# Aegeo-Balkan onomastics and Fertile-Crescent roots

Adrian PORUCIUC (Iaşi)

In this article, I will use an already published summary (Poruciuc 1996) as an introduction, then add illustrative arguments. In fact, what I deal with here goes along the line of a series of articles[1] I have published during this decade. By those articles I try to present and interpret the existence of a Namenbund (i.e. onomastic union) in South-Eastern Europe. That union, in its turn, has quite obvious links with the most archaic Microasian onomastic stock (as presented in Zgusta' s works). In my opinion, the impressive number, as well as the systemic characteristics of the proper names representing the earliest layers of Aegeo-Balkan onomastics should be explained first of all demographically rather than linguistically.

Taking into account that a solid, persistent demographic basis was formed in the area under discussion beginning with the Advanced Neolithic and the Copper Age, one may safely assume that it was at that time of early farming & settled life when an Aegeo-Balkan onomastic system (non-Indo-European in type and matter) was being shaped. That system, in its turn, was most probably part of a vast Sprachbund (i.e. glottic union) fundamentally depending on the spreading of agriculture from the Near-East Fertile Crescent to the Aegeo-Balkan world (as well as to North Africa). I insist: it was mainly the socio-historical context of the 6th-4th millennia BC which can account for the roots of an onomastic union manifest in thousands of proper-names still in use (however modified in shape, and in apparent reference) in the area under discussion.

Specialists should never forget that what Gordon Childe and others regarded as the "Neolithic revolution" did not mean mere passage from hunting-gathering to a new system of subsistence, farming (which implied domestication of both plants and animals). It also meant a demographic explosion, and spreading of a population of the Mediterranoid stock from the Fertile Crescent to other regions. The demographic basis created under those circumstances proved then strong enough to become, in my opinion, a real basis of absorption through subsequent ages. The Fertile-Crescent expansion has little to do, directly, with the "Indo-European homeland", and with "Primitive Indo-European" language[2]. However, an important quantity of linguistic matter could be taken over, later, by Indo-Europeans from idioms of Fertile-Crescent descent (idioms which I suppose to have been of a Hamitoid type, and thus related to Proto-Egyptian).

As for the Aegeo-Balkan area, one major result of the above-presented development was the following: for all the repeated "horizons of destruction"

attested in the area in later times (from the steppic intrusions of the Bronze Age, to the imposition of Roman power) certain speech habits of the archaic farmers, as well as a quite rich system of proper-names could be perpetuated under circumstances of numerous and stable rural communities. Even though "language death" (or, more correctly, language loss) repeatedly occurred in the area, being habitually doubled by new-language imposition (after longer or shorter periods of bilingualism), there was perpetuation of linguistic matter too, and not only genealogically[3]. As already suggested above, certain articulatory habits, morpho-syntactic patterns, appelatives, as well as proper names could be transferred from "lost" idioms to newly imposed ones. To a signifiant extent, that is what must have happened in an area where a stable post-Neolithic demographic basis had to adapt itself to repeatedly renewed socio-historical conditions, many of which were imposed by intruders. The autochthonous majority could either absorb aliens both anthropologically and linguistically, or adopt idioms of superposed alien elites. In order to understand how pre-Greek inhabitants of Greece came to speak Indo-European we should analyse the way pre-Turkish inhabitants of Anatolia came to speak Turkish (for nobody could possibly demonstrate that all Turkish speakers of Turkey are of Turkic blood). And, since I must return to proper-names, no matter how much today's Greeks and Turks may insist on their conflicting distinctness, both peoples continue to use (with local colour) proper-names which are neither Greek nor Turkish, but of the pre-Ancient Aegeo-Balkan stock.

Practically, what I propose (by this article and others) is a doubly expanded vision: from literate-ancient times to prehistory, as well as to present-day. What Zgusta presented as a Common-Microasian onomastic stock (with very few clearcut ethnic distinctions) was made up of names written down during the early history of Asia Minor; but many of those names (even a majority of them) certainly had prehistoric local roots, of which the most important went to the Neolithic Fertile Crescent. Also, it is quite easy to discover that the most frequent of Zgusta's Microasian names had Palaeobalkan correspondents (most of them recorded as Greek, but also as Thracian and Illyrian). As for the other direction of the proposed expanded vision, in earlier articles as well as by the handouts I gave at the 1996 Congress of Thracology (see features included in Table 1) I demonstrated that the ancient Aegeo-Balkan link has clear prolongations in today's onomastics of the same area (i.e. in countries like Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Romania).

In my opinion (cf. Poruciuc 1993: 343), for discussions on onomastic continuity in a certain area, perpetuation of anthroponymus is much more significant than that of toponyms. However spectacular toponymic isoglosses may be[4], one must observe that place-names will frequently be taken over from autochthonous populations by intrusive ones. There also are cases in which natives are literally

removed, while intruders continue to use a number of toponyms learned from the natives before the removal. For instance, Manhattan spectacularly survives, while nothing (to my knowledge) remains of the Algonquian-speaking tribe from which Europeans first heard that place-name. By contrast, as regards person-names, one can hardly imagine any significant anthroponymic perpetuation without demographic continuity[5].

Closer to the point, I consider that the onomastic union I have in mind (with origins in the vast prehistoric Fertile Crescent) shows certain specific features perpetuated through ages. Since many of those features (typologic-formative, phonologic, semantic-referential, and even ideologic) have been discussed, or at least pointed out in previous articles, I will both summarize and add new things here.

