

ASPECTS OF THE NUMERAL IN 18TH CENTURY AROMANIAN WRITINGS

NISTOR BARDU

“Ovidius” University of Constanta, Romania

Abstract. This article is part of a more extensive study on the language of Aromanian writings at the end of the 18th century (by Cavalioti, Daniil and Ucuta), out of which we have already published volume I: *Observații asupra grafiei. Fonetica*. The paper focuses on forms of the numeral presented by Teodor Anastas Cavalioti in *Protopiria*, by Daniil Moscopoleanul in *Tetraglosoul* and by Constantin Ucuta in *Învățătura introducătoare*. We have come to the conclusion that the morphology of the numeral as reflected in the works above is typical of the dialect of two branches of the Aromanians (the Farseroti and the ones from Moscopole) in Albania. There is an exception for *çitî* and its compounds, the inference being that Daniil must have used the phoneme *â* (*î*) in Aromanian through the Greek *ι* (*iota*), since there is no corresponding grapheme for the respective Aromanian sound.

1. If the first Aromanian writings – actually, just short inscriptions, such as the “Inscripția lui Nectarie Târpu” (Inscription of Nectarie Târpu) (1731) and “Inscripția de pe vasul Simota” (Inscription on the Samota Bowl), dating about the same year, are not of much relevance for the Aromanian dialect. The works of the Aromanian writers in Moscopole, Teodor Anastas Cavalioti, Daniil Moscopoleanul and Constantin Ucuta, published in the last decades of the 18th century can be considered the first invaluable sources for the study of Aromanian. To these, we may add, at the beginning of the 19th century, the first attempts at scientific research of Aromanian, carried out by Gherghe Constantin Roja (*Măestria ghiovăsirii românești cu litere latinești, care sunt literele Românilor ceale vechi*, Buda, 1909) and Mihail Boiagi (*Γρμματικη ρωμανικη ητοι μακεδονοβλαχικη. Romanische oder Macedonowlachische Sprachlehre*¹ (Viena, 1813). It is almost one century later that anthologies of Aromanian dialectal texts were published by researchers such as, Gustav Weigand² and Per. Papahagi³, which, together with the writings aforementioned, allowed further research of the Romanian dialect outspoken only by Daco-Romanian. Data gathering and publication of an impressive works on Aromanian by Per. Papahagi was due to state support, i.e. founding schools and churches for the Aromanians in the Balkans, which gave the Aromanian learned the possibility to teach in these institutions and establish a direct contact with speakers of Aromanian in various places in the Balkans. In this context, Cavalioti, Daniil and

Ucuta's writings become even more precious given the various difficulties that these researchers had to confront with⁴.

2. Teodor Anastas Cavalioti is the author of *Πρωτοπειρία* „Prima învățătură”, “The First Teaching” (Venice, 1770), **Daniil Moscopoleanul** of the works entitled *Εισαγωγική διδασκαλία* „Învățătura introductoare”, “The Introductory Teaching” (Venice, 1794), comprising a very valuable *τετραγλώσσον Λεξικον* “lexicon in four languages”, and **Constantin Ucuta** wrote a textbook, *Νέα Παιδαγωγία* „Noua pedagogie”, “The New Pedagogy” (Vienna, 1797). Although using the Greek alphabet, these writings have been fundamental for Aromanian studies. Later, the scientific description of this historical dialect by Aromanian theoreticians, such as, Th. Capidan, Tache Papahagi, Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, Nicolae Saramandu etc. owes much to the efforts of these writings.

As far as we are concerned, in our works *Limba scrierilor aromânești de la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea (Cavalioti, Daniil, Ucuta)*⁵, in which we have dealt with the graphic aspects of these texts, we have also devised a monographic study of the phonetic system of the Aromanian in which the texts had been conceived. This article, dedicated to the morphology of the numeral in the works mentioned above is part of a more comprehensive study to be written on morphological and syntactic aspects⁶.

