

MINORITY V EURÓPE I.

výskum, dokumentácia, prezentácia, revitalizácia

zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie

Zostavovatelia:

Leoš Šatava

Martin Priečko



Vydavateľstvo - Editura

Ivan Krasko

Nadlak, 2019

Zostavovatelia: prof. PhDr. Leoš ŠATAVA, CSc.
PhDr. Martin PRIEČKO, PhD.

Recenzenti: doc. Mgr. Katarína SLOBODOVÁ NOVÁKOVÁ, PhD.
doc. PhDr. Katarína KOŠTIALOVÁ, PhD.

Preklady: Mgr. Lukáš KURAJDA

Za vydavateľa: Ivan Miroslav AMBRUŠ

Zodpovedný redaktor vydania: Ivan Miroslav AMBRUŠ

Počítačová úprava a zalamovanie: Ján ŠUŠLÁK

Návrh obálky: PhDr. Martin PRIEČKO, PhD.

Za jazykovú úroveň príspevkov zodpovedajú autori.

Vydavateľ:

Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko
ul. Independenței č. 36, 315500 NĂDLAC, župa Arad, România

Tlač:

S.C. Carmel Print & Design S.R.L. ARAD

Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României
Minority v Európe : výskum, dokumentácia, prezentácia, revitali-
zácia : zborník príspevkov z medzinárodnej vedeckej konferencie.

- Nădlac : Vydavateľstvo - Editura Ivan Krasko, 2019

2 vol.

ISBN 978-973-107-151-0

Vol. 1 / zostavovatelia: Leoš Šatava, Martin Priečko. - 2019. -

Conține bibliografie. - ISBN 978-973-107-152-7

I. Šatava, Leoš (ed.)

II. Priečko, Martin (ed.)

323.1

© Vydavateľstvo Ivan Krasko, 2019

ISBN: 978-973-107-151-0

Minorities in Europe

Research, Documentation, Presentation, Revitalization
Conference Almanac

Editors: Leoš Šatava, Martin Priečko

Reviewers: Katarína Slobodová Nováková, Katarína Košťal'ová

English Language Editor: Lukáš Kurajda

Vyšlo s podporou Agentúry na podporu výskumu a vývoja SR v rámci riešenia projektu APVV-15-0360: Rozmery revitalizácie etnickej minority na Slovensku: Interdisciplinárny záchranný výskum u zanikajúcej etnickej skupiny Huncokárov (2016-2020).



AGENTÚRA
NA PODPORU
VÝSKUMU A VÝVOJA



PROJEKT
HUNCOKÁRI



KATEDRA
ETNOLÓGIE
A MINOEURÓPSKÝCH
ŠTÚDIÍ

THE AROMANIAN ETHNIC COMMUNITY IN THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA: ETHNOGRAPHIC AND ETHNOLINGUISTIC CHARACTERISTICS

Joana HADŽI-LEGA HRISTOSKA -
Davorin TRPESKI

The paper presents the ethnolinguistic and cultural characteristics of one of the smallest ethnicities in the Republic of Macedonia, the Aromanians. Linguistically, this ethnicity belongs to the eastern Romance group. In the past, the community was concentrated in several relatively larger areas in the southwestern part of the Balkans, primarily in today's Greece and Albania. Later, the social and political developments led to the fragmentation of this community into several smaller compact oases in the region, including in the Republic of Macedonia today. The paper covers the major ethnographic traits of this ethnic community, with particular reference to the theories related to its creation and its cultural and social evolution in a specific Balkan context. We pay particular attention to the development of Aromanian language through time, to the attempts for its standardization, and to the significant scientific and research activity aimed at providing its detailed description of all language levels and thus contributing to the struggle for its preservation.

Keywords: Aromanians, Balkans, ethnolinguistics, ethnography, Republic of Macedonia

I Introduction

“My language is my homeland.” – Fernando Pessoa

A dark prediction expressed by Tache Papahagi, a native Aromanian and a prominent researcher of the language and culture of this small Balkan nation:

“The twentieth century will be the century of the disappearance of the Aromanians, (...) it shall be a linguistic death caused by the nature of the circumstances imposed by historical events.” (PAPAHAGI [1963] 2013:5)

Petar Atanasov, a specialist in Megleno-Romanian, shares the same view:

“Aromanians and their language will disappear in the near future because they do not have education in their own language and they perceive the world through a filter, mediated by the official language of their country of residence. Their language is used almost exclusively within the circle of the family circle, while young generations do not speak it because of the domination of the official language and mixed marriages.” (CAPIDAN [1937] 2004:3)

The question of the survival of a minority group is closely related to the issue of identity and language. If we define identity as the awareness of belonging to a group that has its own language, its history and its cultural and civilizational benefits, its loss leads inevitably to the disappearance of that group. Namely, this might result in its dissolving into the surrounding cultural-language setting. The identity - language relation is reciprocal and the loss of one item implies the loss of the other one.

When it comes to the Aromanian people, the question immediately arises about the reasons underlying its gradual disappearance. This is, in fact, the key issue that appears in all the works devoted to the Aromanians and their language.

