

# THE INTEGRATION WITHIN ROMANIAN OF TOPONYMS OF LATIN OR GREEK ORIGIN. CRITERIA, LIMITS AND POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS<sup>1</sup>

OCTAVIAN GORDON<sup>2</sup>

**Abstract.** The rendering in Romanian of toponyms of Greek and Latin origin is an unsolved difficulty, whether it be in translations of ancient literature by classicists or in scientific articles, books, encyclopaedias and works in other academic areas. In this paper, I outline the main possible criteria for the integration of such toponyms within Romanian. The first indicator for integration should be sought in Romanian literature's reception of Antiquity. Besides the reception of Antiquity, I also put forward the grammatical criteria that need to be outlined, including: inflexion in Romanian, the postpositive definite article in Romanian, affiliation with lexical and grammatical categories, inversion of the singular and plural and/or genders, and so on.

**Key words:** Toponyms of the Antiquity, translation theory, Romanian orthography.

## 1. PROBLEMATICS AND DELIMITATION OF THE SUBJECT. ASCERTAINMENT OF POWERLESSNESS

Much has been said about the integration within the Romanian language of toponyms of Latin or Greek origin, both recently and in the past, unofficially more than at the institutional level, both in connexion with and independently of the question of transliteration, both inside and outside the context of the general issue of the rendering in Romanian of Greek and Latin onomastics, both allusively (and sometimes even abusively) and openly<sup>3</sup>. The present article was born of the need to make preliminary clarifications as part of a research project connected to European mythic toponymy<sup>4</sup>, which continues to be an area of philological debate with little prospect of consensus any time soon. Moreover,

---

<sup>1</sup> I owe the English version of the present article to Alistair Ian Blyth, Philologist.

<sup>2</sup> University of Bucharest, octaviangordon@yahoo.com.

<sup>3</sup> Except for Graur 1972, a relevant analysis of the problem in Romanian linguistics is hard to find. Nevertheless, a lot of discussions on the topic take place among classicists either in the framework of certain research and/or translations projects (as, for example, the *Septuaginta* project, at the New Europe College of Bucharest, or *Monumenta Linguae Daco-Romanorum*, at the University of Iași), or during more or less formal meetings. Also, there are lots of references to Greek or Latin onomastics in many "Prefaces" or "Editorial notes" preceding different editions, but one cannot count them among scientific linguistic references on the topic.

<sup>4</sup> The CNCSIS PN II – "Ideas" (ID\_949 / 2007) project, titled "European Mythic Toponymy. Glossary and Interactive Database for the Study of Toponyms of Mythological Relevance from the Graeco-Latin Space", headed by Professor Dr Florica Bechet. See [www.geomitica.ro](http://www.geomitica.ro).

philologists are not the only ones interested in the subject: the lack of any academically authoritative handbook of onomastics of Graeco-Latin origin is also felt in other Romanian cultural circles, and here I refer primarily to historians, philosophers and theologians.

Certainly, the debate surrounding the integration within the Romanian language of toponyms of Latin or Greek origin needs to be placed in the wider context of the discussion about the rendering of such toponyms in Romanian. Perhaps the most important element of this problematics is the norms for transliterating the names of Graeco-Latin Antiquity. Let it be said in passing that as a rule the discussion is about the transliteration of Greek (i.e. the transliteration of texts in the Greek alphabet), but a series of questions may also arise in relation to the transliteration of Latin words: first of all because Latin graphemes themselves were not always everywhere uniform<sup>5</sup>, secondly because the Romanian language uses a Latin alphabet, it is true, but one that is specifically Romanian, and thirdly because of the various modes and conventions in regard to the modern pronunciation of Latin<sup>6</sup>.

Likewise, it is obvious that a not at all insignificant part of Greek and Latin onomastics cannot merely be transliterated, but requires translation, despite a degree of opposition on the part of classical purists. In effect, what is at stake is an adaptation to the specifics of the target language, in this case Romanian, of names that are quite frequent in the literary sphere, in the wide sense, and which already enjoy a degree of reception, among both consumers of literature and ordinary speakers of the language. When I talk about the “reception” of names, I have in view reception of the content, rather than necessarily the form, a component that lends additional complexity to the problematics and at which I shall look in detail presently.

