

# The etymology of Dac. *deva* in connection with Gk. *Θῆβαι* and with Palaeobalkan phonology

ADRIAN PORUCIUC (Iași)

0. The present paper is meant to propose a new etymology for Dac. *deva* "hillfort, oppidum, city"<sup>1</sup>, by taking into account ancient toponyms of the *Θῆβαι* type, by observing archaeologic-historical evidence, and by adopting a more realistic view on Palaeobalkan phonology.

1. Classical Junggrammatiker provided much rigorous method in the field of Indo-European studies. However, many of their regulations have often proved to be obstructive and sterile<sup>2</sup>. Many 19th century etymologies, fossilized in important dictionaries, have come to be regarded as immovable, through better solutions could have been reached in the meantime, by a significant accumulation of new discoveries and new theoretical standpoints. It will, of course, take lots of collective-interdisciplinary effort to create new coherence and quality in the field of IE studies. This paper stands for a modest contribution to that necessary trend. My intention is to demonstrate that a very old, and generally accepted root-based etymology, namely the derivation of Dac. *deva* (better known as *dava*) from IE \**dhe-* "to set, place, lay" is untenable. That etymology, which forced *deva* to appear as "settlement, open village", should now be replaced by one more strictly based on real attestations, on facts and finds.

2. The above-mentioned traditional etymology is as old as Thracian studies (one century!), since it was imposed by Tomaschek (1894, II, 1: 9). For Dac. *δεβα* he gave the meanings "settlement, dwelling-place, open village" ("Siedlung, Wohnort, offenes Dorf"); and he was convinced that the word belonged to "the root *dhe*, *dhe*" (which, in Greek, produced *-θη,θε-* "to settle, found"). That root, says Tomaschek, was also extended by a "determinative u", supposed to account for Dac. *δεβα*. Tomaschek gives Greek, Armenian, and Celtic correspondents, and rejects the possibility of a link between his *dhe* family and an Iranian one (Zendic *dagyu*, *danhu*, cf. Kurd. *dau* "village" - see them also in Paulys IV, 1901, s.v. *Dauaba*), as well as between *dhe* terms and Kartvelic (Georgian) *daba* "village". I think Tomaschek did not have real reasons to be so sure in

such assertions. First, Dac. *deva* as "open village" is not at all sustained by what archaeologists and historians tell us about *deva*, *dava* (the latter form being preferred by recent specialists). Second, there are arguments which might lead in the future to a new view, according to which a link between Dac. *deva* and Kartvelic *daba* should appear as credible (which might also imply that Tomaschek was wrong in deriving the Caucasian term from *da* "low").

Tomaschek's etymology was perpetuated through the Walde-Pokorny general IE vision: in Pokorny 1959, s.v. *dhe-* "setzen, stellen, legen", a Thracian *-dava* "settlement" is also mentioned, as derived from an extension "\**dheya* or \**dhōya*" which would imply a "formant u" (no such u-extensions appear, however, in the list of *Nominalbildungen* given by Pokorny immediately under 2. *dhe-*). In further support of this interpretation, Pokorny adds, rather curiously, that the above-mentioned two versions of the extension he reconstructed must have been inspired by the double form \**dō-/dou-* "to give" (?). I find this all too complicated to believe. Nevertheless, that opinion about the mother-root of *deva* seems to have been quite influential: an outstanding historian like Iorga (1985: 31), probably under Tomaschek's influence, showed himself inclined to interpret Dacians simply as "villagers", since they were inhabitants of *davae*.

Linguistically, the Tomaschek-Pokorny line proved to be so strong that the 1894 derivation of *δεβα* from \**dhe* remained practically untouched in Thracian studies like Dečev 1957, and Poghirc 1987. Recent specialists, however, could no longer perpetuate Tomaschek's meaning of "open village" (which is against historical evidence), and they had to present *dava* (still derived from \**dhe-*) as belonging to Thracian terms for "fortress" and "township" (cf. Paliga 1987).

3. The most concise definition of a Dacian *dava*, as seen by a historian is a following: "A *dava* was a fortified settlement, a tribal center of the same type as the Celtic *oppidum*, having around it a territory of agricultural exploitation" (G. Penelea, note 32 to Iorga 1985: 31).

A synthetic view on the origin and evolution of that kind of fortified settlement is to be found in Crișan 1986: 145-150. The Romanian Dacologist shows that fortifications appeared in our part of the world as early as the Neolithic (see references to Dimini below), but the direct predecessors of Dacian *davae* were Bronze Age and Hallstatt hillforts<sup>3</sup>. The same author considered that (far from being "open villages") Dacian *davae* descended directly from settlements specific to the 3rd-2nd centuries BC which had an akropolis-like fortified part "with a dominant position" (Crișan 1986: 148). Such settlements were "of a proto-urban type, corresponding to the *oppida* of the Celtic world and having, in fact, the same functions as those of Mediterranean cities, without having, however, the true urban aspect of the latter. Such settlements were called *dava* by Geto-Dacians..." (p.149 - my translation from Romanian). In such conditions, it should not be surprising that the Greeks translated *dava/deva* (Hesych. *Δεβα*) by *πόλις*. On the basis of arguments like the ones presented below, I am positive that it is exactly Bronze Age seats of power like the *Θήβαι/Θήβη* of the Greeks which may convincingly account for Dac. *dava/deva*, not only historically, but also linguistically.

4. The celebrated Boeotian *Thebe* most closely complies with the definition of *dava* as "fortified settlement" and "tribal center having around it a territory of agricultural exploitation". That center - whose name, *Θήβαι*, has "pas d'étymologie" according to Chantraine (s.v.)<sup>4</sup> - was founded, according to classical tradition, by a group of "Phoenicians" led by Kadmos. What is most significant at this point is that both the Kadmeia, the hillfort founded by Kadmos, and the name of the city of Thebe formed around that power-seat can be directly referred to Dac. *dava*, word-and-thing. As for thing, we know that the Kadmeia was placed on top of four joint hills, and it was naturally protected ("durch zwei Schluchten herausgeschnitten" - Paulys V, 1934, s.v. *Thebai*). In the *Iliad*, as basic early attestation, Homer insists on the high-quality fortifications of the Boeotian city: he mentions "the sacred walls of Thebe" (IV, 378), "the seat of Thebe of the seven gates" (IV, 406); and the same city is presented as "fair-crowned" in XIX, 99 (in fact the meaning of the Homeric adjective *εὐστέρανος* is better rendered as "with noble wall", cf. Authenrieth, s.v.).

