

## Semantic Concordance in the South-East European Languages

ANCUȚA NEGREA, 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”.

*Key-Words:* Balkan linguistics, terminology of the word “house”: Bg. *kăšta*, Srb., Cr. *kuća*, Maced. *kuk’a*, slov. *koča*, Rom. *casa*; Ngr. *σπητη*; Alb. *shtepi*; the terminology of “wedding”: *wedding*, *sister-in-law*, *brother-in-law*.

### 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. *kăšta*, Srb., Cr. *kuća*, Maced. *kuk'a*, Slov. *koča* < Old Sl. *kotia* meaning "what is hidden, what is sheltered";
- Rom. *casa* < Lat. *casa*
- Ngr. *σπιτη* < Lat. *hospitium*
- Alb. *shtepi*.

In the Proto-Slavic era, the meaning of "dwelling" of the term *kuća* designated the (half-) buried hut; later on it was attributed the meaning of "dwelling with fireplace" (cf. Germ. *einfeuriges 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. *ógany, oganište, 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 "casă întregă"[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 Bistrita-Nasaud, in

Wallachia[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 *sălaş* 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 *kăšta* 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 domovăe* "grave"[13]; in Serbian, the diminutive *kuhuća* also signifies "placenta". [14] The Bulgarian terms *kăšta, dom*, the Serbian *dom*, the Greek *σπιτι*, 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, kăšta, 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 misqui* “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 *cunake* 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. *kovaki*, 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 Balkan languages 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 *pōjata* (in Serbia), *pōjata* (in Kosmet), *poata* (in north Dalmatia), *pōjat* (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 *pojate* 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. *poiata*.

In Romanian, the word *poiata* 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 *puiata* “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. *čardak* “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 Arom. *čardak* 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 *cuscru*, *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), *încredințare* and *credință* (engagement), and the verbs: *a (se) cununa*, *a (se) mărita*, *a (se) însura*, *a (se) căsători* (all of them signifying to get married), *a peți* (ask a girl in marriage). *Ginere*, *socru*, *nun*, *fin*, *cumnat* / *Son-in-law*, *father-in-law*, *God-father*, *God-son*, *brother-in-law*.

The Romance and Balkan comparative linguistics noticed, from 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 different languages, could occupy the same plane, though they are usually of different origin and are spread over unequal areas.”

We know that a series of pan-Romanic words have been inherited either with the meaning they had in classical Latin (*socrus*, *gener*), or with the sense they developed in popular Latin (*cognatus*).

#### 4 Tendencies of parallel semantic development

In the south-east European languages, there are several onomasiological lexical fields within which we can see *tendencies of parallel semantic development* of certain terms of different origins.

The wedding terminology can be analyzed from this 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*,

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*, *γαμβρός*, *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”:

Lat.	<i>sponsus</i>
Daco-Romanian	<i>mire-</i> in Transylvania, Maramureș, Moldavia; <i>ginere</i> - in Walachia and Oltenia; <i>june</i> - in Banat and a part of the region of Criș; <i>tânăr</i> - in Banat, points 5, 12, 30, 87 ; <i>mărit</i> - rarely, in Transylvania
Macedoromanian	<i>γαμβρο</i> (general term) < Gr. <i>γαμβρός</i> <i>gione</i> (rarely) < Lat. <i>juvenem</i> <i>dzinere</i> (rarely) < Lat. <i>gener</i>
Meglenoromanian	<i>tinir</i> < Lat. <i>tenero</i> <i>tinir</i> - <i>juni</i> <i>nauzet</i> < <i>nou</i> + Bg. <i>zet</i> “son-in-law”
Istoromanian	<i>ojena</i> < Scr. <i>ozena</i> <i>spozo</i> < It. <i>sposo</i> <i>fraier</i> < Scr. <i>Froja</i> <i>mladitu</i> < Scr. <i>mladi</i> “young man”

It. *sposu* < Lat. *sponsus*

Bg. *mladoženek*, *zet*

Scr. *mladožeňa*, *zet*

Alb. *Dhëndër*

Ngr. *Γαμβρός*

B. 1. “daughter’s husband”

Lat. *gener*

Dacoromanian *ginere* (general term)

