Aspects of Balkan Latin

Oswald Panagl & Ioannis Fykias
(Paris Lodron University, Salzburg)

ČLÁNKY / ARTICLES

Abstract

This paper consists of some considerations arising before the start of an ambitious project in connection with the research desideratum to produce an augmented and 'updated' version of Kristian Sandfeld Jensen's pioneering *Linguistique balkanique*, which appeared in French in 1930. This investigation will provide a prolegomena to this edition which should encompass an account of the historical and geographical background as well as studies providing an adequate explanatory theoretical framework. It includes a state-of-the-art survey of the most influential contributions that led to progress in the domain of Balkan linguistics. Our starting points will be based on significant reference books inspired by Sandfeld's approach that date from the last decades of the 20th century. Among them are, in particular, Schaller's monograph on Balkan languages, Mihăescu's work on Vulgar Latin in South-East Europe, Radoslav Katičić's two volumes on ancient languages in the Balkan Area, some publications by Harald Haarmann and, above all, Georg Renatus Solta's *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik*.

Keywords

Balkan linguistics; Sprachbund; koine; balkanisms; plurilinguism; substratum; Transhumanz; Balkan Latin; Vulgar Latin; Dacoromanian; lexical borrowing; structural borrowing; analytical future formation; numerals between 11 and 19

The claim of this paper seems modest and at the same time demanding. Our article is not conceived of as a contribution in the traditional sense, but it consists of some considerations arising before the start of an ambitious project in connection with a long nurtured research desideratum in the domain of areal and contact linguistics, namely to produce an augmented and 'updated' version of one of the most important books on areal linguistics, namely Kristian Sandfeld Jensen's pioneering "Linguistique balkanique", which appeared in the French edition in 1930. It has been envisaged that this comprehensive investigation will provide a sort of prolegomena to this edition, which should encompass – inter alia – an account of the historical and geographical background as well as investigations providing an adequate explanatory theoretical framework primarily on the causation of the phenomena under consideration. Also included will be a state of the art survey of the most influential contributions that led to the progress that has been achieved in the domain of Balkan linguistics. With these aims in mind, our starting

points will be based on significant reference books inspired by Sandfeld's approach that date from the last decades of the 20th century. Among them are, in particular, Schaller's monography on Balkan languages, Mihăescu's work on Vulgar Latin in South-East Europe, Radoslav Katičić's two volumes on the ancient languages in the Balkan Area, some publications by Harald Haarmann and, above all, Georg Renatus Solta's "Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik" – rather a handbook and exhaustive 'bibliographie raisonnée' than a conventional introduction. Before going into details we will comment on a number of quotations, lists and maps taken from some of those reference works.

Under (1), the reader is reminded of the 12 points of convergence and mutual influence Sandfeld had discovered and dealt with.

(1) Sandfeld (1930: Chap. IV): Concordances générales en dehors du lexique: 1) L' article postposé; 2) Extinction de l' infinitif; 3) Formation du futur; 4) Le génitif-datif. Emploi de pronoms personnels datifs au lieu de possessifs; 5) Mêmes formes pour marquer "ubi" et "quo", etc. Emploi proleptique des pronoms personnels; 6) Accusatif avec proposition substantive; 7) Emploi de "et" devant la proposition affirmative qui suit une proposition négative; 8) Autres cas de parataxe; 9) Emploi de deux régimes directs; 10) "Être de dix ans" = "avoir dix ans"; 11) "Comme" = "environ"; 12) Concordances phraséologiques.

Under (2), we provide the inventory of languages that according to Günther Reichenkron belong to the so called "Balkan Sprachbund". The enumeration in this important article from the year 1962 (pp. 91f.) is rather a maximum model than a structured and organized image of linguistic reality. Recent attempts therefore exclude Slovenian and Hungarian, as being outside the borderline of the Balkan region and treat Turkish as a special case.

(2) Es sind dies die beiden, den alten indogermanischen Charakter in verschiedenem Maße bewahrenden Sprachen des Griechischen und Albanischen; die drei südslavischen Sprachen: Bulgarisch, Serbokroatisch und Slowenisch; das romanische Rumänisch, und bis zu einem gewissen Grade die nicht indogermanischen, zugleich auch, jedenfalls in ihrer ursprünglichen Herkunft, nicht miteinander verwandten Sprachen des Türkischen und Magyarischen.