The early Greek-speaking world certainly knew several Thebes. Already in the *Iliad*, three of them are attested: besides the Boeotian one, Homer mentions the one in Egypt, and a Microasian one. We may assume that the name of *Θήβαι* for an Egyptian city is just a piece of *interpretatio graeca*<sup>5</sup>. But we can hardly say the

same thing of the *Θήβη* of Asia Minor mentioned by Homer<sup>6</sup>. That place, Andromache's native city (sacked by Achilles), is described in the *Iliad* as located "beneath wooded Plakes" (VI, 397), and as having walls and "lofty gates" (VI, 416). Though Homer presents the inhabitants of that "well-peopled" city as Cilicians (VI, 416), more recently the city came to be regarded as Mysian (cf. Paulys V, 1934, s.v. *Thebe*). If the latter opinion be correct, it is so much the more interesting in this discussion (taking into account the direct link between Microasian Mysians and Balkan Daco-Moesians).

Greeks of post-Homeric times then mentioned quite a number of cities called *Θήβαι*, *Θήβη*, *Θέβαι*, and that number clearly suggests, in my opinion, that the origin of that type of place-names was a common noun known over a vast area. According to what we find in Paulys encyclopaedia, there was a Thebe at the Red Sea, one in Lucania, one in Palestine (Hebrew *Tēbēs*), one in Siria, two more in Asia Minor. Last but not least, there was another *Θήβαι* in Greece too, in Achaia Phthiotis (cf. Thebae Phthioticae in Titus Livius, XXXII, 33, 16). The latter city is also an extremely interesting example of archaeological continuity: under its akropolis, signs of habitation were discovered which go as far back as the Neolithic Dimini-culture; and Dimini is, most probably, the earliest fortified settlement of Greece (5th mill. BC)<sup>7</sup>.

5. To come back to the origins of the most famous Thebe, the Boeotian one, earlier scholars (Fick, Wilamowitz - cf. Paulys, s.v. *Thebai*) considered its founders to have been Carians (before 2000 BC). Therefore, the name of that city should also be regarded (if we accept that opinion) as Carian, or at least Microasian. An older interpretation of the place-name *Θήβαι* through Sabine *teba* "hill" was rejected by Fick, then accepted by Kretschmer. True enough, a term like *teba* cannot be simply dismissed, since it represents one of the richest Mediterranean isoglosses (cf. Poruciu 1995, study-II). In Hubschmid 1960: 49-51, that isogloss is presented as container of quite a lot of substratic words referring to "stone, cliff, hill": e.g. Cat. *tepa*, Cors. *teppa*, Calabr. *tifa/tiffa*, etc. All these modern dialectal terms may be referred to ancient appellatives like Sabine *teba* "hill", as well as (Hubschmid suggests) to names like that Boeot. *Θήβαι*, interpreted as "city on a hill" ("Stadt auf einem Hügel"), and to other place-names, "vom Typus *Τάβαι*", to be found in Sicily, Caria, and even Persia. Hubschmid explains that big family through Carian *τάβα* "cliff". And, in fact, he resumes a very old etymologic opinion: already Stephanos of Byzantium mentioned that he *Τάβαι* of the

Carian-Phrygian border derived its name from its location on a cliff, since in Carian **τάβα=πέτρα**<sup>8</sup>. Many centuries after Stephanos, G. Meyer asserted that **τάβα** could account not only for **Τάβαι**, but also **Θήβαι**, **Θήβαι** (cf. Furnée 1972: 193). It was in 1892, two years before Tomaschek's Indogermanic interpretation of **δέβα**! Among other things, Meyer's opening also proved to be in keeping with Kretschmer's view on a pre-IE phonologic aspect, namely the alternation between voiceless stops and aspirated stops (later fricatives). I will come back to such alternations below.

Taking Stephanos, Meyer, Kretschmer, Hubschmid and Furnée into account, Homeric **Θήβαι** and Microasian **Τάβαι** (later attested) have their origin in one and the same substratic appellation: the later, in its turn, has quite a lot of modern dialectal heirs, which make up a Mediterranean TAPA/TABA isogloss. Hubschmid (1960: 51) refers that isogloss to an obviously related one of the Near and Middle East: cf. Turkic *tepe*, *töbe*, *tapa*, *döbö*, NPers. *tappa*, Hind. *tāba*, all with a basic meaning "hill"; to these I might add the family of well-known names of Turkic-sounding (?) archaeologic sites, including *Tepe Yahya*, *Tepe Sialk*, *Tepe Hissar*. There is, however, a *Deve Hüyük* too (see below). Also, quite worth mentioning is that Hubschmid (loc. cit.) thought that "maybe" *Dac. Tapae/Tāpai*<sup>9</sup> should also belong to the family under discussion.

6. So, in my argumentation, I have so far reached a stage which implies the following:

- Earlier authors, such as Meyer at the end of the 19th century, observed the possibility of a connection between *Car. τάβα* "stone, cliff" and ancient place-names like **Θήβαι** and **Τάβαι**<sup>10</sup>.

- More recent scholars (already Kretschmer) suggested a link between the **Θήβαι** toponymic family and Italic (Sabine) *teba* "hill" (which can hardly be separated from *Car. τάβα*).

- Even more recent Mediterraneists (notably Hubschmid) observed a quite vast isogloss, which includes both the above-mentioned family of place-names, and a multitude of substratic appellatives meaning "stone, cliff, mound, hill" (*tepa*, *teppa*, *tepe*, *tifa*, *tiffa*, *teba*, *döbö*, etc); that isogloss goes from Spain to Central Asia (see also Poruciuc 1995, study-II).

For all those important steps, and for all the tentative inclusion of *Dac. Τάβαι* in that etymologic vein, *Dac. deva* remained out. The interpretation given by the Tomaschek-Pokorny line must have looked too solid to remove, or, at least, to alter. At this point I must bring phonology into this discussion. But what kind of phonology? Certainly not exactly Brugmann's and Pokorny's, but rather Kretschmer's and Furnée's.

