

The Role of Etymology in Second Language Acquisition (*The Case of Romanian in Kazakhstan*)

Dr. Nicolae Stanciu

Research center "Discourse theory and Practice", "Dunarea de Jos (Lower Danube)" University of Galati, Institute of Romanian Language, Bucharest, Romania, Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan.

Corresponding author email id: nickstanciu@yahoo.com

Date of publication (dd/mm/yyyy): 05/05/2020

Abstract – Extensive research has shown great interest in the origins and evolution of Turkic cultures and languages underlying the importance of history, language and religion in building the ethnicity of different nations in Eastern Europe. However, less attention was paid to semantic convergences, divergences and evolutions of lexical items in the conceptual metaphors and phrases recovered in Romanian culture through Turkish and other south slavic intermediaries. Accidentally encountered in etymological dictionaries and studies, the Turkic elements have not benefited yet from a multidisciplinary research meant to point out the lines of continuity between old Turkic (Pechenges, Cuman and Tatar), those of Ottoman Turkish and their reverberations in Romanian language. In fact, words almost exclusively labelled as Turkish or those with unknown and multiple etymology, preserved in Romanian as relics found in various stylistically registers (academic, archaic, colloquial, popular, regional) as well as in anthroponomy and toponymy, have been recovered in the folklore and literature of the 19th to the 21st centuries. These have been found disguised in metaphorical expressions and symbols considered relevant for the spirituality of this multicultural space. Integrated into an evolution perspective, the concepts and metaphors analysed and interpreted within this article belong to extended cultural areas, and use symbols common to extremely various linguistic groups. Accepting multiple origins and following their semantic evolution in etymological charts designed for interpreting meaning from basic to abstract and semantic deviation found at secondary level or in metaphors, this article constitutes an attempt to design a hermeneutical method based on archaeo- and historical linguistics, etymological confluences and stratigraphy and to use the analysed lexis in the content of classes taught for the students in Kazakhstan. However, the traditional principle of connection between the phonetic body and meaning as unified parts of conceptual-semantic matrix is sustained, combined with the modern one pointing out the role of etymology in underlining the ethnic features of both nations.

Keywords – Etymology, Second Language, Multidisciplinary Science.

I. INTRODUCTION

Etymology as a Multidisciplinary Science and its Reflexes in Second Language Acquisition

In the past decades much research has focused on the importance of language and more specifically of etymology in defining ethnicity anchors together with other seminal concepts in branding a nation, like its heroic past, geography and traditions. Meanwhile, extensive research in second language acquisition has reported the importance of comprehension and syntactic knowledge in learning a new language as mechanisms of ensuring discourse coherence and cohesion. In fact, the language awareness has been underlined in numerous studies over time as a modality to conceptualize meaning and to represent realities in cognitive frames or scenes. The definition of etymology varies from country to country but some exceptions can be found as lines of continuity. According to some researchers, etymology only consists of indicating the language the word comes from or showing its oldest form, root and meaning. In view of the others, etymology is the representation of the smallest units and the derivational affixes that make up the word. In its most widely known sense, etymology is the work of making such explanations credible in the context of phrases, idioms, metaphors and has acquired a

great importance in defining national identities through language evolution. In this comprehensive approach, etymology has become a multidisciplinary science benefiting from data of tangential fields of research like anthropology, ethnic studies, geography, toponymy and history. It has therefore occupied a significant place in second language acquisition. Consequently, to build up knowledge at proficiency level by bringing information on cultures' evolution and improving the ability of professional usage of language, may become an interesting approach to learning and teaching a new language while designing 'etymological charts' (Nourai 2010: 10), which follow the evolution of lexical items from the origin to languages they have been circulating, as well as the stylistic distribution of the terms at colloquial, popular or academic levels.

Asserting that being a proficient user of a language means not only mastering the grammar as an invisible force that makes the speaker able to generate an endless number of enounces and control their correctness, but also comprehending and appropriately using a rich stock of words in their semantic matrix spanning from roots to collocations and phrases and expressing at least three categories of meaning, namely basic, secondary and abstract metaphorical. The author pointed out some cultural links between Kazakh as an old Turkic language and Romanian as a modern one by analyzing the origins, etymological confluences and stratigraphy of Turkic elements. Thereupon, both fields of linguistic and second language acquisition were merged in this academic and didactic endeavour of comprehending a culture through language. As a result, teaching Romanian in Kazakhstan can greatly benefit from an integrative and innovative approach to learning and teaching mostly in the field of comprehension and multilevel skills used for forming and refining linguistic competence in the narrow track of building and boosting vocabulary.

The main assumption of this paper is that the high proficiency in Romanian required by academic objectives can be achieved by creating communicative opportunities and language learning contexts at the most refined levels and skills. Asserting that being a proficient user of a second language implies boosting vocabulary and mastering grammar - in short, being a competent user who can perform at all language levels: comprehension, listening, speaking and writing, this paper suggests some modalities of interpreting etymologies and underlines the role of this science in second language acquisition.

As learners of the fourth foreign language, the students who have chosen to study Romanian display some peculiarities of their linguistic background made of mother tongue and other languages like english and russian, which influence the patterns of learning. It is obvious that collocations, idioms, phrases and word formation patterns cannot be neglected in the language transfer but some other non-verbal items like customs, gestures and rituals reverberate in significant scenes reflecting a stock of beliefs that have been falsely assumed as Kazakh or Turkic and have been used as identity markers. Therefore, tracing the roots from ancient languages and following the interpretation through etymological confluences, lexical interferences, semantic divergences and stylistic differentiation may lead to placing the evolution of the words in etymological charts representing the stratigraphy of meaning evolution in syntactic patterns.

II. BACKGROUND

People and Language in Contact, Historically Motivated Etymology

Numerous scholars from different countries specialized in various fields like archaeology, history, linguistics, religion have acknowledged and demonstrated the cultural contacts among Turkic people (Pechenegs, Cumans

and Tatars), who have passed over and settled down in the territories of today Romania, especially in Moldavia and Wallachia. Their cultures of passage and settlements influenced the local ethnicities and left traces in languages. However, it remains unclear why the vast majority of researchers have connected this massive stock of words represented by more than 20% of Romanian vocabulary only to Turkish, namely Ottoman influence, which has been manifested from the 15th century to the 19th century as a political domination of the empire distinctive from the ancient one. Only a few dictionaries and philological papers have made a difference between Turkic and Turkish just by following a prototypical phonetic pattern like stress on the last vocalic syllable, and the plural made in *-le* (Hristea 1982: 129). Looking across the cognates in surrounding languages like Bulgarian, Hungarian, Serbian and Ukrainian, it has not been noticed yet that the morphological pattern does not function in these language groups which have inherited a significant stock of words with Turkic origins.

