

HABILITATION THESIS

FROM ARCHAEOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS TO ARCHAEOLOGY

by

Adrian Poruciuc, Ph.D.

Professor at the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Faculty of Letters

Senior Researcher (half-post) of the Romanian Academy, Iași Branch, Institute of Archaeology in Iași

Fellow per la Letteratura, Compagnia di San Paolo – Bogliasco, Genova

Fellow of the Institute of Archaeology, Sebastopol, California, USA

Doctor honoris causa of the Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava

2012

Contents

Abstract	3
Rezumat	6
I. Beginnings – in historical linguistics	9
II. Interdisciplinary features in <i>Archaeolinguistica</i>	17
III. Archaeolinguistics and onomastics	22
IV. Archaeolinguistics and substrate studies	28
V. Archaeolinguistics and the domain of Old Germanic loans	41
VI. Archaeomythology enlarged by archaeolinguistics in <i>Prehistoric Roots</i>	50
VII. Envisaged progress	62
References	66

Abstract

The text below represents a synthetic report meant to sustain my application for a habilitation title. I chose a special line of my career as a researcher, namely the line of development “from archaeolinguistics to archaeomythology,” each of the main steps being presented in one of the seven chapters, arranged in chronological order.

The first chapter (“Beginnings – in historical linguistics”) refers to my first steps in the field of historical linguistics (during the 80s of last century), more specifically to my early achievements in Germanic and Indo-European studies. I repeatedly refer to the important influence exerted on my career by a great scholar, Professor Gheorghe Ivănescu of the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași. I also point out significant contacts that I had, during that period, with a whole series of outstanding scholars (Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Cicerone Poghiric, Marija Gimbutas, Herbert Pilch, Hans-Martin Gauger, Zbigniew Gołąb, Eric Hamp and others).

Chapter II (“Interdisciplinary features in *Archaeolinguistica*”) centers upon the volume that I published in 1995. What that volume reflects, methodologically, is mainly “collaboration between archaeology and linguistics,” that is mutual confirmation of data provided by the two disciplines, such data also being often referred to evidence coming from ethnography and folklore. The first study-chapter of the book focuses on “problems and patterns” of the Southeast European ethno- and glottogenesis; the second deals with two types of axes whose shapes, functions and names recall prehistoric implements; the third deals with the implications of the (apparently Indo-European) ethnonym recorded as *Phoinikes* in Ancient Greek and as *Fnhw* in Ancient Egyptian. A central issue of the whole volume is represented by the successive contributions of the Oriental Fertile Crescent and of the North Pontic area to the making of Southeast Europe as we know it.

Chapter III (“Archaeolinguistics and onomastics”) is a concise review of a series of articles on proper names, a subject that I have been permanently preoccupied with. The main reason for such preoccupation is that there are parts of the world (Romania included) for which very long periods are not covered by documents, and under such circumstances vestigial proper names may often represent unique windows to the past. In earlier articles (mainly in the ones published in *Thraco-Dacica*) I focused on possible perpetuation of proper names not only from pre-Roman, but also from pre-Indo-European sources. I paid special attention to categories of substratal names (mainly mono- and disyllabic anthroponyms) which constitute evidence of a very solid demic basis, of Neolithic origin, in both Anatolia and Southeast Europe. Such names can be said to represent a *Namenbund* that unites the two areas. The seemingly miraculous survival of such elements (just like the survival of archaic customs) has as its main explanation the “inertial force” of peasant culture, which proves to have prehistoric roots in areas such as Southeast Europe.

My principal ideas about possibilities of survival, in regard to vestigial elements from long vanished languages and cultures into present-day ones are expressed in chapter IV (“Archaeolinguistics and substrate studies”). My main focus is on words that I consider as substratal (such as Greek *keramos*, Romanian *băț*, Aromanian *lăgamă*). However, my approaches to such words are not exclusively linguistic-etymological, but also cultural-ethnological, along the line of the method that became (long ago) known as “words and things” (*Wörter un Sachen*). For instance, the etymological correspondence between Dacian *dava/deva* (as origin of the Romanian city-name *Deva*) and the vast toponymic isogloss that includes Ancient Greek *Thebai*, can be sustained by data regarding Bronze-Age hillforts that such toponyms appear to have originally referred to. On the whole, I observe the main theories of the Indo-European domain as well as some views expressed by representatives of the Nostratic School. But I also developed my own views on the substratal glottal stock that I designated as “Egyptoid”, since I have found quite a number of elements that the European substratal vocabulary has in common with Ancient Egyptian. In that respect, I have developed several of my theoretical opinions in comparison (and in contrast) with Vennemann’s vision of “Semitidic” elements in European languages (mainly Germanic and Celtic).