In our contribution, we will follow a narrower i.e. a more specific concept of Balkan languages, which is represented e.g. by Schaller (1975: p. 33) under (3): His account encompasses two or three Slavic languages – the number depends on the status of Macedonian –, Albanian, Romanian (with different variants such as Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Istro-Romanian etc.) and (Modern) Greek.

(3) I. Slavisch, hier Südslavisch:
1. Bulgarisch, 2. Mazedonisch, 3. Serbokroatisch,
(4. Slowenisch, das aus geographischen und sprachlichen Gründen nicht zur

Gruppe der südslavischen Balkansprachen gehört),
II. Albanisch,
III. Romanisch, hier Ostromanisch: Rumänisch mit seinen verschiedenen
Vertretungen auf dem Balkan, das u.a. zusammen mit dem Italienischen die
Gruppe der ostromanischen Sprachen bildet,
IV. Griechisch mit der heutigen Vertretung des Neugriechischen.

Furthermore, following Schaller, we distinguish between 'first grade' Balkan languages, i.e. main or core Balkan languages like Albanian and Bulgarian, which share a maximum of grammatical properties, and 'second grade' Balkan language types, such as Serbian or Greek with only a smaller amount of common features.

As far as the phenomenon of 'Language Union' or 'Sprachbund' is concerned, our authority remains Nikolai Trubetzkoy, whose definition – as summarized and explicated by Solta (1980: pp. 3f.) – is quoted under (4): According to Trubetzkoy's conception and analysis, the most prominent positive characteristics are striking similarities in syntax and morphology as well as remarkable agreements in the cultural part of the vocabulary. On the other hand – negatively speaking –, languages of a 'Sprachbund' do not converge in their sound system and in the phonological representation of morphemes. Likewise there are no correspondences in the basic or elementary part of the lexicon. A 'Sprachbund' is founded and supported by long-term and continuous contacts between persons, families and social peer groups. For this convergence phenomenon to emerge, to be effective and to become resistant, a considerably large population of bilingual individuals is necessary. Genetic relationship of the respective languages is neither essential nor inconvenient.

(4)   Ein Sprachbund ist nach Trubetzkoy charakterisiert im positiven Sinne durch
       a) große Ähnlichkeit in syntaktischer Hinsicht,
       b) Ähnlichkeit in den Grundsätzen des morphologischen Baues,
       c) große Anzahl gemeinsamer Kulturwörter;
       bzw. in negativer Hinsicht durch
       a) keine systematischen Lautentsprechungen,
       b) keine Übereinstimmung in der lautlichen Gestalt der morphologischen Elemente – und
       c) keine gemeinsamen Elementarwörter.
       Die Basis für das Entstehen eines Sprachbundes ist der Kontakt, und dieser erfolgt durch eine große Anzahl bilingualer Personen. In der Zugehörigkeit zweier oder mehrerer Sprachen zu einer Sprachfamilie ist noch kein Hindernis zu sehen, daß diese zur gleichen Zeit auch zum selben Sprachbund gehören [...].[1]

---

1   Cf. Trubetzkoy's original formulation: „Jede Gesamtheit von Sprachen, die miteinander durch eine erhebliche Zahl von systematischen Übereinstimmungen verbunden sind, nennen wir eine Sprachgruppe. Unter den Sprachgruppen sind zwei Typen zu unterscheiden: Gruppen, bestehend aus Sprachen, die eine grosse Ähnlichkeit in syntaktischer Hinsicht, eine Ähnlichkeit in den Grundsätzen des morphologischen Baus aufweisen, und eine grosse Anzahl gemeinsamer Kulturwörter bieten, manchmal auch äussere Ähn-

Under (5), we find two maps – taken from Mihăescu's monography – showing the Balkan provinces of the Roman Empire before and after 300 A.D. and pointing at the most important sites and spots of excavations.

(5)

---

lichkeit im Bestande der Lautsysteme, – dabei aber keine systematischen Lautentsprechungen, keine Übereinstimmung in der lautlichen Gestalt der morphologischen Elemente und keine gemeinsamen Elementarwörter besitzen, – solche Sprachgruppen nennen wir Sprachbunde [sic!]. Gruppen, bestehend aus Sprachen, die eine beträchtliche Anzahl von gemeinsamen Elementarwörtern besitzen, Übereinstimmungen im lautlichen Ausdruck morphologischer Kategorien aufweisen und, vor allem, konstante Lautentsprechungen bieten, – solche Sprachgruppen nennen wir Sprachfamilien". Trubetzkoy (1929: p. 18).