To some historians and linguists, the cultures and languages are interrelated and they have developed and enriched each other due to the mutual contacts and interferences of communities that have spoken these dialects. They established epicenters as poles of creation and hypocenters as places of assimilation and distribution. Historically, Turkic and Turkish can be considered as epicenters and although make a distinction in space, history and time as being developed and still used in different areas and epochs, nobody thought of bridging them in a conceptual line of continuity between central Asia and east and south-east of Europe. Elegantly, it was noticed many years ago that ‘the origins of the Turks are veiled in the mist of pre-history’ (Clauson 1962: 14). From a cultural perspective, ‘the history of eastern Europe in the 11th and 12th centuries is marked by mass migration of Turkic speaking tribes from central Asia, which remarkably influenced not only political but also the ethno-cultural life of this significant region’ (Kjashtornyj 1997: 151-152). Ancient Turkic people descend from ethnic groups and tribes who through conquests, migration interaction and assimilation extended their culture to Asia and Europe. After some centuries, the Ottoman Empire has conquered countries like Bulgaria, Hungary and Serbia and transformed them into pachaliks or exerted great control over other countries like Romanian provinces Moldavia and Wallachia in the Balkans (Iorga 1998-3: 102). Geographically, ‘the area between the heart of Asia and Danube’s lower basin acted as a large passage for the movement of nomadic-pastoralist horsemen’ (Spinei 2009: 39 - 40). Consequently, these population replacements generated acculturation and the ethnic groups have grown in a confluent historical and language context with overlapping layers and changeable shapes. The nature of the relationship resulted in long-standing interactions mainly manifested as contacts and interference in the vicinity. Turkic peoples and their languages from the earliest period (the eight century A. D.) to the medieval period appear in ‘scanty Byzantine records’ (Clauson 1962: 2) and numerous genuine words which were known to have existed before medieval language were subjected to a mass invasion of loan words from the languages of foreign people (Arabs, Iranians and Mongols with whom the Turkish peoples then came into contact (Clauson 1972: V). The period of cultural, political co-territoriality favoured linguistic interference and multiple fluxes of lexis’ assimilation. Numerous words labelled as Turkic and Turkish are found in Albanian, Greek, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Romanian and Serbian. When researchers look for deeper roots in the Balkans, they should consider them in the big picture of various cultures and languages mingling in the field, and track the Turkic from co-territorial languages which have been found in contact for a long time. They should also consider a stratigraphic circulation and meaning evolution in this space during many years of control, invasion and occupation of the countries and empire with very changeable borders

and influence spheres and zones.

III. METHODOLOGY

After a long period of oscillation among contradictory definitions of etymological character of Romanian language, we do not know so far whether it was either a pure romance language, a predominant Latin one or a mixture of Indo-European and non-Indo-European, mostly Turkic and Turkish elements. Starting with accepting this stratigraphy based on empires and ethnic groups intermingling and overlapping over centuries, the main focus of this paper is to approach from interdisciplinary point of view the main etymological sources of current Romanian language with a special attention paid to the Turkic and Turkish influences. A broad range of headwords with Turkic roots together with numerous items labeled with unknown etymologies in the dictionaries of some Balkan languages, were analyzed in an evolutive historical perspective following their occurrence in ancient reconstructed dialects, their continuation in Turkish and finally their spread into the above-mentioned national languages like Bulgarian, Hungarian, Romanian, Serbian and Ukrainian.

Cross-cultural, linguistic studies and dictionaries have pointed out the existence of some types of etymology: direct, multiple, folk, but I will follow this old discipline in the new contexts like etymological charts and historically motivated etymons by connecting the two main strata of Turkic lexical items and following their evolution from old Turkic to Turkish and Romanian. The main goal of this etymological approach was to discover the meaning enrichment to a fruitful polysemy materialized, concrete and abstract in semantic extension visible within 'conceptual metaphors' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) encoded in collocations, idioms and phrases. The majority of multiple etymologies described within this article comprise connotation encoded in words belonging to adjectives and to nouns seen as modalities to conceptualize parts of the world and represent them in cognitive frames and at different levels of language competence (comprehension, reading, speaking, writing and translations). Within this article a new concept of historically motivated etymology will be used together with multilayer one just for a more comprehensive understanding of words evolution.

The data used for this study were collected by the author from different sources, mainly etymological dictionaries, historical and linguistic work papers and books on anthropology and toponymy as well as through discussions with native speakers of these three main groups of languages: old Turkic (Kazakh, Uzbek), Turkish, Romanian and Slavic. The main purpose of data collection and interpretation was to establish links between two cultures (Kazakh and Romanian) by tracking back in history roots and following the evolution of lexical items through abstract meaning like metaphors and symbols thus interpreting in a comparative perspective, quite a rich stock of words meant to be used as vocabulary content in second language acquisition. Seen as a specific approach to etymology designed at that time as a linguistic anthropology method, this research path interprets reverberations of Turkic civilizations in Romanian culture.

IV. RESULTS

Narrowing the focus of research on etymology some assumptions should be formulated for following the evolution of the lexis from ancient to the modern times: a) it was a long time ago realized that all Turkic dialects have a significant stock of Arabic and Persian words and they have been transmitted from old Turkic to Ottoman Turkish and other modern languages spoken in the Balkans as resulting from cultural contacts and empires' domination; b) semantic features were retained in the process of meaning divergence, while creating

comparisons, metonymies and metaphors. For example, words like Rom. *arcan* < Tat., Ukr. *arkan* (DEX: 58) ‘lasso’ had a correspondent in Tk. *arqan* ‘necklace’ (DTS: 54), Rom. *mameluk* < Fr. *mamelouk* (DEX:614) ‘sultan’s guard in Egypt; fig. dummy, mollycoddle, fogey/old rooter’ may properly originate in Uigh. *mamluk* ‘the name of an old Turkic dynasty’ (Johanson 1998: 86-87) and further on in Persian *mameluke* ‘military slaves, modern Persian servant’ denote a Central Asian practice of purchasing slaves and training them to be guards of the home of merchants who departed on long voyages to China and elsewhere (Frye 1998: 195-196), Rom. *pehlivan* < Tc. *pehlivan* (DEX: 796) ‘charlatan, mountebank, quack, joker, wag’ rooted in Caucasian *pehlivan* ‘hero’; c) regular phonetical changes, such as *d > t*: Az. Bg. *deli* > Rom. *тели* ‘crazy’ (*Deliorman*, *Teleorman*); *k > g*: Kz. *kol* -Tc. *gol* ‘lake’ have taken place; d) there is a broad range of words which have passed from old Turkic into Ottoman Turkish keeping the same or similar meaning. Therefore, in using concepts like etymological confluences and stratigraphy, the items from Turkic will be followed in Turkish and after that in Balkan languages through convergent and divergent semantic matrixes based on three-fold meaning: basic, secondary and metaphorical.

