

SHORT DESCRIPTIVE HISTORY ABOUT THE ORIGIN OF THE ARM'N-MACEDONIANS

Branislav STEFANOSKI

Historical and linguistic researcher, Tetovo, R. Macedonia

Abstract: *The Armenians, "Pelagians" are European carriers of the achievements in all the fields. The Armenian, "Pelagian" language is identical with the recent Arm'n-Macedonian language. If were the Greeks that borrowed the works of the contemporariness of Homer who write into Armenian, "Pelagian" letters, translated into Greek and preserved them to the future. Arm'n Macedonian are direct successors of the Ancient Macedonians (Pelazgians-Thracians-Illyric) and, in their every use, has almost completely saved the Ancient Arm'n Macedonian language.*

Keywords: *Arm'n-Macedonians, Greeks' origin, Danaans, migrations, Latinization.*

4000 years ago, in East, South, Central and parts of Western Europe, as well as Asia Minor, in zones until Sinai, including even the Ural mountain, one mighty and numbered people lived, divided into hundreds tribes. They spoke one and the same language with insignificant differences in the dialects and the speeches. In means that, regardless to the vast spaces that separated this people, the different tribes could completely well communicate and understand among each other. The only slightly different were the dialects of the Dacians in Dacia, who, in a smaller or huger concentration reach places on the territory of whole Europe, first of all parts of Italy and what is today Portugal.

Somewhere before 4100/3800 years B.C. Middle East groups migrate on the island of Crete and southern part of the Balkans Peninsula. It is first of all the migration of the Cadmeans (Phoenicians). The trojan war, according to my strict analysis and researching presented in the study "Pelasgi: language, Writing, Name" (Tetovo, 1998) took place in 1263 and lasted until 1253 B.C. On the basis of the analysis I did on many Thracian / Illyrian writings as well as the Pelagian scripture from Lemnos which were studied in "Pelasgi...", we can claimed with complete assurance that there is an irrejectable structural and linguistic identity between the Arm'nian (Thracian-Illyrian) and the Armenian (Pelagian) language. Precisely,

the Pelagian dialects are in linguistic interdependence with the Thracian-Illyrian speeches. From Homeric "Iliad" one can clearly see that the inhabitants of Troy, the Trojans (Dardanians) spoke one language with the Phrygians, Mysians, Thracians, Pelagians. They tremendously well understood even the language of the invasionists, even the Danaans who were biligual, and who primarily originated from Egypt.

Herodotus (History, I, 58) is completely decisive when saying that the Greek language is a newborn one that had been speaking parallel with the Pelagians in the beginning, and by time had grown into separate language. So it is no wonder that the members of different tribes in the Balkans and Asia Minor, fighting on the Trojan side, regarding the language understand quite well also the Danaans, who as identity were only part of the intruders.

It is completely sure that we cannot take as Danaans their allies Leleges, Peraebians, Locrians, Myrmidons of Achillees, the Aeolians... Only the Achaeans were literally mixed with the Danaans and is probably why the bilingualism emerged among the Danaans, something that is said by many Ancient historians and philosophers.

Following my additional analysis on the oldest secured text of Homeric "Iliad" I could firmly suggest that this oldest text is only a translation from the original, which had been

written on Armenian (Pelasgian) language, and the language from the translation was mixed Mycenaean-Danaan thick with original Armenian (Pelasgian) words in parallel use.

From Herodotus (History, VII, 73) we know that the Phrygians originated from Macedonia where they had been called Brygi, and that the Armenians shared the same origin with the Phrygians, Armenians and Arm'nians I have spoken in details in the study "Pelasgians...". Herodotus (History, 50-53), also, suggests that the Greek mythology was partly taken from the Egyptians and the most part from Pelasgians. As far as the second generation gods' names are concerned, he decisively says that the description of the character and the features of every god, as well as the naming, was done by Homer.