Given this aspect of the rendering in Romanian of Latin and Greek toponyms, namely their *translation*, we shall therefore discuss two essential issues:

a. The extent to which and the form(s) in which Romanian has culturally assimilated toponyms of Greek and Latin origin in different periods and, above all, in different cultural contexts. In this respect, there is often talk of “naturalised names” or names that have “entered into use,” which may be recognised as such and collected in a normative list. We find ourselves in the situation in which the integration of toponyms into the language – for this is what we are talking about – is a *fait accompli*, of which grammar is obliged to take note, using the tools available to it, and then the pressure works from bottom to top, proceeding from an empirical base, as it were.

b. On the other hand, the pressure may also work the other way, from grammar to speakers/readers, by formulating a paradigm for the expansion of this potential list, at which point the empirical base we have been talking about also acquires an inductive dimension.

<sup>5</sup> See, for example, the change that has taken place between the series of majuscules and minuscule in regard to the distinction between vocalic and consonantal *u*. In connexion with the evolution of Latin writing, it may also be recalled that the legendary founder of the city *Tarquinii* was *Tarcon*.

<sup>6</sup> In very many cases we may speak not of an *ad litteram* rendering of a Latin name in Romanian, but of special standards for reading that name in Romanian: in the absence of such standards, a speaker who hears the name *Cicero* pronounced according to the *restituta* might transcribe it in writing as *Chichero*.

Regardless of the reason, aim or consequences of such guided, cultivated action, however, grammar requires, also when it comes to translating Graeco-Latin onomastics, criteria whereby to operate, criteria based on which it will be able to recognise and ultimately ratify a proper name as having “entered into use”<sup>7</sup>. In the following I shall attempt to describe a number of these possible criteria and the advantages and disadvantages of each. Firstly, however, it is necessary to make a number of clarifications as to the relationship of toponyms to anthroponyms, in regard to the orthoepy and orthography of their translation from Latin and Greek into Romanian.

## 2. TOPONYMS AND ANTHROPONYMS

Everything I have said up to now applies to onomastics as a whole and the entire discussion about the integration of toponyms relates just as well to anthroponyms. Nevertheless, there are linguistic features specific to toponyms, which might separate them from anthroponyms not only from the viewpoint of their genealogy, etymology and functionality, as Alexandru Graur argues in his book (Graur 1972: 7-9), but also from the viewpoint of orthoepy and orthography<sup>8</sup>.

More often than not, as we shall see, the criteria for the integration of Greek and Latin toponyms within the system of the Romanian language are the same as those for anthroponyms, especially given that the two branches of onomastics borrow lexical elements from each other. In the case of toponyms that are based on the names of peoples or heroes (whether historical or legendary), it is clear that their orthography and orthoepy are conditioned by the orthography and orthoepy of the corresponding ethnonym or anthroponym. Nevertheless, this conditioning cannot be total, because certain solely grammatical criteria intervene, which we shall now look at more closely. For example, we will always say *Sicilia* (Sicily), even if we name the eponymous hero *Sikelos* or, in Latin, *Siculus*. Notwithstanding the purists, we will call the Aegean Sea *Marea Egee*, but it is not

<sup>7</sup> Names are also said to have been “naturalised” when they are culturally adopted and enter the literary tradition. As an example, I would add three editor’s notes from three well-known works recently published by Polirom (emphasis added, as a means of drawing attention to the expressions specific to editor’s introductions of this kind, as well as the awkwardness of the vague and provisory expression “enter into use”): 1) “the Patristic works already translated into Romanian have *in general* been quoted in accordance with the *consecrated Romanian titles*... The authors’ names have been reproduced *according to the known Romanian forms* or transliterated *as close as possible* to the original forms” (Moreschini and Norelli 2004: 7); 2) “In regard to the Patristic authors and the works in question, given that the authors themselves have used for these names the forms adapted by their own language, we have opted in our turn for a *consecrated transcription*, such as appears in the majority of Romanian specialist works” (Moreschini and Norelli 2001: 5); 3. “The Patristic works translated into Romanian have been quoted *according to the consecrated Romanian titles*. The names of the ancient authors have been reproduced abiding by *their consecrated form in the Romanian language*, while lesser known names are transliterated” (Pelikan 2004: 9).