Numerous terms grouped in lexical and semantical fields and belonging to existential concepts mostly encoded in parts of speech like adjectives and nouns reflect a long process of cultural and linguistic contacts in which people living in the vicinity have exchanged life experiences and thoughts. Various lexical items found in Romanian contemporary language have Turkic etymology and have evolved at the confluences of cultures. From more than 20% lexis with controversy, Turkic and unknown etymology, the author of this article has chosen those ancient words existing in Kazakh language, which have survived in Ottoman Turkish and can be found in Romanian. In many situations, the words of Arabic and/or Persian origins passed first in Turkic, second in Turkish and finally have entered Romanian through different intermediaries like Neo-Greek, Old Church Slavonic, Bulgarian and seldom Hungarian or Serbian (Dobrisan 1968: 521). Keeping in mind the idea that Proto-Bulgarian and in many ways, Hungarian, have been in contact or originated from Turkic people (Cuman Kipchaks), the concepts encoded in the words were identified by two main bases. The first deals with an archaeological and historical realities reflected in the existence, passing on or settling down of Turkic tribes over the territories of the Balkans, and the second, a linguistic one, is visible in the relics which survived in the languages that have been spoken within this large area over the centuries. In short, the first one explains the connections between Turkic and Turkish tribes with people of different ethnicities in the Balkans; the second uses lexicographic information from etymological dictionaries of Kazakh, Uzbek, Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, Macedonian, Serbian, Hungarian and Romanian for discovering similar terms and explaining the etymology of those words found at the confluences of cultures and preserved in all the above-mentioned languages without pretending to identify the layers in the history. Therefore, lexical items analyzed below were rendered and followed into two main etymological layers: first, called Turkic (Tk) comprising items of Cumans, Pechenegs and Tatars originated in the languages spoken in these territories before the 14th century and the second named the Turkish (Tc) that manifested its influence between the 15th and 19th centuries and tried to establish cultural correlation by following epicenters and hypocenters of the terms used in cultural and linguistic systems.

The words of Turkic and Turkish origins are mostly nouns, just a few verbs, adverbs and interjection and linguistically reflect existential concepts about historical realities related to character features, economic relations and trade, nature (flora and fauna), house and surroundings’ spatiality and holdings, war tools. They also display some categories of meaning spanning from concrete to secondary and abstract. They have a rich

semantic matrix resulting from derivation and lexical-grammatical conversion and at least in some parts of this cultural space their development into different parts of speech go together with a polysemic meaning extension.

Among the nouns, some words labelled in Romanian dictionaries with Hungarian origins *chin* < Hun. *kin* (DEX) ‘torture, torment, agony, excruciating pain, affliction, distress, labor, pain, effort’ do not have any etymological correspondent in contemporary Magyar language, but its rich polysemy is visible in derivatives: *chinuire* ‘torment, torturing’, *chinuitor* ‘torturing, tantalizing, torturer’; past participle adjectives: *chinuit* ‘tormented, tortured, miserable, wretch, unfortunate, uneasy, fretful, worried, over elaborated, overdone, unnatural, exaggerated’, *inchipuit* ‘cockscomb, conceited, person, dandy, imaginary, unreal, fictitious, false, vain’; post-verbal nouns: *chinuire* ‘torturing, tormenting, tantalizing’, *inchipuire* ‘imagination, fancy, delusion, chimera, idea, thought, opinion’; verbs: *a (se) chinui* ‘to torture, to torment, to harass, to put on the rack, to wretch, to plague, to moil and toil, to try hard, to strive, to drudge, to fag away, to fret’; collocations: *chinurile facerii* ‘the throes of the birth’, *chinuri sufletesti* ‘anguish of soul’ may be related to Sumerian *kin* ‘agony’ (Toth 2007: 434) or to Kz. *kynau* ‘torture’. Some other abstract or concrete nouns, such as Rom. *Cherem* < Tc. *kerem* ‘mercy’, Kz. *keremet* ‘good (ness), wonderful (ness)’ and Rom. *habar*, Alb. *haber* ‘information, news, report’ (Newmark 1999: 296), Kz and Uzb. *habar* ‘news’, are supposed to have Persian origins which has developed various meanings across languages: in Kazakh and other Turkic languages, *kerem* ‘favor, pleasure’ function as an autonomous noun as well as in Turkish, *habar* ‘news’, while in Romanian they occur in verbal locutions like *a fi la cheremul cuiva* ‘to be at somebody’s beck and call, to be at somebody’s mercy’, *a (nu) avea habar* ‘to have no idea’ and shows their productivity through expressive derivatives like *habarnist* ‘who does not have any idea/knowledge on the subject’ quite frequently used in colloquial speaking or newspapers. More so, a word of possible Arabic origins can be found in different families of languages and parts of speech like Turkic (Kz. *nazar* ‘attention’), Slavic (Slo. *nazor* ‘surveillance’) and Romanian *a (se) nazari* ‘to think, to fancy, to imagine, to picture, to cross one’s mind, to dawn upon one, to be possessed by an idea’ with significant meaning divergence but keeping a common abstract sense across the languages. It has also been associated with Sb. *nazirati* (DEX: 695) ‘to see unclearly’ but it has non-Indo-European cognates like Hung. *zur* (Toth 2007: 685) ‘chaos’, Lit. *Zuru* ‘abnormal’ and rather belongs to ‘pre-Latin stock’ (Vinereanu 2009: 568–569). Less attention was paid to a word existing Kz. *bahyt* ‘happiness’, preserved in other languages with a similar meaning Rom. *bafta* < Tc. *baht* (DEX 2012:85) ‘good luck, success’ and enriching the etymological triplets.

Celebrations and gift exchange have had a long tradition in cultures and a rich representation of concepts and the words expressing them. It has commonly emanated from primitive cultures, the names of some celebrations and songs originating in Turkic customs that have been spread throughout countries in the region through layers of civilization up to nowadays. Shunned in their etymology, though often encountered in colloquial style of Balkan languages, some items of Turkic and Turkish origins deserve special attention. Despite not being recorded in the etymological dictionaries of Balkan languages: Rom. *Kurban* ‘a Muslim summer celebration consisting sacrificing animals and sharing their meat with the poor’ has similar forms in different languages Kz. *kurbanay* Tc. *qurban*, Arom. *curban* (Papahagi 1963: 336), Rom. *curban*, Srb. *gurban* ‘sacrifice’ and dialects spoken in ethnic communities from Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania and Serbia (Sikimic & Hristo (eds) 2007) and even in the folklore of the Romanians in a spring ritual called *Curbanul Viilor* ‘vineyard pruning’. Moreover, a term of possible Arabic, Persian or even Cuman origins (Djuvara 2007: 44) has lost its autonomy in Romanian contemporary language and retained the metaphorical meaning of noise: Kz. *toi* ‘celebration, rite of passage:

birth, wedding, funeral’, Rom *toi* ‘noise’ and in extension in the middle as in the phrase *în toiul luptei/lucrului* ‘the highest, most intensive moment of a fight or work’.

