

81/P14

SORIN PALIGA

Toponimia slavă și preslavă în sud-estul european.  
Introducere în studiul toponimiei slave arhaice

Slavic and Pre-Slavic Place-Names in Southeast Europe.  
Introduction to the Study of Archaic  
Slavic Place-Names

*Editura Universității din București*

– 2003 –



**SORIN PALIGA**

**Toponimia slavă și preslavă  
în sud-estul european.  
Introducere în studiul toponimiei  
slave arhaice**

**Slavic and Pre-Slavic Place-Names  
in Southeast Europe.  
Introduction to the Study  
of Archaic Slavic Place-Names**

**EDITURA UNIVERSITĂȚII DIN BUCUREȘTI  
2003**

SPECTRU DE TRAI UNIVERSITARIA  
C2003  
IV 514400

56-103

Referenți științifici: Prof. dr. **Mihai Mitu**  
Prof. dr. **Tiberiu Pleter**

Scientific reviewers: Prof. **Mihai Mitu**, PhD  
Prof. **Tiberiu Pleter**, PhD

**B.C.U. Bucuresti**



C20032646

© Editura Universității din București  
Șos. Panduri, 90-92, București - 76235; Telefon/Fax: 410.23.84  
E-mail: [editura@unibuc.ro](mailto:editura@unibuc.ro)  
Internet: [www.editura.unibuc.ro](http://www.editura.unibuc.ro)

**Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României**  
**PALIGA, SORIN**

**Toponimia slavă și preslavă în sud-estul european:**  
**introducere în studiul toponimiei slave arhaice /**  
Sorin Paliga – București: Editura Universității din  
București, 2003  
96 p.; cm.  
Bibliogr.  
ISBN 973-575-730-3

811.16373.21

Introducere .....	5
Introduction .....	8
A General Introduction to the Study of Pre-Slavic and Pre-Romance Place-Names in Central and Southeast Europe .....	11
Generalities .....	11
Classification and Principles of Analysis .....	12
Toponymical Stratification and Linguistic Investigation .....	15
A General View .....	17
The Toponymical Lexicons .....	18
Lexicon A: Pre-Slavic Place-Names in the Balkanic Peninsula .....	20
Lexicon B: Pre-Slavic Elements in the Adriatic Islands .....	35
I. Kvarnerian Group .....	36
II. Archipelago Zadar-Šibenik .....	39
III. Central Dalmatian Group .....	43
IV. South Dalmatian Group .....	44
Lexicon C: Pre-Romance Place- and River-Names in Romania .....	47
Lexicon D: Archaic Place- and River-Names in Czech and Slovak .....	61
Anthroponomical Relics in Romanian and South Slavic .....	67
Remarks on the Thracian, Romanian and Slavic Phonetic Changes .....	73
References .....	85



## Introducere

Studiul comparat al toponimiei este unul dintre domeniile cele mai interesante ale lingvisticii comparate. Cercetările din ultimele decenii au confirmat faptul că toponimia poate oferi date noi privind istoria europeană. Dincolo de inevitabilele dispute științifice, de ipotezele avansate de diverși autori, de-a lungul anilor s-a confirmat faptul că Europa Centrală și de Sud-Est oferă un material bogat și interesant. Alături de cercetările din alte domenii științifice, toponimia comparată, la nivel european sau mondial, ne arată cum, de-a lungul mileniilor, oamenii au gândit în termeni similari sau identici. Este și motivul pentru care, indiferent de structura etno-lingvistică actuală, în Europa de Vest, Centrală sau de Est, vom întâlni toponime, hidronime și oronime de diverse origini – celtice și preceltice în Europa occidentală, trace și pretrace în Europa Centrală și de sud-est, ilire și preilire de-a lungul coastei adriatice, hellenice și prehellenice în Grecia etc. – dar care, în esență, respectă câteva principii; le vom enumera și clasifica în paginile următoare.

În general, referindu-ne doar la spațiul central și sud-est european, asupra căruia ne-am concentrat în acest volum, constatăm că există asemănări sau identități în transmiterea toponimelor arhaice (preslave, preromane), că limbile vorbite, din preistorie și până astăzi, au lăsat urme, și nu puține, în toate limbile studiate preponderent de noi aici: limbile sud-slave, româna, ceha și slovacă. Situații similare sau identice se întâlnesc însă și în alte limbi: polona, ucraineană, rusa. În unele cazuri, formele mai noi interferează, la nivel popular, cu cele arhaice, având loc, gradual și inevitabil, un proces complex de adaptare, fie prin etimologie populară, fie prin substituție etimologică (vezi mai jos numeroase exemple, cum ar fi cele analizate, la timpul lor, mai ales de Petar Skok pentru arealul croat și de France Bezlaj pentru arealul sloven).

Nu ne-am propus, în aceste pagini, o tratare exhaustivă a materialului disponibil. Sperăm însă că am reușit să prezentăm cele mai interesante și mai relevante forme. Deși o sinteză amplă, bazată pe studiul comparativ-etimologic-istoric, privind toponimia Europei ar fi necesară, nu ne putem propune un asemenea orizont. Preocuparea noastră esențială a fost de a aduna forme specifice sud-estului și centrului european, urmând ca, în viitor, să putem cuprinde și alte areale lingvistice. Pe de o parte, o asemenea întreprindere presupune un mare volum de cercetare, ce ar trebui, credem, întreprins de un grup mai larg, din mai multe țări. Pe de altă parte, există câteva sinteze, este drept globale, cum ar fi Kiss 1980, în maghiară, un dicționar de toponimie mondială, dar cu numeroase exemple din Ungaria și al cărui scop principal pare să fi fost teza că maghiara a influențat decisiv structura toponimiei din țările vecine, ceea ce este cel puțin discutabil în câteva cazuri și de-a dreptul eronat în majoritatea cazurilor.

În general, dacă am încerca o privire comparativă asupra toponimiei europene, pentru a ne limita doar la acest spațiu etno-lingvistic, putem constata persistența elementelor arhaice indiferent de arealul luat ca punct de referință, dar cu unele caracteristici specifice fiecărei zone. Sunt de amintit aici cel puțin două lucrări de referință, apărute (întâmplător?) în același an, 1950: cea a lui Charles Rostaing privind toponimia din Provence și cea a lui Petar Skok dedicată toponimiei din insulele adriatice. Acestea reflectau o privire sintetică a cercetărilor începute după primul război mondial, mai ales în Italia, dar și în Franța, ulterior și în alte țări, referitoare la tipologia toponimică din zona mediteraneană.

Lucrarea lui Skok, dar și lucrările altor lingviști (France Bezlaj, Vl. Georgiev, Ivan Duridanov, Ivan Popović etc.) arată că toponimia sud-estului european urmează și respectă principiile deja enunțate în perioada interbelică.

Având în vedere cele expuse mai sus, lucrarea noastră și-a dorit să fie o sinteză și o actualizare a datelor privind toponimia Europei Centrale și de Sud-Est. Mai concret, cititorul va găsi aici:

1. Un lexicon toponimic al formelor arhaice (preslave) din zona continentală a Balcanilor (teritoriile de azi ale Bulgariei și ale republicilor desprinse din fosta Iugoslavie) = Lexiconul A;
2. Un lexicon toponimic al formelor din insulele adriatice = Lexiconul B;
3. Un lexicon toponimic al formelor preromanice de pe teritoriul românesc = Lexiconul C;
4. Un lexicon toponimic al formelor preslave din arealul ceh și slovac - Lexiconul D.

Ocazional, pentru clarificarea situațiilor specifice, am făcut referiri și la forme din Albania, Ungaria, Polonia, Ucraina. Este o sarcină a viitorului ca și formele din aceste areale să fie incluse într-o ediție viitoare, revizuită și adăugită. Ne gândim, în primul rând, la toponimia arhaică a Ucrainei, Poloniei și Rusiei. Acestea însă, prin complexitatea materialului și prin interferențele cu alte areale lingvistice (baltic și ugro-finic), conduc deja spre un amplu volum. Sperăm să îl putem finaliza în anii care vin; fișele noastre sunt, deocamdată, parțiale.

În forma propusă de noi, cercetarea comparativă scoate la iveală:

a. Asemănări clare, chiar identitate, de transmitere a formelor toponimice în arealul sud-est și central european;

b. Diferențe locale, ca urmare a evoluțiilor fonetice, între principalele areale lingvistice din antichitate: trac – pe teritoriile României, Republicii Moldova, Bulgariei, Serbiei, estului Ungariei, estului Slovaciei, sudului Ucrainei; illir – în arealul croat, albanez, sloven, parțial în cel maghiar, dar având interferențe evidente cu arealul trac; celtic – în arealul ceh, parțial în cel slovac precum și în vestul Ungariei.

c. Evoluțiile fonetice confirmă, în general, principiile stabilite de-a lungul anilor de generații succesive de lingviști; sunt însă câteva detalii care vor conduce, mai devreme sau mai târziu, la revizuirea unor ipoteze și a unor concluzii, cum ar fi, de exemplu, existența unei laringale în tracă și în protoromână. Este și motivul pentru care, deși pe scurt, am adăugat un capitol dedicat evoluțiilor fonetice.

d. Interferențele dintre populația romanizată (protoromâni), populațiile de substrat (traci, illiri, celți) și slavi sunt mai complexe și mai greu de analizat decât părea la un moment dat. Nu putem intra aici în detalii; menționăm doar, pe scurt, că faptele expuse aici confirmă ipotezele noastre mai vechi: influența slavă asupra limbii române a fost, uneori cel puțin, mult exagerată. Numeroase cuvinte considerate slave în română sunt, la rigoare, de origine necunoscută în slavă, ceea ce conduce – cel puțin ca ipoteză de lucru – spre ideea că cercetările trebuie reluate din perspectiva noilor date oferite de lingvistică, de arheologie și de istorie:

- Teoria expansiunii în valuri a „populației kurganelor“ – Marija Gimbutas;
- Teoria evoluției interne a proto-indo-europenilor – Gamkrelidze-Ivanov și Colin Renfrew;
- Teoria limbii proto-boreale, un stadiu străvechi al limbilor indo-europene, uralice și altaice

– N. D. Andreev.

Toate aceste cercetări, cu rezultate încă aprins discutate în lumea științifică, vor afecta și viziunea noastră asupra unor situații lingvistice mai noi, cum este procesul complex, dar persistent, al romanizării și, pe de altă parte, procesul – la fel de complex – al reconfigurării etno-lingvistice din perioada secolelor IV–X p. Ch.

Nu ne-am propus aici să prezentăm, încă o dată, lista rădăcinilor slave identificate sau identificabile în toponimia din zonă. Pentru acest lucru, cititorul are la dispoziție lucrarea fundamentală a lui Vl. Șmilauer (1970), care prezintă – în ordine alfabetică – majoritatea rădăcinilor slave, clasificate și ordonate, atât tipologic, cât și pe grupe lingvistice slave (de răsărit, de apus și de sud).

Am insistat însă asupra acelor aspecte dificile sau pe care noi le-am considerat astfel:

interferența lingvistică, etimologia populară, substituția etimologică, tipologia general europeană, comparația cu alte forme înrudite. Toate acestea ni s-au părut esențiale în înțelegerea evoluției lingvistice din zonă, inclusiv în înțelegerea unor fenomene complexe precum cele expuse mai sus: romanizarea, expansiunea slavă, reconfigurarea etno-lingvistică a Europei medievale și moderne. În acest sens, ni s-a părut util, pentru înțelegerea fenomenelor complexe despre care vorbeam, să adăugăm un capitol dedicat tipologiei numelor arhaice de persoane, în special din bulgară și din română. Sperăm că acest scurt capitol va impulsiona noi cercetări și va fi completat pe măsură ce noi date vor fi accesibile. De fapt, lista numelor arhaice de persoane este considerabil mai mare, dacă facem observația că, în multe cazuri, sunt derivate de la rădăcini arhaice, preromane și/sau preslave; acestea s-au adaptat și s-au reconfigurat de-a lungul timpului, începând antichitatea târzie și continuând cu Evul Mediu până în epoca modernă, când s-a generalizat sistemul prenume urmat de numele de familie (inițial, adesea o poreclă).

Datele expuse aici reflectă studiile și cercetările noastre, publicate de-a lungul timpului:

- a. Seriile de studii publicate în diverse reviste de specialitate (*Linguistica*, Ljubljana; *Slavistična Revija*, Ljubljana; *World Archaeology*, Marea Britanie; *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Washington D.C.; *Studia Thracologica*, București; *Limba Română*, București; *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, Besançon; *Linguistique Balkanique*, Sofia etc.);
- b. Capitolul dedicat toponimiei sud-slave din lucrarea noastră *Influențe romane și preromane în limbile slave de sud* (1966);
- c. Comunicarea la al 8-lea Congres Internațional de Tracologie, Sofia-Jambol, septembrie 2000;
- d. Comunicarea la *Etymologické Symposion*, Brno, septembrie 2002.

Aceste studii reflectă, pe de o parte, o preocupare constantă pentru prezentarea unui material cât mai amplu, coerent și – pe cât posibil – sintetic. Ele au fost, de-a lungul anilor, elaborate (adesea în câteva variante de lucru), completate, corectate și acum rescrise ca un volum de sine stătător, unitar, dar care poate fi completat cu noi date. Ne gândim, în primul rând, la datele privind toponimia și hidronimia arhaică din Polonia, Ucraina și Rusia, pe de o parte, precum și la toponimia arhaică din Ungaria. Până când vom reuși întocmirea unui lexicon toponimic al acestor ample areale, în acest volum am făcut referințe la toponime specifice ori de câte ori ni s-au părut relevante demersului nostru. Reiese, sperăm, cu claritate ideea că ne-au preocupat, în primul rând, relațiile româno-slave, dar și rolul substraturilor (trac, illir, celtic) în conturarea profilului specific al Europei Centrale și de Sud-Est. Este o lucrare despre toponimie, despre istoria culturii și despre interculturalitate – caracteristicile esențiale ale Europei de ieri, de azi și de mâine.

Pentru elaborarea formei finale, am optat pentru o prezentare în limba engleză, care va permite – sperăm – o mai bună analiză a faptelor prezentate de cercetători, din România și din alte țări. În acest scop, am tradus și am actualizat unele studii mai vechi sau capitole ale altor lucrări. De asemenea, am făcut referințe la un alt volum de studii (*Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*, București, 1999, Editura Lucretius) care cuprinde majoritatea lucrărilor publicate în diverse reviste de specialitate în intervalul 1986–1998. Sugerăm cititorilor interesați de studierea moștenirii arhaice a sud-estului european să consulte și această lucrare, unde am adus date noi, suplimentare, înțelegerii unor fenomene complexe ale etnogenezei europene.

Mulțumesc tuturor celor care, de-a lungul anilor, m-au sprijinit, în momente uneori dificile, pentru a duce la capăt aceste cercetări; tuturor celor care mi-au făcut observații și sugestii.

Sorin Paliga

Octombrie-noiembrie 2002

## Introduction

The comparative study of place-names is one of the most interesting fields of comparative linguistics. The research of the last decades has confirmed the essential role of place-names in offering new data for the study of European history. Beyond the inevitable scientific disputes and various hypotheses of various authors, Central and Southeast Europe has offered a rich and interesting research material. Together with investigations in other fields or disciplines, the comparative analysis of place-names, in Europe or at world level, has shown that, over millennia, people thought in similar or identical terms. This is why, disregarding the modern ethno-linguistic distribution, we may identify place-names proper, river-names and mountain names in West, Central or East Europe, of various origins – Celtic and Pre-Celtic in Western Europe, Thracian and Pre-Thracian in Central and Southeast Europe, Illyrian and Pre-Illyrian along the Adriatic Coast, Hellenic and Pre-Hellenic in Greece etc. All essentially follow the same principles of evolution and, consequently, we should apply similar principles of analysis. We shall try to briefly present them in this volume.

If referring to only Central and South-East European area, upon which we have focused in this volume, we may identify similarities or identities of preserving archaic (Pre-Slavic, Pre-Romance) place-names; the languages spoken from pre-history down to modern and contemporary times have left important traces in all the languages we have studied: South Slavic, Romanian, Czech and Slovak. There are of course similar or identical cases in other areas as well: Polish, Ukrainian, Russian. In some cases archaic and modern forms interfere with each other at colloquial level, consequently a complex process of gradual adaptation or substitution took place, e.g. those examples once analysed by Petar Skok in Croatia and France Bezlaj in Slovenia.

We could not attempt an exhaustive analysis of the available material. Nevertheless we hope to have offered an extensive list of relevant forms. An ample, Pan-European synthesis would be of course welcome, but such a horizon is still afar. Our essential purpose has been to gather together specific forms in South-East and Central Europe; we shall hopefully attempt to gradually extend our analysis to other neighbouring areas. Such an ample investigation requires a huge volume of research, which is rather appropriate for an extended, international research group. On the other hand, there are some global synthesis, e.g. Kiss 1980 (in Hungarian), a dictionary of world place-names, but with most examples from Hungary. Seemingly the main purpose of this book was to back the thesis that Hungarian decisively influenced the structure of many place-names in the neighbouring countries; this is at least debatable in some cases, and entirely erroneous in most cases.

If we attempt a comparative view of European place-naming (to just limit the research to this vast area only), we may note the persistent survival of archaic forms disregarding the area taken into consideration, but with inevitable localised specific features. I would mention two remarkable volumes published (by hazard?) in the same year, 1950: Charles Rostaing's *Essai sur la toponymie de la Provence* and Petar Skok's analysis of the Adriatic island naming and local place-names (entopic forms). Both studies reflect a synthetic view of the intense research after World War I, first of all in Italy, but also in France, gradually in other countries too, the research aimed at identifying the archaic heritage of the Mediterranean area.

Skok's volume, but also the books of other linguists (France Bezlaj, Vl. Georgiev, Ivan Duridanov, Ivan Popović etc.) show that southeast European place-names reflect the same principles formerly evoked for other linguistic areas.

Considering the general data briefly presented above our work wishes to be an updated synthesis of Central and Southeast European place-names. Specifically the reader may find:

1. A glossary of archaic Pre-Slavic forms in the continental Balkans (modern territories of Bulgaria and the former Yugoslav republics) = Lexicon A;
2. A glossary of forms in the Adriatic Islands = Lexicon B;
3. A glossary of Pre-Romance elements in Romania = Lexicon C;
4. A glossary of Pre-Slavic forms in Czech and Slovak = Lexicon D.

Occasionally, in order to clarify some specific cases, we made references to forms in Albania, Hungary, Poland, Ukraine. Perhaps a future, extended volume will consider these areas too. We have in mind the archaic heritage of Poland, Ukraine and Russia. We are also aware that these areas also reflect interferences with the Baltic and Fenno-Ugrian heritage, and the research will inevitably lead to complex investigations. Our reference card for these areas are, for the time being, limited and partial.

As analysed in this volume, the comparative research reveals:

- a. Similar or identical transmission of forms in Central and Southeast Europe;
- b. Local differences as a result of various phonetic evolutions: a Thracian substratum in the modern territories of Romania, Republic of Moldova, Bulgaria, Serbia, East Hungary, East Slovakia, South Ukraine; an Illyrian substratum in Croatia, Albania, Slovenia, some parts of south Hungary, and also having clear similarities with the Thracian substratum; a Celtic substratum in Czech, West Slovakia and West Hungary.
- c. The phonetic evolutions generally confirm the principles elaborated over years by successive generations of linguists. There are also some details, which would lead – sooner or later – to revising some hypotheses and conclusions, e.g. the Thracian and Proto-Romanian laryngeal. From this reason at least we added a brief chapter which considers some important aspects of phonetic evolution.
- d. The complex interferences between the Romanised groups (Proto-Romanians), on the one hand, and the substratum (Thracian, Illyrian, Celtic) groups as well as the Slavs, on the other, require more complex investigations as they prove to offer interesting data. We cannot present ample details in this volume. Anyway, many data confirm our older hypotheses: the Slavic influence on Romanian was, sometimes at least, much exaggerated. Numerous forms formerly considered of Slavic origin in Romanian prove to ultimately be of unknown origin; consequently, at least as a hypothesis, some data should be revised in the light of recent research in the fields of linguistics, archaeology and history:
  - Marija Gimbutas's theory of Indo-European "wave expansion",
  - The theory of internal evolution of the Proto-Indo-Europeans – Gamkrelidze-Ivanov and Colin Renfrew;
  - N. D. Andreev's theory of a Proto-Boreal language, the ancestor of Indo-European, Uralic and Altaic languages.

This, and similar, research – the results of which are still vividly debated – will affect our view of chronologically newer linguistic situations, e.g. the complex, but persistent, process of Romanisation and, on the other hand, the equally complex process of ethno-linguistic reconfiguration from the fourth through the tenth century A.D.

It was not our purpose to repeat the list of Slavic roots identified in the place-names spread in the analysed area (Central-Southeast Europe). The reader is referred to Vl. Šmilauer's reference book dedicated to the Slavic place-names and roots (1970); most of these roots may be found here, together with a selected list of relevant place-names, classified typologically and linguistically (East, West and South Slavic).

We insisted on those difficult aspects (or at least assumed to be difficult): linguistic interference, folk etymology, etymological substitution, Pan-European typology, comparative analysis. All these are or may be relevant to understanding the linguistic evolution of this area or complex phenomena: Romanisation, Slavic expansion, ethno-linguistic reconfiguration of Mediaeval and Modern Europe. This is why we added a small chapter referring to archaic personal names, mainly in Bulgarian and Romanian, to a limited extent in Serbian and Croatian. Limited as it is we assume it may lead to a further impulse to investigate the field. We just note that the list of archaic personal names is considerably richer if we refer to the detail that personal names are often derived from archaic roots of Pre-Romance and/or Pre-Slavic origin; from the late Antiquity to the Modern times, all these gradually adapted to the contemporary personal naming system: name (given-name) plus surname (family name; often initially a nickname).

The data presented here reflect our studies and research published over years:

a. A series of studies published in various scientific journals (*Linguistica*, Ljubljana; *Slavistična Revija*, Ljubljana; *World Archaeology*, UK; *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, Washington D.C.; *Studia Thracologica*, Bucharest; *Limba Română*, Bucharest; *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, Besançon; *Linguistique Balkanique*, Sofia, etc.);

b. A consistent chapter dedicated to South Slavic place-names in our doctoral thesis *Romance and Pre-Romance Influences in South Slavic* (1966);

c. The paper presented at the Eighth International Congress of Thracology, Sofia-Jambol September 2000;

d. The paper presented at the *Etymologické Symposion*, Brno, September 2002

These studies reflect, on the one hand, a constant preoccupation for offering an ample, coherent and, if possible, synthetic material. The papers written over years had several versions, with more or less additions, corrected and constantly updated. This volume reflects the work of several years, but also open to future additions, e.g. the place-names of Poland, Ukraine and Russia, also the archaic (Pre-Hungarian) place-names of Hungary. Until such a vast work is possible, we have referred to relevant forms of the quoted areas whenever they prove illuminating the topic in discussion. It should be therefore clear, and – if not – it is our fault, that our main purpose was to further explain the relations between the Romanians and the Slavs, but also the role of Thracian, Illyrian and Celtic substrata in sketching the specific contour of Central and Southeast Europe. It is a book about place-names, history of culture and interculturality – the main features of former, present and future Europe.

We have finally chosen an English version for presenting the data; this may hopefully allow a better circulation of ideas, and specialists from other countries may eventually join the project of an ample and comprehensive research. Consequently some pages are translations of former Romanian versions duly updated. The reader is also referred to another volume (*Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*, Bucharest, 1999, Lucretius Publishers), which includes most relevant studies published over years beginning with 1986 through 1998. We warmly invite all those interested in these topics to read those studies as they offer additional data relevant to the topic.

I thank all those who helped me over years, sometimes in adverse conditions, to finalise this series of linguistic research; and all those who made observations and suggestions.

Sorin Paliga

October-November 2002

# A General Introduction to the Study of Pre-Slavic and Pre-Romance Place-Names in Central and Southeast Europe

## Generalities

Place-names represent a chapter apart in the linguistic heritage. Largely speaking place-names refer to place- or location-names (place-names *stricto sensu*) as well as to various names of natural elevations – hills, mountains and peaks, therefore mountain-names – and also to flowing or still waters – rivulets, rivers, ponds or lakes, therefore river-names in general. These toponymic categories together with personal names and ethnic names (ethnonyms) form the large category of *onomastics*. This paper shall focus on substratum (Thracian, Illyrian and Celtic) place-names. In south-east Europe, where Romanian, Albanian and South-Slavic languages are spoken, Thracian and Illyrian typology is relevant. “Pre-Slavic” refers, on the one hand, to Thracian and Illyrian relics, on the other hand to the Romance elements reflecting colloquial Latin spoken in post-classical times, i.e. the Romance idiom(s) spoken approximately in the interval 5th to 7th centuries A.D. After this approximate temporal border we may refer to Proto-Romanian (*Urrumänisch*) or Proto-Dalmatian respectively (Duridanov 1989: 20).

The general problems referring to south-east European ethnogenesis were discussed elsewhere (Paliga 1997). It should be remembered that Illyrian represents the linguistic substratum in south-west and west Balkanic Peninsula, i.e. territories corresponding to modern Albania, Montenegro, south Serbia, western Bosnia, Croatia, Slovenia and Adriatic islands. Thracian (including its northern Thraco-Dacian or Daco-Moesian dialects<sup>1</sup>) represents the substratum in the territories of modern Romania, Moldova<sup>2</sup> (former Soviet Moldavia), south Ukraine, Bulgaria, north and central Serbia, east Bosnia, eastern Hungary and eastern Slovakia. Ancient Macedonian is unknown<sup>3</sup>. It is therefore difficult to say whether the ancient Macedonians spoke an idiom closer to Thracian, Illyrian, Greek or a specific idiom. The natural border between Thracian (eastwards) and Illyrian (westwards) is considered the river of Drina. There surely was a Thraco-Illyrian interference area along this river in the antiquity. Anyway the place-names of modern Macedonia do not indicate a specific ethnic group, other than those known to us from written documents: the Greeks, the Thracians and the Illyrians, with their regional differences.

Russu (1969: 100) showed that there should have been major similarities between Thracian and Illyrian<sup>4</sup>. Some examples may be relevant:

<sup>1</sup> The difference between south (Thracian proper) and north Thracian (Dacian or Getian) dialects gradually increased in the historical process of southeast Europe. On the other hand, there are no solid arguments that there were more Thracian languages; Thracian, Dacian, Getian are geographical, not linguistic, terms. There surely were local, regional or dialectal differences, not different languages.

<sup>2</sup> The political term *Moldova*, referring to former Soviet Moldavia, came into use after the split of the Soviet Union. The “classical” (English) term *Moldavia* refers to the east region of Romania between the east Carpathians and the river Prut. In Romanian, *Moldova* is the geographical term, whereas *Republica Moldova* refers to ex-Soviet Moldova.

<sup>3</sup> Giuliano Bonfante inclines to consider (ancient) Macedonian as closer to Illyrian, maybe an Illyrian or “Illyroid” idiom; it is a hypothesis gleaned from fragmentary documents of the antiquity (personal information). Modern Macedonian is a South Slavic language closely related to Bulgarian. The dispute whether to consider (modern) Macedonian a Bulgarian dialect is a political problem which cannot be discussed here.

<sup>4</sup> According to available data, we may surmise that Thracian and Illyrian were mutually understandable, e.g. like Czech and Slovak, in one extreme, or like Spanish and Portuguese, at the other.

### Illyrian

*Abroi*  
*Aplo, Aplus, Apulia*  
*Bilia, Bilios*  
*Dardi, Dardani*  
*Saprinus*  
*Separi*  
*Sita*  
*Tribulium*  
*Zorada*

### Thracian

*Abre- (NP)*  
*Apuli, Appulus, Apulum*  
*Bila*  
*Dardanos, Darda-para*  
*Sapri-sara*  
*Sapaioi*  
*Sita, Seita*  
*Triballi, Tribanta*  
*Zar-, Zur- (NP)<sup>5</sup>*

Other parallels are also available. We therefore agree with Russu, and with other linguists (see below), that Pre-Slavic Thracian and Illyrian heritage does not have a clear-cut frontier. It should be remembered that later there was a contiguous Romance population from the Carpathians and the Black Sea to the westernmost part of Europe, France and Portugal, until the arrival of the Slavs and later the Magyars. The relative isolation of the eastern branch of *Romania* (the Romanians and Dalmatians) was gradual. The problems of East Romance are complex and cannot be developed here. (See Carlo Tagliavini 1977 and other linguists like Al. Rosetti or Gh. Ivănescu).

The first approach will be to the Pre-Slavic place-names in southeast Europe, Lexicons A and B, then to the Pre-Romance (Thracian) elements in Romanian, Lexicon C; and the archaic elements in Czech and Slovak, Lexicon D. There are several works dealing with this topic, both of general character (e.g. Kiss 1980 or Lutterer, Kropáček and Huňáček 1976). Šmilauer (1970) worked out a general dictionary of place-names organised by roots. On the same occasion he suggested a sophisticated categorisation of Slavic place-names in nine categories and numerous sub-categories. In Paliga (1989 c), in full agreement with the terminology adopted by other linguists (Battisti, Duridanov, Georgiev – see the references), I suggested a simplified but practical classification:

ND	<i>nomen dei</i> : god-name;
NFl	<i>nomen fluminis</i> : river-name or name of a flowing water in general;
NI	<i>nomen insulae</i> : island-name;
NL	<i>nomen loci</i> : place- or locality-name <i>stricto sensu</i> ;
NM	<i>nomen montis</i> : mountain-, hill- or peak-name;
NP	<i>nomen personae</i> : personal name;
NPp	<i>nomen populi</i> : name of an ethnic group;
NR	<i>nomen regionis</i> : name of a region or land;
NSt	<i>nomen stagni</i> : lake- or pond-name.

### **Classifications and Principles of Analysis**

Petar Skok (1950: 256 sq.) suggested a classification system and recorded some principles of linguistic analysis of Pre-Slavic place-names of the Adriatic Islands. Skok's classification is simple and clear, and may be applied – with local changes – to any analysis of place-names in general and in southeast Europe in particular. His system will be summarised below.

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Zarand, Zărând* in Lexicon C, p. 60.

Skok divides the Pre-Slavic (Pre-Croatian) place-names in three categories, in fact three linguistic strata: (1) Pre-Romance; (2) Early Romance, before the settlement of the first “Nerentian” Slavic groups (*rani romanski*); (3) Romance (*rimski*). The latter stratum might be termed “Neo-Latin”.

The Pre-Romance stratum (*predrimski sloj*) includes:

- (1) archaic “Mediterranean” or Pre-Indo-European place-names<sup>6</sup>;
- (2) Illyrian place-names of Indo-European origin;
- (3) Greek place-names.

This stratification means a continuous, millennia-long process of linguistic assimilation and acculturation, i.e. the Pre-Indo-European place-names were integrated, together with the newer Indo-European stratum, into Illyrian which, in its turn, was integrated into, or assimilated by, colloquial Latin, the origin of Dalmatian. All these represent the Pre-Slavic heritage.

Therefore, the Romance period is divided into two major periods: (1) Pre-Croatian (Pre-Slavic) or early period, and (2) contemporary to Croatian (or Nerentian); in its turn the latter is divided into four phases reflecting linguistic stratification:

- (1) Christian-Romance;
- (2) Old Dalmatian;
- (3) “Wallachian” (Romanian) shepherding;
- (3) Venetian.

Skok assumes that the 6th century represents the conventional border between “Old Romance” and “Neo-Latin”<sup>7</sup>. Skok’s stratification may be easily applicable, with the corresponding details, to the Thracian speaking area, thus:

#### **Skok’s Pre-Croatian Chronology**

- (1) Christian-Romance;
- (2) Old Dalmatian;
- (3) Wallachian (Romanian) shepherding;
- (4) Venetian

#### **Thracian Area**

- (1) Christian-Romance;
- (2) Proto-Romanian (sometimes incorrectly labelled “Common Romanian”)<sup>8</sup>;
- (3) Wallachian (Romanian) shepherding;
- (4) Old Romanian (after VI–VII century A.D.)

As we shall see below, the Venetians imposed the Serbo-Croatian speakers specific terms for navigation and fishing, while the Romanians imposed the neighbouring ethnic groups specific terms for shepherding also for social and family organisation. Skok assumes (p. 256) that the Pre-Slavic “Romance” influences are recorded as early as the 6th century A.D. There are further arguments, not invoked by Skok but analysed in this paper, which support Skok’s hypothesis.

*The Pre-Indo-European heritage* poses of course special problems. Specifically referring to the South Slavic area, only Georgiev (1961) categorically rejected the hypothesis that Pre-Indo-European elements might be identified in either vocabulary or place-names. He started from the basic (erroneous) idea that the Balkans were the homeland (*Urheimat*) of

<sup>6</sup> See our reconsideration in Paliga 1989 c and 1999.

<sup>7</sup> Generally this chronological border is considered to be the 5th century A.D.

<sup>8</sup> For the various terms referring to Proto-Romanian see Paliga 1996: 5.

the Proto-Indo-Europeans. Both Skok (1950: 11 and 256 sq.) and Bezlaj (1956–1961, 1961, 1969) showed, with solid arguments, that there are clear correspondences between the Pre-Indo-European (sometimes labelled “Mediterranean”) place-names in the Balkans, on the one hand, and the Pre-Indo-European place-names in Italy or Greece, on the other hand<sup>9</sup>. Such correspondences were also evidenced by Battisti (1956), as well other linguists – especially Italian – like Bertoldi (1931). Generally the studies in *Studi Etruschi*, beginning with 1927, are reference points in the field of Pre-Indo-European linguistic research. In a much quoted book dedicated to the place-names in Provence, Rostaing (1950) showed with solid arguments that the Pre-Indo-European heritage is well documented in this region of France. It may be relevant that two thirds of Rostaing’s book reflect the Pre-Indo-European heritage. Rostaing also worked out a lexicon of Pre-Indo-European roots (labelled “bases”, in his terminology) seemingly the amplest of this kind to date. Rostaing’s book is useful to the study of southeast European place-names as many roots (or “bases”) have clear correspondences. (See also Trombetti 1925, with many details to be carefully considered as they do not reflect Pre-Indo-European roots). In fact, referring to Pre-Indo-European roots has become a common place in many works (e.g. Kiss 1980, dedicated to world place-names, or Dauzat 1947, 1960, dedicated to French place-names). Southeast European place-names, especially Greek place-names, were well analysed by Muşu (1981). See further discussions and references in Paliga (1989 c).

Reverting to Skok’s fundamental study (1950: 256 sq.), we briefly present the *seven principles of analysis* (upoređenja, rapprochements) as they were suggested by the author, and other two additional principles:

(1) Written form and possible errors or approximate spellings, or – using another term – *identity of tradition* (identitet u tradiciji). Examples: spelling *Orido* instead of \**Drido* > *Drid*; *Olentia* instead of \**Solent(i)a* > *Sulet* etc.

(2) *Repeatability of place-names* (opetovanja toponima). According to this principle, a place-name rarely appears isolatedly, related forms (similar or identical) may usually be identified. Examples: *Corcyra*, *Melita* (several in southeast Europe); *Arba* (Adriatic) - *Arva* (Hispania Baetica); *Cissa* - *Cissa* (Mauretania Caesariensis); *Absorus* - *Absaros* (Pontus); *Issa* - *Issa* (Lesbos) etc. In our case, the reader may compare the obvious correspondences between Romanian and South Slavic place- and river-names of Thracian origin.

(3) *Principle of identity* (princip identičnosti ili istovetnosti). As an example, Skok lists the Illyrian place-names in *-ona*, *-este*, *-esta* with the Venetians, Carnians and Illyrians or the Illyrian place-names in *-entia* (e.g. *Solentia*) against the Greek forms in *-inthos* (e.g. *labyrinthos*).

(4) *Identity of the root* (identičnost osnove) is the “most delicate” (najdelikatniji) in Skok’s view. As an example, he compares the place-names in *Crep-* and Pre-Roman (probably Pre-Indo-European, hereafter Preie.) *crepp*, *grepp* ‘stone, cliff’ (Preie. \**K-R-*, \**G-R-*).

(5) *Uninterrupted transmission*. Refers to the oral, “narrative”, transmission of place-names since the oldest periods to our days (pripovijedanja o starim imenima), e.g. *Absorus* > *Osor*, *Olcinium/Ulcinium* > *Ulcinj* (Preie.) etc.

(6) *Economic importance* of the given place or region usually leads to the preservation of that

<sup>9</sup> In fact the territories of Greece, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania witness the oldest Pre-Indo-European (“Pre-Kurgan”) civilisations in Europe, so such anti-Pre-Indo-European theories are contradicted by archaeological evidence. Until newer and well documented theories may eventually appear we should consider that the Proto-Indo-European homeland was in the North-Northeast Pontic area, between the Volga and the Urals (Gimbutas’s “Kurgan” theory). A reconsideration in our paper for the International Congress of Slavicists, Ljubljana 2003.

place-name, e.g. *Brattia* > *Brač*, *Curicum* > *Krk* (Preie.). Generally, major place-names are often of Preie. (“Mediterranean”) origin.

(7) *Identification of origin* by lexically comparable elements, e.g. Pre-Roman (probably Preie.) *grippa* > Cr. dial. *fripa*, *hripa* ‘stone, cliff’.

It should be added that old (Preie. or Indo-European, hereafter IE) place-names may be also identified in isolated areas which were natural shelters across times. These are socially, even strategically important place-names. Therefore, another principle:

(8) The *isolated character* of an area which may offer protection in adverse situations (wars, natural calamities) may lead to conservative forms over millennia. Rostaing (1950, in his book dedicated to Provençal place-names) presents numerous such cases. Other examples for the South-Slavic area are presented below.

Bezljaj (1956–1961, 1961, 1969) showed that old place-names are sometimes subject to adaptations due to folk etymology. Therefore a new principle:

(9) *Etymological substitution*, a particular form of folk etymology. As an example, Bezljaj observes the case *Postojna* < (*arae*) *Postumiae* ‘Postumius’ altars’ associated to Slv. *postojna*, a kind of vulture. Similarly NFl *Vrbas* < ill. *Urbanus*, *Urpanus* (Preie. \*UR- ‘big, huge; a giant’), associated by Slavic speakers to *vrba* ‘a willow tree’. See also our discussion s.v. *Bojan*, *Bojana* below (Lexicon A).

## Toponymical stratification and linguistic investigation

Place-name investigations cannot substitute related research such as vocabulary or dialectology, or further, history or archaeology. Nevertheless place-names may offer interesting and valuable information which complement other data. Trajanovski (1979: 10), in a study dedicated to the Romanians in Macedonia (F.Y.R.O.M.), underlined some old dialectal forms such as *kostol* (< Lat. *castellum*), also found in place-names like *Kostol*, *Kostolac* in Macedonia (F.Y.R.O.M.) and Serbia. The same etymon is accepted for the form *Košljun*, the island of Krk, specifically from a popular form *castellione*, with diminutival suffix (Skok 1950: 23). A similar case is represented by the form *Mošun* (Slovene *Mošnje*), which is attested in numerous place-names spread over a large area in South Slavic derived from popular Latin *mansione* ‘a place for rest, an inn’. These show that \**mošun* ‘a place for rest, an inn’ once was a usual, colloquial form, as the Romanians would use *am mas* ‘I/we passed the night, i.e. stopped somewhere for rest’<sup>10</sup>. Such examples further show that there was initially a habitational continuity between the Carpathian area and western *Romania*<sup>11</sup>. Limited or important differences (regional, dialectal or subdialectal) which now oppose Daco-Romanian to Aromanian (or Macedo-Romanian) were achieved gradually. South Slavic place-names like *Loret* < *Lauretum*, *Kornet* < *Cornetum*, *Prijot* < *presbyter* (Rom. *preot*), *Visitor* (< Pop. Lat. *visitorium*, derived from *video*, *videre*, *visi*, *visum*), *Durmitor* < *dormire* (Rom. *dormitor* ‘sleeping room’) etc. show that Romance population was the most important ethnic component in southeast Europe within the interval Vth to VIth centuries A.D. and continued to play an important role until it was partly assimilated by the neighbouring Slavic speakers (Trajanovski 1979, *passim*). The contemporary situation, when the Romanians represent compact or isolated ethnic groups in Bulgaria, Serbia, Macedonia, Albania and Greece, reflects the major political changes across time.

<sup>10</sup> The word was still used in the 19th century; now it is completely obsolete.

<sup>11</sup> Wherever *Romania* is written in *italics* we of course refer to its linguistic meaning, i.e. the whole area inhabited by a Romance population.

Romanian (and “Proto-Romanian”) place-names are indeed numerous south of the Danube. Maretić (1886: 76–85), Franck (1932, the index and the corresponding references), Hristov (1964: 123), Zaimov (1959: 90–91; 1977: 57), Duridanov (1952: 96 sq.) analysed such cases. There are some obviously “new” place-names of Romanian origin in Bulgarian, e.g. those based on the roots *funija* < *funie*, *tufa* < *tufă* or place-names like *Eporan* < *Iepuran* – *iepure*, *Kapriora* < *căprioară*, *Valelunga* < *Valea Lungă*, *Alba-kačula* < *alba căciulă* etc. In Slovene the parallel situation is represented by the Italian place-names like *Izola* < it. *isola*. Such “newer” cases will not be reflected in this paper, but we did not hesitate to mention some of them if they may clarify an older situation.

In the Adriatic area, the Venetian merchants called a channel in the vicinity of the island of Kvarner *Canalle della Morlacca*; the form *morlacco* derives from Byz. Gr. *maurovlahos* ‘black Vlach’ (Skok 1950: 17 sq.). Just like the Balkanic area some dialectal elements, present in place-names too, show the Romance heritage. A typical case is *prmantur*, NL *Prmantūra* < Lat. *promontorium*. The place-names of the type *Munčel*, spread in the Adriatic islands, have a correspondent in Rom. *muncel*, *muscel*, NL *Muscel* < Lat. *monticellus*, diminutive from *mons*, *montis* ‘a mountain’. For other examples see the Lexicon B.

A most debated problem, also presented in the chapter dedicated to the southeast European ethnogenesis, refers to the question whether – and to what extent – south Slavic groups could borrow elements of vocabulary directly from Thracian or Illyrian. We may firmly assert that Illyrian was no longer spoken in the 6th century A.D. therefore the Illyrian elements in Serbo-Croatian were transmitted via a Romance idiom. The recent research in Bulgaria led to the conclusion that relatively compact Thracian groups were persistent until at least the 6th century A.D. Some Romanian archaeologists too consider that compact north Thracian groups survived in what is today Moldavia until the 7th century, maybe even later (see the discussion in Paliga 1997)<sup>12</sup>. The last word should belong to archaeologists. For the time being there no decisive arguments (or the arguments have not yet been fully assimilated by a large majority of linguists) which would back the hypothesis that Bulgarian Slavs could borrow directly from Thracian, not via a Romance (Proto-Romanian) idiom (*Urrumänisch*). Nevertheless, Duridanov (1960) assumes that Bulgarian preserves some Thracian personal names without an obvious Romanian equivalent. In a paper focusing on the situation of the place-name *Plovdiv*, Duridanov (1986: 27), with arguments which cannot be ignored, assumes that this place-name was preserved directly from Thracian. This is in full agreement with historical and archaeological data, so the linguists should consider such details.

No matter how future research will solve the debated problem of the possible or even probable borrowings from Thracian directly into Bulgarian or Serbian, therefore accepting the hypothesis that, e.g. NL *Plovdiv* reflects a direct borrowing from Thracian without a Proto-Romanian intermediary, we may surmise that most Pre-Slavic elements in South Slavic have been transmitted via Proto-Romanian and Proto-Dalmatian or that, for some time, Thracian groups cohabited with Romance and Slavic groups. I think this would be the most realistic projection for the 6th–7th centuries A.D. This can explain some apparent anomalies of phonetic evolution. In other words, the indigenous Thracian elements were adopted and integrated into Romanian and Bulgarian over a longer period, of at least two centuries into Bulgarian (6th–7th centuries A.D.), and at least five centuries into Romanian (2nd–7th centuries A.D.). If so, the

---

<sup>12</sup> The Carpians, a north Thracian group, were attested until the 5th century A.D. It should be remembered that compact Thracian (Dacian) groups should have survived in the non-Romanised areas in not only Moldavia, but also the Maramureş, Bukovina and some parts of the West Carpathians. The topic is too complex to be developed here.

linguistic reconstruction should consider more complex social, political and religious realities than in a simplified tableau: Romanisation was total and complete by the end of the 4th century A.D. In the case of the Illyrian elements a Romance intermediary is inevitable as long as Illyrian was probably extinct in the 2nd century A.D.

The languages once spoken in southeast Europe have left behind traces of their specific features in both vocabulary and place-names. The problem of substrata is continuous in the history of languages. Starting from the oldest identifiable stratum, generically (and somewhat simplistic) labelled “Mediterranean” or “Pre-Indo-European” (of course, lacking a more precise term), it was transmitted via the idioms emerged in the wake of the Indo-European expansion. In our case we deal with Thracian and Illyrian. Therefore the idiom(s) labelled “Mediterranean” or “Pre-Indo-European”<sup>13</sup> was (respectively were) the substratum of Thracian or Illyrian just as later Thracian and Illyrian represented the substratum of Romanian and Dalmatian respectively. After the Slavic expansion, Proto-Romanian was the substratum of Bulgarian and Serbian and Proto-Dalmatian may have been the substratum of Croatian and Slovene. Nevertheless we should consider the possibility, supported by stronger and stronger evidence, that a form of Late Thracian may have also been the substratum of Bulgarian, at least partially and in a limited sense. Such details might be eventually clarified by future research. It is not irrelevant when Thracian was ultimately spoken in southeast Europe. The problem acquires new dimensions if we accept the idea that Thracian still was a spoken tongue in the 6th century A.D., maybe even later in some isolated areas of the Carpathians basin and the Balkans. The first Magyar groups of the 9<sup>th</sup> century A.D. may have still heard the last non-Romanised north Thracian groups. They might be those *pastores Romanorum* in Anonymus. In this perspective it is obvious that the whole theory of the substratum influence in Romanian and South Slavic should be radically reconsidered.

