


SERBIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AND ARTS
INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

LIII



2022

BALCANICA

D. NIKOLIĆ, Three Votive Plaques from Upper Moesia • I. KOMATINA, A Hypothesis about the Origin of Závaš's Cross • J. HENDERSON & V. ŽIVKOVIĆ, Experiencing Disease and Medical Treatment in Renaissance Italy • F. GUIDA, The Second Eastern Crisis (1875–1878) • A. D'ALESSANDRI, The Opening of the Italian Legation in Belgrade in 1879 • J. I. TOMAŠEVIĆ, Movies about the First World War • M. RISTOVIĆ, The March on Rome and its Consequences • B. MILOSAVLJEVIĆ, Italy in the Writings of Slobodan Jovanović • J. RAFILOVIĆ, Yugoslav-Italian Foreign Trade Relations 1919–1939 • M. T. MRAOVIĆ, Creation of an Alternate Reality • A. EREŠ, The Venice Biennale and Art in Belgrade in the 1950s • E. COSTANTINI, Relations between the PCI and the League of Communists from the Second Post-War Period to the Mid-1960 • M. DOGO, Belgrade 1969–1972 • B. ŽIVKOVIĆ, The Two Last Encounters between Broz and Berlinguer • P. DRAGIŠIĆ, The Yugoslav Perspective on Italian Eurocommunism in the Second Half of the 1970s 

ANNUAL OF THE INSTITUTE FOR BALKAN STUDIES

UDC 930.85(4-12)

BELGRADE 2022

ISSN 0350-7653
eISSN 2406-0801

REVIEWS

DAN DANA, *ONOMASTICON THRACICUM. RÉPERTOIRE DES NOMS INDIGÈNES DE THRACE, MACÉDOINE ORIENTALE, MÉSIES, DACIE ET BITHYNIE*. ATHENS, MÉLÉTÈMATA 70, 2014. CLVIII+ 459 p.

Review by Danilo Savić*

Dan Dana's *Onomasticon Thracicum* is intended to provide a reliable and exhaustive corpus of Thracian anthroponymy, up to date with recent developments in the study of the Thracian language. Dana endeavoured to assemble a much needed, although partial, replacement of Dimităr Dečev's outdated collection of Thracian linguistic remains¹. The book's catalogue of names counts over 700 entries and over 1500 forms, many of which were unknown in Dečev's time. Unlike in the previous corpus, the entries in *Onomasticon Thracicum* follow the order of the Latin alphabet. The presentation of the data is clearer overall. The catalogue itself is preceded by four chapters, which provide insight into a number of relevant issues, such as the history of research, epigraphical

and literary sources, classification of Thracian names, characteristics of the Thracian language. These chapters could have probably been published as an introduction into various aspects of Thracian studies – one benefits from reading them before consulting the catalogue. Although the aim of the book primarily concerns onomastics, a fair amount of introductory discussion has been dedicated to various linguistic questions. The author emphasises early on the crucial role of onomastics in the study of the Thracian language, particularly in view of our poor understanding of indigenous Thracian texts (p. XI).

The chapters preceding the catalogue are 1. "Historiographie de l'onomastique thrace" (p. XII–XLV), 2. "Sources : données anciennes et nouvelles" (p. XLVI–LXII), 3. "L'onomastique thrace" (p. LXIII–CXII),

¹ D. Detschew, "Die thrakischen Sprachreste" (Vienna: R. M. Rohrer, 1957). Note that Dečev's book is not limited to anthroponymy, but includes glosses and toponymy, as well as the Ezerovo inscription.

* danilo.savic@bi.sanu.ac.rs
Institute for Balkan Studies SASA,
Belgrade, Serbia

and 4. “Principes” (p. CXIII—CXX). They are followed by a list bibliographical abbreviations (p. CXXI—CLIV), and by a list of symbols, abbreviations and orthographical conventions used by the author (CLV—CLVIII). The catalogue takes up the main part of the book (p. 1–413). Following the catalogue are various supplements (p. 415–432), annexes (p. 433–458), and a table of maps (p. 459). The following pages will discuss the four mentioned chapters, while the material from the catalogue will be used throughout the review.