My series of articles on Old Germanic elements preserved in Romanian (OGRs) is presented in chapter V (“Archaeolinguistics and the domain of Old Germanic loans”). In it I take into consideration both appellatives and proper names that attest to close contacts between Old Germanic populations and natives of the Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic area. Although I have had to face some opposition (in both Romania and abroad), since I go against the *dominant opinion* according to which Romanian contains no Old Germanic elements, several of my articles on the topic under discussion have been published (in Germany, USA and Romania) and they have been quite well received. I treat OGRs according to words-and-things principles too. For instance, I demonstrate that an extremely important lexical family of Old Germanic origin, namely the one that includes Romanian *ban*, *băni*, *bănat*, *bănu* and *bântui*, recalls an archaic juridical system that appears to have been introduced into Southeast Europe by Old Germanic intruders.

Chapter VI (“Archaeomythology enlarged by archaeolinguistics in *Prehistoric Roots*”) focuses on what my volume of 2010 basically stands for, namely and enlargement of the domain defined as “archaeomythology” by Marija Gimbutas in 1989. I took into consideration that Gimbutas developed an interdisciplinary perspective expressly for archaeologists, and also that she (for all her frequent use of linguistic arguments) insisted on a triangular combination of disciplines: “archaeology, mythology, and folklore.” Schematically, what I propose is a square basis (of more general use) by firm inclusion of archaeolinguistic arguments in all the chapters of the volume, which remains basically archaeomythological. I consider that – whether I refer to the names of Dionysos and Orpheus, or to the

“sea-monster” designated as *dolf* by the Romanians – whatever linguistic conclusions we may draw should be sustained by archaeological-historical, mythological and ethnological arguments too. It is my belief that a “square basis of certitude” can be beneficent for archaeologists and historians as well as for linguists and ethnologists.

Most of my final chapter, VII (“Envisaged progress”), refers to my personal plans for the future (which regard mainly completion of my unfinished projects), as well as to my possibilities of providing academic guidance for young researchers and/or PhD students that would be inclined to make use of interdisciplinary principles in their own scientific endeavors. I am aware of the fact that to reach a square basis such as the one I have referred to above much time and much effort is needed. Nevertheless, I hope that a sufficient number of young intellectuals will be attracted by the idea of true interdisciplinary study. It remains for academic institutions to create (by joint action) favorable conditions for such study.

* * *

Rezumat

Textul de mai jos reprezintă un raport menit a susține intenția mea de a obține un titlu de doctor habilitat. Am ales o linie particulară a carierei mele de cercetător, anume cea care reprezintă o dezvoltare „de la arheolingvistică la arheomitologie”, fiecare stadiu principal fiind prezentat în unul din cele șapte capitole, în aranjament cronologic.

Primul capitol (“Beginnings – in historical linguistics”) se referă la primii pași ai mei în domeniul lingvisticii istorice (în anii 80 ai secolului trecut), în particular la primele mele realizări pe tărâmul studiilor germanice și indoeuropene. Mă refer în mod repetat la importanta influență exercitată asupra carierei mele de către un mare savant, Profesorul Gheorghe Ivănescu de la Universitatea „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași. Scot în evidență de asemenea semnificativele contacte pe care le-am avut, în perioada respectivă, cu o întregă serie de remarcabili oameni de știință (Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovița, Cicerone Poghiric, Marija Gimbutas, Herbert Pilch, Hans-Martin Gauger, Zbigniew Gołąb, Eric Hamp și alții).