It is true, from the analysis on "Iliad" one could undoubtedly accept the conclusion that the names of gods are in function of the epithets representing their activities and characteristics. The impression is even bigger since the epithets could be perfectly explained with the actual Arm'n-Macedonian language, who is related closely with the Ancient Armenian (Pelasgian) language, the one, Homer had written the "Iliad" in. Herodotus (History, I, 94) gives the information about the first known colonization from Lydia to Asia Minor, in Umbria in Italy. Herodotus also provide the information about the second colonisation of the part of the Phocis inhabitants (Pelasgians), town 40km north from Smyra in Ionia, and was founded by the inhabitants of the province Phocis from the south of Thessaly, in part of today France where about 600 B.C. the city of Marseilles was founded. In 560 B.C. after the fall of Lydia under Persia part of the Phocians moved to Alalia in Corsica. In IV c. B.C. the Macedonians, lead by Philip II subjugated whole Balkans, and lead by Alexander the whole, in that time, known world. Besides the many dynastic wars, the conquered territories remained under Macedonian rule for almost 150 years. The Romans dominated Macedonia in II c. B.C.

What could we acknowledge. In the second millennium B.C. on the Balkans peninsula and in the most part of Asia

Minor the only ones who dominated were the Arm'nians (Thracians-Illyrians) and Armenians (Pelasgians).

There were inseparable linguistic and genetic relations between the two identities. The relation is so big that during the whole Ancient times the mixing of the two identities with the same origin is present on these places, especially in the coastal areas.

Generally speaking, Arm'nians (Thracians-Illyrians) are mostly involved with cattle breeding and they populated the mountainous parts of a given region, while the Armenians (Pelasgians) were mostly living from agriculture and inhabited the riverbanks and the lowlands and because of that called themselves by the original name "Pe largi" = on vido, meaning lolanders. In the recent times both terms Armenians and Arm'nians are in active use as names of ethnic self-identification by Arm'n-Macedonians, and the identity "Armenj" in use only in South Thessaly and parts of Epirus. In the beginning of the second millennium B.C. in south parts of today Greece small groups of Phoenicians inhabited. In the middle of the II millennium a bigger group of colonizers came to Peloponnesus, mostly, from Egypt, which according to their leader Danaus identified themselves with the common name Danaans. The migration of the Danaans under the rule of Danaus is a result from the dynastic battles in Egypt. The defeated in 1527/6 B.C. came to Peloponnesus and inhabited the cities of Argos and Mycenae. By time, as a result from the mixing between the newcomers and the autochthonous Pelasgo-Thracians, in a process enduring almost a millennium the Greek ethnicity and the Ancient Greek language was born. It has to be noticed that the emergence and the spreading of the Greek language took place firstly in the urban centers where the education was on a very high level. The area around the "polis" (city/state) remained "barbarian". This situation lasted until the formation of the Greek state for the first time in the history of the Greeks in the first half of XIX c. A.D. After the foundation of Greece, using methods of force and pressures denationalization and assimilation of the

autochthonous Arm'nian (Pelasgian-Thracian) population took and is taking place.

From many readings of the Ancient scriptures, we can conclude that within a period of 4.000 years the Arm'nian-Macedonian (Thracian-Illyrian) language remained almost unchanged. Maybe a small transformation could be noticed at certain words, but the pronunciation and the basic structure are secured. Because of that, we can surely said that the recent Arm'n-Macedonian language is the same as the one spoken by: Pelopes, Achilles, Midas, Philip, Aristotle, Alexander, Spartacus... In the same time, the Greek language had suffered many transformations.

So the question is: how the Arm'nian (Thracian-Illyrian) language remained preserved for four millennia, while the Greeks even today regarded as the carriers of the European culture, changed their language so much that between the old and the new Greek emerges such a difference that the old Greek, and not to talk about the oldest translation of the "Iliad", is not understandable for the modern Greeks.

My opinion, based on many detailed researching, is adequate to the one of Plato, in "Cratylus" and of Herodotus, stated in "History". In the three and a half millennium of mutual cohabitation, many "barbarians" (Pelasgo-Thracian-Illyrians) mixed and melted with the Danaans. By melting, linguistic elements were taken from both languages. The taken words transformed under the influence of the phonetics of the Danaans language. But the basic meaning of the words was more or less preserved. The influence of the Arm'nian language of the Greek by time enlarged, as bigger groups of Arm'nians melted, so that, if one compare the words in Old Greek and the actual one will state that the presence of the original Arm'nian words is much bigger today than in the past. This comparison could lead us to misconception that maybe it is a result from the process of latinization. But is it not the matter, given the fact that in the oldest translated version of the "Iliad" (somewhere from the Vth c. B.C., while the first translation dates VII c. B.C.) whose language was completely nonunderstandable to the Greeks

from the Classical Age, some words were to be interpreted by specially educated persons, and also the fact that some pure Arm'nian words which were later identified as "barbarian" are cleansed from the Greek language, still being completely preserved in the actual Arm'n-Macedonian.

