

**AROMANIAN REPRESENTATIVES OF ENLIGHTENMENT  
(THE LATE 18<sup>TH</sup> AND EARLY 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURIES) – CAVALIOTI,  
DANIIL, UCUTA, ROJA, AND BOIAGI**

Stoica LASCU\*

**Abstract.** The study examines the writings of intellectuals and scientists of Aromanian origin which showed in their writings – under the influence of the ideas of the Enlightenment – not only the Latin origin of Vlachs in the Balkans, and that they should develop a language and own nationality. Is about three Aromanian scholars from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, originating in the city Moscopole (Teodor Cavalioti, Daniil Moscopolean, Constantin Ucuta); and about the writings of two scholars (Gheorghe C. Roja, Michael G. Boiagi) from the early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, in the works which shows the common origin of the descendants from North and South Danube of the Eastern Romanity.

**Keywords:** Enlightenment, Aromanian, Balkan Romanians, Gheorghe Roja, Mihail Boiagi

Among the large tomes that made up the libraries of scientists from Transylvanian Enlightenment, or had been consulted, e.g. Petru Maior<sup>1</sup>, there were without doubt also works by Aromanian scholars from the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century<sup>2</sup> – within what was called (still, through certain mimesis) *the first*

---

\* PhD., Professor at “Ovidius” University of Constanța (Faculty of History and Political Science). Associate Member of Academy of Romanian Scientists.

<sup>1</sup> “Despite the preservation of two lists of the books existing once in Maior’s library, reading his linguistic culture still can be a difficult enterprise. This is because *he used a wider bibliographical area* (emphasis mine) than the one which is found in the mentioned lists” – Maria Protase, *Petru Maior: un ctitor de conștiințe*, Editura Minerva, București, 1973, p. 261.

<sup>2</sup> About them, see the fundamental scientific work – Nistor Bardu, *Limba scrierilor aromânești de la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea (Cavalioti, Daniil, Ucuta)*, Partea I: *Aspecte ale grafiei. Fonetica*, Ovidius University Press, Constanța, 2004 /226 pp./; also – Idem, *The First Aromanian Writers and Their Relationship with the Greek Language*, in xxx *Lucrările Simpozionului Internațional Cartea. Romania-Europa. Ediția a II-a, 20-23 septembrie 2009* (550 de ani de la prima atestare documentară a orașului București), Editura Biblioteca Bucureștilor, București, 2009, pp. 753-766; Idem, *Eighteenth Century Aromanians Writers: The Enlightenment and the Awakening of National and Balkan Consciousness*, in Adina Ciugureanu, Mihaela Irimia, Eduard Vlad (eds.), *Balkan Cultural Identities*. Edited by... (Ovidius University Constanța. Center of Cross-Cultural Studies), Ovidius University Press, Constanța, 2006, pp. 257-268 (also – in „Philologica Jassiensia”, III, 1, 2007, pp. 93-102).

*Aromanian Renaissance*<sup>3</sup>, under the beneficial influence of the ideas of European Enlightenment (marked, in fact, by the assumption of a particular ethnic and linguistic identity – other than the Greek one).

It is about the *Πρωτοπειρία /Protopiria* [First Learning], a sort of reading book written in Greek (for the use of the Balkan youth in the spirit of Hellenic culture), that also had at the end a vocabulary in three languages – Greek, Aromanian, and Albanian<sup>4</sup>. Belonging to an Aromanian erudite of the times – professor at the famous Greek School *Noua Academie* [The New Academy], from the not less famous town, the quasi-totally Aromanian inhabited Moscopole<sup>5</sup> – Theodor Anastasie Cavalioti, this work has been printed in Venice in 1770 and had a rather odd destiny, being destroyed by the Greek clerics who “would not allow to be spoken, much less written, a different language than Greek”<sup>6</sup>. Truly,

<sup>3</sup> Pericle Papahagi, *Scrittori aromâni în secolul al XVIII (Cavalioti, Ucuta, Daniil)*, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Carol Göbl”, București, 1909, p. 7; to this (“highly valuable”) work the philologist Giorgio Pascu reveals its qualities in those times, “by the fact that for the first time some light is shed, as much as it can result from documents, on the cultural and national life of the Romanians from the South of the Danube during the XVIII<sup>th</sup> century”, the work being “of a fundamental importance for knowing the South Danubian Romanians” – G.P., [Review], in “Viața românească”, IV, vol. XIII, 1909, pp. 137-138); also see – Ion Scurtu, *Din literatura fraților aromâni. Trei apostoli naționali în sec. XVIII* [From the Literature of the Aromanian Brothers] /broad commentary on the said book/, in “Minerva”, I, no. 123, April 20, 1909, p. 1: it is “natural to salute in special gladness any sign of political or cultural life coming from the mountains and fields of the Balkans, where *our kin* live (emphasis mine). In such sentiments of joy we found out these days about then apparition of a remarkable scientific work on the cultural and literary past of our Aromanian brothers”; also see – G. Popescu, *Apostoli macedo-români*, in *Album macedo-român*, Stabilimentul pentru artele grafice Socecu, Sandler și Teclu, București, 1880, p. 107; Valeriu Papahagi, *Învățați aromâni din secolul al XVIII-lea* [Aromanian Scholars in the XVIII<sup>th</sup> Century], *Extras din revista Lumina (1938-1939)*, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Tiparul Universitar”, București, 1940 /16 pp./; Idem, Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea*. Prefață, Schiță biografică și Postfață de Viorel Stănilă. [Transcrierea manuscrisului: Enache Tușa] (Institutul de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale), Editura Institutului Cultural Român, București, 2015 /448 pp./.

<sup>4</sup> See – Victor Papacostea, *Civilizație românească și civilizație balcanică*. Studii istorice. Ediție îngrijită și note de Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu. Studiu introductiv de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, Editura Eminescu, București, 1983, pp. 397-405 (respectively, the study *Povestea unei cărți. Protopiria lui Cavalioti* [The Story of a Book. Cavalioti’s Protopiria]. “*Ein unicum*”, published in 1937); also see – Max Demeter Peyfuss, “*Protopiria*” lui Cavalioti – *un exemplar necunoscut* [Cavalioti’s Protopiria – An Unknown Exemplary], in “Sud-Est” [Chișinău], vol. 9, no. 3 (33), 1998, pp. 42-48.

<sup>5</sup> Valeriu Papahagi, *Moscopole – metropola comercială și culturală a românilor din Peninsula Balcanică în secolul al XVIII-lea*, Tip. “Lumina Poporului”, Roșiorii-de-Vede, 1939 /16 pp./; the critical synthesis of research at Max D. Peyfuss, *op. cit.*, respectively pp. 8-46, Chapter entitled *Die Stadt Moschopolis*.

<sup>6</sup> Victor Papacostea, *op. cit.*, p. 400. In the perception of some Aromanian intellectuals, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, it was considered – wrongly, of course – that this scholar was aware of the dimension of Carpathian-Balkan Romanianism, therefore acting in this manner: “The first of

the erudite Cavalioti was the first one in South-Eastern Europe that would scientifically highlight (without national connotations) the existence of different languages besides the Greek one – reason enough for a relentless reaction of the Greek clerical circles: “Naturally, Cavalioti did not do it with any intention – but the precedent was dangerous, as it could broaden the «separation» tendencies of either of those two nations (Albanians and Aromanians – our note). Also the introduction of the Latin alphabet in the last part of the book was likely to stir the bigots. Moreover, its printing in Venice – and not at the Moscopole print press – is another indication that the enlightened teacher was probably afraid of his hierarchs’ lack of understanding and of the excessively conservative elements in Moscopole. When, later, the rage of the clerics increases – also because of the revival of the Greek imperial idea –, Cavalioti’s book, just like other books printed at Moscopole in the Aomanian dialect, was tracked down and destroyed”<sup>7</sup>. Only through a chance, this book, which contains the vocabulary that places “its author among the precursors of modern linguistics”<sup>8</sup>, was not lost forever<sup>9</sup>, part of it, namely the Greek-Aromanian-Albanian lexicon being saved by the reproduction of Johann Thunmann – the first European scientist which also includes the Aromanians in a historical treatise – in a work of his that was printed at Leipzig in 1774<sup>10</sup>, and of which Petru Maior was aware.

---

these Macedo-Romanian scholars which *desired* /Sic!/ that the interests and aspirations of the Macedonian Romanians to be identified with those of the Romanians in Dacia is Tudor (Sic!) Cavalioti, originating from the Romanian town Muscopoli, central Macedonia, where there is a very rich Romanian [Sic!] library” – Nicolae Muzaca, *Considerații generale asupra românilor din Turcia*. Conferință ținută la societatea studenților în litere și filozofie de..., in “Macedonia”, I, no. 7, July 13, 1908, p. 2; this Balkan Romanian – visiting the capital of Romanian Kingdom – was a trader, ephorus of the Romanian Community in Thessaloniki; also, see – Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea...*, pp. 112-127.

<sup>7</sup> Victor Papacostea, *op. cit.*, pp. 400-401.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 397.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 402-403. Basically, after the death of Thunmann, about copy concerned no one knew anything; in 1895, it discovered another copy by Gustav Meyer (published and he the Lexicon), which, in 1910, is purchased by Ioan Bianu, with 600 marks for Romanian Academy Library, from a German antiquarian (from 1916 to 1935 was part of the Romanian Academy collections housed in Moscow); the scrupulous scientist was Victor Papacostea not exclude that the copy be even handed to the Thunmann – *Ibidem*, pp. 403-405.

