alb. *kësullë*, "kerchief"; Dr. *căciulã*, Alb. *këpushë*, "tick"; Dr. *căpu^oã*, Alb. *katund* "village"; Dr. *cătun* "farm"; Alb. *dash* "sheep", Dr. *da^o* "lamb"; Alb. *dru* "tree"; Dr. *druete* "tree trunk"; Alb. *therimmë*, "wood shavings, shards"; Dr. *fârîmã* "fragment, piece"; Alb. *gjemp* "thorn"; Dr. *ghimpe*, Alb. *gropë*, "hole"; Dr. *groapã*, Alb. *mal* "mountain"; Dr. *mal* "shore"; Alb. *modhullë*, "pea"; Dr. *mazãre*, Alb. *përrua* "brook"; Dr. *pîrîu*, Alb. *rëndës* "gizzard"; Dr. *rînzã*, Alb. *shkrump* "carbonized, charred"; Dr. *scrum* "ash"; Alb. *thumbullë*, "button, knot"; Dr. *sîmbure* "seed"; Alb. *shtrungë*, "milking compartment", Dr. *strungã*, Alb. *shut* "hornless"; Dr. *ut*, *ciut*, Alb. *thark* "sheep pen"; Dr. *parc*, Alb. *vatrë*, "hearth", Dr. *vatrã*, etc.

These are considered the "autochthonous" words of the Rumanian language. Even though there are cases in which a borrowing from Albanian is possible (e.g. *ghimpe*), this is excluded in most cases because there are no regular sound correspondences (for example, Alb. *th* may correspond to Dr. *f, s, b*). The possibility exists that Albanian as well as Rumanian could have borrowed these words from a third or a fourth language. The total number of these 'autochthonous' words - (not all of which exist also in Albanian) would, according to I. I. Russu, be 161; but this number can be disputed. The majority of these words can be found in the Albanian language and it may be pointed out that they strengthen the close Albanian-Rumanian connections described above.

There was earlier mention of an Albanian-Rumanian co-existence in the 4th-6th centuries. The question is, where did this take place? Contemporary Albanians who do not live in Albania proper, live in the Southwestern part of Serbia (in Kosovo and adjacent Serbian territory, the Western region of Macedonia and the southern area of Crna Gora), and in the North-West corner of Greece. However, Albanians are not indigenous to this territory, notwithstanding the opinion of Albanian linguists. Old Illyrian place names came to them second-hand, Latin place names have Old-Dalmatian characteristics. Albanians could not have lived along the coast for very long; their word-stock - pertaining to the sea and to fishing - has come from different languages, Slavic included. The language lacks words from ancient - Greek and this suggests that their settlement in these parts came later. The earliest mention of their presence in these parts dates from the 9th century.

The foregoing has shown us that we must not neglect the connection between Albanian and Dacian; in spite of incomplete records we can see the inter-relationship of the two languages. Identical phonetic changes and common words in the two languages suggest stronger connections than records reveal. However, it is likely that we would find in contemporary Albanian the ideal linguistic mix. Not too long ago, G. Meyer described it as a "semi-Romanized Balkan tongue" (*halbromanisierte Balkansprache*). There is only one explanation for the four versions of the Idg. s- (at the beginning of the word) in Albanian (*gj, sh, h, th*): in some of these words the initial s- is not the continuation of the ancient Idg. sound. (Since Latin s corresponds to Albanian *sh*, this is hardly questionable.) Geographic names suggest that (one of) the antecedents of Albanian must be

sought in the Carpathian region. Only Albanian - (or a closely related language) - can explain the -š sound in the name of the rivers Temes, Maros, Szamos in replacement of the original Idg. -s. We can probably include the *Körös* river, but we lack early data. Traces of an Albanian, Tracian and Dacian sound change can be discovered in the name of the River Temes - an - *m* - replacing the original - *b* -. In view of existing linguistic evidence we can hardly doubt that the language(s) spoken during antiquity in the region of the Southern and Eastern Carpathians must have been forerunners of Albanian and that (one of these languages) must have been Dacian. More concisely: what we call Daco-Geta languages - for want of more complete records.

This premise has a highly visible although controversial piece of evidence: the name of the river Szeret. The following variants are extant: *Tiarantos* (Herodotus); *Hierasos* (Ptolemy), *Gerasus* (Ammianus Marcellinus), *Seretos*, *Sarat* (Konstantinos Porphyregennetos), Hung. *Szeret*, Dr. *Siret*. It would be wrong to separate these names from each other as has been done of late (also, by G. Schramm). This is because all can be explained from the Albanian variations (*gj, th, h*) of Idg. *s-*. *Tiarantos* could reflect a secondary transmission of *Ēarant-*, and the same process is operative with *Hierasos* and *Gerasus* vs. *Jeras-*, *Gjeras-*. The root is Idg. *sru-*, *sreu-* "it flows, flowing". The endings are not clear. The - *nt* - in *Tiarantos* is probably denoting a present participle (flowing); we see a modified version of in *Seretos*. The other variants may have been created from the assimilated version of -*nt*- (-*tt*-), enlarged with -*yo*- (*serant-yo*). Thus, the different versions of the name of the river are interconnected; we can attribute the differences to linguistic