### A General View

A comparative-etymological analysis of the archaic place-names in the Balkans, the Adriatic islands, Romania and also in Central Europe leads to some general conclusions.

- All the major river-names are not only Pre-Slavic, but also Pre-Romance, of Thracian, Illyrian or Celtic origin. Some admit an Indo-European root, others are obviously of Pre-Indo-European origin. The regions cut by major rivers have been continuously inhabited since prehistory so these data comply with Principle 6 above.
- With one exception only (the name of the island *Veli Otok*) almost all the names of the Adriatic islands are Pre-Slavic – Illyrian or Romance – in some cases reflecting newer Italian (Venetian) influences.
- Some names of tributaries of main rivers as well as some place- and mountain-names are also of Thracian, Illyrian or Celtic origin.
- Some (quite few) names reflect a Romance origin in the continental (Balkan proper) area; this category is better represented in the Adriatic islands especially in the northern (Kvarnerian) group (see Lexicon B below).
- Romanian place-names are best represented in Bulgaria and Serbia whereas Dalmatian and Italian (Venetian) place-names are well represented on the Adriatic coast and islands.

---

<sup>13</sup> In Paliga 1989 c I used the term “Urbian” to refer to the Pre-Indo-European complex of southeast Europe (c. 7500–3500 B.C.).

The Thracian elements in Romania, on the other hand, have clear correspondences with the Thracian and Illyrian elements in South Slavic (see the Lexicons A and B, on the one hand, and Lexicon C, on the other). Only the assumed discrepancy of phonetic evolution in the case of *Alutus* > *Olt* has posed the question of a “Slavic intermediary”, and maybe the situation of *Samus* > *Someș*. In all the other cases the phonetic evolution is normal and natural<sup>14</sup>.

## The Toponymical Lexicons

Some important works have represented the basis for working out a lexicon of the Pre-Slavic place-names in Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian and Slovene. Thus Pre-Slavic place-names in Bulgaria have been analysed mainly by Duridanov (1952, 1975) and Georgiev (1960 a); Duridanov (1975) is dedicated to the Vardar basin, therefore refers mainly to the river-names in Macedonia (FYROM). Pre-Slavic place-names in the Serbian and Croatian linguistic area were studied by Skok (1950, still a reference book; some examples are also reflected in Skok’s *Etymological Dictionary of Croatian or Serbian Language* (Skok 1971–1974). Dickenmann (1939) analysed the river-names of the Vardar basin, but very few Pre-Slavic relics are present there. For Slovenia some fundamental studies belonging to Bezljaj are available (1956–1961, 1961, 1969). Kiss (1980) records the major place-names of the world, with European place-names in the front plan. Popović (1960: 173 sq.) discusses the major river-names in South Slavic with the conclusion that most of them are of Pre-Slavic origin<sup>15</sup>. A useful comparative analysis of southeast European river-names and place-names is due to Frățilă (1987).

The four toponymical lists we shall present below reflect, as we know, a first attempt to a synthetic analysis of the available data for southeast Europe. As it is an attempt to summing up data previously published in various countries, by various authors and reflecting various areas in southeast Europe (Bulgaria, Macedonia/FYROM, Serbia, Croatia, the Adriatic Islands, Slovenia and Romania) we concentrated on major place- and river-names, but have not avoided minor place-names especially when they refer to the *principle of repeatability* we mentioned above. We mainly referred to the works of Kiss, Bezljaj, Duridanov, Georgiev and Skok, and have not quoted them repeatedly unless divergent explanations were presented. Other studies have been quoted correspondingly. Two lists have been worked out: the first, Lexicon A, refers to the continental Balkanic area, Lexicon B refers to the place-names in the Adriatic islands; Lexicon C refers to the Pre-Romance elements in Romanian toponymy; and Lexicon D refers to the Pre-Slavic place-names in Czech and Slovak.

Secondly, following the initial target, we shall refer to the **Pre-Slavic place-names**, therefore those names admitting a Thracian, Illyrian or Popular Latin origin, i.e. influences prior to 5th to 7th centuries A.D., before and immediately after the beginning of the Slavic expansion. This interval is also the oldest (conventional) limit of the passage from Late (“Popular”) Latin to the modern Romance idioms. It is usual, in accordance with most linguists, to consider the 5th century A.D. as the conventional limit between the Late Antiquity

---

<sup>14</sup> The hypothesis of “Slavic intermediaries” or “Hungarian intermediaries” between Thracian and Romanian has meanwhile become legendary. It was initially advanced when Thracian elements of Romanian were little analysed, if at all; there also was the political intrusion in linguistics, which is another complex story. I think that the apparent discrepancy of phonetic evolution in both *Olt* and *Someș* reflects specific evolution in (late) Thracian, not Slavic and Hungarian intermediaries, as long as the overwhelming majority of the indigenous place-names in Romania does not support such hypotheses.

<sup>15</sup> *Kein Wunder, daß alle wichtigen Flüsse in diesem Raum nicht slavische, sondern in der Regel voroslavische Namen tragen.*

and the Early Middle Ages. Occasionally we have made references to later Romanian or Italian-Venetian influences whenever we consider them useful to understanding the whole complex topic of southeast European ethnogenesis. Lexicon D reflects the Celtic and Pre-Celtic heritage in Czech and Slovak, with probable or possible north Thracian influences in Slovak, to a less extent in Czech (yet see the case of *Čech, Čechy* in Lexicon D).

The lists A, B, C and D cannot be considered exhaustive. It is just a first attempt to be completed in the years to come. We just hope we could include most relevant forms. The formulas *Thracio-Illyrian* or *Thracian and/or Illyrian* have been used whenever the name is located in the interfering supposed border between Thracian and Illyrian along the Drina. A certain Celtic influence may be considered in Slovenia, also in Czech, to a less extent in Slovak and exceptionally in Romania – maybe NF1 *Iza* and NL *Galat(i)*; the latter has parallels all over Central and Southeast Europe.

We may now have a better understanding of the preservation of Pre-Slavic elements in South Slavic languages, of the Pre-Romance elements in Romanian, and of the Pre-Slavic and Pre-Hungarian elements in Central Europe. We have focused here on the Pre-Slavic place-names in Czech and Slovak, but further research will surely complement the present data. Generally we may surmise that the archaic Thracian, Illyrian and Celtic heritage of Central and Southeast Europe witness similar features, with numerous similar or identical forms, disregarding the modern and contemporary linguistic configuration of the given area. The poor analysis, as available to us, of the Pre-Hungarian elements in Hungarian will be sooner or later corrected in the coming years. At the same time, the available data will be generally corrected or put in a larger context: the archaic, Pre-Indo-European and Indo-European, heritage of Europe.

## Lexicon A. Pre-Slavic Place-Names in the Balkanic Peninsula

**Aborna**, a tributary of river Nadiža, Slovenia. Certainly Pre-Slavic (Illyrian), from \**Abarna* (cf. Ill. *Abarnos*) or \**Aborna*, *Alburna*, *Albruna*, cf. ancient *Albarna* > *Aubarne* (France). The root \**ab-*, \**alb-* is presumably Preie. (Bezljaj). It must be \**AL-*, \**AR-* as in Lat. *altus*.

**Abrnca**, tributary of river Reka, Slovenia. Explained from \**Apnarica* < Pre-Slavic (Ill.) *apno* < IE \**ap-* ‘water’.

**Abtat**, NL Bulgaria. Ancient *Abrutus* (cf. *Abrud* in Lexicon C). The phonetic evolution is not clear; perhaps we must start from a local pronunciation, not from the official one recorded in documents.

**Ada**, NFI, tributary of Tisa at the Hungarian-Serbian border. An attempt has been made to explain the form from S.-Cr. *ada* < Tk. *ada* ‘an island’. Nevertheless there are other similar forms for which this origin is unacceptable, e.g. *Adda* (Lombardia) < Lat. *Adua* (cf. Av. *adu* ‘a river or brook’); *Adour* (southern France) < Lat. *Aturus*, the latter of presumably Celtic origin, etc. The hypothesis of a Turkish influence cannot be accepted.

**Ajtos**, NL, the field neighbouring the gulf of Burgas, today in Bulgaria; < Lat. *Aetos*, reflecting an indigenous (Thracian) word, possibly of Preie. origin, maybe the same root as in *Ada*.

**Algunja**, NL; **Algunštica**, NFI, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic of Thracian origin, cf. Lat. *alga*, Lith. *alksna* ‘a marsh, a moor’, NFI Lith. *Alga*. The Thracian reconstructed form is \**Alg-on* (Duridanov 1975: 131). We may also refer to Preie. \**AL-*, \**AR-*.

**Arbeč**, also **Rbeč**, tributary of river Nadiža, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic *Arba*, *Arva*, cf. It. *Erbezzo* < Lat. \**herbidia* < *herba*. In the Slovene area, it may be an Illyrian river-name, initially borrowed by the Romanised population, or a Latin river-name. As the root *ar-* is present in other river-names as well, I rather incline to the hypothesis of an Illyrian river-name (similarly in Bezljaj). Cf. *Arda*, *Dunav(a)*, *Rab*.

**Arčar**, NL (Moesia Sup., today in Bulgaria), NFI < *Ad Ratiaria(m)* (from *ratis* ‘a raft’).

**Arda**, NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of Marica. Thracian, from an IE root akin to O.Ind. *árdati* ‘to flow’, Gr. *ardo* ‘to spill’ or Preie. root \**AR-* (analysed by Chantraine 1950: 56 sq.). See also Hristov (1964: 123). Cf. *Arad* in Lexicon C.

**Avšček**, tributary of river Soča, Slovenia, region of Avče. Frl. *Ause*, *Ausa*, It. *Aussa*, ancient *Alsa*, name of a rivulet or brook in the delta of river Soča. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, eventually Celtic.

**Bač**, **Bačka**, NR, Serbia < Rom. *baci* ‘the chief shephard’, of indigenous Thr.-Dac. origin, possibly also via Hung. *bács* ‘id.’, which is also borrowed from Romanian. There are several place-names **Bač**, **Bača** in Slovenia, also considered Pre-Slavic (Bezljaj 1961 and 1969). For Slovenia, the Romanian origin (from *baci*) is difficult to admit. It is rather an indigenous Illyrian element, which leads to the conclusion that both Thracian and Illyrian had a similar word preserved in both Thracian and Illyrian area. Similarly, cf. NP Thr. *Batsinis*, f. (Dečev 1957: 46) and NP Ill. *Bato*, m., *Batina*, f. (Russu 1969: 175). Cf. next entry.

**Bača**, tributary of rivers Idrjica-Soča, Slovenia. Certainly Pre-Slavic (Bezljaj). There are other similar names in Slovenia: **Bačica**, a water-spring; **Bački Potok**, NFI, tributary of Mirna. Cf. previous entry and Rom. *baci*.

**Bader**, NL, Macedonia, near Skopje. Ancient *Bederiana*, reflecting a Thracian place-name (Duridanov 1975: 19; Franck 1932: 6). Cf. NP Thr.-Dac. *Bedarus*, *Baedarus*. Cf. *Badica* (infra) and Rom. *bade*.

**Badica**, NFI, Slovenia, tributary of river Rabojesca. Cf. Rom. *bade*, *bădiță*, a term to address a male person, in modern dialectal Romanian used by the beloved girl. Considered

“unclear” by Bezlaj, probably Pre-Slavic. As the relation to Rom. *bade* is obvious, it may be questioned whether it is a Proto-Romanian element in Slovene or whether a similar and related (“urverwandt”) word to Rom. *bade* existed in Illyrian too. Cf. *Bač*, *Bača*, supra.

**Baniski Lom**, NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of river Rusenski Lom. Basic meaning: ‘The Lom of Ban’; *ban* is an indigenous Thr.-Dac. element (Paliga 1987 b), and *Lom* is a “toponymical relic” (see below s.v. *Lom*). Cf. *Banja Luka*, infra.

**Banj**, NFI, tributary of Lahinja, Slovenia. River- and place-names having the root *ban-* are unclear, cf. NL *Bane* and its relation to *ban* ‘a local leader’ (archaic, presumably Thracian or Thraco-Illyrian word, as considered by Bezlaj). *Ban* was analysed elsewhere (Paliga 1987 b); the word must be of indigenous, Thr.-Dac. origin. The Illyrian language might have had a similar word. Both the Romanian and south Slavic forms should be explained from either Thracian and/or Illyrian. See next entry.

**Banja Luka**, NL, Bosnia; ‘the plain of the ban’. *Luka* is Slavic; *ban* is Pre-Slavic, Thr.-Dac., via Romanian in S.-Cr.. See the discussion in Paliga 1987 b. See *Baniski Lom*, *Banj*.

**Bar**, NL, a harbour in Muntenegro – Lat. *Barium*. Cf. NL *Bari* (Italy) – Lat. *Barium*, in both cases of Illyrian origin. Probably Preie. \**B-R-*, \**P-R-*, cf. *Bîrgău*, *Parîng* in Lexicon C.

**Barbačina**, NFI, tributary of Vipava, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, cf. ancient *Barbanna* > fr. *Barbanne*. In Slovene, an Illyrian origin may be surmised, probably a root \**barb-* ‘mud, a marsh’ (Bezlaj) or the same root as in *Bar*, *Baredine*.

**Baredine**, NFI, tributary of upper Mirna, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic and Pre-Roman, Veneto-Illyrian \**barradjo-*, of unclear meaning, probably akin to *Bar*, *Barbačina* (supra) and next entry.

**Bargala**, NL, Macedonia. See *Bregalnica*.

**Barman**, NFI, tributary of Rezijanska Bela, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian \**borm-* ‘a water-spring’ (Bezlaj). Suffix *-man* is specific to some Thracian and also Illyrian place-names, e.g. *German*; other examples in Lexicon C.

**Batava**, NFI, tributary of upper Bača, at Podbrd, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic and Pre-Roman, cf. *Batavi*, *Batavia*, *Patavium* (today *Padua*).

**Bate**, NL, Slovenia, at the border with Italy. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, cf. NPP *Venti* and alb. *vend*, *vënd* ‘a place, a locality’, NL Ill. *Avendona* (Bezlaj 1961: 151).

**Batuje**, NL, Slovenia, Ajdovščina. Ancient *Batavia*. (Bezlaj 1969: 25). Cf. NFI *Batava*, supra.

**Bečej**, NL in the region of *Bačka*, Serbia; akin to the latter, see under *Bač*, *Bačka*.

**Bled**, NL, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic \**peld-*, \**beld-*, Illyrian or Celtic, unclear meaning (Ramovš 1936: 26). Might continue Preie. \**P-L*, \**B-L-*.

**Bojana**, NL, near Sofia – Lat. pop. \**boiana acqua* (classical *boviana acqua*) ‘water for cattle’. The same etymon, directly or via Romanian, is acceptable for NL **Bojana**, in Vitoša, Bulgaria (BER 1, 71: “Pre-Slavic colloquial Latin or Romanian”). On the other hand, NFI **Bojana**, originating in the lake of Skadar and flowing into the Adriatic, is named in Albanian *Bunë* (gheg dialect) < \**Buanë*. Ancient form: *Livia Barbenna*. Starting from this form, Skok (1: 183) tries to explain the modern form via a series of phonetic changes: (1) dissimilation *r-n* > *-n*; (2) *-enna* > *-anna*; (3) fall of inter-vowel *b*, as in Romanian and Albanian; (4) *a* > *o*. Therefore the phonetic evolution would be: *Barbenna* > \**Babanna* > \**Baiana* > *Bojana*. Nevertheless the situation of these forms is even more complicated if we take into account the Bulgarian personal names *Bojan(a)*, considered as derived from root *boj-* ‘a battle, a war’ (BER 1: 71). River-, place- and personal names of the type *Bojan*, *Bojana* are attested all over the south Slavic area (e.g. NL Slv. *Bojanci*, *Bojanja vas*, *Bojanji vrh*), as well as Romania, NL *Boian* (districts of Cluj and Sibiu) and *Boianu Mare* (Bihor, absent in Jordan 1963), also *Boița* (Hunedoara,

Sibiu), but also *Boura* (Suceava), *Boureni* (Dolj, Iași). For Romanian, it is acceptable to explain the forms as derived from *\*bovus* (classical *bos*, *bovis*), respectively from *bobulus* > *bour*. It is difficult to state whether all the south Slavic forms *Bojan(a)* may be explained from *\*bovus* (*bos*, *bovis*). As shown above, for the river-name from the Croatian-Albanian border, Skok assumes a direct preservation of a Pre-Slavic Illyrian form. On the other hand, the forms of this type interfere, at the level of folk etymology, with the place-names derived from *bojъ* ‘a battle, a war’, attested all over the Slavic area (Šmilauer 1970: 40) and Romania, e.g. NL *Boina* (Caraș). Newer investigations seem to reject Maretić’s hypothesis (1886: II, 89), who assumes that NP S.-Cr. *Bojan* might be a hypocoristic of *Bogoslav*, *Borislav* etc. Every case should be therefore analysed separately, taking into account possible interferences. I assume that the river-name analysed by Skok also underwent an interference-adaptation at popular level. See also NL *Bujan*, in Tropoja, Albania. The case of *Barbačina* (supra) does not support Skok either. For root *boi-* in Romanian names, see also Constantinescu 1963: 24 and 207, and Jordan 1963: 387, 440, 450. For the situation of *bovinus* (< *bos*) in colloquial Latin see REW 110/1247. Summing up, it may be surmised that the various forms having the root *boj-* in south Slavic languages reflect both an old Romance (Proto-Romanian) influence, and (possibly) also the adoption of a Pre-Slavic Illyrian root (the case analysed by Skok). The interference with the Slavic root *boj-* ‘a battle, a war’ is also possible. The case of Rom. *boier* ‘a rich person’ (later with social and political connotations) was analysed in Paliga 1990, reprinted in Paliga 1999. ***Bojanci*** (Črnovelj), ***Bojanja vas*** (Metlika), ***Bojanji vrh*** (Grosuplje), NL, Slovenia. See *Bojana*.

***Bol***, NL near Split. Lat. *vallum*; same case in Lexicon B, III, 3.

***Bosna***, NFI, NR - Med. Lat. *Bosnia*, reflecting an indigenous (Illyrian or Thracian) element from IE *\*bhoǵ-* ‘a rivulet, a brook; flowing water’, cf. Gm. *Bach* ‘a marsh, a moor’.

***Bosut***, NL, Pann. Inf. < (*Ad*) *Bas(s)ante* (see also Skok 1917: 133, n. 23).

***Bošana*** NL near Biograd, Adriatic coast. Related to *Bošane* (Lexicon B, I, 5); Illyro-Romance, etymon unclear.

***Bračana***, NFI, tributary of Mirna in Istria, Slovenia. Certainly Pre-Slavic, either Pre-Roman (Illyrian) relic, or a Roman personal name. Cf. ancient *Brattia*, *Bratia* (Bezljaj) and NI *Brač*, in Lexicon B.

***Bregalnica***, NFI, tributary of Vardar. Ancient *Astibos*. The river-name is derived from NL *Bargala*, a locality on Bregalnica, indigenous Pre-Slavic of Thracian origin, IE *\*bhergh-* ‘a peak, a hill’, with a phonetic adaptation after Sl. *brěǵъ* ‘a hill, a mountain’ (etymological substitution).

***Bregana***, NFI, tributary of Sava, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, cf. *Brege*, NFI (Baden), Ill. *Berginium*, Celtic *\*briga* ‘a hill, a mountain’ (Bezljaj). Cf. *Birgäu* in Lexicon C. Both forms might be Preie.

***Brenta***, a waterfall of river Volarnica, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear, cf. Slv. *brenta*, Cr. *brenta*, Istr.-Rom. *brente* ‘Butte’ (Bezljaj).

***Brinjek***, a water-spring and other 13 place-names of the type ***Brinje***, ***Brine*** in Slovenia and Croatia. Pre-Slavic and Pre-Roman relic *\*brina* ‘juniperus’, Frl. *brene*, *brena* (Bezljaj).

***Brioni***, O. S.-Cr.. ***Brijuni***, It. *Brioni* < Postcl. Lat. *Brivona*, of Illyrian origin, etymon unclear.

***Briše***, NL, Zagorje region, Slovenia; ***Brišče***, NM, Slovenia. The mountain-name is attested in 888 p.Ch. in the Med. Lat. spelling *Broxias*. Pre-Slavic, probably Illyrian *\*Broskja* > *\*bryšče* > *Brišče*; there is no early document for the place-name, but the relationship with the mountain-name is obvious (Ramovš 1936: 36).

**Budva**, NL (Montenegro) < *Buthua*, *Buthoe*. The spelling must reflect an indigenous place-name. Cf. *Buda* (part of Budapest) and other similar or identical forms in Central and Southeast Europe, e.g. NFI *Buda*, and several place-names *Buda* in Romania (Lexicon C). Kiss 1980 assumes that *Buda* (in *Budapest*) reflects a Hungarian personal-name, but this a frequent cliché regarding many probably or possibly Pre-Hungarian place-names.

**Burgás**, NL, Bulgaria; Tk. *Burgaz*. Probably from Gr. πύργος ‘a tower’, related to NL *Burgos* (Spain). In both cases a Germanic influence may eventually be possible: \**burgs* ‘a fortress’, Gm. *Burg* ‘township’. The Pre-Slavic origin is certain, but we should hesitate whether the Germanic origin is to be considered. Possibly they are related forms, preserved independently in the two linguistic areas.

**Buzet**, v.S.-Cr. **Blzet**, NL, Croatia. Ancient *Piquentum* > Romance \**pilgent-* > Sl. \**bъlzetъ* > *Blzet*, *Buzet* (Ramovš 1936: 31).

**Cavtat**, Cr., **Čedad**, Slv. (It. *Ragusa Vecchia*; ancient *Epidaurum*), NL (Adriatic Coast) < *civitatem* (*Civitas Epidauriensis*) (Ramovš 1936: 34). Cf. Rom. *cetate* (NL *Cetate*, *Cetatea*, in some regions of Romania), alb. *qytet* ‘township’.

**Celje**, NL, Slovenia. Lat. *Celeia*, Med. Lat. *Cilia*. Cf. *Kilia*, NL, Bulgaria and *Chilia*, a branch of the Danube Delta in Romania.

**Cerej**, NFI, tributary of river Koren, Slovenia. Lat. *cerasus* ‘cherry-tree’.

**Cètinje**, NL, Montenegro. Considered derived from a river-name \**Cetina*, related to NFI *Cètina*, flowing into the Adriatic near Omiš. Pre-Latin, probably Illyrian, etymon unclear.

**Cibār**, NFI, NL: *Gorni Cibār*, *Dolni Cibār* on the river *Cibrica*, tributary of the Danube. Ancient *Cebus*, Greek spelling Κέβρος. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 60).

**Čadra**, NFI, tributary of Tolminka, Slovenia. Probably from Lat. *cataracta*, with the evolution Lat. *c* > Slv. *č* and *t* > *d*.

**Cuculka**, NFI, Vardar basin, Macedonia. NM **Cucula**, Veles region, Macedonia. Probably Pre-Slavic Thracian or borrowed from Arom. *țuțulcă* ‘a peak’ (Duridanov 1975: 109). The Romanian root *țuț-* may be of Pre-Indo-European origin transmitted to Romanian via Thracian. Cf. *Țuțora* in Lexicon C.

**Dalmacija**, NR - Lat. *Dalmatia* (NR), NPp *Dalmatae*, *Delmatae*. Further discussions in Paliga 1988 a. A probable Preie. relic. The modern form is bookish. Cf. *Duvno* and *Glamoč*. Cf. *Deal(u)*, *Ardeal* in Lexicon C.

**Davča**, **Davški potok**, NFL, tributary of Selška Sora. Probably related to NL *Avče* in Soška Dolina; initial *d-* may be explained as in other examples in Friulan, e.g. Frl. *Damar* < *Ad Amar*, *Delés* < *Ad Alesso*, *Deveà* < *Aveaco*, *Darte* < *Arte* etc. Further discussions s.v. *Avšček*, supra.

**Djovlenska (D’evinska) reka**, NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of *Vāča*, near Devin; the old name was **D’ovlen (Djovlen)**. Pre-Slavic Thracian, non-attested in the antiquity, from IE \**dhewina* ‘a spring, a water-source’, cf. Gm. *Tau*, Eng. *dew*.

**Dramlje**, **Dramlja**, NFI, Slovenia. See s.v. *Draniča*.

**Draniča**, NFI, tributary of Bregalnica, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic Thracian, cf. NFI ancient *Dramatica*, NR *Drama* (ancient Macedonia). Cf. NFI Pol. *Drama*, Oder basin, IE \**drem-* ‘to go, to run; a road’, Gr. *dromos*. Cf. NFI Slv. *Dramlje*, *Dramlja* (Duridanov 1975: 169). Cf. *Drava*, *Dreta*, *Drina*.

**Drava**, NFI (S.-Cr., Slv.), tributary of the Danube. Ancient: Lat. *Dravos*, *Dravus*, Gr. Δράβος, Illyrian of Thracian origin, IE \**drowos* ‘flowing water’. Cf. *Dreta*, *Drina* and ancient NL *Drobeta*, today Turnu Severin on the Danube in Romania.

**Dreta**, NFI, tributary of Savinja, Slovenia. Unclear, probably related to NFI Cr. **Dretulja**. Slovene forms in *-ija* (*Litija*, *Medija*) are Pre-Slavic. Cf. NFI Slk. *Drietoma*, *Drietomica*, Pre-

Slavic too; suffix *-oma* is Pre-Slavic as well, cf. Celtic *-amo*, *-ama*. The place-names of this type are usually Pre-Slavic (Bezljaj).

**Drina**, NFl, at the border between Bosnia and Serbia; in the Antiquity it represented the border between the Thracians and Illyrians. Lat. *Drinus*, Gr. Δριλων < Illyrian and/or Thracian. Another river **Drin**, art. **Drini** flows in Albania, but in opposite direction. This latter form was also spelled *Drinus* in the antiquity. Both forms are related to *Drava* < IE *\*drowos* ‘water, flowing water’. Probably related to *Drid* (Lexicon B, III, 1) and also *Drencova* and *Dridu* in Romania (Lexicon C).

**Drinjača**, NL (at the confluence of the Drina and Zadar) < *Ad Drinum*. Cf. *Drina*.

**Dunav** (S.-Cr.), **Dunava** (B.), **Dunaj** (in the other Slavic languages; in Slovene the meaning is ‘Vienna’, whereas the bookish form *Donava* is used for the river-name); Rom. **Dunăre(a)**, see in Lexicon C, Hu. **Duna**. The usual Latin spelling was *Danuvius*, *Danubius* (with *ā*); the Greeks used the spelling Ἰστρος. Latin spelling presumably recorded a Celtic form. Romanian has preserved a compound *\*Dan-ar-*, whose second element *ar* is also attested in other European forms, e.g. NFl *Aar*, *Aare*, NL *Aarhus* (a port in Denmark), O. Dan. *aar* ‘a river’. In Romanian, the river-name is – beyond any reasonable doubt – of direct Thr.-Dac. origin, as no neighbouring form preserves the compound. At the same time, these forms put an interesting problem of phonetic evolution: Thr.-Dac. *ā* > Rom. *u*. Similarly see NFl Rom. *Mureș* against B. *Marica* (see discussion s.v. *Marica*). The evolution Thr.-Dac. *ā* > Rom. *u* is specific to the indigenous (Thracian) forms only and reflects an evolution in late north Thracian (Dacian) dialects which is absent in south Thracian. All the Slavic forms reflect, without exception, a borrowing from Proto-Romanian (or a late phase of Thracian?), after the evolution *ā* > *u* was closed. Nevertheless all the Slavic forms reflect not the original Romanian *-ar-* form, but another regional or dialectal form *\*Duna-*. Cf. NP Rom. *Dună*, presumably an initial regional equivalent for NP *Dunăreanu* < *Dunăre* ‘inhabitant of the Danube region’ (till now this personal-name is usual in Romanian). The phonetic evolution Thr. *ā* > Rom. *u* cannot be explained via Slavic or Hungarian, despite some attempts in this sense.

**Duvno**, NL, Dalmatian coast. Ancient *Delminium*. The place-name is presumably related to *Dalmacija* and *Glamoč* (Skok 1917: 128). Cf. Rom. *Deal(u)*, *Ardeal* in Lexicon C.

**Erma**, NFl, Bulgaria; two river-names. Thracian, non-attested, but with clear parallels, e.g. NFl *Hermos*, *Ermos* (Greece, Frigia and Moesia), possibly IE *\*sermo-s*, with *s* > *h*, specific to Greek (Georgiev 1960 a: 53) or another etymon, possibly Preie. root *\*AR-*, *\*ER-*, analysed in Chantraine (1950: 56 sq.). See also Hristov (1964: 193).

**Etăr** (upper course), **Jantra** (lower course), NFl, Bulgaria. Thracian, ancient Ἰάτρον, Ἰάτρων, *Latris*, *Latron*. Unclear etymon (Georgiev 1960 a: 30–31). Cf. toponymical root *\*ad-*, *\*at-* in Romania (Lexicon C), in which case the forms may be Preie.

**Fruška Gora**, NM, Srem area < Lat. *Franca (villa)*, O.Sl. *frogъ* ‘a Frank’ (Lat. *Francus* > Rom. *frînc*). *Fruška Gora* means ‘Frank Hill’, by translating (calquing) the second element of the compound form. The mountain-name should be explained as reflecting the wars of Charlemagne in Central Europe. Ancient *Almus*, of Illyrian origin.

**Gabernica**, NFl, tributary of Sava, Slovenia. Related to *gáber*, *gáber* ‘*Carpinus Betulus* (hornbeam)’. In Slovenia only, there are about 60 place-names with this root, cf. Mac. (ancient) *grabion* ‘(piece of) oak’, Neo-Epirotic *grabos*, NPp III. *Grabaei*, Dalmatian *Gravosium* < III. *\*grab-* ‘oak’ < IE *\*grebh-*, *\*gerebh-*, in various names of plants and trees.

**Galjevica**, NFl, tributary of Ljubljanka, Slovenia. Probably from Lat. *Gallus*. The forms *gal-* are generally unclear, probably all Pre-Slavic (Bezljaj). The root *\*gal-* may reflect Preie. *\*G-L-*, *\*K-L-* ‘rock, stone; rocky’. Cf. *Galaț(i)* in Romania (Lexicon C).

**German**, NM, Macedonia and NFI *Germanaska reka*. Pre-Slavic Thracian \**german-* < IE \**g<sup>h</sup>hermo-* ‘warm’, cf. NL *Germisara* (Geoagiu Băi), NL Thr. *Germania* etc. (Duridanov 1975: 127–128). Cf. NL Thr. *Germania*, *Germanos*, *Germas* (various spellings for the same place-name), on upper Strymon, as well as a homographic form, today *Saparevska Banja* (Dečev 1957: 102). A god-name *German* is recorded with the south Slavs.

**German**, NFI, western Bulgaria. Pre-Slavic Thracian, related to NM *German*, supra.

**Giman**, NL near Dubrovnik. Probably Lat. (*praedium*) *Geminianun*; same case seemingly in *Žman* (Lexicon B, II, 8).

**Glamoč**, NL, NR, Croatia. Formerly *Dlamoč*; attested in 1078 as *Dlanoce* < *Dalmatia*. The shift from *dl-* to *gl-* is recorded in Croatian dialects, e.g. *dlijeto* > *gljeto* (s. *dleto*) ‘chisel’ (Skok 1917: 128–129). Cf. *Dalmacija* and *Duvno*.

**Glana**, NFI (Carintia, Slovenia), a tributary of Krka-Drava. The bookish, literary form is *Glina*. Attested in 983: *iuxta flumen Glana*. Pre-Slavic, with numerous parallels in European river-names: NFI *Glan* (Salzburg, Austria; sec. VIII: *Glane*); NFI *Chiana* (Etruria, Italy) < *Glanis*; *Glan*, a water-source in Scotland; Celtic \**glano-s* ‘bright, to shine’ < IE \**glan-*. Literary form *Glina* has been influenced, by folk etymology, by *glina* ‘mud’; there are numerous place-names *Glina* in the Slavic-speaking area; NL *Glina* in Romania is considered a Slavic place-name or maybe it continues an indigenous Thracian place-name adapted under Slavic influence.

**Grpe**, NL near Split, Croatia. Related to *Grpe* (Lexicon B, I, 4), both from Preie. \**K-R-*, \**G-R-* ‘stone, cliff’, as in Alb. *Karpë* and NM *Carpați*.

**Ibār**, NFI, Bulgaria. The upper Marica is thus called, whereas the lower course is *Poibrene*. Ancient \**Ἐβρος*, *Hebrus*, the name of modern Marica. Other similar forms, also as relics: *Ibar*, tributary of Morava in Serbia; *Ibr*, tributary of Teterev, Ukraine, near Kiev (possibly of Thracian origin too). IE root \**eibhro-s* ‘to flow, a water source’. Cf. NFI *Ibru*, Romania, re-analysed by Frățilă (1987: 118 sq.). See Lexicon C.

**Idrijca**, NFI, tributary of Soča, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, Pre-Roman, cf. NSt *Idrie*, NFI *Idrica*, NFI *Itter*, *Euter* (Germany). Probably Preie., cf. Romanian forms in *ad-*, *at-* in Lexicon C.

**Ig**, **Iga**, NFI, NL, Slovenia; several forms. Pre-Slavic and Pre-Roman, no clear etymon (Bezljaj). Cf. NM *Igman* (Bosnia). The ultimate origin may be Preie. \**AK-*, \**AG-* ‘prominent; a peak’. Cf. the Romanian forms in *ig-* in Lexicon C.

**Iskār**, NFI, Bulgaria - ancient spelling *Skios*, *Oiskos*, *Iskos*, reflecting a Thracian form derived from IE \**eis-* ‘to flow, a river’. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 59).

**Jadran** (S.-Cr., Slv.) ‘Adriatic Sea’ < Lat. (*mare*) *Adriaticum*. It is often surmised that the ancient name *Adriaticum* is related to NFI *Adda* (Lombardia), see s.v. *Ada*.

**Kapela**, NM, Croatia < Lat. *capella*.

**Katun**, NL, Istria, Croatia < Rom. *cătun* ‘a small, isolated village, a hamlet’ (cf. alb. *katun*). We may also admit that the form directly reflects a Pre-Slavic Illyrian word via a Romance-Dalmatian intermediary.

**Kerbovo**, NL, Bulgaria, between Topolnica and Smoleškata reka, reg. Pirdopsko. Probably Pre-Slavic Thracian, cf. Thr. *Κεβρος*, *Κιαβρος*. The explanation from Rom. *cerb* ‘a stag, a buck’ cannot be accepted (Zaimov 1959: 92 and 184).

**Kilia**, NL (Bulgaria) < *Coelia*. Cf. NL *Kellai* (Greece) < *Cellae*. Cf. *Celje*, supra and Rom. *Chilia*, a branch of the Danube Delta.

**Klis**, NL (near Solin, Adriatic Coast) < *Clissa*. Illyrian of probable Preie. origin, root \**K-L-*, \**G-L-*, zero grade \**KL-*, \**GL-*. Cf. *Klis* in Lexicon B, II, 4 (p. 40).

**Ključica**, NFI, tributary of Ziljica, Slovenia. From colloquial Lat. *clusus* < *claudere*. The place-names derived from this word are very frequent in the Romance area, e.g. It. *Chioso*,

*Chiusa, Chiusaforte*. Cf. NL *Cluj*, in Transylvania (Paliga 1992 a, with further references and *Cluj* in Lexicon C).

**Knin**, NL, Croatia; O.Cr. \**Тънинъ* < *Tininium*. Unclear etymon, probably an approximate spelling for an indigenous Thraco-Illyrian form.

**Kobarid**, NL, Slovenia, reg. Tolmin. Ancient *Caporetum* (Bezljaj 1969: 25).

**Kodrdjana**, NFI, tributary of Kozica-Arbeč, Slovenia. From NP Lat. *Quadratus* or Istro-Romanian *kodru* ‘forested hill’, Rom. *codru*, Alb. *kodër* (Bezljaj). *Quadratus* was sometimes invoked for explaining the Romanian and Albanian forms. This hypothesis cannot be accepted any more. Rom. *codru* and Alb. *kodër* reflect indigenous Thracian forms together with the form *Kodrdjana*. IE \**kādh-* ‘to cover, to protect’; or maybe a compound \**ko-dru*, with second element as in NL *Dro-beta*, *Dru-beta* (today Turnu Severin in Romania), *Drina* etc.

**Kokodiva, Kukudiva**, NL, Bulgaria, north from Varna. The first part of the compound probably reflects Preie. \**K-K-*, \**G-G-* ‘to swell; round’, whereas the second part reflects Thr. *deva, dava* ‘a fortress’ (Duridanov 1986: 27 sq.). Cf. *Plovdiv*, infra, and NL Rom. *Deva* in Lexicon C.

**Kokra**, NFI, tributary of Sava, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic; Bezljaj assumes it is related to *Krka* (cf. NFI Gr. *Korkoras*). It rather reflects Preie. \**K-K-*, \**G-G-* as in Romanian *Gagu, Gugu, Goga* (see Lexicon C).

**Kolpa**, Slv.; **Kupa**, S.-Cr., NFI, tributary of Sava, Slovenia. Ancient *Kolapis*, Κολαπις, Κολοψ. Prototype \**Kol-ap-is*, *kol-* having unclear origin, probably Preie., while \**ap-* is IE: ‘water’ (Ramovš 1936: 25; Bezljaj 1956–1961). Cf. Rom. forms *Călan, Călata* (Lexicon C), Preie. \**K-L-*, \**G-L-*.

**Koper**, NL, Slovenia, a port on the Adriatic Coast (It. *Capo d’Istria*) < Lat. *Capris*, from *capra* ‘goat’. Cf. *Koprancj* (Lexicon B, II, 13), *Kopara* (Lexicon B, II, 15) and NSt *Capra* in Romania.

**Koroška, Koroško**, NR, Slovenia, Gm. *Kärnten*. Lat. *Carinthia*. The root *kar-*, *kor-* is Pre-Slavic, ultimately of Preie. origin. Cf. *Carpați*, alb. *karpë* ‘a cliff’, Preie. \**K-R-*, \**K-L-*.

**Kostol, Kostolac**, Several place-names in South-Slavic. From Lat. *castellum*. (Trajanovski 1979: 10).

**Kotor**, NL, Montenegro, It. *Cattaro* < Lat. *Catera, Cathara, Cat(h)arum*, of Illyrian origin: Ill. \**katar-* ‘a fortress’; cf. S.-Cr. *kòtar* ‘a region’ (equivalent for *srez*), probably from IE \**kādh-* ‘to cover, to protect’ the presumed origin of Rom. *codru* ‘dark forest’ and Alb. *kodër*. Cf. *Kodrdjana* supra.

**Krajna**, NR, Croatia - Lat. *Carnia*, reflecting an indigenous Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, name, ultimately of Preie. origin, root \**KaR-* ‘stone, cliff’; cf. *Kranj, Koroška, Kràs*. The association with Sl. (*u*)*krajiti* is a folk-etymology of “etymological substitution”-type. See Romanian forms in *car-* (*Carpați, Caraș, Cărand* etc.) in Lexicon C.

**Kranj**, NL (Slovenia) < *Carnium, Carnia*. Illyrian, ultimately of Preie. origin, cf. *Kras, Koroška, Krajna*. Compare with *Carsium* > *Hirșova* (on the Danube in Romania) with the evolution *c/k* > *h*, to date not explained satisfactorily; Poghirc 1969: 360 considers the latter an indigenous Thracian place-name.

**Krka**, NFI (*Trebinje*) < *Corcoras, Korkoras*. Attested in 799 p.Ch. as *Corca*. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, ultimately of Preie. origin. Cf. *Koroška, Kranj, Krajna, Kras*. (Bezljaj; Ramovš 1936: 25; see also Skok 1917: 121).

**Kupa**, see s.v. *Kolpa*.

**Labin**, NL, south of Istria, Croatia < *Albona*; Latin spelling for an indigenous Illyrian place-name, of IE or Preie. origin (see also Skok 1917: 128). Preie. root would be \**L-P-*, \**L-B-* as in Rom. *Lăpuș* (Lexicon C).

**Labuta, Labota, Labotnica**, NFl, tributary of Drava in Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, seemingly related to *Labin* (see preceding entry) or possibly of Celtic origin, *albanto*, *albento* ‘bright, shining’ < IE \**albh-*. The approach to *labod*, *lavud* ‘a swan’ is a folk-etymology (“etymological substitution”, cf. *Ljubljana*, infra).

**Lanja**, NFl, tributary of Karnalta, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, cf. FrI. *Làgna*, It. NFl *Anio*, *Agno*, *Agnone*. Similar names in Etruria, Lombardia, Venice, South Tirol, Latium, Campania etc. In Slovenia, the name may be Pre-Slavic or, eventually, a Friulan influence. Cf. *Anieș* in Lexicon C.

**Lašta**, NFl, tributary of Soča, Slovenia, and some other place-names of this type, e.g. *Lašta*, *Lašte*, also *lašta* ‘stone’; these forms must be related to north Italic *lasta* ‘a slab’, NL *Lasta*, *Laste*, *Lasturo*, NFl *Lástego*. Cf. Basque *arlasta*, *arralasta*. Root \**lassa*, probably of Preie. origin (Bezljaj). Cf. Rom. *lespede* ‘a stone slab’.

**Lika**, NFl, NR, Croatia. The name of the region derives from the river-name of Illyrian origin < IE \**leik-* ‘to shine’; cf. Rom. *a licări* ‘to glitter, to twinkle’, *licurici* ‘glow worm’, both of Thracian origin.

**Lim**, NFl, tributary of Drina, with the source in the Albanian Alps. Cf. Alb. *lumë*, *lymë* ‘a river’. A borrowing from Albanian is unlikely. The river-name rather preserves an indigenous Illyrian name, co-radical with the Albanian word too.

**Lipljan**, NL, Bulgaria, Lomsko region; NL, Kosovo. Ancient *Ulpiana*, by substitution and association with Sl. *lipa* ‘lime tree’ (Duridanov 1952: 9; Trajanovski 1979: 10; see also Papazoglu 1969: 171). The Bulgarian place-name is located in the ancient region of the Dardanians, being one of the three important Dardanian centres together with *Naissus/Niš* and *Scupi/Skopje*.

**Ljubija**, NL, NFl, tributary of Savinja, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, of unclear origin (Bezljaj). Cf. Thracio-Illyrian forms in *lab-*, *leb-*. See next entry.

**Ljubljana**, NL; **Ljubljana**, NFl, Slovenia. Probably Pre-Slavic, related to the preceding, from \**Lablana*, by substitution and folk etymology (Sl. *ljubiti*). Cf. NL *Labin*, supra and Rom. *Lăpuș* (Lexicon C). In the antiquity, the divinity of the Ljubljana is attested as *Laburus*, and Anonymus Ravennensis named the rivers of *Ljubija* and *Ljubljana* as *Lebra* and *Elebra* respectively (Bezljaj 1961: 149; Russu 1969: 218).

**Logatec**, NL, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, probably Illyrian, ancient *Longatici* (Ramovš 1936: 27).

**Lom**, NFl, NL (Pann. Inf., Serbia; a port on the Danube) < *Almus*, Latin spelling for an indigenous Thracian form < IE \**olmo-s-* ‘an elm (tree), the tree *Ulmus*’. Cf. alb. *lumë*, pl. *luménj* ‘a river’, *lym* ‘silt’. If this approach is correct, the etymon may be Preie. \**AL-*. (Further discussions about this root in Rostaing 1950: 41–52).

**Lug**, NL, Croatia. Attested in 1331: *extra Lugum*. Probably Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon, possibly Latin *lucus* ‘(sacred) meadow’ (Skok 1920: 130) or rather an Illyrian origin.

**-man**. A suffix specific to some indigenous Thracian elements (Poghirc 1969: 363), cf. *Barman*, *German*, *Igman* and Rom. forms in *-man* e.g. *Caraiman* (Lexicon C) etc. It should be carefully discriminated against the Turkish forms in *-orman*.

**Marica**, NFl, Bulgaria. Related to Thr. \**Mārisia* < IE \**mā-ro-* / \**mo-ro-* ‘a sea, still water’. Cf. *Mārisia* > Rom. *Mureș*. The Bulgarian and Romanian river-names are, beyond any reasonable doubt, co-radical, both of Thracian origin, but witnessing a different treatment: *ā* > *a* in Bulgarian, but *ā* > *u* in Romanian. A similar treatment in *Dunav*, *Dunaj*, *Dunăre*, supra. The phonetic treatment *ā* > \**ō* > *u* against *ā* > *a* represents an opposition north-south, i.e. Daco-Mesian v. Thracian respectively. The same evolution is witnessed by Rom. *mumă* ‘mother (in Romanian tales)’ (typical mythological term) and *a mura* ‘to pickle’.

**Medija, Medijski Potok**, NFI, tributary of Sava, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, cf. Frl. *Medée*. The modern form does not allow the reconstruction of the prototype. Cf. NL Rom. *Mediaș*.