<sup>8</sup> It is strange that Alexandru Graur, who in the abovementioned book grants a special space to orthoepy and orthography (see the final chapters “Grammatical Observations”, p. 150–161, and “Pronunciation and Spelling”, p. 162–177), does not also deal with the problem of the transliteration and translation of names from Graeco-Latin Antiquity, apart from in a few fleeting, secondary remarks.

compulsory that we call the Athenian king *Egeu* in writing instead of *Aegeus/Aigeus* (*Aigheus*?). Likewise, regardless of whether we write the name of the legendary hero as *Thessalos*, *Tesalos* or *Tesal* (stressed on the last syllable!), a Romanian speaker will always say *Salonic* (Thessaloniki), regardless of whether he might refer to the ancient or the modern city, and the inhabitants thereof will be called *saloniceni* or *salonicani*, even if two of the *Epistles* of St Paul the Apostle names them *tesaloniceni* (Thessalonians). In theory, there ought to be an exact correspondence between toponyms and anthroponyms derived from the same base, but in that way, besides vainly trying to constrain the Romanian language, we would deprive etymology of its most pleasing aspect: the element of surprise.

I should also add that compared with the names of persons toponyms are more enduring and “do not travel except under special circumstances” (Graur 1972: 9). Moreover, apart from the cultural categories I have listed above – historians, philosophers and theologians – experts in geography will also have a word to say regarding form when it comes to toponyms.

Nevertheless, as we shall see, the majority of the criteria for the recognition of words that have “entered into use” are the same for both onomastic categories.

### 3. POSSIBLE CRITERIA

#### 3.1. Reception

##### 3.1.1. *Reception of ancient toponyms in literary works*

Indeed, Romanian literary works – particularly translations from the classical languages – are the most important indicator of the integration of Latin and Greek toponyms within the Romanian language via translation. In my opinion they provide a decisive reference point because they address a much larger category of readers and implicitly speakers than any other type of text. The widespread occurrence of certain toponymic forms in literary texts therefore provides a criterion for measuring how far toponyms have “entered into use”, but it also has the following limitations:

(a) On the one hand, depending on the various Romanian orthographic rules, various literary trends and movements, and sometimes even the authority of one or another renowned professor, the forms of translated toponyms differ from one period to another, and sometimes from one publisher to another. Of course, the most recent solutions for translating a well-known toponym are not always necessarily the best.

(b) On the other hand, especially in poetry and drama, we encounter transient literary forms from the point of view of their integration into Romanian, be it also the literary language.

We should not forget that the overwhelming majority of such translated forms are neologisms. Therefore, they are subject to the same natural process of selection in the language as any other neologism: they may gain acceptance with the wider public, they may be altered, or they may vanish without having influenced Romanian letters.

### 3.1.2. Reception of ancient toponyms in specialist literatures

As far as specialist literatures are concerned, these enjoy from the outset a given academic authority. In effect, any book in the academically recognised Romanian bibliography for classical studies, history, philosophy or theology is important in establishing which Greek or Latin toponymic form has actually been adopted in the Romanian language.

Of course, given there is more than one specialist literature, and given that it is not possible to rely on inter-disciplinary communication to ensure a uniform shared terminology, in the case of toponymic forms we may expect a diversity imposed by the jargon itself. Thus, not only the toponymic forms favoured by the classicists, but also those traditionally put forward in specialist works from the field of history may be regarded as having “entered into use.” For example, regardless of what the classicists might propose, it will be very hard for historians to accept the names taught in the textbooks, such as *Termopile* (Thermopile) or *portul Pireu* (the port of Piraeus)<sup>9</sup>, even if the second of these may be adjusted thanks to a garish yellow-and-blue Latinising development within the European banking system: *Piraeus Bank*.

### 3.1.3. Reception of ancient toponyms in ecclesiastical and/or theological language

I would add here a separate word about theological and/or ecclesiastical jargon. I consider a separate discussion of theological/ecclesiastical language to be necessary for a number of reasons.