variations, dialects and separate allusions to the upper and/or lower section of the river. The opinion of those who disagree with the premise that a correlation exists seems to be unsubstantiated. Yet, a connection between the various names of the river can only be posited if we assume the existence of an Albanian - like language in the area. Coupled with established records, this linguistic clue traces the Albanian language and the forebears of the Albanians to the beginning of the 1st cent. in the vicinity of the river. Supplemental data also permit us to believe that the predecessor of Albanian was Dacian, more exactly, a close relative of Dacian. When a language, such as this, becomes Romanized to the extent we have seen here, the population must have lived for an extended period in a Latin-speaking region. What's more, a sizeable segment of the population must have been speaking Latin. Nevertheless, some believe that Romanization could - did - take place among peoples residing beyond the frontiers of the Empire. How that works is illustrated by the Latinism of Gothic and Western German languages: these provide a culturally graphic but linguistically shallow view. This access to a Latin linguistic environment is conceivable only within the Roman Empire. Many of those, who spoke a language related to Dacian lived within the Empire (but one cannot definitively include the Getae and Moesi because the Daco-Getan place names in their territory can also be attributed to later settlements). We also know - have observed - that the Romans have evacuated large populations from the left bank of the Danube (such as the resettlement projects of Aelius Catus, Plautius Silvanus). The majority of the people involved must have been speaking a language similar to Getan or Dacian. However, these relocations took place too early for the displaced -

and dispersed - populations to have retained linguistic unity in a Latin and Greek environment (Plautius Silvanus relocated large populations from the left bank of the Lower-Danube in the 60's).

We know of only one Dacian speaking, Dacian-related ethnic group along the Lower-Danube which was relocated to the Roman Empire as a national entity: the Karps. A. Alföldi has been claiming for a long time that Dacia has been given up by the Romans as a result of attacks by the Karps: today we have archeological evidence attesting to Karp settlements in the abandoned former territories of the Province (Septér, Mezőszopor, Obrázsa). Prior to the official relinquishment of the Province, this settlement must have been impacted by strong Roman influence; this we can determine from Roman objects in Karp cemeteries. Once Dacia had been given up, the situation changed. The Karps had been enjoying an actual - or perceived - sense of security (guaranteed by the Romans) but in 295-297 Galerius leads a campaign against them, as a result of which the Karps are relocated within the Roman Empire. (*Galerius Carporum ... gens ... devicta in Romanum solum translate est* (Irod. Rom. 299), *Carporum natio translate omnis in nostrum solum* (Aur. Vict. Caes. 39, 43), *Carporum gens universa in Romania se tradidit* (Cons. Const. ad a 295 - MGH IX. 230). Thus, various sources corroborate that the Karps were resettled within the Roman Empire in 295 (296 or 297?). We know that Galerius takes up the title of *Carpicus Maximus* six times (i.e. he defeated the Karps six times) but, thereafter, we hear no more about them. Although, Constantin the Great is *Carpicus Maximus* in 318-319, we believe, this title was bestowed on him for a successful campaign conducted against territories which had been former Karp settlements. We also believe that it is wrong to identify,

on the basis of Zosimos (*Historia nova* IV, 34, 6), the *Karpodakai* with the Karps; the word is an acronym, made up of Carpathian and Dacian.

Some of the relocated Karps settled in Pannonia, others in Moesia Inferior, the province bordered by the Lower Danube. In Pannonia they left traces in the vicinity of Sopianae (as per Ammianus Marcellinus); Karp graves were found on Heténypuszta (Hungary) and in 368, they were mentioned as living in a settlement - *vicus Carporum* - in Moesia Inferior (Amm. Marc. 27, 5, 5). It may not require special emphasis that people settled "en bloc" within the Roman Empire at the end of the 3rd century, has greater opportunity to retain its national identity and its language than indigenous ethnic groups from the provinces. A majority among the latter must have been speaking - by then - the Empire's common and understandable language: Latin (or Greek in the East). Of the diverse groups of people speaking Dacian, the Karps were the ones with the opportunity to preserve their nationality within the Roman Empire. We can rest assured that they survived, and that the Albanians were their descendants. Albanians call themselves *shqip*, from Greek *skythés* (plural: *skythai*). In Latin: *scythes/scytha*. *Shqip* (Albanian) - if traced from *Scupi*, *Skopje*, *Shkup* - contradicts all phonetic laws (but this is how P. Skok saw it.) Balkan-Latin pronounces - *f* - instead of Greek *ä*, this we see on an inscription in Salona, where the Greek *Athenodóros* was written as *Afenodorus* (CIL III. 9178). In certain cases, the Rumanian equivalent of Alb. "*th*" (Greek *É*) is also -"*f*" and the same is the case with Arumun, which has fallen under strong Greek influence. In Balkan Latin (which - in view of Salona - includes Dalmatian Latin) Greek *skythés* must have been (gens) *scifa*. In this

word the *f > p* change can be explained both in Albanian and Balkan Latin (Dr. *luptã* , Alb. *luftë*, Greek - although not significant - *Astivos*, Lat. **Astifus*, Alb. *Shtip*). In other words: the name by which contemporary Albanians call themselves, can be traced to the designation 'Skytha'; this was the name of a people living on the Northern shores of the Black Sea and the lower Danube; they were called by this name by the Romans as early as the beginning of the 1st century (Greek influence). This was also the name of Karps who migrated from Scythia (and probably of others as well). The Karps adopted this name in course of their cohabitation with Latin speakers and, as time went on, they took it as their own,- as present day Albanians. Since "Scythian" was used to describe only peoples living outside the Empire - along the Lower-Danube or in the vicinity of the Black Sea, - the ancestors of the Albanians must have migrated to the Empire from other parts. As we try to determine where they had lived together with Latin speaking peoples, our records suggest Pannonia and Moesia Inferior. We will, however, exclude Pannonia as a possibility in view of linguistic considerations which we will later enumerate. The idea of Albanian relocation from the left bank of the Danube has surfaced earlier. V. Pârvan thought so; he viewed the Albanians as Dacians. A. Philippide was another exceptional Rumanian researcher. He took the Albanians to be Pannonians - (I. I. Russu also considered this possibility, as his later writings reveal). As we observe the history of Balkan peoples prior to Roman occupation/expansion, it is unlikely that they could have retained their national identity and their language, but it is noteworthy that the Karps - with a 300 year leeway - survived as a people. This is of some

significance in looking at the possible Romanization - within 150 years - of those Dacian natives who may have survived.