<sup>10</sup> The work is entitled *Untersuchungen über die Geschichte der östlichen europäischen Völker* [Studies on the History of Eastern European Nations]; the author, Professor at the University of Halle, interested in languages and civilization of the Balkan peoples details circumstances in which he contacted Cavalioti’s work through a former student of his, merchant – also, literate, the author of several works – Constantin Hagi Ceagani: “First, you should share an Albanian and Aromanian vocabulary. *Maybe this will be the most interesting part of my work* (emphasis mine). Both these languages are as unknown. In short, Franciscus Blandus light gave a Latin-Albanian dictionary, printed in Rome in 1635, and Petro Budi’s from Piatra Bianca signed an Albanian translation of the Catechism of Belarmin appearing by being printed by the Propaganda Fide

Even more important for the historical knowledge of the Aromanian language is however another vocabulary, *Λεξικὸν τετραγλωσσου/Lexicon Tetraglosson* (Greek, Aromanian, Bulgarian, and Albanian) inserted – this one too – in the last part of a book written in Greek, named *Εἰσαγωγικὴ διδασκαλία/Isagoghiki didaskalia* [Introductory Teaching]. This book was designed for the same reasons of instructing in the spirit of Hellenism<sup>11</sup>, and was printed in 1794, probably in Venice, under the signature of Daniil Moscopoleanul (also reedited in 1802, and the vocabulary reproduced in an English work in 1814, known as such to specialists<sup>12</sup>, and in 1881, by Franc Miklošič). These two vocabularies were

Congregation in Rome in 1664. Both books are extremely rare, however. As for the Aromanians language, as far as I know, apart from here shared dictionary it is not known anything. Both dictionaries are very comprehensive indeed, however, they will be for all philologists and historians some gifts not just less pleasant”; as the Aromanian who provided the book, Professor Thunmann inserted a documented note: “Dr. Constantin Hagi Ceagani of Moscopole, I owe him for this rare book: he is a man with more knowledge, especially in philosophy and mathematics, with a power of thinking brilliant and worthy of a happier fate. After over three years while stopping twice at the university, visited Leiden and Cambridge, France and Italy now returns to his homeland as through the knowledge gained to become available and his compatriots. Mr. Ceagani, besides, shared me the knowledge of Aromanians and Albanians, and the name, location, numbers, their language and other” – both citations, *apud* Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-32, 33; about Cegani [Hagi Gheorghiu Gehani] –Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea...*, pp. 94-108.

<sup>11</sup> The following verses, inserted at pages V-V of the original work, are critical:

“Albanezi, vlahi, bulgari /=*Ἀλβανοί, Βλάχοι, Βούλγαροι*, de altă limbă,  
bucurați-vă și pregătiți-vă toți, să deveniți romei /*Ρωμαίοι=grecil*.  
Lăsând limba barbară, vocea și obiceiurile,  
ca să pară strănepoților voștri ca fabule.  
Veți onora neamul și patriile voastre  
prefăcându-le elenești din albano-bulgărești.  
[Albanians, Vlachs, Bulgarians from another language,  
enjoy and get ready everyone to become Roman / Greek Ρωμαίοι = /.  
Leaving barbaric language, the voice, and habits,  
to your grandchildren to seem like fables.  
You will honor your nation and homeland  
pretending them Hellenes from Albano-Bulgarian] – *apud Ibidem*, p. 112.

In that translation, the Romanian scholar of Aromanian origin equated the ethonim *Βλάχοι* with *români*; also see – Grigore Brâncuși, *Observații asupra structurii etimologice a dicționarului aromân al lui Daniil Moscopoleanu* [Observations on the Ethymological Structure of the Aromanian Dictionary of Daniel Moscopoleanu], in xxx *Contribuția românilor la îmbogățirea tezaurului cultural în Balcani*, Fundația Culturală Română, n.p. [București], n.y. [1992], pp. 64-69: the work was made “in avowed order that the offspring of Aromanians, Bulgarians, and Albanians to learn the Greek language” (p. 64), the renowned linguist saying that “lexical material from the work of Daniil belongs generally Common Romanian Language. Only in its peripheral sides (and obviously in the phonetic aspect), it characterizes, strictly, the Aromanian dialect” (p. 66).

<sup>12</sup> See – Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, pp. 40-44; it is about the first English traveler taking contact with the Aromanians and broadly describing their settlements and traditions – colonel William Martin Leake (1777-1860); appearing in London, in 1814, it is entitled *Researches in Greece*, the said

considered by the linguists, for a long time, including the “illustrious scholar” Gustav Meyer, as being the documents „of most importance in the 18<sup>th</sup> century for the knowledge and study of the Albanian and Aromanian languages”<sup>13</sup>.

Also during the last years of the century of Enlightenment is printed in Vienna (1797), the first work written in the maternal speech, with Greek letters, particularly destined for education in Aromanian, entitled *Néa Paidhaghoghia* [*The New Pedagogy*] – with its full title still in Greek – *or Easy primer for teaching the young children Aromanian knowledge, especially for the use of Aromanians. Now for the first time it was edited and directed by the most venerable priest Mister Constantine son of Ucuta, the Moscopolean, chartophilax [archivist] and protopresbyter in Posen from Middle Prussia. And thanks to him it was printed for the glory of the Nation*<sup>14</sup>.

This “primer”, considered to occupy “the most important place in the hierarchy of writing in Aromanian for the use of Aromanians”<sup>15</sup>, aims „at teaching

---

Lexicon being inserted between pages 383 and 403 (in pages before, also news on the past of the Aromanians are given) the author explaining his endeavour: “Having very weak knowledge on the Romanian and Bulgarian dialects [In original text: *the Vlakhote and Bulgarian dialects*], I need to limit myself at reproducing from these dialects the samples found in five languages, annexed in this chapter. These examples are extracted, after changing the alphabet, from a book entitled *λεξικου τετράγλωσσου*, printed in Greek letters (I believe that in Moscopole, about five years before). This method, of show in language examples, was preferred to a simple vocabulary, as it also exemplifies grammar, and the idiom; and the reader would not dislike that, receiving aphorisms and teaching through these exercises, to also be able to make an idea on the manners, superstitions, prejudices and opinions of these singular and uncivilized nations” – *apud Ibidem*, pp. 41-42; on the traveling accounts of Leake, see the broad – Vasile Tega, *Aromânii văzuți de călători englezi (până la 1900)*, in “Buletinul Bibliotecii Române” [Institutul Român de Cercetări-Freiburg (Germania)] vol. X (XIV) – New series, 1983, pp. 136-156; the study has been republished in Romania – Idem, *Aromânii văzuți de călători englezi (până la 1900)*, Editura Fundației Culturale Aromâne “Dimândarea Părintească”, București, 1998 /128 pp./.

<sup>13</sup> *Apud* – Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, p. 9. These two vocabularies are preceded, however, by other witnesses vintage of the same century, testifying practice writing in Aromanian (with Greek characters); there are two inscriptions (so called by Nectarie Târpu, on an icon of wood, dated 1731, discovered in Albania; respectively, the vessel’s family Simota, undated); several *manuscripts* (a *Liturghier* [the Liturgy Book] in the same century, it considered “the oldest book of liturgy written (and found, preserved – our note) in Aromanian”; and the collection of manuscripts anonymous published by Gustav Weigand, the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, under *Codex Dimonie* name) (quotation and information from Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, *Compendiu de dialectologie română (nord≈ și sud≈dunăreană)* [Compendium of Romanian Dialectology (North and South-Danubian)], Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1975, pp. 220-221); also see – Eadem, *Liturghier aromânesc. Manuscris anonim inedit*, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, București, 1962; Eadem, *Biblia la aromâni. Restituiri*, in “Revista de istorie și teorie literară”, no. 3-4 and no. 1-2, 1989-1990, pp. 306-316; see, also – Valeriu Rusu (ed.), *Tratat de dialectologie românească*, Editura Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, 1984, pp. 425-426 (Chapter: *Aromâna*, author: Nicolae Saramandu).

<sup>14</sup> *Apud* – Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, pp. 57, 59; also, see – Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea...*, pp. 142-152.

<sup>15</sup> Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, Ștefan Giosu, Liliana Ionescu-Ruxândoiu, Romulus Todoran,

the young children Romanian knowledge especially for the use of Aromanians”, and from the Greek written title, it is clear that the author – also originating from Moscopole – made it for the pride and glory of his nation. Scientifically, “it is the first attempt to give Aromanians rules for writing and for properly using the Greek alphabet to the needs of the Aromanian language”<sup>16</sup>.

These were the works that Petru Maior could have employed in his attempt to create a Romanian literary language, whose unity and Latin character could better be highlighted by resorting to the Aromanian lexicon.

But not only these.

The historical context is well known to scientists<sup>17</sup>. I have shown elsewhere<sup>18</sup> the suitable environment in the capital of Hungary for the illustration of the individuality of the speech, and hence of the Aromanian nation, by exemplifying the relations between the leaders of the Transylvanian School with members of the Aromanian community there. Now, in the first and a half decade of the X19<sup>th</sup> century, now Aromanian scholars would stand out, whose writings would produce a great impact not only on their fellow nationals, but also on the prominent members of the Transylvanian School – including Petru Maior –, through the historical and philological information provided.

The merit of these Aromanian intellectuals – which, until then, would write in Greek or in other languages of European circulation – is that of trying to also write in Aromanian, breaking the Hellene monopoly, an initiative with deep

*Dialectologie română*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1977, p. 173 (Chapter: *Dialectul aromân*, author: Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu).

<sup>16</sup> *Ibidem*; also see – Th. Capidan, *Constantin Ucuta și începuturile de mișcare culturală la armâni* [Constantin Ucuta and the Beginnings of Cultural Movements at the Aromanians], in “Convorbiri literare”, XLIV, 7, July 1909, pp. 777-784; no. 8, August 1909, pp. 876-882; a first reference to the Romanian Academy on the existence “of this valuable document of the Aromanian dialect” (Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, p. 48) we owe to its “saviour”, Ioan Bianu, the director of the Library of the Romanian Academy in the Meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> of May 1907, followed by a report by Nicolas Papahagi in “*Courrier des Balkans*”, from May 20/June 3, 1907, p. 2, as well as by Nicolae Bațaria’s article, *Din trecutul nostru cultural. O lucrare din 1797 în dialectul aromânesc tipărită la Viena* [From Our Cultural Past. A Work from 1797 in the Aromanian Dialect Printed in Vienna], in “*Graiu bun*”, I, no. 11-12, 1907, pp. 241-244.