Typologically, the onomastic pool I consider as most ancient in the Aegeo-Mediterranean world is not made of names traditionally considered as specific to the Indo-European common core. As regards person-names recorded as Greek there is clear precedence of monomembers such as Ἀττᾶς, Βαβοῦς, Τατίας over bimembers like Ἀρίσταρχος, Δημόδορος, Νικάριστος. While the first category generally implies semantically opaque roots, and pre-Greek suffixes, the more recent bimembers usually show transparent composition of lexemes interpretable through Greek, or at least through known Indo-European vocabulary. Chronological precedence of obscure monomembers over more transpareant (and more aristrocratic) bimembers was also observed in Thracian (cf. Vlahov 1972). Many of the archaic monomembers I take into account were among the ones regarded by earlier authors (of the Fick & Bechtel line) as hypocorisms produced mainly by abbreviation of typically IE Vollnamen, i.e. bimembers (see also Poruciuc 1995b). Anyway, it is quite obvious that the dominant category of hereditary person-names (both officialized family-names and village-bound hereditary nicknames) which survive in today's Balkans are not aristocratic bimembers of the Classical times, but more archaic monomembers.

One thing that might become significant in the future is that, not only in Anatolia and Greece, but also in Egypt, royal anthroponymic compounds represented a development preceded by less sophisticated monomembers. Most of the latter can be explained through common appelatives in Egypt, while they remain obscure in the other two areas of the ancient world. In Egypt, most predynastic and early dynastic kings bore names which looked like monosyllabic radicals, such as **Ska** (probably meaning 'throne'), **Hu** ('scepter'?), or **Ka** ('vital strength')[6]. After them, during early dynasties, royal compounds were gradually introduced (**Ban-n-neter, Kha-sekhem, Neter-ka-ra**, etc.), quite often doubled by either root-like names like the above-mentioned ones, or by reduplicative names (**Bebi, Pepi, Teta** - a category to which I will have to come back below). I would not have paid so much

attention to Egypt (though I am not an Egyptologyst myself) if I had not been struck by the multitude of obvious correspondences between Egyptian simple and reduplicative names and the same categories of the Microasian-Aegeo-Balkan stock. There certainly is more to it than I can say here.

As regards word-formation proper, it is easy to assume that reduplication is a primeval device, which preceded what we know as composition and derivation[7]. Classical philologists considered that widely spread nouns like **papa** (for either 'food'·or 'father'), as well as person-names like **Baba** (quite frequent in languages of the area taken into consideration here) have their origins in infant babble, or nursery speech[8]. My question is: how come that, over a vast area, childlike redu-plications have such similar meanings attached to them? It is true that all infants in the world first utter basic syllables containing consonants like /p/b/, /m/n/, or /k/g/, and vocalic sounds of the /a/ type. But it is parents who teach infants to attach cer-tain meanings to those syllables; and such attachments are fixed by age-old tradi-tions. It so happens that many such traditions seem to have been the same in the Mediterranean world if we consider, for instance, that: Rom. (infantile) **papa** 'food' can hardly be said to have been invented by either infants or grown-ups of Romania, since there was a Lat. **pappa** 'food' (presented by Ernout/Meillet as "mot expressif du langage enfantin"); moreover, the now Semitic-speaking Maltese use **pappa** with the quite specialized meaning of 'bread' (cf. Bugeja 1982). As for proper-names, instead of accepting any idea of independent nursery productions, I will rather consider the possibility of a primeval Fertile-Crescent name-giving system. The latter might account for the Egyptian theonym **Baba, Babai, Babi, Bebi** (Gk. Béβων), borne by the "first-born son of Osiris", as well as for the most frequent Phrygian name, **Baba,** and the Romanian family-name **Baba** (whose position as head-member of a group of over 60 onomastic deriva-tives - cf. Poruciuc 1995b- makes it impossible for me to accept the traditional view according to which such names derive from the Slavic loan **babă** 'old lady'). Speaking of reduplicative appelatives and proper-names in languages as remote (in space and time) as Egyptian, Phrygian, Albanian, and Romanian, both frequency and social-cultural implications of such lexis make me think that it should be referred not to individual infancy, but rather to the infancy of language itself.

I will have to go back to Egyptian again because in it we find early attestations of Fertile-Crescent language, and, more particularly , a multitude of primeval mean-ingful monosyllables, many of which are easily interpretable as "Nostratic" (mainly since they may be referred to radicals traditionally regarded as Indo-European)[9]. And there hardly is any such Egyptian monosyllable without a significant reduplica-tive extension: e.g. **ba** 'soul, might, courage' > **baba** 'to use force'; **ga** 'to see, to look' > **gaga** 'to oggle, to goggle'; **ta** 'bread, loaf, cake' > **tata** 'sacrificial bread';

sef 'flame, fire, heat' > sefsef 'to smelt, to cook'. Such developments may look unusual from the viewpoint of today's European languages. However, we should not forget that reduplication used to manifest itself in certain verbal forms of earlier Indo-European languages (cf. Lat. canō 'I sing' - cecini 'I sang', or dō 'I give' - dedi 'I gave'). As for today's Mediterranean idioms (with traces of prehistoric patterns), most remarkable is the significant amount of reduplications and of reduplicative variation in Maltese: e.g. dekdek 'to drink' - dekdiek 'drunkard', gemgem 'to growl' - gemgumi 'grumbler', sefsef 'to whisper' - sefsif 'whispering'. It is also worth mentioning that, besides reduplications "from the nursery", or of onomatopoeic origin (papa 'food', nani 'sleep', murmur < Lat. murmur), colloquial Romanian makes use of full-word reduplication, especially in creating expressive adverbs. Such products often coincide, in form and meaning, with concoctions of the same type in Albanian (a language which has much in common with the pre-Roman substrate of Romanian): e.g. Rom. gata-gata 'almost' (< gata 'ready') =Alb. gati-gati 'almost' (< gati 'ready'); Rom. roată-roată 'all around' (< roată 'wheel') = Alb. rreth-rreth 'all around' (< rreth 'hoop').