Based on the above observations, we can pinpoint the territory as Moesia Inferior where Albanians and Rumanians lived together between the Balkan-Mountains and the Danube, - at least in the 4th century. This coincides with data we have provided earlier about the Latin antecedents of the Rumanian language: its locus had to be east of a straight line south of Belgrade but, perhaps even further east than we presume. An additional dialect may have existed between this and its Dalmatian predecessor. This hypothetical - and temporary - dialect can only be placed in Moesia Superior (i.e. Dacia Ripensis and Mediterranea after 271). East of that territory, we are only left with Moesia Inferior - where Karps also left their mark in place-names. Taking note of Albanian, we find an explanation for the Bulgarian version of the river *Jantra* (which was known in antiquity as *latrus*) ; a nasal tone is being incorporated which is characteristic of Albanian (for example Lat. *mataxa* > Alb. *mendafshë*, etc). At the end of the 4th and through the 5th centuries - between the lower Danube and the Balkan-Mountains - those who spoke Latin and the descendents of resettled Karps fled South. The former locale of the ancestors of Albanians, can be determined through place names. *Niš* - in contemporary Serbian, instead of Latin Naissus, Naisus - can only be explained by Albanian mediation, and on the basis of the Dalmatian *a*>*e* change (Lat. *casa* > Dalm. *kesa* etc.) from a presumed late-Latin **Neisus*. Another place-name which was borrowed by Slavic via Albanian is Serbian *Štip* (Greek *Astibos*, Lat. *Astibo*). The *s* > *š* sound change and the omission of the unstressed *a*- at the beginning of a word (Lat. *amicus* > Alb. *mik*, etc.) can only be

explained by Albanian. The word the Albanians adopted may have been **Astifus* in popular Latin. Thus, Albanians found refuge during the 5th century in the Morava-Vardar valley, from the region of the lower-Danube. This is where they had been living - until migrating Slavs settled here - perhaps in the 7th century; and it was there they came into connection with the Protoromance ancestor of Dalmatian.

Following the 6th century, the ancestors of the four contemporary Rumanian dialects (Danubian Rumanian, Arumun, Meglenorumanian, Istrorumanian) must have lived together in a narrow enclave. This could not have been in the Vardar-Morava Valley, in the immediate vicinity of Albanians living in occupied territory, nor could it be in the area between the lower-Danube and the Balkan-Mountains. In the latter event, there would have been many more words of Old-Slavonic derivation in Rumanian (such as *sutã*, '100'; *stîñã* - 'sheepfold, pen') - but there are only a few of these. This period is characterized by linguistic changes noticeable in all four of the Rumanian dialects. The changes occurred during the post-Albanian and the pre-South-Slavic or Bulgarian period, i.e. after the 5th and prior to the 9th centuries. Included among linguistic changes is another modification of the sound system. Protorumanian changes unstressed Latin *a* to *ã*. Stressed - *e* - and - *o* - become diphthongs when followed by an *a* (*ã*) or *e* (Lat. *cera* - wax, Dr. *cearã* Ar. *pearã*, Istrorum. *èãra*; Lat. *mors*, *mortem* - 'death', Dr. Ar. Mr. *moarte*, Istr. *mortê*); *an* and *am* become *în*, *îm* (Lat. *manus* - hand, Dr. *mîñã*; Lat. *angelus* - 'angel', Dr. *înger*, Lat. *campus* - meadow, Dr. *cîmp*). It is characteristic of the period that - *l* - becomes - *r* - (Lat. *filum* - 'thread', Dr. *fîr*, Lat. *gula* - throat, Dr. *gurã*; Lat. *sol* - sun, Dr. *soare*); *d*, *t*, *n*, *l*, and *s* preceding the original Latin *î* and *î* > *ie*, were

palatized as a result of which a whole series of new sounds came into being [dz (>z), t, n', l', ɲ]. It is conceivable that the preservation of the masculine vocative (such as *bărbate!*) in Protorumanian occurred in this period, or in the following one. This is attributed to Slavic influence, as is the appearance of *h* in the sound system.