On the other hand, the persistence of the Arm'n-Macedonian language could be comprehend through the following arguments: Arm'nians, Armenians (Pelasgi and Thracians-Illyrians) as the most numbered people after the Hindu, could not put their language on change because the history does not know of any assimilation of a greater people than they were by themselves. On a contrary, vast masses of Thracian-Illyrians melted into less numbered foreign ethnic identities. By melting into the less numbered, the language also influence the less numbered, which resulted in emergence of new language containing features from both languages. It is really a wonder how could the smaller melted the bigger one. We should have in mind that those smaller ethnicities are from Asiatic origin where the national is rather more stressed and in the new mixed area is utmost cared. On the other side, historically, the Pelasgians are the Thracian-Illyrians, as well as their recent descendants, the Arm'n-Macedonians, the nationalism and chauvinism is always regarded as something strange and unimaginable. There could be a severe battle over property, existence, or development, but that battle never was and is on a national level, for securing the linguistic specificity and defense of the national identity. The expression of the linguistic distinguishness is high only in the moments of acute emotional crisis when the feeling of personal pride is put under question.

I think that good example for this could be the accusations of Alexander towards his general Philotas. The accusations claimed that Philotas had no respect for his mother tongue – the Macedonian since he commanded with subordinate Macedonian soldiers using interpreter, saying the commands into Greek. We can see the absurdity in: first, Philotas found humiliating the speaking of his own Macedonian language, and second, Alexander,

as a master of the world, who could impose his mother tongue over the conquered peoples, a huge part of who were from Thracian-Illyrian origin, he proffered the Greek language as a language of communication.

It is the same situation today. Many famous people from Arm'n-macedonian origin, whose mother tongue is the Arm'n-macedonian, prefer not to talk on their mother tongue. But they do not forget, in a moment of emotional rush, regardless whether it is positive or negative reaction, loudly, aggressively, to accentuate their ancient Macedonian origin.

The negligence of the Macedonian aristocracy towards their mother Macedonian tongue can be also viewed through the fact that in the post-Alexander time in many scriptures written into Macedonian language not only Greek words but whole sentences were placed. This behaviour should not astonish, having the fact in that time the Greek language was celebrated as a language of culture the same as in XVIII c. the French language in Europe was the language that every well educated and well bred European had to know.

All this anomalies in the use of foreign words and sentences into an autochthonous language should be regarded as fashion. The fashion of foolishness. The wish to use foreign language in your own community as a fulfillment of intellectual superiority-stupidity. From the comparative analysis I did, clearly, undoubtedly arises the fact that the Arm'n-Macedonian language is the purest and the oldest language in Europe. It is a perfectly saved, preserved language that allow us to reach the linguistic basis of the European languages. It especially refers to the Roman languages and the Greek, and through it on all other European languages. From the other side, by comparative analysis with the Slav languages it could reach deep into the prehistory of the European languages. Despite the century long intensive denationalization of the Arm'n-Macedonians, the language is well enough preserved and a huge number of people still speak it well.

What the Latinization presents. The Latinization is only an improvisation, more simply, one big lie that the educated people in

the time of Humanism and the Renaissance accepted it as a truth. After the Dark Middle Ages, wars and big migrations of the peoples, the Europeans did not have a sound foundation on which follow until the recent days instinctively take it for granted, developed with improvisations in the different scientific institutions and through the educational system spread it among the vast population. A lie is being spread, completely unconsciously, simply, because the truth is not known. One cannot reach truth by reproducing the lie, but through researching. Because the researching are hard and difficult, for those employed in the scientific institutions the easiest way is to reproduce the commonly accepted lie. It brings status, prosperity and money for existence.