Cuisine is a very interesting field of culture and the presence of some concepts related to culinary art and the way of cooking reflect long-term cultural contacts and a process of cultural and linguistic assimilation. Some words in the field of culinary art and dishes are supposed to be of Turkish origins but most of them are properly Arabic or Greek words which were borrowed by Turks. The presence of such words in other Turkic languages which have evolved in contact with Arabic, Persian and Yiddish speaks about their widely spread circulation across languages. Cakes, candies, pastries, sweets have the same names in different languages and the identification of channels they entered the Balkan is quite difficult without considering the cultural history: Rom. *baklava* < Tc. *baklava* (DEX: 85) ‘baklava’ can also be found in Alb. *bacllava* (Newmark 1999: 39), Kz. *pahlava* ‘pastry filled with honey, almonds and nuts’. Some of them have Arabic or other roots: Rom. *cafea* < Tc. *kahve* (DEX > 131-132), Russ. *кофе*, Slo. *kava* ‘coffee’, Rom. *halva* < Tc. *halva* (DEX: 458) < Kz. *halva* < Arab. *halva* ‘halva’. A polysemous one has developed a variety of meanings in Romanian either proper or antiphrastic: Rom. *rahat* < Tc. *rahat* (DEX: 910) ‘Turkish delight,’ is no longer used in contemporary Turkish where it was replaced by *lokum*, but exists in Kazakh language as a common noun or an anthroponym with a totally different meaning: Kz. *rakhat* ‘comfort’ which was extended to name people while, in other languages, it has developed the opposite, antiphrastic sense: Rom. *rahat* ‘dud, failure, squid, trifle, (bull) shit’. A very interesting one with roots in Arabic is Rom. *caimac* < Tc. *kaymak* (DEX: 132) ‘sour cream’ functioning in all Balkan languages with numerous abstract nuances like Rom. *a lua caimacul* ‘to appropriate the best part of something’. An example of abstract meaning development is offered by a term with Arabic or Jewish origins but labelled as Turkish, Rom. *halal* < Tc. *halal* (DEX: 457). In fact, the item exists and roots in Arabic and old Turkic languages with quite concrete meanings: *halyal*₁ ‘allowed to be eaten by Muslims; literally, permitted by religious rules’, which passed into modern Turkic (Kazakh and Uzbek) with a restrictive meaning *halal*₂ ‘meat without fat. In extension, it is good food resulting from slathering animals like lambs and rams in non-stressful conditions’ and finally, through a successive epithetical and metaphorical transformation, it became *halal*₃ ‘gift, gratitude, luck, happiness’ in Balkan languages: Alb. *hallall* ‘which is deserved by someone, something that is one’s right, reward, decent person’ (Newmark 1999:299); Bg. and Serbian *halal* ‘happiness’, Hung. *halal* ‘happiness’ (Toth 2007: 31, 98), Ngr. *χαλαλ*, Romanian *halal* ‘good for you, you have done it!’ (Cioranescu 2002: 387).

Long-term economic and social relationships are reflected in anthropological visions on the others, professions, ranks in the state or religious organization represent an interesting and rich field of concepts reflected in specific lexis in language families. As a confluent cross-cultural area, the Balkans have inherited terms of Indo-European origins as well as of Turkic and Turkish ones. Professional or social statuses encoded in words spread around Balkan languages have multiple meanings and stratified etymologies. Such an old Turkic term of controversial origins as Rom. *bei* ‘governor, ruler’ < Tk. *bay*, Tc. *bey* presumably connected to Mong. *bayan* ‘rich, wealthy’ (Clauson 1972: 609), to Chinese *beg* ‘the chief of the clan’ (Clauson 1962: 15) or to Turk *bey* ‘head of a land’ (Toth 2007: 514) was used in the form *bey* in the second half of the 19th century when a Romanian boyar, Ion Ghika, became the governor of Greek Island Samos. The term *bayan* ‘head, leader, ruler’ has survived as a toponym: *Bayan* village in Kazakhstan (Budagov 1997:102). Claimed by Romanians, Slavs (Bulgarians, Russians, Ukrainians) an item like Rom. *boier* ‘boyar, aristocrat’ with a rich lexical family may

also be linked to Tc. dialectal *boljar* ‘nobleman’ (Rudnicky 1962-1972: 187-188). Some other words for guards, military or outlaws have remained with unclear etymology and at the confluence of cultures. Third, labelled as a Hungarian plural *haiduk* ‘guard, bank teller’ and connected to Tc. *haydud* ‘Hungarian worker’ may have come into Romanian either through Slavic or Turkish intermediary (Cioranescu 2002: 387) and can be found in Alb. *hajduk* ‘person who steals, thief, robber, burglar, renegaded outlaw, mountain brigand, villain’ (Newmark 1999: 297), Bulgarian and Serbian *hajduk* ‘bandit, looter, robber, thief’ and Rom. *haiduc* ‘outlaw’. A positive image of this rural knight who takes from the rich and shares with the poor has been spread around in Balkan folklore and over a century the term was re-evaluated as culturally beneficial. In addition, Rom. *sultan* < Tc. *sultan* belongs to the phase of Ottoman influence and still occurs in Turkic anthroponyms and toponyms like Nursultan ‘the knight of the light’. At least a part of the compound word (*sultan*) was recovered as a brand of tomato sauce in present-day Bulgarian, Romanian, Hungarian and Serbian cuisine. On the other hand, a Turkic word for rank, like Rom. *mârza* < Kz *myrza* < Uzb. *mirza* ‘gentlemen, ruler, sir’ (Kunanbaev 2009: 97), in Kazakh and Romanian languages, is still encountered in three different contexts, namely as a rank in the past, as a family name (*Myrza*, *Marza*) or as a toponym in Kazakhstan. Moreover, the Bulgarian, Romanian, Serbian and Hungarian term *han* ‘khan’ has been explained in etymological dictionaries as a Turkish one (DEX, DLRM), but in fact, it has multiple etymology and deeper cultural historical roots existing in Albanian, Bulgarian, Greek, French, Hungarian, Kazakh, Russian, Romanian and Serbian (Cioranescu 2002: 390). Seen as a Mongolian toponym Khangai is derived from *khan* ‘king’ and designated as civilization and a mountain in this area, whose top is visible among flat fields around (Barut 2018: 8-9). Two abstract nouns denominating enmity, hostility or a sort of friendship like Rom. *dusman* < Tc. *dusman* (DEX: 337) ‘enemy, foe’ used in contemporary Turkish, was recorded in the dictionary of pre-Ottoman Turkish and Rom. *ortac* < Srb. *ortak* (DEX: 752) ‘bud, chum, fellow, friend marrow’ and have in Romanian, a variety of meanings spanning from *ortac*₁ ‘comrade’ to *ortac*₂ ‘lover’ and *ortac*₃ ‘associate’ some derivatives and possible Turkic origins where Az. Kz. Uz. and Tc. *ortak* are ‘friend, shareholder’ (Johanson 1998: 32).

