Semantic Concordance in the South-East European Languages

ANCUȚA NEGREÀ, AGNES ERICH, ZLATE STEFANIA
Faculty of Humanities
Valahia University of Târgoviste
Address: Street Lt. Stancu Ion, No. 35, Targoviste
ROMANIA
negriteofana@yahoo.com; agnes_erich@yahoo.com

Abstract: - The common terms of the south-east European languages that present semantic convergences [1], belong to a less explored domain, that of comparative linguistics.
“The reason why the words have certain significations and not others is not found in the linguistic system or in the human biological or mental structures … it is the societies that, through their diverse history, determine the significations, and the semantics is found at the crossroads between the historical complexity of the reality it studies and the historical complexity of the culture reflecting on this reality… its object is the result and the condition of the historical character, thanks to the relations of mutual conditioning that relate the signification to the historic events of each human community.”[2]
In the south-east European languages, several onomasiological lexical fields have been delimited, in which we can discover tendencies of parallel semantic development for several terms of different origin.
The terminology of the wedding can be analyzed from this perspective.
In the case of the south-east European languages, the parallel semantic tendencies are present as: development of identical meanings by different words in different languages, naming the same reality; borrowings in several languages of the same meanings of a polysemantic word.
In classical Latin, there was a strict opposition according to gender for the verbs denominating marriage, homo uxorem ducit being the counterpart of femina nubet. During the postclassical period, in a sermon of Saint Augustine, instead of these verbs appear uxorati viri and maritare feminae. This old opposition according to gender has been kept in Romanian, in the southern Italian dialects, in Provençal, Catalan and certainly in Dalmatian. In other areas of the Roman Empire, this opposition according to gender has been lost because of the influence of the German languages, so that the same verb is used for both genders. In this sense, it would be interesting to follow the evolution of the French verb marier, attested for the first time in 1155 with the meaning “to marry one’s daughter”. After 1170, the reflexive construction se marier avec “to take for wife” emerges, instead of the transitive verb marier (attested for the first time in 1176), a construction still encountered in some provinces. Se marier, with a subject in the plural, is attested in the year 1220 (DILF 2, 1192; NDEI, 446; Paris, 1971). Yet, in other Romance languages, for instance in Italian, though there is the construction maritarsi – in which the opposition according to gender is neutralized, there is also the verb ammogliarsi “to take a wife”, which is used only from the man’s point of view, including the form moglie “woman, wife”.
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1 Introduction
The “mentality” common to the Balkan world, having manifestations in the language, is the historical product of the cohabitation in similar forms of civilization and culture.
Kristian SANDFELD, in his fundamental work Linguistique balkanique (Balkan Linguistics) reevaluated the linguistic material published before this work, and added a great number of concordances by means of which he supported the theory of the existence of the “Balkan linguistic union.” The great merit of Sandfeld is that of having grouped together all the Balkan idioms, determining at the same time how close these languages are in point of influences.[3]

2 Onomasiologic lexical fields in the south-east European countries
In the south-east European countries, several
onomasiologic lexical fields have been delimited, where we can see the tendencies of parallel semantic development of certain terms of different origin.[4] In order to analyze certain tendencies common for several south-east European languages, we have chosen to deal with the convergent evolution of the **terminology of the word** “house”.

In this way, the languages: Romanian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian, Macedonian, Slovenian, NeoGreek, and Albanese, present **unanimous concordances** for the terms having the meaning:

1. “house”, “dwelling” and also, 2. “room”, “place to live”, though these terms have different origins:
   - Bg. καστια, Srb., Cr. κυča, Maced. *kuk’a*, Slov. koča < Old Sl. kotia meaning “what is hidden, what is sheltered”;
   - Rom. casa < Lat. casa
   - Ngr. στητι < Lat. hospitium
   - Alb. shtepi.

In the Proto-Slavic era, the meaning of “dwelling” of the term *kuča* designated the (half-) buried hut; later on it was attributed the meaning of “dwelling with fireplace” (cf. Germ. einfuehriges Haus).