This period of the Rumanian language: the (6th) - 7th-8th centuries, is characterized by the development of the specifically Rumanian characteristics, with a very weak Slavic influence. In this period were transferred many of the words pertaining to religion of Greek origin, those which, because of their sound pattern cannot have been borrowed later (Gr. *agiasma* "holy water", Dr. *agheasmă*; Gr. *akthistos* "prayer", Dr. *acatist*; Gr. *kalogeros* "monk", Dr. *călugăr*). In all likelihood, the following were also borrowed during this period: Dr. *jur* "vicinity, area" (Gr. *gyros* 'circle'), Dr. *drum* "road" (Gr. *dromos* "running, field"), Dr. *stur* "black-beard, cinder, icicle" (Gr. *stylos* "column"), etc. probably dates from the onset of this period which means that, during this era, Protorumanians drew nearer to the area where Greek was spoken. In other words, they migrated South, which would explain the dearth of Old Slavic words in Rumanian dialects. (It is worth noting that in both Rumanian and Albanian the presence of early, i.e. ancient Greek words is problematical. To be sure, there are many parallels in this respect between Rumanian and Albanian. Gr. *brotakhos*, Alb. *bretëk*, Dr. *broatec* "frog", etc. The same explanation might apply to Alb. *mokën*, *mokër*, Gr. *makhana* 'machine' but the Alb. "millstone" may be an adapted Karp word from Pontus-Greek. This assessment will be validated if we hypothesize that the majority of Protorumanians ended up South of

the Haemus (Balkan) Mountains. Another reference (also noted by th. Capidan) comes from the Arumun who have known since Antiquity, the names of Thessaloniké, Elasson (in Thessalia) and the Aóos river in Epirus: *Sărună*, *Lăsun*, *Băiasa* (although we may have a different explanation for the latter). On the basis of their sound pattern (-/ > -r-, -on > -un), these place names must have existed in Arumanian from the 6th century on; thus, the speakers of Protorumanian in the 7th and 8th centuries must have been living in the vicinity of these territories, i.e., also in these territories. This actually means that the Rumanian language came into being from Latin spoken in that part of the Roman Empire where Greek was spoken.

This is also the territory to which the Slavic loanwords of Protorumanian, i.e. Common Rumanian, link us. Next to a negligible number of Old-Slavic words, we can identify a large number of Bulgarian - Slavic words which found their way into Rumanian. E. Scărlătoiu counts 307 "South-Slavic" words in Arumun; most of these also exist in the other Rumanian dialects. These words encompass the whole material and spiritual culture, referring to the following categories: 87 pertaining to material culture, 18 to agriculture and animal husbandry, 46 or 49 - cultivated plants, etc. (The different figures come from Scărlătoiu). As Rumanians integrated these words into their own language, the Old-Slavic *ì* became *ia*, *ea* (Dr. *mreană*, Ar. *mreană*, Mr. *mreancă* < Old Slavic *mrina* 'barbel', Dr. Ar. *hrean*<O.Sl. *hrinb* "horseradish", etc.) Ancient Slavic *tj*, *ktj*, *dj* changed to *ʔt*, *jd* (Dr. *maʔteră* <Bulg. *mašteha* "stepmother"; Dr. *peʔteră* Ar. *piʔtireauă*, Mr. *peaʔtiră* <O. Sl. *peʔtera* 'cave' etc.). These sound patterns are Bulgarian, i.e. Liturgical Slavic or Old Slavic. The dividing line between Ancient Slavic *tj*, *ktj*, *dj* and Bulgarian *št*, *žd*

goes today (i.e., before the First World War, which changed the borders) through Vidin and Lake Ochrid. In antiquity, however, the situation was different. Even today, in the vicinity of Sofia Ancient Slavic *ì* is still being pronounced in the Serbian manner: *e* and not *ja* - as in other parts of Bulgaria. Our sources indicate that this Bulgarian - type Slavic existed originally only South of the Balkan-Mountains. Let us refer to Bulgarian *Arèar* (*Ratiaria* in antiquity) in which Latin *ti* turns into the *è*, (thus, Old Slavic *tj* changed to *æ* or *è*, not to *ʔt* as in Bulgarian). The early Transylvanian place names of Slavic origin have "ProtoSerbian" characteristics: *Szelicse* and not *Szeliste* (see the remarks pertaining to the word: *Abrud*), as noted by J. Kniezsa. This leads us to the conclusion that contemporary (literary) Bulgarian - Slavic was originally spoken only South of the Balkan-Mountains; - the territory where *ì*, *e*, and *ja*, respectively, is pronounced may be closer to the original status of the language. The spread of 'Southernmost' Slavic may be explained by the strong influence of liturgical Slavic.

Linguistic data attest to the beginnings of the Rumanian language - during the time of the Empire - in Moesia Inferior. This is where Latin speakers co-habited with the Karps (forebears of Albanians), in the 4th-5th centuries. From here, during the Great Migration, they moved South of the Balkan-Mountain into territory where Greek was spoken. This is where Common Rumanian developed in the 7th-8th centuries, and where it lived on through a period of Bulgarian-Slavic influence in the 9th-10th (and 11th) centuries. Many of the well-known Balkanisms of the Rumanian language can be traced to exposure to Greek which may have started

in Moesia Inferior and may have become even more prevalent in the area between the Balkan-Mountains and the Aegean Sea. We do not know what role the Latin spoken in Moesia Superior (i.e. in the two Aurelian Daciae and in Dardania) may have played in the development of Common Rumanian. A. Mócsy attempted to isolate the unique characteristics of Latin spoken in Moesia Superior but the attempt was futile. However, we know that Common Romanian did not preserve Latin (lat. *aut mnus*, Dr., Ar., Mr. *toamnă*, Istr. *tomnê*) and that suggests that Balkan Latin's middle-dialect (the transitional dialect) also played a part in the development of the Rumanian language.

2. Data from topography and history: the testimony of the written sources.

The following sources will also provide data which are not specific to Rumanians only, since these people - known as *Vlah* - appear in written records fairly late; our earliest sources point to the end of the 10th century. However, there is circumstantial evidence pertaining to their presence in various areas of the Balkan Peninsula.