II But who are the Aromanians?

Aromanians are a small Balkan community, representative of the eastern Romance language group. It is spoken today in several Balkan countries (Republic of Macedonia, Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania) where it has a different status, but the Aromanians are officially recognized as a minority only in Macedonia¹ and recently in Albania. Its use mainly in the family sphere has contributed to a large extent to the gradual decrease in the number of its speakers.

1. Different names given to this small community

The ethnonym *Aromanian* (arom. *Armân*) comes from the Latin etymon *romanus*, used by the Aromanians themselves. Its first mention in scientific literature was made by Gustav Weigand (1895). Many languages, like Macedonian, use the the exonym *Vlah* (< celt. *Volcae*, germ. *Walha*, *Wlach*, *Welsch*). In the Middle Ages this term designated a Romance-speaking population in general (especially nomadic stockbreeders and shepherds, sometimes even with a different, non-Latin origin). Friedman (2001:1) stresses the confusion concerning the reference of this ethnonym used by different sources and at different periods of time, resulting in designating populations inhabiting various parts of the Balkan Peninsula.

There are also several exonyms attributed to Aromanians by the neighboring populations according to some linguistic or territorial features: Koutsovlahi, Karavlahi, Beli Vlasi, Rëmëri, Ciobani, Cincari.

Regarding the fact that the Aromanian population belongs to several branches, there are also names related to their origin: Gramustians, Pindeans, Faršerots (that encompass also the group of Muzachiars), Moscopolitans (BARDU 2014:127).

¹Friedman (2001: 8) notes the irony that Macedonian Aromanians have the highest degree of linguistic rights in the country where they are least numerous and constitute the smallest minority.

2. Romance idioms spoken in the Balkans

Aromanian is one of the four Romance idioms (according to some linguists, dialects of Romanian language) that represent a continuation of the Latin language spoken in the eastern part of the Roman Empire (SARAMANDU 2008a:167): Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian.

Daco-Romanian (approximately 27 million native speakers) is spoken north of the Danube: in Romania, the Republic of Moldova and the surrounding countries, and it represents the base of the standard Romanian language (SARAMANDU 2008a:167-168).

Megleno-Romanians represent an ethnographic isle formed by several villages in northern Greece, one village in southern Macedonia (Huma), Turkey (after the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey in the 1920's) and Romania (the region of Dobrudja). Their number is estimated to be around 5.000 speakers. It is a particular idiom that shows a significant number of Slavic loanwords.

Istro-Romanian is spoken on the peninsula of Istria (Croatia, on both sides of mount Učka). There are 300 native speakers of this idiom and 1.100 users as a second language (PAUL – SIMONS – FENNIG).

The exact number of the Aromanian population is almost impossible to determine (FRIEDMAN 2001: 5-8). The official censuses provide some data, but Aromanian speakers live in different states and, often, they do not declare themselves as such (or they do not exist as a separate census category), so this data is not completely relevant and does not reflect the real demographic situation. However, the total number of the Aromanian population can be estimated to about 300.000 – 350.000 speakers (CAPIDAN [1932] 2001). As for the Aromanian presence in the Balkan countries separately, the estimations are as following:

- Greece – not more than 300.000 speakers and around 100.000 fluent speakers (KAHL 2002: 153; CAPIDAN [1932] 2001);
- Albania – 100.000 (KAHL 2002:156);
- Bulgaria – only 3.000 because of the mass exodus of this population to Romania in the period 1923-1940 (KAHL 2002: 160, according to Rakšieva (1994));
- Serbia – only 243 Aromanians according the 2011 census; Saramandu (2008:168) mentions only isolated communities;
- Romania – 25.053 declaring themselves as Aromanians during the 2002 census (KAHL 2002:162) and 50.000 – 70.000 according to Saramandu (2008:168).

The results of the last census showed that in 2002 in the Republic of Macedonia there were 9.695 Aromanian speakers. This is an increase compared to the previous censuses, but it also represents an important

reduction compared to 1900 census (30.000 speakers). Kahl (2008:158) considers that the estimates can go up to 25.000 speakers, including those that understand the language without speaking it.

The Aromanian has several dialects with particular linguistic features, but there are also specific elements related to the way this population dressed in the past, its music, customs, occupations (SARAMANDU 2008: 179). According to Marković (2011:123) and based on Weigand and Capidan's works, the main division of the Aromanian dialects is as follows:

1. northern dialects (those from Gramos, Molovište and Gopeš and the particular group of Farsherots)

2. southern dialects (those from the Pindus, including the dialect of the Aromanians from Olympus).

3. Theories about the origin of the Aromanians

The status of the Aromanian is complicated and still not well defined in the Balkan linguistic landscape. The scientific dilemma is focused around the question whether it is a dialect of the Romanian language or a separate Romance language. The opinion of scientists is divided, considering the extremely complex historical and linguistic evolution of the Balkan region. At a first glimpse, it is a historical issue, but it also concerns the question of language and identity (FRIEDMAN 2001:8).

There are several theories that can generally be divided into two groups that stand for two different points of view: a linguistic and a historical perspective.

