

# Further Data regarding the Latin-Autochthonous Glottic Interaction in the Balkan Area

Marc A. GABINSCHI (Chişinău)

The purpose of this paper is to familiarize the English speaking reader with some of the author's recent not yet published results in the domain they are presented against a broader background of his Balkanologic considerations published in previous years.

It should be noted that, paradoxical as it is, the data obtained and regarded by the author as his most important ones in the domain do not relate to the Latin-autochthonous interaction itself, inaccessible to our direct observations, but to some later glottic phenomena due, in the last analysis, to the pre-requisites which existed long ago, most probably in the first millennium A.D. Now it is practically impossible to state what the concrete source of the autochthonous influence in the pre-Romanian Latin or early Romanian itself was. It may have been the Dacian substratum, as well as the several centuries long (pre-)Romanian-(pre-)Albanian coexistence in some zones of the Central Balkans, like the often mentioned in this connection Dardania or the Morava and Timok basins or the *Niš* (<*Naissus*) - *Skopje* (<*Scupis*) - *Sofia* (<*Serdica*) triangle etc. The two versions do not exclude each other, because we can not yet regard the Illyrian provenance of Albanian as an indisputable fact, so that it could also prove to be Thraco-Dacian, nor do we know what the degree of community (due to kinship and/or Sprachbund-like relations) between Illyrian and Thraco-Dacian was. However, since there were few direct Albanian-Romanian contacts in the present millennium, the two languages' areas not even bordering upon each other for many centuries (the Aromanian micro-areas being of little importance), it is clear that the most striking common features of the two languages owe their existence to the territorial community or intense contacts of remote past times. To say nothing of more wide-spread phenomena, shared by other Balkan languages as well (the loss of the infinitive, the postposed article, the evolution of the verb "to want" into the formant of the future tense, the homonymization of genitive and dative, resp. of their prepositional equivalents etc.) at least the following main Albano-Romanian features should be pointed out: the formal individualization of the genitive through what is called some kind of "articles" which are in fact left semi-confixes, quite indifferent towards the definiteness or the indefiniteness of the noun introduced by them, or the frequent use of the so called "supine" of Romanian, e.g. the action noun of participial form, more productive there in the past and universally productive even now in Albanian (cf. the *të bërë*<sup>1</sup> type). But at the same time, as the productivity of the action names

like *făcut* decreased in the last centuries (almost none of them is now used for the many thousands of neologic verbs which build their action names in *-re*, but also in *-aj* etc.), some of their specific prepositional constructions developed, which, unlike such nouns themselves, are transitive, as in *de făcut, la făcut, pentru făcut*, etc. So the first step towards verbalization was made. The complete verbalization was achieved in cases in which the preposition ceased to be what it was, becoming the left part of a confix, i.e. a discontinuous formant whose right part was inherited from the participial action name. This deprepositionalization is peculiar exclusively to *de*. Standard Romanian approves of a limited number of such uses (e.g. the patterns like *e de făcut; am de făcut; mântui/sfârșesc/termin etc. de făcut; de făcut am făcut; rămâne de făcut; e greu/ușor/imposibil etc. de făcut*), but in substandard spheres, e.g. in folklore, and especially in Moldova, the *de făcut* constructions are much more numerous, cf. such wide-spread uses as *trebuie de făcut; se poate de făcut; de făcut pot/știu/vreau etc.; Cum de făcut?; ca de făcut; este ce de făcut etc.*, cf. especially the subject role, e.g. *De vrut e una, da de putut e alta*. The evolution has reached its present day summit in the sporadic inclusion of verbal clitics, e.g. *de te făcut, de le făcut, de o făcut* etc. Such facts entitled us to state the appearance of a secondary infinitive in Romanian and to suppose a similar shift in Albanian. We meant the *të bërë* type, our assumption being confirmed by two phenomena. First, it was the recent evolution of *për të bërë* (named "future infinitive" already in the first Albanian grammar<sup>2</sup> and frequently characterized later as an "infinitive", but being mostly a destinative form, like the Latin supine I and becoming an infinitive *sensu stricto* only in some sporadic uses peculiar to the last decades). The second phenomenon in question was the verbalization of the *së bëri* type, still usually regarded as ablative, but being in fact already a non-finite verbal form specialized to follow first of all finite verbs (e.g. *mbaroj/pushoj/tresht* etc.), more seldom *vazhdoj/vijoj* and even more seldom *filloj/nis* etc. (cf. Rom. *termin* etc. *de făcut*), cf. also the recent inclusion of clitics as in *s'u bëri, së më bëri* etc. Many facts and considerations on the matter can be found in our special works on the topic<sup>3</sup>. Of course, we were not the first author to notice the strong infinitive-like features of the forms in question, as well as their resemblance in Romanian and Albanian. Our predecessors were K. Sandfeld (-Jensen)<sup>4</sup>, A. Pancratz<sup>5</sup>, A. Philippide<sup>6</sup>, to whom we paid tribute. However, they neither had strict criteria of what noun, verb, participle and infinitive are, nor had they at their disposal so many facts of the intense evolution as we could observe in the last decades. On the other hand, there were some not well thoughts of attempts to deny the very fact of the Balkan secondary infinitivity, based on its absence in Bulgarian and on not seeing the clear confixal character of the forms discussed (Rom. *de... P*, Alb. *për të... P* and *së... Pi*, where *P* is a homonym of the participial ending) by our critics like V. Georgiev<sup>7</sup> and his followers *jurantes in verba magistri* (B. Simeonov, P. Asenova