3. The categories of the numeral that we have registered in the texts focused on: the cardinal numeral, the ordinal numeral, the collective numeral, the adverbial numeral and the distributive numeral.

The cardinal numeral

Out of all the categories, the most commonly used are the cardinal numerals. They are present with all three authors, and Daniil is the one who gives towards the ending of the **Lexicon** a real counting: up to thirty, ten to ten up to hundred, and hundred to hundred up to thousand. The author also urges the reader to continue counting up to million (*miliunea*, Dan 181/34).

We provide a presentation of the main cardinal numerals, comparing them, where necessary, with other pronunciation versions.

Simple numerals

*Unu*⁷, Cav. 263, 616, Dan. 132/10, 178/33; *ună*, Cav. 263, 616, Dan.132/10; *doi*, Cav. 243, Dan 138/13, 139/13, 178/33; *dao*⁸, Cav.243, Uc 67/6; *trei*⁹, Cav.1016 Dan. 123/5, 178/33, Uc 71/12; *patru* Cav 988, Dan 178/33; *ținți*¹⁰, Cav 747, Dan 179/33; *ș'ase*, Cav 266, Dan 179/33, Uc 91/41¹¹; *șapte*, Cav 271, Dan. 179/33¹²; *optu*, Cav 686, Dan. 179/33, Uc. 71/12; *nao*¹³, Cav. 264, Dan 179/3; *țațe*¹⁴, Cav. 209, Dan. 179/33, Uc. 69/9 and the stressed form *țațele*: *țațele dimândăcuhi* “the ten commandments” Uc. 91/39; *ving'it*¹⁵ “twenty”, Cav. 251, Dan 179/34; *sută*, Cav. 254; la Dan. 180/34 : *suta*¹⁶; *miliunea*¹⁷ “million”: *și numiri cătu vrei păn la miliunea* “and you count as long as you wish up to million”, Dan. 181/34.

Compound numerals¹⁸

The typical sentence in numeral formation from 1 to 19 and from 21 to 29 is, in the dialect of the writers that we are discussing here, *spră*, compared to *sprî*¹⁹ used in other dialects: *Unsprățațe*²⁰, Dan. 179/33, Uc 71/12; *daosprățațe*, Dan. 179/33; *treisprățațe*, ibidem; *pasprățațe*, ibidem, *șisprățațe*, ibidem; *ș'asprățațe*, ibidem; *ș'aptesprățațe*²¹, Dan. 179/34 și *șaptisprățațe*, Uc. 71/12; *optusprățațe*, Dan. 179/34; *naosprățațe*²², ibidem.

The Aromanian practice in compounds formation from 21 to 29 is similar to the one from 11 to 10, which is confirmed by Daniil in his counting²³: *usprăving'it*, Dan. 179/34; *doisprăving'it*, ibidem; *treisprăving'it*, ibidem; *pasprăving'it*, Dan. 180/34 and *pasprăving'it*²⁴, Uc. 67/4; *șisprăving'it*, Dan. 180/34; *ș'asprăving'it*²⁵, ibidem; *ș'aptesprăving'it*, ibidem; *optusprăving'it*, ibidem; *naosprăving'it*, ibidem.

Counting ten to ten, from 30 to 90, is very interesting due to the mentioning of tens by Daniil under the form *țați*, as compared to *țați* with Cavalioti, *țați*, *țați'*, *țați*, *điți* in the other Aromanian dialects²⁷: *treițați*, Dan. 180/34, but *treițați* la Cav. 1021; *patruțați*, Dan. 180/34²⁸, but *patruțați* la Cav. 859; *țințați*, Dan. 180/34 and *țințați*, Cav. 745; *ș'aețați*²⁹ and *șaețați*, Cav. 267; *ș'aptețați*³⁰, Dan. 180/34 and *șaptețați*, Cav. 246; *optuțați*, Dan. 180/34 and *obțați*, Cav. 596; *naoțați*, Dan. 180/34 and *naoțați*³¹, Cav. 265.