Macedorom. *dzinere*

Meglenorom. *zinir*

*zet* (partially attested)

Istrorom.	<i>zet</i> (general term) <i>ginere, žener(e), žiner</i>	Old Slav	<i>nevāsta</i>
		Old Russian	<i>nevista</i>
		Rus.	<i>nevesta</i>
		Old Ukr.	<i>nevista</i>
Alb.	<i>dhëndër</i>	Czech	<i>nevesta</i>
Ngr.	<i>Γαυβρός</i>	Old S.Cr.	<i>nevista</i>
Bg.	<i>zet</i>	S.Cr.	<i>nevjesta</i>
Scr.	<i>zet</i>	Bg.	<i>névesta, neviasta</i>
		Hung.	<i>(reg.) myrásza &lt; Rom. mireasă</i>

**B. 2. "bridegroom"**

Dacoromanian *ginere* – in Oltenia and Walachia  
*ginerică* – east of Walachia

Alb.	<i>dhëndër</i>
Ngr.	<i>Γαυβρός</i>
Bg.	<i>zet</i>
Scr.	<i>zet</i>

**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*”

Macedorom.	<i>dzinere</i> (partially) <i>diniri di profi cusurini</i>
Meglenorom	<i>zinir</i>
Bg.	<i>zet</i>
Scr.	<i>Zet</i>

**C.1. "woman on the day (or around the day) of her marriage"**

Dacorom. *mireasă*  
*nevastă nouă* – in some regions of Zarand and Transylvania  
*tânăără* – calc after S.Cr. *mlada* = “young woman, married woman”  
Macedorom. *măireasă* – in north Macedoromanian  
*n(i)veastă*  
*n(i)veastă nauă*  
*dudie* < Tk. *Dudu*

Meglenorom. *niveastă*  
*novă niviastă*  
*tineri niviastă*

Istrorom. *neveste*  
*fraierite* < S.Cr. *frajar*  
*spoze* < It. *sposo* “wife, fiancée, woman”

**C.2. "fiancée"**

Lat. *sposa*

**C.3. "bride"**

Istrorom. *neveste*  
Old Slav *nevāsta*  
Old Russian *nevista*  
Czech *nevesta*  
Bg. *névesta*  
Pol. *névesta*

**C.4. "sister-in-law"**

Istrorom. *neveste*  
S.Cr. *nevjesta*  
Bg. *nevjesta*

**C.5. "young woman"**

Old Ukr. *nevista* (dialectal)  
Slovakian *nevista* (dialectal)  
Czech *nevesta*  
S.Cr. *nevjesta*  
Bg. *névesta*  
Pol. *neviasta*

## 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 uxorem ducit* being the counterpart of *femina nubet* [33]. During the postclassical period, in a sermon of Saint Augustine, instead of these verbs appear uxorati *vir*i 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” (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 *însurăţel*, a diminutive that, in the plural, *însurăţei*, refers to both sexes” [34]. Remains of the Latin etymon *\*inuxorare* (L. Şăineanu gives the hypothetical form *\*insorare* and compares the verb formation to the Provençal *molherar* “a se însura” < 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’s 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 Evangelists of Coresi (Coresi’s Four Gospels): “Cu aceia 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* denominates 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, fiancé”, 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 Indoeuropean 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 16<sup>th</sup> century, *mărit* appears as well with the meaning of “fiancé”, 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, *(mi) 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 *măritiş, măritare*, rarely *mărituş, 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. Brâncuş: “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 *măritiş* (with the suffix *-iş*); 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: băiatul *cere* şi *ia* în căsătorie, iar fata e *cerută* şi *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 Crișana, one in Moldova and one in Transilvania), mark only the verb "a (se) însura": *să-soră, să suară, s-o surat, să-soră 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 Hașdeu's Survey for Iași and Buzău (H. B. 8/2, 143; HBOJ 2,203). From Iași, 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 aședzat *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 \**uxorare*, 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 fitșor ăn 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 feță"; "Ampiratau ansuro marea feată" [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 *αυτσίζω* coming from the archaic *αυδσίζω*, with the included form *αυδζός* "man" is the counterpart of *γυναικίω* "to take a wife", with the included form *γυναικά* "woman" [47]. More often encountered in expressions are the terms *παντρεύομαι* with the included form *αυδζός* and *νυμφεύτομαι* 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 are the 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 denominating 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), *naş* (God-father), *naşă* (God-mother), *cumnat* (brother-in-law), *cumnată* (sister-in-law), *cuscru* (father of the bridegroom/bride in relation to the woman's/men's parents), *cuscră* (mother of the bridegroom/bride in relation to the woman's/men's parents), *fin* (God-son), *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), *domnişoară de onoare* "soră de mireasă, druşcă" (maid or matron of honor), *oameni* "nuntaşi" (participants to a wedding), *invitaţi* "chemaţi la nuntă" (people invited to a wedding), *familişti* (members of the family).