The first chapter is an outline of the history of Thracian studies. Special attention is given to the pioneering contributions of D. Dečev and his predecessors (p. XIV—XX). Dečev’s compendium of the Thracian language is proclaimed “unusable” due to its numerous methodological shortcomings (XX). Most notably, two thirds of the names listed by Dečev are not at all Thracian. Other authors are grouped according to their country of origin in the following order: Bulgaria (p. XX—XXVII), Romania (p. XXVII—XXX), former Yugoslavia (p. XXX—XXXII), Greece (p. XXXII—XXXIII), Hungary and Russia (p. XXXIV), and the “West” (p. XXXIV—XL). The last group, however, mainly covers the contributions of French scholars Louis Robert, Oliver Masson, and Claude Brixhe, while others are mentioned in passing (Edgar Polomé, Augusto Ancillotti, Heikki Solin, etc.). The division of authors into the “Western” and “non-Western” groups is further emphasised by the generally negative evaluation of Eastern European scholarship, as opposed to the more than positive view of its Western counterpart. Dana particularly criticises linguists from the Balkans, including Dečev, for their excessive reliance on speculative etymologies (p. XXIV, XXVI—XXVIII), for their disregard of the historical and epigraphical realia (p. XXV—XXVI), as well as for their ideological and nationalistic biases (p. XXXII—XXXIII, XLI). In contrast, the Western scholars are praised

for their balanced approach (p. XXXIV, XXXVII, XXXIX). While the criticism is far from misplaced in many cases, it may strike the reader as excessive or unbalanced in certain points. For example, the criticism of Vladimir Georgiev does not take into account the positive reception of some elements of his work in “Western” scholarship². Furthermore, a reader acquainted with Palaeo-Balkan linguistics may note the absence of Radoslav Katičić, Günter Reichenkron, or Georg Renuš Solta in this section³. Although the manuals of Katičić and Solta deal with the Palaeo-Balkan languages in general, they do offer a balanced presentation of various problems in Thracian linguistics, while Reichenkron’s comprehensive study of the Dacian substrate in Romanian is yet to be replaced. Dana is curiously silent on the topic of the Dacian (or Thracian) substrate in modern languages, although he seems familiar with it (p. LVIII). Along with the omission of Reichenkron, one may remark that the fairly detailed list of Ioan Iosif Russu’s bibliography (p. XVIII, note

² See, for example, F. Kortlandt, “The Thracian-Armenian consonant shift”, *Linguistique balkanique* 3 (1988), 71–74, and E. Polomé, “The Balkan Languages (Illyrian, Thracian and Daco-Moesian)”, *The Cambridge Ancient History*, ed. J. Boardman et al. (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 868–898. Kortlandt partly accepts Georgiev’s consonant shift in Thracian, while Polomé accepts a number of Georgiev’s relatively reliable etymologies.

³ R. Katičić, “Ancient languages of the Balkans” (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1976); G. Reichenkron, “Das Dakische: rekonstruiert aus dem Rumänischen” (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 1966); G. R. Solta, “Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen” (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980).

100) does not include his work on the substrate in Romanian.⁴

The second chapter deals with the sources, mainly those used in assembling the catalogue of names. Indigenous Thracian texts are summarised here rather briefly, due to their limited input⁵. Dana distinguishes between a “Thracian alphabet” and a “Greek alphabet”, attributing the latter to the Ezerovo inscription only. The terminological distinction is confusing, since all of these texts are written in derivatives of the Greek alphabet; Dana himself says as much about the alphabets from Zone (p. XLVII) and Samothrace (p. XLVIII). Greek and Latin literary sources are not given much attention either since they contain a small number of aristocratic names, some of which may have been corrupted during the centuries of manuscript transmission. On the other hand, Greek and Latin inscriptions are set in a geographical and chronological framework. In a detailed overview, Dana outlines the evolving visibility of Thracians in Greece and Rome, most notably by highlighting their participation in Hellenistic and Roman imperial armies (p. LII–LIII; p. LIV–LVI). For this reason, the book encompasses various parts of the Roman Empire, extending beyond the Thracian “core” mentioned in the subtitle, i.e. Thrace, Western Macedonia, Upper and Lower Moesia, Dacia, and Bithynia. The high concentration of Thracian names in the papyri and ostraca from Egypt, mostly from the Ptolemaic period, is particularly notable in this regard (p. LVIII–LIX). Apart from the Egyptian texts, the majority of the documentation comes from the 2nd and 3rd centuries (p. XLIX), although Thracian anthroponymy survives into the 6th century (p. LVII).

