

Učbenik je metodično pregledno zasnovan in po zahtevnosti povsem ustreza svojemu namenu. „Latinščina za vsakogar“ je namreč namenjena tistim, ki se želijo na preprost način seznaniti z osnovami latinske slovnice, torej popularizaciji tega jezika v najširšem krogu ljudi. Kajti, kot pravi Cicero, ki ga avtorica uvodoma navaja: „Non tam praeclearum est scire Latine quam turpe nescire.“

Sprejeto 4. VI 1988.

Barbara Šega—Čeh
Filozofska fakulteta
Ljubljana.

ACHILLEAS G. LAZAROU: *The Aroumanian and its relation to the Greek, second edition, Athens 1986.*

It rarely happens that a purely professional work, such as a doctoral dissertation, is reprinted due to demand in a second edition, especially in countries in which the tradition of publishing specialized scientific literature is not very strong. The success of this published thesis results not only from its wider implications, but also tells us something about publishing in Greece, which has been flourishing in the last ten years. Greek publishers are, in fact, trying to make up for the time lost during the censorship in the past military dictatorship, as well as to be a part of the current European and world production. Although there is a certain disproportion between the quantity and the quality of the published specialized books, the Greek publishing houses have succeeded in giving their reading public some important original and translated books. Progress is to be seen in the works on the language, which have turned from the brisk, political and emotional discussions of demotike (which has finally acquired the status of the official language) to the studies of the historical development of the Greek language, sociolinguistic research of the Greek diglossia, Greek dialects and so on. The whole activity, best depicted in the „Studies in Greek Linguistics“ proceedings of the annual meeting in Salonika, as well as in more frequent translations of the major works of world literature, simply demonstrates that Greece has become active in publishing in the science of language.

Achilleas G. Lazarou earned his degree in Classical Philology in Athens and later specialized in the history, ethnology, philology and languages of the Balkan peoples with special emphasis on the Roumanian language. He gave lectures on Roumanian dialectology at the Sorbonne as „chargé de cours“. Besides the geographical and historical themes connected with Thessalia, where he comes from, he mainly studied the Aroumanians (namely the so-called Vlachs or Tsintsars) and especially their origin. The fact that the first edition of the book was sold out and translated into French and that the next one in 1986 was very well received, being given prominence in all the main bookshops of Athens, derives not only from the importance of the book for Greek linguistics and the history of the ethnic groups connected with Greece, but also from its political implications. The very title of the book explains his thesis: the so-called Vlachs, namely the Aroumanian people and their language, should rightfully be regarded as related to the Greeks and the Greek language.

The subtitle a historical philological study“ points out that he intends (with the help of historical data) to give us his „correct“ theory of the ethnogeny of the Aroumanians and to examine the Aroumanian dialect on all the linguistic levels. The main point would be to prove that the Aroumanians are latinized Greeks and that they should be treated just as the other slavized, arabized and turkized Greeks. This attitude naturally opposes the deep-rooted theory that the Aroumanian dialect has its origin in the Roumanian language, which broke away from the Dakoroumanian language in the 10th century and developed on its own from that time on. Lazarou's theory contradicts the theories of some Roumanian authors and it also contradicts the „propaganda war“ of Roumania which, according to him, seeks to develop the national self-confidence of the Aroumun people.

With that purpose, right at the beginning of the book in the chapter „Instead of an introduction“, Greek people are invited „to come to their senses at last and to realize how critical the situation is: otherwise the consequences will be much more serious than ever before“ (p. 23). Lazarou substantiates his alarming invitation with detailed data concerning the anti-Greek activity of the Roumanian diaspora. He finally ends by appealing to Greek universities and the Academy of Science to open up new departments for studying „Romance and Roman studies“, which would promote further comprehension of the Aroumun people on the past of Greek science and would also revise the established theory of their origin. The reviews of the first edition of the book, given in the next chapter, are written in the same spirit and have the same emotional attitude.

The study is divided into three parts. The first part deals with the historical facts. By discussing the Roman conquest of the Balkan peoples Lazarou is trying to deny the theory of origin of the latinized inhabitants of Greece who came from Dacia by using facts that sometimes lack enough scientific explanation, as well as assumptions which are not always very clear. Namely, Lazarou, supposes that Epir and above all Macedonia became the center of the Eastern Roman Empire during the Roman conquest, as well as the cross-roads of the military and trade routes. Constant communication with the Roman people and developing economic relations conditioned ever more intensive contacts which led to the bilingualism of the native people. Lazarou substantiates his arguments with the written documents of John Lydos from the 6th century, according to which the natives of the Balkan Peninsula are mainly Greek people who spoke the language of the Itals. In this way Lazarou contradicts the written records of Kekaumenos which state that the people of Dacia descended to Greece during the 3rd and 4th, centuries. This work is also the basis of the majority of other theories. The essence of Lazarou's disputation is his supposition that the Romans would not allow the enemy to settle in the middle of the Balkan Peninsula since they did not speak Latin and because, according to Kekaumenos, they never submitted to the Romans, nor did they ever serve them in any way. He also emphasizes the role of Greek people as tradesmen in the Roman Empire, especially in the Balkans and their role in stimulating the spread of trade. Naturally, the role of the Slavs in the Balkans is in this way diminished, as well as their expansion in Greece and, what is more, the meager presence of Slavic elements in the Aroumanian language (much as in Greek, unlike Roumanian) helps him to prove that the Aroumanians belong to the Greek people. At the end of the first part the author mentions all the Latin-speaking groups in the Balkans: the Vlachs, Tsintsars (belonging according to him to Yugoslav Macedonia), Meglenits, Kucovlachs and Armans.