A reference to their early history lies in the poetic inscription of a grave in Lăžen (see above), part of which reads:

Ipso immargebam caro florente marito in quartum decimumque annum ... 'I died at the age of 14, in the flowering of my precious manhood'.

The meaning of the Latin *mergo* is "I sink," while *in-mergo* could be translated as "I dip, I dive". Yet, C. Daicoviciu is right in translating the text as "*Mergeam în (pe) anul al 14-lea*", i.e., "I departed at the age of 14." In this case we can pinpoint the locale of the change from

Lat. *mergo* "I sink > Dr. *merge* "goes, departs", Alb. *mërgonj* "I remove". The finding was made along the river Asamus, today Osām, Southwest of Novae (Svištov) in Moesia Inferior. The process which led to the formation of the Rumanian language may have begun here. Indications of this process may be seen not only in the change of meaning in *mergo*; in *immargebam* the *a* in place of *e* may be an error but, more likely, it points to a very early *a* > *ã* alteration (Alb. *mërgonj*). We find support for the hypothesis that the locus of the formation of the Rumanian language was in Moesia Inferior from the continued use of local place names: (*Almus-Lom, Ciabrus-Cibrica, Augusta-Ogosta, Oescus-Iskar, Utus-Vit, Asamus-Osām, Jatrus-Jantra*). This adoption / preservation of place names resembles the Pannonian experience which, however, does not mean that the Latin language continued to survive in these parts.

In chronological order, the next period which provides us with data is 553-555. We have Prokopios's writings describing the building program of Justinian (*Peri ktismatón*). It is common knowledge that this work lists a great many fortifications which have Latin names. These also include names with characteristics of the type of Latin from which the Rumanian language subsequently developed. First, among them is *Skumbro*, located in the Remesiana area (Bela Palanka, Serbia) (Procopius, *De Aedificiis* IV, 4). In antiquity, Vitoša was known as *Scombrus mons*; this was the site of Prokopios' *Skumbro* fortification. This name cannot be separated from *Scombrus*. However, in Rumanian, Latin *o*, *ô* changes before *n*, *m* + consonant to *u*. (Lat. *bonus* 'good', D. r. *bun*, etc.). Instead of *Scombrus* (as a place name, ablativus case) *Scumbro* stands out, with its characteristic Rumanian sound change. Along the Istros

(Danube), in Moesia, we find the place name *Gemellomuntes*. We do not know where this "twin peak" was situated, but - according to Beševliev - it would be the *Kalvomuntis*, located between Marcianopolis and Anchialos. At any rate, we must look for it in the Balkan Mountain range. *Muntes* reflects a late Latin form in contrast to the traditional Latin *montes* (cf. D.r. *munte*, *munþi*). Although according to the sound changes in Rumanian, one would expect *munþi*, rather than *muntes* (Italian *monti* is a similar *per analogiam* popular Latin construction of the plural), but this does not alter the fact that *on* + consonant changes in Rumanian (and in Rhetoromance) to *un*. Accordingly, *Gemellomuntes* is a Protoromance form which can be viewed as preceding Common Rumanian. In addition to this location, Prokopios lists *Asilva* (= *Ad silvam*) and *Fossaton* (*Fossatum*), (Procopius, *De aedificiis* IV., 11).

Our next reference has less substantiation. In the province of Haemimons of the Hadrianapolis District (Balkan Mountains), we find a fortress by the name of *Tzitaetus*. A. Philippide assumes the name might come from the Lat. *civitas vetus*, but we may also consider a misspelled *Tzitateus* (>*Tzitaetus*). *Tzitateus* might be a Latinized *citete* 'cultivated', from *citete-us*, which is the equivalent of the D.r. *cetate* "castle" (Lat. *civitas*, *civitatem*). Here, too, we find the type of Protoromance which preceded Common Rumanian.

A map will reflect that the Rumanian - sounding locations listed by Prokopios can be found in the Balkan Mountain-region and, - in the case of Haeminons - in its Southern area. We should add that in the surroundings of the above mentioned names, two fortifications named *Fossaton* appear (cf. Lat. *fossatum*, Dr. *sat*, Alb. *fshat*, "fortification, village").

It is safe to conclude that a late-Latin language was spoken in the Balkan Mountains and its Southern slopes which was the precursor of Rumanian; this occurred during the first half of the 6th century - probably during the reign of Justinian: 527-567. This must have been the environment and the period which marks the linguistic evolution of Latin to Rumanian, i.e. Protorumanian. This mountain range must have contributed to the development of nomadic shepherding. At the time, this was practiced by isolated Thracian groups but later it became a characteristic manner of shepherding for Rumanians. Incidentally, even several hundred years later, the Arumun herded their sheep from Greece to the pasture land of the Balkan Mountain-range. Not surprisingly, for this type of shepherding there are old Slavic words in the Rumanian language (*stînă*, 'sheepfold, pen', *stăpîn* 'farmer/master', etc.). The ancestors of the Rumanians may have met here the remnants of various Balkan groups which maintained a similar lifestyle. The Bessus comes to mind about whom we have references dating back to the 6th century and whose language must have supplied those "autochtone" Rumanian words which have no equivalent in Albanian.

Some decades later, we find another reference to the ancestors of the Rumanians at the Southern end of the Balkan Mountain-range. In the war of 587-588, which followed an Avar raid, Komentiolos - a Byzantine commander - leads his armies from Marcianopolis to the Eastern Balkan Mountains, in the vicinity of the Kamèija river. As Theophylaktos Simokatta writes in *Historia* II, 15, 3-9:

'They took off from the Haimos toward Kalvomuntis and Lividurgon ... they notice the kagan whose tents were put up some four miles away multitudes of his peoples spread over Thracia.