a.o.) who do not know the Romanian, especially Moldavian, glottic reality. Such attempts could by no means overshadow the obvious real character of the intense evolution which we witness every day in Moldova.

Provided the appearance of an infinitive as a process accessible to our direct observations is a chance of utmost importance for Indo-European and general linguistics, we consider the facts referred to above as the most important object of our research in the field of Latin (resp. Romance)-autochthonous glottic contacts, despite our being able to observe only their consequences as they look today.

As to the well-known confrontation of the Romanian "supine" and the Albanian primary infinitive, the now only Gheg *me ba* type (see the works referred to), it is not clear what the degree of their contact-caused community is. The *me ba* type appears completely formed long ago already in the first Albanian texts where it is morphologically developed (inflected for voice and objects) and very poly-functional, unlike the forms mentioned above, even as they appear now. It is also built without the once article *të/së*, now a left semiconfix or a segment of it in the types *së bëri* and *për të bërë* (cf. for contrast the later *me të bërë* type expressing immediate precedence or simultaneity, already containing the *të*). So if *me ba* is also a former preposition + noun, it must have come into being in a time when the participial nomina actions had still no prepositional formant regarded by linguists as an article, as shown by E. Çabej<sup>8</sup>. According to our hypothesis, the *me ba* type could develop in common Albanian (cf. its Tosk remnants) as a commitative prepositional group of an action name ("with doing"), later becoming a gerund (cf. his antonym, the privative Gheg *pa ba*, Tosk *pa bërë*, now sporadically restructured into *pa të bërë*) and then re-interpreted (in contexts like the ones in which gerund and infinitive are interchangeable in Albanian even now) as an infinitive<sup>9</sup>. Unlike the *për të bërë*, *së bëri - de fëcut* pre-infinitive community of prepositional resp. case meanings, it could hardly be pointed out what such a community of Alb. *me* and (pre-)Rom. *de* could have been. The latter, very polysemic, has, in common with Alb. *për*, the destinative meaning, both active (e.g. *çekan për të rrahur - ciocan de bătut*) and passive (e.g. *ujë për të pirë - apă de băut*), as well as, with the ablative, the elative one (e.g. *mbaroj/pushoj/treshit së punuari - sfârșesc/mântui/termin de lucrat*) etc. But Alb. *me* is oligosemic, mostly commitative, while *de* has no such meaning, Alb. *me* usually corresponding to Rom. *cu*. K. Sandfeld's attempt<sup>10</sup> to see in *me* from *me fjet* "un analogie curieuse" (!) of *a* from *a dormi*, which is an old Romance (not secondary post-participle) infinitive, is in itself unsuccessful and, of course, is far from shedding any light on the *me ba - de fëcut* relations. Perhaps the common meaning of *me* and *de* as prepositions, the relative one ("as to..."), rare enough in both, could be invoked: cf. Alb. *i madh'i vogël me trup, i madh me zemër*, Rom. *mic de stat, mare de ani, slab de înger* etc. So the *me ba - de fëcut* initial relations are rather obscure. We know about them approximately as little as