Multiples of hundred up to thousand (*ună nil'e*, Dan. 181/34) are: *dao sute*, Dan. 180/34; *trei sute*, ibidem; *patru sute*, ibidem; *ținți sute*, ibidem; *șase*³² *sute*, ibidem; *șapte sute*, ibidem; *optu sute*, ibidem; *nao sute*, Dan. 181/34.

We register the only multiple of 1000 in Daniil's counting: *dao nil'i* "două mii", Dan. 181/34.

Other numerals

Besides the cardinal numerals, there are few forms for other types of numerals in the texts of the three authors.

The collective numeral. Through stressing, the plural forms of the cardinal numeral function like collective numerals³³³³. We draw attention to form *treil'i*³⁴: *tru treil'i ani* "in three years' time", Dan 171/29.

The distributive numeral. The cardinal numeral preceded by pronoun *căte* becomes a distributive numeral³⁵: *căte unu brănu*, Dan. 156/22; *căte unū tonū*, Uc. 67/5; *căte ună parte*: and *vindu tru anu căte ună parte* "and I sell one part a year", Dan 138/13.

*The adverbial numeral*³⁶. We have registered one form only if the figure is given as such: *di 3 ori: șî tora șî căn[țido]*, *doamne niluia*, *de 3 ori* "now and whenever, God have mercy on us, three times", Uc. 89/38.

The ordinal numeral. We register *protu*³⁷ "the first", Cav. 823 and the definite masculine form *protlu*: *protlu vinu* "the first wine", Dan. 132/10 și *a trea*³⁸: *Șî năstăsî a trea duă de căcun era [în] scrietură* "and He was resurrected the third day, according to the Scripture", Uc. 79/22.

* * *

Concluding this paper, we establish that the morphology of the Aromanian numeral in the writings at the end of the 18th century by Cavalioti, Daniil and Ucuta is actually the one confirmed later by research on the Aromanian spoken by the *Farseroți* and the *Moscopoleni*³⁹. One exception is represented by the form *çiti* in the compounds *treiçiti*, *patruçiti*, *tinçiti* etc. in Daniil's *Lexicon*, a form which has not been registered since. As far as we are concerned, we consider that this form might be *çat'i*, possibly pronounced in Moscopole by the Aromanians, other than the *Farseroti* and *Moscopoleni* and who had got there due to the fame of the great metropolis. Because of the lack of the corresponding letter for *â* (*i*) in the Greek alphabet, Daniil Moscopoleanul could have spelt it as *i* (iota).

Notes

¹ Mihail Boiagi's works was published in another edition by Per. Papahagi under the title *Gramatică română sau macedoromână* (București, 1915).

² See Gustav Weigand, *Die Aromunen*, II, Leipzig, 1894.

³ Cf. the extensive anthologies of oral literature by Per. Papahagi: *Din literature poporană a Aromânilor* (București, 1900), *Graie aromâne* (București, 1905), *Basme aromâne* (București, 1905).

⁴ The Balkan writers of the age who did not write in Greek but in the "barbarian" Balkan languages were confronted with the violent reaction of the Greek ecclesiastical authorities, which had been granted by the sultan the right to "look after" the Christians in the Ottoman empire, as far as confession was concerned, thus, they considered that the language of the cultural manifestations of these Christians had to be exclusively "the sacred language" (*lingua sancta*), i.e. Greek. On the cultural background and the publication difficulties faced by Cavaloti, Daniil and Ucuta, cf. Papahagi, *Scr. arom.* (see Bibliografie); Victor Papacostea, *Civilizație românească și civilizație balcanică*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1983; Nistor Bardu, *Limba scrierilor aromânești de la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea (Cavaloti, Daniil, Ucuta)*, Constanța, Ovidius University Press, 2004); idem, *Conștiința iluministă, aromânească și balcanică a scriitorilor aromâni din secolul al XVII-lea*, în *Ex Ponto*, III, nr.2 (7), apr.-iun. 2005, pp. 197-206.

