

Two Romanian terms (*tureci* and *cioareci*) based on Old Germanic designations of leg-coverings

Adrian Poruciuc
University of Iași

Romanian has two etymologically difficult terms that designate traditional leg-coverings: *tureci* and *cioareci*. The following demonstration is meant to prove that the two terms (however much altered they may look like, in comparison with their original forms) are based on Old Germanic loans, more precisely, on variants of a double-member compound whose second element is a correspondent of Eng. *breeches* 'trousers extending to or just below the knee' (< O.Eng. *brēc*). Although the aims of this article are mainly etymological, many arguments in it are ethnographic, and they can be relevant for the very history of trousers in Europe (and in Eurasia, for that matter).

Probably the earliest representation of the Indo-European horsemen who came to dominate the Iranian plateau towards the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. appears on a seal unearthed at Tepe Sialk. According to Jettmar (1983: 237), the clothing of those invaders is "unspecific". Nevertheless, the checked cloth¹ of their knee-long breeches is a quite remarkable feature (see Fig. XXIII in Jettmar's book). What the horsemen on the Tepe Sialk seal clearly indicate is that riding-breeches were worn by second-millennium Indo-European invaders of Iran. As for Europe, here are some general facts and assumptions regarding Celto-Germanic trousers of the Iron Age, as presented in Owen 1966: 116:

¹For the remotest antecedents of tartan-like cloth, see Mair 2005: 35, with comments on "the world's earliest provable plaids (diagonal twill)," associated with three-thousand-year-old mummies of the eastern edge of Eastern Central Asia. In the same passage, Mair mentions "the co-occurrence of felt (a quintessentially pastoral product) among the earliest inhabitants of the Tarim Basin circa 3800 BP and in western Anatolia circa 4600 BP (the earliest known example of this material in the world)."

This sartorial custom was taken over from the Celts, who in turn had it from the Eastern European, or Asiatic horsemen of the steppes. It is obviously a very satisfactory article of clothing for the horsemen, and this may have been the main reason for its adoption by the Germanic peoples; although deterioration of the climate may also have played a part, since the trousers are clearly much warmer than the dress of the Early Bronze Age. Judging from the illustrations on the monuments, the trousers were narrow at the ankles, a very practical arrangement in a cold, damp climate.

The evolution of trousers as “thing” implies as many obscure turns and missing links as the evolution of most European terms for that piece of clothing. In regard to Rmn. *tureci* and *cioareci*, one can discern at least that those terms have a series of remote relatives in Romanian itself. Most important among those relatives are the members of a lexical family inherited by Romanian from Latin. Rmn. *brace* ‘drawers’, *brăcinar* ‘waistband’, *brăcire* ‘belt’, *îmbrăca* ‘to dress, clothe, put on’, and *îmbrăcămintă* ‘clothing’ are all ultimately based on Lat. *brāca* (pl. *brācae*, or *brācēs* ‘breeches’), which was inherited by other Romance languages too (cf. Fr. *braies*, Sp. *braga*). Lat. *brāca* has generally been considered to be a Gaulish loan (cf. Ernout/ Meillet 1985), which appears to imply that it was in Gaul where the Romans first learned about breeches. (Pliny the Elder mentions that Gallia Narbonensis was also known as *Bracata*, due exactly to the specific leg-coverings of that province’s natives – cf. *Naturalis historia*, III, 31.) The etymology of Gaul. *brāca* is more complicated though.

The Ernout/ Meillet dictionary (s.v. *brāca*) mentions that the term under discussion is a “Celto-Germanic word”. Pokorny’s Indo-European dictionary (1959 - s.v. **bhreg-* ‘to break, crack’) presents Gaul. *brāca* (‘Kniehose’) as a “Germanic loan”, and O.Irish *bróc* as an “Anglo-Saxon loan.”² In his turn,

²An interesting thing is that, if we assume an Old English origin for M.Irish *bróc*, it would mean that the term “returned” to English, which now, besides *breeches*, also has *brogue* ‘rough shoe of Ireland and the Scottish Highlands; hose, trousers; strong outdoor shoe’ < Irish, Gaelic *brōg* < M.Irish *bróc* - according to Hoad 1993 (s.v. *breech*). However, it is the same dictionary that (unlike de Vries 1961) indicates an Old Norse, not an Old English origin for M.Irish *bróc*. (That would imply that the Irish Celts borrowed both breeches and the term that designated them from the Vikings who dominated Ireland in the 9th century.)

de Vries (in his dictionary of Old Norse, 1961, s.v. *brók* ‘hose, beinkleider’) observes that the Celto-Germanic relationship commonly taken into consideration in discussions on Lat. *brāca* and on its correspondents has been diversely interpreted (in regard to the direction of initial borrowing - from Celtic to Germanic, or the other way around). In de Vries’s opinion (s.v. *brók*), one should “rather think of an originally Germanic word, especially since it refers to a piece of clothing specific to horsemen.”³ That remark deserves attention, from an Indo-European standpoint, in the light of archaeological-ethnographic facts such as the ones mentioned by Jettmar, Owen, or Mair (see above). Worth considering, in this context, is also what de Vries says on horsemen’s breeches in his dictionary of Dutch (1963), s.v. *broek*.⁴ In that case, de Vries takes into account that Du. *broek* (as cognate of O.Norse *brók* and O.Eng. *brēc*) designates a prehistoric article of clothing that early Germanic populations must have taken over from the “riding tribes of South Russia and Central Asia.” But, in regard to the etymology of *broek*, de Vries remains among the ones who consider that the origin of the word is uncertain (“de herkomst van het woord is onzeker”),⁵ and he finishes his commentary on Du. *broek* with two rhetorical questions: one on whether there be a connection between the Germanic terms of the *break* family and the Germanic designation of breeches (as double-piece garment); the other on whether the designation under discussion may or may not be a borrowing from a non-Indo-European language.⁶

Another etymological dictionary, Hoad 1993 (s.v. *breech*) presents the whole family of Germanic cognates, including O.Eng. *brēc* (a plural that shows effects of *i*-umlaut), O.Sax. *brōk*, O.H.Germ. *bruoh*, and O.Norse *brók*, as based on a Germanic root (**brōk-*) “of uncertain origin.” We should, however, take into consideration that Bosworth’s dictionary

³All translations from other languages into English are mine.

⁴It is an eighteenth-century borrowing of Du. *broek* that Russ. *brjuki* appears to be based on (see Vasmer’s dictionary of Russian, s.v. *brjuki*).

⁵In his dictionary of Old Norse (1961, s.v. *brók*), de Vries favors the idea that O.Norse *brók* is “an originally Germanic word,” but he ends his comment on that word by considering its etymology as “obscure”.