Komentiolos ... ordered them to go to Astike ... However, fate ruled otherwise ... a pack animal threw off his burden ... those behind him called to his master and told him to turn around and take care of his animal ... this upset the orderliness of the march ... Many echoed the sentence - as they heard it ... they kept yelling about retreat and told each other in their mother tongue (Ἰδέ:-ὐἴβὺ ἀἔϋόç) to turn around: "*torna, torna* ... " (Translated into Hungarian by S. Szádeczky-Kardoss - T. Olajos). We find a similar story in the writings of Theophanes Confessor (Chronographia); his text quotes "*torna, torna phrater*" ("a pack animal divested itself of its burden whereupon another man spoke to the animal's owner in his native tongue (θάῶἴῖῖῖῖῖ ὀῦῖῖῖῖῖῖ: "*torna, torna frater*". The story clearly indicates that the loss of order among the marchers was caused by someone speaking in a "native tongue" (Ἰδέ:-ὐἴβὺ ἀἔϋόç) calling on the one ahead of him to turn around; some soldiers thought a command was given to retreat. (In the Byzantine Army the language of command was Latin: *cede, sta, move, transforma*, etc.). D.r. *turna* means today 'to pour, to pour out; to cast' but, earlier, it also meant 'to turn around'. Undoubtedly, Latin was the language of the soldier who created chaos; a Latin spoken in the area. It is also certain that it carried the seeds of Protorumanian; Komentiolos' army marches from the Balkan Mountain region toward *Kalvomuntis* ('bald mountain') the sound pattern of this name indicate antecedents of the Rumanian language. To be sure, *muntis* is the ablative plural of *monti* - a frequent occurrence in place-names; and *on* > *un* is also characteristic of Rumanian tonal. This place name has a Rumanian - more accurately: Protorumanian - character in both regarding its sound pattern and its structure, and there can be no doubt that the

inhabitants of this region were Protorumanians. This region is the Southern part of the Balkan-Mountains. Although according to V. Beševliev, Kalvomuntis lies on the road leading from Marcianapolis to Ankhalos, this is most improbable (at best, Gemellomuntes could have been located thereabouts), because Komentiolos' army is moving from the Balkan-Mountain region toward Astiké, which lies between Plovdiv and Drinapole. Therefore, Kalvomuntis must be located South of the Balkan Mountain-ridge, as also corroborated by other parts of the narrative to which we referred.

At the beginning of the Protorumanian era, around 600, the ancestors of the Rumanians lived South of the Eastern Balkan Mountain region - in and around today's Bulgaria. Because of the Protorumanian characteristics of *Kelvomuntis*, this era began most probably in the mid-sixth century, around 550.

For the next few centuries, we have only sporadic and unvalidated information pertaining to Protorumanian places of residence. An anonymous writer of the 7th century, whose notes were preserved in the monastery of Kastamonitu (on the island of Athos) is writing about the era of the destruction of paintings (717-843). According to his notations, in the 8th century, Bulgaria was occupied by the *Rhékinos*, the *Blakhorékhinos* and the *Sagudateos*. Advancing further, they took possession of Macedonia and reached *Athos*, the holy mountain, where they were baptized by the monks. Given the late date of the reference we cannot vouch for its accuracy but, it is likely, that the author relied on earlier sources. Earliest note of the *Sagudateos* - *Saguditae* - at the Southern region of the Balkan Peninsula is taken at the beginning of the 7th century in connection

with "The miracles of Saint Demetrius" (recorded in Thessalonika). In the Kastamonitu text, we find a reference to *Blakhorékhinos*; in accordance with the characteristics of such compound words, it refers to Vlaks who live at the Rhékios-river. Accordingly, we are told of Vlahs who were found in the 7th century along the Rhékios river, flowing East of Thessalonika. In light of other pertinent data we have this is by no means impossible. The Greek word *Blakhos*, - of Southern Slavic origin, designates Rumanians. The *Volcae* were a Celt tribe. Their German name, *Walho-*, was originally the name used for Celts in the Roman Empire; later it designated Romans. Eventually, it became the name by which Neo-Latin peoples were known. When the word reached the Slavs it had the latter meaning. They used it for Italians and Rumanians (Bulg. *Vlah*, Serbo-Croat *Vlah* 'Rumanian', Hung. *Oláh*, Kaj-Croat. *Vlah*, Slovenian *Vlah*, *Lah*, Czech *Vlach*, Pol. *Włóch* 'Italian', cf. Hung. *olasz* 'Italian').

There are placenames in northern Greece (*Sārunā*, *Lāsun*, *Flārina*, etc) which have been preserved since the time of antiquity. These, as well as other data, help to establish the presence of Protorumanians in the Southern region of the Balkan Peninsula during the 7th and 8th centuries.