Among the verbs denominating 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), *invitaţie* "letter indicating the day, the hour and the place where the marriage and the gala dinner will take place and also some data on the spouses' families, and the names of the God-mother 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 here some 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 "Wörter 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 polysemantic 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 many 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.

#### References

[1]K. Sandfeld, *Linguistique balkanique, Problèmes et résultats* (Balkan Linguistics. Problems and Results), Paris, 1930, p. 73  
 [2]Tullio de Mauro, *Introduction to Semantics*, Bucharest, 1978, p. 202

[3]Gr. Brancus, *Romanian-Albanese Linguistic Similarities*, Institutul român de tracologie, Bibliotheca Thracologica XXX, Bucharest, 1999, p. 10 & 9  
 [4]Zamfira Mihail, *Etymology from an Ethnolinguistic Perspective*, Encyclopedic Univers Publishing Press, Bucharest, 2000, p. 58  
 [5]I. Ghinoiu, *The Romanian House. The Arrival and the Departure of the Souls*, Ethnos Printing Press, I, 1992, p. 73  
 [6]Dialectal Texts of Muntenia, 3, Bucharest, 1987, p. 661, 725  
 [7]I. Margarit, *Full Houses, Full Parents*, Phonetics and dialectology, 15, 1994, p. 139  
 [8]V. Aleksova, *Termeni za vstapvam v brak v balgarskia i rumanskia ezik, în „Contacte lingvistice”*, an XXVII, 2002, p. 42  
 [9]Idem, *ibidem*  
 [10]M. Marin, I. Margarit, *Dialectal Glossary of Muntenia*, Bucharest, 1999, p. 63  
 [11]P. Coman, *Dialectal Glossary*, Bucharest, 1939, p. 79  
 [12]DLR = *Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, Serie noua, T VI-XIV, Bucharest, 1965-2000  
 [13]Clavari pusskih narodnah govorov, vol. 8, 9; Leningrad, 1972  
 [14]Recinik shpskohpovatskog knjijebnog i narodnog jezika, vol. II, Belgrad, 1981  
 [15]Ancuta Negrea, *Terms from the Semantic Field of Wedding*, Valahia University Press, Targoviste, 2005, p. 122  
 [16]Idem, *ibidem*.  
 [17]DOL= Ferit Develiglu, *Osmanlica-turçe ancicopedik lugat. Eski ve yeni harflerle*, Ankara, 1962  
 [18]Rj.= *Rjecnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, XIX vol., Zagreb, 1880-1972; *Romanski= St. Romanski, Recinik na balgarski ezik*, Sofia, 1941  
 [19]DA = *Dictionary of the Romanian Language (A-De & F- lojnita)*, Bucharest, 1913-1949; *NALR-OLT= New Romanian Linguistic Atlas on Regions: Oltenia*, edited under the coordination of B. Cazacu, vol. II, Bucharest, 1970  
 [20]T. Papahagi. *General & Etymological dictionary of the Aromanian Dialect*, Bucharest, 1963 & second edition, 1974, p. 406  
 [21]J. Cvijic, *La Péninsule Balkanique*, Paris, 1918, p. 244  
 [22]BER= *Balgarski etimologičen recnik*, red. VI. Georgiev, I. Duridanov, Sofia, 5 Vol., 1971-1999  
 [23]P. Skok, *Etimologiski rejenik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 4 vol., Zagreb, 1972-1974, Br. Kojic, *Arhitektura srpskog sela*, Belgrad, 1941.  
 [24]Vacarelski Ch. *Etnografija na Balgaria*, Sofia, 1974, p. 164, 165.