Capitolul II (“Interdisciplinary features in *Archaeolinguistica*”) se axează pe volumul pe care l-am publicat în 1995. Respectivul volum reflectă, din punct de vedere metodologic, “colaborarea dintre arheologie și lingvistică”, mai precis confirmarea reciprocă de date furnizate de cele două domenii, asemenea date fiind adesea trimise și la unele oferite de etnografie și folclor. Primul capitol-studiu al cărții este dedicat “problemelor și modelelor” specifice etno- și glotogenezei Europei sud-estice; al doilea se ocupă de două tipuri de topoare ale căror forme, funcții și denumiri trimit la unelte preistorice; iar al treilea are ca subiect implicațiile unui (aparent indoeuropean) etnonim atestat ca *Phoinikes* în greaca veche și la *Fnkhw* în egipteană veche. O problemă centrală a întregului volum este cea reprezentată de contribuțiile succesive ale Semilunii Fertile orientale și ale zonei Nord Pontice la facerea Europei sud-estice așa cum o știm.

Capitolul III (“Archaeolinguistics and onomastics”) este o concisă trecere în revistă a unei serii de articole privitoare la nume proprii, un subiect care a reprezentat o preocupare permanentă a mea. Motivul principal al unei asemenea preocupări este că există părți ale lumii (inclusiv România) pentru care anumite perioade istorice nu sunt acoperite de documente, iar în asemenea circumstanțe relictele onomastice pot adesea reprezenta unice ferestre spre trecut. În articole mai timpurii (mai ales în cele publicate în *Thraco-Dacica*) m-am concentrat pe posibilele perpetuări de nume proprii din surse nu doar pre-romane, ci și pre-indoeuropene. Am acordat o atenție specială unor categorii de nume proprii (mai ales antroponime mono- și disilabice) care constituie evidențe ale unei solide baze demice, de sorginte neolitică, atât în Anatolia cât și în sud-estul Europei. Se poate spune că asemenea nume reprezintă o „uniune onomastică” (*Namenbund*) care unește cele două zone. Aparent miraculoasa supraviețuire a unor

asemenea elemente onomastice (ca și supraviețuirea unor obiceiuri arhaice) are ca principală explicație „forța inerțială” a culturii țărănești, care dovedește a avea rădăcini preistorice în zone precum Europa sud-estică.

Principalele mele idei privitoare la posibilități de supraviețuire a unor relice din limbi și culturi demult dispărute până în cele de azi sunt formulate în capitolul IV (“Archaeolinguistics and substrate studies”). Mă concentrez acolo mai ales asupra unor cuvinte pe care le consider a fi de substrat (precum grec. *keramos*, rom. *băț*, sau arom. *lăgamă*). Totuși, asemenea cuvinte sunt abordate de pe poziții nu doar lingvistic-etimologice, ci și cultural-etnologice, pe linia unei metode care (cu mult timp în urmă) a devenit cunoscută sub denumirea de „cuvinte și lucruri” (*Wörter und Sachen*). De exemplu, corespondența etimologică dintre dacicul *dava/deva* (ca origine a numelui de oraș românesc *Deva*) și vasta isoglosă toponimică ce include și grec. *Thebai* poate fi susținută și de date privitoare la fortificații (pe vârful de deal) din epoca bronzului, care se pare că erau la origini desemnate prin toponime precum cele în discuție. În plan general, am ținut cont de principalele teorii din domeniul indoeuropeanistic, ca și de unele vederi ale reprezentanților școlii nostratice. Mi-am dezvoltat însă și propriile idei privitoare la fondul glotic de substrat pe care l-am etichetat ca „egiptoid”, deoarece am descoperit un număr important de elemente pe care vocabularul european de substrat le are în comun cu egipteana veche. În privința respectivă, mi-am elaborat opiniile teoretice în comparație (și în contrast) cu viziunea lui Vennemann, care consideră că există elemente „semitidice” în limbile europene (cu precădere în cele germanice și celtice).