<sup>17</sup> See – Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca, *Aperçus of the History of Balkan Romanity*, in Răzvan Theodorescu and L.C. Barrows (eds.), *Politics and Culture in Southeastern Europe* (UNESCO-CEPES) (Series *Studies on Science and Culture*), no publisher, Bucharest, 2001, pp. 97-111; Gheorghe Hristodol, *Scrieri istorice despre români și aromâni*, Argonaut, 2011, pp. 209 sqq.; Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea...*

<sup>18</sup> Stoica Lascu, *Romanitatea balcanică în viziunea Școlii Ardelene*, in Constantin Bușe, Ionel Câdea (eds.), *Studii de istorie*. Editori... (Academia Oamenilor de Știință din România), Editura Istros a Muzeului Brăila, Brăila, 2012, pp. 45-100; Idem, *Romanitatea balcanică în conștiința societății românești până la Primul Război Mondial*, Editura România de la Mare, Constanța, 2013, pp. 18-64, 72-92.

cultural and national implications that will face the fanatical<sup>19</sup> opposition of the Greek clergy and intellectuality.

This intolerance is also the main reason why the genuine Aromanian national-cultural openness from the first two decades of the 19<sup>th</sup> century did not reach the size of a long-lasting current, a perfectly possible fact in terms of intellectual prowess and historically perfectly legitimate, judging in view of the interests of the Aromanian community, and in view of filling the spiritual and national needs related to this nation, spread in the Balkans, in the Romanian Principalities and in the Habsburg Empire. “For use, the Macedo-Romanians, those that remained in the wake of that current that has been suppressed by the vileness of the Greeks, the dearest and greatest names that passed through times of hardship and reached us are the names of Boiagi and Roja” – wrote, at the end of

---

<sup>19</sup> See the words of Neofit Ducas, in which “he bluntly rises against their movement of cultivating in their own language, speaking of it in dire terms” – Per. Papahagi, *op. cit.*, p. 14. The sermon *Către aromânii din Aminciu* [To the Aromanians of Aminciu], inserted in a Greek paper printed in Vienna in 1810 (reproduced at pp 15-17), is an example of fanaticism, the Greek nationalist exclusiveness, which would define, in fact, the Greek attitude towards Aromanians – which are not recognized ethnolinguistically by their own identity – to this day, demonstrating at the same time, without doubt, the existence of current national Aromanians awareness: “so have those who are foolish with the Romanian language, dirty and wretched, if he should be forgiven designate that which everywhere limps language and not particularly follow a different language, with great disgust and disgusting references”; and further developing the image of the most primitive anti-aromanism – contesting them the Balkan Vlachs, despite historical records and ethnolinguistics, their independent existence – proof of “fear of which were included Greeks, that through the movement of national resurgence Aromanians are jeopardizing the Greek ideal, as noted, quite rightly, editor of the said “after so many centuries, is considered the same origin with the Romans, who have shared with no name, no drop of blood in their veins. Show us a kingdom of their own, or an entire province or something very characteristic and others, and then we will hush, all of them a lot but includes the Danube almost to the Peloponnese, a barren mountain range, good for exiles and homeless. Where it is their metropolis? Where are their priests? Where courts, where leadership? Where nobility, where priests, where the gospel, where Psalter, where special characters? Where people know their name, be it closer? Where is their place in geography? Nowhere. Why then boast that they will be the great nation, *while they have no place?* (italics in the text.). For Hellas will never acquiesce in any way the called Vlachs, but I will consider these apostates from intruders, not clean”. On the Greek scholar (ex professor and director of *Academia Domnească* [Lordly Academy] in București, during 1813-1817, having to leave after the coming of Gh. Lazăr); see – Ariadna Camariano-Cioran, *Academiile domnești din București și Iași* (Institutul de Studii Sud-Est Europene), Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România (Coll. *Biblioteca Istorică XXVII*), București, 1971; the author does not mention the attitude of the Greek teacher, “which for years among the educated young offspring of Romanian society, both as tutor and as a professor and director of the Academy”, revealing components of thought and his preparation intellectual: “He has done studies in the West. He was a student of Lambros Fotiadis and had a thorough philological training. Arhaizant and head of the anticoraiste party, he publishes, as Coray, much of ancient Greek works. But his archaic trends show no conservative or traditionalist thinking – *believes the author* – but the renewing expression in the spirit of neoclassicism and the French Revolution” – *Ibidem*, p. 100.

the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the great Romanian scientist, born in Ottoman Macedonia, George Murnu, in an article infused with the emotion of highlighting the rebirth of his kin fellows<sup>20</sup> national ideas.

Through the substance and essence of the national message – rendered in a scientific argumentation – of Enlightenment origins, the works of the two great personalities are fundamental contributions to the individualization of the Aromanian national conscience.

They are at the same time part of the Romanian spiritual heritage, forming documentation parts of its resistance at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, being framed, through their proposed ideas, to the national-cultural current of the Transylvanian School.

They represent, we believe, more than “a double of the Transylvanian School”<sup>21</sup> or its “Aromanian pendant”<sup>22</sup>, as they actually expressed the national ideology and cultural precepts promoted by Samuil Micu, Petru Maior, Gheorghe Șincai and the other leaders of Romanian culture at the dawn of the Modern Times. Writing under the influence of the ideas of the Transylvanian School, they have also provided the Transylvanian scholars with historical and philological information and arguments on the Balkan Latinity. And the scholars made use of those arguments, thus increasing the scientific accuracy of their ideas on the linguistic and ethnic unity of the Romanians, and contributing to the practical – and theoretically explicated – necessity of creating a common literary language for the North- and South-Danubian Romanians<sup>23</sup>. Therefore there existed a reciprocal Aromanian/Daco-Romanian influence in the national-scientific and

<sup>20</sup> George Murnu, *Câteva pagine din trecutul nostru* [A Few Pages of Our Past], in “Macedonia”, II, no. 9, November 1889, pp. 156-160.

<sup>21</sup> Hristu Căndroveanu, *Un dublet aromân al Școlii Ardelene* [An Aromanian doublet of the Transylvanian School], in *Almanahul “Lucașfărul”*, 1986, pp. 103-106; Nicolae Saramandu, *Diaspora aromânească în Austro-Ungaria la începutul sec. al XIX-lea*, în *Perenitatea vlahilor în Balcani. Istorie și civilizație aromânească. 25-26 august 1995. Constanta-România* (Fundatia Cultural-Stiintifică Aromână “Andrei Șaguna”), Editura Fundației “Andrei Șaguna”, Constanța, 1995, pp. 31-36.

<sup>22</sup> Idem, *Pentru o limbă literară comună a românilor nord- și sud-dunăreni. O încercare de la începutul secolului al XIX-lea* [For a Common Literary Language of the North and South-Danubian Romanians. An Approach from the Beginning of the XIX<sup>th</sup> Century], in *Beiträge zur rumänischen Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert*. Akten des Kolloquiums »Die rumänische Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert«, Regensburg 26.28. April 1990. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Ernst, Peter Stein und Barbara Weber [Sonderdruck], Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1992, p. 139.

<sup>23</sup> Th. Capidan, *Macedoromâni. Etnografie, istorie, limbă* [The Macedo-Romanians. Ethnography, History, Language], Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă, București, 1942, pp. 219-221; Nicolae Saramandu, *op. cit.*, pp. 133-141; Idem, *Începuturile scrierii în aromână* [The Beginnings of Aromanian Language], in “Deșteptarea”, I, no. 1, April 1990, p. 3; Idem, *Pentru o limbă literară comună românilor din nordul și sudul Dunării* [For a Common Literary Language of the North and South-Danubian Romanians], in *Ibidem*, I, no. 5-6, August-September 1990, p. 5.



practical crucible of the Transylvanian School, whose national Romanian significations appear, thus, also in the dimension of the whole nation.

The activity for Romanianism of the doctor Gheorghe Constantin Roja<sup>24</sup>, originating from Bitolia (he was born there in 1786, to find his eternal rest in 1847, at Oravița, where he has been working as medic of the named district of Banat since 1821) is truly exceptional. This erudite (also polyglot, as he spoke 14 languages) has shown himself passionate and interested in his people's history, which he wanted elevated to an independent national and cultural state, between the multitude of Slav, Muslim and Greek populations in the Balkans. In 1808 – he publishes at the Pest printing press (where, starting next year, Petru Maior would be censor) the work *Untersuchungen über die Romanier oder sogennanten Wlachen, welche jenseits der Donau wohnen*, translated (also using the Latin alphabet) in 1867 at Craiova<sup>25</sup>. Within this small work (the Romanian edition has

<sup>24</sup> Valeriu I. Bologa, *Medici aromâni în monarhia habsburgică* [Aromanian Medics in the Habsburg Monarchy]. Extras din “Închinare lui N. Iorga cu prilejul împlinirii vârstei de 60 de ani”, “Cartea Românească”, Cluj, 1931, pp. 8-10; Nicolae Saramandu, *Gheorghe Constantin Roja și “Școala Normală a Nației Românești” din Pesta, Ungaria (1808-1810)* [Gheorghe Constantin Roja and the “Gymnasium of the Romanian Nation” of Pesta, Hungary (1808-1810)], in xxx *Contribuția românilor la îmbogățirea tezaurului cultural în Balcani*, Fundația Culturală Română (seria *Colocvii*), n.p. [București], n.y. [1992], pp. 54-60) (study also included in – Idem, *Studii aromâne și meglenoromâne*, Ex Ponto, Constanța, 2003 /260 pp.+ h./, pp. 97-103); Idem, *Un cărturar aromân în cadrul Școlii Ardelene*: [An Aromanian scholar from within the Transylvanian School] *Gheorghe Constantin Roja*, in “Tribuna”, V, no. 16, April, 22-27, 1993, p. 8; Valeriu Papahagi, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea...*, pp. 216-246.