⁴ I. I. Russu, “Elemente autohtone în limba română: substratul comun româno-albanez” (Bucharest: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, 1970).

⁵ On Thracian indigenous texts, see S. Yanakieva, “The Thracian Language”, *Orpheus* 25 (2018), 32–34 with further references.

With the end of Antiquity, Thracian names disappear from historical record⁶.

Dana discards earlier attempts to identify Thracian elements in Bulgarian and Romanian anthroponymy, but does not counter them directly. Instead, based on the fact that even Greek names were replaced by Slavic ones in 10th–14th century Eastern Macedonia, and since no Thracian element is found there, he asserts that “aucune continuité onomastique ne semble dépasser la période « sombre » de la crise iconoclaste” (p. LVII). Yet, the data invoked here pertains to a limited area, and does not necessarily reflect the unknown state of affairs in other Thracian regions. Moreover, there is good evidence that Thracian was still spoken in the Balkans at the time of the Slavic migration to the extent that some linguistic contact between the two populations may be expected⁷. An example of such contact would be Bulgarian *karpa* ‘rock’, allegedly borrowed from the Thracian noun **karpa* ‘id.’, attested indirectly by the Greek form Καρπάτης (ὄρος) ‘Carpathian mountains’, and further related to Albanian *karpë* ‘rock, cliff’⁸. Furthermore, Ivan Duridanov, whose works are cited by Dana, compiled a list of 45 Bulgarian names of possible Thracian origin⁹. A particularly instructive case is

⁶ The language was also extinct around the same time, see R. Katičić, “Ancient languages of the Balkans”, 136 and S. Yanakieva, “The Thracian Language”, 59–61.

⁷ See the references in the previous note, and R. Katičić, “Ancient languages of the Balkans”, 152–153.

⁸ V. Georgiev (ed.), “Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik” (Sofia: Bălgarska akademija na naukite, 2012), 252. The toponym Καρπάτης is either Thracian or Dacian, if one considers the latter to be a separate language. On the Albanian form, see B. Demiraj, “Albanische Etymologien” (Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1997), 213.

⁹ I. Duridanov, “Der thrakische Einfluss auf die bulgarische Anthroponymie”, *Linguistique Balkanique* 2 (1960), 69–86.

the Bulg. name *Buzo* (m.)/*Buza* (f.) which would, according to Duridanov, derive from Thrac. Βουζης/Βυζας. The Thracian forms in Βουζ-, along with their proposed Bulgarian continuants, are sometimes connected to Avestan *būza-* 'goat', and to Armenian *buc* 'lamb' (from Indo-European **bhuǵ-o-*)¹⁰. However, the Bulgarian name may also derive from Bulg. *buzā* 'cheek', further related to Albanian *buzë* 'lip, edge' and Romanian *buză* 'id.' whose etymology is disputed¹¹. In any case, the Palaeo-Balkan origin of Bulg. *Buzo*, *Buza* seems probable. These and other proposed correspondences between Thracian and modern Balkan onomastics could have been problematised at this point in the book. The question of (Daco-)Thracian linguistic and onomastic heritage in Albanian and Romanian is also addressed, perhaps too briefly in view of the complexity of the issue (p. LVII–LVIII). Dana rightfully points out that the evidence for both Illyrian and Thracian origin of Albanian is rather thin, but without citing any relevant references¹². In his opinion, Albanians probably descend from an unknown central Balkan

population whose traces in Albanian onomastics have been erased by various external influences.

The third chapter deals with various questions of Thracian anthroponymy, such as the geographical distribution of Thracian names, the problem of the Dacian language and onomastics, or the phonological and orthographic phenomena observed in the onomastic material. Arguably the most important point of this chapter is the classification of Thracian names into "territoires onomastiques" (p. LXV–LXXXII). The principles of this classification are drawn from a similar classification of Illyrian anthroponymy developed by Radoslav Katičić¹³. What is called a "territoire onomastique" by Dana, or a "Namengebiet" by Katičić, essentially represents an area with a characteristic stock of indigenous names that do not regularly appear elsewhere, i.e. an anthroponymic region. In the areas traditionally inhabited by Thracians, Dana identifies four anthroponymic regions: 1. Thracian and "pan-Thracian" (Thrace proper and most other Thracian regions), 2. Dacian or Daco-Moesian (Dacia, Lower Moesia, Northeastern Upper Moesia), 3. Western Thracian (Western Thrace, Eastern Macedonia, Southern Upper Moesia, Thasos), and 4. Bithynian (Bithynia, i.e. Northwestern Asia Minor).