In general, this literary variant of the Romanian language has been overlooked, being regarded either as marginal – although it is employed within the Church by a not at all insignificant number of speakers – or as archaic or at least archaising<sup>10</sup>. I was surprised recently when a professional colleague described the verb *a blagoslovi* (‘to bless’), used in Romanian Orthodox monastic circles, as an archaism. According to the specialist dictionaries, a word or expression is “archaic” when it was “used in a past period” and is no longer in “current usage”<sup>11</sup>. But even if the verb *a blagoslovi* is no longer in current usage

<sup>9</sup> Which the Microsoft Word programme in Romanian automatically corrected to *Piure* (mashed potatoes). This detail is indicative yet again of the lack of a not at all marginal component from the Romanian official (and Office) orthoepy and orthography, namely toponymy.

<sup>10</sup> In any event, apart from in the case of Neo-Protestant denominations and sects, I do not think it is possible to speak of a religious language, from ancient times down to the present day and in all four corners of the world, which has not had as its defining feature an archaising component, as a natural mark of the conservative spirit. This does not also necessarily mean that religious language fossilises at a given stage, but that linguistic innovations can only be partial.

<sup>11</sup> See DEX 1998 or MDA 2001, under ‘arhaism’. DŞL 2005, under “arhaism”, gives the following definition: “Formă fonetică, sens sau construcție gramaticală care aparține, în evoluția limbii, unei perioade depășite ori pe cale de dispariție, dar este folosită în perioade ulterioare” (Phonetic form, meaning or grammatical construct that belongs, in the evolution of the language, to a finished period or one on the verge of disappearance, but used in subsequent periods). Let it be said in parenthesis that this definition suffers from at least two drawbacks: 1) it seems to be impossible to gauge, in synchrony, therefore a priori, whether a linguistic period is moribund (on the verge of disappearance), and on the basis of such an evaluation to say whether a word is an archaism or not; 2) the final part of the definition (“but used in subsequent periods”) is inadequate, inasmuch as it is not

in standard Romania, within the Church, and in the monasteries in particular, it has never fallen out of use. A monk does not ask for his abbot's *binecuvântare* ('blessing', the standard Romanian word), but his *blagoslovenie*, because in that space – the space in which the Romanian-speaking monk lives – the verb *a blagoslovi* and other derivatives thereof have been in uninterrupted use for centuries, since before they were first recorded in written literary Romanian. It is not even possible to speak of a survival of such terms, but rather a natural, continuous existence.

The same problem arises, for example, in the rendering of toponyms of Latin and Greek origin within the ecclesiastical space (Gordon 2012: 6): St Basil the Great was Bishop of *Cezareea Capodóciei* (Καίσαρεια Καππαδοκίας, 'Caesarea of Cappadocia'), while St Nicholas was pastor in *Mira Lichiei* (Μύρα Λυκίας, 'Myra of Lycia'), also being known as "archbishop or pastor of *Mira* (pl.)"<sup>12</sup>, given that in Greek *Mýra* is a neuter plural. These toponymic forms are all the more difficult to alter given that they are supported by a rich and uninterrupted liturgical tradition, one that is not only read but also chanted. After Hieromonk Macarie (Macarius) and Anton Pann, who are unequalled to this day, laid down once and for all the lines of Romanian psaltic chant, a series of proper names entered into ecclesiastical use and have been perpetuated in troparia, akathist hymns, prayers and even services, their forms having been altered only to the extent that the metre and general poetics of Byzantine music allows. In conclusion, whereas in the lay world toponymic forms such as *Mira* and *Mirele* (*Lichiei*) may be inadequate<sup>13</sup>, in the ecclesiastic space they are current, usual and functional forms.

The complexity of the situation does not end there. The formal unity of names that have "entered into use" in the ecclesiastical language is unravelled by different denominational positions. For example, in the Catholic and Uniat calendar, St Nicholas is "bishop of *Mira Liciei*". But even within the same Christian denomination there may exist a Biblical or dogmatic language that differs from the liturgical language, especially in academic theology, which can lead to the "consecration" of two or more different toponymic forms, with the maximum functionality within each separate jargon.

Consequently, external imposition, inclusively academic imposition, of a toponymic canon in the ecclesiastical language without lay acceptance seems to me to be impossible and I think that in order to achieve orthoepic and orthographic normality what would be required is acceptance of alternative forms for the jargon in question.

Recognition of the existence of this ecclesiastical language by Romanian academic society (and I am not talking about it being forcibly imported into spheres other than that in which it is used naturally and without compunction) therefore requires a separate approach to the question of the reception of toponyms of Greek and Latin origin.