In the fourth and last chapter of the first part, Lazarou deals with the Aroumanians and the theories of their origin:

- I. The theory of their coming from the North, from Pannonia (according to Kekaumenos) or from Dacia (according to Leonid Halkokondile),
- II. The theory of their origins in the Roman colonies and
- III. The theory of them being a latinized native people, namely Greek people who, due to historical developments, became bilingual (this last theory is, of course, the one that the author argues for).

In the second part of the book the author defines the position of the Aroumanian language in relation to other Roman languages. He presents, very briefly, the division made by C. Tagliavini or I. Coteanu, as well as some views of linguists who consider the Roumanian and Aroumanian languages to be genetically congenial (M. Costin, Fr. J. Sulzer, J. Thunman, P. Roesler, Fr. Miklosich, W. Thomaschek), or according to some others different (A. D. Xenopol, N. Iorga, G. Giunglea). Further on he mentions the uncoordinated attitudes of some Roumanian linguists who disagree about considering Aroumanian a language or a dialect (on the one hand, A. Graur and I. Coteanu and on the other hand, D. Macrea, R. Todoran, A. Rossetti and B. Cazacu). Lazarou's opinion is that it is simply a question of a „Roman idiom“, which was a predecessor to all the others in the Balkans, being prevented in its evolution because of certain conditions: namely, as the Aroumanians

used the Greek language there seemed to be no need for the further development of their language, in contrast to the Dacians, who used the new language as their only means of expression.

In the second chapter of the second part Lazarou tries to define the time when Aroumanian broke away from the Eastern Latin language, with consideration of the different points of view (Philippides, Weigand, Siadbei, Coteanu, Rossetti, Caragin, Gamillscheg, Sandfeld-Jensen, Hasden, Cutu—Ronalo, Octave Nandris). He shares the opinion of I. Petkanov, M. Křepinský, S. Pușcariu and O. Nandris who find the beginning of independence of the Aroumanian language in phonological changes (*d* into *dz* in Aroumanian into *z* in Roumanian; also palatization of the labials—which began in the 5th century in order to finish changes on morphological and lexical levels in the next two centuries. He next gives a list and description of the most important written texts in the Aroumanian dialect: text books, grammar books, clerical texts, as well as those of a literary nature, such as folk tales.

As the third part of the book contains the author's genuine contribution to the studies and a review of the Aroumanian dialect, it is also the most important part. It presents this dialect on the phonological, morphological and lexical levels through the prism of the Greek language. In the first chapter, through the phonological development of the language, he examines its similarity with Greek. To this purpose some characteristics of the Aroumanian dialect are adduced to evidence the author's thesis:

- the language retains, unchanged, some Greek consonants (γ , δ , θ) even in words of other origin: *feminus* > $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$, *minu*, *gotini* > $\alpha\gamma\upsilon\eta\sigma\epsilon\sigma\upsilon$
- protetical *a* as a characteristic of Aroumanian left over from Old Greek: *apolutię* < $\rho\omicron\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\alpha$, *arómbu* < $\rho\acute{o}\mu\beta\omicron\varsigma$
- soundless *o* as a common characteristic with North Greek dialects: *prudusie* < $\rho\rho\omicron\delta\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha$, *prufit* < $\rho\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$
- σ > z from Old Greek: *záhare* < $\zeta\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\rho\iota$ < $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\chi\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$
- the origin and the time of the first appearance of *a* and \acute{a} (\acute{i}) as a linguistic phenomenon in the first centuries A.D., not as a result of Slavic influence or the Illyrian—Thracian substratum
- *au* > *af*, *av* and *ev* > *ef*, *ev*: $\nu\acute{\alpha}\delta\tau\eta\varsigma$ < $\acute{n}\acute{a}\phi\tau\upsilon$, $\psi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ < $\psi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\phi\tau\upsilon$.

In the same spirit the development of the Aroumanian verb as well as some characteristics common not only to the Greek language but to the other languages of the „Balkan union“ are analyzed: replacement of the infinitive with the sub-junctive or indicative, weakening of the functional weight of the participle and formation of the future tense with $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ - $\theta\acute{\alpha}$. The chapter ends with morphological analyses of the article, noun, adverb and number.

The third chapter deals with lexical statistics: he demonstrates the percentage of words in Aroumanian taken from Slavic, Albanian or Latin languages as opposed to those taken from Greek. According to the dictionary by Kon. Nikolaidis dating from 1909, out of 6,657 words taken from the Aroumanian dialect, 3, 460 are of Greek origin, 2, 605 of Latin, origin 185 of Slavic, origin 150 Albanian and the rest 257 of unknown origin. Finding a large number of Old Greek elements and classifying them, Lazarou concludes that the Greek words cover almost all the notions of everyday life, while the Latin ones are to be found in the expressions connected with cattle-breeding or agriculture. At the end of the book there is an index and a list of the author's works, as well as some geographical maps and a detailed bibliography which shows the efforts of this Greek scientist to cover everything that has been written on the subject.

Though we cannot touch on the political implications of the book owing to the limited space of this review, there is no doubt that the authors linguistic analysis is written under the strong influence of this main political premise. Nevertheless the material collected in the book, most of it scientifically presented, enables us to use it as a good hand-book in order to study the Aroumanian dialect, as well as Balkan Latinism. This is its main value.