There is another aspect worth considering. Many of the reduplicative words taken into account here (as both appelatives and proper-names) belong to the semantic sphere of 'father, progenitor, procreation', and have clear counterparts among archaic interjections. Though in that field I can hardly accept the idea of mere borrowing (such as from Greek to Latin, as indicated by Chantraine and Ernout/ Meillet), there certainly is correspondence between Gk. βαβαί ("exclamation exprimant la surprise et l'étonnement") and Lat. babae ("exclamation de la langue comique" - to which the Ernout/ Meillet dictionary adds papae = παπαί). Also, there are Lat. tat and tatae, as "onomatopées marquant l'étonnement", to be compared to Lat. attat and babae (cf. Phryg. attas 'father' > Attas, Attes, Attis as most frequent Phrygian anthroponyms; and Phryg. Baba, presented as "nursery word", just like attas, in the glossary of Diakonoff/ Neroznak 1985). The usage of a father-appelative as a means of expressing surprise and amazement seems to be of respectable age, and of impressive spreading, if we also consider a well-known Romanian formula, "mă, tată, mă!", used in the same situations as the ones in which Gk. βαβαί or Lat. tatae were uttered (Romanians do use "tataie!" too). Under such circumstances it becomes hard to believe that there is mere coincidence (and not also ancestral common tradition) in the field of the Egyptian-Microasian-Balkan-Italic "nursery words" turned proper-names, of types like Ata/Atta, Baba/Babba, Papa/Pappa,Tata/Tatta[10].

As for the primeval (mostly monoconsonantal) syllables on which appelatives and names like the ones above are based, it is, again, Egyptian which can give us very early clues. That archaic language contained words which, in Wallis

222

Budge's transcription, appear as at 'father, prince, king, priest' (cf. Alb. atë 'father'), at, ata 'vagina, vulva, womb', pā 'ancestor' (> pāpā 'to give birth to'), as well as theonyms like Ta 'the primeval Earth-god, husband of the Sky-goddess' and Tatiu 'Earth-gods as opposed to sky-gods' (cf. Lat. Tatius!), or Baba 'the first-born son of Osiris'. We will certainly have to go back to them.

I have insisted on reduplication and its implications because I think that device should be taken seriously, especially since it manifests itself so richly in the onomastics of both Egypt and the Anatolian-Balkan-Italic inter-peninsular connection. I do think that both Asia Minor and Egypt can be of much help in interpretations of the phenomenon I designated as Aegeo-Balkan Namenbund. But now, since I am still within a discussion on word-formation, I should add something on the better known device of derivation (see also note 7). In the case of the latter, as in the case of composition (which is not in need of much explanation), we should try to go to the roots too, i.e. we should go as far as we can (through attestations and reconstructions), to discover the probable origins of Aegeo-Balkan formants (prefixes and suffixes). I have proofs (many Egyptian ones, which I will discuss elsewhere) sustaining the independent-word origins of many of the most frequent Aegeo-Balkan formants (like the -EW, -IT, -JA, -WA suffixes contained in derivatives of the Man anthroponymic family of Table 2). We may also discover that "particles" fossilized in appelatives and proper-names of prehistoric origin (see, for instance, the much-discussed -inthos) may even have functioned as grammatical markers in idioms of the remote past. An example is the "optional" prefix lë- in Albanian (mashk/lëmashk 'moss', mazë/lëmazë 'whipped cream' - cf. Gabinschi 1993: 38), a formant which I referred to the Anatolian (Hattic) le-, with collective-plural functions. Albanian lë- has a closer correspondent in Romania lă-/le- occurring in substrate words (like leurdă 'wild garlic'). But I would not be surprised to find proofs in favour of a common origin not only for the above-mentioned Anatolian-Balkan formant, but also for the proto-Semitic preposition-prefix la- 'for, belonging to' ("also dative particle", according to Bergsträsser 1983: 19), and, last but not least, Romanian preposition la 'at, to' (of unknown origin - cf., however, Celtic la), also used in analytic datives (e.g. "Dați mâncare la copii" = "Give food to the children").

For another example, besides the fact that we must dismiss a Hungarian origin for most of the -aș suffixes in Romanian[11], we must also sustain a substrate origin of such suffixes, by more arguments than the ones in Poghirc 1969: 363. For instance, a comparison between Rom. -aș and its Ancient Greek correspondent -ᾱς (and there are many other correspondences of the same kind) may lead to conclusions regarding not only Aegeo-Balkan word-formation, but also semantics and phonology. First of all, we may observe the perfect correspondence in the double

function of the suffix under discussion in the two languages: Gk. -ᾱς created derivatives in the field of trade-names, and in that of diminutives and nicknames (see the Chantraine dictionary, for instance s.v. χήν "oie" > χηνᾶς as "nom de métier" > person-name Χηνᾶς; see also s.v. ἐλέα "oiseau chanteur", where there is a comment on "le suffixe -ᾶς de sobriquets, cf. ἐλασᾶς"); identically, Rom. -aș occurs in trade-names (e.g. coasă 'scythe' > cosaș 'mower'), and diminutives (e.g. copil 'child' > copilaș 'little child'). In both languages the suffix is added to a noun, to create another noun. Whether the Aegeo-Balkan suffix under discussion has something to do with Hittite -aš, functioning as a nominative-genitive marker (cf. Hittite attaš 'father, father's') is hard for me to demonstrate now. I should go back to proper-names.

I will probably never cease to be amazed at the amount of correspondences between ancient Microasian names and a whole mass of Romanian ones (which I just happen to know better, without overlooking the existence of identical or very similar ones in Albanian, Bulgarian, and, partially, neo-Greek and Slavic idioms of former Yugoslavia). There hardly is any Microasian reduplicative person-name without an exact correspondent within the Albanian-Bulgarian-Romanian connection[12]. Here is just a small series:

| MAs. | Βαβα | Γαγα | Δαδα | Λαλα | Νανα | Παπα | Τατα |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|---------|------|
| Alb. | Babo | (Gogo) | Dado | Lala | Nano | Papa | Tato |
| Bulg. | Baba | Gaga | Dada | Lalo | Nana | (Papanov) | Tato |
| Rom. | Baba | Gaga | Dada | Lală | Nana | Papa | Tatu |