Spatiality has a rich lexis and symbolism across the cultures and the items related to household, house parts, surroundings like garden and yard are known in Indo-European and Turkic-Turkish cross-cultural variations. Names of places like pastures, city edges, parts of the house or rooms, household and surroundings (court, enclosures, fence, yard) represent a wide field of denominations in language families and form that part of languages that distinguish them from each other. Additionally, toponymy often reveals linguistic relics of Turkic and Turkish origins preserved in compound nouns denominating places in different parts of the world presumably having been inhabited by Turkic population or used as ethnonyms. Large or narrow spaces with archaic savors have been quite often recalled in the last decades in denoting places used for demonstrations or in artistic literature and journalism. Two old Turkic lexical items existing in Azerbaijan, Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkish and other Balkan languages have equally preserved the bad and good connotations of the margins. The first one is Rom. *maidan* < Az. Uzb. Tc. *meydan* (DEX: 612) ‘waste/ vacant/ land/ ground/ tot’ often re-actualized in the capital of Ukraine during the anti-government protests and still intensively broadcast on Russian media. Second, Bg. Rom. Srb. *ahala* < Tc. *mahalie* < Az. +Uzb. *mahalya* ‘slums, outskirts, suburbs’ functions in numerous collocations like *viață de mahala* ‘life in the gutter’, *de mahala* ‘low, common, vulgar’ as well as derivatives *mahalagism* ‘billingsgate, gossip, scandal’, *mahalagiu/ mahalagioaica* ‘suburbanite, foul mouthed fellow/ woman’ has been currently refreshed in literature of the 19th and 20th centuries. Trading has had a long tradition

across the cultures and Rom. *bazar* < Tc. *bazar* ‘bazaar’ denotes a concept ‘existing in Central Asia already in pre-Islamic periods including caravanserais, warehouse and shops’ (Frye 1998:196). Some words for dwellings and shelters have Turkic and Turkish origins like Rom. *conac* ‘big house’ < Tc. *konak* < Kz. *konak* ‘guest’ > *konak uy* ‘hotel, guest house’ and *odaie* ‘room’ of possible Cuman origins (Giurescu 1961: 258, Djuvara 2007: 44). A metaphoric meaning in the field of funeral and wedding customs to denominate bread rituals: for instance, a sort of sacred bread broken over the bride’s head (Rom. *conacarii* ‘twisted round shaped bread’ or even in alms: (Kz. *konak asy*) ‘bread shared with deceased’s visitors before burial. Almost forgotten in today Balkan languages, an item of Turkic and origins like Rom. *hogeac* < Tc. *ocak* (DEX: 478) ‘chimney, funnel, room, home, digs’ have extended the meaning through metonymy and metaphor: Az. Kz. *hogak* ‘dwelling, shelter’ denominated in Turkish, a body of soldiers but kept in Balkan languages, the initial meaning of Old Turkic *hocak* ‘hearth, oven, fireplace’. Found in some other languages like Azerbaijani and Turkmen either as a common noun *ojak* ‘fire’ or a toponym *Ojagly* ‘marsh-gas coming out’ (Budagov 1997: 102), Russ. *очак* ‘fireplace, hearth’, the term is used in the same limited (fireplace) and extensive meaning (dwelling, house, shelter, place of worship).

House decorations and furniture represent other conceptual and cognitive frames encoded in words of Arabic, Persian, Turkic and Slavic origins for example Rom. *divan* < Tc. *divan* (DEX: 323) ‘couch’ have, besides the basic meaning ‘a long backless sofa especially one set with pillows against the wall’. The others are preserved in literature like a ‘country room, tribunal or public audience in a Muslim country, a seat used by an administrator when holding an audience, a coffee house or a smoking room, and a book of poems’, keep the Arabic, Persian and Turkic nuances of place for gathering or discussing/ debating a topic of great interest (AHDEL: 2209). Among house decorations some lexical items have marked their own regional distribution and semantic evolution: Rom. *chilim* < Kz. *kilim*, Tc. *kilim* (DEX: 178) ‘sort of embroidery, Turkish two-faced has quite a defined area of circulation in Romanian only, Oltenia region, part of Walachia province, in Bulgaria and Serbia. Moreover, such a term as *perdea* < Tc. *perde* (DEX: 801) ‘curtain’ has developed different categories of meaning in Romanian besides the basic one like secondary *perdea de fum* ‘smoke screen’, *perdea forestiera* ‘forest belt’ and metaphorical in phrases like *cu perdea* ‘discreetly, with discretion, reserve, restrain’ or *fara perdea* ‘curtain less (ly), improper (ly), indecorous (ly), scurrilous (ly), straight, obscene, indecent’.

Some nouns of fruits and trees have the same Turkic and Turkish origins. Their reminiscences can be found in anthroponymy and toponymy: Tk. *alma* (DTS: 36) ‘apple (fruit and tree)’ survived as a relic in proper names: Kz. *Almash*, Rom. *Almas* and toponyms found either in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan *Almalyu* (Budagov 1997: 72) or Rom. *Almalau* ‘a place/ village where apple trees grow’ or even *Alma Vii*, a village in Transylvania.

Forestry has in Balkan countries and languages some denominations of different origins but the Turkish lexis survived in toponyms found either in Central Asia or in Romania or Bulgaria: *Caraorman* ‘Black forest’ and *Teleorman* ‘crazy forest’ both of possible Cuman origins (Coteanu & Sala 1982: 143; Sala 2009: 109) have correspondents in Bulgaria (*Deliorman*). Although researchers doubt the Turkic character of the first term and consider it as ‘an ancient borrowing from Indo-European Tocharian’ (Tenishev 2001: 110), its occurrence in contemporary Turkish either as a separate word or a part of a compounded one, *Karakoy* ‘a former Black village, today a district of Istanbul city’ or Rom. *deli* ‘crazy’ which generated a new item in the field of madness terms but *diliu/deliu* ‘crazy, insane’ are the most expressive.

Containers of every kind mostly bottles, casseroles, skin sacks as well as accessories like bags and satchels reflect another conceptual and existential field with various representations and significations across languages: Rom. *burduf* (DEX: 126) ‘leather sack used for keeping cereals, cheese, milk, wine or water’. Although it has a phonetic form similar to other Turkic words circulating in different languages Kz. *funduk* ‘a sort of nuts’, Kz. *kurdiuk* ‘lamb meat with feat’, *sundiuk* ‘dowry wooden box’, the term was recorded in some other Slavic etymological dictionaries: for example, Russ. *бурдюк* (*burduk*) (Vasmer 1986–1987: 147), Pol. *burdziuk* (Bruckner 1985: 49), Ukr. *бурдюк* (*burduk*) (Rudnicky 1962-1972: 259–260) with possible Azerbaijani origins (Az. *borduk*). This, on the one hand, justifies a natural phonetic evolution and, on the other hand, explains the semantic divergence. There are some cognates recorded in the etymological dictionaries of Belarussian, Polish and Ukrainian in forms closer to the Romanian regional *burdiuh*, which can even explain other words’ evolution. A connection with the material this container is made of like camel/sheep skin and its shape divide the nouns denominating this container in different cultural areas: oral traditions reveal the existence of the term in Kazakh language, together with other words of Persian origins derivate with Turkic suffixes, like Turkish *buru* ‘male camel skin’ and *-iuk* ‘burden’ (Larson 1998: 32). Abstract meanings of the word in some Romanian phrases like *branza buna in burduf de caine* (lit. ‘good cheese in a dog skin sack’, but referring to ‘people who are not willing to use their abilities mainly because they are lazy’) or *a lega pe cineva burduf/cobza* ‘to bind/tie somebody tightly’, *a fi burduf//toba de carte* ‘to have full knowledge of a field’ raised other questions regarding the area of circulations, different words for denoting realities in the frame of the same semantic matrix. This term belongs to those words that evidently existed in large areas in Arabic countries, Kazakhstan, Caucasus (Dalb 1998:224) and Romania as a container made of camel or lamb skin or of any animal stomach used for keeping cheese, grains, water and wine (Colarusso 2002: 129, note 1).