What are the arguments.

1. By the analysis of ancient scriptures we can clearly confirm that the Thracian-Illyrian language is still alive miraculously (with exception of some religious terms which are forgotten due to the converting) is almost completely preserved in the actual Arm'n-Macedonian language.

2. Herodotus and Virgil inform us about three migrations of Pelasgian-Thracian-Illyrian population from Asia Minor on the Apennines. The first resulted in the formation of Etruscans and Etruria. The second resulted in the formation of Rome, Romans and the Latin language. I said the formation of the Latin language, not Roman, simply because when we speak about Latin language we should have in mind that it is a new formed, administrative, language of the literature. There is no question if it is some spoken language, that the citizen of Rome used it in their inter-communication. Even less was that language spoken by the Empire population. The people spoke the simple, "vulgar" language, that much differed from the newly established Latin literary. The aim of creating the Latin standard language is the wish to form strict, administrative, state language, language which, by it's mixture of Celtic-Pelasgian-Thracian-Illyrian would be acceptable for the most of the population of the Empire. From the other side, as a literary, standardized language it had to parallel and to cast out the standardized Greek language. This mixture (The Latin one) was result from the

fusion of the ingenious Celtic-Latin population with the new come Pelasgian-Thracian-Illyrians. The third migration is the Fochisians one.

3. Besides the mentioned migrations from Asia Minor, there were also migrations from the Balkans on the Apennines. The famous migration is the one by the Illyrian tribe Venetians from the Black Sea coasts in parts of present Venetia, by which name the whole region was called Veneto, and the city itself, Venetia. I would like to say my opinion about the name Veneti since the Slavs migrating from beyond the Carpathians towards the Balkans also were identified after that name, in the fifth c. A.D. The clandestine of the name, which ostensibly covers one ethnic identity in two quite different time intervals, lies in the meaning of the word Veneti. The identity Veneti, not only in the Italian speeches, but also on the Balkans, meant and meant Neophytes. People who are newcomers. As the Illyrian Venetians, who first inhabit territory with Thracian speech, and later move on the Apennines, so the Slav Venetians on the territories they inhabited were Novice. It is quite logical to use the term Venetians = Newcomers as their identification within time.

4. Another migration, a compulsory one, happened from the territory of Ancient Macedonia on the Apennines. After the victory at Pydna, on 22 June 168 B.C., of the Roman army over the Macedonian one and the devastation of 70 urban settlements, in Upper Macedonia and Epirus, 150.000 Macedonians are taken to the Apennines as slaves.

5. As far as the colonization the Roman Empire did is concerned, seen by the Latino phonic historians and linguists as a fundamental evidence for the theory of Latinization (since the beginning of the process), I can tell that besides the one over Dacia the historic records knows nothing about another. And even this colonization was done primarily with Thracian-Illyrian (Phrygians, Mysians, Dardanians...) from Asia Minor. So globally speaking, we can discuss the Arm'nization, Thracian-Illyrianization of Dacia (the part that is today called Moldova), and not at all about Latinization. The presence of Latino phones in Dacia can be accepted only

in limited numbers in the Danubian part. They were mainly soldiers and administration who became farmers after leaving service. With the later withdrawal of the Empire borders on the river Danube as a border line, all the melted Latino phones together with the barbarians lead by Aurelian (270-275) passed on the right bank of Danube, founding the province Dacia Ripensis with capital city of Racia - present Archer. Their overall number according to the precise historical records did not pass over 80.000. Only the Thracian-Illyrian novice remained north of Danube. The Latinization could not be spread by someone who did not know the Latin language. More over, the question whether there is not Latin colonization in Macedonia is surpassed, if we take into consideration that after the fall of the Greek polices under Rome, and that happened immediately after the fall of Macedonia, the PROTECTORS that Rome appointed as rulers of the Greek polices, were the Macedonians, not Romans.

6. The Romans had officially recognized Troad and Ilion as a cradle of the Roman citizens. It is for this reason the Ilion was the first to have received the privileged status in the Roman Empire.