7. An earlier work of the present author was mildly criticized for having relied "perhaps too much on such disputed views as those of Lahovary, Hubschmid or Furnée on the pre-Indo-European languages of Ancient Europe" (see Edgar Polomé's editorial note to Poruciuc 1992). I accept that criticism as correct inasmuch as it observes today's horizon of academic expectation and acceptability. However, I can presume to declare that it was Balkan historical and linguistic reality which actually pushed me towards a reconsideration of authors like the above-mentioned three. Lahovary, especially in his 1963 work (posthumously published), proposed a remarkable interdisciplinary vision, which, though it has mistakes (mainly in details and examples), is worth reconsidering.

Hubschmid, as continuator of the Kretschmer line and of earlier (mainly Italian) Mediterraneists, ventured to record and discuss substratic-dialectal material which looked "abnormal" from the standpoint of traditional Indogermanistik. Last but not least, Furnée tried to classify, and to apply some method to "pre-Greek" (read, rather, Aegeo-Balkan) material which could hardly be regarded as "regular", either lexically, or phonologically (or both). As I shall point out below, I found good support in Hubschmid and Furnée not only at a general-abstract level in the field of substrate problems, but also at the more concrete level of today's Balkan evidence.

To come back to the correspondence I propose here, namely *Car. τάβα* ~ *Sab. teba* ~ *Gk. Θήβαι* ~ *Microas. Τάβαι* ~ *Dac. deva*. I may ask myself, again, why no specialist (to my knowledge) included the Dacian term in that correlation. Even traditional IE phonology would accept both *Gk. θ/τ* < IE/d<sup>h</sup>/ (cf. Pokorny's \**dhel-* > *Gk. Θόλος*; \**dheigh-* > *Gk. τεῖχος*), and a correspondence between *Gk. θ/τ* and *Thrac. /d/* (since Pokorny's \**dheigh-* seems to have produced *Thrac. -διξος/-διξα* "Burg" too). Moreover, since I am among the ones who insist on including Ancient Greek among Palaeobalkan languages<sup>11</sup>, I was not surprised to discover that the apparently non-IE alternations (*Wechsel*) observed by Furnée in "pre-Greek", and by Hubschmid in "Mediterranean" correspond with features of a vaster Oriental-Mediterranean frame. Some of the most significant such features are:

- "indifference" to voice (cf. hesitant signs for /p/b/, /t/d/, /k/g/) evident in Hittite, Eteocretan, "pre-Greek" and Mycenaean (Linear B), partially also in Thracian and in modern Balkan idioms;

- consonantal "alternations"/"oscillations" implying stop/aspirated/affricate/fricative, which led to quite a number of allophonic-emphatic variants (some implying diachronic variation);

- vowel-letter alternations, such as *α/ο* (which may reflect a dialectical evolution, i.e. labialization - cf. Poghirc 1989), or *α/ε* and *α/η* (which may reflect either a hesitant rendering of Balkan *schwa* - now Rom. *ă*, Alb. *ë* -, or a real Palaeobalkan alternation - cf. Dimitrov 1994: 73-89).

We simply cannot overlook such facts in the field of Thracian studies, where aspects like the ones above quite frequently occur in attestations (mainly onomastic): cf. *Δαρανδός/Ταραντος*, *Διερνα/Tierna*, *-βαρα/-παρα*, *Ταρσας/Tharsis*, *Τιθα/Θιθα*, *-δαβα/-δεβα*, *Παράλίσσον/Πορόλίσσον*, etc. So far, such variation has been viewed from two main standpoints, both worth considering. On the one hand, the impressive number of versions for certain Thracian names (cf. *Μητοκος*, *Μηδοκος*, *Μιττοκος*, *Μηθακος*, *Μηταγος*; or *Σπαράδοκος*, *Σπαρδοκος*, *Σπαρτακος*, *Σπαρτυχος*, *Σπορδοκος*, *Spartacus*, *Sparticus*, *Isparticus*) have been interpreted by certain specialists as resulting from an approximative application of the two classical alphabets (used by Greek and Roman "receivers") to Thracian sounds which had no exact correspondents in Greek and Latin (cf. Ancillotti 1986, 1987, 1989). On the other hand, other specialists assumed mainly that there was more to it than mere allographic deviations and oscillations<sup>12</sup>. An outstanding scholar, Dečev (1952) observed both possibilities. For instance (p. 80), he took into account the approximative rendering of IE */w/* - supposedly preserved as such in certain positions in Thracian words - by Gk. *υ*, *β*, *ου*, *ο*, and by Lat. *υ* (= *u*) and *b*. One example given by Dečev in that respect is exactly the series of Daco-Moesian place-names having, as final member, *-δανον*, *-δαβα*, *-deba*, *-deva* (etymologically interpreted by Dečev in keeping with Tomaschek's *dñe*). However, in the same work of 1952, Dečev also discusses evidence of what he views as Thracian *Lautverschiebung*<sup>13</sup>, of a type similar to the one in Germanic, Phrygian, and Armenian (*/b d g/ > /p t k/*, */b<sup>h</sup> d<sup>h</sup> g<sup>h</sup>/ > */b d g/*, */p t k/ > /p<sup>h</sup> t<sup>h</sup> k<sup>h</sup>/*). What I consider to be original (and worth furthering) in Dečev's vision is the fact that he regarded the Thracian sound-shift not as IE internal change, but as "adaptation of IE sounds to the sound-stock of a non-IE language exposed to Indo-Europeanization" (p. 115 - my translation). Dečev considered that substrate language (or *Sprachbund*?) as "Etruscoid", on which "Iranoid" elements were superimposed.*

By such opinions, the above-presented Bulgarian scholar (who did not have any significant followers, as far as I know) may be rightly regarded as forerunner of the trend which now strives to define the concept of substrate phonology<sup>14</sup>. Also starting from Dečev 1952,

and assuming that there once was a Palaeobalkan *Sprachbund* with Etruscoid phonologic features, we should give more thought not only to Ancillotti, but also to Mihailov (1989: 35). The latter, while referring to possibilities of a linguistic interpretation of Thracian variants like *Amadokos/Amatokos* and *Medokos/Metokos* (see also above), hypothesizes that such cases may have something to do with "un fenomeno esteso a livello balcanico e dell'Asia Minore, molto antico". And it so happens that ancient alternations like the ones observed by Mihailov are of the same type as some of Furnée's "pre-Greek" *Wechsel*. From among the latter, I will refer only to some of direct use for a phonological analysis of the *Θῆβαι-Τάβαι- deva* connection:

*-τ~δ*, *τ~θ*, *δ~θ*, *τ~δ~θ*, as in *τάπητ~δάπις* "carpet", *βάτος~βάδος* "a measure for liquids", *βράθυ~βόρατον* "a kind of cedar" [cf. Rom. *brad* - Alb. *bredh* 'fir!'], *κοτύλη* "a small cup" *~κώδον* "bell, shell" *~κώθων* "drinking vessel"; significantly, in his analysis of such alternations of dentals, Furnée (1972:185) also mentions that such aspects are typical to proper-names recorded in the "north Greek-Balkan area" (e.g. Maced. *Γορτυνία/Γορδυνια*, Thrac. *Κεδρήπολις*, Paphlag. *Κύδωρος/Κύτωρος*, etc.).