For the history and development of the correspondences and features, which we are accustomed to call 'Balkanisms', we may distinguish among at least three steps or stages. According to Eugen Seidel (cf. 6) these convergences have their starting point in a period of 'prehistory', when the conditions for the mutual approach arise. In a phase of 'emergence', the phenomena themselves develop. In a final stage of 'fading' or 'decay' the similarities do not grow any further: they become frozen, sometimes with a tendency to decrease. For the Balkan region this period begins in the 19th century. Political reasons play an important role.

(6)   History of correspondences ('Balkanisms'):
      a) prehistory
      b) emergence
      c) fading-decay   (Seidel)

It has been Ellis, who proposed three types of comparison for the subject of Balkanisms (7): the *descriptive approach* tries to quantify the amount of relationship; the *institutional* attempt draws attention to the social status and the historical conditions of the relevant peoples and ethnic groups; the *genetic* perspective points out that language families are distinctive entities, but may belong to different convergence areas.

(7)   Types of comparison:
      descriptive
      institutional
      genetic   (Ellis)

In this branch of language investigation, genealogical, general, comparative and diachronic interests, standpoints and criteria have to be met, as in (8). For most of the scholars dealing with Balkan linguistics this discipline is an intersection of the following four aspects:

(8)   'Balkanlinguistik'/ 'Linguistique balkanique' as an intersection of
      a) genealogical
      b) general
      c) comparative
      d) diachronic   aspects and criteria

For the purposes of the current paper, it seems expedient to present an outline of three of the most important notions in connection with a possible causation account of the convergence phenomena under discussion, as in (9):

(9)   'Plurilinguism'
      'Categories of stratification'
      'Transhumanz' (transhumance)

Plurilinguism seems to be the indispensable basis for all types of mutual adjustment; the well-known categories of stratification namely *substratum*, *superstratum* and *adstratum* can be specified in the field of Balkan philology: According to Günther Reichenkron, the East Romance group has developed at least five different states or alternatively stages and 'readings' of language: The situation of Latin in Greece may be defined as an *interstratum*; for immigrating peoples like Hungarians, Serbs and Croats, Romance has the status of a *substratum*; with respect to Albanian, Late Latin or Proto-Romance plays the role of an *adstratum*; Dalmatian (Vegliotic and Ragusian) can be characterized as a *language* in the proper sense; but only Romanian instantiates the level or standard of a true *literary* and *national language*. What we want to adopt from ethnology is the concept and term 'Transhumanz'(transhumance), which has been coined for a pastoral and nomadic tribe depending on climate or conditions and pasture opportunities.

Our next point (10) pertains to lexical correspondences in the sense of isoglosses between Romanian and Albanian, which may be candidates for a pre-Roman substrate, either belonging to languages like Dacian and Thracian as the prototypes of Albanian or even to an altogether Pre-Indo-European layer.

(10) Correspondences Romanian-Albanian (substratum)
    a. băc – baç ("shepherd");
    țarc – thark; zară / zar – dhallë
    b. căciulă – kësulë (Bulgarian kacula, dialectal Greek κατσούλα)
    c. vatră – vatër (taboo? cf. Havers 1946)
    d. baltă – baltë; pădure – pyll ("wood, forest" < paludem); mal – mal ("mount")
    e. viezure – vjed(h)ullë / vjetullë
    f. mazăre – modhullë

The common feature of the selected words listed under (10a–10f) is the lack of a satisfying and generally accepted Latin or Indo-European etymology. (11a–11f) offer translations of the items above and some additional explanatory notes.

(11) There are involved lexemes concerning
    a) *stock-farming* ("herdsman, cheese"; "fold"; "whey, butter-milk");
    b) *garments* ("fur cap");
    c) *settlement* ("fireplace");
    d) *soil condition* ("pool, swamp"; "wood" – if *pădure* comes from *paludem*; only the semantic change has to be explained!, "mountain, hill");
    e) *animals* ("badger");
    f) *plants* and *vegetable* ("pea")

As far as the often discussed prehistory of Romanian (12) is concerned, there exist the diametrically opposed opinions of *continuity* vs. *immigration* in their modern residence. The following phases have been proposed:

(12) Prehistory of Romanian

a) Continuity vs. immigration; as a compromise term: dynamic continuity.