Seria mea de articole privitoare la vechile germanisme din română (VGR) este prezentată în capitolul V (“Archaeolinguistics and the domain of Old Germanic loans”). În respectivul capitol abordez atât apelative, cât și nume proprii care indică strânse contacte între populații germanice și populații locale din zona carpato-danubiano-pontică. Deși a trebuit să fac față și unor opoziții, având în vedere că merg împotriva opiniei dominante (atât în România cât și în străinătate) potrivit căreia româna nu conține vechi germanisme, mai multe articole ale mele pe tema în discuție au fost publicate (în Germania, SUA și România), ele bucurându-se de o bună primire. Tratez elementele VGR și conform metodei cuvinte-și-lucruri. Printre altele, demonstrez că o extrem de importantă familie lexicală de origine veche germanică, cea care include termenii românești *ban*, *băni*, *bănat*, *bănuși* și *bântui*, reflectă un sistem juridic arhaic care pare să fi fost introdus în Europa sud-estică de către alogeni vechi germanici.

Capitolul VI (“Archaeomythology enlarged by archaeolinguistics in *Prehistoric Roots*”) pune în discuție volumul meu publicat în 2010 și ce reprezintă el în esență, anume o lărgire a domeniului definit ca „arheolingvistică” de către Marija Gimbutas în 1989. Am avut în vedere că, în mod expres, Gimbutas a dezvoltat o perspectivă interdisciplinară pentru arheologi și că ea, cu toate că folosește frecvent argumente lingvistice, a insistat pe o combinație triunghiulară de discipline, anume „arheologie, mitologie

și folclor”. La nivel schematic, ceea ce propun la rândul meu este o bază-cadrilater (de utilitate mai generală), constituită prin consistent adaos de argumente arheolingvistice în toate capitolele volumului, al cărui caracter de bază rămâne arheomitologic. Fie că mă refer la numele lui Dionysos și al lui Orpheus, sau la „monstrul marin” desemnat de români ca *dolf*, consider că, oricare ar fi concluziile lingvistice, se cuvine ca ele să fie susținute și de argumente arheologic-istorice, mitologice și etnologice. Am convingerea că „baza-cadrilater de certitudine” poate fi benefică pentru arheologi și istorici, ca și pentru lingviști și etnologi.

Cea mai mare parte a capitolului final, VII (“Envisaged progress”), se referă la planurile mele personale de viitor (planuri care implică, în mare măsură, finalizarea unor proiecte rămase în suspensie), precum și la posibilitățile mele de a oferi îndrumare academică unor tineri cercetători și/sau doctoranzi care s-ar simți înclinați să se folosească de principii interdisciplinare în propriile demersuri științifice. Sunt conștient de faptul că, pentru a ajunge la o bază-cadrilater precum cea la care mă refeream mai sus, e nevoie de mult timp și de mult efort. Sper totuși că se vor găsi suficient de mulți tineri intelectuali care să fie atrași de ideea de studiu cu adevărat interdisciplinar. Rămâne ca și instituțiile academice să creeze (prin acțiune conjugată) condiții propice unui asemenea tip de studiu.

* * *

I. Beginnings – in historical linguistics

In accordance with the habilitation provisions included in the new Romanian law of national education (2011), I have written this extended report on my activity and my publications that represent the research direction indicated by the general title above. In the final part of my report I will refer to possibilities of further study in the several interrelated academic directions of my own choice.

To begin with, I will first mention that I graduated in 1971, from a faculty of philology; however, my *linguistic* career proper began in 1983. My graduation, from *Universitatea “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” – Iași (UAIC)*, was in English and Romanian – language and literature, for both lines. During the “dark age” of 1971-1989 (a no-promotion period in Romanian universities, not only in my case) I worked as an assistant professor at the English Department of my home faculty (*Facultatea de Filologie*),¹ which had employed me immediately after graduation. What I taught during the first part of my university career was mainly interpretation of literary texts, stylistics, and much Shakespeare.² Then it happened that, in 1983, my department found itself in need of someone who could prepare and teach courses in history of English and in Germanic philology. I was invited to do it, mainly since I could read and speak not only English, but also German, as well as a little Swedish. For all the hard work that followed, I soon grew so fond of my new academic direction that I expanded my research from Germanic to Indo-European, with much help and encouragement from a great professor, Gheorghe Ivănescu, whom I consider to be my master in historical linguistics.³

At this point I will also mention the precious encouragement, scientific information and advice I received during the 80s of last century from several colleagues of the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, notably from Prof. Hans-Martin Gauger (a specialist in Romance languages) and Prof. Herbert Pilch (a specialist in general linguistics, as well as in Indo-European studies). They repeatedly visited my University, and every time they brought with them not only books, but also an air of academic normality, which we badly needed at that time.