In Turkish and Serbo-Croatian, there are also other terms designating the “room we live in”, which represents at the same time a general south-east European semantic development of the words whose primitive sense was “fire”, “hearth”: očak, Serb.Cr. огъны, ogniste, *dim*, etc.

In the Romanian dialects, the main senses of the lexeme casa are put in relation with the three fundamental moments of a man’s life: birth, marriage and death.

In Oltenia[5] and especially in Wallachia[6] people use the expression **casa copilului** (“the child’s house”) to designate the “placenta”, the area where the soul descends to become matter.

In the Bulgarian dialect spoken around Bucharest, the ethnographers have found the expression **castata na deteta** “the placenta - the child’s place”, a calc after the Romanian model.

The expression “casa întreaga”[7] (“full house”) is specific for the dialects of Wallachia, but its sense is “house in which the two spouses of the first marriage are alive.”

With the Romanians and with the Bulgarians, there is a custom according to which certain subjects who take part in the sequences of the wedding ritual can be chosen only if they belong to a “full house”.

Similarly, only “full houses” can lend things for the wedding: e.g.: “To Sofia have been lent three carpets belonging to full houses”.[8] The expression is also encountered with other peoples of the Balkan area.[9] In different regions in Romania, for instance in Bistritza-Nasaud, in Walachia[10], in Arad[11] people use the expression **casa de brad** (fir-tree house) to designate “the house of the dead”, “the grave”, “the coffin” – namely man’s refuge for the passage to the other world.

The house is perceived as a holy place in the isolation and intimacy of which take place the human marriage, birth and death.

In this sense, the lexeme sâlaș is also interesting; it comes from the Hungarian szállás (“refuge”, “shelter”). This lexeme has a rich signification in Romanian and many derivatives. In certain regions from Transylvania and from Maramures, it has received all the fundamental significations of the term casa quoted above: “placenta, house, hearth, coffin.”[12] So, the Romanian’s representations concerning human life and death have attained a perfect form, derived from a unitary vision on the linguistic level.

Semantic correspondences can be encountered in certain Slavic languages: the Bulgarian kâšta has the sense of “house”, but it also has the sense of “coffin, funeral house” (BER 3,230); the Russian dom (“house”) has for derivatives: domovina, domoviste domovâe “grave”[13]; in Serbian, the diminutive kuhuča also signifies “placenta”. [14] The Bulgarian terms kâšta, dom, the Serbian dom, the Greek σπηλι, the Turkish ev, the Hungarian haz, and the Romanian casa have also received the sense of “family”, in this case recording unanimous agreement.[15]

Different lexicological studies have highlighted the existence of a common model for several south-east European languages, consisting in rendering the sense of “getting married” by making use of certain verbs in whose structure are included the lexemes casa, kâšta, dom, ev, haz and others having the sense of “family.”[16] In this case, too, there are unanimous concordances. In the Turkish language, there is also the term oda, in a regional dialect odak (“little house”), used in the sense of “room where people live”.[17]

But in Romanian the term odaie (“room”) has received as well the sense of “shepherds’ shelter” “permanent refuge for the animals”, “place where the animals remain over night”. (DLR) In the South-Slavic languages, this word is only found with the sense of the Turkish language.[18] In Bulgarian, odaia has the meaning of “room” (for hosts), “flock of sheep”, “place where someone can stop”.

From the terminology of the word “house”, we will retain as well the lexeme konak. In Turkish, it has the meaning of “big house”, “place where someone can stop”. In Albanian, this term has received the
meaning of “room” (konaku i misqi “room for friends”).

In Romanian, like in Albanian, conac has the meaning of room, but it ended up acquiring as well the meaning of “shepherds’ dwelling, house situated far from the village where a man remains in winter to guard the sheep”, “shelter for animals”. [19]

In Aromanian cutar has not only the meaning of “place where someone can stop during a voyage, halt, stage” but also that of “residence, governmental headquarters” [20], cf. Bg. konak, NGr. kovaka, S.Cr. konak, “house”. [21]

The lexeme palat belongs as well to the terminology of the word “habitation”.