His death, at February 12, 1847 is announced in the Romanian magazine of Brașov, with the indication that: “Din trei isvórá primirám știrea despre mórtea lui Dr. Roja. Pe cel venit mai întei, îl publicăm, cu unele adaosuri luate din celelalte” [From three sources we received the news of the death of Dr. Roja. We publish the first one, with some parts added from the others]; *the anonymous obituary* shows the professional career of the medic, the one that in the last 26 years worked in the Banat-Muntenian shire of Oravița, receiving “tótă încrederea, onórea și cea mai caldă simpatie a tuturor” [the whole trust, honour and most warm sympathy of all], subliniază faptul că prin lucrarea publicată în 1808, ”pe cât știm noi fu cel dintâi bărbat macedo-român, care pe acea parte a nației române o făcu mai de aproape cunoscută la români cei din Dacia întreagă” [from what we know he was the first Macedo-Romanian man to make that part of the nation more known to the Romanians in the whole Dacia]; the ending is the following: “Dr. Roja în curs mai mult de 30 ani petrecuți în aceste ținuturi deprinzându-se cu curarea și vindecarea a felurii de boale care domnesc în Bănat, s-au ostenit a le descrie împreună cu domnitóarele friguri din aceste părți, ca publicându-le mai târziu să pótă fi în această formă niamului omenesc folositoriu. Dar acest fruct al minții sale prin repede-ai mórte precurmându-se rămase necopt” [Dr. Roja during more than 30 years spent in these lands healing various afflictions which plague Banat, took the effort of writing them down including the ever present shivers afflicting these land, to publish them later for the use of mankind. But this fruit of his mind remained unripened as he passed away too soon] – *Necrolog* [Obituary], in “Gazeta de Transilvania”, X, no. 22, March 17, 1847, p. 88.

<sup>25</sup> Gheorghe C. Roja, *Cercetări despre românii de dincollo de Dunăre*. Tradusse din limba gréca

62 pages), the author broadly talks about the origin and history of his ancestors and pleads for the usage of the Latin alphabet (not the Greek one).

The scientific arguments for identifying the common origin of the Aromanians and Daco-Romanians are constituted in the backbone of Gheorghe C. Roja's whole approach, and are coherently sustained with arguments coming – for the first time at the scale of such a scientific approach – from a speaker of the Aromanian dialect.

The work is divided in four “sections”, and the organization of the material shows a logical and concise mind, necessary for identifying important details in the purpose of building reliable arguments and assertions. A pragmatic spirit, Roja exposes from the beginning his motivation for writing this book in a short *Precuvântare*<sup>26</sup> [Foreword]: “These *Cercetări* [researches] by which *espunū starea vechiă și nouă a românilorū* [I illustrate and old and new statute of the Romanians], are gathered and composed for the use of those, who do not have a true clear conscience about that people. I know very well that my work is not complete and thus that it cannot be compared with the writings of scholars. Despite this I gladly allow my readers to judge if I speak *truly* or no. I only ask them with all my heart to judge with righteousness and to show me, if they do not consider my observations true, the way of truth. I wrote in Greek on purpose, as I could have just as easily written in Romanian, as it is not that uncultivated to make writing in it impossible, but my purpose was to also allow this book to be read by Romanians and other people that know the said language”.

Therefore the intention of the author is to “spread propaganda” – as people would say today – of an issue that was known by foreigners, as Roja is fully aware of its actuality. His belief in the need to write an impartial book on his nation also penetrates from the extended *Introduction*, a true jewel of professional deontology.

From the perspective of a professional historian, but also of the intellectual and scholar of certain professional and scientific probity, his lines provide a modern understanding of the writing of history, of its role in the evolution of a people, be it smaller – and the contemporary reverberations of his lines, today, are perceivable as such: “Every nation has its own history. Still not all is known regarding their origin, deeds and history. Both at small nation but also at the great and famous nations we often discover many facts hidden by the dark. Truly, a lot of facts even regarding the greater nations are not well understood, as they are full of stories and ornate with myths. This lack of understanding comes from the lack of people capable of showing the truth, maybe because of the little knowledge

---

de Sergiu Hagiadi [Research on the Romanians Beyond the Danube. Translated from Greek by Sergiu Hagiadi], Typ. Națională T. Macinca și I. Samitca, Craiova, 1867; the name of the author is written on the copy from the Library of the Romanian Academy in ink – *G.C. Rosa*.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 1.

provided by historians on the said deeds. There are nations, that because of some similarities in habits and language, we considered as representing the same nation by foreign historians. Often, even though all that is necessary to find out the truth is available, in spite of this the authors do not agree each other. *Summarizing, some did not have the means to find out the truth; others, having them, did not want to research them properly; finally, others created false facts through their imagination. There are also writers, that not knowing historical sources have gone so low as to get their information from the uneducated class of the people and to compose in this way whatever they heard without any judgment whatsoever* (emphasis mine). Useless to say, by acting this way they could not leave for posterity the true and clear idea. Between that nations whose history are more or less incomplete, are also the so called in our maternal language *români* [Romanians]: a big nation and important in the past, as the most reliable historians tell us. *Romanians occupied half of Thrace, three quarters of Macedonia and a great part of Albania, where most cities are inhabited by them. In Hungary, Germany and Poland there are many of them.*

In the old times many courageous men belonged to this nation, and in the fierce battles they had, have subjugated and defeated many neighboring countries, as we will further show. Authors are not of the same opinion, relatively to the origin of the Romanians. The cause of this cleavage lies in them, as they do not know their language and thus they are incapable of discovering their true origins. That is how many ended up saying that «Romanians are of Bulgarian origin» or others that the Romanian race is Asian. Others believe the Romanians are Italians. And we can find many opinions some more suitable than others. By studying the Romanian language and by comparing the general histories and the particular ones written about them, we easily can cast the darkness away and recognize the light and truth in many cases.

From the title of this work it can be seen that I did not write *Istoria română* [The Romanian History], but a collection, to say so, of observations regarding the Romanian race. Byzantine historians have helped me a lot through their writing *Despre gințile Orientului* [On the races of the East], written by Joseph Tunmann, professor of Rhetoric and Philosophy at Halle University, a man that who has written about mostly everything properly. His book, printed 33 years ago is sadly too rare to find. Besides this *I also compared many present facts and studied to draw many probable consequences out of them*<sup>27</sup>.

We have considered presenting, almost wholly, these main methodological preliminaries of the author – especially that our historiography did not retain these important considerations of the historian – allowing ourselves to call him this way –, as Gh. C. Roja grants so much importance to knowing the language of the people whose history he considers discerning and placing on paper.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 2-5.

In the structure of the first section (*Despre addevăratul nume allă ginteī nōstre* [On the True Name of Our Nation]), the analysis of each name is stingingly but rigorously done, the author also adding a slight polemic – otherwise a feature of the whole work. Roja rejects the ethnonym of Vlach, as coming from other populations, and being “given in fact by strangers. Because ourselves, *as well as our brothers this side of the Danube, did not ever use this designation in our language* and now where is written by us this said word, *Vlach*, as we have abandoned it since ancient times. We hear it being said as patiently as it has become too common. The word *Vlach* means in the Slav language *shepherds*; the occupation or profession of the population showing nothing else,”<sup>28</sup> – categorically concludes Roja, also stating that from the Slavs this name passed to the Byzantines, and from them to other populations to designate the Balkan Romanians, also known under the name of *Moesi*. Although the two names “do not belong to our race, still they have a meaning, that can also apply to Romanians or others”, concedes Roja, in attacking other such names, “nicknames, *created for mockery*”, not by the “ancient and decent authors, but by *a few modern half-learned that also look to boast their education is broad by creating such nicknames*”<sup>29</sup>.

It is about the *Koutsovlachs*, a name obviously given in mockery by the “half-learned”, from whose writings it also originates this depreciative aspect: “It can often be clearly seen that these names are given to Romanians to mock them. I truly could not understand – as Roja states annoyed – for what cause were we given the name of *Koutsovlachs*, as not even the *physical* analysis of the word, nor the *moral* one can give us a meaning. In section two – *as the author warns his readers* – it will be proved that not even *our dialect* deserves this epithet. Finally, because this word is found at no important writer and also because it was given on no basis whatsoever, I do not continue any more: *let the denigrators laugh and enjoy their job!...*”<sup>30</sup>.

Also the designation *țințari/çintari* enjoys – in the given explanation – the same manner of approach from Roja; after enumerating the different meanings given to this word and rejecting them (they would trace back to the Roman word *sincere* or from *censi/cesari*, alternatives which he does not trust; or from the “Slav word” *Sin-Czarev*, meaning “Emperor’s son”, to show in this manner the “imperial origins” of the Romanian race, “a laughing matter rather than of serious possibility”; or from the number five (*cinci*), meaning the number of Emperors the “Romanian nation had at its peak”, an opinion that is also “not right”), the author openly expresses his disagreement and shows the lack of any basic historical documentation at the “ancient authors”, sharply and irrevocably concluding that:

<sup>28</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 6.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 9.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 9-10.

“After a few learned men, *this designation has no historical meaning; on the contrary, its given in laughter by the Serbs*, although some of the Greeks also call us this way. I am also sure myself that this name is fabricated in these parts, as *me in 10 years I have not heard this name in Turkey and it is not heard in those parts not even today*. In the same way, our merchants arriving for the first time in Hungary or Slavonia were very surprised to hear this nickname – *as Roja completes his historical comment by bringing this important contemporary testimony*. Besides these – *he adds* –, also there are others: *but I think it is better to remain silent. I have truly said enough to show that such names are not to be found at any ancient or modern author and thus they are in vain given to our nation*”<sup>31</sup>.

Then passing on to the explanation of his nation’s name, Roja shows that “We are called in our parental language *rumâni*, meaning Romans, keeping this name until the present times”, and adding that “the name of *romanî* belongs to our Romanians brothers in Transylvania, Romania, Banat; we are called *romanî* because this is how we were called and the language is *Roman*. Nothing can *justly* be said today against our name”<sup>32</sup>.

Section II exposes the author’s consideration about what he names *Prima locuință a românilor și addevărata lor origine* [The First Establishment of the Romanians and Their True Origin]. He considers Thracia as being “the first establishment of the Romanians”<sup>33</sup>, and details this belief based on the testimony of different ancient writers, the (Balkan) Romanians being the descendants of Romanized Thracians: “they are the grandsons of the Romans who came in Thrace”<sup>34</sup>. While regarding his fellow nationals language, it is descending from Classical and Vulgar Latin, part of the vocabulary being of different origin, but still between these words “much fewer are Greek”<sup>35</sup>; in strengthening his evidences regarding the Latin character of the Balkan Romanians’ language he adds: “and anyone can make sure of this just from the following words – and seven pages of Romanian words of obvious Latin origin follow”<sup>36</sup>.