For the ones inclined to stick to the old idea that such things are only results of mutual borrowing, or, worse, coincidences due to independent nursery productions, I will ask the question: how come that there also is correspondence in (hardly infantile) formants attached to such reduplicative names, in both Microasian and Balkan idioms? Quite many of the Microasian derivatives of the type reduplication + suffix have their clear counterparts in the Balkans. For the sake of simplification, I will give only a Microasian-Greek-Romanian triangle (observe, vertically, correspondence in the -AS/-ES/-IS suffixes, added to reduplicative themes like the above-presented ones):

| MAs. | Νανας | Βαβης | Νανις | Πανις |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Gk. | Νάννας | Βάβης | Νανίς | Πάνις |
| Rom. | Nanaș | Babeș | Naniș | Paniș |

Phonologically speaking, we may be grateful to the Greeks for their consistent marking of accents (while, with few exceptions, Microasian, Thracian, and Illyrian, attested mainly in inscriptions, remained without accent markers). Thus we may observe not only correspondence in the onomastic employment of suffixes (like the ones of the -AS/-ES/-IS type in the three languages taken into considera-

tion above), but also Greek-Romanian similarity in accent patterns. In the case of -ᾶς = -aș, we can see that they occur in common derivatives too, not only in person-names; and in both Greek and Romanian the two suffixes appear as stressed (see Gk. χηνᾶς and its anthroponymic product Χηνᾶς, in comparison with Rom. cosáș and Cosáșu).

There is something Albanian, Romanian, and partially Greek have in common as regards suffixation, namely the regular shift of the stress from theme to suffix. I will stick to -AS, mainly since Greek also participates in that case. The accent shift (without qualitative changes in the root-vowel) visible in Gk. χήν > χηνᾶς is clearly the same as the one in Rom. sútă ('100') > sutáș ('commander of a hundred'), though accents are usually not marked in Romanian writing. Greek only rarely shows a tendency like the Romanian (and partially Slavic, possibly as a substrate feature there too) weakening of vowels which remain unstressed by accent shift. For a rare case in Greek, we might consider the shift ω/ου (most probably /o:/>/u/) visible in the derivation from σάπων 'soap' (I suspect the stress could have been, earlier, on ω in this borrowing from Celtic, maybe through Latin) to σαπουνᾶς (attested at Odessos, and translated by Chantraine as "fabricant de savon"); there is Rom. săpún > săpunáș too, but the latter means 'little soap' (by the diminutive function of -aș). To go back to the above-mentioned vocalic weakening, ó > u is quite well-known in Romanian grammar (cf. pot 'I can' - putém 'we can'), while in derivation proper it remained regular especially in the more archaic Macedo-Romanian (cópil 'illegitimate child'>cupiláčiu 'little boy'). In standard Romanian, we may observe that the acceptable type of derivation is porc 'swine' > porcár, but we may discover that there are family-names like Purcáru, Purcărea, Purcăreánu, Purcăréscu, Purcaréte (all referred by Iordan 1983 to purcar, as an "older and regional" version of porcar 'swineherd'). Unlike ó > u, another manifestation of vowel weakening in Romanian, visible in written form as a > ă, is still part of standard language (with the exception of recent borrowings, in which intellectuals prefer to avoid it): e.g. gázdă 'landlord' > găzdáș 'tenant'; pálmă 'palm of the hand' > pălmáș 'manual labourer'.

Proper-names of the Aegeo-Balkan stock also show (not in a fully systematic way, but rather as numerous reflections of a disturbed and partially lost system) phonologic features like the ones presented above. For instance, Albanian is quite constant in its shift of stress to added suffixes, in appelatives as well as in proper-names (cf. family-names Kálo, Kaléschi, Kalóshi, all most probably derived, ultimately, from Alb. kalë 'horse'; cf. also Rom. family-names Calu, Căléscu, Călúș, Călúț, to be referred either to Rom. cal 'horse', or, possibly also to Thrac. Κάλης included in Detschew 1957). But Romanian, like Greek, has many "hesitations" in stressings of onomastic derivatives (the above-mentioned Gk. Ναΐς was

also recorded with an initial stress, Νάνις - cf. Πάνις in the same list). There is, in Romanian proper-name derivatives, an initial-stress tendency which is too deep-going (cf. Thrac. Κάλης, with an initial stress) to be explained by recent influence like the German and Hungarian ones. There are cases in which an older final stress is considered as correct, against the generalized use of initial stress: for instance, the name of a Romanian writer is pronounced Hógaș by most people, while teachers may insist on the original pronunciation, Hogáș. And, while Albanians pronounce their family-name Baláshi with a stress on the suffix, Romanians prefer an initial stress for the correspondent of that name, Bálaș (just as they pronounce Bábeș, structurally closer to Gk. Βάβης and Thrac. Κάλης).

Some paragraphs, at least, should be on a rather delicate matter, namely that on the relationship between proper-names and appelatives considered to represent origins for those names. One has to admit that all proper-names have (more or less visible) origins in common words. But one should not expect names used in a particular language to derive all from common words of that language. What we should never forget, in onomastics, is that languages may be replaced and lost, while names produced by those lost languages may survive through succesive ethnolinguistic disruptions, under circumstances of (at least partial) demographic continuity in a given area. To resume, what we now have in Balkan linguistics in the field of appelative-name relationship is generally bad; mainly because of what I may call a known-language screen. In that respect, there is a lot of national-myth colouring, and of ideologic bias. For instance, national linguists have "naturally" tried to interpret hereditary names of their own languages primarily through native vocabulary, or through that of neighbouring languages (as most obvious in Iordan 1983). True enough, if one finds a Romanian family-name like Sutașu one should first refer it to Rom. sutaș and its basis sută (even without also considering the rather obscure origin of that numeral). The trouble is that, besides hundreds of transparent Romanian names of the Sutașu type, there are other hundreds of names showing the same kind of suffixation, but no clear relationship with familiar appelatives. In such instances we may assume origins in lost idioms of the same ethnolinguistic area. Let me continue by some illustration.