**Medulin**, NL, Istria, Croatia < Lat. *Mutila*, a spelling for an indigenous Illyrian form.

**Mesta**, NFI, Bulgaria. Thracian. Ancient *Nessos*, an aquatic divinity, NFI *Nessus*, *Nesos*, *Nestos* etc. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 178). The evolution *m* > *n* in archaic place-names is normal, cf. ancient *Mesembria* > *Nesebār* (in Bulgaria). IE root *\*ned-*, O.Ind. *nādati* refers to the noise of flowing water, *nada-h* 'a river'. Nevertheless Preie. *\*N-S-*, in place-names like *Nis(s)a* (analysed by Chantraine 1950: 222 sq.) is also possible. As Preie. *\*N-S-* is well documented in other cases, we may eventually surmise that in this case (and maybe others) there was interference of both Preie. and IE elements.

**Mirna**, NFI, tributary of Sava. Pre-Slavic, possibly related to *Nera*, *Neretva*, *Ner*, ancient *Naron* etc. if the alternance *n/m* may be admitted or a relationship with the forms derived from IE *\*mar-/ \*mor-* (Lat. *mare*, NFI *Morava*, *Marica* etc.). Pre-Slavic origin is certain. The modern form was probably due to the association, by folk-etymology, with Sl. *mirь* 'peace'.

**Modrejce**, NL, Slovenia. Ancient *Matereia* (Bezljaj 1969: 25). Cf. *Motru* in Lexicon C.

**Mogren**, NL near Budva, Montenegro. Related to *Mugranj* < *malum graneum* (Lexicon B, I, 2).

**Morač**, NM, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic Thracian, derived from river-name *Morača*, related to NFI *Morava*.

**Morane**, NL, near Skopje. Attested in 1300 as *Tmorane* (< *\*Тъмor-*) and suffix *-ane*, cf. NM ancient *Tmaros*, *Tmarus*, NM *Tomór*, Albania. Cf. *Tmor*, infra.

**Morava**, NFI, Serbia. Ancient spellings: Gr. *Μάργος*, Lat. *Margus*, reflecting an indigenous Thracian form. Similar co-radical river-names are also attested: *Morava*, a river in the Vardar basin and mountain-name in Macedonia (Duridanov 1975: 159); NFI *Morava*, the natural border between Moravia (Czech Republic) and Slovakia, *Marica* (Bulgaria), *Mureș* (Romania) etc. They generally are Pre-Slavic relics (Pre-Romance Thracian in Romania), reflecting the old European river-names of IE origin. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 190). Suffix *-ova* is Slavic.

**Mošun**, NL, several locations in South Slavic. **Mošnje**, NL, Slovenia. All reflect Lat. *mansionem*, a term mirroring transhumance specific to the Romance (Proto-Romanian) groups (Bezljaj 1969: 25). Further examples in Lexicon B.

**Mura** (S.-Cr., Slv.), NFI, tributary of Drava. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian and/or Thracian, co-radical with *Morava*, *Marica*, *Mureș*. Vocalism *u*, instead of *\*o*, as in *Morava*, is considered a substitution by Bezljaj (1961: 149, comparing it to NFI Venetian *Mare*). Nevertheless, if we consider a North Thracian form, then vocalism *u* is normal; see the discussions s.v. *Dunav/ Dunaj* and *Marica*.

**Murva**, NFI, Dalmatia, near Omiš. Attested in 1251: *aqua que vocatur Murva*. Related to *Mura* (Skok 1920: 133).

**Muzge**, NFI, tributary of Krka, Slovenia. NL *Muzge* (several locations in Slovenia and Croatia); cf. NFI pol. *Muzgawa*, NL *Moskva*. Surely Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear (Bezljaj).

**Nadiža**, NFI, tributary of Tera-Soča, Slovenia; Frl. *Nadisòn*, It. *Natisone*. Ancient *Natiso*. In Slovene, probably via Friulan intermediary or preserving a Pre-Slavic Romanised form.

**Nebula, Nibeljski Potok**, NFI, Slovenia, tributary of Nadiža. Cf. Frl. *Nevolaè, Nuvolaè*, possibly from Lat. *Nubilius*. Surely Pre-Slavic, etymon uncertain.

**Nera**, NFI (Rom., S.-Cr.). Related to *Neretva*. The hypothesis of a Hungarian origin, from *nyár* 'poplar (*Populus*)', thus ignoring other obviously related forms, may not be accepted. The S.-Cr. form reflects a borrowing from Romanian, cf. NFI *Năruja*, Romania. See following entries.

**Nerav**, NL, Macedonia; NFI *Neravska reka*, Vardar basin. Related to *Nera*, *Neretva* etc. (Duridanov 1975: 128).

**Neret**, NL, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic Thracian, related to NFI *Nera*, *Neretva*.

**Nèretva**, NFI, Serbia. Ancient spelling *Naron*, Νάρων, reflecting a Thracian and/or Illyrian form. Cf. NFI *Neretva* (homophonous river-name in Volhinia), *Nera* (see also Skok 1917: 119–120, 132, n. 16 and 134, n. 28; Skok assumes that a folk-etymology was common already in the Antiquity by approaching this form to NP *Nero*, *Neronis*; nevertheless river-names having the root *ner-* may be fairly well explained without referring to the emperor Nero and a possible folk-etymology in the antiquity).

**Nesebăr**, NL, Bulgaria. Thr. *Mesembria*. The second element, *bria*, is present in other Thracian place-names. The first element, *mes-*, is etymologically unclear, but specific to Thracian names (Dečev 1957: 296). It might be Preie. \**N-S-*, \**M-S-* ‘curve; to bend’; cf. Rom. *Nistru* in Lexicon C.

**Nevlica**, NFI, tributary of Kamniška Bistrica, Slovenia. Related to NFI *Nevlja*, at the Bulgarian-Serbian border, to NFI *Nevlja* (Russia), NFI *Neva*, NFI *Nevajärni* (Finland). The root is specific to many European river-names < IE \**snaw-*, \**snaw-* ‘to flow’ (Bezlaj 1961: 151).

**Nevlja**, NFI, at the Bulgarian-Serbian border, Caribrod region; see *Nevlica*.

**Nevlje**, NL, Slovenia. See *Nevlica*.

**Nin** (It. *Nona*), NL, south of Zadar, Adriatic coast < *Aenona*. See the toponymical root *an-*, *in-* in Lexicon C.

**Niš**, NL, Serbia. Ancient spellings: Gr. Νάισ(σ)ος, Lat. *Navissum*, *Navissus*, *Naissus*, *Naessum*. All reflect an indigenous Thracian form derived from IE \*(*s*)*naw-* ‘to flow’. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 60, 171 and 191–192); in the Antiquity, *Naissus* was one of the three great Dardanian centres, together with *Scupi/Skopje* and *Ulpiana/Lipljan*).

**Nišava**, NL, on the Niš, Serbia. Related to NFI *Niš*. The suffix is Slavic.

**Norin**, NL, on the Neretva, Croatia. Ancient *Narona*; related to *Nera*, *Neretva* (Skok 1917: 120–121).

**Ogosta**, NL (Bulgaria) < *Augusta*.

**Omiš**, NL, Dalmatian coast; It. *Almissa*, ancient *Dalmisium*. S.-Cr. form may be explained as a dissimilation from *Dalmis-* > \**almis-* > *omiš*, assumed to be specific to the Romanised Illyrian speakers, known later as Dalmatian. Though the name is surely Pre-Slavic, such an explanation seems rather found *faute de mieux*. The form might be Pre-Indo-European, root \**D-L-*, \**T-L-* as in *Dalmatia* and Rom. *deal* (see *Deal*, *Ardeal* in Lexicon C). See also Lexicon B, II, 3; II, 8.

**Opajska reka** (\***Opaja**), NFI, tributary of Pčinja, Vardar basin. Pre-Slavic Thracian \**Apaja* (\**Opaja*) < IE \**ap-* ‘water’. Cf. NFI *Opawa*, Poland, of Baltic origin. Related to NL **Opila**, Kratovo region, Macedonia and **Opave**, Deževno region, Serbia; the latter place-names should have derived from initial river-names (Duridanov 1975: 136).

**Opave**, NL. See s.v. *Opajska reka*.

**Opila**, NL. See s.v. *Opajska reka*.

**Orga**, NL, Bulgaria, Tolovica region. Pre-Slavic, Thracian. Cf. Thracian place-names in *or-*, *org-* (Dečev 1957). The root \**or-g-* is Preie. (further discussions in Rostaing 1950: 70–71 and Muşu 1981, s.v. *Orbis*, *Orion*, *Oreste*). See also the numerous Romanian forms in *oar-*, *or-* in Lexicon C. The distribution of the forms derived from this archaic root is indeed impressive.

**Osăm**, NFI (Bulgaria) < *Asamus*. Cf. *Someş* in Lexicon C.

**Otljanska reka** (\***Otlja**), NFI, tributary of Opajska reka. The upper course is in the vicinity of the Albanian village of Strima, whereas the lower course is near Otlja. Pre-Slavic Thracian or

Illyrian *\*Atula*, *\*Atulas*, IE *\*ad-* ‘water, flowing water’ or Preie. *\*AT-*, *\*AD-* (see the forms in Lexicon C).

**Panega**, rarely *Paniga*, *Paneg*, *Panig*. NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of Iskār. Thracian. Initial phonetism was *k > g* (*\*panek*, *\*panik*). The evolution *i > e* is specific to Romanian, which leads to the basic idea that the form was transmitted to Bulgarian via Romanian (Proto-Romanian). IE root *\*pani-ko* ‘a moor, marsh’ (Georgiev 1960 a: 59). Cf. *Pan(n)ysis*, *Pannisis*, *Panysus*, Thracian name of the river Kamčija, O. Prus. *pannean* ‘a pond, marsh’. The root *pan-* may also be of Preie. origin (analysed by Chantraine 1950: 232 and Mușu 1981: 321–332). I am rather inclined to the Preie. origin.

**Peneda**, NL, Istria, Croatia. From Lat. *pinetum* (Ujević 1956: 93).

**Pirin**, NM, Bulgaria. Explained from Thracian *\*Pheruna* ‘a cliff, rock’; the root *\*p(h)er-* is attested in several place-names (Dečev 1957). The explanation from ND Sl. *\*Perunъ* cannot be accepted. The root *\*p(h)ar-*, *\*p(h)er-* is probably Preie., cf. *Parma*, *Parnassos* etc. and NM Rom. *Parîng*.

**Plovdiv**, NL, Bulgaria. Thr. *Pulpudeva*, the equivalent (calque) of the Greek form *Philippopolis* ‘Philip’s township’. This place-name has been recently analysed by Duridanov (1986: 25–34 and 1989: 19–22). By relating this form to *Kokodiva*, *Kukudiva* (supra) and bringing forth various arguments regarding the phonetic evolution, Duridanov concludes that it is a Daco-Moesian form, borrowed by the Bulgarians “directly from a late phase of Thracian”. See also *Deva*, *Deda*, *Deta* in Lexicon C.

**Podkrašče**, a water-source in Bohinjska Bistrica, Slovenia. Slavic prefix *pod-* and a Pre-Slavic root *\*kras* ‘a cliff, stone’. Place- and mountain-names in *kras*, *cras* are frequent in south Slavic. They generally are of Pre-Slavic origin, mostly Illyrian (Bezljaj). The root *\*KR-*, zero grade of *\*K-R-* is Preie. See *Kranj*, *Koroška* (supra) and the forms in *car-* in Lexicon C.

**Pòreč**, NL, Istria, It. *Parento* < Ill. *\*Parent-*, ancient spelling *Parentium*. The root *\*par-*, *\*per-* is probably of Preie. origin (Ramovš 1936: 27; Kiss 1980). Cf. *Pirin*.

**Postojna**, NL, Slovenia; one of the longest caves of the world. Lat. *Arae Postumiae* ‘Postumius’s altars’. The modern Slavic form should be also explained by a folk-etymology substitution, cf. Slv. *postojna* ‘a kind of vulture’.

**Ptuj**, NL, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic of Illyrian origin, attested in the antiquity in Latin spelling *Poetovio* > Ill.-Rom. *\*Petojo* > Sl. *\*Pъtujъ* > Slv. *Ptuj* (Ramovš 1936: 34).

**Pula**, O.S.-Cr. **Pulj**, NL, a town-port in Istria, It. *Pola* < Lat. *Pola*, a spelling reflecting Ill. root *\*pol-*, possibly of Preie. Origin, root *\*P-L-* ‘cliff, stone; a peak’. See also *Peleaga*, *Peleş* in Lexicon C.

**Raba** (Gm. *Raab*), NFI (a river flowing at the border of Hungary, Slovenia and Austria, tributary of the Danube; the main course is in Hungary) < *Ar(r)abo*, Latin spelling of an indigenous river-name, Illyrian and/or Celtic < IE *\*orobh-* ‘red, reddish’ or rather Preie. *\*R-B-*, *\*R-M-*, hence maybe also Sl. *ryba* ‘fish’. Cf. NFI *Raba*, tributary of Wisła (Vistula) in Poland and *Rebra* (Romania). See also *Rama*, next entry.

**Rama**, NR, Bosnia and the homophonous NFI, tributary of Neretva. Pre-Slavic, probably Illyrian, eventually Thracian. The ultimate Illyrian origin may be < IE *\*rem-* ‘to stay’ or, as I am rather inclined, Preie. *\*R-B-*, *\*R-M-* as in *Raba* (preceding entry). • A certain hesitation between *b* and *m* was reported in spelling some Thracian names; cf. *Buzău* and *Timiș* in Lexicon C. If so, the relations between *Raba* and *Rama* might be viewed in this perspective.

**Raša**, NFI (Istria) < *Arsia*, *Arsa*. Latin spelling for an indigenous Illyrian river-name; cf. NFI *Aar*, *Aare*, Dan. *aar* ‘river’; see s.v. *Dunav*, *Dunaj*, *Dunăre* (Ramovš 1936: 24; Bezljaj).

**Ražanj**, NL, Knjaževac region, Timok valley. Ancient *Arsena*, etymon unclear; the Latin

spelling undoubtedly reflects an indigenous Thracian place-name (Franck 1932: 6). May reflect Preie. \*AR-, \*AL- as in *Arda* (supra) and *Arad* (Lexicon C).

**Resava**, *Resovska reka*, NFI, Bulgaria, at the border with Turkey. Probably Thracian, cf. NFI Thr. *Resos* (Troada), IE \*res-, O. Nordic *ras* ‘a water-flow’ (Georgiev 1960 a: 39).

**Rgotina**, NL (Timok valley) < *Argentares* (*argentum* ‘silver’).

**Rižana**, NFI; flows into the Adriatic Sea near Koper, Slovenia; It. *Risano*. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, cf. alb. *rjedh* < IE \*reg- ‘to flow, flowing water, river’.

**Rodopi**, NM, Bulgaria < Thr. \**Rud-uphe* ‘red river’, the name of *Dospatska reka*, extended for the mountain-name. See also Hristov (1964: 123).

**Rovinj**, NL, Croatia, Istria. Ancient *Ruginium*.

**Rosica**, old *Rosita*, tributary of Jantra, Bulgaria. Related to NM **Rosita**, Bulgaria and to other forms spread all over Europe: O. Prus. *Rossitten*, Latvian *Rasite*. Etymon unclear; suffix *-ica* is frequent in Slavic river-names, cf. *Marica* etc.

**Rusenski Lom**, NFI. See *Lom*.

**Sava**, NFI, tributary of the Danube at Belgrade. Ancient spellings: Gr. Σαουος, Lat. *Savus* < Ill. \**savas* ‘river’ < IE \**sowos* ‘flowing water’. Cf. NFI *Savu*, Romania; NFI *Sava* (Russia, of Ossetic origin).

**Savinja**, NFI, tributary of Sava. See *Sava*.

**Sefto(v)ite dābe**, **Seftovi čukari**, NL, Bulgaria, Panagjursko region. Probably Pre-Slavic Thracian, cf. NP Thr. Σευθας, Σευθος, (Zaimov 1977: 58 and 161). Cf. NP Rom. *Safta*, fem., *Săftoiu* (family name). See also the chapter dedicated to personal names, p. 71 ff.

**Senj**, NL, Croatia, Adriatic coast, It. *Segna*, Gm. *Zengg* < Lat. *Senia*. Cf. NL *Siena* < Lat. *Saena* (Etruria), *Sena* (Iulia). See also Skok 1917: 128.

**Serava**, NFI, tributary of Vardar. Pre-Slavic Thracian (eventually Illyrian), related to NFI *Saar*, Baltic *Seria*, Rom. *Siret*, *Siriu* etc. It is possible that Slavic root *sěr-* ‘grey’ influenced the modern form by folk-etymology (Duridanov 1975: 86).

**Setole**, NL on the Poroj river, Vardar basin. Pre-Slavic Thraco-Illyrian, related to Lith. *sietuva* ‘a hollow in a river bottom’. Cf. NL Σετουια, Dalmatia (Duridanov 1975).

**Sisak** (štokavian), **Sisek** (kajkavian), NL, near Zagreb. Lat. *Siscia*, Gr. *Siskia* < Celtic \**Se(q)-sq-ya* < IE \**se(q)-sq-a* ‘the sedge (*Carex*)’. See also Skok 1917: 128.

**Skomlja**, NFI (tributary of the Dunube in Bulgaria), NL (Lomsko region). Thracian (Daco-Moesian) \**Skambla* < IE \*(s)*kamb-*, \*(s)*komb-* (Duridanov 1952: 13, 94).

**Skopje**, NL, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic, ancient *Scupi*, Σκουπιοι, capital of Dardania. Related to NFI *Skoplje*, Bosnia; NFI, NL *Uskoplje*, near Dubrovnik; NFI *Uskoplje*, Hercegovina, Trebinje region (Duridanov 1975: 19; see also Papazoglu 1969: 171; one of the three major Dardanian centres together with *Naissus/Niš* and *Ulpiana/Lipljan*).

**Slan**, **Slano**, NL. Several locations with this name on the Adriatic coast. Usually explained as derived from Lat. *salinae*. Probably related to NL **Sali**, in the island of Veli Otok (Skok 1920: 149); see Lexicon B.

**Smèderovo**, **Smèderevo**, O.S.-Cr.. **Smederov grad**, NL, Serbia, port at the Danube; explained from O.S.-Cr.. \**Smeder* < Rom. *Sîmedru*, *Sămedru*, *Sumedru* < Late Latin *San(ctus) Demetrios*. Suffix *-evo*, *-ovo* is Slavic. Meaning: ‘the town of St. Demetrios’; cf. NL *Sîngiorz* (Romania) < *San(ctus) Giorgios* etc. Cf. *Škocjan*, infra.

**Soča**, NL, Slovenia, at the border with Italy; It. *Isonzo* < Lat. *Isontius*, *Sontius*, reflecting an indigenous Illyrian place-name of IE or Preie. origin.

**Solkan**, NL, Slovenia, near Nova Gorica. Ancient *Silicanus* (Bezljaj 1969: 25).

**Sotla**, Slv., **Sutla**, Cr., NFI. Pre-Slavic, Thraco-Illyrian \**Sontula*, \**Aesontula* (Bezljaj 1961:

149).

**Split**, NL, Adriatic coast; It. *Spalato*. Ancient Latin spelling *Spalatum*, Greek spelling Ασπαλαθος, with the basic meaning ‘thorny bush’, probably a folk-etymology in Greek, or – in Latin – another folk-etymology by relation with *palatium*. The place-name must reflect an indigenous Illyrian form. Phonetic evolution: *Spalatum* > *Speletum* > *Split*. (Ramovš 1936: 26; Popović 1960: 53, 171, 389; Skok 3: 312; Kiss 1980: 583).

**Srem**, NFI, NR; the most important town of the region is *Sremska Mitrovica*. Lat. *Sirmium*, reflecting an Illyrian form from IE \**ser-mo-* ‘river’. (See also Papazoglu 1969: 59). Cf. NFI *Siret*, NFI *Siriu*, Romania.

**Strima**, NL, Bulgaria. Related to NFI *Struma*.

**Strjama**, NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of Marica. Thracian, cf. NFI Lith. *Sermas*, NL pol. *Śrem* (Gm. *Schrimm*), O. Ind. *sárma-h* ‘water flow’. The evolution IE \**sr-* + vowel > Thr. (and Thr.-Dac.) *str-* is typical. Cf. *Struma*, *Struga* and Rom. NFI *Strei*, *Stremț*; also next entry. (Cf. also Papazoglu 1969: 59).

**Struga**, NFI, tributary of Savinja, Slovenia; another homophonous river-name, tributary of Krka, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic, Thracian, IE \**ser-* ‘to flow; river’, zero grade \**sr-* with the typical evolution IE \**sr-e-* > \**stre-*. Related to NFI *Struma*. Cf. NFI Rom. *Strei*, *Stremț* and *strugure* ‘grape’, *strungă* ‘a pen, a sheepfold’. The forms with the root *str-* very probably reflect the indigenous Thracian influence, but the primitive root should be carefully analysed as both IE \**str-* and IE \**sr-* + vowel resulted in Thr. \**str-*.

**Struma**, NFI, Bulgaria. Thracian, ancient *Strymyn*, IE \**sreu-* ‘to flow’. The evolution IE \**sr-* + vowel > Thr. \**str-* is typical. Cf. NFI Rom. *Strei*, *Stremț*. Derived forms: NFI *Strumica*, *Strumešnica*, Bulgaria. See above *Strima*, *Strjama*, *Struga*.

**Sužid**, NL, Slovenia, near Kobarid. Ancient *Silicetum* (Bezljaj 1969: 25).

**Šar**, S.-Cr., Mac., NM. Ancient spellings: Gr. Σκάρδος ὄρος, Lat. *Scardus*, reflecting an indigenous Thracian and/or Illyrian form, cf. Lith. *skardūs* ‘hill-side’. Cf. *Škar* (Lexicon B, II, 2).

**Šemnica**, *Ševnica*, NFI, tributary of Crna, Vardar basin. The suffix is Slavic. There are seemingly two old roots which interfered in these forms: one related to the Illyrian river-names *Semnus*, *Semirus*, Lith. *Semena*, IE \**sem-* ‘to pour, to flow’; the other related to NFI *Sava*, alb. *she(u)* ‘a marsh, a moor’ (Duridanov 1975: 222).

**Škocjan**, NL, Slovenia. Pre-Slavic of colloquial Latin origin \**Sant* (*sanctus*) *Cantianus* > \**š̌bnt kočjaň* > Slv. *Škocjan* (Ramovš 1936: 27). Cf. *Smederovo*, supra and *Singiorz* (< *Sanctus Georgios*) in Romania.

**Štip**, NL, on the Bregalnica river, Macedonia. Pre-Slavic, ancient *Astibos*. Etymon unclear (Duridanov 1975: 21). The place- and river-names with the root \**AS-* may be Preie. (further discussions in Chaintraine 1950; Mušu 1981; Paliga 1989 d). Cf. *Asău*, *Asuaj*, *Săsar* in Lexicon C.

**Tavor**, **Taor**, NL, Macedonia, near Skopje. Pre-Slavic, of Illyrian origin, ancient *Taurision* > Sl. \**Tavřb* (Duridanov 1975; Franck 1932: 6). A homophonous place-name is in the Užice region, Serbia. Preie. \**T-R-* as in *Tarcea*, *Tarcău* (Lexicon C).

**Tăža**, upper course; **Tundža**, lower course; NFI, Bulgaria. Thracian, frequently attested in the antiquity beginning with the 3rd century B.C.: Ταζος, Τονζος, *Tonzus*, *Tontus*, *Tountza*. Etymon unclear (Georgiev 1960 a: 27-28; see also Papazoglu 1969: 192).

**Timava**, NFI, Slovenia; It. *Timavo*, Frl. *Timàu*. Pre-Slavic, related to NFI *Timok* (infra), *Timiș* (Romania), *Tynne* (Great Britain), *Thames* (with non-etymological *th*), etc.

**Timok**, NFI, tributary of the Dunube at the Serbian-Bulgarian border. Lat. *Timachus*, a spelling

reflecting an indigenous Thracian form < IE *\*tem-ak-wa*. Another homophonous river-name is in the Vardar basin, tributary of Parištica (Duridanov 1975: 152). Cf. NFI *Timava*, supra; NFI *Timiș* (Romania, two rivers with this name, one in the Romanian Banat, the other in the Bucegi Mts.), NFI Eng. *Thames* etc.

**Tmor**, NL, Adriatic coast near Dubrovnik. See the discussion s.v. *Morane* (< *Tmorane*). Cf. NM *Tomór*, Albania.

**Tolmin**, NL, Slovenia; NFI *Tolminka*. Certainly Pre-Slavic, Ill. *\*Tilmon-*, related to other place- and river-names, cf. Frl. *Talm*, Ligurian *Talamone*, It. *Talamona*, Sp. *Talamon*, Fr. *Talamon* etc. Medieval attestation in 1146: *Tulminium*. Probably Preie. relic (Bezljaj; Ramovš 1936: 26), root *\*T-L-*. Cf. *Talma* in Lexicon C.

**Trakana**, NFI, tributary of Stara Reka, Vardar basin; **Trakanska reka**, NFI, tributary of Bregalnica, equally in the Vardar basin; NL **Trakanje**, same region. All these forms are Pre-Slavic of Thracian origin from a prototype *\*Trakana, -nja* < IE *\*trek-* ‘to pull, to run, to flow’. Probably related to NL *Trakanić*, Serbia (Duridanov 1975: 181). Possibly related to *Thrax, Thraex* ‘Thracian’, in which case we should consider Preie. root *\*T-R-*, as in *Tarcău, Tarcea* (Lexicon C).

**Trakanić** See *Trakana*, above.

**Trògir**, NL, Dalmatia; It. *Trau*. Ancient spelling: Lat. *Tragurium*, Gr. *Tragourion*, of Illyrian origin. Probably related to NL *Tergeste* > *Trieste* > *Trst*, infra.

**Trsat**, NL, Istria < Lat. *Tarsatica*, presumably reflecting an indigenous Illyrian form.

**Trst**, NL; It. *Trieste* < Lat. *Tergeste*, a spelling for an indigenous Illyrian form also reflected in Alb. *treg* and O.Sl. *trǫgb* ‘a market township’. The Illyrian or Thracio-Illyrian origin of *trǫgb* is probable.

**Una**, NFI, tributary of Sava; O.S.-Cr. **Un** < Lat. *Oeneus*, Gr. Οἰνεώς, reflecting an indigenous Illyrian river-name presumably of Preie. origin; cf. Gr. οἶνος ‘wine’, a Preie. “technical” term (Chantraine). The primitive meaning should have been ‘sacred liquid’; Preie. root *\*AN-*, *\*AIN-* in words with chromatic meanings: ‘bright; to shine; white’. See also root *an-*, *in-* (Lexicon C).

**Vardar**, NFI, the most important water-flow of Macedonia; flows into the Aegean near Thessaloniki. Ancient Greek spelling Βαρδάριος, reflecting an indigenous Thracian river-name derived from IE *\*sword(o)-wori* ‘black water’. The usual ancient name of the river was *Axios* (Duridanov 1975: 30–36; the author comprehensively analyses the river-names of the Vardar basin).

**Văča**, NFI, Bulgaria, tributary of Marica. Probably Pre-Slavic Thracian, unclear etymon. Seemingly related to *Vinča* (infra) and *Vința, Vințu* in Lexicon C; Preie. *\*W-N-*, *\*V-N-*.

**Velèbit**, NM, Croatia. Pre-Slavic, reflecting an indigenous Illyrian form, cf. Gr. ἠλίβατος ‘abrupt’. In S.-Cr., the word underwent a process of folk-etymology: *vele-bit* ‘big shelter’.

**Velevka**, NFI, Bulgaria, at the border with Turkey. Unclear, possibly Pre-Slavic Thracian, IE *\*welika* ‘curved, bent’. The local denomination *Kriva reka* ‘curved, meandering river’, probably a loan-translation (a calque), supports this hypothesis (Georgiev 1960 a: 37). Interferes with Slavic root *vel-* ‘big, great’.

**Veles**, NL, near de Skopje. Ancient *Bylazora*. The phonetic evolution is not clear. In any case, the explanation from ND *Veles*, a divinity of the Old Slavs, cannot be admitted (Franck 1932: 6). It may be surmised that, starting from the ancient form and the shift *b > v*, a chain of folk-etymologies played their role, ultimately the association with the root *\*vel-* ‘big, great’.

**Vešala**, NFL, tributary of Vardar. Pre-Slavic (Thracian and/or Illyrian) *\*Vesala*, *\*Vesalus* < IE *\*wes-* ‘wet, water’, cf. alb. *vesë* ‘a drizzle’ (Duridanov 1975: 49). Cf. NFI *Vișeu* in Romania

and *Wisła* (Poland).

**Vidbol, Vitbol**, NFI, tributary of the Danube. Probably Pre-Slavic Celtic, cf. NL *Vindobona* hence Sl. \**Vedbola* > B. *Vidbol*, under the influence of NL *Vidin* and NFI *Vit* (Georgiev 1960 a: 53–54).

**Vidin**, NL, Bulgaria. Ancient spelling: Lat. *Bononia*, Gr. *Bonvnia*, probably of Celtic origin as showed by other place-names like *Bologna*, ancient *Bononia*; *Boulogne*, ancient *Bononia*. These three forms, in Bulgaria, Italy and France, may show the great Celtic expansion in the antiquity. Nevertheless the modern form seems rather to reflect an indigenous Thracian word \**ud-* ‘water’, cf. NFI *Vedea*, NL *Videle*, in Romania. Cf. *Vit*.

**Vinča** NL Serbia. Must be related to NFI *Vāča* (supra), NL *Vința*, *Vințu* in Romania (see Lexicon C). Famous for the eponymous Neolithic culture.

**Vipava**, NFI, tributary of Soča, Slovenia; Frl. *Vipäu*, It. *Vipacco*. Pre-Slavic, Illyrian, related to NP *Vippius*, Lith. *ùpe*, *upis* ‘a water-flow’.

**Vit**, NFI, Bulgaria. Thr. \**utus* < IE \**ud-os* ‘water’. Recently re-analysed by Dimitrov (1994: 98) from the perspective of “Paleo-Balkanic vocalism”. Cf. *Vidin*.

**Vitoša**, NR, Sofia region. Ancient *Skombros*, *Scopius*. The modern form is Pre-Slavic, either of Thracian origin, cf. NP Thr. *Bit(h)us*, with the evolution *b*>*v*, or derived from Rom. *vită* ‘a cow; pl. cattle’ with the suffix *-oș* (BER 1: 155). Cf. NP Pol. *Witosz*, NL Pol. *Witoszyn*. We may also surmise an interference at colloquial level.

**Vogljana**, NL, Slovenia. Probably from *Aquilania*, in any case Pre-Slavic (Bezljaj 1961: 149).

**Vrbas**, NFI, Bosnia. NFI Ill. *Urpanus*, *Urbanus*, NL *Urbate* (Russu 1969: 259). The etymon suggested by Dickenmann (1939: 28) and Kiss (1980) IE \**wrbhas* ‘a willow’. Nevertheless these Illyrian forms rather seem to reflect the Preie. root \**OR-/\*UR-* ‘huge, big’ analysed by Rostaing (1950: 70–71) and Mușu (1981: 199 sq. and 250 sq.). Thracian also witnesses forms with the root *or-/ur-* (see Dečev 1957: 343–345 and 348). The form clearly underwent a process of folk-etymology and “etymological substitution” in Serbo-Croatian, in relation indeed with *vrba* ‘a willow’. Cf. the toponymical root *oar-*, *or-*, *ur-* in Romanian.

**Vukovar**, NL, near Osijek. There is a long and complicated history behind this form. The second part of the compound reflects Hu. *vár* ‘a fortress’, while its first part seemingly reflects an association with S.-Cr. *vuk* ‘a wolf’. The river *Vuka* (ancient *Ulca*, cf. alb. *ujk*, *ulk* ‘a wolf’) flows in the vicinity. In the Middle Ages the place-name was *Castrum Vlcou* ‘the fortress of Vlk (Wolf)’, which is a re-adaptation (calque) of the old meaning of Thracian-Illyrian origin, from IE \**wlk<sup>w</sup>os* ‘a wolf’ > Thr. \*(*v*)*ulk-* ‘a wolf’.

**Zadar**, NL, Dalmatian coast. Ancient: Gr. *Iader(a)*, Lat. *Iader(a)*, of Illyrian origin. In colloquial Latin, the word was pronounced \**Zadar*, \**Zadra* seemingly from IE \**yeudh-* ‘agitated, impetuous’. It is not clear whether there is a relationship with NFI *Iader*, today *Idro*, near Thessaloniki. See also Skok 1917: 124.

**Zgon**, NL, Montenegro. Related to *Zgon* in the Adriatic Islands, see Lexicon B, II, 6. Etymon unclear, Pre-Slavic.

**Zletovska reka** (< \**Zlętava*), NFI, tributary of Bregalnica, Vardar basin. Pre-Slavic Thracian \**Zlent-us*, \**Zlenta* < IE *ghlend(h)-* ‘to shine’. Related to NFI *Glane*, France, of Celtic origin (Duridanov 1975: 184).

**Zrin**, NL, Croatia, south of Sisak. Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon, probably Illyrian \**ger-* ‘a hill, a mountain’ < IE \**g<sup>w</sup>er-* ‘a hill, mountain’. The form witnesses an old satem phonetism or a secondary palatalisation. The explanation from Sl. \**zbrěti* ‘to see, to notice’ cannot be accepted.

## Lexicon B. Pre-Slavic Elements in the Adriatic Islands

Skok (1950) analysed in detail the Pre-Slavic place-names in the four groups along the Adriatic coast. Some major names are also analysed in Kiss (1980; namely *Brač, Cres, Hvar, Kakan, Olib/Ulib, Osor, Rab* and *Vis*). As Skok's analysis clarifies and complements the general view of the Pre-Slavic on the continental (Balkanic) area, we have summarised the data with several additions. We have also included some place-names along the Adriatic coast as they best reflect the *principle of repeatability*.

*Recurrent forms.* Some forms, sometimes with parallels in vocabulary, occur at least twice, some very frequently. We have assumed that a brief presentation of these forms may be useful for the reader. Some have also parallels on the continental area. The phonetic evolution is generally specific to Dalmatian with several Italian (Venetian) and Romanian influences.

**Banàostar, Banuàstar, Brnistrova;** dial. **banestra, brnistra** < Lat. *genista* 'Genista tinctoria; dyer's greenwood'. The first two forms have the suffix *-arius*, the latter has Slavic suffix.

**Kampèlje** < *campellus*, dim. from *campus*. Cf. *Kampor*.

**Kampor** < *campus*, with plural ending *-ora* after *tempus*, *-ora*. Cf. Rom. *cîmp* - pl. *cîmpuri*.

**Kanajt, Kanîtalj (Kanikalj)** < *cannetum* and *cannetulum* - *canna* 'reed'.

**Košljîn, Košljun** < Coll. Lat. *\*castellione* - *castellum* 'castle'.

**Marta**, dial. **mrta** < Gr.-Rom. *myrta* 'myrtle'. Cf. *Mrča*.

**Mostir** < *monasterium*.

**Mošnje, Mošun(a)**; dial. **mošun** < *mansione* 'a halt place'.

**Mrča, Mrčara, Mrčica** < *myrtearia* 'a land where myrtle grows'; cf. *Marta, mrta*.

**Munčel, Mučel, Moncel** < *monticellus*, dim. from *mons, montis* 'a mountain'. Cf. Rom. *Muscel* (e.g. NL *Cîmpulung Muscel*), *muncel* 'a small hill'

**Omišalj** < *Ad musculum*, Coll. Lat. *\*amusc(u)lu*. *Musculus* is a diminutive from *mus, muris* 'a mouse', but later got other meanings like 'mollusc'; 'muscles'; 'a siege hut', then 'hut' in general. The place-names preserve this latter military meaning. At colloquial level this form was confounded with *muscus*, *-i*, dim. *\*musculus* 'moss'. Rom. *mușchi* 'muscle(s)' and 'moss' reflects this confusion.

**Plaj** < Gr.-Rom. *plagium* < Gr. *plagios* 'a hill-side, side'. Very frequent in south Slavic and Romanian (*plai*), and presumably largely spread in colloquial Latin. It. *spiaggia* 'a beach' has the same origin.

**Plantur, Prantur, Promentur, Prmantur** < *promontorium*.

**Prsur, Prsurina** < *frixorium* 'a cooking place'; derived from *frigo, -ere, frixi, frixum/fritum* 'to roast, to fry', with the specific Dalmatian evolution *f > p*, as in *Plomin* < *Flanoniae* etc.

**Sakatùr** < *siccatorium* 'a place for drying' - *siccus* 'dry'.

**Silba, Sirba** < *silva*; cf. Rom. *selbă* (dial.) 'a forest'.

**Slana, Slano** < *sal, salis, salem* (ac.) 'salt'. Cf. *Slan(o)*, Lex. A.

**Sut**, in compound forms **Su-, St-; sut** < *sanctus*. **Stomorina** < *Sancta Maria*; **Supetar** < *Sanctus Petrus* (Rom. *Sâmpetru, Sânpetru*); **Sudùjan, Sudùjma** < *Sanctus Dominus*; **Sudurad** < *Sanctus Georgios*; the latter is equivalent to NL Rom. *Singiorz*.

**Trtuša** < *tortuosa* 'tortuous'.

**Val, Vala** (especially in compound forms), **Valun, Valunta** (with augmentative suffixes)

< *vallis* 'a valley'; sometimes with augmentative suffixes *-at*, *-unta*.

**I. Kvarnerian Group** (*Kvarnerski otočki skup*, pp. 11 sq.) made up of five big islands, named in the Antiquity (*Insulae*) *Flanoniae* or *Sinus Flanaticus*, in Italian (dialect spoken in Venice and Tuscany) *Fianona*, and in S.-Cr. *Plominski zaliv* or *U Plominu*. NI Cr. *Plomin* reflects the Latin form *Flanoniae*, with the evolution *f* > *p* (other examples below). NI *Kvarner* reflects It. (Venetian) *Quarnero*. The navigable zone of this group is named *Canale della Morlacca*; *morlacco* reflects Byz. Gr. *maurovlachos* 'black Vlach'.

The Kvarnerian Group is made up of the islands *Krk*, *Cres* and *Lošinj* ("prava kvarnerska = Kvarnerian proper") and other two islands: *Rab* and *Pag*. The islands *Cres* and *Lošinj* are also named *Opsara*, and *Krk* is also named *Vekla*.

**1. *Krk*** (pp. 21–34). Named in the antiquity *splendidissima civitas Curictarum*, NPP *Curicti*, an Illyrian group, NL ill. *Curicum*, of Pre-Roman origin, Preie. \**K-R-*. *Krk* is also the name of the most important locality of the islands.

*Brgud*, *Brgudac* < *Virgultum*.

*Galun* < Lat. *galla* 'a swelling (on a tree-branch), a prominence' (in place-names the terms refers to an elevated place, a hill), with an augmentative suffix (cf. *Valun*, *Valunta*, infra).

*Kampelje*, ac. pl. < *campellus*, dim. from *campus* 'field'. Recurrent.

*Kanajt* < *cannētum*, dim. from *canna* 'reed'.

*Karkarula* < Lat. *calx*, *calcis* 'heel' with diminutival suffix in colloquial Latin: \**calcalulla*.

*Košljûn* < Coll. Lat. *castellione*, dim. from *castellum* 'castle'. Recurrent.

*Kras* < Illyro-Liburian *carsus*. Cf. *Kranj*, *Krajna* in Lex. A.

*Munčel* < Coll. Lat. *monticellus*, dim. from *mons*, *montis*. Recurrent.

*Negrit* < *niger*, in coll. Latin \**nigritus*.

*Ogrul* < Coll. Lat. \**agerullus*, dim. from *ager* 'field', in competition with *campus*.

Attested in 1453: *basilica S. Nicolaus de Ogrul(l)o*.

*Omišalj* < Coll. Lat. \**amusclu* = *Ad musculum (locus)*. Recurrent.

*Plaj* < Gr.-Lat. *plagium*. Recurrent. Frequent also in Romanian place-names (*plai*).

*Punat*, gen. *Punta* < Lat. *pons*, *pontis*; Rom. *punte* 'a (small) bridge'.

*Spena* < *spina*, the plant *Rubus* (bramble, raspberry).

*Tôrkul* < *torculum* 'twisted object' (*torquo* 'to spin'). See also *torcularium* '(wine) press'.

*Turnac*, diminutive of dialectal form *turanj* < *turris* 'a tower'.

*Valunta* < Coll. Lat. *vallata* 'a valley' (Class. Lat. *vallis*), with augmentative suffix.

Skok assumes that NL *Vrhure* and *Fareča* reflect old Romanian phonetism. The former is the plural form (*vîrfuri*) of *vîrf* 'a peak' of Slavic origin, the latter is the reflex of Lat. *filix*, *filix* 'a fern', with the specific Romanian rotacisation in intervocalic position (Lat. *l* > Rom. *r*). (p. 25).

**2. *Cres*** (pp. 34–44). Ancient *Crexa*, *Crexi*, *Krepsa*. S.-Cr. may be explained as secondary palatalisation, as in *Cavtat* (supra, Lexicon A). The place-name is Illyrian of "Mediterranean" origin. See also Ramovš 1936: 26. The same origin for a small island of the Cres-Lošinj group, *Osor*, ancient *Apsaros*, *Apsoros*, *Apsouros* (further discussions in Skok 1917: 125–126).

*Kormat* < *corrîmare* in the participle (*corrîmatus*), derived from *rimor*, *-ari* and *rimo*, *-are* 'to rummage': the place where the see "rummages" the shore. Cf. *Maskatûr*, infra.

*Krnjacol* < *cornu* with double suffix: *-aceus* and *-olus*, Coll. Lat. \**cornaceolus*.  
*Maskatūr* < *morsicatorium* – *morsico*, *-are* ‘to bite by tearing’: the place where the sea “bites” the shore. Cf. *Kormat*, supra.  
*Merag*, Romance, of unclear origin, probably related to *Merek* (infra).  
*Merek*, gen. *Merga* < *mergus* ‘an ember goose’.  
*Mugranj* < *malum graneum* (*granatum*) ‘pomegranate’. Cf. *Mogren*, near Budva.  
*Pin* (*Mali i Veli*) < *pinus* ‘a pine-tree’.  
*Porozina*, It. *Faresina* < Gr. *pharos* ‘lighthouse’, borrowed in southeast Europe with the suffix *-ensis* or *-inus*. The evolution *f* > *p* is specific, cf. *Flanonae* > *Plomin* etc.  
*Prantur*, *Plantur* < *promontorium*. Recurrent.  
*Punta Križa*, Christian-Romance, ‘bridge of the cross’ < Lat. *Pons* (Acc. *pontem*) *crucis*.  
*Sis*, a hill on the island < Coll. Lat. \**susum* = Class. Lat. *sursum* ‘high-up’; cf. Rom. *sus*. The evolution *u* > *i* is specific to Dalmatian, e.g. Lat. *murus* ‘a wall’ > S.-Cr. *mir*.  
*Slana* < *salis*, ac. *sale(m)* ‘salt’. Recurrent, cf. *Slan*, *Slano* in Lexicon A.  
*Stivan* < *Sanctus Jo(h)annes*, compound with *sut* < *sanctus*, recurrent.  
*Valun* < *vallis*, with augmentative suffix (cf. *Galun*, I, 1).  
*Vanula*, Romance, unclear etymon, cf. *Valun*.

Some place-names are considered Pre-Slavic (Pre-Croatian), Romance or Illyro-Romance: *Baldarin*, *Kaldonta*, *Mezulin* (maybe a diminutive from dialectal form *mezul* < *mediolus* ‘middle’ (adj.); cf. Rom. *mijlociu*, adj. ‘middle’, *miez* ‘a core, a kernel’, as in *žmulj* ‘a cup, a recipient’), *Ridulje* and *Ul. Krušija* reflect It. *corsia* ‘a corridor, a passage’, and *Tarej*, with metathesis (from \**Tajer*), reflects It. *tagliere*. Dialectal form *kapartūr* reflects Lat. *coopertorium* ‘a cover, a shelter’.

**3. Lošinj** (pp. 44-54). It. *Isola dei Lussini*. The name is Pre-Slavic, etymon uncertain.  
*Arbit* < prob. Coll. Lat. \**arbutus*, *arbitus*, dim. from *arbor* ‘a tree’.  
*Kanitalj*, with *t/d*. Probably of Italian origin, etymon unclear.  
*Lakunj* < prob. Lat. *lacuna* – *lacus*.  
*Levrera* < *Leporaria* - *lepus*, *-oris* ‘a hare, a rabbit’.  
*Margarina*, related to dial. *mrgar* < Coll. Lat. \**mulgare* (*mulgeo*, *-ere*) ‘to milk (a cow)’.  
*Mažova* < *Maius*.  
*Mortar*, related to NI *Murter*. The suffix *-er* is Italian-Venetian < Lat. *-arius*.  
*Nembi*, pl. < *Neumae* < Gr. *neuma* ‘a sign, a symbol’.  
*Orjule* < *Auriola* – *aureus* ‘(of) gold, golden’.  
*Orser* (*Veli i Mali*), related to NL istr. *Vrsar* < Lat. *Ursaria*, presumably via a Venetian dialect.  
*Skopalj* < prob. *scopulus* ‘a reef, a small island’.  
*Susak*, Gen. *Suska* < Gr.-Rom. *sansacus*, Gr. *sámpsychon* ‘the plant *Origanum*’.

The following place-names are considered Pre-Slavic, Romance, without a clear etymon:

*Artatore*, *Balvanida*, *Čikat*, *Čirka*, *Kambonara*, *Limaran*, *Maračol*, *Samučel* (< ? *Sanctus Monticellus*), *Sunfarni*, *Tomožina*, *Torunza*, *Unijama*. *Kavuada*, *Kavada* reflect Ven. *cavare* ‘to extract, to dig’, and *Sidro* < *Isidor*.