about the causes of the much discussed resemblances between Alb. and old-Rom. and Arom. *-t* in *kënduat* and *voj cântat*, Alb. and Rom. *-m* in *kam* (cf. also *jam*, *them*) and *am*, Alb. and Rom. *-e* in the feminine genitive and dative indefinite singular (e.g. (*i*) *një shtëpie* - (*al*) *unei case*), the latter being inherited from Lat. *-ae*, but perhaps with the support of a homonym autochthonous formant in bilingual speech. (As to the well-known parallelism in the confixal structure of ordinals, like Alb. *i dytë* - Rom. *al doilea*, the latter seems to be rather due to internal factors, because confixal adjectives are often primary (not derived) and belong to various semantic groups in Albanian, while their Romanian correspondences are exclusively ordinals, i.e. words with numerical meaning, a fact which the Romanian preposition *a* could well account for (cf. *mamă a doi copii*)<sup>11</sup>.

Of course, a condition of the new infinitive's evolution in both languages is the common Balkan loss of the old infinitives. As is generally known, the discussion about the causes of this Balkan phenomenon is very long, at present three of several more once circulating explanations still being of interest. As we have tried to show in detailed examinations of the three versions, the polygenetic one is practically inconsistent, while the now prevailing explanation through Greek influence on other Balkan languages, based on some arguments regarding Greek itself (the traditional phonetic one<sup>12</sup> and the recent one founded by E. Kurzová on semantic factors<sup>13</sup>) is insufficient to account for the loss of the infinitive in Greek. In other words, we continue, in line with G. Weigand and others' views, to regard the preservation of some substratum (most probably Thracian) glottic habits as the main cause of the tendency towards replacing the infinitive. Of the many arguments presented in the discussion we would like to elaborate on the one which he has recently completed with new facts. We mean the extrapolation of data about the source of the phenomenon from a period accessible to our observations into an inaccessible one. So we have invoked the factor of the neo-Balkan languages as natural models of the older ones of the region, to help localize the initial source of the phenomenon. Taking the old Balkan languages themselves for a kind of "black box", we try to see how languages brought later to the Balkan glottic area (not just only in geographical sense) behave. So we have made use of the facts demonstrating various degrees of the infinitive replacement in Southern Calabrian, Southern Apulian and Northern Sicilian formed on Greek substratum (after G. Rohlfs), in some local varieties of the Banat Serbian, where the substratum is Romanian (after P. Ivić), in the also Romanian influenced varieties of Hungarian (*secui* and *ceangău*, after H. Schuchardt, K. Sandfeld and W. Giese), in Gagauz (after L.A. Pokrovskaya) and, the masdar being concerned, in some Balkan Turkish vernaculars (after Zs. Kakuk)<sup>14</sup>. Cf. also the complete loss of the old Indo-Aryan infinitive in Romany, strongly influenced by Greek and Romanian. Scattered examples of the same phenomenon is what we have witnessed in the Russian speech of Molda-

vians. But our main application of the method in question was investigating the Judeo-Spanish (or Sephardic) of the Balkans, where on all their glottic areas there is a more or less strong tendency to replace some Spanish-type infinitive constructions with those subjunctive-based, especially such as *Ké ke (f)aga?* (cf. Rom. *Ce să făc?*) and *Kale ke (f)aga* (cf. Rom. *Trebuie să fac*), i.e. typically Balkan turns of speech, unknown to Spanish.