---

necessarily necessary to reactivate a form/meaning/grammatical construct that has passed out of use in order for that form/meaning/grammatical construct to be regarded as an archaism.

<sup>12</sup> See for example, *The Akathist Hymn to St Nicholas, Archbishop of Myra of Lycia*, at *oikos 7*: "Bucură-te, întâi-stătorule pe scaunul *Mirelor* / Bucură-te, mare ierarh al *Lichiei*" (Rejoice, enthroned primate of *Myra* / Rejoice, great bishop of Lycia) (Acatistier 2006: 381).

<sup>13</sup> But not archaisms, as such toponyms and other did not circulate in the lay world.

### 3.1.4. *Reception of ancient toponyms in dictionaries and encyclopaedias*

In my opinion, the problematics of such a reception is identical with that which relates to the reception of the toponyms of Antiquity in the specialist literature (see section 3.1.2. above) and so I shall not dwell on the details. I shall merely add that given the implicitly normative value of dictionaries and encyclopaedias, regardless of whether or not they were compiled within an academic and/or official context, the toponymic forms they promote constitute more definite points of reference for the consumer of non-specialist literature than the forms presented in specialist literature(s). Thus, more than other types of publication, dictionaries and encyclopaedias are more easily transformed from mere receptors of toponyms into vectors for promoting certain toponymic forms. Consequently, in order for the reception of toponyms in this area of the literature to constitute a correct criterion for the recognition of those toponyms that have “entered into use”, it is necessary carefully to select the dictionaries and encyclopaedias in question, as well as to examine the criteria employed in various editions for the selection of particular toponymic forms.

### 3.1.5. *Reception of ancient toponyms in the virtual world*

Definitely, if we are talking about how ancient toponyms are received in the virtual world, then we are dealing with very recent times. And the virtual world is broadly a reflection of the written literature, as well as that connected with the education of the Romanian-language speakers (authors of articles, bloggers, commenters, etc.). Consequently, an examination of this zone would not be relevant to the various classifications of ancient toponyms, but it might provide unexpected, accidental solutions in the case of specific toponyms.

### 3.1.6. *Other aspects of the reception of toponyms*

**3.1.6.1.** I am not up to date with the **reception of toponyms in the history of Romanian music**, but in regard to anthroponyms, I believe the following example is relevant: after George Enescu entitled his internationally acclaimed opera *Oedip*, it has been hard for Romanian intellectuals to write the name of Sophocles’ hero other than *Oedip* or to pronounce it other than /Ödip/. Strictly related to pronunciation, the toponym *Moesia* (often also pronounced /Mözia/) is in the same situation.

**3.1.6.2. Romanian paremiology** also ought to be examined when lists of toponyms that have “entered into use” are drawn up. *Toate drumurile duc la Roma* (‘All roads lead to Rome’) and *Cartagina trebuie distrusă* (‘Carthage must be destroyed’) are just two Romanian sayings (albeit borrowed ones) that are significant when it comes to the form that has been taken by the toponyms *Roma* and *Cartagina* (rather than *Cartago*, *Cartagena* or otherwise).

**3.1.6.3.** With regard to **reception in the mass media**, it may be understood that television and radio stations and above all the cultural press are spaces that must be taken into account. Nevertheless such spaces are not necessarily defining, as they themselves are in a state of orthographic disorientation and provisoriness more than are other categories of receptors.

### 3.2. Grammatical criteria

#### 3.2.1. Inflection of endings

We now come to the second category of criteria, namely the strictly grammatical, the most prominent of which is the inflection of the word ending. In my opinion, a toponym may be integrated into Romanian as long as it is given the specific endings or the Romanian language in the oblique cases. If we speak of “întemeierea *Tarentului*” (‘the founding of Tarentum’), then we have a city which, in Romanian, is called Tarent; likewise if we speak of “invazia *Lidiei/Lydiei*” (‘the invasion of Lydia’), then the form Lidia/Lydia, stressed on the antepenultimate syllable (the proparoxytone),<sup>14</sup> may be regarded as the established translation of the toponym Λυδία. The same may not be said of *Sagras*, a river in Italy, or Mount *Soracte*.