3.1. Linguistic point of view

Representatives of the first group consider that Aromanian (together with Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian) is a historical and a divergent Romanian dialect. Capidan, for instance, claims that the Daco-Romanians formed north of the Danube, while the other three branches did so south of the Danube (on the territory of the ancient Upper and Lower Moesia). With the arrival of the Slavs, they were separated from the common core and retreated to the southern part of the Balkan Peninsula (Greece, Albania and Macedonia) (CAPIDAN [1937] 2004:7). It is possible that the separation of the Aromanians occurred before the 10th century, while the Megleno-Romanians settled Meglen in the 12th century.

This affirmation is based on the study of the influence of the Balkan languages on the "proto-Romanian" before and after the separation of these idioms. The analysis of language facts indicates that Latin evolved in the same way in all of them and there is a presence of identical elements in all four idioms. That proves that influences have taken place prior to the division of the population. The situation is the same with the

foreign borrowings: there are identical words in Aromanian, Romanian and Albanian, coming from the same Thraco-Illyrian basis, but also from ancient Greek and Old Slavic words that entered the language prior to the division of the population.

3.2. Historical point of view

At the same time, another group of researchers, mostly historians, defends the stand that the Aromanian is an autonomous Romance language. Capidan relates the historian Thunmann's point of view according to which Aromanians developed on the Balkan Peninsula as descendants of the Romanized indigenous Thraco-Illyrian population, without any connection with the Romanians north of the Danube (CAPIDAN [1937] 2004:29).

Friedman (2001:3) considers that the Aromanians are descendants of Romans and Romanized indigenous population in the south of the Balkans who, with the arrival of the Slavs, retreated to the mountains and became pastoralists. However, he doesn't reject the hypothesis of an eastern Balkan Romance unity both north and south of the Danube that was broken up sometime between the Slavic invasion and the first textual references to Aromanians in Byzantine sources (11th century). Regarding the fact that the origin of the Aromanians is an issue implicated in various claims to legitimacy, Friedman stresses the need for new sources that would enlighten this scientific dilemma.

4. Elements of language

4.1. Alphabet and standardization

As we already explained above, the Aromanian is a set of dialects which, despite some attempts for standardization, are still not unified. Its use in the family sphere made impossible its institutionalization and standardization (KAHL 2008:134). The various written documents (newspapers, magazines, collections of poems, translations, dictionaries) use rather varied graphic and lexical elements, reflecting the author's origins or the standards proposed by the linguists.

Saramandu (2003b:83) explains that the first Aromanian documents are written in the Greek alphabet. The same alphabet was used in the works of the first Aromanian writers from Moscopole (alb. Voskopojë) (Constantin Ucuta², Theodor Anastasie Cavallioti³, Daniil Moscopoleanu⁴), as well

²In *Νέα Παιδαγωγία* (New Pedagogy), Vienna, 1797, the first children's reading book in Aromanian, Ucuta proposes a system of writing with the Greek alphabet, as well as an equivalence with the Latin alphabet.

³*Πρωτοπείρια* (The first teaching), a school textbook including a trilingual lexicon of 1170 Greek, Aromanian and Albanian words, published by Thunmann in 1774.

⁴*Εισαγωγική διδασκαλία* (Introductory teachings), with a four-language dictionary (Greek, Albanian, Aromanian and Bulgarian), published by William Martin-Leake in 1794.

as in the first religious texts of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. The authors of those works did not have a predefined system of writing and some of them propose a system that appears the most convenient to them. These works are very important not only from the point of view of their alphabet: they represent, at the same time, the first books intended for teaching and learning Aromanian.

In his grammar, Mihail G. Boiagi⁵ introduces the first writing system with the Latin alphabet, including explanations of Aromanian examples in Greek and German. The author proposes a combination of graphemes for the Aromanian phonemes that don't exist in Latin, avoiding diacritical signs (SARAMANDU 2003b:83-84). Boiagi's system was later abandoned, but the Latin alphabet continued to be used in the second half of the 19th century.

As Saramandu (2003b:84) indicates, a fixed writing system with the Latin alphabet, but based on Romanian orthography, was later proposed by Tache Papahagi in *Antologie aromânească* and in *Dicționarul dialectului aromân*⁶. This system has been followed (with minor changes) by Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu in her *Dicționar aromân (macedo-vlah)*, *DÎ-AR07*.

Around 1980, a new movement of Aromanian national consciousness began to arise. It was based on the evidence that there is no standard way of writing and there are technical difficulties when publishing texts with characters using diacritical signs (CUNIA). Therefore, a symposium was held in August 24-31 1997 in Bitola, aiming at standardization of the Aromanian writing. Linguists, journalists and writers from Albania, Bulgaria, Serbia, Romania, USA and the Republic of Macedonia discussed the rules of writing and pronunciation of Aromanian and decided to recommend the use of digraphs replacing the letters with diacritics. The decisions were reached by consensus and published in "Rivista di Litiratură shi Studii Armăni" (October 1997). Still, this action didn't resolve the writing issue since heterogeneity is still present in the Aromanian texts.