⁶Certainly, a non-IE origin may not be totally excluded; but in such a case one should consider at least a folk-etymological influence of the Proto-Germanic lexical family of **brekan* ‘to break’ on a designation of riding breeches borrowed from a non-IE language.

(ed. 1983) gives O.Eng. *brōk* (pl. *brēc*) with the meanings ‘1. the BREECH, nates 2. a covering for the breech; in pl. BREECHES, trousers, pantaloons; *brāca*, *brācae*, *femoralia*.’ From that presentation it results that a very early Germanic term for a certain piece of clothing simply derived from the Germanic designation of the lower part of the human body (“the breech”), where the trunk appears to “break” into two limbs. It also results, however indirectly, that the English words *break*, *breach*, *breech*, and *breeches* are cognates.⁷ Under such circumstances, the assumption that *break* and *breeches* are etymologically unrelated would represent a rather unusual approach. Among other things, the *American Heritage Dictionary* (AHD 1973) refers *break*, as well as *breach*, *brake*, and *bracken*, to IE **bhreg-* ‘to break’, but *breech* and *breeches* (with the Scottish variant *brecks*) to a separate root, **brāc-* ‘trousers’, which is presented (in the Appendix of AHD) as “a northern European word, only in Celtic and Germanic.” According to Pokorny’s simpler presentation, IE **bhreg-* appears to be the basis of Lat. *frangere* ‘to break’ (showing a specific Italic shift *bh* > *f*, plus a nasal infixation),⁸ of M.Irish *braigid* ‘(he) farts’ (showing preservation of a Proto-Indo-European *g*), as well as of a rich Germanic lexical family. Among the cognates of that family there are, on the one hand, verbs with the basic meaning ‘to break’ (Goth. *brikan*, O.Eng. *brecan*, O.Sax. *brekan*, O.H.Germ. *brehhan*), and, on the other hand, Germanic terms that designate ‘buttocks’ or ‘a cloth worn to cover the loins’.

Not only the existence of a term like O.Norse *brók* ‘hose’, as a typically “northern European word,” but also certain *phonetic* aspects indicate a quite possible (Proto-)Germanic origin of the term that produced (most probably via Celtic) *brāca* in Latin. Speaking of reconstructions, IE *bh* became *f* in Latin, but *b* in both Celtic and Germanic; as for the shift *g* > *k*, it may be regarded as typically Germanic (see, for instance,

⁷Eng. *breach* has a special situation, since it is a word of Germanic origin that does not come from the language of the Anglo-Saxons, but from that of the Franks; the term under discussion entered English via mediaeval French (cf Hoad 1993, s.v. *breach*). Modern Romanian also has *breșă* (‘breach, gap, opening’), which is based on a recent borrowing of Fr. *brèche* (in its turn a word of M.H.Germ origin, according to the Baumgartner/ Ménard dictionary, 1996).

⁸In such an Indo-European perspective, Rmn. *brace* and its family are remotely related to Rmn. *a frânge* ‘to break’ < Lat. *frangere*.

Lat. *tegō* ‘I cover’, Greek *stegō* ‘I cover’, Irish *tuigithir* ‘he covers’, versus Germanic cognates such as O.Isl. *þekia* and Germ. *decken* ‘to cover’). The consonantal shift $g > k$ (as part of “Grimm’s Law”) indicates that the Gaulish term that assumedly stands for the origin of Latin *brāca* could derive from a Germanic term. However, if we take vocalism into consideration, the borrowing of the term under discussion from Germanic into Celtic must have occurred very early (even in Proto-Germanic times), namely *after* the shift IE $g >$ Gmc k , but *before* IE \bar{a} had become \bar{o} (by labialization) in Germanic. In regard to the vowel mutation (i-umlaut) contained by a plural form such as O.Eng. *brēc* (< sg. *brōc*), it reflects a later stage; and it has something to do with the e sounds of the final parts of Rmn. *tureci* and *cioareci* (as demonstrated below).

To conclude this introductory part of the article, it is quite clear that the Northern European word which came to be recorded as *brāca* in Latin (most probably via Gaulish) appears to have been used first in (Proto-)Germanic. Also, I think it is no use presenting English terms such as *breech* and *breeches* as unrelated, since their connection with the verb *to break* and, implicitly, with the IE root **bhreg-* ‘to break, crack’ is undeniable. As undeniable is, in my opinion, the connection between the Old Germanic terms belonging to the Germanic family of Engl. *breeches* and the Romanian terms *tureci* and *cioareci*.

In regard to leg-coverings specific to the Romanian traditional costume, very valuable information is to be found in Zamfira Mihail’s book of 1978. That author deals with traditional clothing on a more general plane, as manifest in the subchapter on terms for “under-waist” clothing pieces, a subchapter that contains a brief history of traditional trousers (1978: 61-62). In that context, Mihail mentions the long motley trousers of the ancient Persians, as well as the striped trousers of Celtic kings in ancient Gaul (that is, in the above-mentioned *Gallia Bracata*.) Mihail goes on by mentioning that, when the Romans conquered Dacia at the beginning of the second century, they found native men wearing that piece of clothing. The same author’s comments (p. 62) on images carved on the Roman *Tropaeum* of Adamclisi (Southeast Romania)⁹ directly concern the main line of this article: “It has

⁹In regard to the representations of Germanic warriors (with a hairstyle known as “the Suebian knot”) on the Adamclisi monument, see Poruciu

been stated that the type of trousers represented at Adamclisi are, to a certain extent, similar to the Germanic ones of the same period.” In fact, I must observe, several of the warriors represented on the monument under discussion did belong to a Germanic population, most probably the Bastarnae,¹⁰ who acted as allies of the Dacians in the early stage of the first-second-century Dacian-Roman conflict.

In the same subchapter, on the basis of various contributions to the history of the European trousers (d’Arbois de Jubainville, Jaberg, Saglio, Nieminen), Mihail traces the evolution of leg-coverings, from archaic puttee-like cloth bands (spirally wound around the leg) to the pipe-like hose tied by strings to the waist (1978: 62). According to the same author, the plural form of terms for “trousers” appears to be a relic from the time when the two main components were independent pieces in the costumes of both men and women. The following passage in Mihail 1978: 63 is relevant in this context:

Since times immemorial the “autochthonous” hose of white heavy cloth has been perpetuated among the Daco-Romanians; that is why the fashion of the stocking-like hose specific to the courtly costume did not spread. Traces of the old manner of protecting the legs by wrappings have survived [...] in combination with peasant shoes [...]; as for traces of the type of archaic hose fixed by strings [...], they are still manifest in traditional stocking-like *cioareci* for women, and in the [Transylvanian] manner of wearing *tureci* [...], or *călțuni* [...], that is, a kind of gaiters of heavy cloth, which stand stiff up to the knee.