In Proto-Slavic, the form polata “palace” finds its etymological root in the Balkan Latin form palatium “palace”. [22]

From the Proto-Slavic polata “palace” comes a word that is spread in all the languages of the Balkan and has semantic developments in the above-mentioned sense.

In Serbian and Croatian, the term is very much used and has acquired multiple meanings. Similarly, the terms pojata (in Serbia), pojata (in Kosmet), pojata (in north Dalmatia), pojat (in Lika) designate the rooms where people sleep or where the food for men or for the animals is kept (hay, grains), barn, as well as an individual house. [23]

In Bulgarian, the term pojata has the sense of “a place for the sheep or for the animals” [24] but also “cottage”, “room where tobacco is dried”, “veranda” – etymology Bg. pojata < Rom. poiată. In Romanian, the word poiată is used in the dialects of all regions, but with different meanings: “construction (made of wood) for the birds” (DLR); “cottage” (ALR SN II, h.400); “shelter for animals” (ALRM II I, map 292 point 605).

In Aromanian, we find the terms poiata “roof before the entrance in the house, shelter” and buiata “shelter for animals” (Papahagi, D.).

From Serbo-Croatian, the terms seem to have passed on into the dialect of north Albania: pojada ou jarevi “habitation in a stable habitat”. [25]

The term pojata has also been borrowed by the Turkish language from the south Slavic languages, with the sense of “flock” and also “shelter for animals”. From the terminology of habitation, we can also retain the Turkish term cardak “vault, vine shelter”, “terrace”. [26] This term has spread in all the south-east European languages, where it designates a part of the construction of the house, which is found before the front door: Maced. čeardak “a sort of entrance for ancient houses” [27], Arom. čirdake “terrace, green shelter” and cutar “shelter for animals”, “shelter for the sheep” a sort of cottage made of leaves” (Papahagi, D., p. 424, 442). [28]

In Aromanian, cardak designates the terrace that is found in front of the houses (in Ohrida-Debar) [29]. Before the houses built in a Vardarian stile there is a covered shelter, a sort of balcony called cardak (Rj. I) with the same meaning as the Bulgarian čardak (BDA I, map 198; BDA II, map 211).

In Romanian, the veranda is an open terrace, situated higher than the ground, an original architectonic construction called ceardac/ terrasse: 1. “high room”, “terrace, open gallery surrounded by pillars, balcony”; 2. “isolated building with only one room, kiosk” (DA).

But in Romanian, ceardac also designates a “shelter for the sheep” (ALR SN II, map 393). As we have already noticed, the terms designating the rooms of the house are also used in certain languages to designate the shelter for animals.

The specialists were able to signal the semantic relation between two categories of denominations: “room where people live” and “shelter for animals”; “the same is true for the terms that cumulate the meanings: “room for habitation”, “room with two or three sides opened, in the continuation of the house, terrace”, “balcony”, and “shelter for animals”. [30]

All these semantic concordances are generally Balkan. They can represent either the result of certain convergent semantic developments or the result of acculturation. Some are encountered in all the south-east European languages: konak, ceardak, poiata (except for the NeoGreek). [31]

This type of semantic evolution can be considered characteristic for the south-east European area of convergence; yet it is inexistent in the languages of Western Europe, Where there are specialized terms for the sense “shelter for the animals”. So, in the case of the terminology of habitation, the parallel semantic tendencies are apparent in:
- the development of certain identical meanings, in different languages, of different words, designating the same realia (reference to objects of the material world);
- borrowing in several languages of the same meanings of a polysemantic word.