By pleading for maintaining the Latin purity of the language of the South-Danubian Romanians, whose lexicon has been altered by: “foreign words especially Greek [which] passed into our language because of our ties with several other populations”, Roja shows that he trusts the conservative power of the Latin character, which lays in the will of its speakers, who have acknowledged the need of its conservation and of maintaining its Latin character: “And the most pure language loses its beauty little by little when we do not remember of its

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 11.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 13.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 14.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 31.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 21.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 21-29.

conservation. Such a sad thing has happened to the present Greeks, our old neighbors. Their language would not have lost its purity, provided they had been continuously interested in using Hellenic words instead of foreign loan and of the conservation the good words – *warns his fellow countrymen, by this example, Roja*. The Romanians too could have avoided this, had they studied to remove the foreign loans and had they expressed as *Latin* as possible. Would it have been possible for them to act differently and to learn Latin while between populations of other origin and under the Turkish yoke? – *righteously poses this rhetoric question the convinced supporter of the Latin character of the South-Danubian Romanian language*. I cannot find a more useful thing for the purification of the language other than the study of Latin; Therefore I recommend it to my fellow countrymen”<sup>37</sup>.

After rejecting “some” opinions that portrait the South-Danubian Romanians of either Asian origin or of being the ancestors of the Bulgarians, trying to “prove that that Romanian nation is not of Latin origin”<sup>38</sup>, Gh.C. Roja find appropriately to insert at the end of this Chapter a *Scurtă adducere a minte de frații noștri din România* [Short memorial of our brothers in Romania]: “My purpose is to talk here about the Romanians in Transylvania and Romania; but I cannot omit to say that *these Romanians are our brothers*; A thing which can be clearly seen from their name (as they too are called Romanians) *and from their language, which is the same as ours*, besides a few Slavic words; We can comprehend each other mostly all the time”<sup>39</sup>.

This is a clear-cut position in the spirit of the basic ideas of the Transylvanian School, and it shows not only the sense of perception and existence of a unitary Balkan Latinity as such (North and South-Danubian), but also surety on the ethnic identity of the Neo-Latin South Danubian speakers with their North-Danubian brethren. This identity would constitute – from now on – a corollary of the movement for the awareness of the ethno-linguistic Aromanian individuality in the Balkan environment, and Gh.C. Roja has the merit of being the first to express it in such clarity, and thus inserting it in the conscience of Romanian intellectuality, who, through the help of the press, has popularized it by making it public.

Section III is occupied *Despre resbellele românilor* [On the Wars of the Romanians], respectively “we are exposing a few Romanian historical facts, necessary for well knowing their ancient status. I will remind only the main facts and happenings for reaching my purpose. A prolonged discourse would truly be in vain here, as they are all written – *makes clear the informed and such methodical doctor* – “abundantly in the history of Byzantium, by the historians: Niceta

<sup>37</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 30-31.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 34.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 38-39.

Coniatu, Georgiū Acropolitū, Ioannū Cantacuzenū, Anna Comnena, Zonara [Nicetas Choniates, George Acropolites, John Cantacuzino, Anne Comnene, Zonaras] etc.”<sup>40</sup>; Truly, based on the Byzantine chronicles it is very briefly reviewed the history of the Balkan Romanians, the Rebellion and the Kingdom of the Asen Dynasty, the deeds of the “five Romanian kings”, references are made “to the most mountainous part of Thessaly”, which is called *România-Mare* [Greater Romania], “which had its own Domnitor”<sup>41</sup>, until its “unification” with the Byzantine empire; later, this country of the Balkan Romanians would pass under the domination of the Despotate of Aetolia “and finally during 1312 part of Thessaly is subjected to *Amuratū Gazi*; the middle parts under the lords of *Cerneilorū* lasted until year 1394, when Bayezed came and ended their reign”<sup>42</sup>.

Roja’s opus is made whole, in the IV<sup>th</sup> Section, by observations and reflections on the features of human nature, and in general, the psychological feats of people and nations – a long introduction, in the structure of the chapter, has the purpose of providing the reader a theoretical motivation regarding the assertions of the author in this chapter, *Despre capacitatea românilorū* [On the Capacity of Romanians]. Thus, Subchapter 39 is constituted in a plea for revealing the native characteristics of his people, sometimes contested in ignorant and malicious writings, his considerations being very topical even today: „Let us see what arguments can we draw for our purpose from the above said. *Romanians and their brothers across the Danube are considered as a good for nothing people. Great injustice is done by those that treat the Romanians so bad: a nation that not only in ancient times but even now has relations and businesses with so many important races. We cannot say that the Romanians are very advanced – says the honest Roja* – as it is not true. Still men that know what the *human* is and that know well the Romanian race, consider it of the 3<sup>rd</sup> class, as it was shown in the paragraph above<sup>43</sup>; meaning that the Romanian race generally has enough intelligence, but it cannot advance as it should because in part it is forced to hide its natural skills; then it does not have the means of developing them. Peace and the necessary means are of uttermost importance for the advancement of a nation. *Romanians do not have them*” – clearly states Roja. He is saying this in a time when politics were beginning to mingle in contesting the continuity, Latinity and unity of the Romanian nation, in a time of informational manipulation, of what the chroniclers call “stories” [*basne*]. He has noticed the importance of geopolitics in Romanian history and is explaining it to the European reader: “Before the Ottoman despotism, they were involved in countless wars. Then falling under the Turkish yoke, what peace could they have, when other very advanced nations had fallen in

<sup>40</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 39-40.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 47.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 49.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 34.

the deepest ignorance? In spite of this, even in that age of great unrest, Romanians have given and continuously show great evidence of intelligence”<sup>44</sup>.

Extremely valuable historical information for that period, that are found in Subchapter *Românii de sub jugulul turcilor* [The Romanians under the Turkish yoke] attest that “At the print press of *Moscopole, city inhabited only by Romanians*, many books were printed with those letters”, meaning “Hellenic letters”, adopted in writing “by some of our Romanians, who having evolved, had to adopt Hellenic letters, which were used nearby, and had to write using them”<sup>45</sup>; the Romanian doctor tells us, knowingly, as being almost contemporary with the events, with the era, that “Romanian has been written in Greek letters especially during the days of the Romanians priest Anastasie Cavaloti” – as resorting to the Greek alphabet and even to Modern Greek was not a viable solution for the national-cultural affirmation of the Aromanians: “But a short time after it could be seen that Hellenic letters are not suitable to write all the words of the Romanian dialect, and then they started communicating their ideas in Modern Greek”<sup>46</sup>.

Perceiving the danger for the independent development of the idiom of the South-Danubian Romanians by resorting to the Modern Greek language, Roja clearly expresses his position in this worrying and decisive matter, during a historical age dominated – *Nota Bene* – in the political and publishing mentality of the Europeans, by the action of Hellenism impregnated by a forthright exclusivist attitude (in the detriment of the national accidence of the Balkan nations): “May God deliver us from this necessity so that *Romanians take back for their own language their own Latin Alphabet or, at least, the Slav one (Sic!), a fact that will contribute a lot to its purification of foreign loans*”<sup>47</sup>.

The last Subchapter of the work entitled *Românii aşşedzaţi în ţerrî liniştite* [Romanians Settled in Peaceful (*Sic!*) Countries] is, again – as far as we know –, a first assessment from a Romanian author of the contribution of the Aromanians to the economic and spiritual life of a „peaceful” European country, an evidence of their economic and spiritual vitality, of their inherent intelligence: “The capacity and intelligence of Romanians for all that means good manners, culture in general and philanthropy has shined especially since a great part of them have moved in well governed and peaceful countries. Many have risen to being part of the nobility of Hungary and contribute a lot to the wellbeing of this country. Their main occupation is trade. Alone or in cooperation with foreigners they have founded important commercial companies in several cities. In Hungary, Saxony

<sup>44</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 54-55.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 58-59; for the nearly four decades of years of printing (1731-1769) were found 21 titles, all in Greek, which has not had excluded, of course, editing and other writings, for “not yet discovered all the moscopolitane prints” – Max D. Peyfuss, *op. cit.*, p. 99; the author makes the description of the detected volumes at 96-163 pages.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 59.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibidem*.



and, I can say, in the whole Germany, there is no true commercial city without firsthand Romanians traders. Besides this, many embrace the study of various fine languages and especially in Germany also sciences and arts like: Theology, Medicine, and Jurisprudence etc., with admirable success. Here are some Romanians famous there for their knowledge: Dionisiu Mantuca of Castoria, Ioannu Calceu, Constantin Nectariu Tarpu, Ambrosiu, and Procopiu Pamperi, men with extended knowledge in Greek, Latin, Italian, philosophers and theology scholars; Demetriu Pamperi and Constantin Zupanu, both doctors and philosophers; then Demetriu Nicolau Darvari etc. So it can be seen that Romanians do not lack intelligence and natural skill, but peace and the means to shine also in Turkey through knowledge and civility<sup>48</sup>.

Therefore this is the work – otherwise<sup>49</sup> often quoted – upon which Romanian historiography did not insist as much as we believe it should have, thanks to its valuable ideas, as we have shown, work that wants to “clarify all those that do not know the South Danubian Romanians, but especially the Romanians themselves, on the origin of this people and the way it appears today”<sup>50</sup>. It is a work that deserves, undoubtedly, its integration in an anthology of the Transylvanian School, as a precious Aromanian component of this patriotic national-cultural Romanian current.