I have seen such heavy-stiff gaiters as part of traditional men’s costumes in Bulgaria too. As regards the original Romanian terms that I preserved as such in the translated passage above, Rmn. *călțuni* (cf. It. *calzoni*)¹¹ undoubtedly derives from a

2005: 371.

¹⁰For the Germanic origin of the Bastarnae, and for their representation on the Adamclisi monument, see Schmidt 1969: 93 and Hoops 1976:89.

¹¹Recently (during my visit to Universidad de La Laguna, Tenerife), I have discovered that the Romanian *călțuni* have relatives in the opposite corner of the Romance world: Canary traditional breeches (of peninsular Spanish origin) are still called *calzones*. (See that term, presented as an augmentative derivative from Span. *calza* < Vulg.Lat. **calcea*, in the Corominas dictionary,

Vulgar Latin term of the same family as Lat. *calx* 'heel, foot' and *calceus* 'boot', whereas *tureci* and *cioareci* are still in need of etymological clarifications. I will first deal with Rmn. *tureci* since some important predecessors (see below) presented it as derived from Old Germanic. (Nevertheless, the Romanian term failed to be included as a Germanism in Meyer-Lübke's pan-Romance dictionary.) Let me first present the position of *tureci* within the lexical stock of Romanian.

Although the plural form *tureci* should have priority, since it appears to have entered Romanian as a Germanic loan in a plural form, Romanian dictionaries generally give singular forms as entries. For example, *Micul dicționar academic* (MDA, IV) gives *tureatcă* (first recorded in the seventeenth century), with feminine and masculine variants such as *tureacă*, *tureapcă*, *turuăcă*, *tureac*, *tureatc*, *tureci*, *turiac*, *turuăc*, and with plurals such as *tureci*, *turetci*, *turetce*. Among the eleven meanings given in MDA for that term, worth mentioning are the following (including regional, obsolete, and figurative ones): 'leg of a boot; a heavy-cloth or felt covering for the legs (extending from the knee to the instep); thick stockings; peasant trousers; each leg of a pair of trousers; a person who wears *turetci*; a stupid person; a person with out-dated ideas; a person with stumpy legs'. To these the same dictionary adds a series of seven colloquial-dialectal phrases, of which I selected three: *a călca pe tureatcă* (literally 'to tread on one's own legging' = 'to make a mistake, through lack of experience'), *a fi la tureac* (lit. 'to be at the legging' = 'to be in despair'), *a lua foc în turetci* (lit. 'to catch fire in the leggings' = 'to be cheated in some business'). All these amply demonstrate that, although the object it refers to is rather rare nowadays, the word under discussion used to be quite well-known to most Romanians of earlier times. Such an assumption is also sustained by the existence of Romanian family names such as *Tureac*, *Tureacu*, *Tureatcă* (entries in Iordan 1983).¹² There also is a Transylvanian village with the name of *Tureac*, in the Bistrița-Nășăud County (as indicated in Ghinea 2000). The occurrence of such a toponym in Transylvania is not surprising, in the light of the rich Transylvanian *tureci* material recorded in

s.v. *calza*).

¹²I found the family name *Tureatcă* in the telephone directories of two Romanian cities placed in opposite corners of the country, namely Iași and Timișoara.

Atlasul lingvistic român (Petrovici 1965, IV). I will add that, near the city of Hunedoara (Southwest Transylvania), there existed a medieval village recorded as *Turek* in 1364 and *Thewrek* in 1455 (cf. Suci 1968, s.v. *Turek*). Also, in a region of today's Southwest Ukraine inhabited by Romanians (south-east of Černivci/ Cernăuți), there is a village whose official name is *Turjatka*, which obviously reflects the Romanian appellative *tureatcă*.

The above-mentioned *Atlas* (Petrovici 1965, IV) includes several maps on which variants of *tureac* (pl. *tureci*) are to be found. On map 1169 (with answers to questions about local designations for *crac de izmene* 'leg of drawers'), we can see that formulations such as *tureac de gaci*, or *turuiac de izmană*¹³ were given as answers only in the north-western corner of Transylvania, and in the extreme-western Crișana. It is also in the latter territory that the designation *tureac* was recorded for 'leg of trousers', as indicated on map 1177. Finally, map 1195 shows a division of Romania approximately into halves, by an imaginary diagonal that goes from the Danube's Iron Gates in the Southwest (Banat) to central Moldavia in the East. Above the diagonal (Banat, Crișana, most of Transylvania, and northern Moldavia), variants such as *tureac*, *turiac*, *turuiac*, *turuiacă*, *tureatcă*, *tureapcă* were abundantly recorded as answers for 'leg of a boot', whereas for the same thing the answer was *carâmb*¹⁴ in the regions below the diagonal (Oltenia, Muntenia, Dobrogea, south-eastern Transylvania, and southern Moldavia).¹⁵ As I will point out in more detail below, there is one geo-linguistic peculiarity that stands for an important difference between *tureci* and its cognate, *cioareci*: unlike the latter, *tureci* has not been recorded among South-Danubian Romanians.¹⁶ So, *tureci* must be considered as specific

¹³I preferred to turn the rather complicated phonetic transcriptions of the *Atlas* into standard Romanian spellings.

¹⁴Whereas most dictionaries give Rmn. *tureac* (or *tureatcă*) as a term of "unknown etymology" (see below), there is a generally assumed Latin origin for Rmn. *carâmb*, namely **calamulus* < *calamus* (cf. MDA, s.v. *carâmb*).

¹⁵Nevertheless, about three decades ago, *tureci* 'long homespun stockings, with galloon trimmings' (according to the glossary of Păunescu 1978) was recorded in the Vâlcea County, that is, south of the above-mentioned diagonal.