3 Terms of the semantic field of wedding common in several south-east European languages

In Romanian, almost the entire terminology related to wedding is of Latin origin [32]. Moreover, most of them are included in the core vocabulary and
have correspondence. So, the terms cumătră (God-mother), cumnat (brother-in-law), ginere (son-in-law), mărit (son-in-law, married man, husband), socru (father-in-law), soacră (mother-in-law), are part of the core vocabulary of the Romanian language and are known throughout the territory where the Romanian language is spoken. The terms cuscră, cuscră (parents of the bride/bridegroom), june (young married man), nun (God-father), tânăr (young man) are present in most of the Romance languages, while fin (God-son), fină (God-daughter), nună (God-mother), are present there only partially. Also Latin in point of origin are the words: nuntă (wedding), ospăt (gala diner), însurătel (young married man), încredinŃare and credinŃă (engagement), and the verbs: a (se) cumuna, a (se) mărita, a (se) însura, a (se) căsătiori (all of them signifying to get married), a peŃi (ask a girl in marriage). Ginere, socru, nun, fin, cumnat / Son-in-law, father-in-law, Godfather, God-son, brother-in-law.

The Romance and Balkan comparative linguistics noticed, form the very first research works, that beside the common words that exist in several languages, there are also common semantic concordances: “In the comparative research of the vocabulary of several languages, by scientific convention, we consider that the same words, in vocabulary of several languages, by scientific perspective. In the case of the south-east European languages, the parallel semantic tendencies are present by:
- development of identical meanings in diverse languages by different words, denominating the same reality
- borrowing in several languages of the same senses by the same polysemantic word.
In the semantic field of “wedding”, terms of different origin, such as the Latin word sponsus, have correspondence.

Dacorom. mire, Arom. yambro, Istr. ojena, It. spasu, Fr. le marié, Bg. mladoženek, Alb. dhëndër etc. are representative concerning the use in different regions and in different moments of a lexical series that has developed the same meaning: “mire” (bridegroom). Other terms, such as ginere, dhëndër, γαµβρόs, zet have developed two categories of meaning: “daughter’s husband” and “bridegroom”. In the following pages we will present the semantic scheme of some of the words under analysis.

5 Semantic table of some of the words under analysis

A. 1. “a man on the day (or around the day) of his marriage”:
- sponsus

Daco-Romanian mire- in Transylvania, Maramureş, Moldavia;
- ginere - in Walachia and Oltenia;
- june – in Banat and a part of the region of Criş;
- tânăr – in Banat, points 5, 12, 30, 87;
- mărit – rarely, in Transylvania

Macedoromanian γαµβρο (general term)
- < Gr. γαµβρός
gione (rarely) < Lat. juvenem
dzinere (rarely) < Lat. gener

Meglenoromanian tinir < Lat. tenero
tinir – june
nauzet < not + Bg. zet “son-in-law”

Istroromanian ojena < Scr. ozena
spozo < It. sposo
fraier < Scr. Froja
mladitu < Scr. mladî “young man”

B. 1. “daughter’s husband”
- gener

Dacoromanian ginere (general term)
Macedorom. dzinere
Meglenorom. zinir
zet (partially attested)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romanian</th>
<th>Zet (general term)</th>
<th>Old Slav</th>
<th>nevășta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alb.</td>
<td>dhăndăr</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngr.</td>
<td>Țămbpőz</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bg.</td>
<td>zet</td>
<td>Old Ukr.</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scr.</td>
<td>zet</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. 2. “bridegroom”

Dacoromanian ginere – in Oltenia and Walachia
ginerica – east of Walachia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>dhăndăr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Slav</td>
<td>Țămbpőz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>zet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>zet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. 3. “brother-in-law”

Lat. gener (rarely)

Dacoromanian ginere: 1. the presence of the Latin meaning was noticed on the territory of the Romanian language; 2. calqued after S.Cr. zet „gener sororis vir”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Macedorean</th>
<th>dzinere (partially)</th>
<th>Old Slav</th>
<th>neveste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meglenorean</td>
<td>zinîr</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakian</td>
<td>zinîr</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>zinîr</td>
<td>S.Cr.</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>zinîr</td>
<td>Old Sr.</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. 3. “bride”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Istrorom.</th>
<th>neveste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Slav</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>nevesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. 4. “sister-in-law”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Istrorom.</th>
<th>neveste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Slav</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>nevesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian</td>
<td>nevășta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. 5. “young woman”

| Old Ukrainian | nevășta (dialectal) |
| Slovakian    | nevășta (dialectal) |
| Polish       | nevesta            |