Also proving that Gheorghe C. Roja lies between the Aromanian intellectuals, not only influenced, but also ground breaking in the historical and linguistic perception of the Romanian phenomenon of the Transylvanian School, is his mentioning in the broad critical edition – which we resorted to so often –, from 1983<sup>51</sup>, or the integration of his linguistic contribution in an approved thematic summary, from 1973<sup>52</sup>. It is about the know opus – it too of small length (56 pages) – entitled *Măestria ghiovăsirii / =citirii/ românești. Cu litere latinești, care sunt literele românilor cele vechi, spre polirea a toată ghinta românească ceii din coace și ceii din colo de Dunăre...* [The Mastery of Reading Romanian. In Latin letters, which are the letters of the ancient Romanians, for the brilliance of the whole Romanian nation, both this side and the other side of the Danube...<sup>53</sup>, printed in 1809 in Buda.

Conceived in bilingual text, Greek and Romanian (the latter having 35 pages), the work is one of the most important contributions, in the first histories of

<sup>48</sup> *Ibidem*, pp. 60-61.

<sup>49</sup> Is not selected, however, in massive synthesis (two volumes – LV + 952 pp.; 991 pp.) – xxx *Școala Ardeleană*. Ediție critică, note, bibliografie și glosar de Floarea Fugariu. Introducere de Dumitru Ghișe și Pompiliu Teodor, Editura Minerva, București, 1983.

<sup>50</sup> Th. Capidan, *op. cit.*, p. 220.

<sup>51</sup> *Supra* 49.

<sup>52</sup> Victor V. Grecu, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

<sup>53</sup> See – *Școala Ardeleană*, I..., pp. 817-827, where the preface is selected – *Cuvânt către români!* [Word for the Romanians!]; it is also published by G. Murnu, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-60.

Romanian linguistics, with recognized pioneering merits, and a modern approach of this discipline, Roja advancing new ideas in the direction of creating a unitary literary Romanian language, for the North- and South-Danubian. Practically he tries, through this book, “*să unifice graiul macedoromânilor cu acela al românilor din țară* [to unify the language of the Macedo-Romanians with the one of the Romanians from Country [/Romania]”<sup>54</sup>, a very actual approach, with certain values of protochronism, even surpassing<sup>55</sup> some linguistic ideas of Petru Maior; of course, the general conception of the “*cetățeanului academicesc și candidatul clinicesc doftor* [academic citizen and clinical doctor candidate]”, fitting in the Latinist current of the Transylvanian School, the ideas of Roja themselves even constituting a part of its backbone.

Let us observe, for now, the long reaching and well aimed words of George Murnu, from 1889, at least for the period during which the personality of the great savant was rising: “In this book the author tries to introduce Latin letters in the writing of the Romanian language and encourages Romanian scholars, that by uniting all that is pure from all the Romanian dialects and removing the foreign loans, to make a literary language that all Romanians can understand, both the ones here and the ones over there.

This is *a grand idea, which nobody exposed before Roja* (emphasis mine)”<sup>56</sup>.

Literary history has retained, well circumstantiated – more than our historiography –, the national interest and scientific signification of Roja’s work: “The title shows the author’s intention and his purpose. Now it was not about the Romanians across the Danube, but all the Romanians, whose unity of language he underlines with energy. He distinguishes, in this totality of Romanianism, the existence of two dialects: North-Danubian and South-Danubian”<sup>57</sup>.

Therefore, Gh.C. Roja has in view the elaboration of a literary language for all the Romanians, both South-Danubian and North-Danubian, starting from the observation – detailed in the preface, entitled, *Cuvânt către români!* [Word to Romanians!] – of the separation “of our Romanian language which the foreigners call Wallachian”, in the Daco-Romanian and Aromanian dialects; to the latter he confers a first clear division in speeches (*grai*), retained as such in the history of Romanian linguistics: “and both these two dialects, partly for lexical differences and partly because of different phonemes, have their own different speeches, like *dialectu voscopolitan, grabovean, gremostean, gopistan, mețovitean, sau epirotean* [the voscopolitan, grabovean, gremostean, gopistan, metsovitean or

<sup>54</sup> Th. Capidan, *op. cit.*

<sup>55</sup> *Școala Ardeleană...*, vol. I, p. 817.

<sup>56</sup> George Murnu, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

<sup>57</sup> Dimitrie Popovici, *La littérature roumaine à l'époque des Lumières*, Cartea Românească, Sibiu, 1945, p. 284.

*epirotean dialects*] (emphasis mine), Moldavian, Transylvanian, Banatean, the one in Hungary, near Cluj, and other”<sup>58</sup>.

Regarding Roja’s political conception, it “surprises by its modernity”<sup>59</sup>, highlighting again the “struggle to «adapt» Daco-Romanian to the needs of the Aromanians”<sup>60</sup>. Still the ideas he proposes in the Preface do not lack historical meaning – which is useful to our current purpose, of showing the emergence and ascension of the interest of Romanian scholars, and later, of the whole society generally in the Romanian Principalities, regarding the history and issues of the Balkan Romanians.

Behold as the very writing of an Aromanian scholar is exposing the concept of the Transylvanian School, according to which, language can acquire a new meaning – that of factor of national cohesion<sup>61</sup>, Gh.C. Roja extending this attribute to the scale of the whole linguistic areal and emphasizing, as N. Iorga shows, that “the duty of teachers is spreading this literary language, which would form the all-powerful link between all the scattered Romanian elements”<sup>62</sup>.

It is indeed an idea clearly stated by Roja, who begins by saying that “A lot of parents, partly because of the darkness of their ignorance, and then because of struggling to accumulate the ones necessary for a living, cannot be occupied by well raising their sons and training their heart”; therefore, he logically concludes: “thus, the teachers must accomplish these by seeding their hearts with lust for knowledge, by teaching them what is good and to know God. Now, what can be more easy and pleasing at Romanians than *teachers teaching our newborn a clean dialect* (*Recte*: the unitary literary language – our note) and by its help, the sciences? These pupils would soon begin sharing their knowledge in a clear Romanian language, and then, teaching their own sons to speak it. Likewise, these would teach their offspring and so on. Nothing prevents that this *purified* language would soon be used by all, even more, by having a usual language and a literary one we would catch up on other nations. And through it, not only *all the Romanians, our brothers* (all are emphasis mine), which have a lot of different dialects, as we have shown above, but also other races will understand us in our language”<sup>63</sup>.

The final part of *Cuvântului cătră români!* pleads, in rhetoric interrogative accents, by appealing to the national sentiments of the Romanians, to write their literary language in Latin letters: “Today all the evolved nations in Europe use the Latin letters. *Thus is it not shameful that we, speakers of Vulgar Latin, to write*

<sup>58</sup> *Apud – Școala Ardeleană...*, vol. I, p. 818.

<sup>59</sup> Nicolae Saramandu, *Pentru o limbă literară comună...*, p. 136.

<sup>60</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 139.

<sup>61</sup> Victor V. Grecu, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

<sup>62</sup> N. Iorga, *Istoria literaturii românești*, vol. III: *Partea întâia (Generalități, școala ardeleană)*, Editura Fundației “Regele Ferdinand”, București, 1933, p. 315.

<sup>63</sup> *Apud – Școala Ardeleană...*, vol. I, pp. 819-820.

*our thoughts in foreign letters?* (emphasis mine) [Au nu e rușine, noi, carii vorbim limba cea lătimească stricată, să ne scriem cugetele noastre cu litere streine?]. It is very true that we are for the ancient Romans like the Greek are today with the ancient Hellenes; now if they are using Hellenic letters what stops us from using Latin letters? Until when we shall postpone our awakening from this state of ignorance, which has been imposed here by foreign powers but which we sustain and empower now by the backwardness of our hearts?<sup>64</sup>.

By showing the need to use the Latin alphabet, Roja agrees to the maintenance of the Cyrillic letters in churchly books, the Latin ones being used “for purifying our language and for the writing of political books”, as there would not be difficult for the young generations to learn them: “Hence, our children should learn to write their thoughts in both Cyrillic and Latin letters. Some say, behold, hardness! Hardness for the children! It is very difficult learning to write in two alphabets! But I say this: in Hungarian or German schools, where children learn either Hungarian or German and Latin letters, and yet they do not find it hard. *In our Romanian school children learn to read Cyrillic, Hungarian and German letters in ten months without finding it hard* (emphasis mine). Little girls learn today to read and understand Greek, German, and French books – *Roja tells us important information, over the centuries, regarding the high, for those times, cultural level of many of the members of the Aromanian community in Hungary or Austria*. But, lets us leave these. Look to the Russians, a great and well-known nation. They learn two alphabets in school, first the Cyrillic ones, then other for political books, and yet they do not find it hard. May God help that we follow their example! Take their example Romanians! And then you will see that against those that cry: It is too difficult to have two alphabets! It is madness! Consider this well Romanians! Both for your accomplishment and also for the fulfillment of your future descendants. Many of our kin could laudably learn other languages, you must think that doing this for your own language is easier, especially as it can be taught by us or written in books. By this book of mine I mean to teach you once and for all to read the Latin letters. So I write the number of the letters, their sound or pronunciation and the description of the sound of some letters, according to Romanian pronunciation. Besides this, in order to offer examples of Romanian words written in Latin letters, I have written the following according to the breakdown of the sounds of the letters, for easier reading. Judge it righteously, and anyone can judge it; those that know all the dialects of Romanian and also Italian and Latin, those who do not know these should not judge, because, unknowingly, they would be wrong and confused. *Therefore, Romanians! take this little book, which is for perfecting the Romanian language* (emphasis mine), as I wrote it as an instrument, and where I have erred please forgive me, and tell me or write me, please, and I will thank you dearly<sup>65</sup>.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 820.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 821. Original text: “Deci, pruncii noștri să învețe a scrie cugetele sale și cu litere

„The little book” of the modest Roja – who also confesses, in a footnote, that “my toil has been supported by Petru Maior, also calling him, without giving his name, «a great Gentleman, my friend and a Romanian who also supports the purification of the language»”<sup>66</sup> – is, as we see, a plea for writing the unitary literary language of the Romanians both to the North and the South of the Danube using Latin characters.