Under this heading, things are clearer for toponyms than for anthroponyms. Whereas we are able to choose between Artemis and Artemida, given that we can say both “scutul lui *Artemis*” (‘the shield of Artemis’) and “scutul *Artemidei*” (Artemis’ shield), toponyms such as Φωκίς, Χαλκίς and Ἀργολίς cannot easily be imported into Romanian as such (*Phokis*, *Chalkis*, *Argolis*, regardless of their orthography), because one is constrained by the genitive/dative forms *Focidei*, *Calcidei/Chalkidei*, *Argolidei*<sup>15</sup>: one cannot say “locuitorii lui *Phokis/Fokis*” (‘the inhabitants of Phocis’), “aurul lui *Chalkis*” (‘the gold of Chalcis’) or “cucerirea lui *Argolis*” (‘the conquest of Argolis’).

If one insisted on preserving the transliterated nominative form at all costs in Romanian, one would be obliged to add an additional word, such as “țară” (‘country’), “ținut” (‘realm’), “pământ” (‘land’): “locuitorii țării *Chalkis*” (‘the inhabitants of the country of Chalcis’). But what if a genitive form is to be translated, such as in the phrase χώρα Ἀργολίδος? The nature of the Romanian language requires the official adoption of nominative forms such as Argolida, Halkida / Chalkida / Calcida, Focida<sup>16</sup>.

#### 3.2.2. The Procrustean bed of specific Romanian grammatical features

##### 3.2.2.1. The postpositive definite article

The postpositive definite article is a grammatically rare feature, which, because it modifies the ending of a word, represents an ineluctable criterion for the rendering of toponyms in Romanian. For example, *Heracleea* (‘Heraclea’), although in Greek Ἀράκλεια does not have a definite article (and is proparoxytone), is perceived as having a postpositive definite article in Romanian, becoming, by association with other classes of noun, a feminine substantive with a paroxytone accent.

Whereas for feminine nouns, which in Romanian translation remain feminine, things might, to a certain extent, appear simple, the same is not true of masculine nouns, to which

<sup>14</sup> The problem of stress will also need to be discussed in the situation in which a standard toponymic lexicon will be compiled, but in the present article I shall limit myself to those aspects that relate primarily to the spelling of place names.

<sup>15</sup> Likewise for the other categories of name whose roots end in -δ-. Cf. the pair Troas Troada (Τρωάς). I have not checked to see whether other categories of root might be added to this.

<sup>16</sup> Of course, this does not exhaust the problems connected with transliteration, as I have mentioned above. The indication of forms such as *Halkida* and *Focida* is purely random.

the Romanian translator must attach a postpositive definite article. For example, the Roman region of *Latium* might in theory be rendered in Romanian either as *Latium-ul* or *Lațiul*<sup>17</sup>.

### 3.2.2.2. Inclusion in lexical-grammatical classes specific to Romanian

There are certain lexical-grammatical classes specific to the Romanian language that require certain toponymic forms, including certain phonetic forms<sup>18</sup>, to which the previous criterion, connected with the postpositive definite article, also contributes. The fact that in current Romanian there are relatively widespread forms such as *epopee* ('epic'), *cornee* ('cornea') and the anthroponym *Andreea* ('Andrea') causes toponyms such as *Heracleea* (Ἡράκλεια, 'Heraclea') and *Eubeea* (Εὐβοία, 'Euboea') to be drawn into this lexical-grammatical class. The following two grammatical criteria may be regarded as reflections of the same process, whereby words are drawn, via identical or similar phonetic form, into a lexical-grammatical class already existing within the Romanian language.