The phenomenon was described by us in a series of works which provoked, as expected, objections of those preferring other explanations of the Balkan evolution. To say nothing of the simple denying of the facts (as B.D. Joseph does<sup>15</sup>), some of the objections were quite unrealistic (as the "mechanism of contacts" itself, by M.J. Rosenzweig<sup>16</sup>), others, on the contrary, suggested (although together with rather strange statements that the infinitive-subjunctive shift took place "almost everywhere") that the Maghreb variety of Sephardic should also be explored (P. Trost)<sup>17</sup>. Of course, should it show the same tendency, it would become clear that the Balkan Sephardic data adduced had no diagnostic value.

Indeed, as soon as Maghreb Sephardic texts became recently available to us, we explored them, as was required, finding among the more than three hundred cases of relevant contexts not a single one of Balkan type (i.e. purely Spanish turns like *tengo que hacer* and *¿Qué voy a hacer?* etc.<sup>18</sup> are the only possible means of expressing the respective contents). Such a comparison delineates once more the exclusively Balkan localization of the phenomenon.

So, as the neo-Balkan languages and dialects suggest, the transmission of the subjunctive replacing the infinitive from one language into another is a real fact. This is an evident advantage of the substratum based explanation of the process over the one attributing the most specific Balkan glottic change to the internal evolution of Greek<sup>19</sup>: the loss of such a morphologically highly developed (cf. its 12 categorial forms) and very polyfunctional infinitive without external influence is a purely hypothetic evolution with not a single known parallel in any language of the world. On the contrary, what is supposed to be the result of an infinitive replacing influence from without, due to some alloglot speaking habits transmitted through bilingualism, is a process directly witnessed in several languages. Moreover, they are spoken just in the area where Thracian (resp. Dacian) was used and is supposed to have influenced in the same way Greek and Latin. That is why the neo-Balkan evolution described has the right to be extrapolated on the Balkan past inaccessible to our direct observations, as opposite to the internal changes supposed for Greek. Most neo-Balkan languages also show, that it is just this tendency which penetrates from one language into another more easily than other Balkan grammatical phenomena do (see above), including the article postposition which Greek does not even know (and also more easily than some phonetic habits of presumably Thracian origin, as identified through their reflexes in mod-

ern Balkan languages by C. Poghirc<sup>20</sup>).

The method of searching for autochthonous, among them presumably Thracian etymons is on the whole similar to that of identifying the same probable heritage in grammar, however it is of a lower degree of certainty. Possible Thracian (resp. Dacian) etymons are sought for first of all among the so called Albanian-Romanian words, since they were identified by J. Thunmann in 1774<sup>21</sup>. But both Romanian and Albanian written texts appear in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, i.e. almost one and a half millennium later than the first certain signs of the infinitive-subjunctive replacement appeared in the Greek New Testament (if not earlier, as some facts of Greek are sometimes interpreted). So, unlike the latter phenomenon which excludes its provenance from languages appeared in the area in the last fifteen centuries, many words of unknown origin may have penetrated Romanian or/and Albanian from more languages than a tendency traced back to ancient times did. Among all the Albanian-Romanian word couples, it is only *mal - mal* and *mëz (mâz) - mânăz* which have sure ancient parallels, but they are also extra-Balkan, while the Dacian *μῖζουλα*, given its meaning, is not a sure parallel of the *modhull - mazăre* couple<sup>22</sup>. Besides that, it is much easier for a word to be borrowed by a language in a relatively short time, as opposed to restructuring a sphere of grammar, which process requires a period of mass bilingualism. The heterogeneity of a lexical stock of unknown origin is especially probable in areas like the Balkans in which many peoples, some of them nomad, alternated. Cf. especially the so called Wanderwörter which come sometimes even from (resp. through) well-known languages being there of unknown origin, to say nothing of languages known only fragmentarily.