Clothing of every kind spanning from fabrics, attires, body decorations and shoes reveal other subtle significations expressed by words of Turkic and Turkish origins. Among foot ware, some archaic but still expressive items such as Rom. *condur* < Tc. *kundura* (DEX:219) ‘pointy lady shoe’ is not only a Turkish slipper but it received symbolical connotations in a novel transposing Cinderella’s story in a-temporal mythical space of the Balkans. Moreover, the name of a dress of possible Persian origins Tc. *kaftan*, Bg. *kaftan*, Rom. *caftan* ‘caftan, mantle, velvet gown’ was used together with its correspondent verb expression *a imbraca in caftan /a caftani* ‘to appoint to the throne’, survived as a family name in Bulgaria and Romania (*Kaftandiev*), a flag used in Moldova and Wallachia while appointing a ruler.

The field of weapons of different sorts like archery, guns, knives comprises numerous varieties: arrows, axes, bows, hatchets, spares, swords have synonyms, similar conceptual metaphors and sometimes different lexical representations. A common core of concepts and words can be found in language families represented through different words, sometimes as homophones or synonyms: *arcan* ‘lasso’ designates a rope used for catching animals or even young people taken in the army. His phonetic body contain a part conceptualizing the shape of a bow Rom. *arc* ‘archery device’ like stretching device to catch the animals or even the young people taken in the army. Being of unclear origins either Tatar (Georgiev et al. 1971: 15) or Turkic: Kz. *arkan*, Rom. *arcan* < Tat. *arkan* (DEX: 58) ‘lasso’ was used by a Romanian story teller in expressions like *a lua la oaste cu arcanul* ‘to chase and take somebody in the army by force’. Existing in languages belonging to different families like Turkic *balta /palta* (Oztopcu et al. 1996:12) ‘axe, hatchet’, Bg. *балтия* (*baltic*) (Georgiev et al. 1971: 39), Rom. *baltag* < Tc. *balta* (DEX 2012: 87) of Cuman origins (Coteanu & Sala 1987:49, Sala 2009: 159) quoted with

possible Sumerian origins: *bal* (Toth 2007: 722), the term acquired high symbolic dimensions of ‘a golden bough’ rather than an instrument for taking revenge in a Romanian novel.

The lexical field of musical instruments represent another realm of semantic evolutions and etymological observation: two words of Turkic origins *cobza/kobuz* ‘kobsa, ten chord guitar’ belongs to a large area of meanings and as other words of different origins occur in an adverbial context: Rom. *a lega cobza* ‘to bind/tie hand and foot’. The conceptual meaning of the terms offers the possibility of analyzing the differences: *kobuz* is an instrument with chords played with an arcus and in a vertical position while the Romanian one uses the fingers: Hungarian *koboz* meaning the same musical instrument is of Cuman/Pecheneg origins the profession *kobzar* ‘kobza player’ is derived by an Indo-European suffix used in other Balkan and Slavic languages.

Anthroponymy and toponymy offer multiple samples and relics of Turkic and Turkish origins which have not benefited yet from a coherent and integrative analysis. When analyzing the origins of the anthroponyms and toponyms a multitude of factors (historical, economical, migration, social) based on cultural and linguistic evolution should be considered. Anthroponymy and toponymy are interdisciplinary sciences that combine history, geography, ethnography and linguistics and etymological interpretation follow the same principles of phonetic changes and the meaning abstracting process. Perceived as a cultural depository of geographical names and relief shapes toponymy was considered the golden book of history nations and together with ethnonyms and oronyms display a rich variety of concepts and linguistic forms. Relics of ethnic groups and populations which lived in a territory and left it after a period or epoch can be found in toponymy either as an expression of traces or as a later recognition of a cultural prestige of those communities by their followers. Hills and mounds, mountains and lakes, plains and meadows were named by lexis originating either in Indo-European or Turkic. One term labelled as Ukrainian in etymological dictionaries: Rom. *corhană* < Ukr. *korhan* (DEX: 237) ‘barren sandy hill’ stays together with another paronym *corhan* ‘a red-yellowish insect living in dark places’ quoted with unknown etymology. At the formal analysis, the gender divergence does not have any explanation as Slavic languages possess a mark of female grammatical gender. The presence of identical lexis from Central Asia: *kurgans* ‘burial mounds of nomads on the steppe’ (Frye 1998:45) assumed to be of Proto-Indo-European (Gimbutas 1997: 312-313) but assimilated by Turkic nomads and spread through migrations to many other languages like Hung. *kurgán* ‘an artificial hill used for burials’, Russ. *kurgan* (Vasmer 1986-2: 324) ‘a jug of metal’, Kz. *kurgan* ‘an artificial hill where the soldiers were buried together with their life belongings’, Rom. (reg). *corhana* ‘hill’ (DEX: 129), Rom. *gorgon* ‘medusa’ (Cihac1879:125), Ukr. *Korhan*, the term displays similar meaning across the cultures spanning from burial, little hill, mound, tombs, observation/ guarding place, border stones or protecting against the flood’s places’. It has a phonetic body, which has changed according to specific rules. Although the word is not recorded in the etymological dictionaries it is found in some language families with quite similar significations: Rom. Mag. Serbian *kurgan* ‘a tumulus or a type of barrow or mound heaped over a burial chamber, often made of wood’ or a *toponym* Az. *Kurgan* ‘mound, artificial made hill’ (Budagov 1997: 122). In the archaeo-mythological representation, the shape of this mound resembles the medusa body, which in Old Greek was significantly called *Gorgona* (Marler 2002: 15-23). Relief forms often resembling the shapes of animal bodies and relics of Turkic roots occur in compounded words revealing a stratification process.