¹ After 1989, at UAIC, the name of the faculty under discussion was changed to Faculty of Letters (*Facultatea de Litere*).

² My interest in Shakespeare is reflected in a series of articles I published during the 70s and 80s of last century, as well as in my volume *Structuri dramatice și imagini poetice la Shakespeare și Voiculescu*. Iași: Casa Editorială *Demiurg*, 2000 (which is practically a Romanian revised version of my doctoral thesis of 1982, written in English, under the title *Basic Dramatic Structures and Imagery with Shakespeare and Voiculescu*).

³ Ivănescu was a rather singular voice in the Romanian linguistics of the latter half of the 20th century. He wrote one of the most coherent and comprehensive histories of Romanian (*Istoria limbii române*, Iași: Junimea, 1980), and he also co-authored (with Theofil Simenschy) a remarkable Indo-European synthesis, *Gramatica comparată a limbilor indoeuropene* (București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1981). Ivănescu showed much patience and understanding with younger colleagues who showed interest in problems of historical linguistics.

In 1987 the UAIC copy-center published the first edition of my coursebook *A Concise History of the English Language*; and it was in the same year that my first significant linguistic article was published (in English), in the UAIC Annals. The article (Poruciuc 1987, recommended by Ivănescu for publication) focused not only on etymology and historical linguistics, but also on a series of religious-mythological figures, including Hittite *Istanus*, Hungarian *Isten*, Old Norse *Thunarr* and Turkic *Tanrı*. Unfortunately, 1987 was also the year in which Ivănescu passed away. I could at least be the first to write an article (Poruciuc 1988, in English)⁴ about Ivănescu's prestigious activity in the fields of historical linguistics and Indo-European studies, respectively.⁵ Here is one passage of what I wrote (1998: 92) in memory of my favorite professor: "G. Ivănescu was a quite complex personality, and he may have been uncomfortable for many, but, scientifically speaking, he undoubtedly was a hero of academic thought." I am of the same opinion today.

Speaking of the same stage of my career, I must now observe that, without really being aware of it at that moment, in preparing the above-mentioned article of 1987 I already approached Indo-European issues from an interdisciplinary standpoint, since I dealt not only with language proper, but also with mythology. (At that time, I had no idea that by my first linguistic article I opened a line that I was to develop later in the two fields now known as archaeolinguistics and archaeomythology.) I was practically getting out of the Indo-European mainstream, since I tackled possible connections with Sumerian, Turkic and Finno-Ugrian. Mainly, I focused on several possible mythological implications of the root that Indo-European specialists reconstructed as **sten-* 'thunder'. In regard to that root, and with direct reference to the Hittite theonym *Istanus*, I assumed an Indo-European origin for the Hungarian name of the Christian God, *Isten* (a word still considered to be of obscure origin).⁶

I also observed an interdisciplinary direction in preparing the material for my first bid to participate in an international congress – *The 6th Congress of Southeast European Studies*, Sofia, 1989. It was during the last summer of Communist Romania, and my passport was "withdrawn" without any explanation, several days before the congress. I mention it also since my seeming failure turned into an opportunity for me to witness – and to benefit from – a rare act of academic solidarity: a well-known Romanian archaeologist, Prof. Mircea Petrescu-Dîmbovița, offered to take the text of my presentation

⁴ In 2006 I published a Romanian (revised and updated) version of that article, under the title of "Contribuția lui Gheorghe Ivănescu în domeniul studiilor indoeuropene" (*Hermeneia*, special issue, 96-104).

