

Anna Oczko

Jagiellonian University  
anna.oczko@uj.edu.pl

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2591-3327>

## AROMANIAN AND ROMANIAN – A LEXICAL- ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS BASED ON TRANSLATIONS OF *THE LITTLE PRINCE* BY ANTOINE DE SAINT-EXUPÉRY

### ABSTRACT

The paper presents a comparative lexical-etymological analysis of Aromanian and Romanian based on translations of *The Little Prince* by Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. While Aromanian is traditionally classified as a dialect of Romanian, the analysis highlights significant lexical differences that have developed due to distinct historical, geopolitical, and socio-cultural influences. Romanian has been shaped by prolonged contact with Slavic languages, whereas Aromanian has been influenced primarily by Greek. The study examines Latin synonymy, and the role of borrowings, demonstrating that these languages have followed independent developmental paths despite their common Latin origin. The findings suggest that Aromanian functions as a distinct language contributing to the broader discussion on Balkan-Romance language classification.

**KEYWORDS:** Aromanian language, Aromanian etymology, Aromanian and Romanian comparison, language contact and borrowings, Balkan-Romance languages

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Within the group of Balkan-Romance languages, Aromanian is of particular interest due to its status, which remains the subject of scholarly debate (Trifon 2016, 2023; Oczko 2021). From a traditional linguistic perspective, it is considered one of the four dialects of Romanian, alongside Daco-Romanian – nowadays identified with Standard Romanian – Megleno-Romanian, and Istro-Romanian (Tagliavini 1977: 285; Saramandu, Nevaci 2013; Brâncuș 2005: 62). Matilda Caragiu-Marioțeanu, a Romanian linguist who devoted her academic career to studying this dialect, even describes it as a hypostasis – one of the forms – of the Proto-Romanian language: “Romanian and Aromanian are two hypostases of the same language – Proto-Romanian” (apud Trifon 2016).

Western European scholars, but not only them, are more likely to consider Aromanian a separate language (Dahmen 2025: 96-97; Metzeltin 2016: 38; Klimkowski 2021; Ungureanu 2024: 33), particularly in sociolinguistic terms, where language is understood as a social construct, produced through social interaction, learned, and transmitted from generation to generation (Rogalski 2011: 39). A large portion of existing research focuses on highlighting the common features linking these historical dialects.<sup>1</sup> However, there are relatively few studies dedicated to the differences resulting from the nearly thousand-year period during which Romanian and Aromanian developed independently in complete isolation.

Furthermore, Romanian studies tend to focus on historical-comparative dialectological analysis, often overlooking the modern, standardized form of Aromanian and its unique socio-cultural conditions. Meanwhile, foreign researchers argue that the traditional classification leads to contradictions:

According to this logic, one would have to assume that what is called Daco-Romanian, i.e., the national language spoken in Romania and the Republic of Moldova, is merely a dialect, even though it is used by 25 million people. Hence, it would fall into the same category as Istro-Romanian, which is currently spoken by only 500 people. Today, the idea of independent languages is gaining popularity (Dahmen, Kramer 2014: 314).

## 2. OBJECTIVE OF THE ARTICLE

The purpose of this analysis is to identify the lexical, etymological, and semantic differences between Aromanian and Romanian vocabulary based on translations of Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*, resulting from linguistic pragmatics, which examines the social and situational conditions of language use and the evolution of both languages. The analysis is based on translations of the first chapter of *The Little Prince* from French into Romanian, translated by Ileana Cantuniari in 2004, and into Aromanian, translated by Maria Bara and Thede Kahl in 2007.

### 2.1. TRANSLATIONS OF *THE LITTLE PRINCE*

*The Little Prince* has been translated into 28 Romance varieties. A comparative analysis of selected text passages across primary Romance languages reveals syntactic and

---

<sup>1</sup> Among others, Romulus Todoran conducts a comparative analysis of the vocabulary in the Romanian and Aromanian versions of Mihai Eminescu's mid-19th-century poem *Luceafărul / Luțiafirlu*. However, his conclusions primarily emphasize the significance of the Latin element in the text – 59.80% in Romanian and 53.17% in Aromanian, respectively. The Romanian text of that period contains relatively few words of Neo-Romanian origin – less than 3% – while the Aromanian text is entirely devoid of them. In the Romanian version, Slavic elements rank second, accounting for approximately 10% of the vocabulary, whereas in the Aromanian version, Greek elements occupy this position, making up nearly 14% (cf. Todoran 1985: 241, 243, 245).

morphological similarities among them (Escudé, Janin 2010: 68).<sup>2</sup> Therefore, selecting this text allows for an authentic comparison of vocabulary and structures in Romanian and Aromanian, both of which stem from translations of another Romance language. The original French text is simple, syntactically uncomplicated, and devoid of elaborate stylistic and literary forms, offering a linguistic sample close to its natural colloquial form.