**4. Rab** (pp. 55–67). Ancient *Arva*, *Arba*. Illyrian < Preie. \**AR-b/w-* The adjectives

Ven. *arbaschio*, It. *rascia*, Sp. *raja*, Pg. *rasa* ‘thick cloth, Rab wool’ are derived from the place-name.

*Banjol* < *Balneolae*, derived from *balnea* ‘bath(s)’; cf. NL *Baia Mare* (lit. ‘great bath’), *Baia Sprie* in Romania, etc.

*Barbat* < *barbatus*, cf. Rom. *bărbat* ‘a man’ (< ‘bearded person’).

*Bruškit* < *bruscetum* ‘the plant *Ruscus aculeatus*; butcher’s-broom’.

*Čifnata*, *Čihnata* < Gr.-Rom. *siphonata* < Gr. *sipho*, *-onis* ‘a conduit, a tube; a water source’.

*Frkanj*. Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon, possibly derived from *frico*, *-are* or related Sicilian *fragaggya*, Napolitan *fragale* ‘a group of small fish’.

*Fuža* < Lat. *fodio*, *-ere* ‘to dig’. The evolution *di-* > *ž* is normal.

*Grpe*. Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon; related to NL *Gripe*, near Split.

*Kampina* < *campanella*, dim. from *campus* ‘a field’. Cf. NL Rom. *Cîmpina*, *Câmpina*.

*Kamplaka*, *Kaplaka* < *caput* + *lacus*, Coll. Lat. \**cap-lac* ‘the lake (pond) at the end’ (e.g. ‘end of the island’ etc.).

*Kâmpor* < *campus*, pop. pl. \**campora*, after *tempus*, pl. *tempora*. Recurrent.

*Kanitalj*, *Kanikalj*, gen. *Kaniklja* < *cannetulum* ‘small reed’, dim. from *canna* ‘reed’.

*Karara* < *carraria* ‘a road’. Cf. Rom. *cărare* ‘a road, path (in a forest)’.

*Kom(o)rčâr* < *commerciarium*. “The former hypothesis, *Campus Martius* ‘field of Mars’ is not acceptable” says Skok (p. 61).

*Košljun* < *castellione*, colloquial form derived from *castellum*. Recurrent.

*Krklant* < *circinatus* ‘round, circular’.

*Miral*, colloquial form derived from *mirare* (Lat. classic *mirror*, *-ari*, deponent). The meaning of the place-name is ‘a place to contemplate’.

*Mošuna*. In the local dialect, there is *mošun* < Coll. Lat. *mansione(m)* ‘a place for rest’. Recurrent.

*Munčel* < Coll. Lat. *monticellus*, dim. from *mons*, *-tis* ‘a hill’; recurrent.

*Palit* < *paludem* ‘a marsh, a moor’. Related to NL *Poljud*, near Split and Rom. *pădure* ‘a forest’, with metathesis<sup>16</sup>.

*Pašturân*, with suffix *-an* from Lat. *pastor* (*pastorius*, *pastoricus*).

*Plaj* < Gr.-Rom. *plagium*. Recurrent. Cf. Rom. *plai*, also frequent in place-names.

*Prsur* < *frixorium*, derived from *frigo*, *-ere*, *frix*. Recurrent.

*Prvorâda* < *Pulveraria* – *pulver* ‘powder’.

*Sakarata* (Sv. *Grgur Sakarata*) < *siccarius* ‘a place where grains are dried’, cf. Pg. *siqueiro* ‘id’. *Grgur* reflects Christian-Romance *Gregorius*.

*Sarakin* < *Saracenus*, pl. *Saraceni*, an ethnic group of Arabia Felix.

*Silba*, *Sirba*, NI *Silba* < *silva* ‘a forest’. Recurrent. Cf. Rom. dial. *selbă* ‘a forest’.

*Sut* < *sanctus*. Recurrent.

*Suvid* < *sanctus Vitus*. Cf. *sut*.

*Val* < *vallis* ‘a valley’, frequent, recurrent; cf. Romanian place-names with the component *Vale*, art. *Valea* from *vale* < Lat. *vallem* (acc.).

<sup>16</sup> This is, at least, the current etymological explanation though it is not shared by all the linguists as neither the Latin meaning nor the metathesis may be so easily acceptable. The construction *păd-ur-e* is similar in indigenous Thracian forms like *brust-ur-e*, *mug-ur-e*, *viez-ur-e*, etc.

*Valsabâna, Valsabana* < *vallis Silvania* ‘valley of (god) Silvanus’.

*Vidilaka* < Coll. Lat. \**valle de laco* ‘valley of the lake’.

**5. Pag** (pp. 67–77).

*Bošane*, pl. < ancient *Bassiana*, Ill.-Rom. Related to NL *Bošana*, near Biograd, on the continental coast.

*Čaška* < ancient *Cissa*, Illyro-Romance.

*Karin* (Sv. *Karin*) < *Quirinus*.

*Lakljan* < *Liciniana* (urbs, civitas) – *Licinius*. Cf. *Lipljan* (Lexicon A) and *Pov(l)jana*, infra.

*Lun* < *leo, leonis* ‘a lion’.

*Makar* < ancient *Muccurum*, Illyro-Romance.

*Maun*, Pre-Slavic and Pre-Illyrian, probably Preie.

*Movra* < *Maurus*.

*Mrtva* < *myrta*, pl; recurrent.

*Novalja* < *navalis – navis* ‘a ship’.

*Povjana* and *Povljana* < *Pauliana* (urbs, civitas) – *Paulus*, Christian-Romance name.

Cf. *Lakljan*, supra.

*Sakrât, Sakarata*, same origin as the homophonic form in the island of Rab (supra, I. 4).

*Škrda* < ancient *Skirda*, Illyrian, probably from IE \*(s)ker- ‘to bend, to curve’.

*Tov(e)rnele* < Coll. Lat. \**taverna* (clas. *taberna*) ‘a hut’, with the diminutive suffix *-ella*.

*Vir*. Attested in 1345 as *Ura*. Preie. The evolution is normal: *urceus* > *vrč*, *hortus* > *vrt*.

Cf. *Vrbas* < *Urpanus, Urbanus*, in Lexicon A and the numerous Romanian forms in *or-*, *ur-* of Thracian origin (Lexicon C).

Skok (p. 71) also records the dialectal form *hripa* < Pre-Latin (Preie.) *grippus, greppus, crepus* ‘a cliff, a rock’. Equally *sut* < Lat. *sanctus*.

**II. Archipelago Zadar-Šibenik.** (Pag. 78 sq.). 15 islands. Only the name of Veli Otok is Slavic, all the other forms are Pre-Slavic.

**1. Olib, Ulib** (pp. 79-85). Late antiquity forms *Aluip, Allybum, Luibo*, which reflect either Lat. *alluvium* or rather an Illyrian word of Preie. origin (\**AL-*) influenced by folk-etymology by the Latin form. Some dialectal forms should be mentioned, e.g. *mošuna* < *mansione(m)* ‘a place for rest’; *lokva* ‘moorish pond’ < *lacuna – lacus*.

*Fučin*. Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon.

*Paršurna* – *prsur* < *frixorium*. Recurrent.

*Sambare* < *Sanctus Bartolomeus* or *Sancta Barbara*.

*Stivan* < *Sanctus Johannes*.

*Stomorini* < *Sancta Maria*.

*Tale*. Related to *Taline* (infra, II, 10).

**2. Silba** (pp. 85–89). Lat. *silva*. A recurrent place-name in the Adriatic islands. Cf. Rom. dial. *selbă*.

*Karf*, probably related to NI *Krf*. Pre-Slavic < Preie. \**K-R-*.

*Marta* < *myrta*.

*Mostir* < *monasterium*.

*Škar*. Similar place-names also in the islands of Olib, Krk and Pag. Pre-Slavic Illyrian. Cf. *Šar* in Lexicon A.

**3. Premuda** (pp. 89–93). Ancient *Pyrótima*; Tab. Peut. records the form *Palmodos*, *Palmodon*, possibly derived from *palma* ‘a palm’ and ‘a palm-tree’, but cannot explain the meaning. Another possibility is a Preie. relic, from \**Pamodos*. *Pri-* might be explained as influenced by Latin *primus*. Undoubtedly Pre-Slavic.

*Bale*, probably related to NL *Bale* in Istria < *vallis* ‘a valley’ or from Italian.

*Krijal* < *Cyriacus*.

*Martovna* < *marta*, *myrta* ‘myrtle’.

*Omiš*, related to the homophonic form in the island of Veli Otok (II, 8); Pre-Slavic Illyrian, cf. *Omiš* in Lexicon A.

**4. Molat, Ist and Škarda** (pp. 94–99). NI *Molat*, It. *Melada* is related to NI *Mljet*, Pre-Slavic, explained from Lat. *mellatus* – *mel*, *melis* ‘honey’. NI *Ist* is of Illyrian origin, cf. *Bast* (ancient *Biston*), in Croatia; *Bistue*, in Bosnia. *Škarda*, ancient *Skardon (oros)*, Ill. *skerd-*.

*Banàostar*, *Banuàstar* < *genista* ‘the plant *genista*, mainly dyer’s greenwood or the *genista sagitalis*’. Recurrent.

*Bargùlje*, related to NL *Brguli* (Kotor), *Brgule* (Serbia), dial. *brgulja* < It. *bergolare* < *verbulare* ‘to chatter’. Rom. *a bìugui*, *bâigui* ‘to talk slow and meaninglessly’ seems related to these forms, though the phonetic evolution is not clear.

*Bavkul*. Unclear, same name in II, 13.

*Funestrata*, dim. from *fenestra* ‘a window’.

*Klunda* < *columna*.

*Maknare* < *machina* cu suf. *-aria* ‘a machine = a mill’.

*Pendùlj* < *pendulus* ‘suspended, pending’.

*Prasùrina*, *Padruara*, related to *Prsur* (Rab) < *frixorium*. Recurrent.

*Sakatùr* < *siccatorium*. Recurrent.

**5. Sestrunj and Rivanj** (pp. 100–103). *Sestrunj* might be explained from *extraneus* ‘an outsider, a foreigner’; *Rivanj* is unclear; the explanation from *Ripanium* (*ripa* ‘a river-side’) cannot be accepted. Pre-Slavic anyway.

*Idula*; an identical place-name on the island of Ugljan. Unclear, Pre-Slavic.

*Iž*. Unclear, Pre-Slavic (It. *Eso*). See below, II, 7. Perhaps same etymon like *Iași*, Romania (Lexicon C).

*Klis*, cf. NL *Klis* near Split (Lexicon A, p. 25). Unclear, Pre-Slavic.

**6. Ugljan, Uljan** (pp. 103–109). Explained from *Gellianum* (NP *Gellius*) with the prefix *u-*, as in *Skopje*, *Skoplje* – *Uskoplje* (cf. Lex. A, s.v. *Skopje*). Cf. *Jakljan* < *Liciniana*, near Dubrovnik.

*Brgačelj*, Celto-Illyrian *briga* ‘a hill, a mountain’ with the diminutival Latin suffix *-cellus*, as in *monticellus*.

*Čeprljana*, *Čeprljanda*, Pre-Slavic, unclear etymon.

*Zgon*, related to NL *Zgon*, in Montenegro. Unclear, Pre-Slavic.

**7. Iž Mali i Veli** (pp. 110–113). Probably Pre-Romance, “Mediterranean” (Preie.), maybe related to Gr. *nēsos* and Lat. *insula*. See also II, 5, above.

*Bršanj* < *versare* with suffix *-an*.

*Košljín* < *castellione*. Recurrent.

*Munčel* < *monticellus*.

*Parda*, unclear, Pre-Slavic.

*Rava*, Preie. Similar place-names are spread over south Italy, while the western Romance language preserve forms with the general meaning ‘a stone, a cliff’.

*Šipnate* < *siphôn*, *-ône* ‘a water-spring’ and Lat. suf. *-atus*. Recurrent.

*Trtuša* < *tortuosa*. Recurrent.

**8. Veli Otok** (pag. 114–125). The only Slavic name in the area; nevertheless it calques Late Latin *Insula Maior* (year 1289); It. *Isola Grande/ Longa/ Grossa*.

*Birbinj* < *verbena* ‘a sacred reed’.

*Garmenjāk* < Pre-Slavic *garma* ‘a hollow in a cliff’, seemingly of Preie. origin, root \*K-R-, \*G-R- ‘stone, rock’.

*Krbušćak*, derived from *krbun* < *carbone* with Slavic suffix.

*Krknata* < *circinatus* – *circinus* < *circino* ‘to make a circle’.

*Lokajne* < *lacuna* – *lacus*.

*Magr-* in NL as *Magrovica* < *Megarus*, Preie. or from Gr. *megaron* ‘a big house, a palace’.

*Mežanj* < *medianus*, “but the name does not seem to have a logical motivation within the local configuration” (Skok).

*Mostir* < *monasterium*. Recurrent.

*Mrtovnjak* – *mrta* < *myrta*. Recurrent.

*Omiš*. Similar NL on other islands too; all are Pre-Slavic, ancient *Almisium*, a spelling for probably Illyrian forms (supra II, 3 and Lexicon A).

*Ozdren* < *consuere* ‘to sew’ with epenthetic *-d-*, as in French *cozdre*, same origin.

*Padrare* < *petraria* ‘rocky place’.

*Sakarun, Saharun, Sakaron* < *siccus* with an augmentative suffix; recurrent.

*Sali* < *sal, salis* ‘salt’. Recurrent.

*Savar* < Gr. *sauros* ‘green lizard’.

*Stivan, Sustipan* < *Sanctus Ivan (Johannes)*.

*Sustipanja* (Luka) < (*vallis*) *Sancti Stephani*; *sut, su-* ‘saint’ is recurrent on the Adriatic Islands.

*Telašćica* < *Tilagus*, Preie. root \*T-L- in numerous place- and mountain-names.

*Utra*, unclear, Pre-Slavic, probably Preie. \*AT-, \*AD-, \*UT-.

*Žman*, maybe from Lat. *medianus* > *Mžan* > *Žman*, with metathesis or related to NL *Giman*, near Dubrovnik, explainable from Lat. (*praedium*) *Geminianum*.

**9. The Kornat Group** (pp. 125–132). Represented by the islands *Kornat, Žut* and *Sit*, all of Pre-Slavic origin. *Kornat* is explained by Skok from Lat. *incoronata* or, perhaps more attractively, from the participle *corrimare* ‘to press, squeeze’, (*insula*) *corrimata*. Rom. *a curma* ‘to stop’ would be derived from the same etymon. • Nevertheless it is doubtful that Rom. *a curma* might derive from the etymon suggested by Skok; it is rather an indigenous Thracian element. On the other hand, the Latin origin of the Adriatic place-name is probable. We suggest a colloquial Latin form *cornatus* < *cornu* ‘(animal) horn’ or another colloquial form derived from *cornus* ‘cornel tree’. • *Žut* has been explained from Lat. *junctus* ‘matched (to), related to’. • *Sit* reflects Lat. *situs* ‘a place, a location’.

*Aba*, Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear. Related to *Abatuta*?

*Balabra*, Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear. Cf. Rom. *palavre*, pl. ‘gossips, nonsense talk’, *a pǎlǎvrǎgi* ‘to talk nonsense, to gossip’.

*Dragunara* < *draco, -onis* ‘a dragon, devil’ with suffix *-arius, -a*. Rom. *drac* ‘devil’ is derived from the Latin form.

*Klint*, isolated form, probably Romance, etymon unclear. Cf. *Klis*, supra, II, 5.

*Lavdara* < *lapidaria* ‘a quarry’.

*Lavsa, Lavca* < Celto-Illyrian *lausiae (lapides lausiae)* ‘a schistose rock, a slab’.

*Opat* < *hospitalis* (probably); the word was initially specific to the Christian

vocabulary.

*Panitula* < *pane* ‘bread’ with diminutival suffix.

*Purara (Vela i Mala)* < *pirus* ‘a pear tree’, with suffix *-arius*, frequent in colloquial

Latin.

*Trtuša* < *tortuosus*. Recurrent.

*Žakanac* < *žakan* < Lat. *diaconus*.

**10. Pašman** (pp. 133–139). From Lat. *Postumius* with suffix *-anus*: *Postumianum praedium*. In 1067 attested as *Flaueyco* < *Flavi vico*, with *ī* > *ey*, specific to Dalmatian. Cf. *Postojna*, Lex. A.

*Banj* < *balneae*.

*Jota*, unclear, Pre-Slavic.

*Kotul*, locally also *Čavata*, *Čavatul*. Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear. Cf. Rom. *cot*, art. *cotul* ‘elbow’, including meanings applied to curved realities such as *cotul rîului* ‘a river bend’.

*Mrljane* < (*praedium*) *Marinianum*; related to NL *Marjan*, near Split.

*Nevijane*, *Nevidane* < *Naevidius* with suf. *-anus*: (*praedium*) *Naevidianum*.

*Ričul* < *ericius* ‘hedgehog’ with diminutival suffix Coll. Lat. *\*ericiullus*; Rom. *arici*, art. *ariciul*.

*Taline*, related to NL *Tale*, island of Olib (II, 1). Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear, probably Preie. \**T-L*.

*Tkon*, dial. *Kûn* < *\*Tuconum*, by metathesis from *Cotunum*, *Cotonum*.

**11. Vrgada** (pp. 139–144). Pre-Slavic, Preie. \**OR-*, \**UR-* ‘big, huge’, as in *Vrbas* (Lexicon A) and the Romanian forms in *oar-*, *or-*, *ur-*. The contemporary form seems deformed or influenced by Venetian dialects. The form *Lapkat* is attested in the 17th century. Named *Insula rubricata* ‘red island’ in the antiquity.

*Sudùjan*, *Sudùjma* < *Sanctus Dominus (-na)*; Recurrent, a compound with *sut* < *sanctus*.

Skok also records the local form *gljendura* < Arom. *gl'indură* < *glandula* ‘a tonsil, a glandule’.

**12. Murter, Morter** (pp. 145–149). Cf. *Kvarner*. Italian origin: *mortaio* < *mortarium* ‘a recipient for mixing or pounding’.

**13. Žirje**, dial. also **Žiraje** (pp. 150–154). probably from Gr. *gyros* ‘round’; this word was borrowed by southeast Romance idioms, cf. Rom. *giur* > *jur* ‘around’.

*Bavkul*, related to an identical place-name in Molat (II,4). Probably Old Dalmatian, etymon unclear.

*Kakan* < Apparently Lat. *cygnus* ‘a swan’. *Kak-* is witnessed in Thraco-Illyrian place-names; the similarity to Lat. *cygnus*, *cycnus* might be fortuitous and/or a folk-etymology. Cf. *Kuknara* (infra, III. 1). May reflect Preie. \**K-K-*, \**G-G-*.

*Kopranj* < *caprula*, dim. from *capra*. Cf. *Koper*, Lex. A.

*Logorun*, cf. NL *Logorun* near Split. Formally, it seems to reflect Gr. *lagaros* ‘mild, delicate’, but there is no reason for this meaning. Perhaps same root as in *Logatec* (Lexicon A).

*Mrtovac* < *mrta* < *myrta*. Recurrent.

*Tijat*, prob. of Latin origin with suf. *-at*; etymon unclear.

**14. Zlarin Group** (pp. 154–156). The islands of *Zlarin*, *Krbela (Vela i Mala)* and *Krapan (Krapanj, Krapjun)*. • *Krbela* < *curvus*, with diminutival suffix. • *Krapan*, *Krapanj*, *Krapjun*, eventually from Gr. *kópranon* ‘mud, a moor’ or rather Preie. \**K-R-*. • *Zlarin* is surely Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear, perhaps related to NFI *Zala* (Hungary) and NFI, NL *Zalău*, *Zălău*

(Romania, Lexicon C).

*Tmara*, unclear, probably Gr. *tomáron* ‘a cut (off), a slice’. See also under no. 15.

**15. Kopara** (pag. 156–159). From Lat. *Capraria* < *capra*. Ultimately same etymon like NL *Koper*, Slovenia (Lexicon A) and NSt *Capra* (Romania).

*Movar*, gen. *Movra* < *Maurus*.

*Stùpin* < Ill. *Stelpona*, *Stolpona*, with suf. *-ona* as *Albona*, *Skardona*, *Aenona*, *Narona*, *Salonae* > *Labin*, *Skradin*, *Nin*, *Norin*, *Solin*, respectively.

*Tmara*, related to the homophonous form under no. 14.

**III. Central Dalmatian Group** (pp. 160 sq.). Represented by the islands *Čiovo*, *Šolta*, *Brač*, *Hvar* and *Vis*.

**1. Čiovo** (pp. 161–167). Italian *Bua*, *Boa*, *Bova* < *bos*, *bovis*. The Croatian form is unclear as it is radically different from Italian.

*Artatur*, Romance, etymon unclear, with suffix *-atore* > Cr. *-atur*.

*Bosiljina* < NP *Bosilj* < Gr. *Basilios* < *basileus*.

*Drid*, Pre-Slavic, etymon unclear. Cf. NL Rom. *Dridu*. The etymon may be Thr. *dru* ‘wood; a tree’ or the same root as in *Drina* (Lexicon A) and NL Thr. *Drobeta*, *Drubeta* (today Turnu Severin in Romania on the Danube). Both place-names must be Thraco-Illyrian.

*Kluda* (cf. NL *Klunda*, in Silba) < *columna*.

*Krknjaš* (*Veli i Mali*) < *circinus* with suf. *-aceus* ‘round, circular’. Cf. *Krk*, *Kranj* in Lex. A; some place-names with root *\*Kra-*, *\*Kr-* may be Preie.

*Kuknara* < Reflects maybe *cycinus* (*cycnus*, *cygnus*) ‘a swan’ or rather related to NI *Kakan* < Preie. *\*K-K-*, *\*G-G-*.

*Supetar* < *Sanctus Petrus*. Recurrent.

*Melevrin*, Pre-Slavic, Romance, etymon unclear.

*Mendulovac* < *mendula* < *amygdalis*, with Slavic suffix.

*Merara*, possibly from Lat. *morum* ‘mulberry’ with suf. *-ara*, Cr. dial. *murva*.

*Rina* (*Vela i Mala*) < *arena* ‘sand, sandy land’ Dial. Rom. *arină* ‘sandy, dusty land’.

**2. Šolta**, dial. also **Šulet** (pp. 167–171). Explained from Lat. *solutus* < *solvo*, *-ere* ‘to solve’; this may simply be a folk-etymology. The form rather reflects an Illyrian place-name, possibly of Preie. origin.

*Kašjum*, *Kašljum* < *castellione* – *castellum*. Recurrent.

*Stomorina* < *Sancta Maria*. Recurrent.

**3. Brač** (pp. 171–181). Ancient *Brattia*, Illyrian, related to NFI *Brenta* (north Italy), Illyrian-Messapic *brendon* ‘a horned (animal), a stag’. Cf. Russu 1969: 102; the etymon is probably ie. *\*bhred-*, *\*bhredh-* ‘to pass a ford, a ford’.

*Bol* < *vallum*. A similar place-name is located near Split.

*Brkàta* < *verticata* – *vertex*, *-icis* ‘a whirl; a peak’.

*Kobila* < *caballaria* – *caballus*.

*Koštilo* < *castellum*. Cf. NM Rom. *Coștila*, isolated form in Romania.

*Lovrečina* < NP *Lovreč* < *Laurentius*.

*Mošnje* < *mansione(m)*. Recurrent. Cf. NL *Mošnje*, Lex. A.

*Žukovic* < *žuka* ‘a broom’ < Lat. *juncus* ‘a rod, a twig’.

*Sutivan*, *Sùpetar*, *Sumartin* < *Sanctus Johannes*, *S. Petrus*, *S. Martinus*, respectively.

Recurrent forms.

*Škrip*, probably related to NL Gr. *Skirphai* < *skir(r)os* ‘uncultivated land’; *skiron* ‘crust’.

Skok also records the dialectal form *puč* < *puteus* ‘a pit, a well’. Rom. *puț* is of the same origin.

**4. Hvar**, dial. **Fôr** (pp. 181–191). Ancient *Pharos*, *Pharia*, Greek-Romance. See also Skok 1917: 122.

*Marginski* < *mrgin* < *marginem*.

*Moster* < *monasterium*; cf. *Mostir*. Recurrent forms.

*Motokit* < *\*monte acutu* (*mons acutus*) ‘a sharp peak’. A similar place-name is located in Dalmatia.

*Sučuraj*. The first part of the compound is *su(t)* < *sanctus* (recurrent in Adriatic place-names); second part is unclear.

**5. Vis** (pag. 192–197). Ancient *Issa*, Preie. Recurrent forms in the Aegean-Mediterranean area.

*Komiža*, Pre-Slavic, etymon uncertain, possibly *Nikomedia*, NPp *Nikomédês*.

*Kostirna* < *cisterna* ‘a water tank’.

*Kumpris* < *cypressus* ‘cypress’.

*Nevaja* < *novalia*, pl., sg., *novalis (terra)* ‘uncultivated land’.

*Promentur* < *promontorium*. Recurrent.

*Seket*, *Seged* < *siccus* plus suffix. Place-names derived from *siccus* are recurrent. Cf. *Szeged* in Hungary.

Skok also records the dialectal form *prîtôr* ‘a recipient’ < *\*praejectorium* – *praejaceo* ‘to stretch ahead’, “unique in the Romance languages”.

#### **IV. South Dalmatian Island Group: Korčula, Mljet and Lastovo, and Elaphite Group** (*elafitske otoke*): **Lakljan, Šipan, Lopud, Koločep, Lokrum and Daksa.**

**1. Korčula** (pp. 198–208). O.Cr. *Krkar*, It. *Curzola*. probably related to Gr. *Korkyra* or of Greek origin proper.

*Brkata* < *verticata*; cf. homophonous place-name in the island of Brač.

*Brnistrova* < *brnistra* < *genista*. Recurrent.

*Kampuš* < *campus* + *-uceus* (dim. suffix). Recurrent.

*Kčara* < *cotiaria* - *cos*, *cotis* ‘hone, whet stone’; *cotoria*, *cotaria* ‘rocky place’.

*Mirje* < *mir* < *mûrus* ‘wall’, with the specific evolution *û* > *i* in Dalmatian.

*Mrtinjak* < *mrta* < *myrta*. Recurrent.

*Petrara* < *petraria* – *petra*. Cf. Romanian place-names *Petroșani*, *P(i)etroșița* (the latter with Slavic suffix).

*Pupnata* < *pampinata* – *pampinus* ‘vine offshoot’.

*Sutvara* < *Sancta Barbara*; place-names in *su(t)* < *sanctus* are recurrent.

*Žjan* < *Junianum*; cf. *Žnjan*, near Split.

*Žukova* < *žuka* < *juncus*.

**2. Mljet** (pp. 209–219). Ancient *Melîtê*. Malta had the same name in the antiquity. Preie. *\*M-L-*, associated by the Greeks by folk etymology (“etymological substitution”) to *mêli*, *melitos* ‘honey’. Most Pre-Slavic place-names are concentrated in the western part of the island.

*Brnjestrova* < *brnjestra* < *genista*. Recurrent.

*Lâgo* < *lacus* (a small island).

*Lêngac*, Pre-Slavic, probably Ill. *lanca* ‘a river meadow’, with *a* > *e*, as in Dalm. *chesa* < *casa*.

*Ogiran* < *aggerarium* – *aggeries*, Class. Lat. *congeries* ‘a heap’.

*Pètro (Veliki i Mali)*, gen. *Petrála* < *petrarius* (*mons*).

*Pinjevci* < *pinj* < *pīneus* – *pinus* ‘a pine’.

*Polače* < *palatium*. A Roman fortress was attested in the antiquity.

*Pôma*, dial. also *Pômena*, *Pomina* < *palma* ‘palm’ and ‘palm-tree’.

*Pòmjenta*, *Podumjenta* < *fundamentum*, with Lat. *f* > Dalm. *p*.

*Pôntu (od Lenge)* < *pons*, *pontis* (*ponte*).

*Pròžura* < Rom.-Dalm. *Proxura* < *frixorium* (*frigere*). Recurrent.

*Sovra*, *Sôbra* < prob. Gr. *sauros* ‘a kind of fish’.

Skok records the dialectal form *tinjal* < *tinellum* (Cat. *tinell*, Sp. *tinelo*) ‘a living-room’

(for servants).

**3. Lastovo** (pp. 219–229). Ancient *Ládesta*, *Ládeston*, then *Lasta*. Ven. *Punta di Laesta*.

Ilyrian, with suffix *-est*, as in *Bigeste*, *Ateste* (> *Este*), *Tergeste* (> *Trst*). The modern S.-Cr. form cannot be explained directly, but via a Latinised form *\*Lasta*, with a Slavic suffix.

*Biševo* < prob. Romance *Busi*, difficult to analyze: genitive-locative or plural?

*Dó*, unclear.

*Duvna* < *domina*. Cf. Rom. *doamnă* of the same origin.

*Mrča*, *Mrčara* < *myrtearia*. Recurrent.

*Sožanj*, unclear, Pre-Slavic.

*Stomorine* < *Sancta Maria*, recurrent.

*Suđurađ* < *Sanctus Georgios*; cf. Rom. NL *Sîngiorz*.

*Ubli*, unclear, Pre-Slavic, probably Preie. via Ilyrian.

*Žaplo* (two other similar forms in the islands of Pag and Molat). Pre-Slavic, etymon

unclear.

**4. Lakljan (Jakljan)** (pp. 229–233). Plinius named the island *Elaphites*, pl. *Elaphitides*

< *elaphos* ‘a stag’. Hence the whole group of islands is named Elaphite Islands. The origin is Lat. (*insula*) *Liciniana* (< *Licinius*), hence Croatian *Laknjan* > *Lakljan* and, by metathesis, *Jakljan*.

*Olipa* < Lat. *alapa* – *ala* ‘a wing’, Dubr.-Rom. *álepa*, Rom. *aripa*.

**5. Šipan** (pp. 233–238). The largest island of the Elaphite Group. Certainly Pre-Slavic.

Attested in 1222 *Juppanae*; 13th century, *Cuppana*, *Zuppana*, *Giuppana*; 1370: *Šipan*. The expected form should be *\*Žipan*; the evolution *ž* > *š* is unclear. Skok suggests that the etymon might be Gr. *gypanon* ‘eagle nest’. In fact the etymon must be *župan*, Rom. *giupîn*, *jupîn*, analysed in Paliga 1987, reprinted 1999.

*Biga* < Lat. *biga* ‘ox cart’, cf. also alb. *bigë* ‘a branch, a twig’.

*Lava* < *labes* ‘abrupt hill-side’.

*Prtuša*, Romance, etymon unclear, cf. *Trtuša* < *tortuosa*.

*Sekanja*, Pre-Slavic, probably Romance, etymon unclear.

*Sutulija* < *Sanctus Helias*; cf. Rom. *Sântilie*.

**6. Lopud** (pp. 239–242). From Gr. *elaphópos*, *-podos*, colloquial Gr. *\*elaphóda* ‘stag-legged...’.

*Igo* < Gr. *aigialós* ‘sea-shore’.

*Mrčica* < *mrča* < *myrta*. Recurrent.

*Skùpio*, gen. *Skupjela* < *scopellus* < Gr. *skópelos* ‘a small island, a reef’.

*Sutmiho* < *Sanctus Michaelis*.

*Šunj*, also *Pšunja* < *Apscium*, *Acscium* (*\*Apšun*, *\*Akšun*).

**7. Koločep**, dial. also **Kalamota**, It. *Calamotta* (pp. 242–246). Lat. *Calameta* ‘reed-land’ < *calametum* – *calamus* ‘reed’. The expected form should have been *\*Kolopeč*, by

metathesis *Koločep*. The place-name underwent a folk-etymology by association to *kolo* and *čep*.

*Lovret* < *Lauretum*.

*Šumet* < prob. Lat. *juncetum* 'reeds'.

**8. Lokrum and Daksa** (pp. 246–249). Certainly Pre-Slavic, the former is attested in 1115 as *Lacromono*; in 1200 as *Acrumina*, as *La-* was assimilated to the Italian definite article. Et.: prob. Lat. *acrumen*, It. *agrume* 'a sour fruit', via a Venetian intermediary. *Daksa* may reflect Lat. *axis*, Coll. Lat. *axa*, with preposition *de*.

*Bòbara* < (*insula*) *barbaria*.

*Superka* < *Sancta Petr(onill)a*.

*Supetar* < *Sanctus Petrus*. Recurrent. Cf. Rom. NL *Sâmpetru*, *Sâmpetru*.

## Pre-Romance Place- and River-Names in Romania

There is a long and tortuous history of the Thracian linguistic studies in Romania. The work initiated by Hasdeu in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century had no followers, and the attempts to create a national school of Thracology after WW2 have had a visible success in the field of archaeology, not linguistics. This abrupt introduction has only the role of warning the readers that things have not settled yet, and that the data presented below may seem extravagant and lead to expected criticism. If it were only that...

Basically there are two reference points in attempting to sum up the available data, and to add additional material: Poghirc 1969 and Ivănescu 1980. To this we may add several studies scattered in various journals, some of them of the author (a general presentation of the problem and the corresponding challenges in Paliga 1991 a, 1993 a). A major impediment was the unproved theory that indigenous Thracian elements of Romanian must follow the same rule of phonetic evolution like the Latin elements. In principle the assertion is correct, nevertheless in most cases the linguists made the confusion between letter and sound (or phoneme), and thus concluded (but not proved) that Thracian intervocalic *b* and *v* should have been lost in Romanian, which is contrary to linguistic evidence, and that Thracian intervocalic *l* should have shifted to *r* (rotacisation) which is again in contradiction to the available data. The treatment of Latin intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* had their evolution to Romanian just because they reflected tendencies present already in spoken Latin and noted as such in documents. Comparative analysis, based on too many examples, shows that Thracian intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* had a different history, as a different history must be postulated, and later proved, for the specific Thracian sounds like *ð*, *č*, *š*, *ž*, *ts* and maybe other sounds we may reconstruct, like *dz*. None of them could be accurately spelled by the Greek and Latin writers, so we must face a real difficulty in “deciphering” the plausibly real pronunciation hidden behind the Greek and Latin letters. On the other hand, a word like *abur* ‘vapour(s)’ is now largely accepted as a clear indigenous term (related to Alb. *avull*), though intervocalic *b* would indicate otherwise: a newer, adstratum or superstratum, element. The same with *căciulă* ‘a fur-cap’, where intervocalic *l* would indicate a newer word. We can add many other examples in both vocabulary and toponymy.

Data presented below would require detailed discussions. Given the limited purpose of this paper we ask the reader to refer to our studies already published (see the references), where punctual analysis was possible. In these papers we tried to refute confuse previous analyses, and to construct a coherent background for future analyses, including the reconsideration of the Pre-Indo-European (Preie.) substratum (see mainly Paliga 1989 c and Paliga 1999).

The purpose of this paper is to synchronise data with other European regions: Aegean, Adriatic, South Slavic, Italy, France and Spain, in the field of place- and river-names of both Indo-European (IE) or Preie. origin. As the readers may note there are obvious and clear correspondences (*Ibăr*, *Ibar* – *Ibru*; *Plovdiv*, *Kokodiva* – *Deva*; *Timok* – *Timiș*; *Arda* – *Arad*, *Ard*; *Bač*, *Bačka* – *baci*, frequent as place-name too; *Celje*, *Kilia* – *Chilia*; *Cuculka*, *Cucula* – *Țuțora*; *Drid*– *Dridu*; *Drava*, *Dreta*, *Drina* – *Drencova* and many other examples.

We also suggested Preie. roots for those forms considered Preie. by Skok and Bezlaj, because the available material now allow such references. And also suggested possible references to basic roots, IE or Preie., in the context in which the given word is surely or probably Pre-Slavic or Pre-Romance respectively. Many forms may now have clearer explanations in the context of the parallel lexicons A, B and D.

**Lexicon C**  
**Pre-Romance Place- and River-Names in Romania**

**Abrud** NFI, NL A tributary of the Arieș; NL Dobrudja (presumably a newer place-name renamed after the “Transylvanian original” in the 19th century). The oldest form must be the river-name on which the town is located. Considered indigenous from a form \**Abrutus* by Hasdeu, recorded as Thracian by Greek and Latin writers (spellings: Ἄβρυτος, *Abrutus*, today *Abtat* in Bulgaria); other related forms in *ab-*, *abr-* are recorded in Dečev 1957. Cf. NFI *Aborna* and *Abrnca* in Slovenia, of Pre-Slavic origin. The ultimate origin may be either IE \**ab-*, \**ap-* ‘water’ or Preie. root \**AB-*, \**AP-* in forms referring to elevated locations or river-names.

**Abud** NL At.: 1567: *Abod*; 1602: *Abud*. Probably related to *Abrud* and *Abuș*.

**Abuș** NL At.: 1361: *Obus-falva*; 1433: *Abus-falva*. Probably related to *Abud*, *Abrud*.

**ag-** Root preserved in some place-names and common names. Preie. \**AK-*, \**AG-*, \**AIK-*, \**AIG-* ‘a prominence, a peak; a thorn’; related (urverwandt) to *ig-* (below). The root is well documented in ancient writers referring to Thracian names (Dečev 1957: 3, 9, 11, 164), e.g. *Aga-thyrsoi*, *Aigissos*, *Aegissus* (the modern town of Tulcea). The verb *a agăța*, also *a acăța* ‘to catch (at)’ is seemingly derived from the same root; archaic meaning: ‘to get to a thorn’. Some relevant forms (see also the root *ig-* below and Lexicon A the forms *Ig*, *Iga*, *Igman*):

- **Agăș** NL, Bacău district and another locality in Bihor, today extinct. There is the hill *Acățel* near the Transylvanian village; this precious detail would be sufficient to reject the explanation from Hung. *ágas* ‘crossroad, branched out’ which obviously is a fortuitous consonance. Cf. Thr. *Aegissus*; we may surmise that the spelling *-ss-* stands for *š* in Thracian.

- **Agnita** NL, Sibiu; cf. ancient *Aigitna*, with metathesis.

- **Agaua** NL, Brașov.

- **Agrieș** NL, Bistrița-Năsăud; see next entry and cf. *Arieș*, *Anieș*.

- **Agriș** NL, several localities spread over a large area, especially in Transylvania; obviously related to *agrișă* ‘gooseberry’ or ‘barberry’; the tree is called *agriș*. The name is related to its thorny branches, the basic meaning of the Preie. root \**A(I)K-*, \**A(I)G-*.

**an-, in-** Toponymical root of Preie. origin: \**AN-*, \**AIN-*, \**IN-*, chromatic meaning; ‘black, dark’ and ‘white, to shine’ respectively. The “classical” prototypes are: (1) Greek *anchysa*, *enchysa*, a plant used for dying in dark-red, and a series of place- and river-names like *Ainos*, *Aineia*, *Ainios*, *Anchisēs*, the father of *Aine(i)as* etc.; (2) Greek goddess *Inō*, “translated” in “good Greek” as *Leukothea* ‘white goddess’, a divinity of the sea and her feast *Inacheia* in the island of Crete at *Inachos*. Seemingly the same root in *Nin* and *Un*, *Una* (Lexicon A).

The root \**A(I)N-* is preserved in the following Romanian forms:

- **Anieș** NFI, a tributary of Someșul Mare; cf. NFI *Anio*, a tributary of Tiberis.

- **Anina** NL, Caraș-Severin.

- **Ant** NL Bihor, possibly also **Antăș** NL Cluj.

- **Ampoi** (< \**AN-p-*) NFI in Transylvania whose course is parallel to the *Arieș*, a tributary of the Mureș. Hu. form is *Ompoly*. The region is famous for its gold ore since prehistory. The Thracian township of the area was *Ampelum*, today *Zlatna* (< Sl. *zlato* ‘gold’).

The root \**IN-* is preserved in the following forms:

- **Ineu**, **Inău** NL, Cluj, on the Crișul Alb (‘White Criș’); NM Maramureș. The place-name is attested in 1214 as *villa Ieneu*, then in 1236 as *Terra Ieneu*, in 1256 as *villa Ienw*, *Jenw* etc. It is not clear whether the compound forms **Chiș-inău** should be discussed here. There are two important place-names of this type: one on the Criș (*Chișinău-Criș*), the other the capital of

Moldova (former Soviet Moldavia). In the case of *Chişinău-Criş*, many would be tempted to consider the first part of the compound as derived from Hu. *kis* ‘small, little’, but this etymon is impossible for *Chişinău*, the capital of Moldova; obviously the forms are symmetrical and do not allow different explanations. The association of *Inău*, *Ineu* to Hu. NP *Jenő* is fortuitous. The closest relationship should be Greek *Inō!* Like many Romanian forms of this type, this also reflects an old masculine form in *-a* (assimilated to the first Latin declension of masculine gender) and the definite masculine article *-u(l)* (cf. *Asău*, *Rărău* etc.). Dialectally, *chiş* means ‘a closure, a pen (for animals)’, of obscure origin, probably indigenous Thracian.

• *Inuc* NL Cluj.

*-and* Suffix in several indigenous place-names: *Cărand*, *Zarand*, *Şimand*, *Vârşand*. The ultimate origin may be Preie.

*Apata* NL, district of Braşov and *Apadia* NL (district of Caraş). The relations with either Rom. *apă* ‘water’ or to Hu. *apa* ‘father’ seemingly are folk-etymologies. The origin must be indigenous Thracian of either IE or Preie. origin; cf. *Abrud*, *Abud*, *Abuş* also *Ip*.

*Arad* and *Ard* (latter form is obsolete) NL At.: 1156: *Urod*; 1183: *Orodium*; 1197, 1206: *Orod*, *prepositus Orodiensis*. Related to NFI *Arda* in Bulgaria (see Lexicon A); both forms are based on similar forms attested in Thracian, e.g. *Arantas* (Dečev 1957: 21), possibly also related to Lithuanian forms like NL *Arantačius* and NP *Arant* (Rimša in *Actes II C Thr.* 99–104); cf. Illyrian *Ardotion* and NL Provence *Arda* (Rostaing 1969: 16). The Romanian forms are seemingly of Preie. origin via Thracian.

*Aranca* NFI in Romanian Banat; also attested as a water female divinity in Romanian tales. Must be related to other archaic forms like NFI *Aran*, a tributary of Gave d’Aspe near Sarranca, NM *Aran-Barranco* and NL *Aran* near Boltaña, Aragon. These forms are considered Preie. by some linguists. In any case the explanation from Hu. *harang* ‘a bell’ (as in Kiss 1980: 60) should be definitely rejected.

*Ardeal* NR; the Romanian name of Transylvania. Traditionally explained as a borrowing from Hu. *Erdély* ‘Transylvania’, which is phonetically impossible: the expected form in Romanian would have been \**Erdei* or \**Ardei*. • NR *Ardeal* must be seen as a compound *Ar-deal* the first part of which had the meaning ‘over, far away’ and should be related to *a arunca*, dial. also *a aruca* ‘to cast (away), to throw’ (indigenous Thracian root) and the second part is *deal* ‘a hill’ also (obsolete and dial.) ‘forest’. *Ar-deal* is a construction similar to NL *Sub Deal* ‘at the foothill’, *Subcetate* (instead of *Sub Cetate* ‘under the fortress’); see s.v. *Deal*, *Deal(u)*. Med. Lat. *Transylvania* (instead of *Transilvania*) is a calque after Romanian; Med. Lat. spellings were also *Ultrasilvania*, *Ultra Silvas*. Hu. *Erdély* is also a calque: *erdő* ‘forest’ and an old postposition *-elu*, *-elv*, hence *előtt*, *előre* ‘in front of; ahead’. The Hungarian form was fortuitously similar to Romanian, or this similarity supported the calque. (Further discussions in Paliga 1986).

*Argestru* NL Bucovina (Suceava district); must be the same root as in *Argeş*, whereas the ending *-estru* must reflect an archaic indigenous construction as in *buiestru* and *Nistru*.

*Argea* NL, Vrancea region. Related to (or derived from) *argea*; see under *Argeş*. The ultimate origin must be Preie.

*Argeş*, old *Arghiş* (1369, cf. Rosetti ILR 228) NFI An important river flowing in south Romania, a tributary of the Danube. Thracian, cf. numerous roots in *arg-*, such as Ἄργιζα, *Arcidava*, Ἀρκίννα, (as Pârvan suggested a long time ago, in Pârvan 1923:12–16) also NP Ἄρκισσα (see in Dečev 1957: 22 and 25). The word must be related to *argea*, archaic indigenous word with two basic meanings: (1) ‘a pit for preserving food’; (2) ‘a beam for supporting the ceiling and roof’. The ultimate root cannot be IE \**arg-*, but Preie. \**AR-*, very well documented in place- and river-names all over Europe. Cf. *Argestru*, *Arghiş*.

**Arghiș** NL, Cluj. See *Argeș*.

**Arieș** NFI, a river in the West Carpathians. Related to *Argeș*; Thracian of Preie. origin. Cf. *Anieș*.

**Asău** NFI and NL in the Tarcău Mts. Preie. \*AS-, chromatic meaning: “black, dark colour”, as in Greek forms *Asos*, *Astale*, *Aisōpos*, *Asai*, *Asaia*, *Asea* etc. Of the same origin is probably Gr. ῥᾶσις ‘mud, marsh’ (< ‘black colour’).

**Asuaj** NFI Maramureș. Related to *Asău*. The ending as in NL *Blaj*, *Cluj*, *Sălaj* etc. It is probable that initial sound was *ș* (ʃ).