The list of pan-Thracian names is short and consists of simple names: *Bithus*, *Cotys*, *Teres*, Σαδαλας/Σεδαλας, *Seuthes* (p. LXV, LXVII). They are found in Thracian and Western Thracian regions, and to a lesser extent in Bithynia, but not in Dacia. The

¹⁰ V. Georgiev, "Trakite i tehniat ezik" (Sofia: Bălgarska akademija na naukite, 1977), 46.

¹¹ See the discussions in B. Demiraj "Albanische Etymologien", 114–115 and in V. Orel "Albanian Etymological Dictionary" (Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill, 1998), 43–44.

¹² Both points of view are presented by R. Katičić, "Ancient languages of the Balkans", 184–188. A different approach has recently been undertaken by Joachim Matzinger who is skeptical towards both Illyrian and Thracian hypotheses. See, for example, J. Matzinger, "Illyrisch und Albanisch – Erkenntnisse und Desiderata", *h2nr. Festschrift für Heiner Eichner*, ed. R. Nedoma & D. Stifter (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2010), 98–106, as well as J. Matzinger, "Zur Herkunft des Albanischen: Argumente gegen die thrakische Hypothese", *Studime për nder të Rexhep Ismajlit: me rastin e 65-vjetorit të lindjes*, ed. B. Rugova (Pristina: Koha, 2012), 635–649.

¹³ Dana seems to incorrectly attribute the development of all Illyrian anthroponymic areas to Duje Rendić-Miočević (p. LXIV–LXV). Rendić-Miočević established the Liburnian anthroponymic area, separating it from the rest of Illyricum, while Katičić further developed Rendić-Miočević's method and applied it to Illyrian anthroponymy. See R. Katičić, "Ancient Languages of the Balkans", 178–184 for a detailed discussion.

lack of documentation in Bithynia and Dacia may have influenced the distribution. Some elements of names also have a similar extent: the first element *Muca-* is present everywhere except in Dacia, while the second element *-por* is found in all four regions. Curiously, the simple name *Bithus* is currently absent from Bithynia (p. LXXX). The list of Thracian proper names includes those with well-known first elements such as *Aulu-*, *Dia-*, *Diza-*, *Epta-*, *Roime-* (etc.), or second elements such as *-centhus*, *-tocus*, *-tralis*, *-zenus* (etc.). The presence of *-zenus* in the Dacian anthroponymic region is noted as well (p. LXVII). However, all of the examples seem to be from Lower Moesia where Thracian names are also common, and none of them comes in a markedly Dacian context (*Amazenus*, *Derzizenus*, *Dituzenus*, *Δριζενις*, etc.), which is not taken into account here. Many of these “Dacian” examples in *-zenus* could probably be attributed to immigrants from Thrace. The classification of first and second elements of Thracian compound names is useful, since it gives visibility to certain regional trends. For example, names with the first element *Roime-* (Ροιμηταλκις, Ροιμηζενις) belong to the Thracian proper region, while the simple name Ροιμος seems to have a Western Thracian distribution. The Western Thracian region also develops simple names such as *Κενθος*, *Πορις*, and *Τραλις*, all of which are usually second elements of compound names elsewhere (p. LXXVIII). Some other Western Thracian characteristics include the first elements such as *Cetri-*, *Mest-*, *Paib-*, *Torc-*, *Zec-* (etc.), and the second elements *-βρης*, *-δελθης*. These do not regularly occur in other anthroponymic regions. Dana, however, brings to light some interesting parallels between the Western Thracian and Bithynian regions (p. LXXXI–LXXXII). Names in *Κοζι-*/*Κοσι-* are particularly frequent in both regions, while the Western Thracian names in *Βαστ-* are compared to the Bithynian hapax *Οαστοζις*. The Bithynian name *Πηροβρης* is identified as a variant

of the Western Thracian *Πυροβρης* (names in *Πυρ-/Pyr-/Pir-* are frequent in the Western Thracian region). Various names in both regions use the suffix *-la-* and the second element *-βρης*. These parallels lead Dana to affirm Herodotus’ claim (Hdt. 7.75) that the Bithynians originate from the valley of the river Strymon. This idea seems attractive and merits further study, as the material is extremely difficult to handle with precision. Namely, Bithynia brings the smallest number of Thracian names out of all four regions. Apart from these similarities, the Bithynian region shows a number of unique characteristics, such as the names in *Βιο*, *Ζηνο-*, *Ζιβ-*, or the presence *Lallnamen* (Λαλα, Ττθα) whose appurtenance may be questioned (p. LXXX).