Both translations were completed within a similar timeframe (separated by only three years), reflecting contemporary, standardized language usage in both cases.<sup>3</sup>

Ileana Cantuniari's translation is the second translation into Romanian: she adapted Benedict Corlaciuc's 1962 first translation to modern Romanian linguistic realities, making the story of *The Little Prince* more natural (Bartosiewicz 2012: 75), and the text is faithful to the French original not only semantically, but also grammatically. From the point of view of comparative analysis, it is significant that the translator makes use of the rich neo-Romanian vocabulary, while using simple syntactic constructions (Bartosiewicz 2012: 76).

Maria Bara and Thede Kahl's translation is among the first literary translations into Aromanian. It follows a similar strategy to Cantuniari's Romanian version. The Aromanian text also reflects contemporary linguistic norms, shaped by the influence of other Balkan languages, while still demonstrating significant syntactic and lexical similarities with Romanian. Notably absent are Romanianized forms that may have been borrowed from Romanian. However, it is unclear whether the translators deliberately chose vocabulary that diverges so significantly from the Romanian translation, which they were undoubtedly familiar with, even though it is noted by dictionaries, such as Aromanian *prints* instead of the title *amirârush*. However, we should bear in mind that both translators, Maria Bara and Thede Kahl, take the view that Aromanian is a language in its own right.

To facilitate the identification of lexical differences between the two texts, automated linguistic analysis tools such as Voyant Tools ([voyant-tools.org](http://voyant-tools.org)) and Sketch Engine ([sketchengine.eu](http://sketchengine.eu)) were employed. Additionally, parts of the vocabulary collation process were supported by Artificial Intelligence (ChatGPT).

### 3. LEXICAL ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATIONS OF *THE LITTLE PRINCE*

The translations of the title itself illustrate the fundamental differences between the two languages, as well as the distinct geopolitical conditions that influenced their later development.

---

<sup>2</sup> Escudé and Janin, in their comparative analysis, unfortunately, make several fundamental errors that need to be corrected here. First, when listing translations of *The Little Prince* into Romance languages, they failed to include Aromanian, instead classifying it as one of the "other European languages" alongside Albanian, Basque, and Celtic languages (Escudé, Janin 2010: 68). Additionally, in several instances, their analysis of Romanian excerpts is inaccurate. For example, the authors overlook the fact that the definite article in Romanian is postposed, and that the possessive pronoun, functioning as *complementul posesiv*, appears before the verb (74–75).

<sup>3</sup> Standardization of Aromanian writing was proposed in 1997 at the Symposium for Standardization of the Aromanian Writing System and adopted by the majority of Aromanian writers from North Macedonia, Serbia, Albania, Bulgaria and Romania (Cunia 2000).

## Aromanian Njiclu Amirărush – Romanian Micul Prinț

In both languages, the first element, an adjective in the articulated form (with a definite article), is inherited from the common Latin etymon *\*miccus*: ar. *njic*, rom. *mic*. Similarly, the definite masculine article ar. *-lu*, rom. *-ul* derives from the Latin demonstrative pronoun *illum*, both of which are characteristic of the Balkan-Romance language group. By contrast, in the Western Romance languages, the definite article is in apposition, e.g., French *le* < Latin *illum*, *petit* < Gallo-Latin *\*pit-*.

The second element, French *prince* < Latin *princeps*, is a later borrowing in these two languages. Neither the early medieval Romanian states nor the regions of Greece and Albania, where Aromanian developed, had an internationally recognized institution of “principality” (Romanian *principat*) or an official title of prince (Romanian *principe* / *prinț*), which was a feature of early Western European feudalism. The Aromanians themselves, as a pastoral and semi-nomadic community at the time, did not develop such organizational structures. In Romanian, the term *prinț* was borrowed from German *Printz* or Russian *princ*, first attested in 1787 (dlr1: prinț). Meanwhile, Aromanian *amirărush* originates from the Turkish *amir*, which entered Aromanian via Greek *ἀμύρας* (Papahagi 1974: 147).

## 3.1. THE MOST COMMON LEXEMES

The first chapter in both language versions contains a nearly identical number of words: 418 in Aromanian and 423 in Romanian. The results of the vocabulary study in terms of word frequency are as follows:

Romanian		Aromanian	
o (11)	definite article, feminine	s (19)	conjunction
			reflexive pronoun
despre (8)	preposition	shi (15)	conjunction, cf. rom. <i>și</i>
și (6)	conjunction, cf. ar. <i>shi</i>	di (14)	preposition, cf. rom. <i>de, din, de la, după,</i>
			conjunction, cf. rom. <i>dacă, ca</i>
			pronoun, cf. rom. <i>câte</i>
boa (6)	noun	ti (9)	preposition, cf. ar. <i>tră,</i> cf. rom. <i>pentru</i>
			pronoun, cf. ar. <i>tini</i>
numărul (5) desenul (5) mari (5) mai (5)	noun noun adjective adverb	tu (8)	preposition ar. <i>tru,</i> cf. rom. <i>în, întru</i>
			pronoun ar. <i>tu,</i> cf. rom. <i>tu</i>
			pronoun ar. <i>al tău</i>