*-π~β*, *π~φ*, *π~β~φ*, *β~π~φ~F*, as in *παλήν/βαλήν* "king" (not a Greek, but a Microasian term, I must observe), *τάπητ/τάβης* (and *δαπις*, see above) "carpet", *παρθένος/φαρθένος* "maid", *μόλιβος/Mycen. mo-ri-wo-do* "lead", *λάπος/λαιός* (<\**λαιFός*) "folk, troop", and, last but not least, *λέτας/λάας* (<\**λάFας*) "stone", which (I am positive) should be referred to both Lat. *lapis* and to the supposedly "misspelled" Hesych. *Λεβα* (= *δεβα*).

*-δ~λ*, *τ(θ)~λ*, as in *δάφνη/λάφνη* "laurel", *λαβύρινθος/Mycen. da-pu-ri-to-jo* "labyrinth", *ἀράκτην/ἄροκλον* "cup", *δοθιήν/δολεών* "furuncle", *Θάπτα/λάττα* "fly", *Ὀδυσσεύς/Ὀλυσσεύς*.

*-α~ο* and *α~ε*, as in *ἀκορνος/όκορνος* "locust", *καλυβός/κόλυβος* "hut" (cf. Rom. *colibă*), *ἄνυξ/ἐμύς* "turtle", *δάλτος/δελτος* "writing tablet" etc.

Though this is only a limited selection out of Furnée's massive material, even the examples above are too many to be dismissed as mistakes, misspellings, or misreadings. And their variations perfectly correspond, in what concerns me here, with the many shapes of *Dac. deva*: see *Αιά-δαβα*, *Ἀργί-δανα*, *Δανε-δέβα*, *Δεβα-βενζις*, *Δοκι-δανα*, *Ζικί-δεβα*, *Ἴτα-δεβά*, *Arxi-dava*, *Arxi-daba*, *Buri-dava*, *Desu-daba*, *Gil-doba*, *Pulpu-deva*, *Suci-dava*, and many others of the same family, given in Dečev 1957, s.v. - *δανα*. Taking into account the view I propose on Palaeobalkan phonology, I consider that,

together with the *deva* names above, we should also consider Hesych. *Λεβα. πόλις ἀπὸ Θρακῶν* as "correct" attestation - cf. the common-Mediterranean *d/l* alternation<sup>15</sup>, cf. also *Ἀρβο-λέβας* "Berghalde an der Tundža", whose second member was left uninterpreted by Dečev. I also propose we should include, in the same toponymic family, place-names in which I can analyse - *δαρα, -δερα, -δορα, -δωρα*<sup>16</sup>. And, to conclude, I am of the opinion that the alternations, of the same type, to be found in the material of both Dečev and Furnée (and in other works on the linguistic situation of the ancient Aegeo-Balkan area) cannot possibly reflect only allographic distortions, or only diachronic-dialectal variation. To the greatest extent, they must have been alternations proper, in keeping with a certain kind of substratic phonology which I have tried to present above. Supreme proof of it is, I think, the fact that alternations like the ones under discussion still occur today, in idioms of the same area.

8. Among other things, by this paper I also wish to pay some homage to a remarkable 19th century Austrian, Johann Georg von Hahn. Unlike library-scholars who chose to deal with Albanian in more recent times, von Hahn possessed tremendous first-hand knowledge of Skenderbeu's homeland and of its language. And, as part of that knowledge, the 18 pages of Albanian alternations (*Lautwechsel*) put down by von Hahn (1854, II: 6-63) are quite worthy of reconsideration. In a footnote, the Austrian scholar mentions that he observed (I translate) "not only the sound-alternations of the Tosk dialect, but also those occurring between the latter and the Gheg dialect" (pp. 6-7). Of the *Lautwechsel* detected by von Hahn, I will mention (in my own transcription of his, basically, Neo-Greek spellings) only some of those which surely are of interest here:

-"α und ε" (in fact *a/ë*): Gheg *ammë*/Tosk *ëmme* "mother", Gheg *dham*/Tosk *dhëmb* "tooth", Gheg *dhanë*/Tosk *dhënë* "gift", Gheg *zamërë*/Tosk *zëmërë* "heart":

-"α und ο": Tosk *varr*/Gheg *vorr* "grave", Tosk *vatrë*/Gheg *votrë* "hearth" [= Rom. *vatră*], Tosk *salat*/Gheg *solat* "salad";

-"λ und δ" (in fact *ll/dh*): Elbass. *fillojg*/Shkodr. *fidhojg* "I begin", Gheg. *ullë*/Tosk *udhë* "way, road", Ljap. *llallë*/Tosk. *dhallë* "whey";

-"β und φ" (= *v/f*): *vëshëlinj/fëshëlinj* "I whistle";

-"π und φ": *kopësht/kofësht* "garden";

-"d oder τ und νδ" (= *d/t/nd*): *dajg/ndajg* "I deal", *trokë* "dirty"/*ndrak* "I dirty", *atejë/andejë* "thither".

Certainly, many of the spellings above are different from the ones in today's standard Albanian (cf. Alb. *dhëmb, zemër, kopsht* etc.), and von Hahn's forms

appear as obsolete-dialectal. But there are no reasons for us to doubt that they were functional in the 19th century, and that they were heard as such. As for alternations, what von Hahn observed in his time was to be confirmed by later Albanologists.