7. If the Romans themselves officially recognized Troad as a place of their origin it means that the Roman language must have been adequate to the Dardanian language (who were the founders of Troad and Ilion), whose language, on its side, is from the same origin with the language of Phrygians-Brygi, the Macedonians, i.e. the recent Arm'n-Macedonians.

8. The problem with the supposed huge influence of the Latin language in Macedonia becomes even more clearer if we have in mind the fact that the tombstones writing even in the time of the Roman biggest power had been written by the Macedonians besides in the Greek and the Macedonian also with the old Pelasgian ortography, which remained in use by the Arm'n-Macedonian until XVIII century, when in Moscopole, in the fury of the national enlightenment and the search for the Latin roots was replaced by the Latin letters, and even, part of the Moscopoleans wanted to convert into Catholicism. Also, from the

analysis of many epitaphs in Ancient Macedonia, dating from the Roman period written by Italians (administration officers of soldiers coming from the Apennines) one can clearly conclude that they are written besides the Latin and Greek language also with the Pelasgian "Greek" letters. It is not clear where is here the Latin influence when the Romans themselves, by chance being in Macedonia, preferred to use of the Greek instead of their mother Latin even their tombstones.

9. The phenomenon of Latinization had to be understood in relation with the actual English domination. Namely, the Englishmen conquered North America and succeeded to impose the English language as official to all the colonizers coming from all over the world. Today the English language is not spread throughout the world by England, but by the U.S.A. It is the same situation with the Latinization. In the ancient times of the Balkans and the Asia Minor regions Arm'nian (Thracian-Illyrian) and the related Armenian (Pelasgian) language was spoken. By the many colonization of the population from these regions into the Apennines, actually, there had been Arm'nization (Thracian-Illyrianization) of the domestic Italian population. Later with the foundation of Rome and the mighty Roman empire we only have subjugation of the Dacian-Thracian-Illyrian-Pelasgian territories over Roman administration. There is not a word for any enforcement of the Latin language, since there was no need and also no way to do it. The people spoke their "barbarian" Dacian-Thracian-Illyrian-Pelasgian identical, although divided into conglomerate of dialects, language, named during the Roman Empire as popular, "vulgar" and continued to be spoken until the present day. When we use the term "barbarian" language, we regard the language that is most standardized according to strict grammatical norms as the Greek and the Latin were.

10. If the Romans, did spread the Latin language, having in mind the strong state administration, the conquered peoples would not speak any "vulgar" language at all, but as it is with the actual spreading of the English, they would have been speaking pure Latin.

What was actually done by Rome. Rome did what Alexander had done earlier. It put under its command and authority all the identical Pelasgo-Thracian-Illyrians and using their aid conquered the rest of the world. This can be proved by the fact that from 80 Roman Emperors 41 were from Roman-Thracian-Illyrian origin. Among them are: Diocletian, Aurelian, Maximinus Thrax, Galerius, Constantine the Great... many of them speaking with strong "barbarian" accent and part of them could not at all throw away from everyday use of many "barbarian" words. It is obvious that the Roman citizens did not have any difficulty in understanding the "barbarian" words. The mentioned number counts only those ruled Rome after the conquest of the Thracian-Illyrian lands.

What we have from Latinization. From Latinization we have nothing. Those who spoke the Arm'nian (Thracian-Illyrian) language preserved it until the recent days with all its dialects and with very small modifications. The Latin language itself died out besides its vast use in the administration throughout the Roman Empire. The Latin language extinct besides the still active use by the Catholic Church and the believers do not understand the meaning of the words. It means that the language is dead. And it is dead since it was artificially created. It was administrative. With the fall of the Roman Empire the language vanished. In the Western part, in the cradle of the Empire it has been replaced by the popular Italian while in the Eastern part the imposed by the majority in Constantinople Greek language.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Densusianu, N., *Dacia Preistorica*, Editura Arhetip, Bucarest, 2002;
2. Lukic, O., *Serbs, the oldest people*, vol. II., Naucna Kniga, Belgrade, 1990;
3. Mashkin, N.A., *Ancient Rome History*, Naucna Kniga, Belgrade, 1951;
4. Branislav, S., *Short Descriptive History About The Origin Of The Arm'n Macedonian*, Casa Gramosta, 2005.