b) Late (Vulgar) Latin as a 'Koiné' in the sense of colloquial language.

c) As an indispensable source cf. Eutrop. 8,6,2: *Traianus victa Dacia ex toto orbe Romano infinitas eo copias hominum transtulerat ad agros et urbes colendas* – "Trajan, after he had subdued Dacia, had transplanted thither an infinite number of men from the whole Roman world, to people the country and the cities"; 9,15: *provinciam Daciam, quam Traianus ultra Danubium fecerat, intermisit, vastato omni Illyrico et Moesia, desperans eam posse retineri abductosque Romanos ex urbibus et agris Daciae in Moesia collocavit appellavitque eam Daciam, quae nunc duas Moesias dividit et est in dextra Danubio in mare fluenti, cum antea fuerit in laeva* – "The province of Dacia, which Trajan had formed beyond the Danube, he gave up, despairing, after all Illyricum and Moesia had been depopulated, of being able to retain it. The Roman citizens, removed from the town and lands of Dacia, he settled in the interior of Moesia, calling that Dacia which now divides the two Moesiae, and which is on the right hand of the Danube as it runs to the sea, whereas Dacia was previously on the left".

Since the Roman province Dacia was part of the Empire only for a relatively short period, some scholars (following Roesler 1864) guess that the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people has taken place in Moesia, Dardania or Thracia. According to this point of view the Romanians should have immigrated in their later areas not before the Middle Ages. But, on the other hand, it seems possible, that not all Roman inhabitants left Dacia on the orders of Emperor Aurelianus (cf. the second passage from Eutropius under c). During the last decades a compromise view has been developed, which figures under the mediating term 'dynamic continuity'. A material support for this position may be gained from the function of Latin as a colloquial language or Koiné for this region. Such an assumption seems to be compatible with the first quotation from Eutropius (under c) which confirms the language policy of Traianus.

Let us now focus on the delicate topic of 'Balkan Latin'. Since this subject is far from totally free of political, patriotic, even chauvinistic moments, some of the positions apparently are pretended *cum ira et sine studio*.

There exist two prototypic standpoints (13):

(13) Prototypic standpoints: Rosetti (Balkanistic) – Iordan (1962) (Mihăescu 1978, Niculescu 1981): see below.

Following Rosetti's (1985) opinion, some scientists are convinced that there has been a sort of Latin with characteristics only represented in the Balkan area. Another group of scholars agree with Jordan and Mihăescu in denying the existence of such a special variety of Vulgar Latin. So Niculescu wrote the pointed maxim: "Nihil est in Daco-Romano, quod non est in Latino".

To achieve progress in this complex situation, it will be necessary and helpful to consider some special features of the Romanian lexicon. Since Bartoli (1906) we are acquainted with a paradoxical status of the Romanian language: "Il romeno è in certo modo il più latino e il meno latino tra i linguaggi neolatini." This point can be summarized under (14):

(14) a. First of all, we find as a conservative trait Latin words that among the Romance languages survive only in Romanian: *a runca* "throw away" (< *averruncare*), *ierta* "forgive, permit" (< *libertare*), *plăcintă* "pancake" (< *placenta*).
b. In another subtype, Romanian preserves the regular sound development, whereas other languages offer 'mots avants': cf. *ager* "quick, sharp-witted" (< *agilis*). Some genuine Latin lexemes are completely lost and substituted for by loan words (*amare* – Slav. *iubi*; *inimicus* – Turk. *dușman*; *negare* – Hungar. *tăgădni*).
c. As a language on the Eastern periphery of the Romance area Rumanian shares some lexemes with other border dialects, whereas the central idioms had lost them: cf. Lat. *vitricus* "stepfather" > Rum. *vitreg* (Alb. *vitkur*), Calabrian *vitrichi* and Logudorese *bidrigu*.

Looking for causes of lexical loss or replacement in the stock of Latin heritage one may take into consideration different aspects along the lines of (15):

(15) a. shortness of the word, lack of weight or clear structure: *ua* (< *uva*) "grape" has been substituted by *strugure / struguri*, *nea* (< *nivem*) "snow" by *zăpadă*, *omăt*.
b. lack of cognates and therefore isolation: *acera* (< *aguila*) "eagle" or *agest* (< *aggestum*) "wash, deposit".
c. flight from homophony: *sanus* "sound" > *sănătos*, because the regular result a **sin* would be identical with the successor of *sinus;* lat. *pecorarius* "shepherd" which develops into *pacurar* becomes replaced by *cioban* in the regions where mineral oil *păcură* (*picula* > *picularius*) is found.