⁵*Romanische oder Macedonowlachische Sprachlehre* (Romanian or Macedo-Romanian grammar), Vienna, 1813.

⁶*Antologie aromânească* (Aromanian anthology), Bucarest, 1922; *Dicționarul dialectului aromân* (Dictionary of the Aromanian dialect), Bucarest, 1963, 2013.

⁷*Dicționar aromân (macedo-vlah)* (Aromanian dictionary), DIARO, Bucarest, 1997.

SISTEME DE SCRIBERE A ROMÂNIEI						
Sistemul ALR	Beiași (1811)	„Zborla a nouă” (1996)	T. Papadogi (1992; 1993)	DIARŌ (1997)	Scriptura acronimică tradițională	Ortografia românească actuală
VOCALE						
ā	ā	ā	ā	ā	ā	ā
ī ā	ī	ū	ī, ā	ī, ū	ī, ū	ī, ā
CONSONANE						
c	c [+ C, V*** (în afara de e, i)]	c [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	c [+ C, V (în afara de e, i, ū)]	c [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	c [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	c [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]
g	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i, ū)]	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	g [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]
k	k [+ e, i]	che, chi	k [+ e, i, ū]	che, chi	che, chi	che, chi
g̃	g̃	ghe, ghi	g̃ [+ e, i, ū]	ghe, ghi	ghe, ghi	ghe, ghi
č	es	es, ci	če, či, čī	ce, ci	ce, ci	ce, ci
g̃	j	ge, gi	g̃e, g̃i, g̃ī	ge, gi	ge, gi	ge, gi
t	t	ts	t	t	t	t
d̃	z	dz	d̃z	d	dz	-
s	sh	sh	s	s	s	s
j	j	j	j	j	j	j
y	g̃	y [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	y [+ C, V (în afara de e, i, ū)]	y [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	gh [+ C, V (în afara de e, i)]	-
ỹ	j	ỹ [+ e, i]	ỹ [+ e, i, ū]	ỹ [+ e, i]	q̃, ṽ [+ e, i]	-
f	f̃	f̃	f̃	f̃	f̃	-
θ	m̃	m̃	θ	θ	θ	-
θ̃	ch	ch	θ̃	θ̃	θ̃	-
θ̃	ch	ch	θ̃	θ̃	θ̃	-
SEMICONSONANE						
ī	j	i	ī	i	i	i
ū	ā	u	ū	u	u	u

4.2. The specificities of the Aromanian

Aromanian linguistic system and its regional particularities are rather well described by different scholars and researchers. There are, of course, some new moments to be studied, especially in the field of the lexicon related to the sociocultural evolution of the countries where this idiom is spoken today.

Capidan ([1937] 2004:40-41, 48) makes a very detailed analysis of Aromanian's linguistic characteristics that separate it clearly from the western Romance languages (and, according to him, proves its common origin with the Romanian language). We will mention only the most important features, providing comparisons with the equivalent forms in several Romance languages in order to demonstrate the difference:

1. the conservation of the short Latin ū:

lat. *lūpus* > arom. *lup*

2. post-positive article:

arom. *omul* / fr. *l'homme*, it. *l'uomo*, sp. *el hombre*

3. contraction of the genitive and the dative in one case
4. pronominal reduplication (of the definite direct object):
arom. *u ved **dada mea*** / fr. *je vois ma mère*, it. *vedo mia madre*, sp. *veo a mi madre*
5. loss of infinitive and its substitution with a dependent clause:
arom. *voi **să zburăscu*** / fr. *je veux parler*, it. *voglio parlare*, sp. *quiero hablar*
6. future tense with the auxiliary *volere* instead of *habere*:
arom. ***va s-măc*** / fr. *je mangerai*, it. *mangerò*, sp. *comeré*

Most of these features appear in the languages that create the so called Balkan linguistic union encompassing Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian and, in some cases, Serbian dialects from the south. Since the region of the Balkans represents an impressive mix of peoples and languages, both in their origin and in their traditions and realities, their tumultuous and very complex history forced all these peoples to live together and share a common destiny. This very close contact over the centuries has resulted in the creation of a heteroclitic and united linguistic community whose languages, representing the four branches of the Indo-European family, share very similar linguistic behaviors, at the phonetic, morphosyntactic and especially the lexical level. We will not tackle here the different theories, summarized in the work by Saramandu (2008c: 226-242), which try to explain the origin of these concordances.

We should also mention that in the past, there was a strong foreign lexical influence on the Aromanian by the Greek, Turkish, Slavic and Albanian languages (CAPIDAN [1932] 2001:225-226). All these languages were superior languages to the Aromanian and had greater social importance and extent of usage in different contexts (SALA 1997:34). This influence led to vanishing of some ancient Latin forms and their substitution with loanwords.

Currently, the Aromanian lexicon is influenced by the official language spoken in the region inhabited by Aromanians. The inevitable adaptation of lexical resources to social changes deepens even more the differences between the Aromanian dialects (Atanasov 2002:306). Nonetheless, the language contact and mutual influences happen also in the opposite direction: some morphosyntactic and lexical elements in the dominant languages, such as Macedonian, are the result of Aromanian influence (NASTEV 1988a:53-60; NASTEV 1988b:65-72).