In a recent article on the Albano-Romanian autochthonous stock, M. Gabinski (1993:39) mentions "the oscillations, frequent in Albanian, but well-known in Romanian too, between voiced and voiceless consonants - cf. those very oscillations in Romanian-Albanian pairs of various origins: *bălc, bālç* - *pellg, covată* - *govatë, cutez* - *guxoj, a viscoli* - *fishkëllej, păstaie* - *bishtaje, zgardă* - *shkardhë* etc." (observe *b/p, c/g, v/f, z/sh, d/dh*). Gabinski then adds: "Sometimes those oscillations occur in both members of such pairs - cf. *călbează, gâlbează* - *gëlbezë, kelbezë*".

What I may add is that such voice alternations occur in all Romanian dialects, including Daco-Romanian (DR), i.e. the basis of standard Romanian (cf. pairs to be found in dictionaries: *boloboc/poloboc*, "barrel", *băltac/baltag*, "battle-axe", *cocoasă* "hump"/*gogoasă* "doughnut", *dobă/tobă* "drum" *tăvălug/tefelig* "clod crusher" etc.). However, according to my own observations<sup>17</sup>, it is Macedo-Romanian (MR), also known as Vlahic, which really abounds in such alternations. Here are some MR examples: *pătedzu*/DR *botez* "baptism" (< Lat.), *biducliu/piducliu* "louse" (< Lat.), *pădure/bădure* "forest" (< Lat?), *fălcare/pălcare* "tribe, clan" (< Lat?), *davan*/DR *tăun* "gadfly" (< Lat?), *bonză/pondză* "oven" (< ?), *tardu/dardu* "late" (< Lat.), *colibă/călive* "hut" (< Gk?), *dăvatură/tăvatură* "quarrel" (< NGk.), *dăvane/tăvane* "ceiling" (< Ngk., or Tk?), *birde/pirde* "curtain" (< Tk.), *Duna/Tuna* "the Danube" (< ?), *căsăbă/căsăbă/hăsăpă* "town" (< Tk?), etc. All these, except *pădure/bădure* (whose second member I recorded myself) are extracted from the Papahagi dictionary of Macedo-Romanian (1974).

The most significant thing about the MR alternative forms given above is that they represent words of various ages and origins: from Latin (and possible substrate) to Neo-Greek and Turkish. And for all that differentiation they show practically the same kind of oscillations (mainly voiced/voiceless, and stop/fricative). That situation strongly suggests, in my opinion, a perpetuation of the same Palaeobalkan articulatory habits as the ones observed by several scholars in ancient Aegean-Balkan idioms ("pre-Greek" included). And, speaking of articulatory perpetuation (which presupposes demographic continuity - cf. Poruciuc 1995, study-I), I think I can finally refer to what had become of some of the ancient toponyms under discussion in this paper.

9. The very forms of certain toponymic survivors in Asia Minor and the Balkans sustain the connection between, on the one hand, **τάβα**, **Θήβαι**, **Τάβαι**, and, on the other hand, *Dac. deva*. According to Paulys IV, 1932, ancient Carian *Tabai* now survives in modern *Dawas* (German *w?*), to be found in "südöstlichen Karien"; also, a most probable etymologic relative of the former, Lydian *Tabala*, appears as the name of a village called *Davaia* in modern times. To that information I may add that a Syrian archaeological site known now as *Deve Hüyük* (cf. Snodgrass 1994:268) very probably perpetuates (or, at least, is related to) the *Tabai* of the same area (**περί Συρίας**), included in Paulys IV, 1932 as a Byzantine attestation. The Thraco-Dacian situation is even clearer: ancient *Pulpu-deva*, after being temporarily obscured by an imperial folk-etymology, *Philippopolis*<sup>14</sup>, developed into today's Bulg. *Plovdiv*, whose *-div* certainly derives from *-deva*. I must add that, contrary to other opinions (cf. Georgiev 1960:148, where the *deva* of *Pulpadeva* is regarded as "seul en Thrace"), there seems to exist another survivor of the same kind in Bulgaria: a toponym *Kokodiva* ("bei Varna") is mentioned in the final addition ("Nachträge") of Dečev 1957. Without "exploiting" it, Dečev simply mentions that toponym as the name of the place where the Thracian person-name **Κοκοκός** was attested. I think that a Thracian compound made of that very anthroponym plus *-deva* (cf. *Pulpu-deva*) would appear as a quite credible origin for *Kokodiva*. And, now that we already have two *deva*-survivors in Bulgaria (I must, however, check the existence of *Kokodiva* "near Varna"), we should have a look at the territory of Dacia proper, where, according to Georgiev (1960:148), a number of 27 (or 29) *deva*-toponyms were recorded in ancient times.

10. It is quite surprising that a well-known synthetic work on Romanian toponymy, Iordan 1963, did not even mention *Deva*, the name of a Transylvanian city. It is true that Iordan generally discusses only Romanian "transparent" names, and avoids difficult problems of substrate perpetuation. Among other things, although he includes Kisch 1929 in his bibliography (and often refers to that work), Iordan never mentions Kisch's interpretation of Rom. *Deva* as continuator of *Dac. deva*. Kisch unhesitatingly asserts that Rom. *Deva* (=Hung. *Déva*, Transylvanian Saxon *Dimrich*)<sup>19</sup> continues the "dakischen Namen für 'Burg' (-dava = *deva*)". Kisch (*loc.cit.*) also mentions the mediaeval attestation *Deva castrum* (1296) referring to the same Transylvanian city. To that, let me add that, besides *Deva*, there is (in the neighbouring district of Alba) a village called *Deve*.

I consider Rom. *Deva* to be a capital argument in this discussion, not only because (whatever any anti-

continuity specialist might say against it) that place-name quite obviously continues a Dacian one, but also because the very place perfectly fits the above-discussed meaning of "hillfort" (and "city upon a hill/cliff"). The steep volcanic cone dominating today's *Deva* is known as *Cetate* (Rom. *cetate* 'fortress' < Lat. *civitas*). That hill, on top of which ruins of mediaeval *Deva castrum* are still standing, represents the ideal referent for a name of the same category as ancient **Θήβαι**, or **Τάβαι**. Like *Băta Doamnei* (a *dava*-site near *Piatra Neamț*), the probable continuator of *Dac. Πετρό-δava*)<sup>20</sup>, the steep hill of *Deva* is, like the Kadmeian top of **Θήβαι**, a naturally protected spot, perfectly fit for defence, observation and domination. So, in the case of *Deva*, we do not have the mere perpetuation of a toponym, but also the perpetuation of a certain seat of military-political power, from a hillfort designated as *deva* (**δεβα**, *dava* etc.) in Daco-Moesian and translated as **πόλις** into Greek, to the mediaeval fortress presented as *Deva castrum* in 13th century Latin.