The material from the Dacian or Daco-Moesian anthroponymic region in large part comes from Lower Moesia and only to lesser extent from Dacia and Upper Moesia. The term “Daco-Moesian” is used here to denote the territorial extent of this anthroponymic region, and not to single out Moesian anthroponymy as a component distinct from Dacian (p. LXXI). According to Dana, the presence of toponyms with the typical Dacian element *-dava* in Lower Moesia indicates that the Dacians were part of the indigenous population there (p. LXX). Several typical elements of Dacian anthroponymy are known (p. LXXXIII): names in *Deci-*, *Diurpa-*, *Nat-*, *Pueri-* (etc.), or in *-blasa*, *-gissa*, *-pier* (etc.). The pan-Thracian second element *-por* comes in combination with typical Dacian names, such as *Natopor*. At the same time, the most frequent Thracian names do not occur in the Dacian region. The differences between Thracian and Dacian anthroponymy and toponymy are, according to Dana, “trop grandes pour qu’on puisse considérer les Thraces et les Daces comme parlant la même langue” (p. LXXI). In this, Dana broadly agrees with the hypotheses of V. Georgiev, who established the distribution of toponymic elements *-bria*, *-para* (Thracian), and *-dava/-deva* (Dacian) as one

of the main arguments in favour of Dacian as a language separate from Thracian. Yet, this distribution of toponyms has recently been described as an inadequate criterion by Svetlana Yanakieva, who points out that the toponyms *Pulpudeva* and *Desudaba* sit well outside of Dacia¹⁴. Furthermore, the phonological differences between Dacian and Thracian that Dana attempts to establish are either trivial or questionable (p. LXXII–LXXIII). For example, what he sees as Dacian *a* for Thracian *e* (e.g. in *Apta-/Epta-, -dava/-deva*) should be regarded in the context of orthographical fluctuations between *a* and *e* that are unrelated to the question of Daco-Thracian linguistic unity¹⁵. What is described as the diphthongisation of Indo-European **ē* into *ie* is based on dubious etymologies of Dacian plant names (unexpectedly so, in view of the book's critical attitude towards etymological speculations). Indeed, some phonological differences between Dacian and Thracian forms exist, but these are better sought elsewhere.¹⁶

The onomastic status of some areas is described as ambiguous (p. LXXXII–LXXXIV). These are Dardania, Paeonia, Mysia, and Phrygia. There is, however, nothing ambiguous in the case of Phrygia, whose language and onomastics are distinct from Thracian, as Dana correctly points out (p. LXXXIV). In the case of Paeonia and Mysia, the label is quite appropriate. Limited signs of Thracian presence are attested in both regions, but a general picture of indigenous onomastics remains unclear due to a lack of documentation. In this sense, Dana is probably correct in doubting that the Mysians (*Μυσοί/Mysii*)

of Asia Minor are related to the Moesians (*Μοισοί/Moesi*) of Europe, although the two ethnonyms may very well share the same Thracian origin. Finally, Dardania may be understood as ambiguous in terms of its diverse onomastic material: the south-western parts are predominantly Illyrian, while the eastern parts are predominantly Thracian¹⁷. Dana, however, writes that “le caractère illyrien de l’onomastique dardannienne est indubitable et il convient d’écarter de manière définitive l’idée d’une origine ou d’une participation thrace (du moins considérable) à leur ethnogénèse” (p. LXXXII). To be sure, the Illyrian element in Dardania is not negligible, but Thracian input should not be downplayed. Indeed, some literary sources consider the population of the future Dardanian kingdom to be Illyrian, but the name Dardania appears only towards the end of the 3rd century BCE, at which point the Dardanian population could have been mixed¹⁸. Moreover, there are good reasons to believe that the name Dardania and related onomastic items are of (Daco-)Thracian origin. Some anthroponyms in *Dard-/Derd-* are assigned to the Dacian anthroponymic region, such