- [25] O. R. Budina, Narodnoe zilisce severnoj Albanii, Kultura i byt narodov zarubeznoj Evropy, Moscow, 1967, p. 101.
- [26] Turçe sozluğ, Ankara, 1969
- [27] J. Koneski, Rečnik na makedonski ezik, 3 vol., Skoplje, 1965-1969
- [28] Papahagi, D., General & Etymological dictionary of the Aromanian Dialect, Bucharest, 1963 & second edition, 1974, p. 424 & 442
- [29] Cvijic, op. cit., p.230
- [30] Zamfira Mihail, op. cit., p.59
- [31] For a detailed analysis of the terminology of habitation see Zamfira Mihail, op. cit., p.57-66
- [32] Grigore Brâncuș, Histoire des mots, Coresi Printing Press, Bucharest, 1991, p. 182
- [33] Ancuța Negrea, op. cit., p. 146.
- [34] Gr. Brâncuș, *op.cit.*, p.83.
- [35] L.Șăineanu, The semasiology of Romanian language, Timișoara, 1999, p. 87
- [36] I. Stepanova I.G., Suhacev N.L., Dalmatinski i balkanoromanski (lexico-semanticeskie izoglosi), Romanobalkanica. Vaprosi adaptatii latinskovo iazikovo elementa v balkanskom areale, Leningrad, 1987, 54
- [37] Aleksova, Verben und Ausdrücke für „heiraten“ im Bulgarischen und Rumänischen. Vergleichende Untersuchung: bulg. zadomiavam se – rum. a se căsători. A revue of south-east European studies, 1997, no. 3-4, p.34.
- [38] C. Vătășescu 1997, The Latin vocabulary from Albanian language in comparison with Romanian language, Bucharest, 1998, p. 116
- [39] Gr. Brâncuș, op. cit., p.83; see as well T. Teaha 1995, Panroman sauf roumain?, “Fonetica și Dialectologie” 14, p.79
- [40] Ibidem
- [41] E. Benveniste, 1969, Indo-European institutions vocabulary, Paris, 246-247; D. Burkhart, 1984, Die soziale Stellung der Frau auf dem Balkan und ihre Manifestation im semantischen Feld Heiraten sowie einigen Komplementärfeldern-Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, nr.1, p.47
- [42] Gr. Brâncuș, op. cit., p.83; T. Teaha 1995, Panroman sauf roumain?, “Phonetics and dialectology” 14, p.79
- [43] Capidan, 1935 = Th. Capidan, 1935, Meglenoromâni, Bucharest, III
- [44] S. Fl. Marian, 1995, Romanian wedding, Bucharest, Grai și Suflet Publishing House, p. 18, note 2
- [45] Gr. Brâncuș, op.cit.,p.83.
- [46] Capidan 1935, Meglenoromâni
- [47] A.A.Papadopolu 1958, Istorikov lexicov tis Pontenes dialektov, T I, A-L, Atena, 77, 245

*Acronimes*

- ALR SN, II = Romanian linguistic atlas [II], new series, vol. I-VII [Bucharest], 1956-1972
- ALRM II SN = The small Romanian linguistic atlas, [II], new series, vol. I-VII, [Bucharest], 1956-1967
- DILF 1,2 = The historic dictionary of French language, vol. I-II, Paris, 1992
- GDLI I = S. Battaglia, Grande dizionario della lingua italiana, t. I, Torino, 1970
- NDEI 1971 = A. Dauzat, J. Dubois, H. Mitterand, the new etymologic and historic dictionary, Paris, 1971
- ALR I / II = Romanian linguistic atlas, part I, Sextil Pușcariu, Sever Pop, Cluj, 1938 – 1942
- H.B. = B.P. Hasdeu, Etymologicum Magnum Romaniae, tom. I-II, Bucharest, 1887, Tom. III, Bucharest, 1803
- HBOJ = The answers of B.P. Hasdeu's questionnaire, mss. 3437 – 3438, T 1-2