11. Though there certainly are more things to say<sup>21</sup> (besides the ones I have pushed down to the footnotes) in favour of the ideas proposed here, the arguments so far presented do, I think, enable me to draw some conclusions.

Linguistically, topographically, and historically, the idea of a connection between, on the one hand, **Θήβαι** and **Τάβαι** (both already referred, by earlier authors, to terms like Car. **τάβα** "stone" and Sab. *teba* "hill"), and, on the other hand, between those two and *Dac. deva* "hillfort, *oppidum*, city" (> Rom. *Deva*) is quite tenable.

-The semantic development from "stone, cliff, hill" (cf. Rom. *piatră* 'stone', *pisc* 'peak' > *Piatra*, *Fiscu*, as settlement-names) to "fortress, city" is quite easy to understand. In that respect, we should observe that, beginning with the Bronze Age (and continuing into the Iron Age), hillforts of the akropolis-type came to represent a dominant type of power-centers of the Aegeo-Balkan area.

-The surviving forms of ancient toponyms like those of the **τάβα-deva** line show obvious similarity (*dav/dev/div*), which indicates, I suppose, original closeness in pronunciation (for all divergent transcription), rather than later phonologic convergence. Anyway, today's Rom. *Deva*, *Deve*, Anatolian *Dawas*, *Davala*, and Syrian *Deve* (*Hüyük*) appear as geographically peripheral, but linguistically central arguments, as surviving members of an archaic logloss. Those survivors also make possible a clearer explanation for Gk. **Θήβαι** too, so far considered as etymologically obscure.

- All the toponyms, ancient and modern, of the above-discussed family offer very important clues to the features and evolution of an Aegeo-Balkan substratic articulatory-phonologic system, relics of which are still to be found in Balkan idioms of today (probably also in the pronunciation of certain Anatolian speakers of Turkish).

- To conclude, the *Θῆβαι-Τάβαι-Deva* toponymic family reflects, basically, a Bronze-Age phenomenon with a significant spreading along an Aegeo-Mediterranean axis, as well as along an Aegeo-Carpathian one.

## NOTES

1. Of the many variants of that toponymic element (cf. Dečev 1957, s.v. *-δανα*), I chose *deva* as blanket term (instead of the *dava* preferred especially by historians) because the earliest outstanding Thracologist, Tomaschek (1894, II, 1:9), discussed it as *δέβα*, and because *Deva* is a most spectacular survival in Romanian. Other reasons for the choice of the form *deva* may come out in course of this paper.

2. From that point of view, I think we should be more critical towards a certain scholarly inertia manifest with some recent historical linguists, who simply perpetuate (and "cosmeticize") the traditional, even "pre-laryngeal" model of IE phonology, together with outdated etymologies of the Walde-Pokorny stock.

3. For a significant example, Gimbutas 1980:288 (fig. 10) gives a reconstruction of a very early manifestation of intrusive power in SE Europe: the Vučedol hillfort, belonging to the Baden horizon of 3400-2900 BC. That "seat of tribal power" contained many "foreign culture elements", in comparison with settlements of the contemporary "substratum population".

4. Speaking of Chantaine's lack of etymology for *Θῆβαι*, I must add that the same author mentions Palmer's proposal of a link between the Boeotian toponym and a "mycēa. *te-q-a-jā*: *Θῆβαία*". I must also mention that, after I presented an early version of this paper at the 1991 Indo-European Conference in Los Angeles (UCLA), Prof. Jaan Puhvel, in his comment, suggested I should also consider Mycenaean attestations (and I hereby thank him for that suggestion). However, what I can say now about those attestations is that they still represent only interesting possibilities. It is true that Mycen. *te-q-a-jā* (with q=g<sup>h</sup>/, later /b/, cf. also *qasireu* > *βασίλειος*) can be regarded, according to Ruijgh (1967, I:222), as "ethnique". And we can, of course, assume that *Θῆβαι* comes from a "toponyme peut-être attesté à Mycènes" under the form of the *te-q-a*, interpretable as \**Θῆγ*\*a (cf. Ruijgh, *loc.cit.*). In that context, Ruijgh considered that: "Il est tentant de penser à *Θῆβη*, *Θῆβαι*". But, however tempting those Mycenaean attestations may be, I find it hard to turn Ruijgh's "peut-être" into certainty. Moreover, I must also observe that the same author (I:181) mentions another "ethnique", *da-wi-jo*, as derived from *da-wo*, a "toponyme d'interprétation incertaine". Taking into account "pre-Greek" alternations like *τῶδᾱ*, *ῖβ* and *αῖν*, *αῖε*, could we not consider *da-wo* to be as important as *te-q-a* in an analysis of the *Θῆβαι-deva* connection?

5. According to the presentation in Paulys V, 1934 (s.v. *Thebai*) Egyptian *Θῆβαι* appears rather as an application of a Greek place-name to a non-Greek city. We should, however, observe the existence in today's Egypt of a city called *Taba* (where important Israeli-Egyptian talks took place not long ago).

6. It was, most probably, the same *Θῆβη* as the one by which Phamabazus' Persians encamped, according to Xenophon (*Hellenica*, IV,1,41).

7. Piggot 1965 presents Dimini itself as "indeed a little rustic Troy in layout, with more than one phase of fortification" (p.121). That settlement had "concentric walls" and "gateways" (p.161), just as the Neolithic predecessor of Phthiotic Thebe may have had. As for chronology, Gimbutas 1991:23 gives 5500-4000 BC for Dimini.

8. Hubschmid and Fumée give *τάβα = πέτρα*; the same St.Byz. equation is presented in Paulys IV, 1932 (s.v. *Tabai*) as *ταβάς=πέτρα*. The -as ending is interesting, not only since Paulys also mentions a *Tabai* (now *Tavi*) in Sicily, but also since Asia Minor preserved a *Dawas* to modern times. Moreover, Thracian place-names (cf. Dečev 1957) include a *Τυμ-δαβας*, besides the above-mentioned *Ἀβρο-λέβας*.