¹⁶I take into account that there is no Macedo-, Megleno-, or Istro-Romanian variant of *turea(t)c(ă)* in the spaces reserved for South-Danubian correspondents in the corners of the above-mentioned maps of the *Atlas*. Also, no such variant is included in Papahagi's comprehensive Macedo-Romanian dictionary (1974).

only to *Daco-Romanian*, more precisely, to the language spoken in the above-mentioned half of Romania in which variants of that term are used (or were still used in the former half of the twentieth century). However, whereas the spreading of *tureci* appears to be limited to only one part of the Romanian ethnic space (namely the part populated by “Western Daco-Romanians” – in the vision of Pușcariu 1976: 346), it is also *tureci* that may be directly referred to a multitude of Germanic loans recorded in West Romance. Those Romance correspondents, by themselves, can make one reject the idea that Rmn. *tureci* is a word of “unknown etymology” (cf. DEX – Coteanu 1996, s.v. *tureatcă*).¹⁷

Under “8967. *tubrucus* (germ.) ‘Art Hose,’” Meyer-Lübke gives a whole series of Romance terms whose status of Old Germanic loans has generally been accepted. First of all there are North Italian dialectal terms such as *trūži*, *travüš*, *traviš*, *truš*. Then there are Prov. *trebuc*, O.Fr. *trebu*, and Mozarab. *tarabuka*, *tubaka*. To all those Meyer-Lübke (following Jokl) adds Alb. *tirku*,¹⁸ obviously the same word as the one given as *tirk* ‘Gamasche’ in Meyer’s Albanian dictionary of 1891.¹⁹ It is also under *tubrucus* that Meyer-Lübke mentions two interesting derivatives, namely an Alpine Romance *traučai* (‘grob wollene Frauenstrümpfe oder Füßlinge’), and a Catal. *trobiguera* (‘Strumpfband’). In the same context, Meyer-Lübke considers that the Latinized singular form *tubrucus* (first attested with Isidore of Seville) reflects a Visigothic *þiuhbrüks*, which can be referred to the variant *þiuhbröks* recorded in Wulfila’s Bible. The West Romance *tubrucus* area extends from Northern Italy to Southern France and to Spain. Or, I must observe, it may extend quite far to the north-west, taking into account that Eng. *trousers* (earlier *trouse*) comes “from Scottish Gaelic *triubhas*, perhaps from Old French *trebus*” (according to AHD, s.v. *trousers* - see also, in the same dictionary, Eng. *trews* ‘close-fitting trousers, usually of tartan’ < Scottish Gaelic *triubhas*.)²⁰

¹⁷The authors of MDA chose to label the etymological status of *tureatcă* as “uncertain,” but they tentatively referred it to Rmn. *tur* ‘seat of trousers’.

¹⁸The Duro/ Hysa dictionary of Albanian (1995) gives *tirk* ‘a kind of close fitting trousers’. A more comprehensive Albanian dictionary, Kostallari 1984, gives *tirk* with several meanings: ‘white felt; man’s stockings; gaiters; man’s trousers of felt’.

¹⁹Meyer simply refers Alb. *tirk* to Rmn. *tureac*, with no other comments.

²⁰Taking into consideration the material recorded in MacLennan 1991, Engl. *trousers* is translatable into Gaelic by *triubhas* and *brìogais*; but Gaelic also has

At the end of his *tubrucus* article, Meyer-Lübke rather abruptly (and uncritically) excludes the possibility of a connection between the West Romance *tubrucus* family and Rmn. *tureci*, by simply accepting Skok's (untenable) opinion according to which that Romanian term derives from Hung. *török* (which means 'Turk, Turkish!'). Skok's proposal was meant to be a reply to Diculescu,²¹ who had (correctly) presented Rmn. *tureci* as an Old Germanic loan of the same origin as the West Romance terms apparently based on the Latinized Germanism *tubrucus*. The only outstanding specialist who joined Diculescu, with significant addition of arguments, was Gamillscheg.

In the first volume of his *Romania Germanica* (1934, I: 374) Gamillscheg refers a reconstructed Gothic compound, **þeuhbrōks* (pl. **þiuhbrōkeis* 'Schenkelhosen')²² to O.H.Germ. *thiohþruah* (or *deohproh*, "in den Kasseler Glossen"). Haralambie Mihăescu, a Romanian philologist who asserted the existence of Old Germanic loans in Romanian, included *turea(t)că* 'tige de la botte' among those loans, and he referred it not to Gothic *þeuhbrōks*, but to the two above-mentioned Old High German cognates ("cf. a.h.allem. *theohproch*, *diohpruoch* 'pantalons'" – Mihăescu 1993: 322). Anyway, the West Romance *tubrucus* terms are quite obviously based on an Old Germanic compound made of a first element meaning 'thigh' and a second element meaning 'breeches'. In that respect, to Meyer-Lübke's illustrative examples Gamillscheg adds some more, such as the ones with a voiced consonant *g* and with metathesis (*trabugos*, *tribugos* – recorded in the fifth-century writings of Paulus Diaconus), or the North Italian *tabrugu*, whose origin was considered by Gamillscheg (1934, I: 374) to be Ostrogothic. It was in the same passage where Gamillscheg states that "the word is to be found in East Romance too." The only East Romance language that survived is Romanian.

In the second volume of the same book (1935, II: 258),

triuhhsair, which represents a borrowing of Eng. *trousers*.

²¹ Diculescu's name was misspelled as *Diciulescu* in Meyer-Lübke's dictionary (s.v. *tubrucus*).

²² Köbler's Gothic dictionary (1989) includes the following Gothic terms: **brōks* 'trousers', **þiuh* 'thigh, hip' (< Gmc. **þeuham*), as well as the compound **þiuhbrōks* 'knee breeches', reconstructed mainly on the basis of West Romance terms derived from it.

Gamillscheg develops Diculescu's view on Rmn. *tureci* 'wollene Gamaschen, Stiefelschäfte',²³ regarded as derived from the designation of a specific Germanic "Kniehose". Like Meyer-Lübke, Gamillscheg took into consideration the development of a Latinized form *tubrucus*, as referable to Goth. *þeuhbrōks*. However, unlike his predecessor, Gamillscheg includes not only Alb. *tirk*, but also Rmn. *tureci* among the cognates of the West Romance *tubrucus* family. On the one hand, Gamillscheg tacitly agrees to Jokl's opinion, according to which, for phonetic reasons, Alb. *tirk*²⁴ could not develop from a Vulgar Latin form *tubrucus*, but rather from a Gothic-Gepidic plural, **þeuhbrōki(s)*. (The *ō* of that reconstructed plural suggests a very early occurrence of a vowel mutation – that is, an i-umlaut - produced under the regressive influence of the front vowel contained in an Old Germanic plural ending.)²⁵ On the other hand, the same author opposed both Skok and Meyer-Lübke, in considering that Rmn. *tureci* developed from an earlier **tubreci*, and the latter reflected exactly a Romanization of the above-mentioned East Germanic plural form **þeuhbrōki(s)*. In a footnote (on the same page) Gamillscheg rightly criticizes the "irrational attacks" against Diculescu's view, so much the more irrational as the (unnamed) "attackers" appear to have had no objection whatsoever to Jokl's proposal of an Old Germanic origin for Alb. *tirk*. It is in the same footnote that Gamillscheg favors the idea that certain forms of umlaut (reflected in both the *e* of Rmn. *tureci* and the even more contracted Alb. *tirk*)

²³ According to Diculescu (as quoted by Gamillscheg, loc.cit.), the plural *tureci* was the earliest Romanian form of the term, from which a singular form *tureac* was subsequently created.