Since there have been so many Baba names above, I may go back to them and assume that, while certain Romanian Baba names may have something to do with Slav. baba or Baba (cf. Iordan 1983), Slavic cannot account for Microasian and Greek names of the same isogloss. Moreover, there is an etymologically obscure derivative, Rom. babán 'big, full-grown', accounting for Rom. family-name Babán (see, however, Alb. Babani, besides Babi, Babo, Baboçi, Baburi). Taking into consideration that, whatever national folk etymologies say, Baba names represent an Ancient Aegeo-Balkan tradition, and given the fact that

such names obviously reflect archaic reduplication, I presume to assert: such reduplication must have started from primeval Fertile-Crescent syllables, such as the one recorded as Egypt. ba 'soul, might, courage' (> baba 'to use force'). I, for one, can easily admit that, in keeping with archaic name-giving ideology (with a lot of magic-wishful thinking in it), names like the ones recorded as MAs. Βαβης, Gk. Βάβης, as well as Rom. Babeş, can be thought to have originally meant "Mighty-One" or "Brave-One", rather than "One-Looking-like-an-Old-Lady".

For another example, as already suggested above, Rom. Nana, with its rich group of (over 30) derivative family-names, also has quite clear Aegeo-Balkan correspondents, ancient and modern (among other things, the Nana family may also be considered as showing Aegeo-Balkan /a/c/o/ alternation -see Table 1 -, since there are Rom./Bulg. Nana-Nena-Nona family-names too). Rom. Nana could be explained "on national ground" as derived from nană 'god-mother' (also a form of address to elderly women); there is a masculine of that too, nan 'god-father', synonymically doubled by its derivative nănaş, abbreviated as naş (cf. family-names Nanaş, Nănaş, Naş). So, since it would be hard for anyone to deny the existence of an Aegeo-Balkan isogloss in the case of Nana names, should we think that the Romanian above-mentioned appelatives (as possible relics from lost idioms) can account for the original semantics of that isogloss? Why not, I would say. Many of the most widely spread Aegeo-Balkan names do have referents in the field of religious-ritual practices (and what about Egypt naā 'great, greatness', naanu 'good, beautiful', or nan 'to proclaim'?). If Rom. nan, nană, nănaş have been Christianized and have good positions (at least in Romanian villages) among social-ritual terms, I might say that few Romanian speakers know now that nănaş once also meant 'offering, gift' (cf. Iordan 1983, s.v. Nănaş).

With examples like these at hand, we should be reluctant to consider that Romanian names of the Man type (included in table 2)[13] come either from abbreviations of the Judeo-Christian Emanuel ('God-with-Us'), or from family-names of the neighbours (who are bound to have their own folk-etymologies in that respect). We should rather consider the probability of Man names being gradually attached to Emanuel (as pseudo-diminutives of it) after Christianization; and we should try to find credible appelatives as clues to the origins of the Man isogloss. Good candidates are, in my opinion, words representing the above-mentioned religious-ritual sphere: e.g. Gk. μῆνις/μᾶνις 'divine rage', Lat. mānēs 'good gods' (and mānis 'good'), and, last but not least, the semantically rich Rom. a meni 'to foretell, to wish, to promise, to decide, to predestine, to soothsay' (which cannot possibly derive from Slavic words based on men- 'change'). More study is needed here too[14].

For the time being, what I here propose for publication are only scraps of a vision of the Aegeo-Balkan onomastic union as manifestation of major facts and

factors of the Aegeo-Balkan ethnogenesis. While in previous articles I insisted on observation of links between Asia Minor and the Palaeobalkan domain, as well as between such links and certain aspects surviving in modern Balkan languages, this time I added (cautiously enough, I hope) references to Egyptian as continuator of primeval Fertile-Crescent language. I have now a sufficient number of arguments to declare myself in favour of Muşu's idea of an "Aegeo-Egyptian fund"[15], as long as that fund may be shown to have had its original basis in the Neolithic and Copper-Age demographic boom (of course, with many subsequent reinforcements). I hope to make ready for publication, as soon as I can, quite a number of other arguments sustaining the existence of an Aegeo-Balkan onomastic union, with specific features which have correspondence in both the Hamito-Mediterranoid stock of Egyptian, and in modern languages of the Balkans (and other parts of Europe). I already know that there is system in that field; and I hope others will reach similar conclusions soon.

Adrian Poruciuc
Universitatea "Al. I. Cuza" Iaşi
Bd. Copou nr. 11, 6600 Iaşi
România

## NOTES

1. See especially Poruciuc 1992a, 1993, and 1995b in the bibliographic list.

2. Although I insist on the importance of primitive Near-East farming and of its spreading to Europe, I find no reason to believe Renfrew (1987) about Neolithic Anatolia as Indo-European "homeland" (see good criticism in Haarmann 1994). As regards imposition of Indo-European idioms in the Aegeo-Balkan area I think we should develop the Gimbutas-Martinet-Mallory line (cf. Poruciuc 1995: 58). As an opponent of the genealogic (Schleicherian) glottogenetics I do not really feel in need of a unique "homeland". And as a representative of what I may call the polygenetic model I will refuse to accept things like "the coming of the Greeks" (we may, of course, say something like "the coming of the linguistic ancestors of the Greeks").

3. For instance, genealogically, Romanian is a "daughter-language" of Latin, which was the language imposed on natives of Dacia (where Latin-speakers were also colonized). But, if we have a look at the numerous correspondences between linguistic (also onomastic) elements of the Ancient Italic fund, and those of the Palaeobalkan one (i.e. also of pre-Romanian), we may say Latin and Romanian have substrate elements in common too. If we have a look at any collection of Romanian family names (many looking very much older than the modern age in which they became officialized), we may discover that the number of names derived directly from the mother-language, Latin, is small enough; also, the number of hereditary names transparently derived from Romanian appelatives, on Romanian ground, is not

bigger than that of obscure monomembers strikingly resembling not only Albanian and Bulgarian names, but also Ancient Microasian, Mycenaean, Thracian, Illyrian, and Greek. That situation imposes the idea of a common Aegeo-Balkan onomastic stock, of prehistoric origins.