Zoo-anthroponyms and toponyms are those geographical and human proper names formed on the animals of

every kind either by using their real names or immortalizing their totemic functions performed in ethnic communities. Sometimes the shape of plains, hills or mountains resemble the body of an animal and such relics can be found in the anthroponymy and toponymy of Balkan languages. Alive and extinct animals in the area have received either Indo-European or Turkic names, both categories circulating in colloquial standard languages or being limited to anthroponymy or regionalisms. With it is the case of two lexical items spread around Balkans for the king of the animals. While one of them is found in different language families despite controversial etymology (*leu* <*lev* ‘lion’), an old Turkic but less-known word *arslan* ‘lion’ (Colarusso 2002:152, Tóth 2007:735) is still used in the Balkan cultures and limitedly as an anthroponym in Romanian. Together with some words of Indo-European origins which have complicated the etymology of lion (Poruciu 2010:42-49), in some Balkan countries like Macedonia, used as proper names in Romanian and Turkic languages, is the word *Kz. arstan*>*Tc. arslan* > Rom. *Mc aslan*, Hun. *oroslán* ‘lion’. A very interesting example of etymological confluences is the name of a village which has become well known due to the new political decisions and controversial residents’ behaviour: Rom. *Deveselu* ‘a village in Olt county where NATO placed an anti-missile shield’ seems to be a combination of a Turkic term *deve* ‘camel hedge’ (Budagov 1998: 123) with an Indo-European one *selo* ‘village’ (Derksen 2008:444). Other names of Turkic origins are Rom. *Ilan* ‘snake’, Rom. *gurd* ‘wolf’

The Turkic name of forest Rom. *orman* ‘forest, woods’ is found in some toponyms spread around Eastern Europe and Central Asia as well: *Caraorman* ‘Black forest’ is a place in Romanian Danube Delta, while *Deliorman* and *Teleorman* considered as of Cuman origins are found in Bulgaria and seem to be taken from the Pechenegs (Menges 1995: 12), Romania or even in Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan. In compounded toponyms another Turkic word as *gol* ‘lake’ occurs in Rom. *Murighiol* ‘lake’ *Techirghiol* ‘Tekir’s lake’ or *Meidanghiol* ‘open-filed lake’. Others like Rom. *Carasu* rather refer to a compound noun made of two old Turkic parts Tk. +Tc. *cara* ‘black and Tc. *su* ‘water’, *Sarica-Niculitel* seem to be more a reminiscence of Cuman-Turkic *sary* ‘yellow’ (Toth 2007: 176) commonly found in the metaphorical name of Karaganda region *Saryarka*< Cuman, Kz. Tk. *sary* ‘yellow/golden’ (Toth 2007: 176) +Cuman *arka* ‘land’ (Toth 2007: 237). Some places in Bosnia, Bulgaria and Romania denoting salt mines have been named by a Turkic and Turkish name *Tuzla*. The term is a compound from old Turkic Kz. *tuz-la* (Budagov 1997: 124) ‘salty lake’. Finally, a term which has not been analyzed so far Rom. *uzu* of possible Cuman origins (Toth 2007: 171) occurs in a toponym *Valea Uzului* ‘Uzu Valley’.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study clearly show that Old Turkic terms sometimes originating in Arabic, Persian and Sumerian have survived in Turkish and Romanian with similar meaning stratified at least at three different levels: basic or concrete, secondary or deviant, tertiary or metaphorical and symbolic. Disposed at colloquial and popular registers of the language, their meanings have continuously been enriched and refreshed in the discourse of literature and media as a fruitful source of expressivity. The main outcome of this paper is, on the one hand, to point out the etymological continuity of these words within the main strata of Turkic, Turkish and Romanian and, on the other hand, to underline their expressivity in contemporary language where they have been actualized in the most sensitive field of language usage: literature and media style. One explanation of their polysemy consists of their ancestry: the vast majority of the terms originate from old cultures and survived in

Turkic, while travelling across cultures and languages. This lexical stock has acquired a variety of meanings and has been used for expressing ironical, pejorative and symbolic nuances. Assimilating the etymology of these terms by using the cultural background of mother tongue, may become a modality of boosting and refining vocabulary demonstrating a cultural and language proficiency while studying Romanian in Kazakhstan. Discovering links between cultures and using languages as markers of identity imply a deeper understanding of the modality of meaning conceptualization and a productive approach to second language acquisition proving the validity of initial hypotheses.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The Turkic influence on Romanian and language has not benefited yet from a comprehensive and integrative study in the recent years and be able to harmonize the polarized points of view and include the etymologies in an extended framework of research meant to bring some new insights into the subject. This article is a first attempt to involve different disciplines in the hermeneutics of etymology and consider this science as one of multiple possibilities of interpretation, which complement but do not exclude each other. Following complex analytical paths as phonetic, morphological, word formation changes, metaphorizing and syntactic autonomy loss, the author aims at extending the framework of interpretation and research and offer new cultural insights into the Turkic world, which in many ways has remained influential in the Balkans and, consequently, in Romanian.

A significant part of Turkic stock of words in fact belongs to ancient linguistic heritage before the coming of Arabs and Turks and the terms which remained at the confluence of etymologies are properly common to Indo-European and non-Indo-European cultures, mainly concentrated in semantic fields of nomadic, pastoralist and finally existential concepts and universal ways of representation.

The Turkic and Turkish inventory of Balkan lexis contains not only items which evolved to ironic and pejorative connotations but also rather old and therefore poly-semantic words, which due to their circulation, have been emerged in lexical-grammatical category change (conversion), idioms and phrases with expressive and suggestive metaphorical meanings. Consequently, old items staying at the crossing of cultures and civilizations, especially those belonging to the pre-Ottoman stock of words, reveal the power of common concepts and stories, which have migrated over centuries and the importance of history and religion in assimilating meanings that can be found in wide areas and reverberate in relative or remote cultures as expressions of collective imaginary.

In the flow of history, these words were integrated in the Balkan and Romanian languages and prove their expressivity and validity by lexical innovation and use in collocations, which despite limiting their autonomy, have gained significant cultural and metaphorical possibilities.