²⁴ Since I learned only indirectly about Jokl's view on Alb. *tirk*, I do not know the precise arguments the Austrian scholar used in demonstrating the ultimately Old Germanic origin of that Albanian word. Anyway, it is clear that the form *tirk* derives from an Old Germanic mutated plural of a **þeuhbrōki* type. I will not insist along that line here; but I must mention that Albanian also has *brekë* 'drawers' (presented in Meyer 1891 simply as derived from Lat. *brāca*, with no explanation for the *e* of the Albanian form). There also is a derivative from *brekë*, namely Alb. *brekushe* 'long and loose drawers' (Duro/Hysa 1995). Besides *brekë*, the Kostallari dictionary (1984) includes Alb. *brakesha* 'white drawers' (with unmutated *a*).

²⁵ An interesting thing is that (unlike other Romance languages) Romanian also shows umlaut shifts, as manifest in examples such as *văr* 'cousin' - pl. *veri*, or *bandă* 'band' - pl. *benzi*. However, there is no Romanian example of an *o* mutated to *ö* and eventually to *e*, as in Germanic (cf. Germ. *Ton* - pl. *Töne*, Eng. *foot* - pl. *feet*).

could occur in East Germanic too. As a general conclusion of his commentary on Rmn. *tureci*, Gamillscheg firmly states that Diculescu was right, and that Rmn. *tureci* reflects the Romanization of a term that originally designated a piece of a typical Germanic costume.²⁶

The formation of Rmn. *tureci* has very interesting implications regarding the passage from Vulgar Latin to the earliest forms of Romanian.²⁷ First of all, the initial consonant of Rmn. *tureci* shows the same shift of Gmc. *þ* to V.Lat. *t*²⁸ as the one manifest in *all* the above-mentioned members of the West Romance *tubrucus* family.²⁹ The contracted form of Rmn. *tureci* (like that of Alb. *tirk*) is due mainly to the (quite expectable) disappearance of the *hb* consonantal cluster. The disappearance of *h*³⁰ actually poses no problem, since recorded Old Germanic words for “thigh” do indicate native weakening of that sound. In that respect, Gothic is supposed to have had **þiuh* (< IE **teuk-* ‘schwellen’ – cf. Köbler 1989, s.v. **þiuh*), and Old High German had *dioh*, whereas Old English had both *þeoh* and *þeo*, and Old Norse had only *þjó* (cf. Skeat 1993, s.v. *thigh*). In fact, it is a form like that of O.Norse *þjó* that most clearly accounts for the first part of Rmn. *cioareci* (see below).

Even if we consider that the uncomfortable cluster *hb* (represented as such in the reconstructed **þeuhbrōki*) was still in place when the Germanic compound was borrowed, an Old Germanic *h* was bound to vanish in early Romance anyway, just as its Latin counterpart.³¹ As for the Old Germanic *b*

²⁶ Gamillscheg, 1935, II: 258: “Auch diese Etymologie scheint mir evident zu sein. Das Wort ist als Ausdruck der typisch germanischen Tracht romanisiert worden.”

²⁷ According to Starostin’s glottochronological tree-diagram (as presented in Blažek 2007: 93), the earliest signs of Romanian as a distinct Romance idiom (that is, as a distinct branch of Late Vulgar Latin) appeared in the latter half of the sixth century. It was a period in which Latin still was the official language of the Eastern Roman Empire.

²⁸ I do not exclude the possibility that, in the case under discussion, speakers of Vulgar Latin might have heard a Germanic variant whose initial consonant sounded (in the original) closer to /t/ than to /θ/.

²⁹ “Ebenso sicher ist, daß [got.] *þ* im Anlaut stimmlos blieb und im Romanischen durch *t* ersetzt wurde...” (Gamillscheg, 1934, I: 40).

³⁰ According to Bennett (1980: 4), “*h* in the time of Wulfila probably denoted [h] as in English *he*.”

³¹ The *h* of classical Latin did not survive in the pronunciation of Late Vulgar Latin, therefore it practically left no trace in the pronunciation of Romance idioms – cf. Lat. *homō*, *hordeum*, *praehendere* > Rmn. *om*, *orz*, *prinde*, respectively.

(pronounced bilabially),³² it was still written in the Latinized form of *tubrucus*, and it survived (as either *b* or *v*) in some West Romance continuators (see above); but in the case of Rmn. *tureci* it appears to have vanished (by complete “vocalization”). Such a total dropping can be compared, for example, to what happened with the *b* of Lat. *consobrinus*, which survives in Macedo-Romanian as *cusurîn* ‘cousin’. (In fact, in comparison with M.Rmn. *cusurîn*, Fr. *cousin* – from the same Lat. *consobrinus* – looks as contracted as Alb. *tirk* in comparison with Rmn. *tureci*.) Finally, in regard to the *e* of *tureci*, as Diculescu suggested (see above), the earliest Romanian form of the Old Germanic loan under discussion must have been a plural form. That form was directly based on the Germanic mutated plural reconstructed by Gamillscheg as **þeuhbrōki(s)*, whereas the Romanian singular forms - *tureac*, *tureacă*, *tureacă* – appear to have been analogically created later.³³

In conclusion, the phonetic evolution that led to Rmn. *tureci* must have been approximately the following: **þeu(h)brōki* > **tūwreki* > *tureci* (pronounced /tu'reč/). The term under discussion (or, rather, one or another of its singular forms) has been presented in most Romanian dictionaries as a word of unknown origin, or as a word which can be referred only to Rmn. *tur* ‘seat of trousers’ (itself obscure, since it has only one correspondent, in Serbian-Croatian). In his etymological dictionary of Romanian, Ciorănescu (2001, s.v. *tur*) observes the generally assumed connection *tur* ~ *tureac*; nevertheless, he also mentions (with no comments) Diculescu’s proposal of a derivation of *tureac* “from O.Germ. *theobroch*, Gepid. **theubreki*, wherefrom M.Lat. *tubroces*.”³⁴ That connection appears to be,

³² In Gothic, after a vowel or a diphthong, *b* represented “a sound resembling *v* in English *have* but formed with both lips (bilabial)” – Bennett 1980: 3.

³³ The existence of both masculine and feminine singular forms in Romanian (*tureac* vs. *tureacă*), may indicate that there was some hesitation as to what kind of singular to create for a foreign term borrowed in a plural form, which eventually became Rmn. *tureci*. We know, for instance, that O.Eng. *brōk* (pl. *brēc*) was a feminine noun, like all its Old Germanic cognates; but in Romanian a plural form that has *-eci* as its final part can represent either a masculine or a feminine noun: e.g. masc. *lilic* ‘bat’ – pl. *lilici*, and fem. *teacă* ‘sheath’ – pl. *teci*. So, a plural like *tureci* could inspire either masc. *tureac* or fem. *tureacă* as singular forms.