Nevertheless, since finding Thraco-Dacian or Illyrian etymons among Romanian and Albanian words of sure Latin, Greek, Slavic, Turkish, Romance or whatever other origin is excluded a priori, the sphere of Romanian-Albanian words of unknown provenance remains the one in which Thraco-Dacisms (but also Illyrisms, old Macedonisms etc.) could be found. It does not mean, however, that all such words are certainly of one and the same origin, e.g. Thraco-Dacian, contrary to some overoptimistic theories according to which all the words in question come surely from Thraco-Dacian, all of them allegedly reflecting there Indo-European roots and having penetrated already the local Latin. This theory, promoted by I.I. Russu and his followers (criticized by us more than once, but without any known reaction) is vulnerable in the light of both general and particular considerations. For the former see above, a fact corroborated by the very heterogeneous composition of the common Albano-Romanian vocabulary of well-known origin: cf. first of all the Latin etymons, inherited by Romanian and ancient borrowings in Albanian which has more than 600 of them, more than 300 having Romanian parallels. In similar numbers both languages share their Greek, Slavic, Turkish and modern European borrowings. Nor each of these strata is homogeneous in itself

(e.g. there are more indirectly borrowed Arabisms and Iranisms penetrated from Turkish than indigenous Turkisms). Besides that, some of I.I. Russu's concrete etymologies are beneath criticism: to say nothing of many of his artificial reconstructions of alleged Indo-European roots, e.g. the Slavism *gorun*, declared by him "co-radical", with Lat. *glans* > Rom. *ghindă* proved to be a Slavism whose prototype is one of a series of South-Slavic names for species of oaks: cf. Maced. *благун*, *горун*, *крастун*, *сладун*. Nor *droaie* (*droan'e* in Banat) can be deduced from an imaginary *\*drugia*, nor can words like *burlan*, *cârlan*, *noian* a.o. come from Latin Thracio-Dacisms because of their endings.

So that to equate each old Romanian word of unknown origin, even if it has an Albanian correspondance, with a Thracio-Dacism is an illusion. It is also clear that such a double attestation itself does not grant the Indo-European origin of the words. On the other hand, even if sometimes the Indo-European character of an Albano-Romanism is very probable, we can not be sure that it comes just from Thracio-Dacian (and not e.g. from Illyrian): cf. our comparison of Rom. *a zburda* and Alb. *shpurdh* and *shpurthem*, with regular phonetic correspondences, and with a presumed initial sense of "escaping from a burden" (cf. Engl. *burden*, Germ. *Bürde* etc. and the privative *s-* mobile).

Nor is it realistic to ascribe, as is often done now, the whole of the Albano-Romanisms to the Roman epoch. While some of the words in question do show sure phonetic signs of such a penetration (e.g. *ceafă - qafë*, *jumătate - gjysëm* or *zară - dhallë*, *brusture - brushtull*, *sâmbure - thumbull* etc.), others say clearly by their phonetics that they are post-Roman (e.g. *chelbe - qelb*, *ghionoaie - gjon*, *ghiuj - gjysh*), while a great deal of the words concerned show no clear signs of being borrowed before or after the individualization of Romanian (e.g. *baltă*, *bâlc*, *a bucura*, *buză*, *copil*, *gata*, *groapă*, *gușă*, *mare* etc.).

So that in most cases we tried to identify some Albano-Romanian correspondences of presumably autochthonous origin without a more concrete specification. In all such cases our purpose must be neither to lengthen, nor to shorten, as an end in itself, the list of presumably autochthonous words, but to make the list as precise as possible in the light of all the data at our disposal. Sometimes a purely hypothetic etymology was proposed for discussion (e.g. *bârsană*, *a găsi*, *olog*, *a răbda*, *rutes(e)*, *toromac* etc.), and even some definite revisions have taken place<sup>23</sup>. So our autochthonous etymologies are the following<sup>24</sup>: *bârsană - bërthamë*; *bleg - blegë*; *bole - bollë*; *borză - \*bollëzë*; *ciucure - sukull*; *cârcel - kërcell*, *kërciell*, *kër-cyell*; *fușoi - fushë*; *gaoace - guaskë*, *guackë*, *gosë*, *gocë*; *a găsi - has*; *gogoriță - gogol*; *a (se) îndopa - zhdëp(em)*; *olog - ulok*; *a pica - pik*; *pojghiță - lëvozhgë*, *lëvoshkë*, *çvoshk*, *shvoshk*, *xhvoshk*; *a răbda - i rreptë*; *rutes(e) - rishtas* or *rretas*; *speie - shpenje*; *toromac - torollak*; *țiței - thith*, *cicë*, *sisë*; *țurană - curt*; *țurture - xurxull*; *a zburda - shpurdh(em)*; *zdup*, *zdupac*, *a zdupăci - zhdëp*; *a zgâria - gërryej*.