REFERENCES

- [1] AHDEL: *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Third Edition, Ed. by Anne H. Soukhanov, 2010, New York: American Heritage Publishing Co.
- [2] Barut, K. 2018: 'Some thoughts on Otukan' in *Journal of Old Turkic Studies*, 2 (2), pp. 7-25.
- [3] Bruckner, Al. 1985: *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* [Etymological Dictionary of Polish Language], Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna (Universal Knowledge).
- [4] Budagov, B. 1997: *Turkic Toponyms of Eurasia*, Baku: Elm.
- [5] Cihac, A.1879 : *Dictionnaire d'étymologie daco-romane. Eléments slave, magyares, turcs, grecs-moderne et albanais* [Dictionary of Dacian-Roman Etymologies. Slavic, Magyar, Turkic, Modern Greek and Albanian Elements in Romanian], Francfort : St. Goar.
- [6] Ciorănescu, Al. 2002: *Dictionarul etimologic al limbii române* [Etymological Dictionary of Romanian Language], București: Editura

- Saeculum I.O. (Bucharest: Saeculum I.O. Publishing House).
- [7] Clauson, G. 1962: *Turkish and Mongolian Studies*, London: The Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland.
- [8] Clauson, G. 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth Century Turkish*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- [9] Colarusso 2002: *Narts Sagas from the Caucasus. Myths and Legends from Circassians, Abazas, Abkhaz, and Ubyks*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- [10] Coteanu, I & M. Sala 1987: *Etimologia și limba română. Principii-probleme*, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România (Etymology and Romanian language. Principles-problems, Bucharest: Publishing House of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania).
- [11] Dalb, V. 1998: *Tolkovyj slovarj zhivogo velikoruskogo jazyka* [Etymological Dictionary of Real High Russian Language], Moskva: Tzitatel.
- [12] Derksen, R. 2008: *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Vocabulary*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- [13] *Dictionarul explicativ al limbii române (DEX)* [Explanatory Dictionary of Romanian Language] 2012, București (Bucharest): Univers Enciclopedic Gold.
- [14] Djuvara, N. 2007: *O scurtă istorie a românilor povestită celor tineri* [A Short History of Romanian Retold for Young People], Ediția a IV-a, București: Humanitas.
- [15] Dobrișan, N. 1968: 'Cuvinte de origine araba intrate în română pe filiera limbii turce' [Arabic Words Which Have Entered Romanian Language through Turkish Intermediary] in *Analele Universității din București. Seria Științe Sociale. Filologie (University of Bucharest. Social Sciences Series. Philology)*, anul XVII, pp. 521-539.
- [16] Frye, H. N. 1998: *The Heritage of Central Asia. From Antiquity to the Turkish Expansion*, Second Edition, Princeton: Markus Wiener Publishers.
- [17] Georgiev et al. 1971: Georgiev, V., Iv. Гръбров, I. Zaimov, St. Пчев: *Български етимологичен речник* [Etymological Dictionary of Bulgarian Language], I, Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Българска Академия на Науките (Publishing House of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences).
- [18] Gimbutas, M. 1997: *The Kurgan Culture and the Indo-Europeanization of Europe*, Eds. M. R.
- [19] Dexter and K. Jones-Bley, Washington DC: Institute for the Study of Man (*Journal of Indo-European Studies* monograph 18).
- [20] Giurescu, C.C. 1961: 'Imprumuturi cumane în limba română: odaie, cioban' [Cuman Loans in Romanian Language: small room, shepherd] in *Studii și cercetări lingvistice (Linguistic studies and research)*, anul XII (1), pp. 205–214.
- [21] Hristea, Th. 1984: *Sinteze de limba română* [Syntheses of Romanian Language], Ediția a 3-a, București: Editura Albatros (3rd Edition, Bucharest: Albatros Publishing House).
- [22] Iorga, N. 1998: *La place des roumains dans l'histoire universelle* [The Place of Romanians in Universal History], vol. I-III, Bucuresti:Albatros.
- [23] Johanson, L & E. Á. Csato (eds) 1998: *The Turkic Languages*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [24] Klyashorny, S. 2008 : *Old Turkic Runic Texts and History*, Bucharest : Editura Academiei Române, Brăila: Editura Istros (Romanian Academy Publishing House, Braila: Istros Publishing House).
- [25] Kunanabayev, A. 2009: *Black Words. The Book of Wisdom*, Almaty: Mezhdunarondyi Klub Abaya (Almaty: International Club Abay).
- [26] Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson 1980: *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- [27] Marler, J. 2002: 'An Archaeo-mythological Investigation of the Gorgon' in *Revision*, vol. 25(1), pp.15-23.
- [28] Menges, K.H. 1995 [1968]: *The Turkic Languages and People. An Introduction to Turkic Studies*, 2nd revised edition, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- [29] Newmark, L. 1999: *Albanian English Dictionary*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [30] Nourai, A. 2010: *An Etymological Dictionary of Persian, English and Other Indo-European Languages*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [31] Ofriim, Al. 2007: *Strazi vechi din Bucurestiul de azi* [Old Streets in Today Bucharest], Bucuresti: Humanitas.
- [32] Oztopçu et al. 1996: K. Oztopcu, Z. Abuov, N. Kambarov, Y.Azemoun : *Dictionary of Turkic Languages: English, Azerbaijani, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Tatar, Turkish, Turkmen, Uighur, Uzbek*, London and New York: Routledge.
- [33] Papahagi, T. 1963: *Dicționarul dialectului aroman general și etimologic. /Dictionnairearoumain /macedo-roumain general et etymologique* [General and Etymological Dictionary of Aromanian Dialect], București: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române (Papahagi, T. 1963: Dictionary of the general and etymological Aromanian dialect. / Romanian-Romanian Dictionary / general and etymological Macedonian-Romanian [General and Etymological Dictionary of Aromanian Dialect], Bucharest: Publishing House of the Academy of the Romanian People's Republic).
- [34] Poruciu, A. 2010: *Prehistoric Roots of Romanian and Southeast European Traditions*, Joan Marler & Miriam Robbins Dexter (eds.), Sebastopol: Institute of Archaeomythology.
- [35] Rudnicki 1962-1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language*, Winnipeg: Ukrainian free Academy of Sciences.
- [36] Sala, M. 2009: *Cuvintele-mesageri ai istoriei* [The Words as Messengers of History], București: Meronia, pp. 160–166.
- [37] Sikimić, B. & P. Hristo 2007: *Kurban in the Balkans*, Belgrade: Institute of Balkan Studies.
- [38] Spinei, V. 2009: *The Romanian and the Turkic Nomads North of Danube Delta from the Tenth to the Mid-Thirteenth Century*, Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- [39] Tenishev, E. R. 2001: *Sravnitel' no istoricheskaja gramatika tjurskih jazykov. Leksika* [A Comparative Historical Grammar of Turkic Languages], Moskva: Nauka (Moscow: Science).
- [40] Toth, A. 2007: *Etymological Dictionary of Hungarian*, The Hague: Mikes International.
- [41] Vasmer, M. 1986–1987: *Etymologicheskii slovarj russkogo jazyka* [Etymological Dictionary of Russian Language]. Translated from German by O.N. Trubachev, Moskva: Nauka.
- [42] Vinereanu, M. 2009: *Dictionar etimologic al limbii române. Pe baza cercetarilor de indoeuropenistica* [Etymological Dictionary of Romanian Language. On the Bases of New Indo-European Researches], București: Alcor Edimpex (Bucharest: Alcor Edimpex).

AUTHOR'S PROFILE

Dr. Nicolae Stanciu is a lecturer of Romanian language, culture and civilization at Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan. He has a long experience in teaching Romanian abroad in some universities in Belgrade, Serbia, and Ljubljana, Slovenia. He holds a PhD in Philology of Bucharest University, Romania, from 2005. Fields of interest: cultural anthropology, comparative linguistics and mythology, etymology, second language acquisition, theory and practice of translations.