The amount of Slavic loanwords in Romanian is remarkable (cf. 16) and can be assigned to some prominent thematic fields, such as agriculture, craft and trade, social relations, kinship and cultural as well as religious subjects.

(16) *plug* "plough", *coasă* "scythe", *brazdă* "furrow", *grădină* "garden"
mac "poppy", *ovăs* "oats"
zidar "mason", *covaciu* "blacksmith", *zlătar* "goldsmith"
bogat "rich", *sărac* "poor", *a iubi* "to love", *drag* "dear, darling", *prieten* "friend"
babă "grandmother", *maică* "mother", *nevastă* "wife"
molitvă "prayer", *greșeală* "guilt", *a izbăvi* "redeem", *sfînt* "holy", *duh* "spirit"

Among the lexical elements of Greek origin in (17), one must distinguish between popular words of Ancient Greek (like *broatec* βρόταχος "frog"; *mic* μικκός "small"; *stur* στῦλος

ČLÁNKY / ARTICLES

"icicle"; *frică* φρίκη "fear") and items dating from the Byzantine period (*folos* "profit, advantage" < ὄφελος; *a lipsi* "lack, fail" < λείπω, ἔλειψα; *a sosi* "arrive" < σώνω, ἔσωσα).

(17) | *broatec* | < | βρότᾱχος | "frog" |
mic	<	μικκός	"small"
stur	<	στῦλος	"icicle"
frică	<	φρίκη	"fear"
folos	<	ὄφελος	"profit, advantage"
a lipsi	<	λείπω, ἔλειψα	"lack, fail"
a sosi	<	σώνω, ἔσωσα	"arrive"

The best testimonies for the existence of a special Balkan-Latin seem to be some exclusive isoglosses between Romanian and Albanian going back to Latin words in a specific or (in a way) marked meaning: the examples under (18) illustrate this point.

(18) *cuvînt – kuvend* "word, speech" (< *conventus*);
      drac – drec "devil" (< *draco*);
      a merge – mërgoj "go, walk" (< *mergere*);
      soţ – shok "husband" (< *socius*);
      şes – shesh "plain" (< *sessus*).

Special cases of semantic change in Romanian are *bărbat* "man" (< *barbatus* "bearded") and *femeie* "woman" (< *familia*, not < *femina*). Though for this instance we may point at typological parallels of semantics such as German *Stute* "mare" or Ancient Greek δάμαρ "wife", the meaning of both lexemes should be influenced by similar polysemic relations in Turkish.

A further source of evidence to support a particular variant of Latin consists of Albanian lexemes coming from this sort of koine, such as the examples under (19).

(19) *parmendë* "plough" < *apparamentum*;
      bujk "peasant" < *bubulcus*;
      qershi "cherry" < *cerasus*;
      ullashtër "savage olive-tree" < *oleaster*;
      kërshëndella "Christmas" < *Christi Natale*.

A peculiar semantic change appears in *qytet* "city" < *civitatem* and *rrugë* "road, gateway" < *rugam* "wrinkle".

Coming to the end of the presentation, we want to mention at least the problems in connection with two 'Balkanisms' [along the lines of Sandfeld's list: 3) Formation du futur; 4) Le génitif-datif. Emploi de pronoms personnels datifs au lieu de possessifs]:

The well-known merger of genitive and dative in the core Balkan languages (cf. 20 below

– the examples [lightly modified] are taken from Solta 1980: pp. 205f.) should not be considered as an exclusively Balkan Sprachbund phenomenon.