In rare cases double etymologies can be admitted: cf. *s(e)arbad* vs. *i tharbët* and *exalbidus*. But also the following Albanian borrowings from Latin and Balkan Romance have been identified: *a astruca - strukem*; *a căra - kërrej*; *cărbune - karbun*; *fəcior - fiçor*; *măciucă - m(ë)sukë*; *măsură - misur*; *plai - pllajë*; *scroafă - skrofkë*; *sfârc - cfurk, sfurk*. The series *stâng - shtëng*, *i shtëngër - stingher* illustrates a probable borrowing and retro-borrowing. An even more rare case is Alb. *ka mort* (= *ka vdekur*), i.e. a perfect form built with a Romanian participle (cf. the Gheg dialectal infinitive *me trasë*, also containing a Romanian participle, as described by N. Jokl and E. Çabej)<sup>25</sup>.

It is known as well that some autochthonous Balkan etymons have Iberian parallels: cf. the much discussed Rom. *mal* and *mânz* (see above), but also Rom. *păstaie*, Arom. *tâmbare*, Alb. *zagar* a.o. As a post-Latin element of the kind, with parallels in many other languages, Rom. dial. *gaidă* (= *cimpoi*) can also be named. Now we could add to the same series Rom. *balegă* - Alb. *bajgë, bagëlë* etc.: cf. Sp. *boñiga*, Catal. *buina*, dial. *bonyiga*, Astur. *boñica, moñica*. As such variations within Iberia itself show, it is no wonder that there is a *n-l* difference between them and the Balkan words.

But even smaller phonetic differences exist between Basque *doinu, doiñu, doiñu* "melody", more seldom "song", and Rom. *doină* (cf. also its variants, especially *daină* "melody" in Transilvania, sounding like Lith. *daina* "song" and Latv. *daiņa* "folk-song", compared with *doină* already by B.P. Hasdeu), to which we add Catal. *en doina* "in movement". The latter, given the sense of Sp. *en danza* "in dance" > "in movement", indicates a probable Iberian \**doin-* connected with dance, music, singing, etc.<sup>26</sup>

Proper names also offer some material for new comparisons in the domain. E.g. the Romanian family name *Borș*<sup>27</sup> is now, of course, firmly associated by the speakers with *borș* (< Ukr. *борщ*), but as we recall Rom. *Borș, Borșa* as local names and especially Alb. *Borshi* and *Borsha* both as local and family names, we admit a *Borș - Borsh* community much older than the Romanian-Ukrainian contacts (cf. also Rom. *Balș, Balșa* and Alb. *Balshi, Balsha* with a probable identical formant). The supposition of superseding in the *Borș* case is in line with some recent theses of A. Poruciuc<sup>28</sup>, as well as with cases like that of *Çamëria*, now associated with Alb. *çam* (< Turk. *çam*), but coming, in the last analysis, from the ancient *Θύαμις* > *Thyamis*, identified already by M. Leake in 1814. Cf. also Rom. *Hâncu* - Alb. *Hanko* or the Romanian popular variants of *Alexandru* (*Aleca, Alecu, Lec, Leca, Leco* etc.) and the Albanian popular name of Alexander the Great *Leka i Madh*. Some of the name couples identified by A. Poruciuc may have reflexes in Ukrainian: cf. *Бойко* and *Галан*. It is still an enigma if the name of the now President of Moldova *Snegur* is related to Alb. *thnegullë* (a North-Gheg and Arbëresh variant of *thnegël*) of which it is a perfect phonetic correspondence,



and as to semantics cf. Alb. *Bubrrëc*, Rom. *Furnică* and "ant" meaning names of other languages.