4. As Poruciuc 1995a demonstrates, I do not deny that substrate toponymus can offer important linguistic clues too.

5. I do not overlook special cases of apparent perpetuation through intermediaries, such as that of Etruscan names which first became Roman, then Romanic (we should not forget, however, that Etruscans were not simply removed, since most of them gradually became Latin-speakers). As for ideologically spread anthroponyms (like the Hebrew ones which became pan-Christian, or the Arabic ones which are now pan-Islamic), they represent a phenomenon of real signifiance only for ages too recent to count in this discussion.

6. Egyptologists will excuse my usage of the outfashioned vocalization (practically Wallis Budge's). I simply find that more recent "literal" (i.e. mainly consonantal) transcriptions make Egyption somehow look like an unreal and inaccesible language, which it certainly is not. Since most of the "exact" values of Egyptian vocalic sounds are not known even to specialists, and since, in inherited vowels, Coptic shows a lot of variation (often strangely resembling Palaeobalkan "alternations" and "oscillations"), I may not regret using a where most Egyptologists now use **i**, and using arbitrary-conventional **e** where they write nothing.

7. While reduplication primarily meant repetition of semantically charged monoconsonantal syllables, the result being semantic intensification or enlargement (e.g. Egypt. sa 'to break, to destroy' > sasa 'to run against, to attack, to change, to overthrow'), what is generally known as composition implies combination of different words, often different parts of speech, as in Engl. blackbird and runway. In its turn, derivation obviously developed later than (and out of) composition, since many of the particles now regarded as mere formants (mainly prefixes and suffixes) once were independent words (e.g. Engl. -dom has the same origin as the independent noun doom; and the now opaque Engl. -ly has the same origin as like, namely an old Germanic word meaning 'body').

8. Chantraine regards Gk. πάππα (a vocative for 'father') as "un terme de la nursery [!] avec redoublement et gémination"; in its turn, the Ernout/ Meillet dictionary presents Lat. **tata** ("papa") as "mot enfantin" to be compared to Gk. τάτα· the same dictionary adds that **tata** was epigraphically attested (so it must have been very old), and was probably related to person-names like **Tata, Tatta, Tatius.**

9. In Poruciuc 1995: 39 there is a brief presentation of the undeniable correspondence between a radical traditionally considered as Indo-European, namely *ak- (referring to notions like "stone", "sharp or pointed objects", "sharpness, quickness"), and a whole Egyptian family of appelatives, such as **aku** 'stone quarry' and **aken** 'a digging tool, hoe, plough, pick'.

10. I prefer variants of **a**-vocalism here, not only because, as stated above, the earliest infantile vocalic sounds are mostly of the /a/ range (as easiest to articulate), but also because, at least as regards the Italic pool, **a**-vocalism has been interpreted as a sign of archaic-rural-dialectal language (see repeated remarks on it in Ernout/ Meillet).

11. I have to admit that, though Rom. -aş has an Aegeo-Balkan explanation, in cer-

tain words that suffix could be of other origins (such as Turkish, or Hungarian), as indicated in Poghirc 1969: 363.

12. While for Microasian names my sources are mainly Zgusta's works, for Romanian-Bulgarian correspondences in family-names I made use of Iordan 1983 (without accepting his general tendency of indicating borrowing from Bulgarian). As for Albanian, I did my own collection of person-names (also from telephone directories) during my 1996 stay in Tirana.

13. To the Man names in Table 2 I tentatively added some names recorded with initial B-, as I took into account a well-known Palaeobalkan /b/m/ alternation (cf. the Thracian theonym Bendis/Mendis). Moreover, I am aware of a similar alternation in Egyptian too: e.g. bait 'house' (= Hebr. bayit) - mait 'dwelling'; or bet 'grains, seed' - met 'seed, offspring'. Much more can be said on a larger Egyptian-Aegeo-Balkan correspondence which appears as a /b/p/f/m/ alternation (quite similar to many things presented as Palaeobalkan in Poruciuc 1995a); see also a mention of "exchanges between m, p, and b, with especial reference to Anatolia" in Bernal 1991: 582.

14. As an opening for a future discussion, I may invite Indo-Europeanists to explain the position (and the Aegeo-Balkan type of /a/e/o/ vocalism) of a group of assumedly related roots. Two root-variants appear as "manu-s oder monu-s" in the Pokorny dictionary. The same dictionary considers that "maybe" (vielleicht) the two variants are related to men- 'to think', which, in its turn (as suggested by Pokorny, with a question mark), may be referred to another men-, meaning something like 'to remain, to stop to think, to dwell upon' - cf. Lat. manēre > Rom. a mânea 'to stay (overnight)'. The strange (?) thing is that Egyptian has both men 'calculation, statement' and another men 'to remain, to abide, to be permanent, to be stable'; and the latter could be written by the single hieroglyph "draughtboard", the one which could also mark the name of Men (Gk. Μήνης), the legendary king who established Dinasty I and thus laid the foundations of the Old Kingdom. We will have to come back to such correspondences, now that there is a credible connection established between Egyptian Men and Cretan Minos (cf. Bernal 1991: 171-177); maybe future studies will also solve the situation "made still more confusing by the fact that the legendary Indian founder of political order and lawgiver was called Manu" - cf. Bernal 1991: 571 (to which I may add some more confusion by mentioning that Germanic tribes also had a "founder", and his name was Manus).