³⁴ Ciorănescu (s.v. *tur*) mentions Philippide’s idea of a connection between Rmn. *tureac* and “Alb. *trik*” (sic!); he also mentions the derivation Rmn. *tureac* < Lat. **thylacus* < Gk. *θύλακος* (Densusianu, Rosetti, Candrea), which is hardly tenable.

in fact, the only way to a credible etymology for *tureci*, especially if we take into account the opinions expressed, after Diculescu, by scholars like Gamillscheg and Mihăescu (see above), and if we also take into account the rich West Romance material presented by Meyer-Lübke, s.v. *tubrucus*. At this point I must observe, on the one hand, that Rmn. *tureci* (a basically West Daco-Romanian term) has a clear connection with Old Germanic loans in West Romance; on the other hand, *tureci* cannot be said to be a *pan*-Romanian term, taking into consideration its absence from about one half of Romania, as well as from South-Danubian dialectal forms of Romanian.

There is, however, another Romanian term, *cioareci*, whose correspondence with *tureci* is (in my opinion) undeniable, and whose presence all over the Romanian ethnic space (north and south of the Danube) has been amply recorded. Dialectal evidence indicates that the *tureci* area is practically included in the much vaster area of the *cioareci* isogloss. As a particular illustration, I will mention two samples of dialectal speech recently recorded by Hoțopanu (2006: 29) in Cenad, a Romanian village in Hungary. The first sample is a rhymed couplet from a humorous “holler” (*strigătură*): “Bat’e cizma pă tureac,/ Că nu îi făină-n sac” (“Slap your boot on the tureac,/ For there’s no flour in the sack”); the second is a villager’s statement, from which we learn that in Cenad “iarna se-mbrăcau cu cioareci” (“in winter they would put on *cioareci*”).

Ciorănescu’s etymological dictionary of Romanian gives *cioareci* (pl.) with three meanings: ‘1. typical peasant trousers, made of white homespun; 2. (in certain regions) linen or cloth stockings worn by women in winter; 3. heavy woolen cloth.’ In the same entry, Ciorănescu mentions the existence of the Macedo-Romanian terms *cioarie* ‘cloth’ and (pl.) *cioariți* ‘stockings’ (see also *čioarie* ‘sorte de chausse en drap de ménage blanc ou noir, qui montent au dessus de genoux’, in Papahagi’s dictionary of 1974).³⁵ In MDA (vol. I) five meanings are given for *cioareci* (pl.): ‘1. peasant tight trousers, made of rough homespun or woolen cloth, often trimmed with galloon; 2. city trousers; 3. thin and colored stockings of homespun,

³⁵ A recent ethnographic documentary on the Romanian public TV confirmed to me that heirs of the Macedo-Romanians (Aromanians) who came to settle in Dobrogea (SE Romania) between the two World Wars still wear *cioariți* as part of their traditional festive costumes.

with trimmings, worn by peasant women in cold weather, or as protection against thorns; 3. gaiters; 4. heavy woolen cloth, of which *cioareci* are made.’ Rather surprisingly (in comparison with the rich material given under *tureatcă*, in MDA-IV), under *cioareci* MDA-I gives no figurative meaning, and no idiom (the same absence being evident in the case of M.Rmn. *čioaric* as presented in Papahagi 1974).

In regard to the origin of Rmn. *cioareci*, Ciorănescu (s.v. *cioareci*) gives a whole list of “insufficient” explanations (through Turkish, Hungarian, Bulgarian, or Neo-Greek), proposed by various predecessors. Ciorănescu’s own opinion is that the Romanian term under discussion should be regarded as being of “unknown origin.”³⁶ (The same author’s hypothesis, according to which *cioareci* might derive from an unattested Rmn. **ițari(c)* is unacceptable.) DEX, s.v. *cioareci*, also gives “unknown etymology” for the term under discussion, and so does Papahagi 1974, s.v. *čioaric*. It is only the more recent MDA (vol. I) that goes back to an earlier (hardly tenable) view according to which Rmn. *cioareci* might derive from Turk. *čaryk* (also mentioned, as *çarek* ‘Oriental boots’, in Ciorănescu 2001, s.v. *cioareci*).³⁷

I have no hesitation in assuming that Rmn. *cioareci* can derive only from an Old Germanic plural **pio(h)breki* ‘thigh-breeches’, that is, from a cognate of the term that Diculescu and Gamillscheg reconstructed as **theubreki* and **peuhbrōki(s)*, respectively, as the source for Rmn. *tureci* (see above). What happened to the second part of such an Old Germanic compound in the latter’s evolution towards becoming Rmn. *cioareci* is the same as what happened to that part in the case of *tureci* (< **tiu-wreci* < **piu-breki* < **peuh-brōki*). In regard to the origin of the first part of Rmn. *cioareci*, we should, first of all, imagine an Old Germanic term for “thigh” with an *o* (> Rmn. *oa*), such as the Old Norse word presented in de Vries 1961 as *þjó* ‘oberschenkel, arschbacke’ (< Gmc. **peuha-* < IE **teuk-*).

Whereas Rmn. *tureci* shows (like all its West Romance correspondents) passage through Late Vulgar Latin, Rmn. *cioareci* appears to have passed rather through the pre-Roman

³⁶The same opinion (“Etymologie Unbekannt”) had been expressed by Tiktin 1998 (1903), s.v. *ciorec*, pl. *cioreci* (“Bauernhosen aus weissem Tuch”).

³⁷I can imagine no historical circumstances under which a Turkish (or Turkic) term could come to designate a piece of the traditional costume specific to natives of north-western Romania.

substratum of Romanian. To be observed, in that respect, is not only the above mentioned *o* (which probably indicates an Old Germanic variant slightly different from the one that produced Rmn. *tureci*), but also the turning of an Old Germanic /θ/ not into /t/ (as in *tureci* and in its West Romance correspondents), but into an affricate of a /c/ type.³⁸ The subsequent shift from /c/ to /č/ poses no problem on Romanian ground: see correspondences between Macedo-Romanian and Daco-Romanian terms of Latin origin, such as *țeară* ~ *ceară* ‘wax’ and *ținți* ~ *cinci* ‘five’, or see Daco-Romanian shifts like *uliță* (‘street, lane’) > dim. *ulicioară*, *Bistrița* > *Bistricioara*, *Marița* > *Maricica*. Anyway, these as well as other arguments prove that *cioareci* must have become part of the common vocabulary used by early Romanians, in whose speech an Old Germanic compound **piobreki* became **cjoreči*, and eventually *cioareci* (pronounced /čwareč/ in modern Daco-Romanian), by sound shifts that are more archaic than the turning of Germanic /θ/ into Romance /t/.