C.1. “woman on the day (or around the day) of her marriage”

Dacoromanian mireasă nevășă nouă – in some regions of Zaran and Transylvania

tănăță – calc after S.Cr. mlada = ‘young woman, married woman’

Macedorean măireasă – in north Macedoromanian

n(i)vecăstă n(i)vecăstă nouă

dudie < Tk. Dudu

Meglenorean nivășă novă niviastă

tineri niviastă

Istrorom. neveste

friarite < S.Cr. frajar

spoz < It. sposo “wife, fiancée, woman”

6 LATIN LINGUISTIC REFLECTIONS IN THE EUROPEAN AREA

In classical Latin, there was a strict opposition according to gender for the verbs denominating marriage, homo uxorati viri being the counterpart of femina nubet [33]. During the postclassical period, in a sermon of Saint Augustine, instead of these verbs appear uxorati viri and maritare feminac.

This old opposition according to gender has been kept in Romanian, in the southern Italian dialects, in Provençal, Catalan and certainly in Dalmatian. In other areas of the Roman Empire, this opposition according to gender has been lost because of the influence of the German languages, so that the same verb is used for both genders. In this sense, it would be interesting to follow the evolution of the French verb marier, attested for the first time in 1155 with
the meaning “to marry one’s daughter”, After 1170, the reflexive construction se marier avec “to take for wife” emerges, instead of the transitive verb marier (attested for the first time in 1176), a construction still encountered in some provinces. Se marier, with a subject in the plural, is attested in the year 1220 (DILF 2, 1192; NDEI, 446; Paris, 1971).

Yet, in other Romance languages, for instance in Italian, though there is the construction marier, there is also the verb ammegliarsi “to take a wife”, which is used only from the man’s point of view, including the form moglie “woman, wife” (GDLI I).

The Romanian language inherited the opposition according to gender, so “the verbs a (se) mărita and a (se) însura differ in meaning from one another according to sex... We must notice that along with maritare “to marry”, used concerning both sexes, Latin had as well the construction uxorem ducere “to get married, to take one’s wife home”, which supports, in a way, the reconstructed etymon *inuxorare (from uxor “wife”) of the Romanian verb a (se) însura... We can see that this verb has remained isolated, as uxor has not been transmitted in nowadays Romanian. On the Romanian land, a derivative from the same family was înşurăgel.a diminutive that, in the plural, înşurăţei, refers to both sexes’[34]. Remains of the Latin etymon *inuxorare (L. Şăineanu gives the hypothetical form *inuxorar) and compares the verb formation to the Provençal motherar “a se insura” < lat. mulier “woman, wife ”)[35] are also the Aromanian însor (PDDA 1963), the Meglenoromanian qnsor (Capidan 1935), as well as the south-Italian nzurare (SDE; PDDA 1963), and the Old Dalmatian nzdrizare [36], with the same meaning [37]. In Romanian, (se) însura “to get married (for a man), to give one’ son or relative in marriage” covers the entire Daco-Romanian linguistic area, being characteristic both for the common language and for all the dialects (ALR I/II, h.251). It is attested in the oldest linguistic monuments, for instance the Evangels of Coresi (Coresi’ Four Gospels): “Cu aceaia vrea să se însoare” (DA). From the verb a (se) însura are derived as well the denominations for marriage: însurare, însurătoare, însurat.

The verb a (se) mărita designates marriage from the viewpoint of the woman and of her relatives. It has been inherited from the Latin maritare which has been inherited in all the Romance languages, as well as in Albanian martaj, martohem [38], where there is no difference according to gender.

“Out of the lexical family of maritare (coming from the adjective mas, maris “manly”, which gave masculus, inherited in Romanian as mascur), in Old Romanian was kept the noun mărit (Lat. maritus “husband, fiancée”, meaning “son-in-law, newly married man, husband”) [39]; “in Aromanian, mărit “husband, man” is a currently used word (cf. Papahagi, DDA)” [40].