⁵ In fact, it was also Ivănescu who – by several of his articles – encouraged me to go beyond the limits of "classical" Indo-European studies. Among his articles, published in French (during the 60s of last century), I could find two in which he ventured to reconsider some aspects of the "Japhetic" theory, and one which focused on Near-East divinities borrowed by the Indo-Europeans.

⁶ At present, I still believe that Hungarian *Isten* (which shows a prosthetic *i-* that early Hungarians automatically applied to loanwords with an initial consonantal cluster *st-*) is of Indo-European origin. But, taking into consideration the long-lasting Central Asian (Iranoid) tradition of ritual-commemorative *stelae* (cf. Poruciuc 2010: 10-11), I now assume that the base of Hungarian *Isten* must be an Indo-European root such as **stā-* 'stand' or **stei-* 'stone', rather than **sten* 'thunder' (as I assumed in 1987).

with him to Sofia, where he handed it to another remarkable scholar, Prof. Cicerone Poghiric, who, at that time (as a Romanian exile), taught historical linguistics in France and Germany. That is how, in a rather mysterious way, my first “fugitive” article came to be published in a West German journal, *Kurier* (Universität Bochum), at the beginning of 1990.

Poruciu 1990 was the article in which I expressly resorted (with some additions of my own) to the method of “words and things” (*Wörter und Sachen*),⁷ as visible in the following statements (p. 196):

In analyzing historically significant objects, we could make use not only of the *word-and-thing* method, but also of the one based on *distinctive features*, known especially to phoneticians [...]. We may assume that any implement has four principal features: (1) material, (2) shape, (3) function, (4) name. In historical linguistics, the change from one phoneme to another should not be regarded as a simultaneous change of *all* the distinctive features of the earlier phoneme (e.g. Proto-Indo-European /p/ > Proto-Germanic /f/), but only of one or two of those features (both /p/ and /f/ are labial, voiceless, strong consonants, but the former is a stop, whereas the latter is a fricative). Similarly, we may assume that, from the Stone Age to our times, one or several features of some tool or weapon may have survived, whereas others have changed several times: e.g. the material could change from stone to copper, then to bronze and iron; the function may have passed from tool to weapon, then to a symbolic usage, then to mere tool again. It appears that shape and name may be considered as the most constant features: the former because it is dictated by usage, or rather by physical possibilities (of the implement itself and of the human body, which wields it), the latter because language proves many times to be more conservative than its environment, even though a word may have passed through several languages before reaching us.

Along the line that I define by the formula “languages die – words survive,” what I did in the rest of the article was an analysis of various types of axes, both of the ones found by archaeologists on various sites, and of the ones still in use in more recent times. My special focus was on axes with names of the *tapar* type, to which the famous Cretan double axe, λάβρυς (Mycenaean *da-pu-ri-*), also belongs. Among other things, in following a suggestion from Furnée (1972), I assumed a connection between the name of such a type of axe (“as symbol of chieftainship”) and the title of Hittite kings, *taparna/ tabarna/ tlabarne/ labarnas* (p. 199). As for the other “lexical relic,” Romanian *baltag* ‘hatchet, (small) battle-axe’, I analyzed it in connection not only with Turkic *balta* (as usually done by earlier philologists), but also with Sumerian *balag* ‘axe’. My conclusive statements were based on data from both historical linguistics and archaeology. In connection with the etymological link represented by Hittite *taparna* ‘ruler’ ~ “Old Iranian” *tapara* ‘axe’ ~ Greek *labrys* (λάβρυς) ‘double axe’ and *labyrinthos* (λαβύρινθος) ‘king’s house’,

⁷ It was in Simenschy and Ivănescu 1981: 89-90 where I first read about the *Wörter und Sachen* method founded, at the beginning of the 20th century, by Rudolf Meringer, who had followed suggestions coming from earlier scholars such as J. Grimm, H. Osthoff and O. Schrader.

I considered that the implements designated by terms of the *tapar*- family (of possible pre-Indo-European origin), must have represented “a certain type of Copper-Age double axe specific to both N Iran and SE Europe,” and that such an implement “leads back to the very beginnings of metallurgy and social stratification in the Near East and in the Balkans” (p. 205). As for the type of implement called *balag* by the Sumerians, I took into consideration “a one-bladed axe (well represented at Mari), identical in shape with some SE European Early-Bronze types (notably Veselinovo),” such a type being the one that “probably replaced the earlier Copper-Age double axes,” without, however, totally ousting the names and symbolic implications of the latter (p. 206).