(20) Die Sätze „*das Haus des Alten*" und „*er sagte (es ihm) dem Alten*" lauten folgendermaßen:

rumän.	*casa moşului*,	*(îi) a spus-o moşului*
bulgar.	*kъštata na starikъt*,	*(mu) reče na starikъt*
alban.	*shtëpia e plakut*,	*ia tha plakut*
griech.	το σπίτι **του γέροντα**,	το είπε **του γέροντα**

Already in postclassical ancient Greek, there is convincing evidence for the loss of distinction between the aforementioned two cases some centuries earlier, and the genitive was the case that has survived: cp. the example of Joh.13, 6: σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας vs. Latin: *tu mihi lavas pedes*. In Latin, we can find possessive datives, which turned from adverbial use into adnominal position, already in Roman comedy: *Philocomasio amator*. Further evidence in favour of this construction type can be found in the Dalmatian inscription (CIL III 9552: *area Stephano presbytero…*) and in the bilingual epigraphic text in Egger's collection: υἱός Εὐφρασίου κόμητος vs. *filius Euphrasio comiti*. Because of numerous examples of this merger in other languages (genitive in Old Persian, Pali, dative in German dialects: *dem Vater sein Hut*) the phenomenon becomes a specific Balkanism only in the context of other traits.

The same holds for the analytic formation of the future (21; examples taken from Tomić 2006 and modified) by employing a frozen form of the verb "will": comparing English and Danish data as opposed to corresponding German constructions under (22), we find the same type of formation.

(21) a. Do   ta   blej
     will   subj.mark+3sg.dat.cl+3sg.acc.cl   buy.1sg
     librin   nesër.
     book+the.m.sg   tomorrow
     'I will buy the book tomorrow.'   Albanian

   b. Šte   napravi   tova   utre.
      will.mod.cl   do.3sg.perf.pres that   tomorrow
      '(S)he will do that tomorrow.'   Bulgarian

   c. Tha   su   po   avrio.
      will.mod.cl   2sg.gen.cl   say.1sg.subj.aor.tomorrow
      'I will tell you tomorrow.'   Modern Greek

   d. Ion   o   să-i   ceară
      Ion   will.mod.cl   subj.mark-3sg.dat.cl   ask.3sg.subj
      maşina.

car+the.f.sg
'Ion will ask him for the car.'   Colloquial Romanian

(22) a. Danish
      Hvad *vil* der nu ske?
      b. English
      What *will* happen now?
      c. German
      Was *wird* jetzt passieren?

In the synthetic verb inflection of ancient Indo-European languages (e.g. Ancient Greek) the same element *-s-* is used to characterize future tense and volitive derivation. The priority of Albanian or Bulgarian is not so clear as it has been sometimes maintained by scholars from these countries, as you can see in the correlation *volentes suscipere* (Itala) vs. *suscepturi* (Vulgata) or in some examples from CIL III: si quis *volet* imponere; si *velit* aperire. Once again only the cumulative evidence turns this trivial feature into a Balkanism.

Even the most striking instance of convergence between Albanian, Bulgarian and Romanian, namely the procedure of forming the numerals between eleven and nineteen by means of a preposition meaning "on" (one-on-ten etc., cf. 23a) is not a unique Balkanism, since there occur sporadic examples of the same type in ancient Greek authors too (cf. 23b).

(23) a) Bulg.   šest   -na-   decet
         Alb.   gjashtë -mbë- dhjetë
         Rom.   şais   -pre-   zece

     b) Plut., Theseus 24.4: ἔθυσε δὲ καὶ Μετοίκια **τῇ ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα** τοῦ
         Ἑκατομβαιῶνος, ἣν ἔτι νῦν θύουσι
         "He instituted also the Metoecia, or Festival of Settlement, **on the sixteenth** day of the month Hecatombaeon, and this is still celebrated."
         Dem., 19.57: **τρίτη ἐπὶ δέκα** τοῦ Σκιροφοριῶνος μηνός...
         "**on the thirteenth** day of the month Skirophorion"

Cf. Kühner & Blass (1890: Vol. 1, p. 630): Auch findet sich zuweilen die Ausdrucksweise der Addition durch die Präposition ἐπί, seltener πρός mit dem Dative, wobei die kleinere Zahl vorangeht, als: πέντε ἐπὶ εἴκοσι, πέμπτος ἐπὶ εἴκοσι (25). Diese Ausdrucksweise findet sich besonders bei den Späteren, als: τρισχιλίους ἐπὶ μυρίοις = 13 000 Plut. Popl. 20. Ὀλυμπιὰς ὀγδόη πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατόν Diod. 16, 53; aber zur Bezeichnung des Datums vom 13.–19. schon auf den attischen Inschriften regelmäßig (Meisterhans 129{2} f.), vgl. in (unechten) Urkunden μηνὸς Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα (am 16ten) Dem. 18.156. 181; bei Hippokr. VII, 138 τῇ πέμπτη καὶ ἕκτη ἐπὶ δέκα; mit μετά bei den Zahlen über 20: ἕκτη μετ᾽ εἰκάδα das. 115, jedoch Inschr. vor der Kaiserzeit vielmehr μετ᾽ εἰκάδας, Meist. das. 130.