Maritus is in connection with the denomination for “young man or girl at the age of marriage” in different Indo-European languages [41]. According to E. Benveniste, the Latin noun *mari denominated the girl at the age of marriage, while maritus, naturally, was “the one that has a young woman, wife”. Also in Romanian, in the texts of the 16th century, mărit appears as well with the meaning of “fiancée”, meaning it also had in Latin. [42].

A (se) mărita “to marry” is used in all the Daco-Romanian dialects (ALR I/II, h.250), as well as in the Aromanian dialect, (mii) mărit (PDDA 1963) and in the Meglenoromanian one, (mă) mărit [43] where it also refers only to women. The action măritare is expressed by the derivatives măritiș, măritare, rarely mărituș, măritat (DLR 6/4). The verb a mărita is often used in the sense of “losing” as well: “N-a măritat lucrul cutare = N-a pierdut lucrul cutare” [44], as, “by marriage, girls generally lose their parents’ family name and adopt their husband’s.” (id. ib.) In connection with the marital custom for the girl to leave her parents’ house, is considered another meaning of a mărita: “selling for a low price something no longer useful or valueless, to get rid of something, to free oneself from something”. Interesting in this sense is the dialectal phrase a se face de măritat used: a) for people, when someone does not do his duty and has to be removed, eliminated, b) for animals, when they are no longer good for work and must be sold and c) for objects, when they get worn out and have to be replaced.

In spoken Romanian, a (se) mărita is connected to the indirect object not just by means of the preposition cu, as it happens in the literary language, but also with the preposition după: a (se) mărita cu / după (cineva), which is the expression of the opposition shown by Gr. Brâncuș: “Between the verbs a (se) însura and a (se) mărita there is a difference as well on the level of the abstract derivatives, of the names of action: însurătoare (with the suffix -toare) and mărităș (with the suffix -ț); the first is connected to a name of agent (însurător, with the suffix -tor), the second does not suppose such a name. From here would result the following opposition: baiatul cere și ia în căsătorie, iar fata e cerută și luată în căsătorie (the boy asks and takes in marriage, while the girl is asked and taken in marriage)...” [45]
All the Romanian lexicographic works highlight the opposition according to gender between the verbs *a (se) însura* and *a (se) mărita*. There is, certainly, an exception, for the situation already presented, when after the wedding, the man goes to live in the woman’s house, situation when “a (se) mărita” is used with a subject in the masculine gender.

It is hard to say if, on a dialectal level, in some dialects, this opposition according to gender has ceased to be relevant. Some data of the Romanian Linguistic Atlas (ALR 2/1) on map 159, for “se căsătoresc” – namely common for the two genders, in a few points (three in Crişana, one in Moldova and one in Transilvania), mark only the verb “a (se) însura”: *să-soră, să suară, s-o surat, să-sură laolaltă*, used for both genders. Similar answers have been given as well for the verb *a (se) mărita*.

Similar answers can be found as well in the answers to Haşdeu’s Survey for Iaşi and Buzău (H. B. 8/2, 143; HBOJ 2,203). From Iaşi, for instance, in answer to question no. 123 – concretely oriented towards marriage terminology, is put down the following text presenting the main stages of the wedding ceremony: “Când un tânăr au mers la o fată să zice că merge de vorbește, după ce au vorbit să duce de să așadză, după ce s-au așezat croește... după croeală logodesc, după aceea își scot formalitățile și în fine se însor.” (H. B. 8/2, 143). As we can notice, *se însor* is used with a subject in the plural, namely the opposition according to gender is annulled. Yet, there are no data attesting that *a (se) însura* can be used in the singular and with a subject in the feminine gender.

In a research on the Dalmatian and Balkan-Romance lexical correspondences, which presents the hypothesis that it is in connection to southern Italy that the Romanization of the Balkans occurred, it is stated that the Aromanian (*mi)*nsor, inherited from the Latin *auxorare*, means not only “a (se) însura” (to take a wife) but also “a (se) mărita” (to take a husband) (Stepanova, Suhacev 1987, 55, according to Aleksova, op. cit., p. 36). Yet, T. Papahagi shows in his dictionary that (*mi)*nsor is used only for men (PDDA 1963).