⁵ See supra, note 4.

⁶ See also in this sense, Nistor Bardu, Aspecte ale morfologiei adjectivului în scrierile aromânești moscopolene din secolul al XVIII-lea, în *Analele Stiintifice ale Universității „Ovidius”*, Seria Filologie, tom XVI, 2005, pp. 181-187.

⁷ With Ucuta, 67/5 is written as short final -*ũ* in the distributive numeral *către unũ*. Its pronunciation as as short final -*ũ* is confirmed by Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu*, p. 243, Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 447. Functioning as indefinite adjective, Neiescu, *Mic atlas* mentions *un* with two places in Albania (h. 27, 3-4).

⁸ In other dialects *ḑoáuuă*, *ḑoáuí*, *dámuă* și *dáuí*, cf. Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 402, Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *loc. cit.*, Saramandu, *loc. cit.* We mention here Capidan's remark, *loc. cit.*, that "The Aromanians in the North begin counting with the feminine forms: *ună*, *daquă*, *trei* etc. .

⁹ Weigand registered in Albania a feminine form *treiă* (Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 404), mentioned in *DDA trei*, with diphthong. It can be considered an Albanian influence, where there is the difference masculine-feminine for this numeral (*tre* și *tri*). Cf. and Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 475, note 124. Still with Ucuta there is, in this context, *trei*, with *i* as a semivowel written as: *cu trei* (τρει) *bofi* "cu trei voci" 71/12; *cu trei* (τρει) *prósopé* "cu trei chipuri" 73/15.

¹⁰ With Farseroti, Capidan registered the pronunciation *ținț*, without final *-i*. cf. *Fărșeroții*, pp. 202-203, *Aromânii*, p. 402.

¹¹ With Daniil, in the original *σσιάσε*, written (“corrected”) cu Latin letters by Papahagi Per., *Scr. arom.* p. 179 as *șase*, and by Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 402, *șiase*. It is about soft *ș'* typical of Daniil’s dialect, which with Cavalioti (cf. Hetzer, *Kavalliotis*, p. 125, 0277) and Ucuta (*σσιάσε*) is missing. With Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 447: *ș'asi* and with Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu*, p. 243 *șase (șasi)*. See next note too.

¹² With Daniil in the original *σσιαπτε*, so *ș'iapte* as mentioned by Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 402. Soft *ș'* is present here as well. With Cavalioti *șapte (σσιάπτε)* cf. Hetzer, *Kavalliotis*, p. 228. With Saramandu, *loc. cit.*: *ș'apti*. Form *șapte* and in *Codex Dimonie, Basme* cf. Capidan, *loc. cit.* Also see Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu* p. 243: *șapte (șapti)*. Also see *infra*, p., note 12.

¹³ In other dialects: *noáúă*, *noáo* (cf. Capidan, *loc. cit.*), *náuă (náuî)* (cf. Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *loc. cit.*), *noauî* (var. *nauî*), Saramandu, *loc. cit.*

¹⁴ Form *čați*, with Capidan, *loc. cit.* Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *loc. cit.*, Saramandu, *loc. cit.*. Here, as with *șase* and *șapte* there is final unstressed *-e*, which has not closed to *-i* in the writings in Moscopole in the 18th century.

¹⁵ Cavalioti and Daniil confirm for Aromanian numeral *vinviț* of Latin origin *viginti*. Papahagi Per., *Scr. arom.* p. 250, s.v. *șaptesprăving'iț* thinks that “It is possible that the form *ving'inț* was present with Daniil. Other versions in Macedo-Romanian, written *yinyintsî, yinyitsî, g'ing'its, ying'iț'*, *yiyinț'*, *yiyinț*, with the authors quoted at note 13. Of all, only Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu*, pp. 243-244, claims to have found the forma *dauîčăț'* and its compounds *dauîčățîŃn*, *dauîčățîdói* etc.. Starting from the results of the studies in the field for the Aromanians in Dobrogea and in the Blakans, Saramandu, *Aromâna* p. 475, notes 125 and 127 shows that he has never come across numeral *dauîčăț'*, which is not registered by Tache Papahagi either in *DDA*.