¹⁷ See R. Katičić, “Ancient languages of the Balkans”, 181; F. Papazoglu, “Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times: Triballi, Autariatae, Dardanians, Scordisci and Moesians”, (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1978), 221–245, and S. Loma, “Domorodačko stanovništvo Kosova i Metohije u rimsko doba u svetlu antroponimije”, *Kosovo i Metohija u civilizacijskim tokovima*, Knjiga 3, Istorija, istorija umetnosti, ed. M. Atlagić, (Kosovska Mitrovica, 2010), 19–40. Loma convincingly refutes Papazoglu’s claim that there existed a separate Dardanian (i.e. non-Illyrian, non-Thracian) group of names. Dana criticises Papazoglu on this point as well (p. XXXI–XXXII).

¹⁸ On the sources see F. Papazoglu, “Central Balkan Tribes”, 210–218. On the borders of Dardania, which included lands inhabited by Thracians, see F. Papazoglu, “Central Balkan Tribes”, 187–209, 224–225.

¹⁴ S. Yanakieva, “The Thracian Language”, 56–59.

¹⁵ S. Yanakieva, “The Thracian Language”, 41.

¹⁶ For example, see E. Polomé, “The Balkan Languages (Illyrian, Thracian and Daco-Moesian)”, 885–898 for a concise overview of possible Dacian phonological traits.

as Δαρδιολα and *Derdipilus* (p. 112, 124), while *Dardisanus* and its graphical variants surface in a Thracian context (p. 112). The toponym Δαρδάρα, with a typical Thracian second element *-παρα* 'river (?)' is attested in Dardania¹⁹. It has also been suggested that the names in *Derz-*, attested primarily in Thrace and Lower Moesia, such as *Derzizenus*, *Derzitrallis*, or *Derzō* (p. 124–125), are in fact palatalised variants of *Dard-/Derd-*²⁰. This is admittedly uncertain, since the names in *Derz-* may also constitute a separate group, related to the theonyms in *Derz-* (Δερζις, Δερζέλας, etc.), as Dana suggests (p. 124)²¹. In any case, the onomastic items in *Dard-/Derd-* are often found in a Thracian context or territories, but never in a clearly Illyrian milieu²². Dardanian onomastics is inherently complex and diverse, and even its Illyrian component “bears witness to a superimposing of ethnic strata as a consequence of

successive migrations over many centuries”, as recently concluded by Svetlana Loma²³.

The remainder of the third chapter deals with many smaller topics of Thracian anthroponymy. It includes a useful presentation of regional forms of the genitive singular (p. XCII–XCIV) and of several graphical fluctuations found in Thracian names (p. XCV), a discussion on the “noms d’assonance” (p. CII–CVI), on theophoric and mythological names (p. CVI–CVIII), as well as on phantom names (p. CVIII–CIX). Unfortunately, the list of phantom names omits the unattested Βριαζενις, which is in fact an unwarranted reading of Βριζενις. It is beyond regrettable that the uncritical mention of Βριαζενις and its comparison to Gk. Αστυγηνής persists in recent surveys of Thracian, since it is an explicit conjecture on Dečev’s part²⁴. The short presentation of the glosses is practically limited to obscure Dardanian plant names and could have been omitted (p. CIX–CX). Finally, some remarks found in these short discussions are, however, confusing. For example, it is unclear why exactly is *-l-* in the names *Didalsa* and *Τυρελσης* described as a result of an epenthesis (p. XCVIII).

The fourth chapter discusses some methodological difficulties and explains the structure of the catalogue of names. As already mentioned, the order of entries in the catalogue follows that of the Latin alphabet. Graphical variants of the same name are given separate entries that point the reader

¹⁹ On Δαρδάρα see D. Detschew, “Die thrakischen Sprachreste”, 118–119. On the element *-para/-παρα* see V. Georgiev, “Trakite i tehniat ezik”, 187. Δαρδάρα occurs twice in Procopius (*Aed.* 4.4) once in Dardania, and once near Remesia (therefore, again in Dardania). The two occurrences may refer to one and the same settlement as suggested by S. Yanakieva, “Thracian toponymy until the end of the first millennium BC”, *Orpheus* 22 (2015), 22.