Finally, some Balkan phraseological parallels should be pointed out for which we have found neither Western, nor Eastern correspondences, so that we probably have to do with a sphere of possible ancient autochthonous forms of expression: cf. *câte şi mai câte - sa e sa* (+ a plural noun); *a-i da (cu ceva) - ja ep* (+ dative); *se îngroaşă gluma - i trash shakarati*; dial. *maluri de vreme - mal ditë*; *a-i da mâna (să facă ceva) - (s')më jep dorë (të bëj diçka)*; *cu musca pe căciulă - me mizën nën kësulë*; *a-i ieşi pe nas - i del prej hundësh*; *a avea obraz (să facă ceva) - kam fytyrë (të bëj diçka)*; *a-i fi drag ca sarea'n ochi - e kam si kripën në sy; pe semne - sipas shenjave*; *cu stea în frunte - me yll në ballë*; *în bortă (or gaură) de şoarece - në vrimën e miut*; *nu më taie capul - s'më pret mendja*; *puşintel la trup - i pakët nga trupi*; *nici cât negru sub unghie - sa e zeza e thoit (or për të zezë të thoit)*. Some of the sayings contain post-autochthonous words (e.g. Alb. *shaka* has come from Turkish, Rom. *vreme* is of Slavic origin etc.), but this does not mean that such words did not displace their older now less comprehensible or disappeared synonyms. Cf. also a Romanian-Macedonian parallel, the folklore personage *Statu-Palmă-Barbă-Cot* and *Дедо-Педа-Лакат-Брада*, as well as two types of emotion expressing tautologies, also specific, to our knowledge, to Romanian and Albanian cf. *feciorul mamei, fecior - bir i nënës, bir* and *mânca-l-ar ciuma să-l mănânce - ta hajë dreqi ta hajë*.

These are the main spheres of modern Balkan glottic phenomena among which reflexes of Thracian or other ancient Balkan languages could be found<sup>29</sup>.

Marc A. Gabinski  
2028, Chişinău, 28, poste restant  
Republica Moldova

## NOTES

1. Since we address balkanologists, we do not translate examples supposed to be easy to understand for them.

2. See F.M. da Lecce, *Osservazioni grammaticali nella lingua albanese*, Roma, 1716, p. 59, 65, 177 etc.

3. See e.g. M.A. Габинский, *Возникновение инфинитива как вторичный балканский языковой процесс (На материале албанского языка)*, Ленинград, 1967; idem, *Распространение дакорумынского вторичного инфинитива*, in: *Балканско езикознание*, XIII, 1968, Nr. 1, p. 55-76.

4. See K. Sandfeld-Jensen, *Rumaenske studier*, I, København, 1900, p. 65-80 and other works, later summarized in K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*, Paris, 1930, p. 130-131.

5. See A. Pancratz, *Das Participium Perfecti Passivi und seine Anwendung im Rumänischen*, "Balkan-Archiv", I, 1925, p. 71-149.

6. See A. Philippide, *Originea românilor. II. Ce spun limbile română și albaneză*, Iași, 1927, p. 606-619.

7. See М.А. Габинский, *Вторичная инфинитивность в балканских языках*, in: Actes du Premier Congrès International des études balkaniques et sud-est-européennes. VI. Linguistique, Sofia, 1968, p. 649-662 and V. Georgiev's commentary on p. 669, where he does not even distinguish between impersonal verbal forms, subjunctive and verbal nouns.

8. See E. Çabej, *Unele probleme ale istoriei limbii albaneze*, Studii și cercetări lingvistice, X, 1959, nr. 4, p. 532 qq.

9. See М.А. Габинский, *Появление и утрата первичного албанского инфинитива (К проблеме инфинитивности в балканских языках)*, Ленинград, 1970, p. 65-130.

10. See K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique...*, p. 131.

11. See M. Gabinschi, *Referitor la structura și originea ordinarilor române*, Revistă de lingvistică și știință literară, 1996, nr. 1, p. 23-33.

12. See М.А. Габинский, *Появление ...*, p. 148-307.

13. See idem, *Новая этиология утраты греческого инфинитива*, Listy filologické, 91, 1966, Nr. 3, p. 241-251.

14. See idem, *Появление...*, p. 157-159, 289-298.

15. See B.D. Joseph, *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive. A study in areal, general and historical linguistics*, Cambridge, 1983, p. 252-253, 312.