**-aj, -aș, -eș, -iș** Suffix in numerous indigenous Thracian place- and river-names: *Argeș*, *Arieș*, *Asuaj*, *Dej*, *Mureș*, *Caraș*, *Turdaș*, *Someș* etc.

**at-, ad-** Toponymical root of Preie. origin spread over a large part of Europe, e.g. NFI, NM and NL *Adulas*, *Addiris*, *Atlas*, *Addua* (today *Adda*, a tributary of Po), also the numerous Greek forms in *ath-*, *at-*, e.g. Ἀθηναί, Ἀτενία, Ἀττανάσσοσ and, of course, ND Ἀθήνη, Ἀθάνα, seemingly related to ἄτταννα, *athanuvium*, *athanulus*, *attanulus* ‘a hollow, a recipient’; archaic Pre-Hellenic terms. The following Romanian forms reflect this root via Thracian:

• **Adea**, NL Arad; 1202–1203 – *villa Adia*; 1332 – *Adya*.

• **Atea** NL Satu-Mare; 1334 – *possessio Athya*; 1343 – *Atya*, *Atthya*, *Atthye*.

• **Atia** NL, Hunedoara; 1567 – *Attijha*; 1576 – *Athya*.

**-ău, -eu** Ending specific to some indigenous place-names: *Inău/Ineu*, *Asău*, *Bîrgău*, *Buzău*, *Ilteu*, *Mineu*, *Paleu*, *Rarău*, *Tarcău*, *Tărtărau*, *Vișeu*, *Zalău*. All these must have been *masculina* in *-á* or *-é* (stressed), assimilated to the first and third Latin declension and articulated with *-u* (definite article masculine singular). In no case do they reflect Hu. *-ó*, *-ő* as many linguists hastened to postulate.

**Bacău**, NFI, NL Must be related to, and explained by, NP *Boko*, *Boka* (p. 73).

**Bărăgan** NR covering an important area in south Romania east of Bucharest. Unexplained so far. Probably related to dialectal form *bară* ‘a pond; marsh, moor’ and, if so, cf. Prov. *brac*, *brasc* ‘a marsh’, NL *Brasque* considered of Preie. origin in Rostaing 1950: 101, root \*B-R-, \*P-R-. See also *Bîrgău*, *Parîng*.

**Bîrgău** NM Reflects Preie. \*B-R-, \*P-R- in various hill- and place-names with the basic meaning ‘hill, mountain’. The relation with Gm. *Berg* may be eventually considered as a *Urverwandschaft*. Cf. *Bărăgan*, *Parîng*.

**Bîrzava** NFI, NL Banat. Cf. Thr. Βέρζαβα, a castle in Dardania, NL *Bersovia*, *Bersobis*, a township in southwest Dacia; the latter is seemingly the ancient form for modern *Bîrzava*. Related to *barză* ‘stork (*Ciconia*)’ and Alb. *bardh*, *-i* ‘white’ < IE \*bherǵ- ‘to shine; white, bright’. The preservation of intervocalic *-v-* is normal in an indigenous Thracian word. The association to Sl. \*brъzъ ‘quick, fast’ is fortuitous.

**Buda** NFI, NL (several locations). Seemingly related to *Budva* (Lexicon A) and *Buda-Pest*. Kiss (1980) assumes that *Buda* (Budapest) is a “simple Hungarian personal name”.

**Buzău** NFI, NL on the river *Buzău*. Attested in the antiquity as Μουσαῖος, Μουσεός, probably “instead of \*Βουσεός” considers Dečev (1957: 320, as already suggested by Tomachek a century ago). Related to *buză* ‘a lip’, NP *Buzea*, *Buzeascu* and to NP Thr. *Byzas*, *Beuzas*, *Busa*, Gr. spelling Βύζας, hence *Byzantion* ‘the town of Byzas’, according to the legend. All reflect ultimately IE \*b(h)eu- ‘to swell, to curve’. • Kiss (1980: 115) suggests a Slavic *Bъzovъ* as the intermediary between Dacian and Romanian [?!]. • A certain oscillation *b/m* in ancient spellings referring to Thracian names may be rarely observed as in the case of *Timiș*. See parallel personal-names on p. 73.

**Caraiman** NM, a peak in the Bucegi Mts, south Carpathians. Same root as in *Carpați* and also archaic Preie. suffix or second element *-man* (see also *-man* in forms like *Barman*, *German*, *Igman* in Lexicon A). See also the parallel form *Căliman*.

**Caransebeș** NL Compound form: **Caran-sebeș**; the first part is related to *Caraș*, *Carpați*, while the second part is related to *Sebeș*, *Sibiu*. Cf. *Călan*.

**Caraș** NFI Preie., same root as in *Carpați*.

**Carașova** NL Banat; same root as in *Caraș* with Slavic suffix *-ova*.

**Carpați** NM The indigenous Romanian name of the Carpathians. Preie. \*K-R-, \*G-R- ‘a stone, cliff; mountain’, very frequent in place-names, e.g. *Krajna*, *Kranj*, *Krka* etc. in Lexicon A. A parallel Preie. root \*K-L-, \*G-L- is also attested (see s.v. *Căliman*). Same origin in Alb. *karpë* ‘a cliff’ and in other Romanian place- and mountain-names: *Caraș*, *Caraiman*, *Caran-sebeș*, *Gurghiu*, maybe also in *Hîrșova* (ancient *Carsium*, with *k > h* unexplained; the initial sound probably was a laryngeal, see the chapter on phonetic changes, below) and in *Gherla* (if not derived from *gheară* ‘a claw’, anyway an indigenous Thracian element).

**Călăcea** NL Cluj; must be related to *Călan*.

**Călan** NL, south of Deva, Hunedoara. Must be of the same origin as *Căliman* and similar to *Caran-* in the compound form *Caran-sebeș* (see s.v. *Carpați*, *Caraș*). The preservation of intervocalic *-l-* is normal in indigenous Thracian forms. Further related must be *Călăcea* and *Călata*. Cf. NP *Călin*.

**Călata** NL Cluj; must be of the same origin as *Călan* and *Călăcea*.

**Căliman** NM Preie. root \*K-L-, \*G-L-, parallel to \*K-R-, \*G-R-. See s.v. *Carpați* and *Caraiman*. Intervocalic *-l-* is normal in indigenous forms of Thracian origin, despite contrary opinions by many Romanian linguists. Cf. NP *Călin*, frequent as both family and given name.

**Cărand** NL, east of *Ineu*, *Inău*. Same root as in *Carpați*, *Caraș*. Suffix *-and* is found in archaic Thracian place-names, cf. *Zărand*; may be of the same Preie. origin as Gr. *-inthos*.

**Ceahlău**, NM, East Carpathians; must be related to *ceafă* ‘neck’, NL *Cefa* and, considering the alternance *f/h*, would indicate an initial laryngeal, as in *Čech*, *Čechy*; see Lexicon D. • The usual explanation from Hungarian is erroneous.

**Chilia** NFI, a branch of the Danube Delta. Must be related to *Kilia* in Bulgaria (ancient *Coelia*) and *Celje* in Slovenia (see Lexicon A). The preservation of intervocalic *-l-* is normal in indigenous Thracian forms. Cf. *Sulina*.

**Cleja** NL. Initial form was probably \**Cleșa*; seemingly related to *Klis* (Lexicon A); cf. next entry.

**Cluj** NL Transylvania. Att. in 1173 – *Klus*; 1213 – *Clus*, *castrum Clus* etc. Med. Lat. form was *Claudiopolis* ‘Claudius’s town’. Related to *Ključica* (see Lexicon A), ultimately from colloquial Lat. *clusus* < *claudere*, but with a tortuous history. The Romanian place-name probably refers to emperor Claudius II Gothicus (268–270) whose name was Thracianised to \**Kleus*, \**Kluš* hence Rom. \**Cluș* > *Cluj* (Paliga 1992 a, with further references).

**Criș** NFI with three branches: *Crișu Alb*, *Crișu Negru* and *Crișu Repede* ‘white, black and quick Criș’ respectively. Ancient *Crisia*, *Grisia*, *Gresia*, Greek spelling Κρίσοϛ. Related to *creț* ‘curly’ < IE \*(s)ker- ‘to bend, to curve’, hence also Alb. *kërrús*, *kurrús* ‘to bend’, Gr. *kyrtós* ‘twisted, curled’, Lat. *curvus*, Sl. *krъčiti* ‘to bend, to shrink’ etc. Some linguists assume that the river-name is related (Urverwandt) to Sl. \**černъ* ‘black’, which is an error. The basic meaning of the three-branched *Criș* is ‘bent, curved (river)’. Hu. *Körös* is borrowed from Romanian with svarabhakti (Rom. *cr-* > Hu. *kör-*).

**Curcubăta** NM, a 1848 m peak in the Bihor county, the highest elevation of the West Carpathians. Obviously related to *curcubeu* ‘rainbow’. The origin must be either IE \*(s)ker- as

in *Criș* or perhaps Preie. \**K-R-*, \**G-R-* as in *Carpați, Caraș, Gurghiu, Gurgu*. Both *Curcubăta* and *curcubeu* reflect a reduplication, as in e.g. *Rarău*. Cf. *curpen* ‘a young branch of a creeping plant; various species of the plant *Clematis*’ and Alb. *kulpër(e), kurpul, kurpen*, on the one hand, and Alb. *karpë* ‘a cliff, stone’, on the other.

**Deal, Dealu(l)** Toponymic root present in tens of place-names all over Romania. Derives from *deal* ‘a hill; (dial. also) forest’. Reflects Preie. \**T-L-*, \**D-L-* ‘elevation; a hill’; hence also Lat. *tellus* (in etymological relation with *terra*) and many other derivatives. Cf. *Ardeal*. There is a long and difficult story of the studies dedicated to this form; anyway it cannot be explained as Slavic *děl-* as many linguists erroneously suggested. See further discussions in Paliga 1986 and 1988 a.

**Deda** NL Transylvania. Must be related to *Deta* and *Deva*. Att. in 1393 – *possessio Deda*.

**Dej** NL Transylvania. Att. in 1214 – *Dees*; 1261 – *Deeswar*. Must be related to *Deda, Deta, Deva*. The initial pronunciation should have been \**Deș*.

**Deta** NL Banat. Cf. Thr. NL *Datos*, Gr. spelling Δάτος; related to *Deda, Deva*.

**Deva** NL Hunedoara. Att. in 1269 as *castrum Deva*. Reflects Thr. *deva, dava* ‘fortress’. Cf. NL *Kokodiva/ Kukudiva* and *Plovdiv* in Bulgaria (Lexicon A). See also *Deda, Deta, Dej*. All ultimately reflect IE \**dhē-* ‘to set, to put’. • Intervocalic *b/v* in an indigenous element is normal.

**Drencova** NL Banat on the Danube. Known in the antiquity as Δρέγκων, Δρηκων. The root must be the same as in *Drina* (see Lexicon A) and Slavic suffix *-ova*. • The expected form should have been \**Drâncova*, so a Serbian influence in pronunciation is possible, or a peculiar evolution in a place-name, which is also possible.

**Dridu** NL Related to *Drid* in Lexicon B, III, 1.

**Dunăre(a)** NFI The indigenous Romanian name of the Danube. See *Dunav, Dunava, Dunaj* in Lexicon A. Also indigenous are *Chilia* and *Sulina*, two branches of the Danube Delta, and also *Tulcea*, the most important town of the Danube Delta region. Cf. *Mureș* which reflects the same evolution Thr. *ā* > Rom. *u* (via a phoneme like *ō*) and *a mura* ‘to pickle’.

**Feleac** NM near Cluj. Att. in 1310 – *Fellok, Fellak*; 1377 – *villa Olachorum Felek*. Unexplained. Probably related, with a shift *p* > *f*, to *Peleag, Peleş, Paleu* (see). The origin of *f* in some indigenous Romanian words poses difficult problems; this may be one of these cases. If we consider the correspondence Rom. *fârîmă* – Alb. *thërimë*, therefore Rom. *f* – Alb. *th*, which is not regular, then we must consider another etymon, maybe Preie. \**T-L-*, \**T-R-*. Cf. *Talma, Tarcea*.

**Gagu** NL Ilfov; same origin as, and related to, *Gugu* and *Guga*.

**Galaț, Galați** NL; several place-names in Romania (a peak in the Rodna Mts., also other minor localities in the districts of Bistrița, Alba and Suceava), best known being the town of *Galați* on the Danube near Brăila. There are numerous European place-names with the root *gal-*, usually held for Celtic, which may be also acceptable for the Romanian territory as well, at least for the name of the Danubian town. A Celtic origin is less acceptable, if at all, for the other names, some in isolated mountainous areas. The ultimate origin must be Preie. \**K-L-*, \**G-L-*. The original spelling should be *Galaț* whereas *Galați* is “felt” as a plural and is probably a modern bookish influence. Cf. ancient *Callatis* on whose ruins is located the modern town of *Mangalia* at the Black Sea.

**Galda** NL Same origin as *Galaț, Galați*.

**Gersa** NFI, Rodna Mts.) and NL on the river. Etymon unclear, seemingly related to NFI *German* (Lexicon A); cf. ancient Thr. NL *Germisara*.

**Gherla** NL, Cluj. 1291 – *Gerlahida*; 1410 – *Gerlah*. There is a similar place-name in Hungary, *Gerla* (attested in 1259/1466 as *Gwrla*, cf. Kiss 1980: 238), and NM *Gerla* in the Tatra Mts.,

which must be discussed in this context. For Romanian, closest relationship may be either *gheară* ‘(an animal’s) claw’, indigenous Thracian of IE origin, or the Preie. group represented by numerous forms like *Gurghiu*, *Gurgu*.

**Guga** NL Cluj; same origin as, and related to, *Gugu*.

**Gugu** NM (2292 m., one of the highest in Romania, near the Godeanu peak). Giurescu and Giurescu 1975: 69 assume that this might be the sacred Thracian mountain *Kogaion*, which is a reasonable hypothesis. The forms are anyway related and derived from Preie. Root \*K-K, \*K-G-, \*G-G- ‘a peak, a mountain’. See also *Guga* and *Gagu* above; cf. Alb. *gogë* ‘a phantom, a ghost’ seemingly related to Rom. *gogă* ‘id.’ and NP *Goga*, *Gogu*.

**Gurghiu** NM, NL near Reghin, Braşov. Seemingly related to *grui* ‘a peak, a hill’ and Alb. *gur* ‘stone, cliff’. Cf. NP *Gurghianu*. Preie. \*K-R-, \*G-R-, as in *Carpați*, *Caraș*, *Caraiman*. Slavic *gora* may derive from the Preie. root, like – among others – *ryba*, Preie. \*R-B-, \*R-M- ‘round, curve’. See s.v. *Rebra*. The initial name of NL *Sfintu Gheorghe* ‘St. George’, at the foot of the *Gurghiu* Mts., may be a folk-etymology/substitution after *Gurghiu*. See the *Generalities* referring to Lexicon A and B.

**Gurgu** NM Same origin as the neighbouring *Gurghiu*.

**Hîrșova** NL Dobrudja. Reflects ancient *Carsium*, with an unexplained change *k > h*, and Slavic suffix *-ova*. • Phoneme *h* against ancient spelling *c/k* may witness an original laryngeal.

**Iași** NL; the most important town of Moldavia and former capital of this region until 1859. Usually held for reflecting the Slavic name of the Alans after the 9<sup>th</sup> century (see Kiss 1980: 286). Poghirc 1969: 360 considers it indigenous Thracian, a hypothesis supported by the detail, always ignored so far, that similar forms are spread on a large area in Romania: *Valea Iașului* (Argeș), *Gura Iașului* (former county of Romanai), *Iași* (Gorj), *Ieșul* (a peak in the Pârîng Mts). It is obvious that the basic meaning of the root *iaș-*, *ieș-* cannot be explained by the name of the Alans. Ancient place-names like *Iasos* (several locations), *Iasion*, *Iasios*, *Iasis*, *Iassos* etc. must be related to Rom. *Iași* possibly also to NL *Iž* (Lexicon B, II, 5; II, 7) and *Vis* (Lexicon B, III, 5). Cf. *Histria*, *Istria*, several locations with this name in antiquity, one on the Black Sea, north of Constanța.

**ig-** Root preserved in several place-names. See also Lexicon A, the forms *Ig*, *Iga*, *Igman* and root *ag-* above:

- **Ighiș** NL, Sibiu.
- **Ighiu** NL, two localities, one in Alba, the other in Hunedoara.
- **Igniș** NM, the highest and main peak of the Volcano Mountains (the Carpathians).
- **Igoiu**, NL Vâlcea.
- **Igrîș** NL, Timiș; cf. *Agriș* above, root *ag-*.
- **Igrîția** NL, Cluj

**Ilba** NL, Maramureș. At.: 1490 – *Iloba* (with svarabhakti, specific cu Hungarian). Must be related to NL *Ilva > Elba*, Preie. \*IL-, \*IR- in various place- and river-names, e.g. NR *Illyria*, *Ilios* (the old name of Troy); cf. Iberian forms *ili* ‘township’ and *iri* ‘a village’ (Dauzat 1947: 95 and Rostaing 1969: 129). The Preie. root \*IL- is also recorded in Thracian forms (see Dečev 1957: 215). Related to *Ilva*, *Ilteu* and *Iltuț*.

**Ilteu** NL Argeș. Same root and origin as *Ilba*, *Ilva*, *Iltuț*.

**Ituț** NFI Transylvania. Related to *Ilba*, *Ilva*, *Ilteu*. The root *ilt-* must be related to *olt* (see *Olt*), both reflecting archaic Pre-Indo-European forms derived from Preie. \*OL-, \*IL-. The ending *-uț* is diminutival. Cf. *Olteț* as derived from *Olt*.

**Ilva** NL Two localities with this name on the river *Iltuț(u)*: *Ilva Mare* ‘big Ilva’ and *Ilva Mică* ‘little Ilva’. At.: 1552 – *Ilva*; 1576 – *Ilwa*. Closely related to *Ilba* and further to *Ituț* and *Ilteu*.

**Ip** NL (district of Sălaj). At.: 1208: *venatores bubalorum de villa Ypu*; 1213: *villa Ip, Ipu*. The spellings *Yp-u*, *Ip-u* must reflect the Romanian definite article *-u*. Obviously related to another archaic Pre-Slavic NFI *Ipoly* at the Hungarian-Slovak border (“an old Indo-European river-name” says Kiss 1980: 291). The form must be of Thracian origin in Romanian; the ultimate origin might be Preie., not IE as Kiss assumes. • NFI *Ipoly* may reflect the basic form *Ip* and the Romanian definite article *-u(l)*.

**Iza** NFI in Maramureş. Related to *Isara* > *l’Oise*, *l’Isère*, *Yser* etc. < IE *\*eis-* ‘vehemence, energy, pathos’. Possibly a Celtic influence, cf. *Galaţ(i)*, Pre-Romance anyway.

**Lăpuş** NM, NL Maramureş. Other closely related forms must be: NFL, NL *Lăpuşnic* (Semenic Mts), NL *Lăpuşna* (Gurghiu Mts and another in the Republic of Moldova), and other forms like *Lăpuşata*, *Lăpuşnic* spread over a large area; cf. NP *Lăpuşneanu*. Some forms interfere with Sl. *lopuch* from which forms like *Lopuşna*, *Lopuşnica*, *Lopuşnik* are explained (so in Šmilauer 1970). Mediaeval Transylvania had three localities *Lăpuş*, attested as early as 1416; a fortress *Lăpuş* is attested in 1320 as *Lapis Sanctis Michaelis* which may also be the real etymology: a form related to Latin *lapis* of Preie. origin, root *\*L-P-*, *\*L-B-* ‘stone, a cliff’. Cf. Rom. *lespede* ‘a piece of stone’ (now usually with reference to a tomb-stone, cf. Russu 1981: 340–342), presumably by metathesis from *\*lep-sede*, probably an archaic indigenous Thracian form of the same origin.

**-man** Suffix or rather second element in compounds: *Căliman*, *Caraiman*. Seemingly related to the second part in *ortoman* ‘rich’ (regional and obsolete). Identical to *-man* in Lexicon A.

**Mandra** NL Olt. Seemingly derived from the Preie. root *\*M-N-* (*man-*, *min-*) largely spread in Europe. See s.v. *Miniş*.

**Manga** NL Dîmboviţa. Related to *Mandra*; used also as personal family name: *Manga*, *Mangu*.

**Mara** NFI Maramureş. Also the first part of the compound *Mara-mureş* (for the second part see *Mureş*). The approach to the Pan-Christian NP *Maria* can only be a folk etymology, though many linguists incline to such a hypothesis. Also the river-name cannot be related (Urverwandt) to *Mureş* as the root does not allow this approach. *Mara* must be derived from Preie. *\*M-R-*, also *\*M-L-* ‘stone, cliff’ (see the forms with root *mal-*).

**Mediaş** NL Sibiu. Seemingly related to *Medija* (Lexicon A).

**Mineu**, also locally pronounced and spelled **Mîneu** NL Maramureş. At. in 1335 – *sacerdos de Mened*; later in 1435 – *Menye*, *Menew*, *Meney*. See *Miniş*. The spelling *Mîneu* reflects a normal pronunciation by closing the initial *i* to *î(â)* and may eventually support a folk etymology with *mînă* ‘hand’.

**Miniş** NL; several localities with this name. Best known is the one in Banat attested in 1302 as *villa Menesy*; 1310 – *Menesi* etc. Seemingly related to NP *Mina*, *Minea* and Bg. NP *Mino*, *Mina*. The same root may be identified in other forms too: *Mintia*, *Mineu*, *Mandra*, *Manga* (see). The root *min-*, *man-* is archaic, of Preie. origin. Numerous place-names in Provence have the same origin (see Rostaing 1950: 209–215). The root is also largely spread in Greece in forms like *Minos* (see ample discussions in Muşu 1981: 220–239).

**Mintia** NL At. 1330 – *terra Nempty*; 1389 – *possessio Nymiti*. Considered, together with *Mintiu* (see) as derived from Hu. *német* ‘German’ by most linguists (Drăganu 1928: 56; 1933: 281; Jordan 1963: 278). *Mintia* and *Mintiu* should be analysed in relation with *Miniş*, *Mineu* (see). The approach to Hu. *német* must be a folk etymology eventually based on the approximate spelling of the Romanian forms in the Medieval documents, which is a frequent situation.

**Mintiu** NL At. 1332 – *sacerdos de Fulnempty*; 1380 – *possessio Nemetu*. See *Mintia*.

**Moldova** NFI, NR Jordan (1963: 478) assumes it is derived from *molid* ‘spruce tree’ (indigenous

Thracian origin) and Slavic suffix *-ova*; Hasdeu (*Istoria Critică*: 300) assumes it would be of Germanic origin, related to *Moldau*, the German name of the Vltava. It may be rather related to Bg. NL *Muldava* (Ilčev 1969: 346). The root *mal-*, *mol-* is Preie. indeed, and is the same preserved in *mal* ‘river-side’ (< ‘rocky river-side’ related to Alb. *mal* ‘a hill, a mountain’). The second part may be Thr. *dava*, *deva*, *dova* as in NL *Deva* (see) and NL *Plovdiv* (Lexicon A). The preservation of intervocalic *-v-* is normal in indigenous Thracian words. *Moldova* would thus mean ‘the fortress on the hill/river-side’. The initial meaning, presumably applied to a fortress, was extended to the whole region in the Middle Ages.

**Motru** NFI Ancient Ἀμούρτιον, later Μώτρειες. Must be related to the series of French river-names like *Matra*, *Moder*, *Marne*, *Meyronne* etc. derived from IE *\*māt-*, *\*mot-* ‘mother’. The evolution Thr. *ā* > Rom. *o*, *u* is specific to the north Thracian dialects; cf. *Dunăre*, *Mureș*. See also *Modrejce* in Lexicon A.

**Mureș** NFI Ancient *Marisia*, *Maris*, later Μορήσιες. From IE *\*mā-ro*, *\*mā-no* ‘wet’. Related to *Marica* (Lexicon A) with the evolution north Thr. (Dacian) *ā* > Rom. *u* (via a phoneme like *ō*) as in *Dunăre*. This evolution is specific to only the north Thracian (Dacian) dialects. Related to *a mura* ‘to pickle’ (specific traditional term). See also *Mura* and *Murva* in Lexicon A.

**Năruja** NFI Related to *Nera*.

**Nera** NFI Timiș. Flows at the Romanian-Serbian border. See Lexicon A s.v. *Nera*, also *Nerav*, *Neret*, *Neretva*.

**Nistru** NFI A major river of Central-East Europe, the conventional easternmost border of Romanian. Ancient *Tyras*, known later as Δάναςτροις, Latinised *Danaster* (Porphyrius, *adm. imp.* 42). Slavic forms: OCS *Днѣстръ*, *Dněstrъ*, R. *Dnjestr*. *Nistru* is also a small river in the Gutii Mts and a village in Maramureș att. in 1555 as *Miszt* (details never mentioned by the linguists who analysed the Romanian form). As in the case of *Dunăre*, the indigenous Romanian form is archaic and original, so the hypothesis of a simple borrowing from a neighbouring Slavic language is unsustainable. Closely related Romanian forms are *nisetru* ‘the fish *Acipenser Güldenstaedti*’ and *nasture* ‘a botton’ (< ‘round botton’). The forms seemingly reflect Preie. *\*N-S-*, *\*M-S-* ‘round, a curve’. • The Scytho-Sarmatian forms seemingly reflect a compound *\*dānu-istru* which probably represented the base for the Slavic forms, but cannot explain Rom. *Nistru*. There surely were popular interferences and folk etymologies which play their role in history and often impede linguistic analysis. Anyway the Slavic forms for the fish *Acipenser* (Ukr. *osétr*, *jasétr*, Bg. *esétăr*, S.-Cr. *jěsetra* etc.) cannot explain Rom. *nisetru*. I really doubt that Slavic forms reflect old IE forms; they are rather borrowed from a Preie. idiom, like – among others – *ryba* and *somъ* (see also s.v. *Someș*). In Romanian, *Nistru*, *nisetru* and *nasture* form an etymologically compact group which should be analysed as such. From the same Preie. root are also derived *mistreț* ‘a boar’ and *moș* ‘old man’ < ‘(with) curved back (when old)’. See also *Nesebăr* in Lexicon A.

**Olt** NFI One of the most important rivers of Romania. Attested in the antiquity as *Alutas*, *Alutus*, *Alutum*, Ἰλουτάς. Related to *Oltina*, a lake in Dobrudja, attested in the late antiquity as Ἰλτινα (Procopius) and *Altinum* (Notitia Dignitatum). There is no doubt that the modern form preserves the old Thracian river-name. Problems have been raised by vocalism *o* against *a* in Thracian, considered by most linguists as reflecting a Slavic influence, i.e. a Slavic intermediary. If so, it would be the only ancient river-name of Romania affected by Slavic vocalism. Cf. NFI *Alta* in Russia, of Iranian origin, and without the shift *a* > *o* in an area with powerful okania. Cf. also NFL *Olt*, *Oulet* in Occitany (see E. Tănase in *Revue Internationale d’Onomastique* 15/1963: 195–209). I am rather inclined to consider an ancient vocalism *o* (a dialectal form) against *a* attested in documents.

**oar-, or-, ur-** Numerous place-names witness a root derived from Preie. \*OR-, \*UR- ‘big, huge’ spread over Europe; see also *Orga* and *Vrbas* (Lexicon A) and *Vir* (Lexicon B, I, 5). Of the same origin must be the series of Hungarian place-names in *or-* quoted in Kiss 1980 s.v. In Romania some place-names witness the same root:

- **Oarța** and **Orțița** NL, both in Maramureș. Att. in 1391 as *Trywarcha* and then *Warcza* in 1475;
  - **Oarba** NL, Mureș district, east Transylvania; related by folk etymology to *oarbă*, fem. of *orb* ‘blind’;
  - **Oradea** NL, Bihor. Att. in 1103 – *Varadinus*. The Latinised form reflects Hung. *Nagyvárad*, lit. ‘Great *Várad*’ as Germ. *Großwardein*. Kiss 1980: 453 assumes that Rom. *Oradea* is borrowed from Hungarian, which is phonetically impossible (just like Rom. *oraș* from Hu. *város*, almost a legendary, but equally erroneous, etymology). *Oradea* is built like *Vedeia*, *Vrancea* (see both forms). The key to understanding this form is the general context of the Preie. root \*OR-, \*UR-, as presented here and its relations to both *oraș*, dial. also *uraș* ‘township’ and *uriaș*, dial. also *oriaș* ‘huge; giant’ (the latter sense typical in folk-tales).
  - **Orlat** NL, Brașov district. Att. in 1317–1320 as *ecclesia de Monte Civinii* ‘the church on the hill of Cibin’; 1322 – *villa Warolyafolw* (with Hungarian deformed spelling and in association with *vár* ‘fortress’ for which see below);
  - **Orlea** NL district of Hunedoara; closely related to NL *Urlea* (see below)
  - **Orman** NL Cluj. Att. in 1292 as *Urlman*, then *Urman*, *Orman*; 1312 – *possessio Urman*; 1333 – *Orman*. For the ending *-man* see also Lexicon A.
- Urca** NL, Cluj. Att. in 1289 as *terra Heurke*; 1312 – *Eurke*.
- **Urcu** NL, Caraș. No early mediaeval attestation; possibly derived from *a urca* ‘to climb’ which has, on the other hand, the same Preie. origin. The basic meaning is also ‘high’ hence ‘to go (to the) high, i.e. to climb’.
  - **Urdeș** NL, Cluj. At folk level related to *urdă*, a kind of cheese which gathers together at the surface of the milk. Archaic pastoral term of the same Preie. origin.
  - **Uric** NL, Hunedoara. Att. in 1473 as *Wryk*.
  - **Uria**, NL, Olt. No early mediaeval attestations.
  - **Uriu** NL, Bistrița; cf. *Uroi*, infra.
  - **Urlea**, **Urleta** NL, near Ploiești; cf. early form *Urlman* for *Orman*.
  - **Uroi** NL, Hunedoara; cf. *Uriu*, supra.

For all these forms the reader should refer to the Thracian forms in *or-*, *ur-* like NFI *Ordessos* in Scythia, a tributary of the Danube; NFI *Orosines* and NP *Oroles* for which cf. Rom. *Orlea*, personal family name. See also the Thracian place-names in *-ora*, *-oros*, *-oron* (Dečev 1957), like *Tarporon*, *Clevora* etc. Rom. *oraș*, dial. also *uraș* ‘township’ and *uriaș*, dial. also *oriaș* (1) adj. ‘huge, very big’ and (2) noun ‘a giant’ (a typical figure of the Romanian tales). • It is interesting to note that the linguists have not noticed the close relationship of these forms. The hypothesis according to which Rom. *oraș* would be derived from Hung. *város* should be definitely rejected from linguistic and extralinguistic reasons. ALL these forms reflect a Preie. heritage in the large context of the forms derived from Preie. \*OR-, \*UR- ‘huge, very big’ preserved over a large area in Europe. This archaic root is remarkably well preserved in both vocabulary and place-names, quite well represented in South Slavic toponymy as well.

**Paleu** NL Bihor. Seemingly related to *Peleaga*, *Peleş*; the approach to Hu. *palló* ‘a small bridge’ or Sl. *paliti* ‘to burn’ cannot be invoked.

**Parîng** NM, an important chain in the South Carpathians. Obviously reflects Preie. \*P-R- ‘mountain, hill’; hence also NM *Pirin* (see Lexicon A) and NL *Praha* (< \**Paraga*; Lexicon D).

**Peleaga** NM Banat. Related to *peleg*, *peleagă* ‘a small hill, a hillock’, cf. Thr. and Ill. NL *Pelen-dova*, *Pelva*, *Pala*, *Palae*. Reflects Preie. root \*P-L-, also \*P-R- ‘a hill, a rock; mountain’, spread all over Europe. The preservation of intervocalic -l- is normal in indigenous Thracian words. Cf. *Peleş* (next entry) and *Pula* in Lexicon A.

**Peleş** NL Maramureş; NM in Sinaia, Prahova. Related to *Peleaga*. Considered as derived from Hu. *pilis* ‘baldness’ by Iordan 1963: 118–119, an impossible hypothesis, which ignores obvious parallel forms.

**Perşani** NM, Vrancea region. If not derived from a family-name *Perşanu*, then it should be derived from Preie. root \*P-R- as in *Parîng*.

**Prut** NFI Ancient Greek Πυρετός, by the Scythians as Πορότα, Βροῦτος (first centuries A.D.), Βουράτ (by the Pecenegs). Reflects IE \*preu- ‘to spring out’, as in *prunc* (nasalised) ‘a baby’ (< ‘sprung out from mother’s belly’), hence also Skr. *pru-th* ‘to spring out, to explode’.

**Rarău** NM (East Carpathians). The original form should have been \**ararâ-*, of masculine gender, articulated \**ararâu*. Closest forms which explain the mountain-name are Thr. *Araros*, Ἄραρος, Ἄραυρος; cf. NFI *Arar* (France). The possible approach to *rar* ‘rare’ is, of course, a folk-etymology. The forms ending in -*ău*, -*éu* must have been *masculina* in -*a* or -*e* followed by the masculine definite article -*u(l)*.

**Rebra** NFI in Rodna Mts. Closely related to *Raba* (Lexicon A).

**Savu** NFI Closely related to *Sava* (Lexicon A).

**Săsar** NFI in N Romania (Maramureş). From \**as-ar-ar-*, the same root as in *Asău* and *Asuaj*, i.e. Preie. \**AS-* in words with chromatic meaning: ‘black, dark’, with reduplication as in NM *Rarău* (Preie. origin) and NM *Curcubăta* (related to *curcubeu* ‘rainbow’, IE origin). The component -*ar* is frequent in river-names, e.g. *Dunăre(a)*, *Argeş*, *Arieş* etc.

**Sebeş** NFI, NL Alba; also **Sebiş** NL Arad, NL **Caran-sebeş** (see s.v. *Caransebeş*) and NL **Sibiu**. For a long time the indigenous Thracian words with intervocalic *b/v-* and -*l-* have been denied this origin on the unproved assumption that these sounds would have been either lost in this position (the case of -*b/v-*) or changed to -*r-* (the case of intervocalic -*l-*) as usual indeed with the words of Latin origin. In reality these phonemes are never changed if present in a Thracian word; the explanation resides in the different situation of Late Popular Latin, on the one hand, and Thracian (or vernacular Thracian), on the other. See other similar situations, e.g. *Deva*, *abur(e)* etc. These forms must reflect Thracian root \**sab-*, \**seb-* as proved by Thracian forms like NL *Sabatium*, *Sabation*, NL *Sabin-iri-bes*, NPp *Saboces* etc. (Dečev 1957: 406). The name of river *Cibin*, which flows in the area of *Sibiu*, was modelled under German pronunciation: \**Sibin* > *Zibin* > *Cibin* (pron. *čibin*) as known for a long time (Drăganu 1933: 552). Various explanations have been offered for each of these forms: *Sibiu* was tentatively explained from Bg. *sviba* > *siba* (?); *Sebeş* was explained from Hu. *sebes* ‘quick’ (Iordan 1963: 122) etc. The ultimate origin must be Preie. \**S-B-*, possibly related to \**S-M-*, ‘high’ or ‘deep, depth’; cf. *Someş*, *Semenic*.

**Semenic** NM Banat. Related to *semeŃ* ‘high; proud and arrogant’; reflect Preie. root \**S-M-* as in *Someş*.

**Sibiu** NL; the most important town of the eponymous district. Att. 1192–1196: *prepositus Cipiniensis*; 1211: *prepositus Scibiniensis*. See s.v. *Sebeş*.

**Siret** NFI Attested in the antiquity under approximately similar forms, e.g. Τιάραντος, Ἰέρασος, *Gerasus*. The modern forms must be explained from IE \**ser-* ‘to flow’ as in *Séretos* (the name of *Siret* by Procopius, *aed.*), Ill. *Serétion* (Dalmatia), *Séretos* (Dardania). Related to *Siriu* and also to *şiroi* ‘a meandering water’, *a şiroi* ‘to flow out’. The opposition *s~ş* must be inherited as such from Thracian. See also *Serava*, *Srem* in Lexicon A.

**Sîriu** NFI, NM, NL Vrancea region. Related to *Siret*.

**Someş** The ancient river-name *Samos*, *Samus*. The root-vowel *o* against *a* in ancient texts can be hardly explained as a Slavic intermediary (see the case of *Olt*); it either reflects a local pronunciation with *o* or an evolution *a* > *o* in the vicinity of the nasal *m*. Cf. NFI *Somme* < *Samara* against NFI *Sambre* in the same area (Dauzat 1947: 197; Kiss 1980: s.v. *Szamos* and *Somme*). The primitive root is Preie. \**S-M-* ‘high; a peak’ or ‘a hollow, a cave’ and may be the same as in the case of Sl. \**somъ* ‘the fish *Silurus*’ and Rom. *somn* ‘id.’. Skok (1971–1974: 3, 305) also considers the origin as Preie.: “*Nije isključen predindo-evropski supstrat koji dolazi u obzin i kod drugih ihtioloških termina*”. See also s.v. *Nistru* and its relationship with other ichthyologic terms. Cf. *Semenic*, *Simeria*, *Şimian*, *Şimleu*, *Şimand*.

**Strei** NFI Closely related to *Stremţ* and further to *Strima*, *Strjama*, *Struma*, *Struga* in Lexicon A. IE \**ser-* ‘to flow’, zero grade *sr-* and evolution *sr-* + vowel > Thr. *str-*, as in the typical indigenous word *strugure* ‘a grape’. The same root, but with other vocalism, also in *Sîriu*, *Siret*.

**Stremţ** NFI Related to *Strei*.

**Suceava** NFI, NL in Bucovina. Related to *Suciu* and suffix as in *Bîrzava*, *Deva* (\**De-va*) etc.

**Suciu** NFI Maramureş; also used as NP. Cf. Thr. NP *Sucus*, Σουκους, Σουκτιος; must be related to *Suceava* and probably to *Soča* (Lexicon A). If an IE root should be looked for, then we may refer to \**keu-k-* ‘to shine; bright’ > Thr. *suk-y-* > *suč-*.

**Suciu** NL Transylvania; two localities: *Suciu de Jos* and *Suciu de Sus*. Att. in 1325 – *Zuchtu*. Hungarian forms are *Alsószöcs* and *Felsőszöcs*. Identical to the river-name *Suciu*.

**Sulina** NFI, a branch of the Danube, and NL, the most important locality of the area. This form should be connected to Thr. *-sula*, *-sule*, *syle* in place-names like *Scapten-sula*, *Enkiri-sula*, *Scapte-sule*. I wonder whether the possible approach to *sulă* < Lat. *subula* should be considered a folk etymology or the Latin etymology is erroneous. Anyway the preservation of intervocalic *-l-* is normal in indigenous Thracian elements as in *Călan*, *Chilia*, *Căliman* etc.

**Suru** NM in the Făgăraş Mts. Cf. Thr. NP *Sura*, *Surus*, *Suris* and Rom. *sur* (now only about horses) ‘with white and black fur’; also Basque *xuri* (*şuri*) ‘white, whitish’. Preie. \**S-R-* in words with chromatic meaning (other discussions and examples in Mûşu 1981, chapter *Simfonia culorilor* ‘symphony of colours’).

**Şimand** NL Arad. Same suffix as in *Cărand*, *Zarand*. Preie. root \**S-M-*; see s.v. *Someş*.

**Şimian** NL Bihor. Seemingly same root as in *Şimand*.

**Talma** NFI Oaş. Cf. Gr. τέλμα ‘a marsh, a moor’, τέλμις ‘mud’, NL Τελμεσσός, Τερμεσσός etc. and *Tolmin*, *Tolminka* in Lexicon A. Preie. \**T-L-*, also \**T-R-* in various words with toponymic meaning.

**Tarcău** NM, NL East Carpathians. The root *tar-* is present in numerous European place-names and reflects Preie. \**T-R-*, also \**T-L-*, hence Lat. *terra*, *tellus* and Rom. (via Thracian) *tărîm* ‘land; region’ (typical term of Romanian folk-tales). Cf. *Tarcea*. The root-development as in *Buzău*, *Inău/Ineu*, *Ilteu* etc. The explanation from Hu. *tar-kő* ‘bald stone’ or *tarkó* ‘neck’ are simple exercises (cf. Kiss 1980: 631). • Must be related, with metathesis, with *Trakana*, Lexicon A.

**Tarcea** NL Bihor. Att. 1163 – *villa Thorsa*; 1326 – *possessio Tarcha*. Must be related to *Tarcău*.

**Tăpia** NL Banat. The same as, or close to, ancient *Tapae* where the Roman and Dacian wars took place. Cf. Rom. dial. *tipie* ‘a small hill’ and *tăpşan* ‘an elevated flat place’. Reflects Preie. \**T-B-*, \**T-P-*. See also *Tebea*, *Țibleş*.

**Tărtărău** NM, a peak in the Paring Mts. Preie. root \**T-R-* (as in *Tarcău*, *Tarcea*) by reduplication (as in *Rarău*, *Curcubăta*). Cf. *Tărtăria*.

**Tărtăria** NL Alba. The archaeological site where the famous tablets were discovered by N. Vlăssă in the early 1960's. Same type as *Tărtărașu*.

**Timiș** NFI Several rivers with this name; best known is the one in Banat which gave the name of the largest town of the region, *Timișoara*. Ancient *Tibisis*, *Tibisca*, later *Tiphesas*, *Timeses*. The oscillation of spelling *b/m* may be also observed in the case of *Buzău*. Must be related to *Timava*, *Timok* (Lexicon A) and further to *Thames*. All reflect IE \**tī-*, *tī m-*, *tī bh-* 'to melt, to flow'.

**Tulca** NL Bihor. Same root as *Tulcea*.

**Tulcea** NL Dobrudja. Cf. Thr. *Tuleus*, *Tylis* today *Tulovo* in Bulgaria and Rom. NL *Tulca*, also *tuleu* 'a tree-trunk' and *tulei* 'undeveloped part of a bird's wing; a young man's beard'. Preie. \**T-L-* as in *Talma*.

**Tur** NFI and NL **Turda** on the river *Tur*. The town is attested in the first centuries A.D. as *Τυρόδιζα*, *Τουρούς*, and later in 1197 as *Thorda*. The forms reflect a large category of place-names spread over a large area; they reflect Preie. \**T-R-*. Same root in *Tura*, *Turdaș*, *Turia*, *Turu-lung*, *Turț*. In Kiss (1980: 661) *Tur* is considered of Slavic origin (from *turъ*), whereas another river-name of Tobol, also *Tur*, is considered of unknown origin. Cf. *Turieci* in Slovakia, for which see Romanian form *Turț*. The association with Sl. *turъ* is a folk-etymology in Slavic speaking areas; the river- and place-names with the root *tur-* are Pan-European and should be explained as closely related (*urverwandt*). • Must be related with *Turieci*, Lexicon D.

**Turdaș** NL Cluj. Same root as in *Tur*, *Turda*. • Famous for the eponymous Neolithic site.

**Țebea** NL near Brad, Transylvania. Related to ancient forms like *Tabia*, *Tavia* (today *Taggia*, in Liguria), *Tabai*, Gr. *Theba* etc. Preie. \**T-B-*, \**T-P-*. See also *Țibleș* and *Tăpia*. All related also to *țepă* 'a thorn' and Alb. *thep* 'a peak', and to *țipar* 'the fish *Misgurnus fossilis*; eel' (after the thorny form of this fish). • Traditionally the archaic, Pre-Romance origin of the forms preserving the sequence vocal-*b/v*-vocal were rejected this origin on the erroneous ground that intervocalic *b/v* should have disappeared in Romanian. This phonetic law is valid only for the Latin elements in Romanian, and reflects a tendency in Post-Classical Latin, later almost general in Romanian (there are some exceptions though; see other observations below in the chapter dedicated to the phonetic changes).

**Țibleș** NM in East Carpathians. Related to *Țebea*.

**Țuțora** NL Iași. Related to *țuț*, pl. *țuțuri* 'a prominence on the skin' also in expressions 'astonished' and to *țuțuiu* 'a peak', hence *a se țuțuia* 'to climb'. Preie. \**T-T-* 'high' also 'bright, shining'. The same root is preserved in a series of place-names and words among which Gr. *τίτανος* 'lime (< white)', NL *τίτανος* in Thessaly. The same root is seemingly preserved in Thr. *ziby-thides* 'Thracian nobles' (Gr. spelling *ζιβυθιδες* in Hesychius); the first part of the compound reflects IE \**ǵheib-* 'bright'. *Zibythides* is therefore an etymological tautology. Cf. *Cuculka* in Lexicon A.

**Vărșand** NL Bihor. Att. 1214 – *Vozian*, 1217 – *Vosyan*, 1467 – *Varsan*. Seemingly related to *Vrancea* with the indigenous Thr. suffix *-and* as in *Zarand*, *Cărand* etc.

**Vedea** NFI on which *Roșiori-de-Vede* is located and other localities with this name (districts of Argeș, Ilfov and Teleorman). Cf. Thr.-Phr. *bedy* 'water'. Related to *Vidu*, *Videle* and *Vit*, *Vidin* (Lexicon A).

**Vidu** NFI a tributary of the Crișu Negru. Related to *Vedea*, *Videle* and *Vit*, *Vidin* (Lexicon A).

**Vinga** NL Arad. Must be related to some Preie. place-names derived from \**V-N-*, \**W-N-* as in NM Iber. *Vindius*, NM Prov. *Ventoux* < *Vinturi*, NL Prov. *Vénasque* < *Vindasca* etc. Cf. *Vința* (and *Văța*, *Vința* in Lex. A), *Vințu*. • The etymology suggested by Kiss (1980: 696) < Sl. *vinjaga* 'wild vine' < *vino* 'wine' is, of course, impossible. See Šmilauer 1970: 190 for the place-names derived from *vino* in Slavic.