¹⁶ In the original *σσιúτα*, *si*, in the definite form. Papahagi Per., *Scr. arom.*, p. 180 and Kristophson, *Das Lexikon*, p. 87 “corrects” the original form writing *sută*.

¹⁷ The etymology of this numeral (functioning here as an adjective) is given by Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 447: < gr. *μύλλιο*, it. *milione*. See *DDA*. too, s.v. *miliúnă*, *miliúne*.

¹⁸ Regarding the formation of compound numerals, see Capidan, *Aromânii*, pp. 402-403, Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu*, p. 109 and pp. 243-244, Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 447.

¹⁹ *Spră* < lat. *supra* but *sprî* < lat. *supre*, cf. *DDA*, s.v. *spră*, *sprî*. Yet, the system is *unus super decem*, using the preposition *super*, cf. Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *loc. cit.*

²⁰ In other dialects *unsprădzatse (unsprădzatsi)*, *usprăs* (În *Codex Dimonie*), *unsprătsi*, *usparatsi*, *uspredsatse* (with Weigand) cf. Capidan, *Aromânii*, pp. 402-403, *únsprîdaț'* with Caragiu-Marioțeanu, p. 243 *únsprîdați (unîspîrdați)* with Saramandu, *Aromâna* p. 477.

²¹ In the original *σσιασπρατζατζε* și *σσιαπτεσπρατζαταε* with soft *ș* (written *σσι*). See *supra*, notes 4, 5. With Ucuta : *σσαπτησπρατζατζε* , with stressed *ș*.

²² Other version of numerals form 12 to 19, with the authors quoted at note 14. Out of these, we mark the short versions (re-written by Capidan) *unspră* (*unăspră*), *doispră* (*daospră*), *treispră*, *paspră*, *tsispră*, *șaspră*, *șaptispră* *optspră* and *opspră*, *nauspră*, very close or almost identical forms in the dialect of Grăveň of Nisipari village of Moscopole. Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 402, considers that these forms are specific to the Aromanians in the North. His finding is confirmed by Popescu and Balkanski, *Aromânii din Rodopi*, p. 58.

²³ See *supra*.

²⁴ Here final *-î* final is short because Ucuta writes it *ði* (cu psili): *πασπραγήν'γηεζόι*

²⁵ In the original, the groups of these forms are written with palatal *ș* (*σσι*), see *supra*. With Kristophson, *Das Lexikon*, pp. 85-87, the writing of *șease*, *șeapte* and of their compounds obeys the rules of the original forms written with Greek letters.

²⁷ It is a common use with the Aromanian writings. Papahagi Per., *Scr. arom.*, p. 210 s.v. *ḍațe* considers *ḍiți* “a very special form” .

²⁸ Cf. Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 403. Also see Caragiu-Marioțeanu, *Compendiu*, p. 244-245, Saramandu, *Aromâna*, p. 447, Popescu and Balkanski, *Aromânii din Rodopi*, p. 58.

²⁹ With 132/10 there is *patrudăți* but in the original, *patrudiți* : *πατρουτζιτζη* is preserved.

³⁰ In the original *σσιαετζιτζη*, *ααιαπτεπτζιτζη*. See *infra* and its compounds *șase sute*, *șapte sute* in which Papahagi Per. repeatedly “corrects”, the original ones written with cu *σσι* .

³¹ Other uses of these numerals, with the authors quoted above *supra*, note 21.

³² See *supra*.

³³ Cf. Saramandu , *Aromâna*, p. 448.

³⁴ Capidan , *Aromânii*, p. 407, discusses the indefinite forms of the ordinal numeral in Aromanian and Megleno-romanian.