5. Elements of culture

The discussion about the causes of the gradual loss of the Aromanian people as a whole places this reflection in a diachronic perspective

(ATANASOV 1996). The sociocultural context in which this population has evolved can provide us with elements contributing to the answer to the question of their survival.

5.1. Occupation

In the past, Aromanians led mainly a cattle breeding, nomadic life. They also dealt with transport of goods throughout the Balkans (Trieste and Venice, Vienna and Pest, Constantinople), that was an extremely powerful civilization factor (ATANASOV 1996) for it opened the path to trade, not only across the entire Balkan Peninsula, but also in many countries of Europe, Africa and Asia Minor.

5.2. Cultural past

Aromanians' cultural past can be divided in three historical periods (ATANASOV 1996).

I period (10th – 18th century): there are no real written documents from this period, only isolated words inserted in Greek, Turkish or Slavic texts.

II period (18th century): documents written in the Greek alphabet. The oldest record of Aromanian language is an inscription of the hieromonk Nectarie Tărbu on an icon found in Albania (1731) (SARAMANDU 2003b:83). In this document, the Aromanian text is given alongside the texts in Greek, Albanian and Latin.

This period is marked by a strong Greek influence, realized through schools and the church.

From the end of the 16th century, foreign travel writers, like Pouqueville, write about several cities that had become prestigious economic and cultural Balkan centers (CAPIDAN [1937] 2004:73-85). One of them is the city of Moscopole (today situated in Albania), whose development reflects the cultural movement for awakening of the national consciousness. The golden era of this city, the largest one in the southern part of the Balkan Peninsula (60.000 inhabitants), was between the 16th and 18th centuries. It had 27 churches, the only Academy (higher education in Greek) in the Ottoman Empire and the first printing press in the Balkans (1740) (CAPIDAN [1937] 2004:73-85). Its intellectual elite maintained close ties with several foreign cultural centers and made great contribution to strengthening of the national awareness of Aromanians. They did so by writing textbooks and dictionaries meant for the education process in order to replace the Greek language that had been used up to that time (Ucuta, Cavallioti, Moscopoleanul).

The wars and plunders of the city in the 17th and 18th centuries stopped the development of cultural awareness. Many intellectuals left the city and went to Austria-Hungary and other cultural centers, where they continued their activities.

III modern period (from the 19th century): this is not only the period when the Latin alphabet was used (as explained before), but also the period of creation of important scientific literature (artistic, didactic, publicist, original, as well as translations). From this period, we can list the names of relevant authors, such as Nicolescu, Belimache, Murnu, Tului, Batzaria, Beza. Furthermore, different studies related to folklore collections had also been published at this period (Gustav Weigand, Pericle Papahagi).

In spite of their small number, eminent historical personalities with Aromanian origin (philanthropists, politicians, artists) made great contributions in many areas of the social and cultural life in the Balkans and in Europe.

6. Significant works and researchers

The Aromanian language and civilization have been the subject of many field researches and scientific works. It is especially pleasing that this interest is also occurring on other continents, with scientists who did not have immediate contact with this idiom.

Particularly important for an exhaustive linguistic study is the point of view of linguistic geography. Linguistic atlases note in a very detailed form the particularities of languages and give arguments in building theories. Saramandu (2003:71-76) underlines the necessity of studying Aromanian, especially through collecting dialectal material (based on a pre-made questionnaire). The main goal is to create an atlas based on a questionnaire conducted in all the territories inhabited by this people (insufficiently utilized until now). He gives an overview on this type of field research related to Aromanian dialects.

Gustav Weigand was the first scholar to study Aromanian using dialectal materials (despite the fact he did not create an atlas). There were also other linguists (Pericle Papahagi, Theodor Capidan, Tache Papahagi) that worked on collections of texts, lexicographical works, dialectal studies, researches of descriptive and historical grammar. This work contributed in building the scientific knowledge about Aromanian.

The first concrete works of linguistic geography appeared before the Second World War, starting with the *Atlasul lingvistic român (ALR)* by the authors Sever Pop and Theodor Capidan based on the research among Aromanians from Dobrudja. Later, Dahmen and Kramer published the first atlas of Aromanian⁸. It was followed by the works of Petre Neiescu⁹

⁸*Aromunischer Sprachatlas. Atlasul lingvistic aromân (ALiA)*, Hamburg, 1985, 1994.

⁹*Micul atlas al dialectului aromân din Albania și din fosta Republică Iugoslavă Macedonia*, Bucurest, 1997.

and Nicolae Saramandu (editor: Manuela Nevaci)¹⁰, author of the most complete and detailed geolinguistic study of the Aromanian.

Megleno-Romanian¹¹ and Istro-Romanian¹² have also been the subject of linguistic atlases. These very important scientific works give not only a detailed view of the linguistic facts in these idioms, but also allow researchers to establish the intensity of their contacts with the surrounding languages (SARAMANDU - NEVACI 2008:190).