We have already noted that the Rumanian language contains few words of Old-Slavic origin, and lacks entirely Bulgaro-Turkish words. The North-East region of today's Bulgaria was occupied in 681 by the Bulgarians of Asparukh; their subsequent expansion into other territories does not alter the fact that their home base remained to the North of the Balkan Mountains. The absence of words from their language in Protorumanian suggests that the latter must have lived quite a ways South of the Balkan Mountains. An additional indication:

in the Rumanian language no trace is left of the Latin name of the Danube, which was *Danuvius*. If this had been inherited, it should be today in Rumanian **Dînuj*, yet the Danube is called *Dunăre* in Rumanian. Although there are those who assume a Dacian *Donaris* (from this, *Dunăre* could really result), from which it would originate, this name is not recorded in the sources. We have evidence that the original inhabitants of the lower-Danubian region (including the Dacians) called this river by the name *Istros*. Even if the ancestors of the Rumanians had been in contact with the Dacians, their language should have retained the Latin name of the river.

Contemporary names for the Danube (*Donau, Dunav, Dunaj, Duna*) eventually lead us to the Gothic *Dônaws*, which was mentioned around 400 as *Dunawis* (Pseudo-Caesarius Nazianzus). Jordanes recorded *Nedao*, which is the same name: *Denaw- Donaw*, with metathesis. From Gothic *Donaw-*, Slavic *Dunaví* developed regularly. Yet, in most Slavic languages - Bulgarian and Serbian excepted - *Dunaj* (*Dunaj;*) became universal. Geography connects it to the Bulgaro-Turkish *Dunag*; Turkish and Bulgaro-Turkish words do not usually end in -v ; thus the - ã - ending. In the Petcheneg and Cuman languages the word became *Dunaj*. This is the root Rumanian *Dunăre*, since - in that language - j frequently turns into r: e.g. Hung. *tolvaj* > Dr. *tîlhar*; Hung. *melegágy* "hotbed">Dr. *melegar*, Dr. *are* "he/she has" cf. <*aiť, aiure(a)*< *alíubî* "elsewhere"; *speria* < *expavçre* "to scare", etc. Presumably, Dr. *ma^oterã* < Bulg. *mašteha* belong to this group.

We presume that Rumanian *Dunăre* is of Cuman origin (an analogous fit among nouns ending in -ea). As such, it cannot possibly

pre-date the 12th century. The Latin name of the Danube became extinct in Rumanian which suggests that the ancestors of the Rumanians, the Protorumanians, must have lived quite a distance from the Danube because even those who did not live close to great rivers, usually knew their name. We can safely assume that Protorumanians were staying far from the Danube also at the time of their Southern-Slavic contacts in the 9th, 10th and 11th centuries; otherwise their language would have borrowed the Bulgarian version of the Danube: *Dunav*. This again implies that the ancestral home of the Protorumanians must have been in the Southern area of the Balkan Peninsula; which also is in accordance with the records in Kastamonitu.

A certain reference from the 9th century also pinpoints the vicinity of Thessalonike. It is common knowledge that an apostle of Slavs, Konstantin-Cyrill, created the Glagolitic alphabet, wherein he used for the *f* - sound - (which the Slav language lacked) the Greek *ö* and *è*. However, in the Greek language, *è* never was used for the *f* sound. But it was used for this sound in Balkan Latin just as - *th* - in Arumun sounds as - *f* . Therefore, it is safe to assume that, when Konstantin developed the Glagolitic alphabet, he considered the Protorumanian dialect from the area of Saloniki (his home base). Consequently, many Rumanians must have been living in the Thessalonike-region in the 9th century.

The first mention of Vlachs (Rumanians) is from 976. In his *Synopsis Historiarum*, Ioannes Skylitzes writes that David, brother of Samuel, who later became Tsar of the Bulgarians, was murdered by a "Vlah coachmen" (*Blakhoi hoditai*) between Kastoria, Prespa and

Kalas drys ('Beautiful Oaks'). This event is to have taken place in the area where the borders of contemporary Macedonia, Albania, and Greece converge. At this time, Vlachs could be found in large numbers in Northern Greece. In 980 the Byzantine Emperor, Basileios II. named one Nikulitzas to be the "arkhon" of the Vlachs who lived in the Hellas (administrative area) - thema, the seat of which was Larissa. In 1020 the Emperor establishes an archbishopric at Ohrida (the Moldavian and Muntenian church remains under its jurisdiction until 1767!) which will have jurisdiction over the Vlachs of "all Bulgaria". At this time Bulgaria was under Byzantine domination. Skopje was the seat of the territory. Its major towns were: Strumitza, Prilep, Prizren, Ohrida, Kastoria, Štip, Niš and Serdica. Today, these can be found in Serbia's Southern and Bulgaria's Western region. Given the data at our disposal it is unlikely that Vlachs would have inhabited the Northern districts (themata) of Bulgaria at the time (10th century). Nevertheless, as they were free to roam, they could well have migrated Northward: the Byzantine Empire's expansion on the Balkan Peninsula, created conditions favourable to exploration. In 1095, a Vlach named Pudilos (Slavic *Budilo*) reported to emperor Alexios Komnenos, who was camping near Ankhialos that the Cumans crossed the Danube; these Cumans were guided by Vlachs across the Balkan Mountain passes. Thus, Vlachs can be found by the end of the 11th century on the Northern slopes of this mountain range.

The speedy Northward expansion of Rumanians is noted by Kekaumenos (Strategicon) in the 11th century. His chronicle is often cited as one of the pieces of evidence substantiating the Rumanians' Dacian origin. This Byzantine official wrote (translated to Hungarian

by M. Gyóni): “the race of the Vlachs is an altogether unreliable and corrupt group ... they fell into captivity after Emperor Trajan defeated and vanquished them; even their emperor was slaughtered. His name was Dekebalos and the Romans exhibited his head on a spear in the center of the town. These people are the so-called Dacians and Bessos. Earlier, they had been living near the Danube and Saos rivers, which we now know as the Savas, where the Serbs live in a fortified and inaccessible location. Relying on this haven, they pretended friendship for the Romans and submissiveness toward their late emperors, but they went off from their fortifications to plunder Roman provinces. Therefore, the Romans took umbrage and, as I said before, set out to destroy them. Thus, they left the area they inhabited and spread all over Epeiros and Macedonia, but the majority settled in Hellas.”