### 3.2.2.3. The perception of singular forms as being plural

This linguistic reality is not an aspect related to the transposition of toponyms from one language to another, but a process intrinsic to the language<sup>19</sup>. Even if the plural may still be found in fossilised terms such as *Bucureștii Noi* ('New Bucharest', *litt.* 'New Bucharests'), *Arhiepiscopia Bucureștilor* ('The Archbishopric of Bucharest', *litt.* 'of Bucharests'), and, at the limit and with an obvious stylistic emphasis, *Bucureștii de odinioară* ('the Bucharest(s) of olden days'), contemporary speakers of Romanian will use singular expressions and phrases such as *Bucureștiul cel mohorât* ('Bucharest the gloomy') or *Piteștiul începe să arate a oraș modern* ('Pitești is beginning to look like a modern city'). Likewise, a traveller returning from Greece nowadays will talk of *frumoasa și însorita Atenă* (beautiful and sunny Athens (sing.)). On the same analogical basis as mentioned under the previous point, that of inclusion in certain lexical-grammatical classes, *Teba* (Θῆβαι, Thebes) will therefore be a feminine substantive with a singular definite article in form, while *Delfi* – Δῆλφοι (and also, for that matter, *Locri* – Λοκροί) will be a masculine substantive, likewise perceived as singular, but not having any postpositive definite article. It remains to be discussed whether this form without a definite article can function as such, the same as in Greek, with a full awareness of the fact that it refers to a definite place, or whether the Romanian speaker, by reflex, will tend to add a definite article: *Delfi este un loc al cunoașterii enigmatice* or *Delfi-ul* ('Delphi' + postpositive definite article) *este un loc al cunoașterii enigmatice* ('Delphi is a place of enigmatic knowledge').

<sup>17</sup> In the present case, as well as in other cases of well-known toponyms, the criterion of reception may play a decisive role. Romanian poetry testifies as to *Lațiu*: "Grecia capturată și-a cucerit sălbaticul învingător / Și în necioplitul *Lațiu* a adus artele frumoase" ('Captive Greece conquered the savage conqueror / And to uncouth Latium brought the fine arts') (Teodosiu 1980: 156–157).

<sup>18</sup> See likewise the problem of stress.

<sup>19</sup> Based on the same natural tendency of each language, the speaker of modern Greek perceives the monosyllabic (initially) masculine plural *Iasi* (Jassy) as a bisyllabic neuter single: το Ιάσι, and the German city *Stuttgart* has the modern Greek form η Στουτγάρδη (cf. 3.2.2.4).

#### 3.2.2.4. *Inversion of genders*

Based on the same logic, the gender of the substantive in the source language may be lost when transposed into the target language. A toponym such as *Constantinopol* ('Constantinople') may be given the feminine definite article, as in *Constantinopolea*, as long as the oblique form *Constantinoplei* (genitive/dative) exists, but it becomes *Constantinopolul* ('Constantinople' + masc. postpositive definite article) when we talk about *căderea Constantinopolului* ('the Fall of Constantinople'). Things are much simpler if we think of *Egipt* ('Egypt'), *Cipru* ('Cyprus'), *R(h)odos* ('Rhodes') and all the myriad of predominantly feminine Greek islands.

Likewise, a modern toponym such as Πανόραμα, the same as the whole range of Greek neuter nouns in -μα, will be perceived as being feminine singular, just as all the common nouns in -mă derived from Greek have become feminine: *problemă* ('problem'), *anatemă* ('anathema'), *paradigmă* ('paradigm'), *epigramă* ('epigram'), *patimă* ('passion') (see also section 3.2.2.2 above)<sup>20</sup>.

#### 3.2.3. *Pressure from common nouns with a toponymic base*

Another linguistic criterion (but not necessarily a grammatical one in the strictest sense) for establishing whether a toponymic form has "entered into use" is the presence in Romanian of common words with a toponymic etymon. The wide distribution of the word *maraton* ('marathon') has led, in my opinion, to the adoption of the spelling *Maraton* (rather than *Marathon*) for the ancient toponym. Likewise, the presence of the adjective *laconic* in Romanian has led to the spelling *Laconia*, with the stress falling on the proparoxytone, rather than *Lakonia*, with the stress on the paroxytone, especially given that we also have to translate the corresponding adjective in phrases such as Λακωνικός Κόλπος (*Golful Laconic*, 'the Laconic Gulf').

### 3.3. *Pronunciation of toponyms in the modern languages*

The pronunciation in the modern languages of an ancient toponym or place name whose etymon is a toponym found in Antiquity may be a criterion for the translation of the word in question into Romanian. For example, since every tourist agency offers holidays in *Halkidiki* (Gr. Χαλκιδική),<sup>21</sup> this toponymic form might be an argument for the adoption of the form *Halkida* (rather than *Chalkida* or *C(h)alcida*) when translating the Greek Χαλκίς. Likewise, the Italian pronunciation of intervocalic -s- will lead us to say *Siracuza* ('Syracuse') rather than *Siracusa*. The pronunciation as well as the form of the toponym *Lazio* in Italian may have supported the dissemination of the form *Lațiu* when transposing the Latin *Latium* (cf. section 3.2.2.1 above), given that the modern toponym itself is translated as *Lațiu* (Vatican 2009).