In the Meglenoromanian dialect, the verb *qnsor* can be used equally with an object in the masculine or the feminine gender, as it results from the examples given in the dictionary of T. Capidan, after the classification through prepositions: “1) for men, 2) for girls”: “Tsista fițsor ân trei zoli s-la’ nsor dupu(Here is interesting the use of the preposition dupu with the verb *qnsor*, probably this thing is possible because of the fact that, for it the opposition according to gender is relevant) nostra fetă”; “Ampiratau ansuro marea feță” [46].

Concerning the other Balkan languages, an opposition according to gender of the pair verbs with included form, identical to that from Romanian and the Slavic languages, is noticed in the Pontic dialect of the Greek language, where *αυτζίο* coming from the archaic *αυδζίο*, with the included form *αυδζό* “man” is the counterpart of *γυνιζό* “to take a wife”, with the included form *γυνιακα* “woman” [47]. More often encountered in expressions are the terms *παντζεύμοια* with the included form *αυδζό* and *νυμεύετομια* with the included form *νυμφη* “wife”, for which the opposition according to gender is not relevant.

7 Neologisms in the terminology of “wedding”

The lexicon of a language, far from being a static whole, is in a constant motion, enrichment, transformation, creating ever new lexical units and others, which no longer meet the needs of speakers, was gradually pushed to the periphery of vocabulary and in time, disabled.

This dynamic is characteristic to the vertical development of any literary language.

Lexical mutations occur either in the internal system of language or as result of linguistic contact, direct or indirect, with other idioms. The impact that economic and social development had on the wedding terminology sector is revealed by dialectal texts recorded in the period 1960-2001. One of the factors determining the development of local speech is the school. School role has often been pointed out like a unifying factor of the language, in learning process, the pupil being the subjective element of confrontation between local speech and literary language model which school has the mission to provide in a systematic way to be accepted and followed. Therefore, the influence of modern literary language occurs predominantly in younger informants, as evidenced especially by introducing the vocabulary of neologisms in special languages, but should be noted, secondly, that, in quantitative terms, they are not too numerous and, secondly, that there are certain areas more permeable to this phenomenon than others, so it seems a natural phenomenon in some areas, but surprising in others.

In the terminology of “wedding”, we notice the low number of neologisms, a thing that is extremely natural when it comes to words designating basic notions of the vocabulary.

So, in the case of the terms denoting the people in the foreground of the marriage: *mire/ginere* (bridegroom), *mireasă* (bride), *socri mari*...
(bridegroom’s father and mother), socri mici (bride’s father and mother), naș (God-father), nașă (God-mother), cumnat (brother-in-law), cumnătă (sister-in-law), cuscru (father of the bridegroom/bride in relation to the woman’s/men’s parents), cuscără (mother of the bridegroom/bride in relation to the woman’s/men’s parents), fină (God-daughter), all of them are the same throughout all the Daco-Romanian linguistic territory, the dialectal texts and linguistic atlases highlighting the inexistence of neologisms. As far as the people in the background of the wedding are concerned, the dialectal texts and linguistic atlases signal the following neologisms: muzicanți “lăutari” (singers in a wedding band), cavaler de onoare “frate de ginere, vornicel” (best man), domnișoară de onoare “soră de mineașă, drucă” (maid or matron of honor), oameni “nuntași” (participants to a wedding), invitați “chemați la nuntă” (people invited to a wedding), familiiști (members of the family). Among the verbs denoting the ritual activities in connection to the wedding, we shall mention the verb a invita “to call to a wedding” (to invite to a wedding). Some neologisms denominate certain accessory elements: voal (veil), rochie (bride’s dress), cadou (present), invitatie “letter indicating the day, the hour and the place where the marriage and the gala diner will take place and also some data on the spouses’ families, and the names of the Godmother and the God-father” (invitation to a wedding), muzică (music) etc. In researching this terminology are useful clarifications on the Romanian regional areas for spreading the word and are also attracted and dialects of the southern Romanian Danube. From there comments extralinguistic nature, such as that which the strength of family feeling in Romanian or related collective mentality while protecting social community. The comparison with the Bulgarian, Greek, and Russian is based on a recent bibliography and highlights the idea of communion maintained Balkan Orthodox Byzantine influence.