Still, the first Aromanian scholar to use the Latin alphabet in writing Aromanian is the professor Mihail C. Boiagi (c.1780-c. 1842). He is responsible for publishing in Vienna, in 1813, time during which he was teaching Greek at the Greek School there, the first scientific grammar, written in Latin letters, of the Aromanian dialect – ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ ΡΩΜΑΝΙΚΗ ΗΤΟΙ ΜΑΚΕΔΟΝΟΒΛΑΧΙΚΗ / Romanische oder Macedonowlachische Sprachlehre [Gramatica română sau macedonovlahă / Romanian or Macedo-vlach Grammar]<sup>67</sup>.

---

latinești și cu litere chyrliliane. Ci, iată, strigă unii, întunerec! Întunerec pentru prunci! greotate mare pentru polire cu doao plase de litere! Ci eu zic așa: în școala cea unguerească, și în cea nemțască de odată învață pruncii literele și cele nemțești și cele lătinești, și încă nu s-au întunecat. În școala noastră cea românească învățară pruncii nostri în zece luni a ghiovăsi cu litere chyrliliane, nemțești și unguerești, fără greotate (subl.n.). Fetitele învață astăzi acasă a ceti și a pricepe cărți grecești, nemțești și frâncești – ne transmite, peste timp, importante informații Roja privind elevatul, în epocă, nivel cultural al multora dintre membrii comunităților aromânești din Ungaria și Austria. Ci, să lasă acestea. Căutați la ruși, ghintă mare, vestită și precunoscută. Acestea doao plase de litere învață în școală, chirilianele, și apoi altele pentru cărți politicești, și totuși nu s-au întunecat. Să dea Dumnezeu să aibă nația noastră polirea lor! Púneți dară înaintea voastră pilda lor, români! Și atunci veți vedea că coantra acelora, carii strigă: întunerec! întunerec, cu doao plase de litere! E nebunie! Luați dar, români! mijlocire, atât pentru deplinirea voastră, precum și polirea celor ce vor fi după voi. Dacă mulți de ai nostri cu laudă putură întru alte limbi pricipsi, cu cât va fi mai ușor a se nevoi pentru polirea limbii noastre, cu cât va fi mai ușor polită acum, așa, limba, sau acum încă cusfînd noi a învăța întrânsa pre alții sau în cărți a o lăsa. Întru această cărticică a mea nu voiu alta acum odată a învăța, fără a ghiovăsi (a ceti) cu litere latinești. Deci, pun numărul literelor, sonul sau viersul lor, și dezvrătatea viersului a unor litere, după dezbinarea dialectului ghintei românești. Afară de aceaia, ca să dau paradigmă de vorba cea românească cu latinești litere scrisă, cele ce urmează, după răschirarea sonurilor literelor pentru deprinderea ghiovăsirei le-am întocmit. Judecați drept, judecați și oricarii; însă aceia, carii știți toate dialectele limbei românești, și aveți cunoscută și limba latinească, cu cea italienească, iară ori carii sunt neștiutori de aceste, se nu judece, pentru că, ca neștiuți, vor mesteca cele rătunde cu cele pătrate, și așa veți întărâta pre svinga. Luați dar, români! această cărticică, carea pentru polirea limbii românești (subl.n.), ca organ o-am scris, așa unde am smintit ertați, și unde am smintit, spuneți-mi sau scrieți-mi, rogu-vă, că voiu mulțemi-vă foarte”.

<sup>66</sup> See – Nicolae Saramandu, *Pentru o limbă literară comună a românilor nord- și sud-dunăreni...*, p. 139.

<sup>67</sup> See the fourth edition, taken care of by Vasile Barba (the unconfessed intention was of using the said work – besides the praiseworthy providing those interested with a monument of Aromanian culture, on the occasion of 175 years since its publishing – as a historical argument in the more extensive efforts of imposing certain orthographical norms for the so called creation of a literary Aromanian “language”) – Mihail G. Boiagi, *Gramatică aromână ică macedonovlahă*. Editsie faptă di V.G. Barba (Uniunea Culturală Aromână), no publisher [Zborlu a nostru], Freiburg i. Br.,

Written in Greek and German, with examples and bits for reading in Aromanian (in the final part of the work, between pages 192 and 208, is inserted the Chapter *Fabule, icâ paramithe shi istorii alepte* [Fables, Meaning Narrates and Chosen Histories] translated from the *Evanghelia de la Luca* [Gospel of Lucas], it addressed the Aromanian of the Balkans but also the ones scattered in Central Europe. That is why Mihail C. Boiagi feels the need to write his *Grammar* in two languages. All the writing, pronunciation, declension and conjugation rules being shown both in Greek and German, in two adjacent columns, a third column in Aromanian does not imply – expert linguists say<sup>68</sup> – a trilingual character of the book, as “Aromanian is the described language, the other two being the language of its *description*, so that it can be understood by all Aromanians scattered across Europe”<sup>69</sup>.

The documentary, literary and scientific value of this work, edited under the influence of the national patriotic message of the Transylvanian School – especially under the mark of Petru Maior, who had relations with Boiagi<sup>70</sup> –, is with relevance and courage, as we will see, revealed in the *Προοίμιον/Vorrede* [Preface], dated *Wien den 1. September 1813*.

It is a true programmatic document, besides the one written five years earlier by Roja, in demonstrating to the European public opinion the existence as such of the South-Danubian Romanians, of the Aromanian nation – everywhere called *Vlach* – in a distinct individuality, as having their own spiritual voice between the other Balkan nations, with clearly expressed national ideas, and representing a cultural document of historical significance – as in the case of Roja – in the national movement of the Aromanians during the Modern Times. “Boiagi, just like Roja, also depicts a cultural and national page (*besides the linguistic importance of his work* – our note of the greatest importance for the past of the Aromanians. Shaped by the current of national vigor that made its way

---

1988 /304 pp./; is reproduction, by photocopy, of the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, from 1915 (Per. Papahagi), the editor creating an “Aromanian” edition, equaling the terms of *romanisch*, *Βλάχ*, *Vlach* through *aromân*; also see the professional opinions of Nicolae Saramandu, *O nouă ediție a Gramaticii române sau macedonovlahe de Mihail G. Boiagi (Discuții)* [A New Edition of the Romanian or Macedonian-Vlach Grammar by Mihail G. Boiagi], in “Fonetica și dialectologie”, X, 1991, pp. 121-123 (the reviewer concedes, at p. 122: “Trebuie să recunoaștem că traducerea titlului german realizată de V.G. Barba este mai în spiritul lui Boiagi, care este o gramatică a r o m â n e i [We must admit that the translation of the German title done by V.G. Barba is more in the spirit of Boiagi, which is a grammar of Aromanians]”); Idem, *O gramatică aromână la începutul secolului al XIX-lea*, in “Analele științifice ale Universității «Ovidius». Secțiunea Filologie”, IV, 1993, pp. 133-141; see, also – Th. Capidan, *op. cit.*, pp. 221-222.

<sup>68</sup> See the appreciations of – Matilda Caragiu Mariotseanu, Wolfgang Dahmen, John Nandris, Max Demeter Peyfuss, Rupprecht Rohr, Hans-Martin Gauger, in Mihail G. Boiagi, *op. cit.* Editsie V. Barba..., *Anexa I/1-I/8*.

<sup>69</sup> Matilda Caragiu Mariotseanu, in *Ibidem*, *Anexa I/1*.

<sup>70</sup> Maria Protase, *op. cit.*, pp. 263-264.

through the Romanians in Austro-Hungary, it fights for the national awakening of their fellow countrymen, the ones in Austro-Hungarian Empire as well as those that remained home”<sup>71</sup> – says the well known Pericle Papahagi, the editor of the third edition<sup>72</sup> of Boiagi’s *Grammar*. Referring to the same *Preface*, our contemporary and distinguished knower of the Aromanian history and idiom, Professor Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, rightfully believes that Boiagi’s *Preface* “is *the act of our awakening* [of the Aromanians] as a people with a distinct individuality in the Balkan Peninsula, a people with its own language and which has the right to cultivate itself in its maternal language”<sup>73</sup>.

From the onset it should be shown that, unlike Roja – which pleads for a literary language for both the Aromanian and Daco-Romanian dialects, as we have seen –, Boiagi configures, through his *Grammar*, an Aromanian literary language, in the conditions of highlighting, of course, its Latin character, and the Daco-Roman unity<sup>74</sup> of the two idioms. By showing that “Any language is a depiction of the human spirit, the more languages somebody learns, the more

<sup>71</sup> See – Per. Papahagi, *Introducere. O pagină culturală din viața aromânilor* [Introduction. A Cultural Page from the Life of the Aromanians], in Mihail G. Boiagi, *Gramatică română sau macedo-română*. Reeditată cu o introducere și un vocabular de [Romanian or Macedonian-Romanian Grammar. Re-Edited with an Introduction and a Vocabulary by] Per. Papahagi, Tipografia Curții Regale F. Göbl Fii, București, 1915, pp. IX-X.

<sup>72</sup> A second edition published in Bucharest, in 1863, being prefaced by D. Bolintineanu, which reveals the merits of the author, the motivation of re-printing and the ones behind the new edition: “Mihael Gheorge Boiagi, român din Macedonia, este cel d’ânteiu ce a făcut o gramatică în limba româno-macedono. Gramatica sa este tipărită în Viena la anul 1813, când era emigrat și trăia acolo, dând lecții de limba greacă modernă. Acéstă gramatică este scrisă în trei limbă, română, greacă, germană. Acest bărbat, fiu al civilisatei și învățatei coloniî din Moscopolea sau Voscopolea, a mai lăsat alte scrieri din care traducția cătoru-va evangeliî. El este cel d’ânteiu ce avu curagiul să dzică lumii în fața atâtor popóre al căror interes era a ascunde naționalitatea română din Macedonia, că între slavî, albanezî și greci este un popor român plin de viață, de virtuți străbune, de naționalitate. Acéstă gramatică a devenit cu totul rară și anevoie de aflat; un singur esemplar s’a mai găsit, dupe care învățiatul în litere D. Massimu a compus o noă gramatică. D. Massimu nu apucase a termina bine urmtórele rânduri:

«Meritar-ar să o retipărescă româniî în eterna memorie a bărbatului învățat ce consecră tótă viața sa la luminarea națiunii sale și care fără îndoire, se depuse în mormântu cu o mare amărire sufletescă vëdzëndü că tóte silințele sale fuseseră deșerte, de óre ce compatrioții luî se arătaseră surdzî la chemările luî...».