It was also during the historic year 1989 when I tried very hard to send a twenty-page article to America, in response to an invitation from Marija Gimbutas.⁸ I sent it three times by mail, to no avail; and eventually I had another occasion to see academic solidarity at work. The late Prof. Samuel Longmire (Evansville, Indiana University) was at that time a Fulbright visiting professor in Iași, at UAIC. Although he knew the Romanian secret police (*Securitate*) kept a permanent eye on him, he accepted to take a copy of my article and to smuggle it to the United States. After almost one year, when I arrived in Chicago, in September 1990, I was happy to find out that my article – “Lexical Relics (Romanian *teafăr*, German *Zauber*, English *tiver*) – A Reminder of Prehistoric Red-Dye Rituals” – had been published in the spring issue of *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, DC). In that article (Poruciuc 1990a) – again without knowing it – I foreshadowed my own kind of archaeolinguistics as well as of archaeomythology, which I would promote in the subsequent period. That is why I will say a few more things on Poruciuc 1990a.⁹

The main idea of the article under discussion is that a Romanian term, *teafăr* ‘healthy, whole, unharmed, sane’, and a whole Germanic lexical family, including German *Zauber* ‘witchcraft’ and dialectal English *tiver* ‘red paint (for marking sheep)’, appear to be etymologically related. First of all I had to demonstrate that the Germanic terms under discussion were cognates (taking into account that there is sufficient proof of the fact that red paint did represent a kind of magic protection, in Europe as well as many other parts of the world, throughout millennia). Then I also had to show what chances there were for a Romanian term such as *teafăr* to be related to those Germanic terms. Although in the final part of Poruciuc 1990a I was rather hesitant in my conclusions, in a subsequent Romanian variant of the article (included in my volume of 1995 – see below), I more firmly sustained the idea of an Old Germanic origin of Romanian *teafăr*. Actually, Poruciuc 1990a also announced what I would have to say, as a linguist, in

⁸ As I will mention in more detail, below, I first met Marija Gimbutas in 1984, when she came to Iași to participate in an international conference on the prehistoric Cucuteni culture.

⁹ I must observe that the article under discussion shows several misprints and omissions, since the *Mankind Quarterly* editors could not reach me for a final proofreading.

regard to the much debated issue of the Old Germanic loans preserved in Romanian (see especially Poruciuc 1999, 2008a, 2009 and 2011).¹⁰

Methodologically, Poruciuc 1990a indicated my decisive choice of an interdisciplinary perspective. Linguistics remained a primary source of arguments, especially in my demonstration of the fact that the form of Romanian *teafăr* reflects both the probable Old Germanic origin of the term and its evolution in keeping with regular Romanian phonology (see the subchapter entitled “The Probability of an East Germanic Source,” p. 212-215). But, besides linguistic arguments, I made use of information provided by archaeology (such as the data regarding the prehistoric “Ochre-Grave Culture” – p. 209) as well as by ethnography. Notably, in the last respect, I found much support (p. 209) in the opinions of an earlier Romanian scholar, Petru Caraman, who had written a fundamental study (included in the posthumous volume Caraman 1988) on the Romanian tradition of ritual tattooing, which he considered to be inherited from pre-Romanian times. It was Caraman who (in the same study) demonstrated that body-painting and tattooing actually represent one and the same ritual act.¹¹

The final conclusions of Poruciuc 1990a, an article that I still consider to be a landmark in my academic evolution, were the following (p. 220):

The problems raised by the lexical survivors belonging to the *tiver-Zauber-teafăr* axis are not merely linguistic, since [...] by tracing the history of those words we open a way to the very roots of Eurasian religion, whose earliest properties surely included sacral red-dyes. It remains for further research to specify whether we should attribute the terms of the above-mentioned axis to the ample North Pontic (“ochre-grave”) vector, to eastern-central European urnfields, or simply to some “Picts” at the dawn of European history.