Aromanian has significantly more homonymous words belonging to different grammatical categories and fulfilling different syntactic functions., e.g. *tu* is a shortened form of the preposition *tru* ‘in’, but it can also function as a second-person singular personal pronoun (acting as the subject) or as a possessive pronoun in an attributive role. Romanian, on the other hand, uses more varied forms, e.g. Aromanian *shi*, which occurs 15 times in the text (compared to only 6 occurrences in the Romanian version), corresponds to multiple synonyms in Romanian, depending on the context, e.g. Romanian *tot*, *de asemena* ‘too’.

### 3.2. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ROMANIAN PREPOSITION *DE* AND AROMANIAN *DI*

A detailed analysis of the preposition *de* / *di* in both texts reveals both similarities and differences in their morphological and syntactic usage. An identical function is observed in expressions denoting necessity:

Aromanian: *avea ananghi di* → *Daima elj au ananghi di ma multi exiyisi.*

Romanian: *avea nevoie de* → *Ei au mereu nevoie de explicații.*

However, the semantically key elements *ananghi* (Aromanian) and *nevoie* (Romanian) differ in etymology: the first one is of Greek origin, while the other one has a Slavic origin. Interestingly, both Romanian (e.g. dexonline) and Aromanian (DIXI<sup>4</sup>) dictionaries list synonyms, cf. Romanian archaic *ananghie* ‘difficult situation’<sup>5</sup>, Aromanian *nivolji* ‘poverty, misery, misfortune’<sup>6</sup>, yet these words have developed distinct meanings and functions in modern usage.

Function	Romanian	Aromanian
collocation with a verb, introduces the circumstance of manner	<i>de aproape</i> ‘close-up’ <i>I-am văzut de aproape</i>	<i>di aproapea</i> ‘close up’: <i>Putui di-lj vidzui di aproapea</i>
preposition in a prepositional phrase	rom. <i>deoparte</i> ‘from afar, on the side’: <i>Oamenii mari m-au sfătuit să las deoparte desenele</i>	ar. <i>di-ună parti</i> ‘from afar, on the side’: <i>Oaminjlji mări mi urnjipsiră s-alas di-ună parti diseamnli a meali.</i>
preposition, comparative function	distinguish one from another: <i>Știam să deosebesc (...) China de Arizona</i>	distinguish one from another: <i>(...) sh-puteam s-aleg China di Arizona</i>

In translations, differences are also observed in structures with *de/di*, which do not always correspond directly between the two languages. These differences result from variations in lexical choices and grammatical constructions unique to each language.

<sup>4</sup> DIXI is an online searchable version for the Tiberius Cunia’s *Dictsiunar a Limbâljei Armânească*.

<sup>5</sup> <https://dexonline.ro/intrare/ananghie/2102>, cf. <https://dlr1.soliorom.ro/#> (last accessed: March 7, 2025).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.dixonline.net/index.php> (last accessed: March 7, 2025).

Function	Romanian	Aromanian
collocation rom. <i>verb + direct object</i> ar. <i>verb + di + indirect object</i>	<i>verb + direct object</i> <i>De ce ne-ar speria o pălărie?</i>	<i>reflexive verb + di + indirect object</i> <i>Catse s-nă aspărem di una capela?</i> (cf. rom. <i>a se speria de ceva</i> 'scare sth.')
determination of age in years	<i>a avea + number (număral)</i> <i>Când aveam șase ani</i>	<i>hire + di + number</i> <i>Cându earam di shasi anj</i> (cf. rom. <i>a fi de vârsta cuiva</i> 'to be someone's age')
phrase	adjective: <i>Șerpil boa își înghit prada întreagă,</i>	adverbial phrase: <i>Năpărtica boa angljiti pravda tută di-ună oară</i> cf. rom. arch. adverb <i>odinoară</i> 'once / at once'
	noun: <i>Am desemnat atunci interiorul șerpelui boa.</i>	adverbial phrase: <i>Feci deapoa shi tsi ari di nuntru năpărtica boa</i> <i>di nuntru =/= di nafora,</i> cf. rom. adverb <i>dinăutru =/= dinafară</i>
	adjective: <i>(...) desenele cu șerpi boa deschiși și închiși</i>	adverbial phrase: <i>diseamnili a meali cu năpărtitsi di nuntru ică di nafoară</i>
conjunction ar. <i>di</i> → rom. <i>dacă</i>	<i>dacă te-ai rătăci cumva pe timp de noapte</i>	<i>Aestă ts-agiută multu ma s-hibă di ti cheri noaptea</i>
	only by means of a conjunction introducing adverbial of time: <i>dorm vreme de șase luni cât își fac digestia</i>	phrase 'until the day (when) ...' <i>doarmi shasi meshi di dzăli pănă u hunipseashti</i> cf. rom. * <i>dorm șase luni până zi în care / când</i>