**Vința** NL Alba. Must be related to NFI *Văča* in Bulgaria and NL *Vinča* in Serbia (see Lexicon A) and further to *Vinga* and *Vințu*. Preie. \*V-N-, \*W-N-.

**Vințu** NL; two localities with this name: *Vințu de Jos* (Alba) and *Vințu de Sus* (Cluj). Att.: *Vințu de Jos* – 1248: *teutonici in Wynch*; 1289 – *Wynch inferior*. *Vințu de Sus* – 1219: *terra Wynchy*, *villa Wynchy*; 1221 – *locus qui vocatur Oronos Winch*; 1227 – *Oranas Winc*. Related to *Vința* and *Vinga*.

**Vișeu** NFI Maramureș and three other villages. Also NL *Vișea*, *Vișa*. Must reflect IE \*weis- ‘to flow, to melt’; related to *Vešala* (Lexicon A) and *Wista* in Poland.

**Vrancea** NR A region where the East Carpathians turn abruptly to the west. IE \*wer- ‘to bend, to curve’ as in Lat. *verto*, *-ere* and *vermis*.

**Zalău, Zălau** NFI, NL Sălaj. Related to NFI *Zala* at the Slovene-Hungarian border. Reflects Celtic *Sala*. It is not clear the change *s* > *z* identical in two relatively distant areas. Yet NR *Sălaj* (< \**Sălaș*) reflects the initial *s*, maybe by association with Hu. *szálas* ‘a shelter’ which is still an accepted etymon for *Sălaj*, but ignoring the other forms. • Intervocalic *l* is normal in an indigenous Pre-Romance element.

**Zarand, Zărand** NM A region rich in gold and silver ore. IE \**ǵhel-* ‘to shine, bright; gold’. Suffix as in *Vărșand*, *Cărand* etc. Cf. Thr. NL *Ziridava* ‘gold fortress’ and NL *Zarand* south of Tehran.

## Lexicon D

### Archaic Place-Names in Czech and Slovak

To my knowledge there is no comprehensive analysis of the archaic (Pre-Indo-European) heritage in Central Europe. For Western Europe, Ch. Rostaing's analysis of the Provençal toponymy remains unsurpassed. The topic is complicated by the still oscillating views regarding the relation/non-relation of these forms with southeast European forms, much better analysed, and even classified to a certain extent. It is not my purpose to review the few studies dedicated to the exciting topic of the archaic heritage in Central Europe, but to bring forth some relevant data, which may eventually stimulate debates and further research. The following list is limited to the available data, therefore it cannot be comprehensive. Its purpose is to be an incentive to further investigations, and tries to put together data from Central and Southeast Europe, especially South Slavic archaic, mainly Thracian and Illyrian, heritage. It continues the lexicons A, B and C above.

#### A tentative lexicon of archaic place-names in Czech and Slovak

**Beskydy** Unknown origin. The relationship with Albanian *bjeshkë* 'mountain pasture' (as Šafařík suggested), therefore a Thracian place-name, seems to have a major impediment: there is no similar place-name in the neighbouring area (Skok's basic principle of repeatability), so it is at least doubtful whether we may explain a Czech-Slovak place-name via an Albanian-related form. • The place-name, together with its related forms (Ukrainian *Beščady*, Polish *Bieszczad*) is seemingly Pre-Slavic, without a clear etymon. The proto-form would be *\*Beskēdъ*. A solution may be offered by further comparing Czech *Beskydy* to the Romanian form *pisc* 'a (mountain) peak', also frequent in place-names in mountainous locations. The root may *\*pesk-*, *\*besk-* 'a peak'. On the attested alternance *p/b* in Thracian, see Paliga 1987. Šafařík's comparison seems correct, and may be accepted with the additional data offered by the Romanian toponymy.

**Brno** Unknown origin, sometimes connected to *brnět* 'to tingle'; (about wind) 'to whistle, to whizz', which is – as often in the case of archaic place-names – a fortuitous similarity (many similar examples are analysed by Skok 1950 and Bezlaj in the case of South Slavic toponymy). • Presumably reflects Preie. *\*B-R-*, *\*P-R-* 'stone; cliff'; adapted to the Czech spirit in accordance with *zrno* etc. • There are numerous Pre-Indo-European place-names derived from this root; see lexicons A and C.

**Čech** Blažek and Klain (2002) have recently reviewed all the hypothesis regarding this place- and ethnic name, otherwise difficult to explain. I should add that identical or similar place-names are in Transylvania and East Carpathians. NL *Cehu Silvaniei* 'the Czech of Sylvania' (Romanian *ceh*, *cehu* is pronounced as in Czech proper); NM *Ceahlău* in the East Carpathians, also not satisfactorily explained so far. If the archaic alternance *h/f* is accepted, and it indeed documented in some cases of Romanian words of Thracian origin, than the relation might be to Rom. *ceafă* 'back side of the) neck', Albanian *qafë*, same meaning as in Romanian. The primitive meaning seemingly was 'neck', hence 'hill, elevated location = mountain'. The ultimate origin is uncertain, possibly Pre-Indo-European. If so, it may lead to the conclusion that the modern Czech lands reflected to archaic Neolithic and Chalcolithic influence from

the south, at least in some cases. There are numerous place-names of this type in Romania, especially in the mountainous Transylvanian Carpathians, and they have reflection in the current vocabulary, so the principle of repeatability seems assured. • The alternance *f/h* in Romanian witnesses the existence of a former laryngeal in Thracian; its result in Romanian is zero, *f* for *h*. • There are therefore several place-names with the root *čech-*, spread also – beside the Czech area and Romanian – in Ukrainian, Polish, Slovene and northern Greece. This stresses the main idea presented here: *čech-* is not an isolated root, but a well and largely represented root, presumably of Thracian-Illyrian origin, with the basic meaning ‘neck’, hence ‘hill neck, hill in general’.

**Dyje** A river at the Czech-Austrian border; German *Thaya*. Pre-Slavic, perhaps from IE *\*dhū-* ‘rapid, quick move, flow’. Possibly related to British NFI *Tyne*.

**Hron** A tributary of the Danube in Slovakia. Pre-Slavic, ultimately of Preie. origin, root *\*G-R-*, *\*K-R-* ‘a stone, a cliff’, presumably via Thracian, Celtic or Germanic, less probably via Illyrian as formerly held by some linguists. But the idea that the Illyrians came from more northern regions is still considered occasionally. • Earliest attested form is *Gran* (1075, 1124, 1217); closest related form must be Slovenian *Kranj*; see Lexicon A.

**Chanava** A region in Slovakia between the Slaná and the Rimavská Sobota. Obscure. The Hungarian form in *Hanva*, obscure as well. Kiss 1980: 263 assumes that the Slovak form would be borrowed from Hungarian, but this detail – doubtful or debatable – does not clarify the topic.

**Ida** NFI Slovakia; NL **Velká, Malá Ida**. Must one of the numerous Pre-Slavic, probably Pre-Indo-European river-names, cf. Greek *Ida*, a location on the island of Crete, Greek spelling *Idē*, Gr. *idē*, Dorian *idā* ‘forest, forested land’. Chantraine, I, 455 considers it a Pre-Hellenic term. • May be akin, also as an archaic Preie. heritage, to NFI *Ada*, a river at the Hungarian-Serbian border (see Lexicon A). The reconstructable Preie. root *\*AD-*, *\*ID-* is identifiable in some other Preie. place-names.

**Ipeľ** (Slovak), Hungarian **Ipoly**, German **Eipel** A river at the Slovak-Hungarian border. Attested in the early Middle Ages as *Ipul*. Kiss (1980: 291) considers the form related to Bulgarian *Ibār*, Serbian *Ibar*; we may also add Romanian *Ibru*; the assumed IE root would be *\*eybhros*. • The form is undoubtedly Pre-Slavic and Pre-Hungarian, but the best connection may be Rom. NL *Ip*, definite article *Ipu*, *Ipul*, as the earliest Medieval form show for the river as well. The ultimate origin may be Pre-Indo-European.

**Jizera** NFI Czech Republic. Closely related to Fr. *Isère*, Rom. *Iza* (for the latter see Lexicon C: Place-names in Romania). As all other related forms, must be of Celtic origin. This may be the only Celtic river- or place-name in Romania, which may reflect the archaeological finds.

**Krkonoše** A major mountainous chain at the Czech-polish border. Named in German *Riesengebirge* and *Oriás-hegység* lit. ‘huge mountains’ in Hungarian. The approach to Czech *krk* must be a folk-etymology. The genuine relationship should be the numerous forms, all of Pre-Slavic, presumably Pre-Indo-European origin in South Slavic: Slovenian NFI *Krka* (< *Corcoras*, *Korkoras*), then *Kranj*, *Koroška*, Serbo-Croatian *Krajna* etc. Cf. ancient *Carsium*, today *Hîrșova*, in Romania, on the low Danube. The change *c(k) > h* has not been satisfactorily explained; it may be due to a laryngeal in Thracian, impossible to note in Greek or Latin. • The form seems closely related to NL *Krknjaš* (*Veli i Mali*) in the island of Čiovo, Central Dalmatian Group of the Adriatic Islands; Skok 1950: 160 ff. assumes that the origin may be Lat. *circinus* ‘round, circular’ + suffix *-aceus*. Just like *Krkonoše*, the etymological family seems the large group derived from Preie. *\*K-R-*; I assume Skok would agree with this hypothesis, as he himself postulates it for many other examples. Other discussions under entries in Lexicon A.

**Labe, German Elbe** Beyond any doubt, an old river-name, currently explained from IE \**albho-s* ‘white’. In Medieval Latin, *Polabi* got the meaning ‘the Slavs along the Elba’. Polish *Łeba* seems also related, also NL *Labin*, south of Istria, Croatia, ancient *Albona*. • A Pre-Indo-European origin is also possible, root \**AL-b-* or \**L-B-/ \*L-P-* ‘stone, cliff’, also in river-names flowing in/originating from mountainous regions. • Other examples in Lexicon A.

**Laborec** A major river of Slovakia. Sometimes assumed as Pre-Slavic, maybe form Celtic \**labaros* ‘turbulent, furious’ as Kiss 1980: 369 assumes. The form seem closely related to South Slavic NL *Labin*, south of Istria in Croatia < Ancient Illyrian *Albona* and/or to Slovenian *Labuta*, *Labota*, *Labotnica*, a tributary of Drava. Here the similarity to *labod*, *lavud* ‘a swan’ is due to folk etymology. • May be also related to Polish NL, NFI *Łeba*, German *Leba*.

**Mátra** A mountainous chain in northern Hungary between the Zagyva and Tarna rivers. A difficult form. On the one hand, the closest approach would be to Romanian NFI *Motru*, perhaps incorrectly derived from Latin *mater* ‘mother’, though such an origin may not be excluded. On the other hand, both north Hungarian and Romanian forms might be akin to Romanian *mutră* ‘a figure, face’ (pejorative meaning, against *față* ‘face’, from Latin), archaic heritage, perhaps related to Basque *mutur* ‘muzzle’. Finally, Rom. *mutră* - Basque *mutur*, seemingly closely related [sic!] may be analysed independently from the pair *Mátra-Motru*, although the similarity is striking indeed. • The origin must be archaic, but further analysis should clarify if the origin of many similar forms in European toponymy is the same in all cases, or we must accept multiple origins for similar or identical forms.

**Morava** A major river, the traditional border between Moravia and Slovakia. Must be closely related to Serbian NFI *Morava*, ancient *Margus*, *Margos*; another *Morava* is in the Vardar basin, also a mountain-name in Macedonia etc. Usually they are held for Pre-Slavic, IE \**mor-* ‘a moor, a marsh, wet land’.

**Nitra** NL, NFI Slovakia. sometimes considered of Germanic origin, \**Nitrahwa* < IE \**neid-*, \**nid-* ‘to flow’. • The Germanic intermediary is not necessary, though of course possible. Hungarian *Nyitra* is adapted after Slovak.

**Ohře** A tributary of Labe/Elba. German *Eger*. Usually considered of Celtic origin, perhaps related to Old Indian *ajirah* ‘rapid, quick’. • As often with European place-names, the ultimate may be Preie., root \**AG-/ \*AK-*, \**OK/ \*OG-* ‘a prominent place, a peak, a hill’, also in river-names. The archaic parallels in Romanian seem to be *Agăș*, *Agnita*, *Agaua*, *Agriș* (Paliğa 2000). There are also parallels in Provence, once analysed by Rostaing 1950.

**Olomouc** Unexplained so far. Must be related to the forms derived from Preie. \**OL-*, \**OR-*, also \**UL-*, \**UR-*, closely related to \**OR-*, \**UR-* ‘big, huge; giant’, cf. Greek *Olynthos* etc. • Another possibility would be to compare *Olomouc* with NFI, NL *Lom* < Thracian *Almus*, *Almos* < IE \**olmo-s* ‘an elm’ (the tree *Ulmus*) ; cf. Romanian *Olt*, ancient *Alutus*, with a change *a > o* maybe due to Slavic influence, but this is not certain as the ancient spelling is approximated. The place-names in *al-*, *ol-*, *ul-/ or-*, *ur-* are frequently of Preie. origin. *Olomouc* (old *Olomúc*) may be another example.

**Opava** River and town in northern Moravia. The town is attested in 1195 as *Oppauia*, 1201 *Oppaua*; the earliest attested form for the river is *Vpa* in 1031 and *Opa* in 1062. Closely related to *Opave* (Serbia, Deževó region), *Opila* (Macedonia, Kratovo region), *Opajska reka* (\**Opaja*), the Vardar basin, a tributary of Pčinja. A Thracian form \**Apaja* or \**Opaja* is reconstructed for the south Slavic forms, ultimately from IE \**ap-* ‘water’. For the Moravian form, we must assume a Celtic or (north) Thracian origin.

**Orava** A tributary of Váh. Pre-Slavic, usually considered derived from IE \**er-*, \**or-* ‘to

spring, to come out'. The form may be rather included in those derived from Preie. \*OR-, \*UR- 'big, huge; a prominence, a hill/a river'. The form **Oravská Magura** has the second element derived from Romanian *măgură* 'an isolated hill cut by waters'; archaic indigenous (Thracian) term probably of Preie. origin, root \*M-G-, \*M-K- 'a prominence'; also related to *mugur(e)* 'a blossom'.

**Plzeň** Unknown origin; attempts quoted in Lutterer, Kropáček and Huňáček. The origin must be archaic, Pre-Slavic, ultimately of Pre-Indo-European origin, root \*P-L-, \*P-R- as in *Praha*. The Pre-Czech form must have been \*Pal-s-, \*Pul-s- as in NL *Pula*, formerly *Pulj*, Italian *Pola*, of Illyrian origin.

**Praha** The approach to *práh* must a folk-etymology, just like the approach to *pražiti*. This essential place-name is seemingly related to the numerous Pre-Indo-European place-names derived from the root \*P-R-, \*B-R- 'a stone, a cliff, a mountain', and is ultimately related (Urverwandt) to *Brno*. The Pre-Slavic form must have been \*Paraga, cf. NM *Parnassos*, NM *Parîng* (Romania, Southern Carpathians) etc. There are extremely numerous place-names probably or possibly derived from this Pre-Indo-European root, among these possibly Hungarian *Pereg*, *Pereked* and Romanian NM *Pereg*, *Parîng*. • Slavic *pragъ* 'a threshold' may be ultimately of Pre-Indo-European origin, same root quoted above; in this case the similarity *Praha-pragъ* is not fortuitous, though probably a result of hasard, not a post-Classical derivation *pragъ* > *Praha*, via \*Paraga > \*Paraya > \*Praya. • The form may be eventually explained as an Indo-European origin, related to Old Irish *airne* 'stone' and Anatolian *pēr-*, \**parn*<sup>o</sup> 'house' as in Blažek, *Celtic-Anatolian Isoglosses*.

**Rimava** A river in Slovakia. Akin to Hung. NFI *Rima*, a tributary of Sajó. Must be related to NFI *Rama*, a tributary of Neretva in Bosnia. The ultimate origin may be IE \*rem- 'to stay' or rather, as I am inclined to consider, Preie. \*R-M-, \*R-B- 'to curve, to bend', i.e. 'meandering water flow'. The alternance b/m is attested in some archaic forms, so *Rima/Rimava/Rama* would be related to *Raba*; further discussions and examples in Lexicon A. • Hence also *Rimavská Sobota*.

**Tatry** Unexplained so far. Must be derived from Preie. \*T-T- 'bright, to shine' (from the high peaks), cf. Greek *Titanos* 'the bright one', hence 'the powerful one, the Titan'. A Thracian origin is suggested by Kiss 1980: 394, with further references, also noting the Mediaeval form *Turtur: per montes turtur*. This would suggest an approach to Romanian *țurțur* 'an icicle' (Rom. *ț* = *ts*), an archaic word of presumably Pre-Indo-European origin (other examples in Paliga 1999). Nevertheless the modern form cannot be explained from an older form \**turtur*, which seems a parallel form to *Tatry* or we may admit complex phonetic changes without a clear, analysable parallel.

**Torysa** NFI Slovakia; Hungarian **Tarca**. Must represent the large group of place- and river-names derived from Preie. \*T-R-, also \*T-L- 'stone, cliff; hill; a river flowing through/originating in a mountainous region'. There are numerous parallel examples, e.g. *Tarus* > Italian *Taro*, a tributary of Pádus/Po. • Also related must be Hung. *Tarac* = Ukrainian *Teresva* and Hung. *Tarcal*. • At a larger scale, cf. Rom. NL, NFI *Tarcea* [pron. /tarčă/], *Tarcău* (probably erroneously explained from Hung. *tarkó*; also Rom. NL *Turda* (cf. ancient Thracian *Turodiza*), NL *Turdaș* (hence the eponymous Neolithic culture, the Transylvanian parallel of Vinča) etc. See Lexicon A.

**Turiec** A river in Slovakia. Traditionally considered derived from \**Turьсѣ* in its turn from *turь*. There are numerous place- and river names derived from an archaic, Preie. root \*T-R-, \*T-L-, like NFI *Tur* in Hungary, the numerous river-names in Romania e.g. NFI *Tura*, *Turia*, *Tur* and

the town of *Turda* on the Tur, *Turulung* ('long Tur'), NL *Turdaş* etc. An ancient attestation is only for *Turda*: ancient *Touródiza*, *Tourous*, then *Thorda* in 1197. • Beyond any doubt, in Slavic areas these archaic forms interfered with those derived from *turbъ*, and is sometimes impossible to determine the accurate origin. On the other hand, we must assume an archaic origin if the form has clear archaic parallels in the area. See parallel forms in lexicons A and C.

**Vlára**, hence **Vlársky priesmyk** NFI, NM Slovakia. Unexplained. Must be archaic Pre-Slavic, ultimately of Preie. origin, root *\*OL-*, *\*UL-*, *\*UL-ar-a*, *\*OL-ar-a* > *Vlara*. Cf. *Vrbas* < *Urbanus*, *Urpanus*, which interferes with Sl. *vrba*. See parallel forms in lexicons A and C.

**Vltava** An important river flowing in the Czech Republic; Prague is on the Vltava. Pre-Slavic, sometimes considered from Germanic *\*Wilpahwō* 'wild, savage water' (thus at least in Kiss 1980: 430). Nevertheless the Germanic origin is improbable; we may accept, at the most, a Germanic intermediary from an older, Pre-Indo-European form derived from *\*UL-*, also *\*AL-*, *\*OL-* 'big, huge, high', development *\*UL-t-a* > Old Czech *\*Vlta-* and ending adapted after the largely spread river-names in *-ava*, *-ova*, e.g. *Morava*, *Opava* etc. The evolution *\*ol-t-* > *\*vl-t-* as in South Slavic *Vrbas* < *Urbanus*, *Urpanus*, *Vir* < *Ura* etc. (many other examples in Paliga 2000). • If our interpretation is correct, both *Praha* and *Vltava* are of archaic, Pre-Indo-European origin, via Celtic or Germanic.

## Discussion

The analysis of the archaic, Pre-Slavic place-names in the Central European, Czech and Slovak, area cannot be different from the basic approach of Petar Skok regarding the Pre-Slavic place-names in the Croatian/Adriatic area. There is just an additional problem: the Pre-Slavic place-names in the South Slavic area may be easier to analyse given the more frequent documents, which record the evolution of a given place-name from the antiquity through the Middle Ages to the modern and contemporary times; in change as we move north, such an analysis is more and more difficult, consequently it is often difficult or impossible to determine the ultimate origin of a given word.

It is therefore easy to determine that apparently typically Slavic forms like *Vrbas* (cf. *vrba*) or *Ljubljana*, *Ljubljunica* (cf. *ljubiti*) are in fact Pre-Slavic, and just adapted to the Slavic linguistic peculiarities because we may follow the attested forms from the antiquity. It is more difficult or impossible to follow the century-long evolution in the case of probably archaic terms like *Praha*, *Vltava* or *Brno*, even though they probably are archaic, Pre-Slavic forms.

Otherwise, there are largely spread forms, reflecting what we may label *archaic Pre-Indo-European typology* or *archaic Indo-European typology*, disregarding the modern linguistic configuration of the area. Such forms are persistent over millennia, in Greece, Thrace, Illyria, the Carpathian basin, Pannonia or western Europe.

It is easier to assume the archaic, Preie. or IE, origin of some forms if we consider the basic *principle of repeatability* so convincingly presented by Skok: *Čech(y)*, *Dyje*, *Hron*, *Ida*, *Ipeľ*, *Mátra*, *Morava*, *Opava*, *Orava*, *Tatry*, *Vlára* clearly have parallels in the neighbouring area; it is more difficult with other forms without an immediate and obvious parallel, but which may be considered archaic too, on the basis of careful comparative analysis: *Brno*, *Krkonoše*, *Olomouc*, *Plzeň*, *Praha*, *Turieč*. It is not probably hazard that this latter category includes archaic, Pre-Indo-European forms.

Future research may confirm or reject our solutions presented here. A more convincing analysis should put together as many examples as possible. The author has completed so far a

quite large *corpus* of forms in South Slavic, Romania and Central-Europe, mainly Czech and Slovak. A larger *corpus*, to include Albanian, Hungarian, Polish and Ukrainian forms would be more convincing. This is a task of the future. The future should also clarify the extent of north Thracian (Dacian) influence in the Czech area, as the present day research has clarified this influence for the Slovak area only. Forms like *Beskydy* or *Čechy* would indicate that, at least occasionally, the north Thracian influence in the Czech area may be identifiable or that a satem group, more or less related to Thracian, is responsible for some archaic, Pre-Slavic place-names not only in Slovakia, but also in the Czech area too.

## Lexicon E: Anthroponomical Relics in Romanian and South Slavic

The modern anthroponomical system crystallised along the Middle Ages on the basis of Christian names. As compared to place-names, by definition a static component of onomastics, personal names are, by contrast, the mobile factor, always exposed to changes and distortions, intentional or not, by their being recorded in documents, often according to the local habit, spelling or political and/or administrative influence. This is why archaic personal names are more difficult to analyse, quite rarely approached in linguistic research and, if approached, with frequent misinterpretations. If we refer to the archaic personal names in southeast Europe, there seemingly is only one study dedicated to this topic: Duridanov (1960) analysed the Thracian (substratum) origin of some Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian and Romanian personal names. Several years later, the same (Duridanov 1969) drew some parallels between Thracian and Baltic personal naming.

Yet the analysis is possible in the context of southeast European personal naming and, in a larger context, we may analyse them just like the Celtic names in English, as an example: *Alasdair*, Gaelic; *Arthur*, 'a bear' or Irish 'stone'; *Bridget*, *Brigid*, f., Celtic 'power', also the name of the goddess of fire; *Dilys*, f., Gaelic 'reliable, constant'; *Dougal*, Celtic 'black stranger' (Gaelic *Dùghall*); *Ena*, f., 'wonderful, delicate', interfering with a hypochoristic form derived from *Eugenia*; *Gwyneth*, f., Gaelic 'blessed'; *Kevin*, 'welcome on birth' etc. (see Macdonald 1972, the addendum).

Zaimov (1988), in a work dedicated to Bulgarian personal names, regularly avoids any references to Romance (i.e. Romanian) forms, further suggesting explanations within Bulgarian. Thus NP Bulg. *Bade*, *Bado* is not referred to Rom. *bade*, NP *Badea*, *Bădescu* but Sl. *badati* (p. 11); NP Bulg. *Brad* is not explained via Rom. *brad* 'a fir-tree', hence NP *Brad*, *Brădean(u)*, but from *O-brad* or from *Bradi-slav* (p. 32); NP Bulg. *Večin* is not referred to Rom. *vecin* 'a neighbour' (Lat. *vicinus*), NP *Vecinu*, but as derived from *Veko*, *Vetko* and suffix *-in* (p. 49); NP Bulg. *Dajna*, *Dajno*, *Dojna*, *Dojno* are not referred to Rom. *daină*, *doină* 'a typically Romanian folk-song', NP *Doina* (p. 78 and 91; see also Paliga 1994 with further references on this archaic, probably Pre-Indo-European).

Such etymological analyses, and there are numerous such attempts, lead to even more difficult approaches as obvious relationships are denied in favour of more facile, but erroneous, explanations, perhaps starting from the usual point in the 1970's and 1980's that such an attitude is politically 'correct'. Yet other attempts may prove useful. Grković (1983: 88-89) convincingly proved that there must be some Thracian-Illyrian relics in Serbo-Croatian personal naming. Unfortunately the author quotes only one example: the 'anthroponomical root' *Vata-* in *Vataš*. This must be surely analysed together with the S.-Cr. forms *vatah*, *vatak*, Rom. *vătaf*, *vătaș* (see further discussions in Paliga 1996: 34 ff.). In another study, Grković (1986) also analysed some Serbian personal names of the 14<sup>th</sup> century: some are of Romanian origin or, in any case, non-Slavic, rather of indigenous Thracian and/or Illyrian origin: *Ban* (derived from *ban* analysed on another occasion, see Paliga 1987), *Bataš*, *Bač*, *Bukur*, *Burja* (labelled as 'Illyrian relic', cf. Ill. *Burnia*), *Viganj* etc. Given the large distribution of these forms all over southeast Europe, it is often difficult to determine an accurate chronology, but they clearly reflect an archaic heritage.

In the given context we assume that a certain reference point may be offered by the substratum elements in Romanian and the neighbouring languages, such analysed in various linguistic studies such as Poghirc (1969), Russu (1981, who also analyses the personal-names

derived from some basic roots) and Brâncuș (1983), critically adding the data in Duridanov (1960) and Zaimov (1988, but considering the data mentioned above), than paralleling Romanian, Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian names as in Jordan (1983), we may attempt to a more realistic database, many years after Duridanov's attempt, and with inevitable new data. References to the Thracian forms follow Dečev 1957.

Even a brief and limited comparison of modern (Romanian, Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene) and Thracian-Illyrian forms allows to trace the contours of an archaic structure of personal naming. In some instances, the basic meaning of the root was always clear as they were/are obviously related to elements of vocabulary. Consequently the personal name was always synchronised with the general evolution of vocabulary. There still are a few roots which may be assumed to reflect archaic forms as they have been preserved exclusively as place-names or personal names. I would quote examples like Rom. *Mușă* - Bg. *Mušo* or *Strug* - *Strugo*, where the semantic association is difficult or impossible at the level of common speakers. Duridanov and others showed that some Thracian and Illyrian personal names have obvious correspondences with modern forms in Romanian, Bulgarian, Serbian, Croatian and Slovene. It is difficult to assume that these similarities are a mere result of hasard. Ultimately there is no linguistic or historical impediment, as such a linguistic analysis is in full agreement with historical and archaeological data: Thracian still was a vivid tongue when the Slavs began to expand. It is also possible that some northernmost Thracian (Dacian) groups also had a certain role in the Slavic ethnogenesis, for which see Paliga 2001 (in Slovene with an English abstract). And this archaic character is again, and even more relevant, proved by the archaic place-names analysed in the preceding chapters.

The lexicon below is, beyond any doubt, a draft. It will be amplified by future research. We assume that the archaic heritage in the sphere of personal names is much more important in southeast Europe as long assumed by some linguists. As a simple mention, there are tens, maybe hundreds of parallels in Romanian: Thracian elements of the current vocabulary – personal name(s). If such a view is adopted, it is obvious that the lexicon may be considerably larger. The following examples are therefore just a first synopsis of a complex and rich reality.

### Anthroponimical Lexicon

**Arda**, f., **Ardô**, **Ardju**, m. Same as in NFI *Arda*, see above Lexicon A. (Zaimov).

**Bača**, S.-Cr., Rom. **Baciu**, relate to Rom. *baci* 'a leader of shepherds'. See above NFI, NL *Bača* in Lexicon A. Cf. NP Thr. *Batsinis*, NL *Baðçiavia*.

**Bade**, **Bado**, Bulg., Rom. **Bade**, **Badea**, **Bădescu** etc. Referring to only Bulgarian, Zaimov assumes the forms may be derived from *badati*. Both Romanian and Bulgarian forms obviously reflect Rom. *bade* 'an epithet for an older male person', perhaps initially a term referring to a local leader, NP *Badea*, *Bădescu* etc.

**Balo**, **Balov**, **Balaur**, Bulg., Rom. **Bală**, **Balaur**, *bală*, *balaur(e)* 'a dragon, a mythological fantastic figure', cf. NP Thr. *Balas*, *Bales*. Zaimov also suggests this approach. The Thracian origin of this root seems certain.

**Ban**, Rom., **Ban**, Bulg., *bano* 'the elder brother'. See the discussion regarding the essential terms referring to social and political organization (Paliga 1987). • Archaic terms, undoubtedly of Thracian origin, with Illyrian parallels.

**Bešo**, **Beško**, masculine, Bulg.; **Beša**, S.-Cr. Duridanov refers to Thr. NP *Βησως*, *Bessius* (Dečev 57), NP Alb. *Besa*, f., *besë* 'an oath, creed'.

**Bițu**, Rom.; **Bico**, m., **Bica**, f., Bulg. Duridanov explains the forms as derived from NL Thr. *Βιτει-μαιας*, NP *Bitimas*, *Biti-centus*, *Biti-tralis*. In Bulgarian, sound *c* (ts, spelled in Romanian as *ț*) may be explained from a late Thracian form where *t + ilj > ts (c)*. Cf. NFI, NL Alb. *Bica*.

**Biso**, m., NFI *Bisov*, Bg.; S.-Cr. **Bisa**, f. “Undoubtedly Pre-Slavic” (Duridanov), cf. NP Thr. *Bisa*, *Βισ-υρας*, m., compound with *Bisi-*, *Βιση-ζενις*, NP Ill. *Bisena*, Alb. NP *Bisa*, f., NL *Bisa*.

**Boko**, m., **Boka**, **Bok’a**, f., Bg. Duridanov rejects an approach to Cz. *Bok*, *Boček*, and suggests an approach to Thr. NPP *Costo-bocae*, *Κοστο-βωκοι*, *Sa-boces*, *Σα-βωκοι*. Cf. NFI, NL *Bacău*, Romania.

**Boto**, **Botó**, m., **Bota**, f., Bg. Duridanov assumes a relation with Rom. NL *Boteni*, *Botești*, further compared with Thr. NPP *Bottiaioi*, *Bottiaei*, NP *Βοτειρας* < \**Βοτας*, \**Βοτας*. Cf. Alb. NFI *Bota*. If this may prove true, then an approach to Rom. *bot* ‘a muzzle’, NP *Bot*, *Botu*, *Botea*, *Botescu* cannot be avoided. • This may be a linguistic interference, in which the archaic Thracian forms were remodelled under the influence of Rom. *bot*. See many such examples in the Lexicons A and B above.

**Brad**, Rom., Bg. Zaimov assumes a derivation from *O-brad* or *Bradi-slav*. Yet everything rather shows a simple derivation from Rom. *brad* ‘a fir-tree’, NP *Brad*, indeed of Thracian origin as accepted by all linguists now. • The name is frequent in Romanian as family name, with derivatives e.g. *Brădeanu*, *Brădescu* etc.

**Brakov**, Bg., Rom. **Bracău**. Cf. ND Thr. *Βραγγας*, NP Thr. *Βρεκως*. See Lexicons A, B and C for other forms with radical *bra-* in place-names. • Root *bra-* may have of course other origins as well, but we refer to only the archaic heritage of southeast Europe.

**Bukur**, Bg., S.-Cr., Rom. **Bucur**, cf. *a se bucura* ‘be glad’, Alb. *bukur* ‘beautiful, pretty’. (Grković 1986: 48). Beyond any doubt an archaic root, spread all over southeast Europe. The ultimate origin may be Pre-Indo-European.

**Buro**, Bg., **Burja**, S.-Cr., Rom. **Buru**. Cf. NP Thr. *Burus*, *Βουριος*, Ill. *Burnia*, radical *bur-*; this root is also well attested in Thracian (Grković 1986: 49).

**Buzo**, m., **Buza**, f. **Buzatov**, Bg.; S.-Cr. NP **Buzo**, m., Rom. **Buzatu**, **Buzea** (Rom. *buză*, Alb. *buzë*). Cf. NP Thr. *Βουζης*, *Βουζας*, *Βυζας*. NL *Byzantion* is reportedly derived from this personal name. Cf. NFI Rom. **Buzău**. Duridanov accepts the Thracian origin of all these forms, but reconstructs a basic meaning ‘he-goat’ < IE \**bhuǵo-*, unconfirmed in a larger comparative context; Romanian forms indicate a basic meaning ‘lip’, hence also ‘a limit’. The same origin is in NFI, NL **Buzău**.

**Capov**, Bg., Rom. **Țap**, **Țapu**, **Țapău**. Cf. Rom. **țap** ‘a he-goat’. Bulgarian forms reflect a borrowing from Romanian, but a direct borrowing directly from Thracian also is possible, if indeed there was a direct interference between the late Thracian speakers and the Slavic groups in expansion after the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. This is now the already largely accepted hypothesis of the Bulgarian schools of Thracian studies.

**Dada**, **Dado**, Bg. and *dada* ‘elder sister’, S.-Cr. **Dade**, dial. *dada* ‘mother’. Duridanov compares these forms with Thr. NP *Dada*, *Dadas*, well attested in Thracian personal naming. Cf. *daj-*, *did-*, *dod-*, *dud-* (below), also with clear Thracian parallels. As largely presented on another occasion (Paliga 1994 with further references) radical *dad-/did-/dod-/dud-*, well attested in Romanian, Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian personal names, also with clear Thracian precursors (see forms in Dečev), is closely related to *daină*, *doină*.

**Dajna**, **Dajno**, **Dojna**, **Dojno**, Bg. See under *Dajo*. Cf. Rom. *doină*, *daină*, NP *Doina* (Paliga 1994, and the previous entry).

**Dajo**, **Dae**, **Dajčo**, Bg.; **Daja**, **Dajko**, S.-Cr. Duridanov considers them related to NL Rom. **Daia**, **Dăești**, all of Thracian origin, cf. Thr. NP *Daus*, NPP *Daci*, *Dacisci*, Greek spelling *Δαιοι* (oldest spelling of the ethnic group of the *Daci*). See above under *Dada*, *Dade*.

**Dako**, Bg.; **Dako**, **Daka**, S.-Cr., **Dacu**, Rom. Duridanov considers this form as directly reflecting the ancient ethnic name NPP *Dacus*, *Daci*, *Δακοι* etc. ‘the Dacians’ (i.e. the northern branch of the Thracians, in north Danubian region). Cf. Alb. NFI *Daka*. This is another argument

that both *Dacus* and *Thrax*, *Thraex* have been continuously preserved until the modern and contemporary times; see also above, Lexicon A under *Trakana*. Further discussions on the Thracian root *dak-/dek-* in Paliga 1994. See also under *Geto*, *Geta* below.

**Dardan**, m., **Dardana**, f., Bg. From NPp Thr. *Δαρδανοί* pl, *Dardanos*, sg.; cf. NP III. *Dardana*, f., Alb. NFI *Dardha*, *dardhë* ‘a pear, a pear-tree’, from Thraco-Illyrian \**darda*.

**Deko**, m., **Deka**, f. Cf. NP Thr. *Dece-balus*, *Dece-neus*. Cf. *Dako* above.

**Dida**, f., **Dido**, **Didjo**, m., Bg. NP Rom. **Dida**, **Didu**. Cf. NP Thr. *Dida*, *Didas*, *Didis*, *Didila*, NP Alb. **Dido**, NFI **Didha**. The parallel forms in Romanian, Albanian and Bulgarian, on the one hand, and Thracian, on the other, cannot be ignored. The sequence *d + e/i* in Romanian may pose specific problems only if we analyse it in the light of the Latin elements, where the result would have been *dz > z*. If we assume a Thracian origin, then the sequence seems natural, cf. *Deva* in Lexicon C.

**Dilo**, m., **Dila**, f., Bg. Cf. NP Thr. *Διλλης*, *Διλι-ζελμης*, *Διλι-πορις*, Alb. NP *Dilo*, m., *Dilë*, f.

**Dio**, **Dijo**, m., NFI **Dieva**, NL **Diovo**, Bg. S-cr. NP **Dija**, f. Cf. NP Thr. *Dios*, *Deios*, *Dius*, explained by Duridanov from IE \**diwios* ‘referring to she sky, divine’ > Thr. \**div-* therefore with the fall of intervocalic *b/v* which is a specific Romanian evolution in the Latin elements, but preserved in NFI Alb. *Diva*. • Intervocalic *b/v* is regularly preserved in the Thracian elements of Romanian, so the suggested etymon does not seem plausible; I am inclined to refer again to the root \**DA-*, \**DE-*, \**DI-* as in *Daia*, *Dako*, *Daina* etc. (see above).

**Dito**, m., **Dita**, f., Bg. Cf. NP Thr. *Ditas*, *Dita* and Alb. NP *Dito*.

**Dodo**, m., **Doda**, **Dodina**, f., Bg. NP s. **Doda** (referring to a Romanian), Rom. NP **Doda**, **Dodu**, **Dodea**. Cf. Bg. *doda* ‘elder sister’, cf. Rom. *dodă*. Cf. Alb. NP *Dodë*, NFI *Doda*. (Duridanov). Cf. *Dada*, *Dajo*, *Dako*, *Dida*, *Dudo*.

**Dudo**, m., **Duda**, **Dudeva**, f., Bg. Cf. Rom. *Dudea*, *Dudu* and Thr. NP *Δουδης*, *Dudis*, Alb. NP *Duda*. Cf. *Dodu*.

**Duño**, **Duné**, m., **Duna**, **Duňa**, f., Bg. NP S.-Cr. **Dunja**. Cf. Thr. NP *Dunas*, *Dunis*, Alb. NFI *Duna* < IE \**dhen-* ‘to run; to flow’ (Duridanov).

**Duro**, **Durko**, **Durčo**, m., **Dura**, f., Bg., S.-Cr. NP **Dura**, f., **Durad**, m. Cf. Thr. NP. *ΔουραςΔουρα-ζερις*, *Durises*, *Durisses*, Alb. NP *Dura*. All seem related with (but not borrowed from) Lat. *durus* (Duridanov).

**Eto**, m., **Eta**, f., Bg. Cf. Thr. NP *Epta-*, e.g. *Epta/poris*, *Epta-kenthos*, also *Eti-centus*; cf. Alb. NFI *Eta*, NP *Jet*, m., *Jeta*, f. (Duridanov).

**Geko**, m., **Geka**, f. Cf. Thr. NP ending in *-gekos*, e.g. *Γυλι-γηκος*, m., Alb. NP *Gjek*, m.

**Gera**, **Geran**, Bg., Rom. **Gheară**, **Gheran** < *gheară*. There are many Thracian forms in *ger-* (Dečev 1957), see above in Lexicon A under *Germania*, *German*. It is probable that some Thracian roots continue with some modern and contemporary forms, but it is impossible to state whether ALL these forms may ultimately reflect Thr. *ger-*.

**Geto**, m., **Geta**, f., Bg. Cf. Thr. NP, NPp *ΓεταςΓετης* etc. and Alb. NP *Gjet*, NFI *Gjeta* (Duridanov). If this parallel is accepted, then all the three basic Thracian ethnonyms seem preserved until the contemporary times: *Thrax/Thraex*, *Dacus*, *Getas*. See under *Trakana* (Lexicon A) and *Dako* above.

**Gigo**, m., **Giga**, f. NR *Gigin*, *Gigina*, district of Burel, Bulgaria. Rom. NL *Ghighiu*, *Ghigoești* (see Lexicon C). Cf. Thr. NP *Γεργων*, *Γηγων*, and Alb. NFI *Gjiga* (Duridanov). The ultimate root may be Pre-IE \**G-G-* ‘great, big’.

**Giko**, m., **Gika**, f., Bg. Alb. NP *Gika*, *Gjikë*, NFI *Gjika*. Cf. Thr. NP *Γικην-τιηνος*, *Γεικαι-τιηνος* (Duridanov).

**Gilo**, m., **Gila**, f., Bg. Rom. NL *Ghilea*, *Ghilești* (< personal name). Cf. Thr. NP *Gil-*, *-geilos*, e.g. *Γιλ-πυρις*, *Βουρ-γειλος* (cf. yet NP Rom. *Burghete*, *Burghetea!*) cf. also *A-γιλλας*, Np III. *Γιλλος*, Alb. NP *Gjile*, f. (Duridanov).

**Gito**, m., **Gita**, f., Bg. Cf. Thr. NP Γίτις, f., Alb. NP *Gjitë*, NFI *Gjita* (Duridanov). See above under *Geta*, *Geto*.

**Gruia** (< *grui* 'a small hill') - Bg. **Gruja**, **Gruev**. Cf. NL Thr. *Gurbikon*. The Thracian root *gur-*, *gru-* may ultimately reflect Pre-IE \**K-R-/ \*G-R-* 'a hill, a mountain', with an impressive heritage all over southeast Europe and further in the Mediterranean basin.

**Gudŏ**, m., Bg., S.-Cr. **Gudan**. Cf. Thr. NP *Gudila*, *Gudilas*, probably a simple graphical variant of *Kutilas*, *Κουτίλας*, -ης < IE \**ghodh*, \**ghed-* 'to tie, to fix' (Duridanov).

**Jata**, f., Bg., also NFI *Jata*. Cf. Thr. NP *Αθυς*, *Αθης*, *Ατις*. NFI Cz. *Jateš* seems Pre-Slavic (Duridanov).

**Kačul(a)**, -ov, Bg., Rom. **Căciulă**, -escu derived from *căciulă* 'a fur-cap'. Cf. NP Thr. *Cutiula*, *Κοθηλας*; the ancient spellings, as often, with -*ti-* or -*θ-* must reflect the original sound -*č-*.

**Kodo**, m., **Koda**, f., Bg. Cf. Thr. NP *Κοδις*, *Κωδινος*, maybe a dialectal, Daco-Mysian variant of *Kotις*, *Koto* says Duridanov. Yet an approach to Rom. *coadă* 'a tail', radical *cod-*, e.g. NL *Codea*, *Codlea*. But this may simply be an etymological substitution as often in personal names, and not rarely in place-names too (see further discussions on this topic in the introductory part to the Lexicons A to C).

**Koto**, **Koté**, m., **Kota**, f., Bg.; S.-Cr. NFI **Koti**, Rom. **Coteni**, **Cotești**. Duridanov compares these forms with Thr. NP *Κοτις*, *Κοττις*, *Cotus* etc., Alb. NP **Kotë**; he seemingly ignores the possible derivation from Rom. *cot* 'an elbow', hence NP *Coteanu*, *Cotescu*, NL *Coteni* etc. See above under *Kodo*, *Koda*, and below under *Kuto*, which may ultimately support Duridanov's hypothesis. There may be, as often, a reconfiguration of these archaic forms by folk-etymology, and therefore such an explanation should not be rejected *de plano*.

**Kračun**, S.-Cr., Slv. Rom. **Crăciun**, obviously in relation with *crăciun* 'Christmas', also dialectally 'a piece of wood, a log'; closely related to Alb. **kërcú** 'a log, a piece of wood'. Romanian form was often explained from Lat. *creatio*, which is not satisfying etymologically or semantically. The basic meaning of the word must have been 'wood, piece of wood, a log', as in Albanian and dialectally in Romanian, therefore the forms must be of Thracian origin, a hypothesis with more and more supporters (thus in Mușu 1973: 50 sq., with a history of the problem; also Brâncuși 1983: 137). • The semantic parallel 'piece of wood' – 'Christmas' is also in Italian *ceppo*, and reflects the traditional creeds around the winter solstice (more in Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, chapter referring to fire creeds). This word of Thracian origin is spread on a large area in central, east and southeast Europe, directly from Thracian in Romanian, possibly also in Bulgarian and Serbian, via Romanian in Hungarian, Ukrainian and Russian.

**Kuto**, **Kutŏ**, m., **Kuta**, f., Bg., Alb. NFI **Kuta**, NL **Kuta** (north Albania). Compared by Duridanov with NP Thr. *Κουτοϋς*, *Cutius*, *Cutiula* etc. See above under *Koto*.

**Magul(ev)**, Bg., Rom. **Măgură**, **Măgurescu**, Alb. **magullë**. Cf. NL Thr. *Magaris*, near Serdica (today Sofia). The Bulgarian form rather reflect Albanian phonetism.

**Melko**, Bg., Rom. **Melcu**, **Melcea** (< *melc* 'a snail'). Cf. NP Thr. *Melgis*, *Melgidianus* and many other Thracian forms with root *mel-*. Possibly related to Rom. *mal* 'a river-side', Alb. *mal* 'a hill', Pre-IE \**M-L-* 'a hill, rock'. The snail was perhaps interpreted as a 'small, moving hill(ock)', and thus the relation 'hill, hillock' – 'snail' proves its archaic character.