Și D. C. Negri, ce tot d’auna a avut fericita și meritósa idee de a face ceva pentru acesti românî macedonî, se oferi a retipări cu cheltuiala sa proprie gramatica luî Boiagi, ca un demn monument al naționalității românilor aurelianî.

Retipărirea dar a acestiî Gramaticî o suntem datorî D-luî Negri; am dori ca și alți patrioți să vie în ajutorul altor opere ce sunt a se tipări în acéstă limbă” [The reprinting of this Grammar is owned to Mr. Negri; we would also like that other patriots help the printing of other works in this language] – Dimitrie Bolintineanu, *Prefația*, *apud* Mihail G. Boiagi, *op. cit.* Editsia V.G. Barba..., *Anexa III/ 2-3*).

<sup>73</sup> Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, *op. cit.*

<sup>74</sup> Wolfgang Dahmen, *apud Ibidem*, *Anexa I/6*.

sides his mind will know and, therefore, the more multilateral he himself becomes”, Boiagi configures the less favorable historical context for his maternal language’ recognition: “Our Romanian language<sup>75</sup> [βλαχική//*valachische* = *aromână* = *Aromanian*], spoken by four million souls, *politically too spread in order to build an important whole* (emphasis mine) (conversely, how important is shown the united nation of the Hungarians of two three millions), and which, in such a happy nation by its own nature, in the country named by its inhabitants Wallachia /as well as in Moldova<sup>76</sup>/, has to step down in the high circles to the language of the rulers – still has the most certain guarantees in its sisters, in Italian, French and Spanish, which represents what it could become when the whole Aromanian nation, both of the high and the low classes, would gladly cultivate it.

Its above mentioned sisters were too in their beginnings sloppy and derelict – encouragingly circumstantiates Boiagi – if not even more than the Romanian language, as their oldest records testify; in spite of this, today Italian is the universal language of canto in all Europe, even where they speak and write in German, English, or French”.

For Mihail Boiagi, cultivating his maternal language must constitute an axiom, in spite of the important political impediments, and also practical ones, because of the actions of the exclusivist actions of the Greek nationalists: “Therefore – *he continues his reasoning* –, the Romanian [*Βλάχος*//*Vlache*/ = *aromânului* = the Aromanian] has no reason to be ashamed of his language, conversely, he must feel proud, and when he will embellish and cultivate his spirit, his language will follow him, gladly, or in any case, more gladly than other languages. Thus, for hard to reject considerations, become obvious the trivialities spoken by the ignorant Neofit Ducas<sup>77</sup>, who because he did not know any other language, would have liked to destroy all the languages in the world, and to replace them by “Maccaronish” [*μακαρωνική*//*maccaronisches*], Greek (as their own fellow countrymen mockingly call it). And so blind is his zeal in this issue that he desires this transformation in spite of always saying that Romanian are more inclined towards culture and better and keener in beau arts than the Greeks themselves. Being driven only by his blindness and ridiculous ignorance, he can ostentatiously ask where Romanians have their own country, cities, priests, laws, nobility etc.

<sup>75</sup> *Apud* – Edition Per. Papahagi, p. X; „Limba a noastră aromânească” [Our Aromanian Language]: as it is translated in Editsia V.G. Barba, *Anexa II/10*; the explanation of the two ethnical attributes at Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, in *op. cit.*

<sup>76</sup> Lacking in the Greek text, but present in the German one – *apud* Mihail G. Boiagi, *op. cit.* Editsia V. G. Barba..., *Anexa II/3*).

<sup>77</sup> *Supra* 19.



Still I thought appropriate to remember the ridiculous ignorance of this sycophant, but it does not deserve combating it; I only declare so much *that even if the Romanians were Hottentots, they would still have the right and duty to cultivate their own language as mean of their accomplishment* (emphasis mine). Still, the Romanian language belongs to those modern languages that sound better than all other. Then, it is a language spoken by 4 million Romanians, a number that cannot be ignored, least by a Greek, whose fellow countrymen barely surpass the Romanians in this issue”<sup>78</sup>.

These are, in a general order, the considerations that make Boiagi a pioneer in the national and political culture of the Aromanians, a reliable guide in their modern history, in their self-awareness as a separate Latin nation in the Balkans, speaking an idiom that could become a literary language of European circulation – still<sup>79</sup> with its own different aspects than literary Romanian (Noth-Danubian, based on the Daco-Romanian dialect) –, as it can be deduced from the author’s insertion: “But returning to my work, which is this grammar of the Macedo-Romanian [*μακεδονοβλαχιχής/macedonovlachischen*], language, just as the South-Danubian Romanians speak it, and which, *compared to the idiom spoken at the North of the Danube, will be useful for both those of the same origins* (emphasis mine), as well as for foreigners and scholars”<sup>80</sup>.

Rightfully, commenting this short, but so significant document of Aromanian national-cultural rejuvenation, Per. Papahagi considers it as being “an urge to national feelings, which elevates; it comprises ideas that contribute to the awakening of a people; planting the seed of a current of reawakening for the Aromanians”<sup>81</sup>.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bardu, Nistor *Limba scrierilor aromânești de la sfârșitul secolului al XVIII-lea (Cavalioti, Daniil, Ucuta)*, Partea I: *Aspecte ale grafiei. Fonetica*, Ovidius University Press, Constanța, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Eighteenth Century Aromanians Writers: The Enlightenment and the Awakening of National and Balkan Consciousness*, in Adina Ciugureanu, Mihaela Irimia, Eduard Vlad (eds.), *Balkan Cultural Identities*. Edited by... (Ovidius University Constanța. Center of Cross-Cultural Studies), Ovidius University Press, Constanța, 2006, pp. 257-268.
- Boiagi, Mihail G. *Gramatică aromână ică macedonovlahă*. Editsie faptă di V.G. Barba (Uniunea Culturală Aromână), no publisher [Zborlu a nostru], Freiburg i. Br., 1988.

<sup>78</sup> *Apud* – Idem, *Introducere. O pagină culturală...*, pp. XI-XII; Mihail G. Boiagi, *op. cit.* Editsia V.G. Barba..., *Anexe* II/10-12.

<sup>79</sup> Matilda Caragiu Mariotseanu, in *op. cit.*; but according to Per. Papahagi (*op. cit.*, p. XIV), Mihail G. Boiagi “Does not seek to create a different language for the Aromanians, this scholar, absorbed by the idea that all Romanians should use a single literary language”.

<sup>80</sup> *Apud* – Edition Per. Papahagi, p. XII.

<sup>81</sup> Per. Papahagi, *Introducere. O pagină culturală...*, p. XIII.

- Capidan, Theodor. *Constantin Ucuta și începuturile de mișcare culturală la armâni* [Constantin Ucuta and the Beginnings of Cultural Movements at the Aromanians], in "Convorbiri literare", XLIV, 7, July 1909, pp. 777-784; no. 8, August 1909, pp. 876-882.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Macedoromânii. Etnografie, istorie, limbă* [The Macedo-Romanians. Ethnography, History, Language], Fundația Regală pentru Literatură și Artă, București, 1942.
- Lascu, Stoica, *Romanitatea balcanică în conștiința societății românești până la Primul Război Mondial*, Editura România de la Mare, Constanța, 2013.
- xxx *Necrolog* [Obituary], in "Gazeta de Transilvania", X, no. 22, March 17, 1847, p. 88.
- Papacostea, Victor, *Civilizație românească și civilizație balcanică. Studii istorice. Ediție îngrijită și note de Cornelia Papacostea-Danielopolu. Studiu introductive de Nicolae-Șerban Tanașoca*, Editura Eminescu, București, 1983.
- Papahagi, Pericle, *Scriitori aromâni în secolul al XVIII (Cavalioti, Ucuta, Daniil)*, Institutul de Arte Grafice "Carol Göbl", București, 1909.
- Papahagi, Valeriu, *Viața culturală a aromânilor în secolul al XVIII-lea și în prima jumătate a celui de-al XIX-lea. Prefață, Schiță biografică și Postfață de Viorel Stănilă. [Transcrierea manuscrisului: Enache Tușa]* (Institutul de Științe Politice și Relații Internaționale), Editura Institutului Cultural Român, București, 2015.
- Peyfuss, Max Demeter, "Protopiria" lui Cavaloti – un exemplar necunoscut [Cavalioti's Protopiria – An Unknown Exemplary], in "Sud-Est" [Chișinău], vol. 9, no. 3 (33), 1998, pp. 42-48.
- Roja, Gheorghe C., *Cercetări despre românii de dincolo de Dunăre*. Tradusse din limba greacă de Sergiu Hagiadi [Research on the Romanians Beyond the Danube. Translated from Greek by Sergiu Hagiadi], Typ. Naționale T. Macinca și I. Samitca, Craiova, 1867.
- Saramandu, Nicolae, *Pentru o limbă literară comună a românilor nord- și sud-dunăreni. O încercare de la începutul secolului al XIX-lea* [For a Common Literary Language of the North and South- Danubian Romanians. An Approach from the Beginning of the XIX<sup>th</sup> Century], in *Beiträge zur rumänischen Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert*. Akten des Kolloquiums »Die rumänische Sprache im 19. Jahrhundert«, Regensburg 26.28. April 1990. Herausgegeben von Gerhard Ernst, Peter Stein und Barbara Weber [Sonderdruck], Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Studii aromâne și meglenoromâne*, Ex Ponto, Constanța, 2003 /260 pp.+ h./.
- xxx *Școala Ardeleană*. Ediție critică, note, bibliografie și glosar de Floarea Fugariu. Introducere de Dumitru Ghișe și Pompiliu Teodor, Editura Minerva, București, 1983.
- Tanașoca, Nicolae-Șerban, *Aperçus of the History of Balkan Romanity*, in Răzvan Theodorescu and L.C. Barrows (eds.), *Politics and Culture in Southeastern Europe* (UNESCO-CEPES) (Series *Studies on Science and Culture*), no publisher, Bucharest, 2001, pp. 97-111.