### 3.3. PHONETIC DEVELOPMENT OF WORDS INHERITED FROM LATIN

The dialectal fragmentation of the Balkan-Romance language group occurred in the 10<sup>th</sup> century (Saramandu 2021: 17). However, by that time, a core vocabulary inherited from Latin had already been established, as evident in both translated texts.<sup>7</sup> These similarities are much stronger than those observed between the Balkan-Romance languages and the Western Romance languages. However, due to phonetic developments, modern forms of these words differ. For example, the Romanian conjunction *când* corresponds to Aromanian *cându*, while the Aromanian past perfect (simple perfect) verb form *vidzui* is based on the first-person plural root, whereas the Romanian equivalent *văzui* is derived

<sup>7</sup> According to Mariana Bara's calculations, Aromanian has inherited some 1,600 words from Latin, of which 878 are part of the core vocabulary, compared to 782 lexemes in Romanian (Bara 2007: 48, 70).

from the first-person singular form (cf. first-person plural *vedem*). In the Romanian translation, however, the translator decided not to use the simple past tense, which in Romanian is mainly used in literary texts, in favor of the compound past tense, which is more commonly used in spoken language, e.g. Romanian *am văzut* (cf. ar. *am vidzută*).

Phonetically, Aromanian exhibits a more archaic character than Romanian (cf. Caragiu-Marioțeanu et al. 1977: 175). It preserves phonemes such as [dz], which in modern Romanian have evolved into [z]. However, the phonetic differences extend to orthography, e.g., Romanian *șase* – Aromanian *shasi* ‘six’, Romanian *ani* – Aromanian *anj* ‘years, plural form’, which are identical phonetically but differ in spelling. It should be mentioned, that in the standardization process the Aromanian orthography has been explicitly distinguished from the Romanian one (Cunia 2000).

### 3.4. LATIN SYNONYMY

An interesting phenomenon in both languages is Latin synonymy, where words share a common Latin origin but derive from different Latin etymons. This results in synonymous pairs such as Aromanian *aroamigu* ‘to chew’ and Romanian *mesteca* ‘to chew’. In most cases, both Latin etymons continue in both languages, e.g.:

Romanian *rumega* < Latin *rumigare*  
Aromanian *masticu* < Latin *amixticare*

However, the meanings have evolved differently. The more general Aromanian verb *aroamig* ‘to chew, to ruminate’) has become more specialized in Romanian, where *rumega* now applies only to ruminant animals or, pejoratively, to humans who eat very slowly.<sup>8</sup>

A similar semantic narrowing is observed in:

Romanian *peri* ‘to perish, die, disappear’  
Aromanian *chirii* broader meaning: ‘to perish, get lost, disappear’

In modern Romanian, the term *pădure necălcată* ‘untouched forest’ is still used but mainly in phrases like *necălcată de om* ‘untouched by humans’ or *necălcată de pas de om* ‘untouched by human footsteps’. The Sketch Engine corpus records only 8 instances of *\*pădure necălcată\**, whereas *\*pădure virgină\** ‘virgin forest’ appears over 2200 times, indicating a shift in preferred terminology.

A similar case is the word for *month* as a unit of time:

Aromanian *mes* < Latin *mensis*, similar to Western Romance languages: French *mois*, Italian *mese*, Spanish, Catalan *mes*

Romanian *lună* ‘month’, uniquely derived from Latin *luna* ‘moon’, likely a calque from Slavic languages, cf. Polish *miesiąc* ‘month’, archaic meaning ‘moon’.

<sup>8</sup> <https://dexonline.ro/definitie/rumega> (last accessed: March 18, 2025).

<i>Les serpents boas avalent leur proie tout entière, sans la mâcher.</i>	
<i>fără s-o mestece</i> <i>a mestece</i> < lat. * <i>amixticare</i> , cf. ar. <i>masticu</i>	<i>fără s-u aroamigă</i> <i>arumigari</i> < lat. <i>rumigare</i> , cf. rom. <i>a rumege</i>
<i>(...) si l'on s'est égaré pendant la nuit.</i>	
<i>te-ai rătăci cumva pe noapte</i> <i>a (se) rătăci</i> < lat. * <i>erraticire</i>	<i>ti cher noaptea</i> <i>chireari</i> < lat. <i>perire</i> , cf. rom. <i>a pieri</i>
<i>Alors je ne lui parlais ni de serpents boa, ni de forêts vierges (...)</i>	
<i>pădurea virgină</i> < lat. <i>virgo</i> , -onis	<i>(pădurea) nicâlcată</i> der. ar. <i>câlcari</i> < lat. <i>calcare</i>
<i>(...) ils dorment pendant les six mois de leur digestion.</i>	
<i>dorm vreme de șase luni</i> rom. <i>lună</i> < lat. <i>luna</i>	<i>doarmi shasi meshi</i> ar. <i>mes</i> < lat. <i>mensis</i>