15. There still are some hesitations in my acceptance of two Egyptian-inclined authors, namely Bernal and Muşu. The former (of whom I know only through his Black Athena, vol.II) uses an extremely rich amount of interdisciplinary information, and insists mainly on Bronze Age influence of Egypt on the Aegean (also by colonization); my primary concern is with the effects of a much earlier phenomenon, the Fertile-Crescent deomographic expansion of the Neolithic and the Copper Age. As for Muşu, I included only his most recent book in the bibliographic list of this article (and I will only mention he has an earlier one, Lumini din depărtări (= Lights from Far Away, 1981), with similar ideas and intentions. What I find most appealing in Muşu is his general vision of an "Aegeo-Egyptian fund". It is a pity that Muşu only incompletely used archaeology, and he often resorted to literature instead of minute linguistic analysis. He observed mainly correspondences between Egyptian and Greek, but he also took into account "pre-Thracian", Romanian and Albanian. Though Muşu did not know about Bernal, they often coincide in conclusions. So there must be something there.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bechtel, F., 1917, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit,* Halle: Niemeyer.
- Bernal, M., 1991, *Black Athena -The Afroasiatic Roots of Classical Civilization,* II, Rutgers U.P.
- Bergsträsser. G., 1983, *Introduction to the Semitic Languages* (transl. P.T. Daniels), Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Best, J.G.P./ N.M.W de Vries, 1989, *Thracians. and Mycenaeans - Proceedings of the Fourth International Congress of Thracology, Rotterdam, 24-26 September, 1984.* Leiden: Brill.
- Breasted, J.H., 1964 (1905), *A History of Egypt,* New York: Bantam.
- Boutouras, A., 1912, *Ta neoellenika kyria onomata,* Athenai: Raphtanes.
- Bugeja, P., 1982, *Kelmet il-Malti,* Malta.
- Chantraine, P., 1968, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque,* Paris: Klincksieck.
- Constantinescu, N.A., 1963, *Dicţionar onomastic românesc,* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei.
- David, A.R., 1982, *The Ancient Egyptians,* London: Routledge.
- Detschew, D., 1952, *Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache,* Sofia: Akademie.
- id., 1957, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste,* Wien: Rohrer.
- Dimitrov, P., 1994, *Paleobalkanskijat vokalizăm,* Sofija: Kliment Okhridski.
- Diakonoff, I.M./ V.P., Neroznak, 1985, *Phrygian,* New York: Caravan.
- Doçi, R., 1983, *Antroponimia e Llapushës (Prekorupës),* Prishtinë: Instituti Albanologjik.
- Dornseiff, F./ B. Hansen, 1978, *Reverse Lexicon of Greek Proper-Names - With an Appendix Providing a Reverse-Index of Indigenous Names from Asia Minor in Their Greek Transcriptions, by L. Zgusta,* Chicago: Ares.
- Ernout, A./A. Meillet, 1985, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine,* Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fick, A., 1874, *Die griechischen Personennamen nach ihrer Bildung erklärt, mit den Namensytemen verwandter Sprachen verglichen und systematisch geordnet,* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fraser, P.M./ E. Matthews, 1987, *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names,* Vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Furnée, E., 1972, *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen,* The Hague: Mouton.

- Gabinschi, M., 1993, *"Contribuții la depistarea elementelor fondului autohton în limba română",* Thraco-Dacica, XIV, 1-2, 33-40.

- Gardiner, A., 1988 (1957), *Egyptian Grammar,* Oxford: Griffith Institute.

- Gordon, C.H., 1987, *Forgotten Scripts,* New York: Dorset.

-Haarmann, H., 1994, *"Contact Linguistics, Archaeology and Ethnogenetics: An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Indo-European Homeland Problem",* Journal of Indo-European Studies, Vol.22., 3-4, 265-288.

- Hahn, J.G. von, 1854, *Albanesische Studien,* I-II, Jena: Mauke.

- Held, W.H./W.R. Schmalstieg/ J.E. Gertz, 1987, *Beginning Hittite,* Columbus: Slavica.

-Iordan, I., 1983, *Dicționar al numelor de familie românești,* București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

-Landau, O., 1958, *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen,* Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksells.

-Nilsson, M.P., 1972, *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology* (ed. Emile Vermeule), Berkeley. University of California Press.

- * * * 1995, *Numeratori telefonik i Shqiperise,* Tiranë.

- Poghirc, C., 1969, *"Influența autohtonă",* in Istoria limbii române, II, București: Editura Academiei.

- Pokorny, J., 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch,* Bern: Francke.

- Poruciuc, A., 1992, *"Observații asupra filonului paleobalcanic din antroponimia românească",* Thraco-Dacica, XIII, 1-2, 15-23.

- id., 1992a, *"Onomastica românească în perspectivă paleo- și panbalcanică: direcții și principii de abordare",* Symposia Thracologica, 9, 187-190.

- id., 1992b, *"Problems and Patterns of the SE European Ethno- and Glottogenesis (ca. 6500 BC - AD 1500)",* The Mankind Quarterly, XXXIII, 1, 3-41.

- id., 1993, *"On Palaeo-Balkan Elements in Romanian Onomastics",* Banatica, 12, 339-346.

- id., 1995, *Archaeolinguistica,* București: Bibliotheca Thracologica.

- id., 1995a, *"The etymology of Dac. deva in connection with Gk. Θῆβαι and with Palaeobalkan phonology",* Thraco-Dacica, XVI, 1-2, 275-283.

- id., 1995b, *"Phrygian and the SE European Namenbund",* given at the International Symposium "Thracians and Phrygians: Problems of Parallelism", Ankara, June 3-6, 1995.

- id., 1995c *"Ce (mai) este de substrat în limba română",* Limba română (Chișinău), 6, 37-41.

- id., 1996, *"Specific Features of the Aegeo-Balkan Namenbund"* (summary), in The Thracian World at the Crossroads of Civilizations - Reports and Summaries, Bucharest:Institutul Român de Tracologie.

- Russu, I.I., 1969, *Illirii - Istoria - limba și onomastica - romanizarea,* București: Editura Academiei.

- Toçi, V., 1969, *"Données sur l'onomastique illyrienne a Dyrrhachium et dans d'autres centres de l'Albanie",* Studime filologjike, 3, Tiranë.

- Vlahov, K., 1972, *"Typologie und Chronologie der Personennamen bei den Thrakern",* in Thracia, I, 249-262, Sofia: Akademie.