9. In fact, it seems there were at least two Dacian places with the same (or a very similar) name: one was the *Τάπαι* where (cf. Cass. Dio LXVII, 10, 2) Dacians tried to stop Roman penetration into their intra-Carpathian homeland; the other was (cf. in *Tapis* mentioned in Iord. *Get.*, X, 63) a *Tapae* of the Lower Danube, where Darius' Persians were opposed by native Getae (see Paulys IV, 1932, s.v. *Tapae*). Both places, we may deduce, were strategically important. Already Tomaschek referred *Tapae* to Rom. *Tapia* "near Lugosch" (=Lugo).

10. Whatever the toponymic ending -ai may have meant, originally, it is worth observing that the same ending is to be found (besides *Θῆβαι*, *Τάβαι*, *Τάπαι*) in the name of a Thracian "Kastell", *Δανα-δέβαι* (Dečev 1957, s.v.), in an apparently older Lydian *Ελμ-δαναι* (Dečev, op.cit., s.v. *-δανα*), and - we should not overlook it - in quite a number of modern Lithuanian names of cities and villages such as *Trakai*, *Tryškiai*, *Tytuvėnai*, *Varniai*. Though in Lithuania, as far as I know, such names are felt as transparent plurals (as in ancient Greek!), we should not dismiss the idea that such a model may be one of the manifestations of the Balkan-Baltic substrate axis about which scholars like Duridanov have written about. Is Rom. *Deve* a substrate plural too?

11. Though the scarcely attested *linguae minores* of Ancient Balkans can hardly be compared to Greek, I am positive that the latter shared a lot (phonologically, lexically, and even grammatically) with the idioms spoken by neighbouring "Barbarians". In that respect, Petăr Dimitrov (in a recent discussion we had in neo-Petrodava!) also insisted on the necessity of including Ancient Greek among Palaeobalkan idioms.

12. For a more general IE view on allography (i.e. effects of the application of certain writing systems, made for certain languages, to other languages, which might have quite different phonologic systems), see Poruciu 1993.

13. In the present paper I will not discuss the fact that there have been Thracian scholars (notably Georgiev) who considered that it was *Lautverschiebung* which made Thracian appear as a language different from Daco-Moesian (which, supposedly, did not show that aspect). For the time being, I am inclined to believe, like Ivănescu (1980:10), that the material which may sustain the idea of such a distinction is insufficient.

14. Henning Andersen's paper at the 1991 Indo-European Conference of UCLA was entitled "Substratum Phonetics in Common Slavic". For some possibilities of perpetuation of substrate speech habits, see also Poruciu 1992:15.

15. The alternation dental/liquid is a well-known Mediterranean aspect, which I discuss elsewhere (Poruciu 1995, study-II) as reflection of a substrate retroflex pronunciation (I may use the same



explanation for the origin of the Albanian version of that alternation discussed in a special paragraph of this paper). A special remark: I will not dismiss (as Tomaschek and Dečev did) the Thracian city-name *Λέβα* (Hesych.) as just a misspelling (i.e. supposedly *lambda* instead of *delta*). If a *Lautwechsel* like *λδ* could still be heard in 19th century Albanian (according to von Hahn) I see no reason why a *λέβα*, as variant of *deva*, could not be heard at the time when Hesychian material was being recorded. Moreover, I think that such an assertion is confirmed by the already mentioned Thracian place-name 'Αβρο-λέβας presented by Dečev 1957 as "Berghalde an der Tundža" (so, in this case, *λέβας* might reflect the primeval sense of Gk. *λέπας/λάας*).

16. Since /p/b/ is a Palaeobalkan alternation as usual as /a/o/e/, I propose that in at least some of the Thracian proper names which Dečev (1957, s.v. -apa) analysed, in order to make them fit certain roots, as *Burd-apa*, *Ζάδ-απα*, *Ζάδ-επα*, *Βουρδ-απα-ηνός*, *Βαλφ-απα-εις* etc., should in fact be analysed as compounds with *-dapa*, *-bapa*, *-dapa*, *-bapa*, respectively, as variants of *deva* (a *Ζάδ-απα* also appears, *loc.cit.*, immediately after *Ζάδ-απα*, so we may certainly suppose that the two represent simply a *-dapa/-bapa* alternation of one and the same toponym).

17. I analyse that special aspect in an article to be published soon as part of a *Schrift* in memory of Z.Golab (ed. V.Friedman, University of Chicago).

18. I have come upon divergent presentations of *Pulpudeva*. For instance, Georgiev (1960:140) asserted that "cette ville a été construite par le roi macédonien Philippe II qui lui a donné son nom: en grec *Φιλιππόπολις* et en thrace *Pulpudeva* 'la ville de Philippe'". In his turn, Dečev (1957, s.v. *Pulpudeva*) considered that *Pulpu-* was just the Thracian version of Gk. *Φιλίππου*. I must, however, observe that, contrary to Georgiev's indication of a Macedonian origin, the Latin attestation quoted by Dečev (*loc.cit.*) suggests a more recent, Roman origin for the official name of the city under discussion: "Philippus (Arabs)... urbemque nominis sui in Thracia, que dicebatur Pulpudeva, Philippopolim reconstituens nominavit" (Iord.Rom. 283). There is quite a distance between Macedonian Philip II and Roman Philip the Arab (the emperor under whose rule that Thracian city was, apparently, still

known under its indigenous name, *Pulpudeva*, from which modern *Plovdiv* derives).

19. TSax *Dimrich* comes, according to Kisch 1929:97, from \**Dewenburg*, the latter is, however a High German reconstruction. More correctly, we should consider an early \**Dewenbrich*, according to Transylvanian Saxon pronunciation. TSax *-prich/-brich* can correspond with either *Burg*, or *Berg* in High German - cf. TSax *Kirprich* (= *Kirchburg*, or *Kirchberg*) > Rom. *Chirpăr*.

20. Dac. *Πετροδάβα* may recall *τάβα=πέτρα*. However, the very components of that place-name (first attested in Ptol. 3,8,4) demonstrate that, in Dacian, the semantic shift from "stone, cliff, hill" to "hillfort, city" had long been completed. So, the name of *Petrodava* could not possibly mean "stone-stone" (and not even "stone-hill"), but certainly "stone-fortress" (or, like its remote Greek and Microasian relatives, "fortress on a hill"). If some archaeologist or historian should critically observe that not all Dacian *davae* were actually fortresses on cliffs or hills (which is true), my answer is exactly this: in historical Dacian times, *deva/dava* had already become a common designation for any kind of proto-urban settlement.