The semantic evolution of Latin continuants does not just lead to mere broadening or narrowing of meanings. Some inherited words remain semantically and pragmatically identical across both languages., e.g. Aromanian *antrebu* and Romanian *întreba*:

<i>et je leur ai demandé (...)</i>	
<i>și i-am întrebat</i> < Latin <i>interrogare</i>	<i>(...) shi älj antribai</i> < Latin <i>interrogare</i>
<i>Les serpents boas avalent leur proie (...)</i>	
<i>Șerpîi boa își înghit prada întreagă (...)</i> < Latin <i>ingluttire</i>	<i>Năpătica boa angljiti pravda tută (...)</i> < Latin <i>ingluttire</i>

### 3.5. INDIGENOUS VOCABULARY

Words indicating autochthonous origin are scarce in both texts. One example is Aromanian *năpărtică* (*nipartică*) ‘snake’, cf. Albanian *nëpërkë* ‘viper’, also noted in this sense in Romanian *năpărcă*. The Romanian equivalent of the species name is *șarpe* ‘snake’ from Latin \**serpes* (*serpens*). Although Aromanian also has *sharpi* from the same Latin root, the choice of *napărtică* in the translation suggests that substrate-origin words remain in active use in Aromanian.

<i>Les <u>serpents</u> boas avalent leur proie tout entière, sans la mâcher.</i>	
<i>Șerpîi boa își înghit prada întreagă, fără s-o mestece.</i>	<i>Năpătica boa angljiti pravda tută di-ună oară, fără s-u aroamigă.</i>

## 3.6. BORROWINGS FROM DIRECT CONTACTS

The translations of *The Little Prince* allow us to trace lexical differences resulting from a later, independent period of development when both languages underwent significant external influences, each within different cultural and political spheres. In the Romanian translation, there is a considerably higher number of borrowings from Slavic languages and later from Neo-Romance languages. In the Aromanian translation, borrowings from Slavic languages, Greek, and Albanian play a parallel role. However, it is essential to note that Slavic borrowings in these two languages stem from different sources. In Aromanian, Slavic borrowings primarily come from later interactions with South Slavic languages (Macedonian, Serbian, or Bulgarian), which Aromanian was in direct contact with. In contrast, the influence of Slavic borrowings in Romanian is shaped by long-term Slavic-Romanian bilingualism, which was also reinforced by cultural, political, and religious factors.

Romanian Slavisms, which date back to the earliest periods of Slavic-Romanian contact, often correspond in Aromanian to borrowings of Greek or Albanian origin.

<i>Ils ont toujours <u>besoin</u> d'explication.</i>	
<i>Ei au mereu nevoie de explicații.</i> rom. <i>nevoie</i> < Slavic <i>nevolja</i> , cf. ar. <i>nivolji</i> , <i>nivolje</i> 'pains, trouble, misery'	<i>Daima elj au ananghi di ma multi exiysi.</i> ar. <i>ananghi</i> < Greek <i>ἀνάγκη</i> (id.)
<i>Histoires vécues</i>	
<i>Povești trăite</i> cf. <i>a trăi</i> 'to live' < Slavic <i>trajati</i>	<i>Isturii bânati</i> derived form, ar. <i>banâ</i> 'life', cf. Alban <i>bane</i> 'shelter, habitation'

Similarly, Slavisms in Aromanian also appear in other Balkan languages. These words often correspond to non-Slavic-origin words in Romanian, either inherited from Latin or borrowed later.

<i>Les serpents boa avalent leur proie toute entière (...)</i>	
<i>Șerpîi boa își înghit prada întragă (...)</i> rom. <i>pradă</i> 'victim' < lat. <i>praeda</i>	<i>Năpărtica angljiti pravda tută di-ună oară (...)</i> ar. <i>pravdâ</i> 'animal, cattle', cf. Bulgar <i>pravda</i> 'truth' (Papahagi 1974: 1007)
<i>j'ai vu, une fois, une magnifiave image (...)</i>	
<i>am văzut odată o minunată poză (...)</i> <i>minunată</i> 'miraculous', cf. <i>minune</i> 'miracle' < lat. <i>*mirionem</i>	<i>vidzui una oară un cadhur ti ciudii (...)</i> <i>ciudii</i> 'strange', Bulgar <i>čudo</i> 'miracle', cf. Alban <i>tšiuđi</i> 'i.d.' (Papahagi 1974: 447)
<i>(...) boa qui avalait un fauve.</i>	
<i>(...) boa care înghițea un animal sălbatic.</i> <i>animal (sălbatic)</i> < lat. <i>animalis</i> , cf. fr. <i>animal</i>	<i>(...) boa tsi măca ună prici ayră.</i> <i>prici</i> 'wilde animal, beast' – probably from Slavic <i>pritičca</i> 'parable' (Papahagi 1974: 1011)

Both Romanian and Aromanian have borrowed words from neighboring languages to express the concept of pondering or reflecting. Romanian uses the Hungarian *gond* ‘think’, which led to *a (se) gândi* ‘to think’, whereas Aromanian adopted the Albanian *mendon* ‘to think’, giving rise to *\*minduescu* (id.).