III As a conclusion

Fortunately, Papahagi's prediction given in the introduction to this article is still a hypothesis. However, the Aromanian-speaking population and its language are in a constant decrease. Numerous extra-linguistic factors are the cause of this: mixed marriages, collectivization, collapse of the individual economy and community dependence, same religion with the dominant population. Aromanian language is not used in a professional context, which leads to its stagnation and subordination in the situation of bilingualism with the official language of the respective country¹³.

The name that is often attributed to the members of this community, "chameleons of the Balkans", reflects well the Aromanians' tendency to adapt their ethnic identity to the geopolitical and social situation of the moment (ŠATAVA 2013:6). Wherever they live, they establish and maintain good cooperation with the members of all other ethnic groups, a relation that is based on constructiveness and respect, and make significant contributions to the economic, social and cultural life in their homeland.

Despite numerous efforts deployed in the Republic of Macedonia for the revitalization of this minority group (social and language rights, elective classes in Aromanian, TV and radio broadcast, participation in the political processes), the effects are not very encouraging. We agree with Liaku-Anovska (2000:332) who considers that the Aromanian family is the most important transmitter of the tradition and keeper of the mother tongue. However, the extremely reduced use of Aromanian in the modern family and the weakening of the consciousness of belonging to a particular ethnic community will eventually lead to the disappearance of this Balkan community and its language.

¹⁰*Atlasul lingvistic al dialectului aromân*, Bucurest, 2014.

¹¹Beate Wild: *Meglenorömânischer Sprachatlas*, Hamburg, 1983; Petar Atanasov : *Atlas lingvistic meglenoromân* (Dictionnaire meglenoroumain général et étymologique), Bucurest, 2008, 2013, 2015.

¹²Radu Flora: *Micul Atlas lingvistic al graiurilor istroromâne (MALGI)*, Bucurest, 2003; Goran Filipi: *Atlasul lingvistic istroromân*, Pula, 2002, 2004.

¹³For detailed analysis of the actual situation related to Aromanian as an endangered language, see the work of Thede Kahl (2008).

Literature

- ATANASOV, Petar (1996): Vlasi: minato i segašnost. In *Jazicite na počvata na Makedonija, kniga 3*, MANU, Skopje, pp. 187-197.
- ATANASOV, Petar (2002): *Meglenoromâna astăzi*. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- BARDU, Nistor (2014): Nouvelles considérations sur certains ethnonymes des Aroumains des Balkans. In *Romanistika i balkanistika*, Zbornik na trudovi vo čest na prof. d-r Petar Atanasov po povod 75 godini od životot, Univerzitet « Sv. Kiril i Metodij » - Skopje, Filološki fakultet « Blaže Koneski » - Skopje, pp.125-133.
- CAPIDAN, Theodor ([1932] 2001): *Aromânii. Dialectul aromân. Studiu lingvistic*. Craiova: Fundația "Scrisul Românesc".
- CAPIDAN, Theodor ([1937] 2004): *Makedo-Romancite. Istoriska i opisna skica na romanskite naselenija na Balkanskiot Poluoostrov*, (Les Macédo-Roumains: esquisse historique et descriptive des populations roumaines de la péninsule balkanique). Skopje: Jugoreklam.
- CUNIA, Tiberius: On the standardization of the Aromanian system of writing (the Bituli-Macedonia symposium of August 1997). Online version: http://www.farsaroutul.org/nl23_3.htm.
- FRIEDMAN, A. Victor (2001): The Vlah minority in Macedonia: language, identity, dialectology, and standardization. In Juhani Nuoluoto, Martii Leiwo, Jussi Halla-aho (ed.): *Selected papers in Slavic, Balkan, and Balkan studies*, (Slavica Helsingiensia 21). Helsinki: University of Helsinki, pp. 26-50.
- KAHL, Thede (2002): The ethnicity of Aromanians after 1990: the identity of a minority that behaves like a majority. In *Ethnologia Balkanica*, vol. 6, pp. 145-169.
- KAHL, Thede (2008): Does the Aromanian have a chance of survival? Some thoughts about the loss of language and language preservation. In Biljana Sikimić, Ašić, Tijana (ed.): *The Romance Balkans*. Srpska Akademija nauka i umetnosti, Balkanološki institut, posebna izdanja 103, pp. 123-140.
- LIAKU-ANOVSKA, Kleanti (2000): *Socijalno-folklorni interakcii vo vlaškoto semejstvo*. Skopje: Institut za folklor "Marko Cepenkov" – Skopje.
- MARKOVIĆ, Marjan (2011): Konstrukcii so 'esse' i 'habere' vo aromanskiot. In Zbornik "Perifrastični konstrukcii so 'esse' i 'habere' vo slovenskite i vo balkanskite jazici", Morfosintaksički studii 2, Istraživački centar za arealna lingvistika, MANU, Skopje, pp. 123-145.
- NAŠTEV, Božidar (1988a): Aromanskite elementi vo makedonskiot jazik. In *Aromanski studii*. Skopje: Ogledalo, pp. 53-60.
- NAŠTEV, Božidar (1988b): Kontakti megu makedonskiot i aromanskiot jazik. In *Aromanski studii*. Skopje: Ogledalo, pp. 65-72.
- PAPAHAGI, Tache ([1963] 2013): *Dicționarul dialectului aromân. General și etimologic*. București: Editura Academiei Române.
- PAUL M., Lewis, SIMONS F., Gary, FENNIG D., Charles (eds.) (2015): *Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Eighteenth edition*. Dallas, Texas: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- RAKŠIEVA, Svetla (1994): *Razprostraenie i broj na armănite v Bălgarija*. Sofia (unpubl.).
- SALA, Marius (1997): *Limbi în contact*. București: Editură enciclopedică.
- SARAMANDU, Nicolae (2003a): Atlasul lingvistic aroman (Alia). Proiect. In *Studii aromâne și meglenoromâne*. Constanța: Ex Ponto, pp. 71-76.