- Wallis Budge, E.A., 1978 (1920), *An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary,* New York: Dover.

- id., 1983 (1910), *Egyptian Language,* New York: Dover.

- Zgusta, L., 1964, *Kleinasiatische Personennamen,* Prag: Akademie.

- id., 1978, *"Reverse-Index of Indigenous Names from Asia Minor in Their Greek Transcriptions",* in Dornseiff, F./ B. Hansen, 1978.

Table 1

Some features of specific Aegeo-Balkan anthroponyms
(presented at the 7th International Congress of Thracology, 1996)

1. Reduplication (at two chronologic-geographic extremes):

| MAs. | Βαβα | Δαδα | Γαγα | Λαλα | Νανα | Παπα | Τατα |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Rom. | Baba | Dada | Gaga | Lală | Nana | Papa | Tatu |

2. Vocalic alternations (Wechsel), mainly /a/e/, /a/o/, /a/e/o/:

a) MAs. Αδα - Εδα, Αρμοας - Ερμοας, Ταβεις - Τεβεις.
b) MAs. Δαδης - Δηδης - Δοδης.
   Alb. Dado - Dede - Dode.
   Rom. Dadu - Dedu - Dodu.
c) Whole "alternative" families of person-names:

| MAs. | Αν(ν)α | Αννας | Αννακη | Αννικας | Ανιτα | Αννηλις |
|------|--------|-------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
|      | Ενα    | Εννας |        |         | Ενιτα |         |
|      | Οανια  | Οννης | Ουανα  |         |       | Ουαναλις |
| Rom. | Ana    | Anea  | Anachi | Anica   | Aniță |         |
|      | Ene    | Enea  | Enachi | Enică   | Eniță |         |
|      | Oană   | Onea  | Onacă  | Onică   | Oniță | Onel    |

a) Myc.  O-na-jo,  O-ne-u, O-na-se-u / Wa-ni-ko, Wa-na-si-
   MAs.  Οννης,  Οννεις          / Ουανια, Ουναις, Ουαναλις
                                    (Βαναλις, Φαναλις).
   Rom.  Onu,     Onea,    Onciu   / Oană, Oane, Oancea (Vancea)
b) MAs. Μολεας, Μολιανος           / Μοαλεις, Μωαλεις
                                    (cf. Μοαγετας, Μωγετας)
   Rom.  Molea,  Moleanu (Molianu) / Moale (< moale "soft"?)

a)  MAs. Ανα, Αινα· Ενα, Εινα· Ατες, Αιτες· Δηδις, Δειδας
b)  Bulg. Mano, Manja, Majnov, Mănju,  Măjno
    Rom. Manu, Manea, Mânea,  Mâinea, Mănescu, Măinescu
c)  Rom.  Bonea, Boinea; Gunea, Guinea

a) MAs. Βαβα/Παπα, Δαδας/Τατας
   Alb. Babi/Papi; Dado/Tato
b) MAs. Ατις/Αττις/Αθης; Δαδεας/Θαθεας
   Thrac. Αττις/Ἄττις/Αθης
c) MAs.  Βαβα, Βαββα, Βαβυλα/ Παπας, Παππας, Παμπας
   NGk. Βάβε, Βαβὴ/ Μπαμπὴ, Μπαμπούλα/ Παπάς, Παμπῆς, Παπούλια
   Rom.  Babu, Bambu, Vamvu (> Vamvulea)/Papiu, Pampu
         (> Pampulea)

| Table 2 An Aegeo-Balkan anthroponymic isogloss | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Mycenaean | Asia Minor | (Neo-)Greek | Thracian | Illyrian | Albanian | Bulgarian | Romanian |
| (1)  **Ma-no** ("Μανω") **Me-na** ("Μηνα") **Pa-no?** ("Φανός"?) | Μαν(ν)ος Μαννη Βανις? | Μανος Μανες Μανις Ν. Μπανος Ν. Μπενος | Μανης Μαν(ν)ις Μηνις Βανης? | | Mano/Bano? Mane/Bane? Mani Mene Meni/Beni | Mano Bana? Bena? Pano? | Manu/Banu? Bană? Bena? Beni Panu? |
| (2)  **Me-ne-u** ("Μενευς?") | | Μηνω? | | | | Menev? Majnov? | Mănău |
| (3)  **Ma-na-je-u** ("Μαναιευς?") | Μηνει | Μαννειος Βαναιω? | Βενναιοι? | | Manaj Menaj | | |
| (4)  **Ma-na-sa** ("Μνασας?") **Ma-na-so** ("Μνασος?") | Μανας Μανοσας Βανας? | | | | | | Manasa Manase? Manasia Mănese |
| (5)  **Ma-no-u-ro** ("?*Μαν- ουρος") | | Ν. Μανολης | | | Manol Menella? | Manul | Manole Manuli |
| (6)  **Me-ni-jo** ("Μενιος") | | Μανιος Μηνιος | | | | Mănju Măjno | Maniu Măin(escu) |
| (7)  **Me-nu-wa** ("Μενυας") | Μενουα | | | | | | |
| (8) | Μαν(ν)εα Μαν(ν)ια | Μανια Ν. Μανας Μηνας | Μανια | Μανοί? | Manja Banja? | Manja | Manea/Mânea Mâinea Banea? |
| (9) | Βενος? | | Manius | Bennius | Manushi Banushi? | Manuš | Manoș/Banuș? Mănuși/Bănuș? |
| (10) | | Ν. Μανικας Ν. Πανικας? | | | Meniku | | Mănică/Bănică? Benică |
| (11) | Μανιτας | | Μανιτης | Βενετος? | | Manica | Manița/Băniță? Manițiu Mâneață? |

\* Mark specific alternations, and types of suffixes (-AS/-ES/-US; -AJ/-EJ; -AW/-EW; -EL/-OL/-UL; -IK; -IT; -JA; -WA etc.)

235