Future work will attempt a critical survey of the most influential specialized contributions of the last three decades in the domain of Balkan linguistics (such as Tomić 2004 and 2006, Joseph 1983/2009, Asenova 1989/2002) as well as significant investigations in the fields of language contact and typology (such as Thomason 2001 and Hickey 2010) that are relevant to Sprachbund phenomena.

Bibliography

Asenova, P. (1989/2002). *Balkansko Ezikoznanie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Bartoli, M. (1906). *Das Dalmatische. Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der apennino-balkanischen Romania* (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Schriften der Balkankommission: Romanische Dialektstudien; 2 vols.). Wien: Hölder.

Egger, R. (1926). *Der altchristliche Friedhof Manastirine* (Nach dem Materiale Fr. Bulić' bearb. von Rudolf Egger; Forschungen in Salona, 2). Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Staatsdruckerei.

Ellis, J. (1967). Some remarks on the place of Balkan linguistics in general linguistic theory. *Linguistique Balkanique, 12*, 37–44.

Haarmann, H. (1972). *Der lateinische Lehnwortschatz im Albanischen* (Hamburger philologische Studien, 19). Hamburg: Buske.

Havers, W. (1946). *Neuere Literatur zum Sprachtabu* (Sitzungsberichte: Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, phil./hist. Kl., 223, 5). Wien: Rohrer.

Hickey, R. (Ed.). (2010). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Malden (Mass.): Wiley-Blackwell.

Iordan, I. (1962). *Lingvistica romanică: evoluție, curente, metode*. Bucureşti: Ed. Acad. Republicii Populare Romîne.

Joseph, B. (1983/2009). *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Katičić, R. (1976). *Ancient languages of the Balkans* (Vol. 1–2; Trends in linguistics, State-of-the-art report, 4–5). The Hague: Mouton.

Kühner, R., & Blass, F. (1890). *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache. Elementar- und Formenlehre* (3. ed.; vol. I/1). Hannover: Hahn.

Mihăescu, H. (1978). *Limba latină în provinciile dunărene ale imperiului roman. La langue latine dans le sud-est de l'Europe* (Trad. du roumain par Radu Creteanu). Bucureşti: Ed. Acad. – Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Niculescu, A. (1990). *Outline history of the Romanian language*. Padova: Unipress.

Reichenkron, G. (1962). Der Typus der Balkansprachen. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie, 1*, 91–122.

Roesler, E. R. (1864). *Das vorrömische Dacien* (Sitzungsberichte: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil./hist. Kl., 45, 8; pp. 314–379). Wien: Gerold in Comm.

Rosetti, A. (1985). *La linguistique balkanique*. Bucureşti: Ed. Univers.

Sandfeld (Jensen), K. (1930). *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris: Klincksieck. (= *Balkanfilologien*. Copenhagen: Luno 1926).

Schaller, H. W. (1975). *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Seidel, E. (1968). Bereiche der Balkanlinguistik. In V. Georgiev et al. (Eds.), *Actes du premier congres international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes, VI: Linguistique* (pp. 123–126). Sofija: Académie bulgare des sciences.

Solta, G. R. (1980). *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

Tomić, M. O. (Ed). (2004). *Balkan Syntax and Semantics* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today; Vol. 67). Amsterdam–Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Tomić, M. O. (2006). *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, 67). Dordrecht: Springer.

Trubetzkoy, N. S. (1929). Abstracts zur Vorlesung über Sprachgruppen. In *Actes du premier congrès international des linguistes à la Haye* (pp. 17–18). Hague–Leiden: Sijthoff.

Univ. Prof. Dr. Oswald Panagl / oswald.panagl@sbg.ac.at

Department of Linguistics
Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Faculty of Cultural and Social Sciences
Unipark Nonntal, Erzabt-Klotz-Straße 1, 5020 Salzburg, Austria

Univ. Ass. Dr. Ioannis Fykias / ioannis.fykias@sbg.ac.at

Department of Linguistics
Paris Lodron University of Salzburg, Faculty of Cultural and Social Sciences
Unipark Nonntal, Erzabt-Klotz-Straße 1, 5020 Salzburg, Austria