- SARAMANDU, Nicolae (2003b): Sisteme de scriere a aromânei. In *Studii aromâne și meglenoromâne*. Constanța: Ex Ponto, pp. 83-88.
- SARAMANDU, Nicolae (2008a): Les dialectes roumains au nord et au sud du Danube. In *La romanité orientale*. București: Editura Academiei Române, pp. 167-178.
- SARAMANDU, Nicolae (2008b): La romanité sud-danubienne aujourd'hui. In *La romanité orientale*. București: Editura Academiei Române, pp. 179-189.
- SARAMANDU, Nicolae (2008c): L'étude typologique des langues balkaniques. In *La romanité orientale* București: Editura Academiei Române, pp. 226-242.
- SARAMANDU, Nicolae, NEVACI, Manuela (2008): The south-Danubian Romanian dialects from the spatial perspective. In *La romanité orientale*. București: Editura Academiei Române, pp. 190-205.
- ŠATAVA, Leoš (2013): The ethnolinguistic situation of the Aromanians (Vlachs) in Macedonia: young people in Kruševo as indicators of ethnic identity and attitude to the language. In *Treatises and documents journal of ethnic studies* (Razprave in gradivo revija za narodnostna vprašanja), 71, pp. 5–26.
- WEIGAND, Gustav (1894, 1895): *Die Aromunen. Ethnographisch-philologisch-historische Untersuchungen über das Volk der sogenannten Makedo-Romanen oder Zinzaren*, I-II, Leipzig.

ZOZNAM AUTOROV PRÍSPEVKOV • LIST OF AUTHORS

PhDr. Andrea Baranovská, PhD.

Katedra psychológie, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave

andrea.baranovska@ucm.sk

PaedDr. Silvia Barnová, PhD.

Vysoká škola Dubnický technologický inštitút v Dubnici nad Váhom

barnova@dti.sk

Mgr. Matej Beránek, PhD.

Múzeum holokaustu, Slovenské národné múzeum – Múzeum židovskej kultúry v Seredi

matej.beranek@snm.sk

prof. PhDr. Ján Botík, DrSc.

emeritný profesor

janobotik@gmail.com

prof. PaedDr. Ján Danek, CSc.

Katedra pedagogiky, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave

jan.danek@ucm.sk

Mgr. Adriana Daneková

Múzeum kultúry Rómov na Slovensku, Slovenské národné múzeum v Martine

adriana.danekova@snm.sk

PhDr. Dominika Doktorová, PhD.

Katedra psychológie FF UCM, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave

dominika.doktorova@ucm.sk

prof. Joana Hadzi-Lega Hristoska, PhD.

Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje

joana_77_99@yahoo.com

Mgr. Štefan Izák, PhD.

Katedra etnológie a mimoeurópskych štúdií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave

stefan.izak@gmail.com

Mgr. Terézia Kopčíková

Katedra etnológie a mimoeurópskych štúdií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
t.kopcikova@gmail.com

PhDr. PaedDr. Slávka Krásna, PhD.

Vysoká škola Dubnický technologický inštitút v Dubnici nad Váhom
hlasna@dti.sk

prof. doc. PhDr. Ladislav Lenovský, PhD.

Katedra etnológie a mimoeurópskych štúdií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
ladislav.lenovsky@ucm.sk

Mgr. Veronika Michvocíková, PhD.

Katedra pedagogiky, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
veronika.michvocikova@ucm.sk

Mgr. Pavel Miškařík, PhD.

Katedra etnológie a mimoeurópskych štúdií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
p.miskarik@gmail.com

doc. Mgr. Mariana Sirotová, PhD.

Katedra pedagogiky, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
mariana.sirotova@ucm.sk

Mgr. Andrej Solár

Múzeum kultúry Chorvátov na Slovensku, Slovenské národné múzeum v Bratislave
andrej.solar@snm.sk

prof. PhDr. Leoš Šatava, CSc.

Katedra etnológie a mimoeurópskych štúdií, Filozofická fakulta Univerzity sv. Cyrila a Metoda v Trnave
lsatava@tiscali.cz

prof. Davorin Trpeski, PhD.

Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje
davorin777@gmail.com

doc. PhDr. Miroslav Válka, PhD.