**Moga**, **Mogoš**, Bg., **Moga**, S.-Cr., Rom. NP, **Moga**, **Mogoș**, **Mogoșescu**. Compared by Duridanov with NP Thr. *Mogita*, NP Celtic *Mogitu-maros*; he equally rejects the approach to Sl. *mogę*, root *mog-* 'can, be able to'. His hypothesis is supported by the probable parallel form *Muga*, below.

**Mošte**, **Mošto**, Bg., Rom. **Moș(u)**, **Moștea** < *moș* 'an old man'; the feminine *moașă* has developed the particular meaning 'midwife' < 'old woman'. There are numerous Thracian

forms with root *mos-*, *mus-* e.g. Npp *Moesi*, NR *Mossynos*, NP *Μουσις*; it is difficult to assume that all these forms have the same origin and meaning, but most of them must belong here. Cf. *Muša*, *Mușea*, below. The ultimate origin may be Pre-IE \**M-S-* (1) ‘to curve, to bend, to bow’, and/or also \**M-S-* (2) ‘to shine, bright’. It is not clear whether the parallel meanings ‘to bend, to curve’ and ‘to shine’ may be archaically related. More on this topic in Paliga 1989 c and the preceding volume *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*).

**Muga**, Bg., Rom. **Muga** (cf. *mugur* ‘a blossom’). There are numerous Thracian forms with root *muk-*, *mug-*, recently re-analysed from the perspective of the Thracian heritage in Romanian by Stelian Dumistrăcel (*Anuarul Institutului de Istorie și Arheologie “A.D. Xenopol”*, Iași, 25, 1/1988: 391-408). Cf. *Moga*, supra.

**Muša**, Bg., Rom. **Mușă**, **Mușea**, **Mușu** (cf. *mușat* ‘beautiful’, *mușețel*). The basic, archaic meaning of Romanian root *muș-* seemingly was ‘beautiful’. The relation with *moș* ‘an old man’ is not clear, unless we assume an archaic Pre-Indo-European origin, and a possible relation ‘to bend, curbe’ – ‘to shine, bright’, which is confirmed by recent research: light is composed of CURVED components! See also under *Moște* above.

**Neno**, **Nenko**, **Nena**, **Nenka**, Bg., S.-Cr. Also **Nono**, **Nonko**, **Nona**, Rom. **Nanu**, **Nancă**, **Nenea**, **Nenescu** etc. Compared by Duridanov with NP Thr. *Νηνας*, *Nonnus*, *Nonna*, Ill. *Nenavava*. Further discussions about this root in Paliga 1996, chapter dedicated to social and family relations. • The expected phonetic treatment in Romanian would be with a closed vowel in the sequence vowel+n, but there are also exceptions, this case too. For sure, some place- and personal names follow other rules of phonetic evolution, presumably because they persisted as such over a longer period of time.

**Pato**, **Paťo**, Bg. Compared by Duridanov with NL Cr. *Patkovac* and NL Rom. *Pățești* (< NP *Pățescu*), then with Thr. NP *Πατας*, *Πατης*, NP Ill. *Patulus*.

**Safta**, f.; family-name *Săftoiu*, Rom. Must be related to NL *Seftovite dăbe* in *Lexicon A*, p. 31.

**Strugo**, Bg., Rom. **Strug**, **Strugaru**; cf. *strugure* ‘a grape’. Seem closely related to NFI *Struga*, see *Lexicon A*. Beyond any doubt, an archaic Thracian root well preserved until modern times.

**Toko**, **Toké**, m., **Toka**, f., Bg.; **Toko**, S.-Cr. Compared by Duridanov with Thr. NP *Τοκος*, *Τοκος* and personal names ending in *-τοκης*, *-τοκος*.

**Tuťo**, m., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with NL Cr. *Tutić*, S. *Tutin* then Thr. NP *Tutius*, *Τουτενης*, *Τουτα*, Ill. *Tutia*.

**Vătaf**, **Vato**, **Văto**, Bg., **Vataš**, **Vatavala**, S.-Cr., Rom. **Vătafu**, **Vătavu**. Cf. *vătaf*. See above in our study *Herrschaft* under *vătaf*. Grković (1983: 88-89), referring to S.-Cr. form, considers it Thracio-Illyrian”.

**Vezo**, **Vezenko**, m., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with NFI Alb. *Veza*, *Vegja* and NP Thr. *Ουεζινας* (\**Vezinas*) < IE \**weg* ‘vigorous, robust’.

**Zajko**, m., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with NL Rom. *Zăicești* (< NP *Zaicu*) and Thr. NP *Zaika*, *Zaike-δενθης*, *Zaece-thures*.

**Zané**, **Zano**, m., **Zana**, f., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with Thr. NP *Zanus*, *Zania*, *Αυλοζανης*, *Αυλουζανις*, Ill. *Zanatis*, Alb. *Zana*, NFI *Zana* < IE *gēn-* ‘to give birth to’. Other arguments and discussions about the relationship between these forms and Rom. *zână* ‘a fairy’, *Sân-ziene* ‘holy fairies’ in Paliga (1989 b, with further references). Cf. *Zino*, *Zina*, below.

**Zino**, m., **Zina**, f., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with Alb. NP *Zina*, f., NFI *Zina* and Thracian NP *Ziva*, *Ζεινης*, *Zines* etc. Presumably related to *Zane*, *Zano* above.

**Zura**, f., Bg. Compared by Duridanov with Alb. NP *Zura*, NFI *Zura* and Thr. NP *Zura*, m., *Ζουρης*, *Ζουρις*, *Ζουρο-*.

## Remarks on the Thracian, Romanian and Slavic phonetic changes

At the end of this volume, which analyses various linguistic phenomena in Central-Southeast Europe, predominantly in Romanian and the neighbouring area, it is perhaps the high time to resume our considerations on a much analysed topic, unfortunately still incoherent, with too often errors, many of them with a large circulation. Some of hypotheses have deeply influenced linguistic analyses, and misguided numerous studies in the field.

We remind that most studies presented in this and preceding volume (Paliga 1999) refer to the archaic heritage in Romanian and the neighbouring Slavic languages, mainly in Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, also in Hungarian and other Slavic idioms: Czech, Slovak, Polish and Russian. Our main effort is to reconstruct a plausible tableau of the social, linguistic and political realities from the end of “classical” antiquity to approximately 10th century A.D., those famous “dark ages”.

### Popular Latin

Popular Latin is sometimes called Vulgar Latin (a term which may be misleading, and therefore we avoid it), or Colloquial Latin (maybe the best in this context, but less extended in the linguistic literature from unknown reasons). It is notable, first of all, that *Romania Orientalis* (East Romance) sometimes had peculiar phonetic evolutions. This phenomenon is common in Romanian, Albanian (in the case of the numerous Latin elements of Albanian) and, to a less extent, Dalmatian (notably in closed syllables). A brief view on East Romance vocalism is useful:

#### Classical Latin, Colloquial (“Popular”) Latin and East Romance Vocalism

Classical	$\check{a}$	$\bar{a}$	$\check{e}$	$\bar{e}$	$i$	$\bar{i}$	$\check{o}$	$\bar{o}$	$u$	$\check{u}$
Colloquial										
	/									
	a		e	e	i	i	o	o	u	u
East Romance										
	a		e	e	i	i	o	o	u	u

We should stress that these evolutions, reconstructed by comparing the situation in post-classical inscriptions and in the Romance languages, also in Albanian, lead to conclusions in what concerns the situation of the Latin elements in Proto-Romanian, NOT in the case of the indigenous (Thracian) elements of Romanian as too many linguists assumed without a corresponding analysis of data. As we shall show below, summing up the data presented in this volume and on other occasions (see also our previous volume *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*), in many instances the phonetic evolution of the Thracian elements in Proto-Romanian, later in Romanian, follows completely different rules, NOT ALWAYS the same rules as in the case of the Latin elements. There are numerous examples proving this assertion, and we shall discuss them below.

## Consonantism

Some tendencies already manifested in Classical Latin continued their evolution and ultimately led to a radical change of the initial system. The most important features are the following:

- Consonant *h* must have had a feeble pronunciation already in classical times, as clearly proved by post-classical inscriptions like *abeo* = *habeo*; *anc* = *hanc*; *onorem* = *honorem* etc. The contrary case is the use of *h* where it should not have been, e.g. *heius* = *eius*; *hossa* = *ossa*, the peremptory proof that, in those time already, the speakers lost the sense of the initial phonetic system.

- Consonants *c* (*k*) and *g* have a similar behaviour, also in positions where palatalisation later occurred. Yet *g* has a peculiar evolution in intervocalic position, and the non-regular result was that it was sometimes lost, e.g. *ego* > Rom., Port. *eu* (in Romanian, pronounced *yeu*).

- There was a tendency to eliminate the labial component in *qu*, therefore the real pronunciation became *ecus* not *equus* (*ek<sup>w</sup>u-us*). On the other hand, Romanian and Sardinian labialised the groups *qu* and *gu*, therefore these languages stressed the labial component, and nulling the velar component: *aqua* > Rom. *apă*, Sard. *abba*; *lingua* > Rom. *limbă*, Logudorese *limba*.

- *x* (*ks*) had the tendency to simplify to *ss* (*s*) in the first century A.D., yet sometimes the classical pronunciation was preserved. Romanian and the Latin elements in Albanian reflect these two tendencies: *coxa* > Rom. *coapsă*, Alb. *kofshë*, but also *dixit* > *dissit* > Rom. *zise* ‘(he/she) said’; *maxilla* > *massilla* > Rom. *măsea* ‘a tooth’.

- A particular situation refer to *b* and *v*. In postclassical Latin both sounds had the tendency to be pronounced similarly disregarding the original sound, or – in other words – the initial opposition was lost in favour of a positional opposition: a bi-labial ( $\beta$ ) pronunciation in initial position (as in modern Spanish), and *b* in internal position. Betacism (*v* pronounced as *b*) is indeed frequent in post-classical inscriptions, and also confirmed by evolutions in the Romance languages: *verbex* = *vervex*, *berbex* > Rom. *berbece*, Fr. *brébis*; *corvus* and *\*corbus* > Rom. *corb*, Fr. *corbeau*, but It. *corvo*.

A peculiar situation refers to **intervocalic *b/v***. The post-classical tendency was to lose them in this position: *avi-* > *au-* (*aw-*) as in *avica* > *auca*; *avicellus* > *aucellus*; *-avit* > *-aut* etc. This oscillating pronunciation is reflected in the treatment of borrowings from Germanic. Germanic *w* (bi-labial) was initially equalled to *v*, but in post-classical times it was heard as *gu*, as in *werra* > It. *guerra*, Fr. *guerre* ‘a war’.

**The situation of intervocalic *b/v* is crucial** in explaining some particular, and not at all uniform, tendencies in East Romance, particularly in Proto-Romanian. Obviously some unorganised tendencies of phonetic evolution are reflected in modern Romanian too. Therefore Latin *uber* ‘udder’ is reflected in Rom. *uger* (against the expected *\*uăř*), and *habeo* (already pronounced *\*abeo*) preserves intervocalic *b/v*: *avem*, *aveți* ‘we, you have’, but (*ei*) *au* ‘they have’; equally intervocalic *b/v* was lost in the other forms of *a aveā* ‘to have’: *am*, *ai* ‘I, you have’, whereas (*el*, *ea*) *are* is not uniquely explainable from Latin, so a substratum (Thracian) influence may be postulated as in other cases: some forms of *a fi* ‘to be’, the personal pronouns and various other oblique forms of the Romanian flexion; and of course the important substratum (Thracian) influence in the Romanian vocabulary as shown in other chapters of this book and elsewhere in our studies.

In **MUST BE STRESSED** that, in opposition to the Latin elements, the indigenous (Thracian) elements of Romanian **DO NOT LOSE INTERVOCALIC B/V** as erroneously postulated (without any proof!) by numerous linguists. There is no such example, as shown in this book, and on another occasions (see particularly our volume *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*). This assumption was based on the simplistic formula “all the Thracian elements of Romanian must follow the same phonetic rules as the Latin elements”. The phonetic inventory of Thracian was indeed very different from (popular) Latin, and there is no reason to doubt that the different phonetic evolutions reflected basic differences between the two languages: (popular, colloquial) Latin *v.* Thracian; there is no need to add the epithet ‘colloquial’ for Thracian, as this idiom was uniquely colloquial. The very few supposed Thracian documents cannot change this situation, so the Thracian phonetic inventory must be deduced from analysing the ancient glosses and the modern forms in Romanian, Albanian and South Slavic.

## **Thracian and Illyrian**

Romanisation of the former Illyrian territory must have been deep and rapid so, beginning with the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D., Illyrian and the Illyrians are no longer attested as either languages or ethnic group respectively: Illyria became a geographical, not a linguistic or ethnic term. The total absence of any reference to either Illyrian or Illyrians cannot lead to another conclusion, and we have no reason to doubt the reality of these documents.

In change Thracian continued to be spoken for some time. For how long? The more and more accepted theory of the last decades, much supported especially by the Bulgarian linguists, and ultimately accepted by more and more Romanian specialists, is that Thracian still was a vivid idiom when the Slavs began their expansion, i.e. the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. We may surmise that Thracian continued to be spoken for at least some time later, until at least the 7<sup>th</sup> century. This means that the substratum of Bulgarian is not uniquely Romance, as largely accepted for many years, but a double Romance-Thracian substratum. The situation could not be very different in the north Danubian region as numerous groups of the so-called *Daci Liberi* ‘free Dacians’ were attested at least until the 4<sup>th</sup> century A.D. And the numerous data offered by Romanian, Albanian and other neighbouring languages show that the gradual integration of the indigenous Thracian elements into Romanian must have lasted several centuries. It is indeed difficult to advance a possible time interval when Thracian became a totally extinct language. It still was a vivid tongue in the 6<sup>th</sup>-7<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D., we may surmise that it could be still spoken in the isolated, not directly Romanised areas in the Carpathians. It may not be excluded a priori the hypothesis that Thracian might have been still spoken when the Magyars (the Hungarians) settled in Pannonia in the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D. Some phonetic details in Romanian, where only the Latin elements witness particular evolutions quite late in Mid-Middle Ages may show that the complete Romanisation of the last remnants of the indigenous Thracian population was accomplished after the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D., but not later than the beginning of the 14<sup>th</sup> century when the Romanians began their political, administrative and economic organisation specific to the Mediaeval society.

Unlike Latin, Thracian and Illyrian may be analysed mainly by comparing (1) the Ancient Thracian and Illyrian names (divinities, personal names, place-names etc.) as spelled by the Greek and Latin authors, therefore with a simplified phonetic equivalent; we should not forget that phonemes like *č, dz, š, ts, ž*, the neutral vowel *ə* etc. could not be normally spelled by the Greeks and Latins, so their spellings may be almost always considered approximative, not accurate; (2) indigenous Thracian, also Illyrian, elements preserved mainly in Romanian,

Albanian and Bulgarian, but also in other South Slavic languages and Modern Greek. The existence of an identical or similar neutral sound ( $\partial$ ) in Romanian, Albanian and Bulgarian cannot be mere hazard; and the postulated phonemes  $\check{c}$ ,  $dz$ ,  $\check{s}$ ,  $ts$ ,  $\check{z}$  are specific to any satem idiom.

It is indeed difficult to clearly answer the question whether some Thracian elements in Bulgarian reflect a Proto-Romanian (or Late Latin) intermediary, or rather – in some cases at least – a direct borrowing. A definite answer to this topic is directly connected to a possible consensus regarding the approximate period when we consider Thracian an extinct language. As shown above, and against the previous hypothesis, this date may be now accepted as quite late, maybe as late as the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D. as the uppermost acceptable limit. Anyway, we may now accept the basic idea that Thracian was still spoken at the arrival of the first Slavic groups around mid-sixth century A.D., and was probably spoken some time after, until gradually assimilated by the Romanised groups.

On the other hand, I. I. Russu (1969) brought solid arguments supporting the idea that Thracian and Illyrian must have been closely related as suggested by the onomastic material analysed by Russu. For sure, Illyrian forms could not be directly borrowed in South Slavic as Illyrian was an extinct language in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. There are some examples, spread mainly in Slovene and partially in the Serbo-Croatian area, which also support Russu's theory regarding the close relationship between Thracian and Illyrian: the striking similarities between some Romanian and Slovene forms cannot be the result of hazard or a possible Thracian/Proto-Romanian influence in Slovene as this cannot be logically or scientifically documented. Nevertheless we cannot exclude the basic hypothesis that a very early Proto-Romanian–Proto-Slovene contact may have taken place after the Slavic expansion, but before the settlement of the Hungarians in Pannonia, when there was a *Romance continuum* from the Black Sea to the Atlantic Ocean. This is a possibility. Basically we may now accept the hypothesis that the remarkable resemblances between the archaic (Pre-Slavic) heritage of Slovene and the Pre-Romance heritage of Romanian reflect rather independent, but of course more or less related, evolutions. If Thracian and Illyrian were closely related and, on the other hand, Proto-Romanian and Proto-Dalmatian were the basic intermediaries between Late Latin and South Slavic, then such resemblances cannot be surprising.

### **A Tentative Reconstruction of the Thracian Phonetic Inventory**

Reichenkron (1966), Russu (1967, 1981) and the so-called Bulgarian School of Thracology, represented, among many others, by Georgiev (1960, 1964, and on other occasions quoted in this volume), also followed by the Romanian linguist Poghirc (1969) represent three main trends in reconstructing the Thracian phonetic inventory, and its evolution to modern forms. Nevertheless not all these tendencies have the same persuasive force and, consequently, the same level of being accepted or rejected. In my view the tentative reconstruction attempted by the Bulgarian colleagues is closest to that reality we are trying to imagine as plausible, at linguistic or social level. And it may offer a good starting point in a discussion regarding the Thracian world and the Thracian language. Ultimately other Romanian linguists, few as they are, have later adopted the general view of the Bulgarian School of Thracian studies, e.g. Brâncuș (1983, 1991), with more or less important corrections. The authors of these pages also has his corrections and/or additions.

## Vocalism

A reasonable reconstruction of Thracian vocalism may be accomplished by (1) carefully analysing and comparing the Thracian naming (personal and place-naming), just approximately spelled by various writers of the Greek and Latin antiquity, but precious anyway; and (2) by analysing and comparing various archaic forms preserved mainly in Romanian and Albanian, but also in other southeast European languages: South Slavic and Modern Greek. Ultimately this is the generally adopted method by many specialists, with some remarkable successes, and this book cannot be any exception.

Against the attempts due to Georgiev (1960, 1964), followed by Poghirc as well, we may note the relatively recent attempt due to Dimitrov (1994), who aims at reconstructing a “Paleo-Balkanic vocalism”. It is beyond our purpose to review this book in detail; some observations may be yet useful.

- It is most probable that Thracian had a neutral vowel similar or identical to Romanian *ă*, Albanian *ë* or Bulgarian *ѐ*, in fact three graphic variations of the same similar/identical sound. This was long noted by Poghirc (in a brief study published in 1960, *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, p. 279 ff.) by comparing some Thracian names recorded in Greek authors, with alternating *ε* and *η* in some specific forms. Poghirc’s conclusion was that the Greek authors wished to note a phoneme absent in Greek, which must be true for many other specific Thracian phonemes. Poghirc later repeated this observation (1969: 320). It is normal to assume that the preservation of this sound in Romanian, Albanian and Bulgarian cannot be the result of mere hazard. There is no decisive argument to assert that Thracian would have had two neutral vowels: beside the already named *ă/ë/ѐ* another neutral sound similar to Romanian *î/â*, absent in Albanian and Bulgarian (which cannot be a decisive argument in itself), but similar to Polish *y* or Russian *ы*; this sound was specific to Old Church Slavonic, and – beyond any doubt – was inherited from Pre-Expansion Slavic (a term preferable to “Common Slavic”). In the Romance area, Romanian *î/â* is similar to Portuguese *e* in unstressed position, which may be labelled a parallel, but independent innovation. In what refers to Romanian, Albanian and Bulgarian, we may surmise with fair accuracy that the specific phoneme Romanian *ă*, Albanian *ë* and Bulgarian *ѐ* preserves an archaic pattern, whereas *î/â* is an innovation in Romanian only; future research may also confirm the alternative that both neutral vowels were specific to Thracian, and Romanian only has preserved both, while Albanian and Bulgarian have preserved only one.

- An interesting situation was seemingly represented by *ā* and *ǎ* respectively. There are some clear examples, which show that *ā* later, in Post-Classical times, turned to first *ô* then *u* or *o* (seemingly dialectal realisations of the same phonetic evolution) in only the northern branch of the large Thracian speaking area, sometimes labelled Daco-Mysian. Romanian *Dunăre* and *Mureș*, from Thracian *\*Dān-ar-* and *\*Mār-iș* respectively, reflect this peculiar evolution, perhaps the same as in Rom. *a mura* ‘to pickle’ (to preserve vegetables in salted water over winter). The same evolution may be identified in *mumă* ‘mother’, now in only mythological terms like *Muma Pădurii* lit. ‘Forest’s Mother’, traditionally an ugly, old woman of evil character. Rom. *mumă* opposes to *mamă*, of Latin origin, and the dialectal form *maică* of Slavic origin. The mountain-name *Codru Moma*, lit. ‘the Forest [called] Muma’ reflects the dialectal evolution of the original *ā* to *o* via *ô*. This phonetic phenomenon is not identifiable in the southern Thracian area (e.g. NFI *Marica*, in Bulgaria, etymologically related to *Mureș*), but is seemingly present in Albanian. This detail supports the hypothesis, gradually adopted by more and more linguists (Georgiev, Bonfante, Russu), that modern Albanian must have had a decisive northern Thracian influence, which ultimately contoured its later form. See other discussions in Lexicon A, supra.

Other details regarding Thracian vocalism are difficult to reconstruct. It is not the purpose of this study to review all the hypotheses suggested over time. Yet we may suggest other possible or probable influences of the substratum upon Romanian, Albanian and, directly or not, Bulgarian, Serbian, to a less extent in Slovene or Croatian, though some parallel evolutions in Romanian and Slovene would indicate a certain Thracian/Proto-Romanian influence on Proto-Slovene. We limit ourselves to mention the close situation of a to *ǎ*, and *o* to *u* respectively in unstressed position (a feature common to Romanian and Albanian); also the alternation *a/e* and diphthongation of *e/ea* and *o/oa* in certain anticipative situations, especially in the case of the feminine nouns, and 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular of verbs: *fată*, pl. *fete* ‘girl/girls’, *masă*, pl. *mese* ‘table/tables’, etc; *crede* ‘[he, she] thinks, believes’/ *să creadă*, conjunctive; *alege/ să aleagă* ‘[he, she] chooses/ subjunctive’, etc. Dialectally (Transylvania), the opposition *o/oa* is open *o*/ close *o*.

Finally, it seems that Eric P. Hamp’s brief observation in 1973 (Thracian had a laryngeal) seems proved by comparatively analysing the documents of the antiquity, on the one hand, and the situation of the indigenous elements in Romanian as compared to Albanian and Bulgarian. If this is accepted by the majority of the linguists, then major changes in our view regarding the complex ethno-linguistic changes between the fourth and tenth centuries A.D. are expected. We shall resume the problem of the Thracian laryngeal and its probable persistence in Proto-Romanian in a special study, now in preparation.

## Consonantism

The difficulties in accurately reconstructing the Thracian, then Proto-Romanian, consonantism are similar to those encountered in the case of vocalism. The main difficulty again is that ancient Greek and Latin documents cannot record specific phonemes like *č*, *ğ*, *š*, *ž*, possibly also other specific phonemes like *ts* (Romanian *ț*), *dz* etc. It seems probable that Romanian, like Albanian, inherited all/some of these phonemes from the Thracian substratum, and each of the two languages later innovated more or less independently. It is true that other Romance language, particularly Italian, share some common features with Romanian in the field of both vocalism and consonantism. Nevertheless similar results do not have identical explanations, as Poghirc (1969: 320 ff.) keenly noted.

• The situation of Romanian *h* has often raised questions regarding its archaic (indigenous) v. newer, borrowed (from Slavic) character. It is true that phoneme *h* is present in many words of Slavic origin in Romanian, but it is also true that it is present in some words of clear archaic origin. Poghirc (loc. cit.) noted that ancient place-name *Carsium* resulted in Romanian *Hîrșova*, with a Slavic suffix. It is obvious that Rom. *Hîrșova* clearly reflects the ancient form *Carsium* with some specific, not entirely clear phonetic changes like ancient (Thracian, but really correctly spelled?) *c* (*k*) > *h*. Poghirc basically rejects the hypothesis that Romanian borrowed the phoneme *h* from Slavic, stating that generally languages do not borrow sounds, but words, and make the appropriate phonetic changes according to their native aptitudes. Equally, Romanian *h* is also present in some forms of clear archaic origin: Rom. *hămesit* ‘hungry’ – Alb. *hamës*, *hututui* – *hutoj*, *lehăi* – *leh* etc. Add that, at dialectal level, initial *a* is often preceded by a non-etymological *h*-, presumably the remnant of the former laryngeal, which also occurred in initial position.

All in all, we may surmise that Romanian and Albanian *h* often reflect an archaic, original phoneme, and is not necessary to postulate a Slavic influence. As noted above, Slavic *h* (spelled *х* in Old Church Slavonic texts, and *x* in modern Cyrillic) is reflected as *f* or *h* in

Romanian: *f* in oldest borrowings like Rom. *praf* ‘dust’, and *h* in newer borrowings from Serbian or Bulgarian.

• **Intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l*.** There is a long debate on the situation of intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* in the Latin elements of Romanian against the indigenous (Thracian) and Slavic elements. The traditional view was that the situation of these phonemes should be the same in both the Latin and Thracian elements, i.e. they should have been lost in both situations. In fact there are complex realities, which cannot be covered by this simplistic approach to a difficult topic.

On the one hand the tendency of loosing the opposition *b/v* was manifest in Post-Classical Latin as proved by inscriptions. Obviously they recorded a linguistic reality in which the opposition *b/v* was gradually replaced by a syntactic opposition disregarding the etymological origin. This oscillation is manifest all over *Romania*, e.g. Rom. *bătrîn* < *veteranus*, otherwise Romanian loses intervocalic *b/v* in most, yet not all, cases, e.g. *cal* < *caballus*, but preserves intervocalic *b/v* (with the shift *v/b*) in some forms of the verb *a avea* ‘to have’ < *habeo*, *habere*, beginning with the infinitive, and also *avem*, *aveți* ‘we have, you have’, but [ei, ele] *au* ‘they have’. In principle we may assume that a certain substratum influence may be discernible in the verb *a avea* ‘to have’, *a fi* ‘to be’, various oblique forms of the pronouns and, of course, vocabulary. In the case of intervocalic *l* in the Latin elements of Romanian, the situation seems quite clear: it is regularly lost if feeble (*l*), and preserved if strong (*ll*). The form *cal* reflects the fall of intervocalic *b* and preservation of strong *ll*. In *miere* ‘honey’ < *melis*, Ac. *melem* the evolution is normal.

What happens with these sounds in the indigenous Thracian elements. Against the traditional view, it is now clear that intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* are REGULARLY PRESERVED disregarding their position in the word:

• *abur* ‘vapours’ – Alb. *avull* ‘id.’ (intervocalic *b*); now largely accepted as a clear Thracian elements of Romanian.

• NL *Deva*, Romania (Thr. *dava*, *deva* ‘a township, a fortress’, one of the ‘standard’ Thracian terms for ‘township’) – NL Bulgaria *Plovdiv*, ancient *Pulpu-deva*, calque after Greek *Philipo-polis*, where Thr. *deva* reflects Greek *polis*; traditionally, NL *Deva* was considered of unknown origin or reflecting Sl. *děva* ‘a girl’, impossible from phonetic and extra-linguistic reasons.

• NFI Romania *Ibru* – *Ibăr*, Bulgaria – *Ibar*, Serbia where the sequence *br* is preserved not turned to *ur* as in the Latin elements.

• *căciulă* ‘a cap’ – Alb. *kësulë* (intervocalic *l*); the relation Rom. *ci* (č) – Alb. *s* has not been satisfactorily explained, just like many other phonetic situations.

Such examples may continue, for which see the Lexicons A, B and C, also Lexicon D with some brief observations regarding the preservation of some archaic place-names in Czech and Slovak. Intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* are also present in many words of unknown origin, a standard way of assuming their possible Thracian origin, e.g. a *šovăi* ‘to hesitate’ (Reichenkron 1966 considers it indigenous Thracian, but indeed Reichenkron’s reconstructions are often debatable, so this, otherwise good, observation passed unnoticed).

We may thus surmise that intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l* had a different evolution in the Latin, against the Thracian, elements of Romanian. Some examples are now clear, though specific details of special evolution remain unexplained. Future research will clarify these issues too. It should be remembered that the Thracian elements of Romanian were gradually integrated into East Romance (Proto-Romanian) over centuries, beginning with the conventional year 106, the conquest of Dacia, until we may expect the total extinction of the last Thracian speakers; this may be dated in the 7<sup>th</sup> century at the earliest, if not even later. In any case, the first Slavic

groups in expansion towards south surely met the Post-Classical Thracian speakers. The topic is difficult, complex and is directly related to the general situation of the so-called *Barbaricum* in Post-Classical times; and is also related to the long debated problem of the Slavic ethnogenesis, in which some northern Thracian groups may have played their role, perhaps a decisive role.

- Thracian sequence *\*sr-* followed by a vowel turns to *str-*; this is a specific evolution of Thracian, e.g. IE *\*sreu-* ‘to flow; a river’, NFI *Strymon*, now *Struma* in Bulgaria; the same evolution in NFI *Strei*, *Stremț* in Romania; the parallel root *\*ser-*, *\*sir-* is reflected in NFI *Siret*, *Siriu* in Romania, without the change *\*sr+* vowel > *\*str-*; see also a *șiroi* ‘to flow’, *șiroi* ‘a water course’ etc.

- Vowels *e* and *i* palatalise the preceding consonant under certain circumstances; this is a phonetic phenomenon specific to the satem area. The main problem with reconstructing the Thracian realities is directly connected to the impossibility to spell such specific sounds in Greek or Latin. A plausible solution is to compare the ancient forms with their modern parallels in Romanian, Albanian or Bulgarian, also in other ‘Balkanic’ languages. Thus the sequence IE *\*k<sup>w</sup>-e/i-* > Thr. *č*, and IE *\*g<sup>w</sup>-e/i-* > *dž* (*ǰ*), as in IE *\*k<sup>w</sup>o-* > Thr. *č*, probably in the goddess name spelled *Kottys*, real pronunciation *\*Čot-*, as in Rom. *ciot* ‘a (prominent, cut) piece of wood’, also *ciut* (about animals:) ‘hornless’, *ciută* ‘a (small) deer’ (i.e. hornless), *ciung* ‘one-armed’ (i.e. ‘with one arm cut off’), all reflecting – I assume – the same archaic root, with the basic meaning ‘to cut (off) wood’, then ‘to cut (off)’ in general.

- Thracian seemingly had a series of aspirated consonants, which do not palatalise before *e/i* (unlike their non-aspirated pairs), e.g. NM, NL, ND (South Slavic) *German*, but S.-Cr. *Đerman*, which is a later, third palatisation), related to NP Romanian *Gherman*. Seemingly related is also Rom. *gheară* ‘a claw’.

- It is not clear whether Thracian had apical consonants like Albanian *th* (*θ*) and *dh* (*δ*). Albanian may have developed them by internal evolution; anyway they are absent in Romanian and Bulgarian, so it may be surmised that they reflect an Albanian innovation. They may have yet existed at dialectal level in Thracian.

### Evolution of Indo-European *l, r, m, n*

PIE	Thracian	Slavic	Lithuanian	Latin	Greek
<i>r</i>	<i>ur</i>	<i>ir, ur</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>or</i>	<i>αρ, ρα</i>
<i>l</i>	<i>ul</i>	<i>il, ul</i>	<i>il</i>	<i>ol, ul</i>	<i>αλ, λα</i>
<i>m</i>	<i>um</i>	<i>ę</i>	<i>im</i>	<i>em</i>	<i>αλ, λα</i>
<i>n</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>in</i>	<i>en</i>	<i>αλ, λα</i>

It may be observed that sonants generally have a symmetrical evolution. Thracian, Baltic and Slavic features largely reflect this evolution in the satem area. This reconstruction is based on some clear data, e.g. IE *\*bhr-* ‘to carry, to bear’ > Rom. *burtă* ‘belly; stomach’ (initially seemingly ‘a pregnant woman’s belly’), related to German *Ge-burt* ‘birth’, with a similar evolution in Germanic as well.

### A General Tableau

Thracian had a phonetic inventory specific to the satem area. It may be now reconstructed with fair approximation, with many uncertain points and many lacking details. A probable scheme is the following:

<i>b</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>gh</i>	<i>ǵ</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>ž</i>	<i>dz</i>
<i>p</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>kh</i>	<i>č</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>š</i>	<i>ts (t)</i>

*H* (laryngeal) > *f, h, zero*; *f, h, zero*, also seemingly *th* and *dh* in Albanian.

Thracian therefore had a phonetic inventory similar to Baltic, sometimes with Slavic, which is normal for the satem continuous bloc from the Adriatic and Aegean to the Baltic and further east to India. Some phonetic changes seem similar to Germanic, as the change  $\bar{a} > \hat{o} > o/u$ , and also IE \**r* > *ur*.

This brief summary shows why, in some instances, an important number of indigenous Thracian forms in Romanian seemed Slavic; now the linguistic comparative methods are more refined than a century ago, or than several decades ago, and such errors may be identified and corrected. The case of Rom. *sută* may be a good example: for more than a century it seemed a Slavic element in Romanian, whereas a more attentive linguistic analysis proves the contrary: it is either a Thracian or a Proto-Romanian elements in Pre-Expansion Slavic.

### The Slavic Phonetic Inventory

We cannot insist on the complex problems connected to the Slavic phonetic evolutions from Indo-European. Some basic elements were mentioned when relevant to our discourse. It is yet important to note that, at the historical horizon of the 5<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> centuries A.D., when the Slavs began their movement towards south, later to west and east, there were Late Colloquial Latin/Proto-Romanian and still Thracian speakers; and Dalmatian speakers along the Adriatic coast. We may be sure that Illyrian was not spoken later the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D.

The main features of Slavic vocalism referred to:

- Vowels *o* and *u* are pronounced rounded, labialised;
- Vowel *ě* was probably pronounced as diphthong *ea* or *ja*;
- There were two nasal vowels, *ę* and *ǫ*;
- There was no clear distinction between long and short vowels as in Latin, Greek and, we may be sure now, in Thracian as well. There still were quantitative differences leading to qualitative differences.

- Preiotation (an additional weakening of both anterior and posterior vowels) led to false diphthongs: *ja, je, ju, ję, jq*. Vowels *y (bi)* and *ɷ* do not weaken.

Thracian and Slavic, as two neighbouring satem groups, at a given moment with a quite strong Thracian/Proto-Romanian influence on Proto-Slavic, had some common points, also shared by Baltic and, at a larger scale, by the vast satem Indo-European group. Both Thracian and Slavic had neutral vowels, but with different pronunciation; and both languages had a series of similar, yet not identical, palatal and fricative consonants. These similarities often led linguists to over-estimating the Slavic influence upon Romanian; in many instances, these are indigenous, Thracian elements, and in other instances they even are Thracian elements into Slavic. Future research will enlarge this view, and eventually correct our (and others') errors.

### Interferences between Proto-Romanian, Thracian and Slavic

The continuous, for some centuries reciprocal influence of the indigenous Thracian

and Romance elements, Proto-Romanian must have had its basic contours in the 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D., when the Slavs began their expansion. Unlike former views, there is no analysable Slavic influence on (Proto-) Romanian before the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D. at the earliest; more probable, earliest Slavic influence on Romanian began in the 12<sup>th</sup> century. The so-called “earliest borrowings from Slavic”, which included a series of words we (and others) consider indigenous Thracian (*sută, jupîn, stăpîn, smîntînă, gard*), are a list of similar Romanian-Slavic forms, all of debated origin in Slavic. The assumption that they reflect “an early Slavic influence on Romanian” was a cliché of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries.

### The Treatment of Proto-Romanian Vowels in Slavic

- Rom. *a* and *ă* have different treatments in Slavic. In some forms, Slavic languages preserve *a* unaltered to *o*, and borrowed *ă* (usually unstressed *a*) as *a*: NFI *Aborna* < \**Abarna* or \**Aborna*; Thr. NFI \**Mārisia* > Bulgarian *Marica*, but – from a similar etymon – Rom. *Mureș*, with the specific Late North-Thracian evolution *ā* > *ô* > *o/u*. Generally, in a series of indigenous forms of Pre-Slavic origin, *a* is NOT regularly changed to *o* as sometimes suggested. The situation seems to have been more complex, and reflected century-long linguistic interferences and chronologically discriminated borrowings and phonetic evolutions. Other examples of Pre-Slavic (Thracian, Illyrian) forms preserving the original *a*: *ban* (Romanian, South Slavic), Rom. *Crăciun* ‘Christmas’, dialectally also ‘piece of wood, a log’ > Sl. *Kračun*, Hung. *Karácsony* (related to Alb. *kërcú* ‘piece of wood, a log’). The evolution Rom. *ă* (usually *a* in unstressed position, rarely stressed as well) > Slavic *o*, as *stăpîn* > *stopan*, but usually stressed *î* (also spelled *â*) is reflected as *a* in Slavic.

In other instances Rom. *a* > Sl. *o*: *Augusta* > *Ogosta*; *Asamus* > *Osăm*. It is not clear why only some forms reflect this phenomenon, others don’t. We may think at dialectal, local evolutions or chronologically discriminated borrowings. Anyway, the evolution *a* > *o* is not general. There is only one case only in Romanian place-naming with this evolution: ancient *Alutus* > Rom. *Olt*, also the derived form *Oltina*, a lake in Dobrudja. Linguists largely assume that it must reflect a Slavic influence (the only case in archaic, Pre-Romance place-naming), and thus the evolution would be as in the case of *Ogosta* and *Osăm*. It may also reflect a Late Thracian evolution. Ultimately the reconstruction starts from an approximate spelling in the Latin and Greek writers. Being the only such example, it is impossible to draw a rule.

- Vowel *e* is generally preserved unaltered disregarding its position against the stressed syllable, cf. *Neva, Nesebăr, Senj* etc. In South Slavic *Peperuda* (a mythic representation of young girls in times of draught) and Rom. *Păpărudă*, the presumable original *e* was preserved in South Slavic and turned to *ă* (unstressed position) in Romanian.

- Vowel *i* in South Slavic may either reflect an original *i*, as in *Drinjača*, or an evolution *e* to *i* as in *Niš* < \**Neš-*, ancient spelling *Naissus*; NFI *Ibru* (Romania), *Ibăr* (Bulgaria), *Ibar* (Serbia) < *Hebrus* etc.

- Vowel *o* is generally preserved, e.g. NL *Orga, Soča* < *Isontius*, real Post-Classical pronunciation probably \**Isonč*. It is difficult to clearly draw back the evolution *o* > *u*, but this becomes extremely difficult given the general lack of accurate spellings of ancient Thracian and Illyrian names.

- Vowel *u* had a different evolution. It may be preserved as such, e.g. NL *Lug*; yet there are at least two clear cases when Proto-Romanian *u* was reflected as *ъ* (strong yer) in Slavic: (1) Post-Classical form \**kumatra* (< *commater*) > Rom. *cumătră* > Sl. *къмотра*; (2) Rom. *sută* ‘100’, of Thracian origin, > Sl. *сто*. In place-names, initial *u* is sometimes changed to *v*, e.g. *Urbanus* > *Vrba*, a process facilitated by the association with *vrba* ‘a willow tree’ among the Slavic speakers. Such a change cannot be identified in the indigenous elements of Romanian.

## The Treatment of Proto-Romanian Consonants in Slavic

There are certain problems in analysing the evolution of consonants, including the already quoted situation of intervocalic *b*, *v* and *l*, which – in itself – is not a difficult point, but rather a preconceived idea automatically accepted without being investigated. Obviously these three cases reflect processes already documented in Post-Classical Latin, and reflected – at various levels – in the Romance languages, particularly in Romanian. These Post-Classical evolutions contrasted with the evolution of the Thracian elements later integrated into Romanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian and Serbian (to a less extent in Croatian and Slovene). As (Post-Classical) Latin and Thracian had different phonetic inventories, it is clear that phonetic evolutions were, in many instances, different. The following examples also refer to Paliga 1999.

- The series of terms referring to social and political organisation in southeast Europe, of Thracian origin, may help us to understand some of these evolutions, linguistically and historically: Rom. *stăpîn*, *stăpân* > Sl. *stopan*; *giupîn*, later *jupîn* > Sl. *župan*; *ban* is preserved in Romanian, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian. It has remained a vivid term only in Romanian, with the derived meaning ‘money, coin’ < ‘master’ (i.e. ‘coined issued under the authority of a local master’, cf. English *sovereign*). Rom. *ban*, *jupîn* and *stăpîn* and their South Slavic equivalents reflect the indigenous, Thracian influence.

- *C(k)* and *g* are either preserved or palatalised in certain circumstances. Some examples: Coll. Latin and Proto-Romanian \**kumatra* (classical *commater*, hence French *commère*, Sp. *comadre* etc.) > Sl. *къмотра*; *koliba* (archaic southeast European term of unknown origin, presumably Thracian and/or Illyrian) > Rom. *colibă*, Sl. *koliba*; in the case of Romanian, the alleged Slavic origin on the grounds that intervocalic *b* would reject a direct borrowing from Late Thracian cannot be sustained, as intervocalic *b/v* is usual in such cases, see above); Coll. Latin \**calende* (classical *calendae*) > *kołęda*, with *a* > *o* and the nasal sequence *en* reflected as *ę* (Old Church Slavonic **Ѧ**); *Crăciun* ‘Christmas’ and dialectally ‘piece of wood, a log’ is akin to Alb. *kërcú* ‘piece of wood’ and undoubtedly reflects an indigenous Thracian element with the basic meaning ‘piece of wood, a log’ (not Lat. *creatio*, which is an erroneous etymology) > Sl. *Kračun*, Hung. *karácsony*; Ancient *Cebros* > *Cibăr* with evolution of *c(k)* to Sl. *c* (*ts*), but in a similar situation *Kebros* > *Kerbovo*, without palatalisation; *Cataracta* > *Čudra*, but *Clissa* > *Klis* as in Rom. *Cluj* from an indigenous personal name, in which case the expected Latin evolution *cl* (*kl*) to Rom. *chi* (*k’*) is not followed, as in all the cases of indigenous Thracian origin; Thracian and Coll. Latin \**German* (place-, mountain- and personal name) is reflected in Rom. *Gherman*, Bulg. *German* (identical pronunciation as in Romanian), but S.-Cr. *Đerman*, with a secondary, late palatalisation; Bulg. *Struga* reflects a Thracian \**Struga*, and is closely akin to other river-names like *Struma* (Bulgaria), *Strei*, *Stremț* (Romania). There are some cases with clear palatalisation of the ancient *c(k)* as in *Celeia* > *Celje*; *civitatem* > *Cavtat*, *Čedad*; *Crexa*, *Crexi* > *Cres*.

All these, and other similar, cases show that the integration of the indigenous Thracian elements in both Romanian (Proto-Romanian) and South Slavic took place over a long period, beginning with the 2<sup>nd</sup> century A.D. (Proto-Romanian) and 6<sup>th</sup> century A.D. (Slavic), and lasting until the extinction of the Thracian language, which may be dated approximately some time later, probably not earlier than the 7<sup>th</sup> century, but possibly to have survived, at least in some isolated areas, until the 10<sup>th</sup> century A.D.

- *D* and *t* generally have a parallel evolution and, like *c(k)* and *g* are either preserved or palatalised. Some examples (if ‘/’ is used, it shows the Proto-Romanian/Slavic forms): Coll.

Lat. *kumatra* > *cumătră/kômotra*; Thr. \**vataH* (\**H* notes a laryngeal, see above) > *vătaf/vataš*, *vatah*, *vatak*; *vatra* (archaic Thracian term, spread all over southeast and central Europe); Thr. \**bord-* > *bordei/bordej*, *bordelj* (with emphatic, epenthetic *lj* in South Slavic, instead of the etymological *j*); mythological figures like *Dodola* and *Peperuda* in South Slavic, and their equivalents in Romanian: NP *Dodă*, *Doda*, *Păpărudă*; NFI *Tăža*, *Tundža* probably with *ž* inherited from Thracian; equally *Timok*, *Timava* and *Trojan* (*Traianus*, but probably with a folk-etymology in Slavic by associating the legendary figure of the Roman emperor with Slavic root *tri-*, *tro-* ‘three’ and hence with the alleged Slavic three-headed god *Triglav*). In NFI *Soča* (cf. Rom. NFI *Suciu*, *Suceava*, pronounced *suču*, *sučava* respectively) sound *č* seems archaic but not spelled in Greek and Latin as there was no letter for it (a frequent situation as mentioned in this volume). The same sound seems initial in *Brač* (spelled *Brattia*). A secondary palatalisation is in *Škocjan* < \**Sant* (= *sanctus*) *Cantianus*, with the sequence *t+i/j* > *c(ts)*. In *Materieia* > *Modrejce*, the group *ter* closed to *tr* and then turned to *dr*; and in *Dalmatia* > *Dlamoc* > *Glamoč* the evolution was *t+i* > *c(ts)/č*.