Kekaumenos does, indeed link Vlachs and Dacians to events which occurred in 1066, and links them also to the Bessus, (Bessos) a Dacian tribe living in the Balkan Mountains. However, he does not know where the Dacian country was; he places them in the vicinity of the Sava river. This linkage cannot be attributed to Kekaumenos describing the Aurelian Dacian provinces south of the Danube because these were East of the habitation of Serbs at the time. Nor can it be assumed that the Thessalian Arumun would have retained traditions from origins pointing to the Dacia located on the right banks of the Danube - (so states A. Mócsy in his latest writings). Kekaumenos links Vlachs, Dacians and Bessi in accordance with the Byzantine custom of giving names used in antiquity to contemporary peoples. But why would specifically Vlachs from the Larissa region be identified with Dacians and the Bessi? It is easier to find an

explanation for identification with the latter. Kekaumenos records that Thessalian Vlachs tended their sheep in the mountains of Bulgaria between April and September; this is the earliest written record of transhumant shepherding, and it was known that the Bessi lived in the mountain region of Bulgaria in ancient times. The identification with the Dacians must have been for different reasons. We assume this had to do with Vlach shepherds who, by then, reached Serbian-inhabited areas near the Sava river. (One of the routes of nomadic shepherding leads from Thessaly by way of Skopje to Serb-inhabited territory along the Ibar river.) This group of people could not be linked to the Bessi; another source of identification had to be found. Kekaumenos chose Dacians. In all probability the similarity between *Blakhoi* and *Dakai* (in contemporary Greek pronunciation) had to do something with it. This done, the only thing left for Kekaumenos to do was, to share all the negative information about Dacians which he interpreted in the context of his limited education. According to him, the Vlachs reached Serbia by the second half of the 11th century in the same manner as they moved north of the Balkan Mountains during this period.

Thereafter, we hear of them in the vicinity of the Danube with increasing frequency. In 1164, they capture Kommenos Andronikos near Halics, (where he is trying to flee) in the Danube delta. Their settlements in the Balkan Mountains become gradually permanent. In his "Historia" Niketas Kloniates notes (in relation to the events of the establishment of the II. Bulgarian Tsardom in 1185) that Isaakios Angelos II. enraged the Barbarians residing in the Balkan Mountains with tax levies; these were the people "who had been called the Mys at an earlier time but now they are known as Vlachs". We know that,

between Branièevo and Niš, Greeks, Bulgarians, Serbs and Vlachs attack the crusaders of Frederick Barbarossa in 1189. Also, from 1198-99, to the middle of the 15th century, the official documents of Serb Kings repeatedly refer to the Vlachs living in their country; and there still are many placenames of Rumanian origin in the territory of the Serbian kingdom.

All this does not imply that in those days the Vlachs of the Balkan peninsula were purely Rumanians. True, the Vlachs serving in the Byzantine army are described as the descendents of early settlers from Italy; so says Ioannes Kinnamos, as he writes about the 1167 campaign of the Byzantine Emperor, Manuel, against the Hungarian king, Géza II. However, at the turn of the 11th century, Anna Komnéné claims that all those who maintain a nomadic lifestyle are called *Vlachs* in everyday language. The majority of personal names they used during the period were also Slavic. Nevertheless, some differentiation must have existed among the Vlachs, which is borne out by the comment of Presbyter Diocleatis (*Regnum Slavorum*) around 1160-1170. He writes that "Bulgarians occupied the entire province of the Latin-s; once upon a time, they were called Romans, but now they are known as Morovlachs i.e. Black Vlachs". (However, it is most likely that, in this case, they refer to "Byzantine Vlachs": *Morovlachi* derives by metathesis from the original *Rhomaiovlakho*).

Our data make it clear that the framework for the northward migration of Vlachs was created by the Byzantine recapture of the Balkan Peninsula up to the Danube; part of their pasture-land shifted to the southern portion of the Carpathians. This was the result of conditions for the Bulgarian-Vlach-Cuman coexistence in the 2nd Bulgarian Tsardom (which was established in 1185-86). From there

on, their appearance within the Carpathian Basin was only a matter of time. However, in the 13th century only small groupings, sporadic settlements were to be found within the Kingdom of Hungary, as revealed by the decree from 1290 of the King of Hungary, András III (see above). The story of the Vlachs' extensive migration into the area is part of the history of later centuries and parallels the period when they disappeared from Serbian territory. Some settled on the Istrian Peninsula.

Historical data indicate that the Latin-speaking population fleeing Moesia Inferior became "Rumanian" in Northern Greece, South of the Balkan Mountain-range, on the banks of the Aegean Sea. Starting with the 11th century, there is a Northward migration in groups of ever-increasing size. As a result of this migration, the unified Rumanian language is divided into four dialects towards 1200 AD; the historical data are in accordance with the conclusions drawn from the study of the Rumanian language.

Notes:

¹ - denotes the letter *e* or *o* with a dot under it

² - denotes the letter *o* with a right curling tail under it similar to

ı

(These symbols could not be created by any Font set at the editor's disposal)