Ústav evropské etnologie, Filozofická fakulta Masarykova univerzita v
Brně

valka@phil.muni.cz

Mgr. Beáta Zámečnicková

Múzeum kultúry Chorvátov na Slovensku, Slovenské národné múzeum
v Bratislave

beata.zamecnikova@snm.sk

OBSAH • CONTENTS

Úvod (Leoš ŠATAVA) <i>EDITORIAL</i>	7
Vzdelávanie maďarskej menšiny v období po vzniku Československej republiky (Silvia BARNOVÁ – Slávka KRÁSNA) <i>EDUCATION OF HUNGARIAN MINORITY IN THE PERIOD AFTER ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC</i> <i>ŽIDIA V PROPAGANDE SLOVENSKEHO ŠTÁTU</i>	9
Protižidovská propaganda v dobovej tlači (Matej BERÁNEK) <i>JEWS IN THE PROPAGANDA OF THE SLOVAK STATE. ANTI-JEWISH PROPAGANDA IN SLOVAK PERIODICALS</i>	15
Procesuálnosť v minoritách enklávneho a diasporálneho typu (Ján BOTÍK) <i>PROCESSUALITY IN MINORITIES OF THE ENCLAVIC AND DIASPORIC TYPE</i>	29
Multikultúrna výchova a vzdelávanie ako súčasti dynamiky a kultúry života spoločnosti (Ján DANEK) <i>MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND EDUCATION AS A PART OF THE DYNAMICS AND CULTURAL LIFE OF A SOCIETY</i>	39
Vybrané otázky dokumentácie dejín, kultúry a jazyka rómskej národnostnej menšiny na slovensku múzejnými prostriedkami v súčasnosti (Adriana DANEKOVÁ) <i>SELECTED QUESTIONS ON DOCUMENTATION OF HISTORY, CULTURE AND LANGUAGE OF ROMA MINORITY IN SLOVAKIA BY MEANS OF CONTEMPORARY MUSEUM TECHNIQUES</i>	51
Entwicklung emotionaler Intelligenz bei Kindern im Vorschulalter im Rahmen der multikulturellen Bildung und Erkennung der Abhängigkeit von der Ebene emotionaler Intelligenz des Lehrers, um Fremdenfeindlichkeit zu reduzieren (Dominika DOKTOROVÁ - Andrea BARANOVSKÁ) <i>DEVELOPMENT OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AMONG PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND DETECTING ITS DEPENDENCE ON THE LEVEL OF THE TEACHER'S EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE TO REDUCE XENOPHOBIA</i>	65

The Aromanian ethnic community in the Republic of Macedonia: ethnographic and ethnolinguistic characteristics (Joana HADŽI-LEGA HRISTOSKA – Davorin TRPESKI)	81
Podoby binárnych opozícií my a oni v prokremel'ských diskurzoch o migrácii (Štefan IŽÁK) <i>WE AND THEM. THE FORM OF BINARY OPPOSITIONS IN THE PRO-KREMLIN DISCOURSES ABOUT MIGRATION</i>	94
Prvá generácia kubáncov na slovensku: problémy identity (Terézia KOPČÍKOVÁ) <i>THE FIRST GENERATION OF CUBANS IN SLOVAKIA: IDENTITY ISSUES</i>	116
K etnokultúrnej diverzite, kontinuite a revitalizácii minorít (Ladislav LENOVSÝ) <i>ABOUT THE ETHNO-CULTURAL DIVERSITY, CONTINUITY AND REVITALIZATION OF MINORITIES</i>	131
Komunikatívna a kultúrna pamäť ako konštitutívny faktor identity menšín na príklade namíbijských Čechov (Pavel MIŠKAŘÍK) <i>COMMUNICATIVE AND CULTURAL MEMORY AS A CONSTITUTIVE FACTOR FOR IDENTITY OF MINORITIES ON EXAMPLE OF NAMIBIAN CZECHS</i>	152
Etnojazyková revitalizace – vize salonních vědců či reálný jev? (Leoš ŠATAVA) <i>ETHNOLINGUISTIC REVITALISATION – A CLOISTERED SCHOLARS' VISION OR A NATURAL PHENOMENON?</i>	163
Pohľad vysokoškolských študentov na multikultúrne vzdelávanie (Mariana SIROTOVÁ – Veronika MICHVOCÍKOVÁ) <i>MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN THE VIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY STUDENTS</i>	174
Minulost' a súčasnosť chorvátskej menšiny na Slovensku (Andrej SOLÁR – Beáta ZÁMEČNÍKOVÁ) <i>THE PAST AND THE PRESENT OF CROATIAN MINORITY IN SLOVAKIA</i>	184
The Aromanian ethnolinguistic and cultural community in the Republic of Macedonia: Anthropology of a small community losing its struggle in society (Davorin TRPESKI - Joana HADŽI-LEGA HRISTOSKA)	194

Moravian Croats – a Betrayed Nation. A history of a Minority in the Czech Republic (Miroslav VÁLKA)	202
Zoznam autorov príspevkov	
<i>LIST OF AUTHORS</i>	214