- *F* and *v* generally reflect parallel evolution in both Latin and Thracian elements, but in modern languages *f* and *h* also reflect a former laryngeal in Thracian. Generally *v* reflects a sonorisation of the archaic Indo-European *w*. Thus NL *Cavtat* (Croatian) and *Čedad* (Slovene) reflect Lat. *civitatem* as also Rom. *cetate* ‘a fortress’. In NFI *Dunav*, *v* is epenthetic in order to integrate this form in a large category of masculine nouns. On the other hand, *f* is preserved in a form like *Fruška* (Gora) < *Franca* (villa), as in Rom. *frînc* ‘a representative of West Romance’ (not preserved in modern Romanian with this meaning, but only as a personal name: *Frînc*, *Frîncu*). In the Dalmatian area, *f* > *p* as in NL *Flanonae* > *Plomin*; *p* may also sonorise in certain circumstances, e.g. close to *r*, e.g. NL *Levrera* (the island of Lošinj of the Kvarnerian group) < *Leporaria*; the evolution might have been *Leporaria* > \**Leprera* > *Lebrera/Levrera*.

As shown above Rom. *f/h* witnesses the existence of a Thracian laryngeal, which might have survived until quite late as some phonetic evolutions suggest.

- Consonants *s*, *z*, *š* and *ž* put specific problems. It is clear now that both *š* and *ž* were present in Thracian, most probably also in Illyrian, together with other specific sounds like *č*, *ğ*, *ts*, *dz*, the neutral vowel *ə*, etc., hence in East Romance (Proto-Romanian) as well, but could not be spelled in Greek and Latin text. Therefore the only reasonable solution for restituting their presence in Thracian and (Proto-) Romanian is comparative analysis of both ancient and modern forms. It may be surmised that *ž* in Rom. *jupîn* < *ğupîn* and Sl. *župan* derives from Proto-Romanian *ğ*, where – in its turn – is a reflex from Thracian. Otherwise, the phonetic evolutions are expected, e.g. *Clissa* > *Klis*, *Asamus* > *Osăm* etc. In *Kljužica*, *ž* rather reflects a sonorisation of the initial *š* from Coll. Latin *clusus* = *clausus* – *claudio*, *claudere* ‘to lock, to close’, hence also Rom. NL *Cluj* from \**Cluș* (see the paper on this place-name in *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies* = Paliga 1999). In NFI *Lašta*, *š* is presumably inherited from the substratum.

There are, of course, many other aspects regarding the phonetic evolution in Colloquial Latin/Proto-Romanian/Proto-Dalmatian, Thracian and Slavic. The purpose of these pages is to just point out some basic aspects, mainly referring to erroneous hypothesis regarding the relations between Thracian and Colloquial Latin, including some largely spread, but wrong, hypothesis regarding some peculiar evolutions like intervocalic *b/v* in Latin as compared to Thracian, and the existence of a laryngeal in Thracian. Further investigations will surely clarify these aspects in either sense.

## References

- Alessio, Giovanni** 1935–1936. Le base preindo-europee *KAR(R)A/GAR(R)A* ‘pietra’. *Studi Etruschi* IX: 133–152 and X: 165–189.
- Alessio, G. 1955. *Le lingue indoeuropee nell’ambiente mediterraneo*. Bari: Adriatica.
- Andreev, Nikolaj Dmitrievič** 1986. *Ranne-indoevropskij prayazyk*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Avram, Andrei** 1990. *Nazalitatea și rotacismul în limba română*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Barić, Henrik** 1919. *Albano-rumänische Studien*. Sarajevo: Institut für Balkanforschung.
- Battisti, Carlo** 1927. Per lo studio dell’elemento etrusco nella toponomastica italiana. *Studi Etruschi* 1: 327–349.
- Battisti, C. 1934. L’etrusco e le altre lingue preindoeuropee d’Italia. *Studi Etruschi* 8: 179–196.
- Battisti, C. 1941. Alfredo Trombetti ed il problema dell’origine mediterranea della lingua etrusca. *Studi Etruschi* 15: 165–170.
- Battisti, C. 1956. I Balcani e l’Italia nella preistoria. *Studi Etruschi* 24: 271–299.
- Baylon, Christian, Paul Fabre** 1982. *Les noms de lieux et de personnes*. Introduction de Ch. Camproux. Poitiers: Nathan.
- Benkő, Loránd** (ed.) 1967–1980. *A magyar nyelv történeti-etimológiai szótára, I–IV*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Benveniste, Emile** 1962. *Origines de la formation des noms en indo-européen*. Paris: Adrien Maisonneuve.
- Beranová, Magdalena** 1988. *Slované*. Praha: Panorama.
- Berneker, Ernst** 1908–1913. *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, I (A–L)*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Berneker, E. 1927. *Russische Grammatik*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Revised by Max Vasmer. Berlin–Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bernstein, S.B.** 1965. *Gramatica comparată a limbilor slave*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Bertoldi, Vittorio** 1931. Essai de la méthodologie dans le domaine préhistorique de la toponymie et du vocabulaire. *Bulletin de la Société Linguistique de Paris* 32: 93–184.
- Bertoldi, V. 1933. Preellenico *βάτος, μαντία* ‘cespuglio, rovo’ e preromanzo *matta, mantia* ‘cespuglio, rovo’. *Glotta* 22: 258–267.
- Bevan, Edwyn, Charles Singer** (eds.) 1927. *The Legacy of Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Bezljaj, France** 1948. Doneski k priznavanju glagolskega aspekta. *Slavistična Revija* 1, 3–4: 199–220.
- Bezljaj, F. 1956–1961. *Slovenska vodna imena*, 2 vols. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija znanosti in umetnosti.
- Bezljaj, F. 1961. Die vor-slavischen Schichten im slovenischen Namen- und Wortschatz. VI. *Internationaler Kongress für Namenforschung*, München 24.–28. August 1958, hgg. von Karl Puchner, vol. 2: 148–153.
- Bezljaj, F. 1976 sq. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*. Ljubljana.
- Bezljaj, F. 1969. Das vor-slavisches Substrat im Slowenischen. *Alpes Orientales* 5. *Acta Quinti Conventus de Ethnographia Alpium Orientalium Tractantis Graecii Slovenorum* 29. III – I.IV. 1967. Redegit Niko Kuret. Ljubljana.
- Bláhová, Marie** 1986. *Evropská sídliště v latinských pramenech období raného feudalismu*. Praha: Univerzita Karlova.
- Blažek, Václav** [2002?]. Celtic-Anatolian Isoglosses. *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* Band 52: 125–128.
- Blažek, Václav, Václav Klain** [2002]. Etnonym *Čech* v kontextu slovanských a indoevropských etnonym. [In print when this volume is being prepared; an electronic copy was available to me].
- Bonfante, Giuliano** 1966. Influences du protoroumain sur le protoslave? *Acta Philologica* 5: 53–69.
- Bonfante, G. 1970. Il tipo delle radici indoeuropee. *Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere ‘La Colombaria’*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki, 19–26.

- Bonfante, G. 1994. *La lingua parlata in Orazio*. Venosa: Osanna (Italian edition of the initial work published in a low number of copies *Los elementos populares en la lengua de Horacio*, Madrid 1937).
- Borza, Alexandru** 1968. *Dicționar etnobotanic*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Brâncuș, Grigore** 1983. *Vocabularul autohton al limbii române*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Brâncuș, Gr. 1991. *Istoria cuvintelor*. București: Coresi.
- Brâncuș, Gr. 1999. *Concordanțe lingvistice româno-albaneze*. București: Institutul Român de Tracologie; Bibliotheca thracologica XXX.
- Brückner, Aleksander** 1970. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa.
- Buchholz, O., W. Fiedler, G. Uhlisch** 1977. *Wörterbuch albanisch-deutsch*. Leipzig.
- Candrea, I.-A.** 1927. *Elemente de origine dubioasă în limba română* (text litografiat), vol. I, București.
- Candrea, I.-A., Ovid Densusianu** 1914. *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române. Elementele latine* (a-putea). București: Socec.
- Chantraine, Pierre** 1968–1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Christol, Michel, Ségolène Demougin, Yvette Duval, Claude Lepelley, Luce Pietri** 1992. *Institutions, société et vie politique dans l'Empire Romain au IVe siècle ap.J.-C.* Roma: École Française de Rome.
- Cihac, Alexandru de** 1870–1879. *Dictionnaire étymologique daco-romane*, I–II. Frankfurt.
- Ciorănescu, Alexandru (Alejandro)** 2002. *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*. Edited and translated from Spanish by Tudora Șandru Mehedinți and Magdalena Popescu Marin. București: Saeculum I.O. Spanish original:
- Ciorănescu, Alejandro** 1960 sq. *Diccionario etimológico rumano*. La Laguna.
- Cocco, V.** 1942. Lat. *cantharius* 'cavallo castrato' e la nuova base mediterranea *KANTH* 'curva, rotondită'. *Studi Etruschi* 16: 387–401.
- Comșa, Maria** 1982. Quelques conclusions historiques concernant le I-er millénaire de n.è. fondées sur l'origine des mots se rapportant à la famille et aux liens de parenté dans la langue roumaine. *Thraco-dacica* 3: 76–84.
- Constantinescu, N.A.** 1963. *Dicționar onomastic românesc*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Coteanu, Ion** 1981. *Originile limbii române*. București.
- Coteanu, I., L. Seche, M. Seche** (ed.) 1975. *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române. (DEX)*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Coteanu, Ion, Marius Sala** 1987. *Etimologia și limba română. Principii, probleme*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Çabej, Eqrem** 1976. *Studime gjuhësorë*, I–VI. Prishtinë: Rilindja.
- Dan, Ilie** 1983. *Contribuții la istoria limbii române*. Iași: Junimea.
- Dauzat, Albert** 1947. *Les noms de lieux*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Paris: Delagrave.
- Dauzat, A. 1960. *La toponymie française*. Paris: Payot.
- De Bray, R. G. A** 1980. *Guide to the Slavonic Languages*, 3 vols. (1: South Slavonic; 2: West Slavonic; 3: East Slavonic). Columbus (Ohio): Slavica Publishers.
- Dečev (Detschew), Dimităr** 1929. *Die thrakischen Pflanzennamen*. Godišnik na sofijskaja universitet, ist.-fil., XXIV, nr. 1.
- Dečev, D. 1952. *Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache*. Sofia.
- Dečev, D. 1957. *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*. Wien: R.M. Rohrer.
- Devoto, Giacomo** 1939. *PALA* 'rotondită', *FALTER* 'le cupole', *PALATIUM* 'Caelius'. *Studi Etruschi* 13: 311–316.
- Devoto, G. 1954–1961. Le fasi della linguistica mediterranea. *Studi Etruschi* I: 23: 217–228; II: 29: 175–189.
- DEX** = Coteanu et al. 1975.
- Dickenmann, Ernst** 1939. *Studien zur Hydronimie des Savesystems*. Budapest: Ostmitteleuropäische Bibliothek (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Heidelberg 1966, unavailable to us).
- Dimitrescu, Florica** (ed.) 1978. *Istoria limbii române*. Fonetică, morfosintaxă, lexic. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

- Dimitrov, Petăr** 1994. *Paleobalkanskijaz vokalizăm*. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".
- Domi, Mahir** 1983. Problèmes de l'histoire de la formation de la langue albanaise. Résultats et tâches. *Iliria*: 5–38.
- Drăganu, Nicolae** 1928. *Toponimie și istorie*. Cluj.
- Drăganu, N. 1933. *Românii în veacurile IX–XIV pe baza toponimiei și a onomasticii*. București: Academia Română.
- Duridanov, Ivan** 1952. *Mestnite nazvanija ot Lomsko*. Sofia: Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1960. Der thrakische Einfluss auf die bulgarische Anthroponymie. *Linguistique Balcanique* 2: 69–86.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1969. Thrakisch-dakische Studien, I. *Linguistique Balkanique* 13, 2.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1975. *Die Hydronimie des Vardar-systems als Geschichtsquelle*. Köln-Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1986. Pulpudeva, Plovdiv, Plovdin. *Linguistique Balkanique* 29, 4: 25–34.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1989. Nochmals zum namen PLBPDIVB, PLOVDIV. *Linguistique Balkanique* 32, 1: 19–22.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1991. Die ältesten slawischen Entlehnungen im Rumänischen. *Linguistique Balkanique* 34, 1–2: 3–19.
- Duridanov, Iv. 1993. Bulgarian Bădni (večer), bădnik again. *Linguistique Balkanique* 36, 2: 101–104.
- Ernout, A., A. Meillet** 1959. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. 4th ed., Paris.
- Fassel, Luminița** 1987. Sprachreste aus vorrömischen Zeit im Rumänischen. *Akten der Theodor Gartner-Tagung in Innsbruck 1985*. Innsbruck: 289–296.
- Fischer, I.** 1985. *Latina dunăreană*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Flora, Radu** 1985. Onomastique des V(a)laques balcaniques et celle des istroroumains actuels. *Linguistica* 25, 2: 81–93.
- Fol, Al.** (editor-in-chief), **K. Jordanov, K. Porožanov, V. Fol** 2000. *Ancient Thrace*. Sofia: International Foundation *Europa Antiqua*, Institute of Thracology – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Fraenkel, Ernst** 1955–1965. *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Franck, Otto** 1932. *Studien zur serbokroatischen Ortsnamenkunde*. Leipzig: Markert & Petters.
- Frățilă, Vasile** 1987. *Lexicologie și toponimie românească*. Timișoara: Facla.
- Frisk, Hjalmar** 1960 sq. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Gamkrelidze, T., V.V. Ivanov** 1984. *Indoeuropejskij prayazyk i indoeuropejcy*. Tbilisi: University Press.
- Gămulescu, Dorin** 1983. *Influențe românești în limbile slave de sud*. I. Sîrbocroata. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Georgiev, Vladimir** 1957. *Trakiiskijaz ezik*. Sofia.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1960 a. *Bălgarska etimologija i onomastika*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1960 b. Albanisch, dakisch-mysisch und rumänisch. Die Herkunft der Albaner. *Linguistique balkanique* 2: 1–19.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1961. *La toponymie ancienne de la péninsule balkanique et la thèse méditerranéenne*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1964. Die dakische Glossen und ihre Bedeutung zum Studium der dakische Sprache. *Linguistique balkanique* 8: 5–14 (continuare a studiului 1960 b).
- Georgiev, Vl. 1968. Illyrier, Veneter und Ursclaven. *Linguistique Balcanique* 13, 1: 5–13.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1971. L'ethnogenèse de la péninsule balkanique d'après les données linguistiques. *Studia Balcanica* (Sofia) 5: 155–170.
- Georgiev, Vl., Iv. Gălăbov, J. Zaimov, St. Ilčev et alii** 1971–1979–1986 (3 vols., to be continued). *Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik* (BER). Sofia: Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.
- Gerola, B.** 1942. Substrato mediterraneo e latino. *Studi Etruschi* 16: 345–368.

- Gimbutas, Marija** 1971. *The Slavs*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Gimbutas, M. 1973 a. Old Europe c. 7000–3500 B.C.: the earliest European civilization before the infiltration of the Indo-European peoples. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 1–2: 1–20.
- Gimbutas, M. 1973 b. The beginning of the Bronze Age in Europe and the Indo-Europeans. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 3–4: 163–214.
- Gimbutas, M. 1974. An archaeologist's view of PIE in 1975. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 2, 3–4: 289–307.
- Gimbutas, M. 1979. The three waves of the Kurgan people into Old Europe, 4500–2500. *Archives suisses d'anthropologie générale* 43, 2: 113–137.
- Gimbutas, M. 1982. *Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Gimbutas, M. 1984. The Religion of Old Europe and its legacy in the Bronze Age. *4th International Thracian Conference, Boston 7–10 June 1984*. Milano 1986: Drăgan Foundation.
- Gimbutas M. 1985 a. The Pre-Indo-European Goddesses in Baltic Mythology. *The Mankind Quarterly* 19–25.
- Gimbutas 1985 b. The Megalithic Tombs of Western Europe and Their Religious Implications. *The Quarterly Review of Archaeology* 6, 3: 1–8.
- Gimbutas, M. 1985 c. Primary and secondary homeland of the Indo-Europeans. Comments on Gamkrelidze-Ivanov articles. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 13, 1–2: 185–202.
- Gimbutas, M. 1986 a. Remarks on the Ethnogenesis of the Indo-Europeans in Europe. *Ethnogenese europäischer Völker* ed. by Bernhard Kandler-Pálsson: 5–20. Stuttgart: Gustav Fischer Verlag.
- Gimbutas, M. 1986 b. The religion of Old Europe and its legacy in the Bronze Age. *4th International Thracian Conference, Boston 7–10 June 1984*. Milano: Drăgan Foundation: 249–285.
- Gimbutas, M. 1989 a. *The Language of the Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Gimbutas, M. 1989 b. *Civilizație și cultură. Vestigii preistorice în sud-estul european*. București: Meridiane (Romanian version of the studies 1973 a, b, 1974, 1979, 1985).
- Gimbutas, M. 1991. *The Civilization of the Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper Collins.
- Giuglea, George**. 1922. Cuvinte și lucruri. *Dacoromania* II: 327–400.
- Giuglea, G. 1923. Crâmpeie de limbă și viață străveche românească. Elemente autohtone (pre-romane), greco-latine, vechi germanice. *Dacoromania* III: 561–628.
- Giuglea, G. 1983. *Cuvinte românești și romanice*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Giuglea, G. 1988. *Fapte de limbă. Mărturii despre trecutul românesc*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Gluhak, Alemko** 1993. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb: August Cesarec.
- Godłowski, Kazimierz** 2000. *Pierwotne siedziby Słowian*. Wybór pism pod redakcją Michała Parczewskiego. Kraków: Instytut Archeologii Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Grafenauer, Bogo** 1979. Slovani pred prihodom na Balkanski polotok. *Zgodovina Slovencev*, ed. by Meta Sluga. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva Založba.
- Grković, Milica** 1983. *Imena u dečanskim hrisovuljama*. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet.
- Grković, M. 1986. *Rečnik imena banjskog, dečanskog i prizrenskog vlastelinstva u XIV veku*. Beograd: Narodna knjiga.
- Guțu, G.** 1983. *Dicționar latin-român*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Hänsel, Bernhard and Walter Althammer** ed. 1987. *Die Völker Südosteuropas im 6. bis 8. Jahrhundert. Südosteuropa Jahrbuch* 17.
- Hasdeu, B.P.** 1882 a. Originea poeziei poporane la români. *Columna lui Traian* 9, 7–9: 397–406.
- Hasdeu, B.P. 1882 b. Doina răstoarnă pe Roesler. *Columna lui Traian* 9, 10–12: 529–536.
- Hasdeu, B.P. 1877. Zina Filma. Goții și Gepizii în Dacia. *Columna lui Traian* 153–182.
- Hasdeu, B.P. 1887-1898. *Etymologicum magnum Romaniae*. București.
- Hasdeu, B.P. 1973. *Scrieri istorice, I–II*, București.
- Hasdeu, B.P. 1988. *Studii de lingvistică și filologie*. Ed. by Gr. Brâncuș, 2 vols. București: Minerva.
- Holub, Josef, Stanislav Lyer** 1978. *Stručný etymologický slovník jazyka českého*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Praha:

- Státní pedagogicé nakladatelství (1<sup>st</sup> ed.: 1952).
- Holzer, Georg** 1999. Zur Auswertung von Toponymen antiken Ursprungs für die kroatische Lautgeschichte. *Folia onomastica Croatica* 8: 81–96.
- Hristov, Georgi** 1964. *Mestnite imena v Madansko*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Hubschmid, J.** 1971. Eléments préromans du roumain. *Actele celui de-al XII-lea congres internațional de filologie romanică*, ed. by Al. Rosetti, vol. 2: 975–979. București: Editura Academiei.
- Huld, Martin E.** 1984. *Basic Albanian Etymologies*. Columbus (Ohio): Slavica Publishers.
- Iļčev, Stefan** 1969. *Rečnik na ličnite i familni imena u Bălgarite*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na naukite.
- Iliescu, Maria** 1977. Retoromana și cuvintele românești de substrat. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 28, 2.
- Ionescu, Christian** 1975. *Mică enciclopedie onomastică*. București: Editura științifică și enciclopedică.
- Ioniță, Vasile** 1982. *Nume de locuri din Banat*. Timișoara: Facla.
- Iordache, Gh.** 1980. *Mărturii etno-lingvistice despre vechimea meseriilor populare românești*. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.
- Jordan, Iorgu** 1960. *Lingvistica romanică*. București.
- Jordan, I. 1963. *Toponimia românească*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Jordan, I. 1983. *Dicționar al numelor de familie românești*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Ivănescu, Gheorghe** 1980. *Istoria limbii române*. Iași: Junimea.
- Ivănescu, Gh. 1983. *Lingvistică generală și românească*. Timișoara: Facla.
- Kammenhuber, A.** 1969. *Altkleinasiatische Sprachen*. Leiden-Köln: E.J. Brill.
- Kiss, Lajos** 1980. *A földrajzi nevek etimológiai szótára*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Klein, Ernst** 1971. *A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language*. Amsterdam-London-New York: Elsevier.
- Kluge, Friedrich** 1963. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 19. Auflage, bearbeitet von Walther Mitzka. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
- Kondratieva, Tamara** 2000. *Vechea Rusie*. București: Corint. (French original: Tamara Kondratieva, *La Russie ancienne*, PUF, 1996).
- Krahe, Hans** 1925. *Die alten balkan-illyrischen geographischen Namen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Krahe, H. 1942. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Krahe, H. 1955. *Die Sprache der Illyrier*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harraschowitz.
- Lehmann, W.P.** 1987. Linguistic and archaeological data for handbooks of protolanguages, in Skomal and Polomé (eds.) 1987: 72–87.
- Lloyd, Paul M.** 1971. L'action du substrat et la structure linguistique. *Actele celui de al XII-lea congres internațional de lingvistică și filologie romanică* (ed. by Al. Rosetti) București: Editura Academiei, vol. 2: 953–963.
- Loma, Aleksandar** 1993. Neue Substratnamen aus Dacia Mediterranea. *Linguistique Balkanique* 36, 3: 219–240.
- Lutterer, Iv., Kropáček, L., Huňáček, V.** 1976. *Původ zeměpisných jmen*. Praha: Mladá Fronta.
- Machek, Václav** 1971. *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia.
- Macrea, D.** (ed.) 1958. *Dicționarul limbii române moderne*. București.
- Macrea, D. 1982. *Probleme ale structurii și evoluției limbii române*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Mallory, J. P.** 1973. A history of the Indo-European problem. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 1, 1–2: 21–65.
- Maretić, T.** 1886. O narodnim imenima i prezimenima u Hrvata i Srba. *Rada Jugoslovenske akademije znanosti i umetnosti, fil.-hist. razred.* I, 81: 81–146; II, 82: 69–154.
- Matei, Horia C.** 1983. *Civilizația lumii antice*. București: Eminescu.
- Matzenauer, A.** 1870. *Cizí slova ve slovanských řečech*. Brno.
- Mayrhofer, M.** 1953. *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*. Heidelberg:

Carl Winter.

**Meillet, Antoine.** 1902–1905. *Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave*, 2 vols. Paris: Émile Bouillon.

Meillet, A. 1922. *Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indo-européennes*, 5th ed., Paris.

**Meyer, Gustav** 1891. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg.

**Meyer-Lübke, G.** 1935. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

**Mihăescu, Haralambie** 1978. *La langue latine dans le sud-est de l'Europe*. București-Paris: Editura Academiei-Les Belles Lettres.

**Mihăilă, Gheorghe** 1971. Criteriile determinării împrumuturilor slave în limba română. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 22, 4: 351–366.

Mihăilă, G. 1973. *Studii de lexicologie și istorie a lingvisticii românești*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

Mihăilă, G. 1974. *Dicționar al limbii române vechi (sfârșitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI)*. București: Editura Enciclopedică Română.

**Mikkola, J.J.** 1913–1950. *Urslavische Grammatik*, 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

**Miklosich, Franz** 1884. *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen*, I–II. Wien.

Miklosich, F. 1886. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien: Wilhelm Braumüller.

**Mitreă, Ioan** 1980. Regiunea centrală a Moldovei dintre Carpați și Siret în secolele VI–IX e.n. *Carpica* 12: 55–190.

Mitreă, I. 1994. Așezarea din secolele V–VII de la Davideni, jud. Neamț. *Cercetările arheologice din anii 1988–1991. Memoria Antiquitatis* 19: 279–332.

**Mitreă, I., C. Eminovici, V. Momanu** 1987. Așezarea din secolele V–VII de la Ștefan cel Mare, jud. Bacău. *Carpica* 18–19: 215–250.

**Morris, William** (ed.) 1979. *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

**Moszyński, Kazimierz** 1962. *O sposobach badania kultury materialnej Prastowian*. Wrocław–Kraków–Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk.

**Mușu, Gheorghe** 1972. *Zei, eroi, personaje*. București: Editura științifică.

Mușu, Gh. 1973. *Din formele de cultură arhaică*. București: Editura științifică.

Mușu, Gh. 1981. *Lumini din depărtări, Civilizații prehellenice și microasiatice*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.

Mușu, Gh. 1982. *Din mitologia tracilor*. București: Cartea Românească.

Mușu, Gr. 1995. *Voci din depărtări*. București: Editura științifică.

**Nica-Câmpeanu, Ioana** 1979. Riturile funerare în Transilvania de la sfârșitul secolului al III-lea e.n. până în sec. V e.n. *Acta Musei Napocensis* 16: 157–170.

**Olteanu, Pandlele** (ed.) 1975. *Slava veche și slavona românească*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

**Olteanu, Ștefan** 1983. *Societatea românească la cumpănă de milenii (sec. VIII–XI)*. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

**Onions, C.T.** (ed.) 1969. *The Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford.

**Oppermann, Manfred** 1984. *Thraker zwischen Karpatenbogen und Ägäis*. Leipzig-Jena-Berlin: Urania.

**Oštir, Karel** 1921. *Beiträge zur alarodischen Sprachwissenschaft, I*. Wien-Leipzig: Beyers Nachfolger.

**Ovsec, Damjan J.** 1991. *Slovanska mitologija in verovanje*. Ljubljana: Domus.

**Paliga, Sorin** 1980. *Jazyk a čas. Se zvláštním zřetelem ke vztahu mezi časem a videm*. Thèse de licence à l'Université des Lettres de Bucarest (Bibliothèque de slavistique).

Paliga S. 1986. Ardeal, Transilvania. *Tribuna* (Cluj), nr. 8, 20 feb., pp. 1 și 6.

Paliga, S. 1987 a. Thracian terms for 'township' and 'fortress', and related place-names. *World Archaeology* 19, 1: 23–29.

Paliga, S. 1987 b. The social structure of the southeast European societies in the Middle Ages.

A linguistic view. *Linguistica* 27: 111–126.

Paliga, S. 1988 a. A Pre-Indo-European place-name: Dalmatia. *Linguistica* 28:105–108.

Paliga, S. 1988 b. Slovansko \*sъto – izzivalen problem? (in Slovene with an English abstract: Slavic \*sъto – a challenging problem?). *Slavistična Revija* 36,4: 349–358.

Paliga, S. 1989 a. Zeităţi feminine ale basmelor româneşti: zîină, Sînzienne. Originea cuvîntului şi a cultului profan. *Limba română* 38, 2: 141–149.

Paliga, S. 1989 b. Types of mazes. *Linguistica* 29: 57–70.

Paliga, S. 1989 c. Old European, Pre-Indo-European, Proto-Indo-European. Archaeological Evidence and Linguistic Investigation. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 17, 3–4: 309–334.

Paliga, S. 1989 d. Oraş. Fascinaţia unei etimologii. *Noi Tracii* 18 (no. 172, Feb.): 16–21

Paliga, S. 1990. Este boieria o instituţie împrumutată? *Revista Arhivelor* 67, vol. 52, 3: 250–260.

Paliga, S. 1991 a. Aperçu de la structure étymologique du roumain. *Linguistica* 31: 99–106 (Paulo Tekavčić sexagenario in honorem oblata).

Paliga, S. 1991 b. Civilizaţia vechilor urbieni. *Academica* nr. 5: 11–12. (Versiune abreviată în limba română a studiului 1989 c).

Paliga, S. 1992 a. Toponimul Cluj. *Academica* 2, 5 (17): 8 şi 27.

Paliga, S. 1992 b. Pururi: focuri. *Academica* 2,8 (20): 14.

Paliga, S. 1992 c. Ali obstajo 'urbske' prvine v slovanskih jezikih? (in Slovene with an English abstract: Are there 'Urbian' elements in Slavic?). *Slavistična Revija* 40, 3: 309–313.

Paliga, S. 1992 d. Un cuvînt străvechi – oraş. *Academica* 2, 10 (22): 25.

Paliga, S. 1992 e. Un cuvînt străvechi – doină. *Euchronia* 1, 2: 22–32.

Paliga, S. 1993 a. Slovani, Romunci în Albanci v l. tisočletju. *Slavistična Revija* 41, 2: 237–243.

Paliga, S. 1993 b. The Tablets of Tărtăria – an Enigma? A Reconsideration and Further Perspectives. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19, 1: 9–43.

Paliga, S. 1993 c. Metals, Words and Gods. Archaeometallurgical Skills and Reflections in Terminology. *Linguistica* 33: 157–176.

Paliga, S. 1994 a. An Archaic Word: Doină. *Relations thraco-illyro-helléniques*. Actes du XIV<sup>e</sup> symposium national de thracologie (à participation internationale), Băile Herculane (14–19 septembre 1992), éd. par Petre Roman et Marius Alexianu. Bucarest: Institut Roumain de Thracologie.

Paliga, S. 1994 b. La divinité suprême des Thraco-Daces. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 20, 2: 137–150.

Paliga S. 1997. *Influenţe romane şi preromane în limbile slave de sud*. Doctoral thesis. Bucureşti: Lucretius Publishers.

Paliga, S. 1998. A Pre-Indo-European Lexicon. *The Thracian World at the Crossroads of Civilizations* ed by Petre Roman, Saviana Diamandi and Marius Alexianu. Bucureşti: Romanian Institute of Thracology.

Paliga, S. 1999. *Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies*. Bucureşti: Lucretius Publishers.

Paliga, S. 2001. Oris zgodovine Slovanov. *Slavistična Revija* (Ljubljana) 49, 4: 327–349 (in Slovene with an English abstract: *Sketching a History of the Slavs*).

**Papazoglu, Fanula** 1957. *Makedonski gradovi u rimsko doba*. Skopje: Živa antika, posebna isdanja, knjiga I.

Papazoglu, F. 1969. *Srednjobalkanska plemena u predrimsko doba*. Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine.

**Pătruţ, Ioan** 1971. Le roumain *sută* 'cent' et le problème des premières relations linguistiques slavo-roumaines. *Actele celui de-al XII-lea Congres internaţional de lingvistică şi de filologie romanică*, vol 2: 1061–1068.

Pătruţ, I. 1980. *Onomastică românească*. Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

Pătruţ, I. 1984. *Nume de persoane şi nume de locuri româneşti*. Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică.

**Pârvan, Vasile** 1923. *Consideraţii asupra unor nume de râuri daco-scitice*. Bucureşti.

Pârvan, V. 1926. *Getica*. Bucureşti.

**Pieri, Silvio** 1912. D'alcuni elementi etruschi nella toponomastica toscana. *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei* 21: 145–190.

**Philippide, Alexandru** 1923–1928. *Originea românilor*, I–II. Iaşi.

- Poghirc, Cicerone** 1968. *B. P. Hasdeu, lingvist și filolog*. București: Ed. științifică.
- Poghirc, C. 1969. *Influența autohtonă, în Rosetti et alii* (ed.) 1965–1969, 2: 313–364.
- Poghirc, C. 1976. Thrace et daco-mésien: langues ou dialectes? *Thraco-dacica* 1: 335–347.
- Poghirc, C. 1987. Latin balkanique ou roumain commun? *Romanica Aenipontana* 14: 341–348.
- Pokorny, Julius** 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern-München: Francke Verlag.
- Popović, Ivan** 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Pospelov, E.M.** 1988. *Školnyj toponimičeskij slovar'*. Moskva: Prosveštenie.
- Preda, Constantin, Alexandru Vulpe, Cicerone Poghirc**, eds. 1976. *Thraco-dacica*. Recueil d'études à l'occasion du IIe Congrès International de thracologie, Bucarest, 4–10 septembre 1976. București: Editura Academiei.
- Pușcariu, Sextil** 1905. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der rumänischen Sprache*, I. Heidelberg.
- Pușcariu, S. (ed.) 1913–1948. *Dicționarul Academiei Române*, A-L. București. (= DA).
- Pușcariu, S. 1923. Contribuțiuni fonologice. *Dacoromania* 3: 378–397.
- Pușcariu, S. 1943. Biata cumătră e departe. *Langue et littérature, section littéraire*, 2: 5–19.
- Pușcariu, S. 1976. *Limba română*. București: Minerva (1<sup>st</sup> ed.: București 1940).
- Raevskij, Nikolaj Dmitrievič, Mark Gabinskij** (eds.) 1978. *Scurt dicționar etimologic al limbii moldovenești*. Chișinău: Redacția Enciclopediei Sovietice Moldovenești.
- Raevskij, N.D.** 1988. *Contactele romanicele răsăriteni cu slavii*. Chișinău: știința.
- Rădulescu, Mircea Mihai** 1981. Daco-Romanian–Baltic Common Lexical Elements. *Ponto-Baltica* 1 (Editrice Nagard): 15–113.
- Rădulescu, M. M. 1984. Illyrian, Thracian, Daco-Mysian, the substratum of Romanian. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 12, 1–2: 77–131.
- Rădulescu, M.M. 1987. The Indo-European Position of Illyrian, Daco-Mysian and Thracian. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 15: 239–271.
- Reichenkron, Günther** 1966. *Das Dakische*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Ribezzo, Francesco** 1927. Le origini etrusche nella toponomastica: fatti, fonti e metodi. *Studi Etruschi* 1: 313–326.
- Ribezzo, F. 1950. Di quattro nuove voci mediterranee già credute celtiche: *ébhura* 'tasso', *leme* 'olmo', *támara* 'uva di sepe', *sámara* 'fosso d'acqua'. *Revue internationale d'onomastique* 2, 1: 13–25.
- Rosetti, Al., B. Cazacu, I. Coteanu** (eds.) 1965–1969. *Istoria limbii române*, 2 vols. București: Editura Academiei.
- Rosetti, Alexandru** 1978. *Istoria limbii române*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Rosetti A. 1986. *Istoria limbii române*, fully revised, final edition. București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Rostaing, Charles** 1950. *Essai sur la toponymie de la Provence*. Paris: éd. d'Artrey.
- Rostaing, Ch. 1969. *Les noms de lieux*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Paris.
- Russu, Ion I.** 1967. *Limba traco-dacilor*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. București.
- Russu, I.I. 1969. *Illirii*. București.
- Russu, I.I. 1981. *Etnogeneza românilor*. București.
- Rusu, Grigore** 1983. *Structura fonologică a graiurilor dacoromâne*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Rusu, Mircea** 1979. Aspecte ale relațiilor dintre romanitatea orientală și slavi. *Acta Musei Napocensis* 16: 189–200.
- Sadnik, Linda, R. Aitzetmüller** 1955. *Handwörterbuch zu den altkirchenslavischen Texten*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Sala, Marius** 1976. *Contributions à la phonétique historique du roumain*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Sala, M. (ed.) 1988. *Vocabularul reprezentativ al limbilor romanice*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Sala, M. (ed.) 1989. *Enciclopedia limbilor romanice*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Samsaris, Dimitrios Const.** 1993. *Les Thraces dans l'Empire Romain d'Orient* (le

- territoire de la Grèce actuelle). *Etude ethno-démographique, sociale, prosopographique et anthroponymique*. Jannina: Ektypose Typographeio Panepistemion Ioanninon.
- Sanie, Silviu** 1981. *Civilizația romană la est de Carpați și romanitatea pe teritoriul Moldovei, secolele II î.e.n.–III e.n.* Iași: Junimea.
- Simenschy, Theofil, Gheorghe Ivănescu** 1981. *Gramatica comparată a limbilor indo-europene*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Sîrbu, Valeriu** 1993. *Credințe și practici funerare, religioase și magice în lumea geto-dacilor (pornind de la descoperiri arheologice din Câmpia Brăilei)*. Galați: Porto Franco.
- Skeat, W.W.** 1879. *An etymological dictionary of the English language*. Oxford (many subsequent editions).
- Skeat, W.W. (ed.) 1913. *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*. Oxford.
- Skok, Petar** 1917. Studije iz ilirske toponomastike. *Glasnika zemeljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo): 29: 117–144.
- Skok, P. 1920. *Prilozi k ispitivanju srpsko-hrvatskih imena mjesta*. Priljeno u sjednici razreda historičko-filološkičkoga od 16. junija.
- Skok, P. 1936. Južni Sloveni i turski narodi. *Jugoslovenski istoriski časopis* 2.
- Skok, P. 1950. *Slavenstvo i romanstvo na jadranskim otocima. Toponomastička ispitivanja*. Zagreb: Jadranski institut Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umetnosti.
- Skok, P. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, I–IV. Zagreb.
- Skomal, S.N., E.C. Polomé** (eds.) 1987. *Proto-Indo-European: the archaeology of a linguistic problem*. Studies in honor of Marija Gimbutas. Washington D.C.: Institute for the Study of Man.
- Suciu, Coriolan** 1967. *Dicționar istoric al localităților din Transilvania*, 2 vols. București: Editura Academiei.
- Șăineanu, Lazăr** 1885. *Elemente turcești în limba română*. București.
- Șăineanu, L. 1896. Ielele, Dînsele, Vîntoasele, Frumoasele, șoimanele, Măiestrele, Zînele. *Revista pentru istorie, arheologie și filologie*. București.
- șăineanu, L. 1900. *Influența orientală asupra limbei și culturii române*, I–II. București.
- Șăineanu, L. 1929 (DU). *Dicționar universal al limbii române*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. by M. Stăureanu. Craiova.
- Šaur, Vladimír** 1975. *Etymologie slovanských příbuzenských termínů*. Praha: Academia.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír** 1970. *Handbuch der slavischen Toponomastik*. Praga: Academia.
- Tagliavini, Carlo** 1928. Divagazioni semantiche rumene. *Archivum romanicum* XII, 1–2: 161–231; review: șt. Pașca în *Dacoromania* VI/1931: 451–458.
- Tagliavini, C. 1977. *Originile limbilor neolatine. Introducere în filologia romanică*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Tamás, Lajos** 1967. *Etymologisches-historisches Wörterbuch der ungarischen Elemente im Rumänischen*. Haga: Mouton. Reprinted after the 1966 edition, Budapest: Adadémiai Kiadó.
- Tăpkova-Zaimova, V.** 1962. Sur les rapports entre la population indigène des régions balkaniques et les “barbares” du VIe–VIIe siècle. *Byzantinobulgarica* 1: 67–78.
- Tăpkova-Zaimova, V. 1972. La compétence des sources byzantines sur la survivance de l’ethnie thrace. *Thracia* 1: 223–230.
- Teodor, Dan Gh.** 1981. *Romanitatea carpato-dunăreană și Bizanțul, secolele V–XI e.n.* Iași: Junimea.
- Teodor, D. Gh. 1984. *Continuitatea populației autohtone la est de Carpați. Așezările din secolele VI–XI e.n. de la Dodești-Vaslui*. Iași: Junimea.
- Tiktin, H.** 1903–1925. *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. București.
- Tomaschek, Wilhelm** 1893–1894. Die alten Thraker. *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*. I: 128, 4: 1–130; II, 1: 130, 2: 1–70; II, 2: 131, 1: 1–103.
- Toporišič, Jože, T. Logar, F. Jakopin** (eds.) 1992. *Miklošičev Zbornik*. Mednarodni simpozij v Ljubljani od 26. do 28. junija 1991. Ljubljana: Slovenska Akademija.
- Trajanovski, Todor** 1979. *Vlaškite rodovi vo Struško. Prilog kon istorijata na narodnostite vo Makedonija*. Skopje: Prosveten Rabotnik.
- Trautmann, Reinhold** 1970. *Baltisch-slavisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (1<sup>st</sup> ed.: 1923).

- Trombetti, Alfredo** 1925. Saggio di antica onomastica mediterranea. *Arhiv za arbanasku starinu, jezik i etnologiju* 3: 1–116. (Reprinted in *Studi Etruschi* 13/1939: 263–310).
- Trombetti, A. 1927. La lingua etrusca e le lingue preindoeuropee del Mediterraneo. *Studi Etruschi* 1: 213–238.
- Ujević, Mate** 1956. Toponimika zapadne Istre. *Anali, Leksikografski zavod FNRJ*.
- Vámbéry, Armin** (Hermann) 1878. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der turkotatarischen Sprachen*. Leipzig.
- Váňa, Zdeněk** 1983. *Svět dávných Slovanů*. Praha: Artia.
- Vasmer, Max** 1924. Iranisches aus Südrussland, in *Streitberg Festgabe*. Leipzig.
- Vasmer, M. 1953–1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Vătășescu, Cătălina** 1997. *Vocabularul de origine latină din limba albaneză în comparație cu româna*. București: Institutul Român de Tracologie, Bibliotheca Thracologica XIX.
- Velkov, Velizar** 1962. Les campagnes et la population rurale en Thrace au IVE–VIe siècle. *Byzantinobulgarica* 1: 31–66.
- Velkov, V. 1972. Thrakien in der Spätantike (IV–VI Jhd.). *Thracia* 1: 213–222.
- Vlahov, Kiril** 1963. Nachträge und Berichtungen zu den thrakischen Sprachresten und Rückwörterbuch. *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, ist.-fil. fak.* 57, 2: 219–372.
- Vraciu, Ariton** 1972. *Studii de lingvistică generală*. Iași: Junimea.
- Vraciu, A. 1976. Sur la méthodologie des recherches dans le domaine des rapports linguistiques du thraco-dace et des autres langues indo-européennes. *Thraco-dacica* 1 (ed. by C. Preda, A. Vulpe, C. Poghiric): 315–326. București.
- Vraciu, A. 1980. *Limba daco-geților*. Timișoara: Facla.
- Vraciu, A. 1981. Unele probleme ale cercetării limbii traco-dace și ale urmelor ei în română. *Limba română* 30, 1: 27–35.
- Vraciu, A. 1984. Foreword to: A. Berinde, S. Lugojan, *Contribuții la cunoașterea limbii dacilor*. Timișoara: Facla.
- Vulpe, Radu** (ed.) 1976. *Actes du IIe Congrès International de Thracologie*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Wald, Lucia, Dan Slușanschi** 1987. *Introducere în studiul limbii și culturii indo-europene*. București: Editura științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Walde, Alois, J.B. Hofmann** 1938–1954. *Leteinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 3rd ed., 3 vols. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Wasserzieher, Ernst** 1979. *Kleines etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut.
- Zaimov, Jordan** 1959. *Mestnite imena v Pirdopsko*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Zaimov, J. 1977. *Mestnite imena v Panagjursko*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Zaimov, J. 1988. *Bălgarski imennik. I. Lični imena u bălgarskite ot VI do XX vek; II. Familni imena ot čužd proizvod*. Sofia: Bălgarska Akademija na Naukite.
- Zgusta, Ladislav** 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Praha.

VERIFICAT  
2017



VERIFICAT  
2007

1014/2003

---

Tiparul s-a executat sub c-da nr. 1014/2003 la  
Tipografia Editurii Universității din București

---



# DATA RESTITUIRII

7 DEC 2004		
13 IAN 2006		
27 MAR 2006		
16 DEC 2006		
5 FEB 2007		
12 MAR 2007		
<del>06 MAR 2007</del>		
06 MAR 2007		
<del>06 MAR 2007</del>		
18 DEC 2015		

BIBLIOTECA CENTRALA  
UNIVERSITARA „CAROL I”



DE SPIRITU ET ANIMA

## De același autor

### Studii în periodice (selecție)

- 1987 The social structure of the southeast European societies in the Middle Ages. A linguistic view. *Linguistica* (Ljubljana) 27: 111-126.
- 1989 Zeități feminine ale basmelor românești: zână, Sânziene. *Limba română* 38, 2: 141-149.
- 1990 Este boieria o instituție împrumutată? *Revista Arhivelor* 67, vol. 52, 3: 250-260.
- 1993 The Tablets of Tărtăria – an enigma. A reconsideration and further perspectives. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 19, 1: 9-43.
- 1993 Metals, words and gods. Archaeometallurgical skills and reflections in terminology. *Linguistica* 33: 157-176.

### Cărți

- 1993 Serbarea. București: Ecce Homo. Poeme și proză scurtă.
- 1996 *Influențe romane și preromane în limbile slave de sud*. București: Lucretius.
- 1999 Thracian and Pre-Thracian Studies (reunește studiile de lingvistică publicate în perioada 1986-1998). București: Lucretius.

### Traduceri

- 1989 Marija Gimbutas, *Civilizație și cultură*. București: Meridiane.
- 1991 Václav Havel, *Interogatoriu în depărtare* (traducere din limba cehă). București: Tinerama.
- 1993 *Dicționar de analiză politică*. București: Ecce Homo.
- 1994 Alan Lightman, *Visurile lui Einstein*. București: Ecce Homo.
- 1997 Larissa Bonfante et alii. *Civilizația etruscilor*. București: Meridiane.
- 1997 Marija Gimbutas, *Civilizația Marii Zeițe și sosirea cavalerilor războinici*. București: Lucretius.
- 1998 Vladimir Holan, *Toscana*. București: Editura Lucretius.
- 2003 Isabelle Klock-Fontanille, *Hittiții*. București: Meridiane.