That *cioareci* is part of a stock of Romanian terms that designate pieces specific to the traditional Romanian costume results not only from the fact that *cioarecar* (‘one that wears *cioareci*’) is sometimes used as a synonym of *peasant*, but also from the spectacular spreading of both thing and word. In regard to thing, the glossary of the recent ethnological volume of Ghinoiu (2002) gives *cioarec* (*cioareci*) with the following meanings: ‘1. fulled woolen cloth; 2. trousers of white homespun worn in most ethnographic areas of the country’. By “the country” Ghinoiu means Romania, within which (according to map 7 in Mihail 1978: 220) there is an impressive continuous area over which *cioareci* has been recorded (Muntenia, Oltenia, Banat, Transylvania, Crișana, plus a number of points in mountainous Moldavia and southern Dobrogea). The same situation is rendered by map 1176 of *Atlasul lingvistic român* (IV - Petrovici 1965). Also, according to Moise/ Klusch 1978: 8, the *cioareci* are part of the traditional man’s costume of Central-Southern Transylvania

³⁸ In regard to the first stage in the evolution of the initial consonant (/θ/ > /c/), I will observe that Romanian substratal terms such as *țarc* ‘enclosure, fold’ (pronounced /cark/) and *țep* ‘spike, thorn’ (pronounced /cep/) correspond to Albanian *thark* ‘enclosure’ and *thep* ‘ridge, muzzle’, respectively, which have initial /θ/.

(Sibiu County, to be more precise).³⁹ The same authors mention that the earliest graphical representation of Romanian *cioareci* appears in a book published by a Transylvanian Saxon, Laurentius Toppeltinus, in 1667.

The solid position of the term *cioareci* in Romanian is sustained by a series of Romanian proper names based on that appellative: Constantinescu 1963 (s.v. *CIORIC*) gives the family name *Cioricel* and the village name *Ciorecești*; and Iordan 1983 includes the family names *Cioarecu*, *Ciorec*, *Cioric*, *Cioriceanu*, *Cioriciu*. I extracted several Romanian family names of the same series from the telephone directories of Iași (*Cioarec*, *Cioric*, *Ciorici*) and Timișoara (*Cioaric*, *Ciorecan*).⁴⁰ Nevertheless, we should not confine ourselves to the Romanian state.

As indicated in a corner of the above-mentioned map 1176, the Daco-Romanian term *cioareci* has the Macedo-Romanian correspondent *čioariț* (the one also included in Papahagi's dictionary— see above). In such a case we should consider that the Old Germanic term Rmn. *cioareci* is based on was used in the earliest form of Romanian (that is, before the putative separation that occurred between the direct ancestors of the Macedo-Romanians and those of all the other Romanians). One significant fact, revealed by the same map 1176 of the *Atlas*, is that, when asked about the designation of their traditional trousers, Megleno-Romanians and Istro-Romanians did not give anything like *cioareci* or *čioariț*, but they gave *bărnivec* and *benevreke*, respectively. The relationship between, on the one hand, Rmn. *tureci* and *cioareci*, and, on the other hand, the rich group of Southeast European correspondences that include Rmn. *berneveci* (recorded only in Northeast Romania), Bulg. *beneveci*, and Serb.-Croat. *benevreke*, *benebreke* would require a large extension to this article. (Suffice it to say that the final parts of all those

³⁹ "The *cioareci* worn during the cold season are made of white fullled homespun. In summer they wear white *cioareci* made of hemp or cotton cloth." — Moise/ Klusch 1978: 19.

⁴⁰ Some of those names can, of course, derive not from Rmn. *cioareci*, but from Rmn. *cioric(iu)*, an obsolete-dialectal variant of a word now generally known as *șorici* 'skin of bacon, rind'. But the latter (itself considered to be a word of obscure origin), may very well derive from *cioarec*, by a jocular comparison between hairy cloth and hairy pig's skin. I must also observe that Rmn. *șoric(iu)*/ *cioric(iu)* was included by Russu (1981: 399) in his list of "autochthonous" terms.

correspondents reflect the same element *-breki* as the one visible in *tureci* and *cioareci*, and that the first part of Bulg. *beneveci* was referred, by Mladenov, to Germ. *Bein* – cf. Georgiev 1971, s.v. *beneveci*).⁴¹

In the above-discussed cases that indicate Old Germanic influence on non-Germanic idioms, one should note that not only peculiar trousers, but also the material they are made of must have represented an element of novelty spread by the early expansion of Germanic populations.⁴² Since, as late as Caesar's time, the Germanic tribesmen were known as stockbreeders rather than as ploughmen (see *De bello Gallico*, I, 2),⁴³ it is not difficult to assume that the same stockbreeders were good at processing animal hair into cloth and felt. But such aspects belong to other directions of study.

My conclusion is that the Romanians are the only European people who preserved two distinct words⁴⁴ based on an Old Germanic compound that originally meant 'thigh-breeches'. According to the demonstration above, Rmn. *tureci* (with correspondences in West Romance and in Albanian) could come from Gothic via Vulgar Latin, whereas the more archaic *cioareci* (now exclusively Romanian) could have its origin in a historical context of close contacts between Old Germanic intruders and Southeast European populations, possibly even in pre-Roman times. As regards form, a remarkable aspect is that both *tureci* and *cioareci* reflect very early Germanic mutated plurals, with i-umlaut. Taking such aspects into consideration, the etymological analysis of Rmn. *tureci* and *cioareci* as Old Germanisms proves to be relevant for Germanic proto-history, as well as for the *Romania-Germania* relationship in general.

⁴¹I already have sufficient material that indicates an origin of Rmn. *berneveci* and of all its Balkan correspondents (including the remarkably transparent Serb. *benebreke*) in an Old Germanic compound that designated leg-coverings, more precisely a compound that can be perfectly translated by Germ. *Beinkleider*.

⁴²Observe, for instance, that Rmn. *cioarec* designates both a type of leg-covering, and the special cloth the latter is made of (cf. the glossary of Ghinoiu 2002: 290, s.v. *cioarec*).

⁴³I used Handford's translation of *The Conquest of Gaul* (ed. 1960).

⁴⁴Or even three, if we also take *berneveci* into consideration.