<sup>20</sup> In contrast to the other common names mentioned, which Romanian absorbed via French, *patimă* was borrowed directly from Greek, in the context of the ecclesiastical language.

<sup>21</sup> Which the majority of Romanians pronounce as a paroxytone, probably by analogy with the paroxytone stress of the majority of words with more than three syllables. A similar case is the pronunciation of the word *tiramisu* ('tiramisu').

Nevertheless, as Professor Graur also points out, “it would be a mistake to imagine that the standard of pronunciation and even spelling is always set by the language from which the name originates” (Graur 1972, 162-163)<sup>22</sup>. Even if the Greeks today pronounce Cyprus as /'ki-pros/, in Romanian it would be difficult to write it other than as *Cipru* or to pronounce it other than according to the usual rules of Romanian.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Consequent to these observations, the only clear conclusion that can be drawn is that the problematics of the integration within Romanian of Greek and Latin toponyms is of a complexity such that it requires a concerted effort, primarily on the part of philologists. First of all, in order to avoid energy being wasted on adjustments and re-adjustments, I believe that the problem of the transliteration from the Greek into the Latin alphabet requires a solution that will be valid not only for the onomastics of Graeco-Latin Antiquity, but for terminology as a whole. In the second place, what is required is an evaluation of each separate criterion presented above and the addition of any others I may have omitted.

Lastly and most importantly, a team whose members should be academically authoritative should compile an orthographic and orthoepic dictionary of Graeco-Latin onomastics that might serve as a handbook for the whole of Romanian cultural society. I should emphasise yet again that in compiling such a philological instrument account should also be taken of the specifics of jargons that employ on a large scale the toponymy – and more generally the onomastics – of Graeco-Latin antiquity, leaving the possibility of alternatives open, an aspect otherwise essential to lexicography.

#### SOURCES

Acatistier 2006 = *Acatistier*, Bucureşti, Editura Institutului Biblic şi de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române.  
 Teodosiu, L., 1980, *Epistles of Horace*, translated by Lelia Teodosiu, in Horatius, *Opera omnia*, Bucureşti, Univers.  
 Vatican 2009 = The Romanian-language Radio Vatican site of 19.02.2009: [http://storico.radiovaticana.org/rom/storico/2009-02/267442\\_noi\\_reguli\\_pentru\\_taberile\\_de\\_nomazi\\_de\\_la\\_roma\\_si\\_regiunea\\_latiu\\_aspecte\\_pozitive\\_si\\_rezerve\\_intemeiate.html](http://storico.radiovaticana.org/rom/storico/2009-02/267442_noi_reguli_pentru_taberile_de_nomazi_de_la_roma_si_regiunea_latiu_aspecte_pozitive_si_rezerve_intemeiate.html)

#### REFERENCES

DEX 1998 = *Dicţionarul limbii române*, Bucureşti, Univers Enciclopedic.  
 DŞL 2005 = *Dicţionarul de ştiinţe ale limbii*, Bucureşti, Nemira.

<sup>22</sup> As an example I would add the British toponym *Greenwich*, whose correct pronunciation in English is /'grɛnɪdʒ / or /'grɛnɪtʃ /, but which Romanians generally pronounce /'gri:nwɪtʃ/, based on the pronunciation of the adjective *green* and the pronoun *which*.

- Gordon, O., 2012: "Denominational Differences in the Romanian Rendering of Greek- and Latin-Origin Proper Names in Ecclesiastical Literature. A Translation Theory Perspective", in O. Felecan (ed.), *Name and Naming – Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*, Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Graur, A., 1972, *Nume de locuri*, București, Editura Academiei.
- MDA 2002 = *Micul dicționar academic*, București, Univers Enciclopedic.
- Moreschini, C., E. Norelli, 2004, *Istoria literaturii creștine vechi grecești și latine*, vol. II / 1, Iași, Polirom.
- Moreschini, C., E. Norelli, 2001, *Istoria literaturii creștine vechi grecești și latine*, vol. I, Iași, Polirom.
- Pelikan, J., 2004, *Tradiția creștină. O istorie a dezvoltării doctrinei*, vol. I, Iași, Polirom.