A special attention is given to the etymologies, supported in the paper by a very strong research work; are determined parentage of meanings, the appearance of the phrase construction, derived chains and links with known objects, being agreed, sometimes, the intuitive method "Worter und Sachen", as if home-marriage relationship, the phrases give after (someone) to go after (someone), to require (get) the wife etc. There are parallel expressions in other languages to show that marital union act is based on relationships that go in depth to the specific of Indo-European society physiognomy. Overall, we find Romanian language as a very conservative one. The wedding terminology, through popular excellence (neologisms contribution is insignificant), kept old values of collective psychology.

8 Conclusion

This type of semantic evolution can be considered characteristic for the south-east European area of convergence; yet it is inexistent in the languages of Western Europe, where there are specialized terms for the sense “shelter for the animals”.

So, in the case of the terminology of habitation, the parallel semantic tendencies are apparent in:

- the development of certain identical meanings, in different languages, of different words, designating the same reality (reference to objects of the material world);
- borrowing in several languages of the same meanings of a polysemic word.

Experts explained the factors that favored the emergence of so-called “Balkan linguistic union”: Kr. Sandfeld think that most of the phenomena which led to similarities between the Balkan languages were due to Greek influence in the region. Greek language contact with the Romanian language has been almost continuously throughout the Roman history of the Lower Danube, more intense at certain times, more limited in others. No other Roman language, apart from southern Italian dialects, had ties both lengthy and, at the same time, direct from the people to people, the Greek world. Across South-East Europe the role played by the Greek people, the bearer of a brilliant millennial civilization, was leading. That could not remain without consequences on the linguistic plan, as witnessed by the many loans made by all Balkan languages from Greek language.

But we note that for Romanian language the Greek language contact varied in intensity, both from a dialect to another (we refer to the four main Romanian dialects: Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian, Istro-Romanian) and from one epoch to another. The much Greek elements penetrated the Aromanian dialect, which was for centuries in direct contact with Greek language. Fewer words are of Greek origin in Megleno-Romanian dialect and even fewer in the Istro-Romanian. As regards Aromanian dialect, the enormous number of Greek loan, not limited to vocabulary, but broke even in the phonetic and derived system, in some places and in the
morphological one, not to mention the combinations of words and parallel phrases resulted through loan translations, can not be explained only by symbiosis that caused the two peoples bilingualism. From this point of view, might admit that Aromanian dialect falls within the so-called 'Balkan linguistic union', the leading role being assigned to the Greek language.

Studying the Greek elements from Romanian spoken language at the north of the Danube shows that it is not at all, both quantitatively, numerical, and by their share in other compartments of the Dacoromanian structure the importance they have in Aromanian dialect.

Other specialists make the common features of Balkan languages the Latin Greek Linguistic Community, consisting of one side of the line Jireček:
The linguistic type with Latin trends continues in Romanian language and at least one layer of Albanian language; studying some Latin words stored only in Romanian or only in Romanian and Albanian (and in Greek), interesting conclusions can be drawn about the ancient civilization of the Balkan world, rustic character of the economic and social life of peoples in this area;
The Greek type is kept in Neo-Greek language.

Most of the Balkan features from Romanian language and of a layer of Albanian language (in total 12 phenomenon) is due to the Daco-Thracian substratum common to both languages and through the syntax of Ancient Roman Latin. As Bulgarian language, its differences from the rest of the Slavic languages come near from the Roman languages and from the Greek language. Many of the so-called 'Balkanism' can be independent appearances in each language.

Daco-Thracian substrate role in shaping the particular physiognomy of the Romanian language in relation to other Roman languages, has captured the attention of the foremost linguists, who have clarified that Daco-Thracian was a Illyrian component, too – a language that spoken in antiquity in the Western Balkans, and therefore the area where Albanian is spoken today, which explains the linguistic duplication of Romanian and Albanian language.
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