References

- AHD – *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*
1973 Ed. William Morris. New York: American Heritage Publishing Co.
- Baumgartner, Emmanuèle and Philippe Ménard
1996 *Dictionnaire étymologique et historique de la langue française*. Paris: Le Livre de Poche.
- Bennett, William H.
1980 *An Introduction to the Gothic Language*. New York: MLAA.
- Blažek, Václav
2007 From August Schleicher to Sergei Starostin – On the development of the tree-diagram models on the Indo-European languages. *Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 35, 1&2, 82-109.
- Bosworth, Joseph
1983 *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, ed. T. Northcote Toller. Oxford: University Press.
- Ciorănescu, Alexandru
2001 *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, ed. T. Șandru Mehedinți and M. Popescu Marin. București: Saeculum.
- Cojocaru, Victor (ed.)
2005 *Ethnic Contacts and Cultural Exchanges North and West of the Black Sea from the Greek Civilization to the Ottoman Conquest*. Romanian Academy, Iași: Trinitas Publishing House.
- Constantinescu, N. A.
1963 *Dicționar onomastic românesc*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Corominas, Juan
1967 *Breve diccionario etimológico de la lengua castellana* (2nd ed.). Madrid: Gredos.
- DEX – *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*
1996 Eds. I. Coteanu et al. București: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Diculescu, Constantin
1922 *Die Gepiden -Forschung zur Geschichte Daziens im frühen Mittelalter und zur Vorgeschichte des rumänischen Volkes*. Leipzig: Kabitsch.
- Duro, Ilo and Ramazan Hysa
1995 *Fjalor anglisht-shqip*. Tiranë: EDFA.
- DUW – *Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*
2001 Mannheim: Dudenverlag.

- Ernout, Antoine and Antoine Meillet
1985 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Gamillscheg, Ernst
1934-35 *Romania Germanica - Sprach- und Siedlungsgeschichte der Germanen auf dem Boden des alten Römerreiches* (I, II). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Georgiev, Vladimir et al.
1971 *Bŭlgarski etimologičen rečnik (A-Z)*. Sofija: Akademija na Naukite.
- Ghinea, Eliza and Dan Ghinea
2000 *Localitățile din România – Dicționar*. București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Ghinoiu, Ion et al. (eds.)
2002 *Sărbători și obiceiuri* (Vol. II). București: Editura Enciclopedică.
- Handford, S. A. (transl.)
1960 *Caesar – The Conquest of Gaul*. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books.
- Hoad, T. F. (ed.)
1993 *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford University Press.
- Hoops, Johannes et al.
1976 *Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hoțopanu, Ana
2006 Chizeșii și organizarea jocurilor inițiatice în Cenadul Unguresc. *Revista română*, 3 (27-28).
- Jordan, Iorgu
1983 *Dicționar al numelor de familie românești*. București: Editura Științifică.
- Jettmar, Karl
1983 *Arta stepelor*, transl. C. Popescu. București: Meridiane.
- Kostallari, Androkli et al. (eds.)
1984 *Fjalor i shqipës së sotme*. Tiranë: Akademia e Shkencave.
- Köbler, Gerhard
1989 *Gotisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Krahe, Hans
1966 *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*, I. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- MacLennan, Malcolm
1991 *A Pronouncing and Etymological Dictionary of the Gaelic Language*. Aberdeen: University Press.

Mair, Victor H.

- 2005 Recent Physical Anthropological Studies of the Tarim Basin Mummies and Related Populations. In: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference – Los Angeles, November 5-6, 2004*, Journal of Indo-European Monograph Series, No. 50 (1-47), Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.

Meyer, Gustav

- 1891 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg: Trübner.

Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm

- 1930-35 *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (3. vollständig neubearbeitete Auflage). Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

MDA – *Micul dicționar academic* (I-IV)

- 2001-03 Eds. M. Sala et al. București: Univers Enciclopedic.

Mihail, Zamfira

- 1978 *Terminologia portului popular românesc în perspectivă etnolingvistică comparată sud-est europeană*. București: Editura Academiei.

Moise, Ilie and Horst Klusch

- 1978 *Portul popular din județul Sibiu*. Sibiu: Centrul de Îndrumare a Creației Populare.

Moldovanu, Dragoș (ed.)

- 1991 *Tezaurul toponimic al României – Moldova*, Vol. I. București: Editura Academiei Române.

Owen, Francis,

- 1966 *The Germanic People – Their Origin, Expansion and Culture*. New Haven, Conn.: College & University Press.

Papahagi, Tache

- 1974 *Dicționarul dialectului aromân – Dictionnaire aroumain (macédo-roumain)*. București: Editura Academiei.

Păunescu, Dumitru (ed.)

- 1978 *Folclor din Bunești*. Rîmnicu Vîlcea: Centrul de Îndrumare a Creației Populare.

Petrovici, Emil et al. (eds.)

- 1965 *Atlasul lingvistic românesc*, Vol. IV. Cluj: Academia R.S.R., Filiala Cluj.

Pfeifer, Wolfgang et al.

- 1989 *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Plinius Maior

- 2001 *Naturalis historia*, transl./ed. I. Costa. Iași : Polirom.

- Pokorny, Julius
1959-69 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (I, II). Bern: A. Francke.
- Poruciuc, Adrian
1999 The Significance of Old Germanic Elements Preserved in Romanian. In: Reiter 1999: 175-189.
2005 Lexical Elements that Reflect Close Contacts between Old Germanic and Autochthonous Populations in Southeast Europe. In: Cojocaru 2005: 369-381.
- Puşcariu, Sextil
1976 *Limba română*, I, ed. I. Dan. Bucureşti: Minerva.
- Reiter, Norbert (ed.)
1999 *EuroLinguistik – Ein Schritt in die Zukunft. Beiträge zum Symposium vom 24. Bis 27. März 1997 im Jagdschloß Glienicke (bei Berlin)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Russu, I. I.
1981 *Etnogeneza românilor*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.
- Sârbu, Richard and Vasile Frăţilă
1998 *Dialectul istroromân – Texte şi glosar*. Timişoara: Amarcord.
- Schmidt, Ludwig
1969 *Die Ostgermanen*. München: Beck.
- Skeat, Walter
1993 *Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*. Ware, Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Editions Ltd.
- Suciu, Coriolan
1967-68 *Dicţionar istoric al localităţilor din Transilvania* (I, II). Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.
- Şerb, Ion (ed.)
1967 *Folclor din Oltenia şi Muntenia* [with glossaries of regional Romanian terms]. Bucureşti: Editura pentru Literatură.
- Tiktin, Hariton
1998 *Dicţionar român-german*. Bucureşti: Paideia.
- Vasmer, Max
1986-87 *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, ed. O.N. Trubačev. Moskva: Progress.
- Vries, Jan de
1961 *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
1963 *Etymologisch Woordenboek*. Utrecht: Aula-Boeken.