<i>(...) J'ai alors beaucoup réfléchi sur les aventures de la jungle</i>	
<i>M-am gândit mult atunci la aventurile din (...)</i> junglă	<i>Atumtsea minduiam multu la tuti tsi s-fac (...)</i> tu giunglă

### 3.7. BORROWINGS IN THE MODERN ERA

In the modern era, the Romanian language underwent a process of re-Romanization, which led to the massive integration of French, Italian, and (Neo-)Latin-origin terms, significantly altering the lexical structure of the language. Aromanian, on the other hand, remained under Greek influence for centuries and only sporadically adopted words of Neo-Romance origin. An example is Aromanian *capâlă*, most likely borrowed from Italian *cappelleria*, which derives from Latin *cappellus*. Probably, the same etymon gave rise to Romanian *pălărie* ‘hat’ (cf. DER 572).

<i>« C'est un chapeau. »</i>	
<i>„Asta e o pălărie.”</i>	<i>„Aestă easti ună capelă.”</i>

In Romanian and Aromanian linguistic pairs, Neo-Romanian-origin words are typically found in Romanian, while their Aromanian counterparts are of Greek origin.

<i>(...) ils dorment pendant les six mois de leurs digestion</i>	
<i>digestie</i> ‘digestion’ < French <i>digestion</i> <i>(...) dorm vreme de șase luni cât își fac digestia</i>	<i>hunipsii</i> ‘digest’ < Greek <i>χωνεῖω</i> <i>(...) doarmi shasi meshi di dzăli pănă u hunipseashti</i>
<i>(...) j'ai réussi ; avec un crayon de couleur, à tracer mon premier dessin.</i>	
<i>creion</i> (Neo-Romantic) ‘crayon’ < French <i>crayon</i> <i>(...) am izbutit, cu un creion colorat, să fac primul meu desen.</i>	<i>muliv</i> ‘crayon, pencil’ < Greek <i>μολυβί</i> <i>(...) shi cu un muliv cu buiei adrai protlu a meu disemnu.</i>
<i>Voilà la copie du dessin.</i>	
<i>desen</i> (Neo-Romantic) ‘drawing’ < French <i>dessin</i> <i>Iată copia desenului.</i>	<i>cadhur</i> ( <i>cadhru</i> ) ‘drawing, photography’ < Greek <i>κάδρον</i> <i>Ai aua una copii dupu atsel cadhur.</i>

### 3.8. NEOLOGISMS

Scientific and technical neologisms have been phonetically adapted to match the characteristics of each language. For instance, in Romanian, *geography* is rendered as /*ǵeografie*/, while in Aromanian, it appears as /*g'eografie*/. Romanian is more conservative in terms of graphic adaptation of internationalisms, which usually retain their original foreign spelling. For example, the Romanian word *junglă* is pronounced /*ǵunglă*/, whereas in Aromanian, the term follows the language's orthographic norms as *giunglă* /*ǵiunglă*/. Both languages draw terminology from different sources within the international lexicon, depending on the era in which the borrowing occurred. In the early 20th century, French remained one of the primary sources of loanwords in Romanian. As a result, the French term *avion* (first attested in 1910<sup>9</sup>) was adopted into the language.

In contrast, Aromanian refers rather to internationalisms, cf. English, German, French, Polish *aeroplan*, although it is difficult, in the absence of complete lexicographical data, to determine the exact period in which this word entered the Aromanian vocabulary.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS

A comparative analysis of *The Little Prince* in Aromanian and Romanian, in the context of their distinctiveness and shared features, provides valuable insights into their evolution and interaction. While Aromanian is traditionally classified as a dialect of Romanian, it exhibits significant differences in vocabulary, morpho-syntax, and lexical influences. These differences stem from distinct geopolitical and socio-cultural conditions.

As Escudé and Janin point out in their comparative analysis of *The Little Prince* translations, within a language family, each language is inherently dialectal:

Within each language, there is linguistic variation, with changes (more or less significant) in lexicon, phonological and orthographic form, morphology, and gender. Thus, a language undergoes a certain degree of internal standardization or fragmentation, influenced by the social, historical, or political conditions of its existence, i.e., essentially the way it functions (Escudé, Janin 2010: 76).