21. Further studies may, for instance, more clearly demonstrate that we can distinguish between two diachronically different levels: one, more archaic, perpetuated in appellatives and place-names of a \**ἰρδ* type, cf. Hubschmid's Mediterranean stock covering the semantic field of "stone, cliff, hill", cf. also the corresponding Turkic family of *tepe* (to which I may add those Turkic-looking names of Near-Middle East archaeological sites, such as *Tepe Yahya*, *Tepe Hissar*, *Tepe Sialk*); a second, subsequent level represented by possible allophonic-emphatic derivatives (from the former), belonging to a \**ἰρδ* type and reflecting the very semantic shift from "stone, cliff, hill" to "hillfort, city". Also, in the future, a Romanian obscure word like *tipie* 'hill with a flattened top' may prove to be a relic of the former level, while Rom. *tabie* MR *ūbyie* 'fortification' may be reinterpreted as a substratic Aegeo-Balkan appellation, rather than a Turkish one (as dictionaries indicate). Finally, the connection (rejected by Tomaschek) between Dac. *Deva* and Irano-Caucasian terms like Zend. *dagyu* (cf. Mycen. *te-qa*, or Turkic *dag* 'peak?'), Kurd. *dau*, and Kartvel. *daba* "village" may eventually prove to be valid (at a Nostratic level?).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ancillotti, A., 1986, "I grafismi <θ> e <lh> in trace", AION, 8, 235-270.
- Id., 1987, "Due morfemi derivazionali in trace", AION, 9, 191-226.
- Id., 1989, "Il condizionamento degli alfabeti classici nella nostra conoscenza del trace", in *La civiltà dei Traci: tradizioni classiche e ricerche archeologiche moderne* (V Symposium Internazionale di Tracologia - Spoleto 26-28 novembre 1987), Roma: Nagard, 37-42.
- Authenrieth, G., 1958, *A Homeric Dictionary* (transl. R.P. Keep), Oklahoma: Norman.
- Chadwick, J., 1989, *The Decipherment of Linear B*, Cambridge UP.
- Chantraine, P., 1968 (1990), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*, Paris: Klincksieck.
- Crișan, I.H., 1986, *Spiritualitatea geto-dacilor*, București: Albatros.
- Dečev, D., 1952, *Xarakteristika na trakijskija ezik/Charakteristik der thrakischen Sprache*, Sofia: Akademija.
- Id., 1957, *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*, Wien: Rober.

- Fumée, E., 1972, *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*, the Hague: Mouton.
- Georgiev, V., 1960, *Bălgarska etimologija I onomastika*, Sofia: Akademija.
- Gimbutas, Marija, 1980, "The Kurgan Wave 2 (c. 3400-3200 BC) into Europe and the Following Transformation of Culture", *The Journal of Indo-European Studies*, 8, 273-315.
- Id., 1991, *The Civilization of the Goddess* (ed. Joan Marler), San Francisco: Harper.
- Hahn, J.G. von, 1854, *Albanesische Studien*, Jena: Mauke.
- xxx Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon, 1867 (ed. M. Schmidt), Jenae: Dufft.
- xxx Homer - *The Iliad* (transl. A.T. Murray), 1965, Harvard UP.
- Hubschmid, J., 1960, *Mediterranean Substrate*, Bern: Francke.
- Iordan, I., 1963, *Toponimia românească*, București: EA.
- Iorga, N., 1985, *Istoria poporului românesc* (ed. Georgeta Peneles), București: ESE.
- Ivănescu, G., 1980, "Traca și dacomezica", in *Antichitatea și moștenirea ei spirituală*, Iași UP, 1-15.



- Kisch, G., 1929, *Siebenbürgen im Lichte der Sprache*, Leipzig: Meyer.
- Lahovary, N., 1963, *Dravidian Origins and the West*, Bombay: Orient Longmans.
- Paliga, S., 1987, "Thracian terms for 'township' and 'fortress', and related place-names", *World Archaeology*, 19, 1, 23-28.
- Papahagi, T., 1974, *Dicționarul dialectului aromân/ Dictionnaire Aroumain (Macédo-Roumain)*, București: EA.
- xxx Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, I-1901 (ed. G. Wissowa), IV-1932, V-1934 (eds. W. Kroll/ K. Mittelhaus), Stuttgart: Metzler.
- Mihailov, G., 1989, "Le iscrizioni di Rogozen: Problemi linguistico-storici", in *La civiltà dei Traci*, Roma: Nagard, 33-36 (see Ancillotti 1989).
- Piggot, S., 1965, *Ancient Europe*, Chicago UP.
- Poghir, C., 1987, "Noms thraces et geto-daces d'habitation et leur survivances balkaniques", *CahBalk*, 12, 260-270.
- Id., 1989, "Considérations chrono-géographiques sur l'oscillation a/o en thrace et en daco-mésien", in *Thracians and Mycenaeans* (eds. J.G.P. Best/N.M.W. de Vries), Leiden: Brill, 298-306.
- Pokorny, J., 1959, *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern: Francke.
- Poruciuc, A., 1992, "Problems and Patterns of the SE European Ethno- and Glottogenesis (ca. 6500 BC-AD 1500)", *The Mankind Quarterly*, XXXIII, 1, 3-41.
- Id., 1993, "Observații asupra scrierii și a relației pronunție-scriere (cu referire specială la limbile indo-europene)", *Thraco-Dacica*, IV, 1-2, 5-12.
- Id., 1995, *Archaeolinguistica - Trei studii interdisciplinare*, Bibliotheca Thracologica IX, Ministerul Învățământului, Institutul Român de Tracologie, București.
- Ruijgh, C.J., 1967, *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*, Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Russu, I.I., 1981, *Etnogeneza românilor*, București: ESE.
- Snodgrass, A.M., 1994, *Grecia epocii întunecate* (trad. M. Gramatopol), București: Meridiane.
- Tomaschek, W., 1893-1894, *Die alten Thraker*, Wien: Akademie.
- xxx Xenophon-Hellenica (transl. C.L. Brownson), Harvard UP.