²⁰ D. Savić, “Some Illyrian ethnonyms and their supposed Albanian cognates: Taulantii, Delmatae, Dardani”, *BeLiDa 1: Thematic Collection of Papers*, ed. Natalija Panić-Cerovski et al. (Belgrade, 2022), 457. In Thracian, *d* becomes a palatal *z* in front of *i*, cf. the pair Βενδις ~ Βενζις ‘a goddess’. The palatalised form *Derzizenus* could then correspond to *Dardisanus*.

²¹ The same was suggested by V. Georgiev, “Trakite i tehniat ezik”, 73.

²² Cf. the material in D. Savić, “Some Illyrian ethnonyms”, 457–458.

²³ S. Loma, “Domorodačko stanovništvo Kosova i Metohije u rimsko doba u svetlu antroponimije”, 40.

²⁴ W. Sowa, “Thracian”, *Palaeohispanica: Revista sobre lenguas y culturas de la Hispania antigua* 20/2 (2020), 787–817; C. Brixhe, “Thracian”, *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European linguistics* 3, ed. Klein J. et al. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2018) 1852; D. Detschew, “Die thrakischen Sprachreste”, 87–88. Dana only mentions that Βριαζενις is a phantom name on p. XXIV, note 78.

to the main entry containing all occurrences: e.g. the occurrences of *Bitus* and Βειθυς are listed under the entry *Bithus*. The names are further grouped according to their province and toponym of origin. Other important details are provided when possible for each attestation, such as the type of document, the number of occurrences within the same document, complete onomastic formulae, or the anthroponymic region of the name. The result is a well-structured and thorough corpus, yet one unencumbered by digressions.

Onomasticon Thracicum in many ways surpasses Dečev's corpus and supplants it as the main point of reference for Thracian anthroponymy. The updated repertoire of Thracian names and their classification into anthroponymic areas are probably its most important contributions. Data in some older corpora which relied on Dečev to identify Thracian names, such as *Inscriptions de la*

Mésie supérieure, should now be compared with the results of Dana's work. The book does not address interactions between Thracian and neighbouring anthroponymies in great detail, but it provides excellent grounds for such a study. Finally, while *Onomasticon Thracicum* does not recommend itself as a manual of the Thracian language, researchers of Palaeo-Balkan languages stand to gain from consulting not only the catalogue, but also the chapters dealing with non-linguistic issues. Dana's calls for caution and his mistrust towards the etymological method's application in Thracian studies may seem exaggerated, but they are a necessary reminder of the not infrequent disregard of historical and epigraphical circumstances in the study of Palaeo-Balkan languages, embodied by the unfortunate appearance of the phantom name Βραζενις in recent outlines of Thracian grammar.

EUGENIA BEU-DACHIN, *THE LATIN LANGUAGE IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF ROMAN DACIA*, MEGA PUBLISHING HOUSE, CLUJ-NAPOCA, 2014, 276 p.

*Reviewed by Jelena Vukojević**

The great importance of the inscriptions for the study of spoken Latin and its linguistic tendencies has long been recognised. The language of epigraphy is the most important source for the study of the degree of Romanization and acculturation in the provinces, especially when there are no literary sources from the province, as in the case of Dacia. The growing number of inscriptions, their study, as well as the revision of previously published texts, contribute greatly to the study of Vulgar Latin and also make it possible to identify the characteristics of the language of epigraphy in a province in comparison with the rest of the Empire. We expect this book to provide a systematic approach to linguistic phenomena in inscriptions from Dacia, as it is based on the richest

and most comprehensive corpus of inscriptions from Dacia to date. The carefully studied, critiqued, and described epigraphic habit and language of the inscriptions may be a suitable tool for further research on the Latin language in general and for numerous comparative studies.

The book under review was originally written as a doctoral thesis, submitted and presented in 2011 at the Faculty of History and Philosophy of Babeş-Bolyai University in Cluj-Napoca. The present version has been thoroughly and carefully revised by Eugenia Beu-Dachin, a scholar primarily of

* jelena.vukojevic@f.bg.ac.rs
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philosophy,
Department of Classics, Belgrade, Serbia

ISSN 0350-7653



9 770350 765003 >