This applies equally to Aromanian and Romanian, which, despite belonging to the same language family, function both as dialects and as separate languages, each with its own grammatical and lexical characteristics.

One key aspect of this study is the identification of external linguistic influences on both language systems. Romanian maintained prolonged contact with Slavic languages, leading to numerous borrowings and semantic shifts in its vocabulary. Aromanian, functioning within the Balkan linguistic environment, was instead influenced by Greek and Albanian, which significantly shaped its modern form. Moreover, Aromanians are

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://delr.lingv.ro/?searchTerm=avion&includeVariants=true> (last accessed: March 10, 2025).

generally bilingual, speaking both Aromanian and the official language of the country in which they reside (Nevaci 2013: 118).

In terms of grammatical structure, both languages share similarities due to their common Balkan-Romance origin. However, differences in syntax, as well as in the use of specific prepositions and conjunctions, indicate independent evolutionary trajectories. One example is the frequent occurrence of homonymous forms in Aromanian, such as \*tu\*, which can serve different grammatical functions. Romanian, by contrast, uses a wider variety of distinct forms depending on the grammatical context.

Etymologically, both languages contain a layer of vocabulary inherited from Latin, yet their modern forms differ due to phonetic evolution. For example:

Romanian *când* vs. Aromanian *cându* (conjunction)

Romanian *văzui* vs. Aromanian *vidzui* (past perfect tense)

Additionally, the presence of the voiced [dz] in Aromanian indicates the preservation of phonemes resulting from the earlier common development of Latin, where *di* > *dz* (Sala 1970: 76). Another notable phonetic difference is the prosthetic vowel [a] at the beginning of certain words in Aromanian, such as *aroamig*, cf. Romanian *rumega*, both derived from Latin *rumigare*.

A frequently observed phenomenon is “Latin synonymy”, in which both languages retain synonymous words that stem from different Latin etymons. For instance:

Romanian *a se rătăci* vs. Aromanian *chireari* ‘to get lost’

In some cases, Romanian meanings have become more specialized compared to their Aromanian counterparts. For example, *rumega* ‘to ruminate’ is used specifically for animals, while its Aromanian equivalent *aroamigu* retains a broader meaning ‘to chew, to ruminate’. However, this semantic shift did not occur uniformly, as many inherited words remain identical in meaning across both languages, such as:

Aromanian *videare* – Romanian *vedea* ‘to see’.

Regarding “borrowings in the modern era”, various sources of loanwords reflect either direct linguistic and cultural contact or indirect influences arising from political and cultural conditions. In Aromanian, the primary sources of borrowed vocabulary are Greek (*muliv* ‘pencil’) and Bulgarian (*pravda* ‘truth, justice’).

For comparative purposes, it is useful to consider lexical distribution in Mihai Eminescu’s *Luceafărul*. In the Aromanian translation of the poem, nearly 14% of the vocabulary is of Greek origin, compared to only 1.15% in the Romanian version (Todoran 1985: 241, 243).<sup>10</sup> Meanwhile, Romanian borrowings are predominantly from Neo-Romance languages, primarily French (e.g., *animal*).

<sup>10</sup> However, these statistics are not representative of modern languages, since the poem’s Romanian text was written in 1873, and Eminescu’s language is considered a model for literary Romanian, based on colloquial language (Todoran 1985: 239).

In conclusion, this analysis demonstrates that despite their common Latin origins, Romanian and Aromanian have evolved in distinct directions under the influence of different historical, cultural, and linguistic factors. The two translations of *The Little Prince* indicate that both languages and their vocabularies now function independently, even though dictionary equivalents exist for many terms. From the perspective of linguistic pragmatics, it is increasingly difficult to maintain the view that Aromanian should be analyzed solely as a dialect of an archaic form of Romanian (Proto-Romanian), which no longer exists in its historical form.

Of course, this analysis does not fully exhaust the topic of lexical differences between Romanian and Aromanian. However, it contributes significantly to the understanding of the linguistic nature of both languages and serves as a foundation for further research.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### *Sources*

- SAINT EXUPÉRY Antoine de, 2006, *Micul Prinț*, trad. Ileana Cantuniari, București: RAO.  
 SAINT EXUPÉRY Antoine de, 2007a, *Le Petit Prince*, Paris: Gallimard.  
 SAINT EXUPÉRY Antoine de, 2007b, *Njiclu Amirărush*, trad. Maria Bara, Thede Kahl, Neckarsteinach: Tintenfass.