16. See В.Ю. Розенцвейг, *Языковые контакты*, Ленинград, 1972, p. 74.

17. See P. Trost, *Balkanismes et judéo-espagnol*, Les études balkaniques tchécoslovaques, IV, Praha, 1972, p. 50-62.

18. See М.А. Габинский, *К вопросу о балканизмах в сефардском языке и их значимости (свидетельство магрибского наречия)*, in: Актуальные проблемы иберо-романистики, Санкт-Петербург, 1996, p. 80-93; idem, *Die sephardische Sprache aus balkanologischer Sicht*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, 112, 1996, Heft 3, p. 450-457.

19. Of course, since the whole Greek perfect, future I, future II and medium voice disappeared, their respective infinitives disappeared together with other forms. But this does not account for the elimination of the four remaining forms (present and aorist, active and passive), a typologically usual paradigm and a part of the verbal subsystems well preserved in their other forms. Cf., for contrast, the similar loss of five Latin infinitive forms (the non-popular future ones, as well as those of perfect and passive, completely restructured in Romance). Nevertheless, the present active infinitive was well preserved throughout non-Balkan Romania.

20. See e.g. C. Poghirc, *La valeur phonétique de l'oscillation graphique thrace "a/e" à la lumière des données des langues balkaniques modernes*, Studii clasice, III, 1961, p. 33-37.

21. See J. Thunmann, *Über die Geschichte und Sprache der Albaner und der Wlachen*, Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1774 herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen von H. Haarmann, Hamburg, 1976, p. 339.

22. For details and references regarding the most part of our Romanian-Albanian etymologies see M. A. Gabinschi, *Contribuții la depistarea elementelor fondului autohton în limba română*, Thraco-Dacica, XIV, 1993, 1-2, p. 33-40. See there also (p. 40) "Nota redacției" by Gr. Brâncuș and our responses in: *Despre legăturile româno-albanismelor cu dacismele*, Revistă de lingvistică și știință literară, 1994, nr. 6, p. 89-94 and *Lexicul autohton al românei și iluziile în jurul lui*, in: *Originea și dezvoltarea tracilor la est de Carpați*. Materialele sesiunii din 21 martie 1996, Chișinău, 1996, p. 66-75.

23. We mean the Moldavian dialectal word *screea* (in some places *creauă*, *creuă*) "backbone" which we first took for an autochthonous element related to the Albanian local and personal name *Shkrel* and the common *shkrelë*. But as proved to be later in the light of data not available before, *screea* reflects a very old Slavism, now absent in the Slavic (and other) languages bordering Romanian (the Albanian words quoted seem to reflect the same old Slavic root).

24. See for many details the papers referred to in note 22.

25. See M. Gabinschi, *Ун каз sui генерис де инфлуенцэ романикэ ын Балкань*, Лимба ши литература молдовеняскэ, 1988, nr. 4, p. 31-37.

26. See our last considerations about *doină* in *Etimologii: a bălăbăni, ciucure, doină* (completare), *farfală, hoira: de-a hoira, ostrov 'închisoare', teafăr*, Revistă de lingvistică și știință literară, 5, 1993, p. 99-100.

27. See M. Gabinschi, *Numele propriu Borș*, Revistă de lingvistică și știință literară, 6, 1995, p. 101-105.

28. See A. Poruciuc, *Observații asupra filonului paleobalcanic în antroponimia românească*, Thraco-Dacica, XIII, 1-2, p. 18; idem, *Onomastica românească în perspectiva paleo- și panbalcanică: direcții și principii de abordare*, Symposia Thracologica nr. 9. Bibliotheca Thracologica 2, București, 1992, p. 187-190.

29. However, we would like to warn once more against running to extremes: taking every Romanian-Albanian etymon for a sure (Thraco-) Dacism, as it is in vogue now, resembles, through its overresoluteness, the opposite extreme according to which "În limba română nu se mai păstrează nici un cuvânt dac" (a statement by F. Lot quoted in G.I. Brătianu, *O enigmă și un miracol istoric: poporul român*, București, 1988, p. 162).