³⁵ Cf. and Capidan , *Aromânii*, p. 407.

³⁶ On the formation of this numeral, see Saramandu , *Aromâna* , p. 448.

³⁷ From ngr. *πρωτος* , cf. *DDA* , s.v. *prot*, Saramandu , *op. cit.*, p. 448.

³⁸ Other forms of ordinal numeral in Aromanian with Capidan, *Aromânii*, p. 405-407, Saramandu , *op. cit.*, p. 448.

³⁹ We refer to Th. Capidan, Fărșeroții; Nicolae Saramanmdu, Cercetări asupra aromânei vorbite în Dobrogea; idem, Structura aromânei actuale. Graiurile din Dobrogea, Petre Neiescu, Mic atlas al dialectului aromân din Albania și din Fosta Republică Iugoslavă Macedonia (see References).

References

- Bardu, Nistor. 2005. "Aspecte ale morfologiei adjectivului în scrierile aromânești moscopolene din secolul al XVIII-lea", in *Analele Științifice ale Universității „Ovidius”*, *Seria Filologie*, tom XVI. 181-187.
- Bardu, Nistor. 2005. "Conștiința iluministă, aromânească și balcanică a scriitorilor aromâni din secolul al XVII-lea", in *Ex Ponto*, III, nr. 2 (7), apr.-iun. 197-206.
- Bardu, Nistor. 2004. *Limba scrierilor aromânești de la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea (Cavalioti, Daniil, Ucuta)*. Constanța: Ovidius University Press.
- Boiagi, Mihail. 1813. *Γραμματικὴ ρωμανικὴ ἢ τοὶ μακεδονοβλαχικὴ. Romanische oder Macedonowlachische Sprachlehre*, Viena.
- Capidan, Th. 1932. Aromânii. Dialectul aromân. Studiu lingvistic. București.
- Capidan, Th. 1931. "Fărșeroții. Studiu lingvistic asupra aromânilor din Albania", in *Dacoromania*, VI, 1929-1930, București, 1931. 1-210.
- Caragiu Marioțeanu, Matilda. 1975. *Compendiu de dialectologie română nord- și sud-dunăreană*. București : Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Hetzer, Armin. 1981. *Das dreisprachige Wörterverzeichnis von Theodoros Anastasiou Kavalliotis*. Hamburg.
- Kristophson, J. 1974. „Das Lexikon tetraglosson des Daniil Moschopolitis, neu ediert von J. Kristophson“, in *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, X, Heft 1, München.
- Neiescu, Petre. 1997. *Mic atlas al dialectului aromân din Albania și din Fosta Republică Iugoslavă Macedonia*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Papacostea, Victor. 1983. *Civilizație românească și civilizație balcanică*. București: Editura Eminescu.
- Papahagi, Per. 1909. *Scriitori aromâni din secolul al XVIII (Cavalioti, Ucuta, Daniil)*. București.
- Papahagi, Per. 1905. *Basme aromâne*, București.
- Papahagi, Per. 1900. *Din literatura poporană a Aromânilor*. București.
- Papahagi, Per. 1905. *Graie aromâne*, București.
- Papahagi, Tache. 1974. *Dicționarul dialectului aromân general și etimologic (DDA)*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Popescu, Radu Sp., Balkanski, Todor. 1995. *Aromânii din Rodopii Bulgariei și graiul lor*. Craiova.

- Saramandu, Nicolae. 1984. "Aromâna". *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.
- Saramandu, Nicolae. 1972. *Cercetări asupra aromânei vorbite în Dobrogea*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Saramandu, Nicolae. 2005. *Structura aromânei actuale. Graiurile din Dobrogea*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Weigand, Gustav. 1894. *Die Aromunen*, II, Leipzig.
- Weigand, Gustav. 1894, 1897-1899. *Der Codex Dimonie*, von Gustav Weigand, in Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache, I, IV-VI, Leipzig.