### *Consulted literature*

- BARA Mariana, 2007, *Limba Armânească. Vocabular și stil*, București: Cartea Universitară.  
 BARTOSIEWICZ Olga, 2012, “Mały Książę Antoine’a de Saint Exupéry’ego w Rumunii. Analiza porównawcza przekładów Benedicta Corlaciui i Ileany Cantuniari”, (in:) *Le Petit Prince et les amis au pays des traductions*, Joanna Górnikiewicz, Iwona Piechnik, Marcela Świątkowska (eds.), Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka, 73–83.  
 BRÂNCUȘ Grigore, 2005, *Introducere în istoria limbii române*, București: Editura Fundației România de Măine.  
 CARAGIU-MARIOȚEANU Matilda, GIOSU Ștefan, IONESCU-RUXĂNDIOIU Liliana, TODORAN Romulus, 1977, *Dialectologie română*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.  
 CUNIA Tiberius, 2000, *The Bituli-Macedonia Symposium of August 1997*, <https://farsharotu.org/on-the-standardization-of-the-aromanian-system-of-writing/> (last accessed: March 20, 2025).  
 DAHMEN Wolfgang, 2025, “‘Și totuși aromâna este limbă’ – Zum Status des Aromunischen zwischen rumänischen Dialekt und Balkanromanischer Sprache”, *Quo Vadis Romania* 65: 95–112.  
 DAHMEN Wolfgang, KRAMER Johannes, 2014, “La Romania sud-danubienne”, (in:) *Manuel des langues romanes*, Andre Klump, Johannes Kramer, Aline Willems (red.), Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 313–317.  
 ESCUDE Pierre, JANIN Pierre, 2010, *Le point sur l’Intercompréhension, clé du plurilinguisme*, Paris: CLE International.  
 KLIMKOWSKI Tomasz, 2021, “Współczesne języki wołoskie”, *Balcanica Posnaniensia. Acta et Studia*, 28 (1): 363–394. DOI: 10.14746/bp.2021.28.15.  
 METZELTIN Michael, 2016, *Româna în contrast, o cercetare tipologică*, Iași: Ed. Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.  
 NEVACI Manuela, 2013, *Identitate românească în context balcanic*, București: Ed. Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.

- OCZKO Anna, 2021, “Aromanian – Language or Dialect? Overview of Historical and Contemporary Opinions”, *Romanica Cracoviensia* 21 (2): 105–114, DOI: 10.4467/20843917RC.21.011.14066.
- ROGALSKI Andrzej K., 2011, “Socjologia języka”, *Uniwersyteckie Czasopismo Socjologiczne* 5: 38–57.
- SALA Marius, 1970, *Contribuții la fonetica istorică a limbii române*, București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
- SARAMANDU Nicolae, 2021, *Limba română. Originile*, București: Ed. Academiei Române.
- SARAMANDU Nicolae, NEVACI Manuela, 2013, *Sinteze de dialectologie română*, Bucharest: Ed. Universitară.
- TAGLIAVINI Carlo, 1977, *Originile limbilor neolatine*, Bucharest: Ed. Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- TODORAN Romulus, 1985, “Luceafărul în română și aromână. Componenta lexicală”, *Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară* 30: 239–245.
- TRIFON Nicolas, 2016, “Les études aroumaines en Roumanie à l’heure européenne: quelques observations”, *Cahiers Balkaniques* 44, December 11, 2017, <http://journals.openedition.org/ceb/9806> (last accessed: March 18, 2025).
- TRIFON Nicolas, 2023, *Aromâna. Dialect al limbii române sau limba de sine stătătoare. Istoria unei controversă*, ed. Alexandru Gica, București: Vreamea.
- UNGUREANU Dan, 2024, *Istoria limbii române*, Chișinău: Cartier.

### Dictionaries

- ACADÉMIE française, n.d., *Dictionnaire de l’Académie française*, <https://www.dictionnaire-academie.fr>.
- CIORĂNESCU Alexandru, 2002, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, ediție îngrijită și traducere din limba spaniolă de Tudora Șandru-Mehedinți și Magdalena Popescu Marin, București: Editura Saeculum I.O.
- CUNIA Tiberius, 2008, *Dictsiunar a limbâljei armânească (di-aoa sh-vără 100 di anj) după dictsiunari T. Papahagi, S. Mihăileanu și I. Dalametra sh-cu turnarea-a zboarâlor armâneshti tu limbili rumânească, frântesească și inglizească*, Editsii Timpurară (proschiră) Andreu.
- DELR: *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, <https://delr.lingv.ro>.
- DEXONLINE, n.d., *Dicționar explicativ al limbii române | dexonline*, <https://dexonline.ro>.
- DIXI: *Dictsiunar xiyisitu online a limbâljei armânească*, <http://dixonline.net/>.
- DLR1: Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române* [DA], 1913–1949, ediție digitală anastatică în CLRE. *Corpus lexicografic românesc electronic*, 2021–2022, <https://dlr1.soliorom.ro/>.
- DLR1: Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române* [DLR], 1965–2010, ediție digitală anastatică în CLRE. *Corpus lexicografic românesc electronic*, 2022, <https://dlr1.soliorom.ro>.
- PAPAHAGI Tache, 1974, *Dicționarul dialectului aromân general și etimologic*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., București: Ed. Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.