In my case, however, “further research” could not possibly be represented only by such interdisciplinary investigations as the ones that led to the article presented above. My university career as well as certain secondary institutional affiliations required coverage of other lines of study too, as indicated below.¹²

¹⁰ My investigations and publications in the field of Old Germanisms preserved in Romanian and in other non-Germanic languages of Europe (see also chapter V below) are numerous enough to provide material for a separate habilitation thesis.

¹¹ Caraman’s remarkable ethnological studies are still being published by his disciples and his admirers. After WW II, since he was regarded as “undesirable” by the Communist regime, he was not allowed to publish his fundamental works. He died in 1980 and he left behind an impressive quantity of unpublished materials. Throughout the last two decades or so I have often resorted to Caraman’s examples and conclusions (see especially Poruciuc 2010).

¹² Although I have kept trying to find my own way in historical and anthropological linguistics, throughout my career I have remained preoccupied with issues of general Indo-European interest – see, for instance, Poruciuc 1993 (on writing in Indo-European languages), 1996 (on Indo-European implications of an Old English document, *Wulfstan*), 1997d (on correlatives of Greek *nemos* and Latin *nemus*) and 2004a (on the etymology of English *child*). A special series of my articles deal with Romanian as a Romance language in a Balkan context – see Poruciuc 2000c (on correlated Albanian and Romanian names and appellatives), 2002b (on the “confluent model” as applied to

A two-year stay at the University of Chicago (UC), as a *Fulbright visiting scholar* (1990-1992) meant a lot for my career. Firstly, my grant was for research in Indo-European studies as well as in Southeast European traditional culture. Secondly, not only could I work in the Regenstein Library every day, but I could also benefit from frequent meetings and talks with UC colleagues (such as Professors Eric Hamp, Zbigniew Gołąb, Kostas Kazazis, Victor Friedman and others). Moreover, I had the opportunity to deliver papers at various congresses, colloquiums and symposiums, in Chicago as well as in Washington, DC (Georgetown University), Columbus (Ohio), Evansville (Indiana) and, last but not least, Los Angeles (California), where I had the opportunity to meet Marija Gimbutas in person again. At UCLA I participated in two of the annual conferences (1991 and 1992) organized by representatives of their interdisciplinary Indo-European center. The papers I delivered at the two conferences subsequently turned into articles that I published in *The Mankind Quarterly* and *Thraco-Dacica* (see Poruciuc 1992 and 1995a, respectively). It was also during my stay in the USA that I contributed a presentation to *The Eighth Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature and Folklore* (9-12 April 1992), organized at the University of Chicago and dedicated to Professor Zbigniew Gołąb. An article based on that presentation was to be published long after my return to Romania (see Poruciuc 1997c discussed in chapter IV below).¹³

My long article of 1992 (38 pages), entitled “Problems and Patterns of the SE European Ethno- and Glottogenesis (ca. 6500 BC – AD 1500),” can be considered as one of my main contributions to Indo-European studies,¹⁴ but also as my real beginning in archaeomythology.¹⁵ In regard to the Indo-European issues touched in Poruciuc 1992, I expressly joined a theoretical model that I labeled as GMM, from the names of three outstanding scholars, namely Gimbutas, Mallory and Martinet (two archaeologists and a

the genesis of Romanian), 2011a (on Romanian place names referring to salt) and 2012 (on the Latin origin of Romanian *f/sat* and Albanian *fshat* ‘village’).

¹³ Although I cannot say that my participation in the Chicago conference really turned me into a specialist in Balkan linguistics proper, it so happened that (after my participation in the conference “Balkanisms – Today,” Vienna, 2010), the leadership of the Commission for Balkan Linguistics (CBL) invited me to become the main organizer of their next conference, which took place (under the title proposed by me, “Balkan Linguistics as/vs Euro linguistics”) at the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, in September 2011.

¹⁴ I felt honored by the editorial note that an outstanding specialist in Indo-European studies, Edgar Polomé (as representative of the editorial committee of *The Mankind Quarterly*), attached to my article of 1992 (p. 40-41). For all his criticism of some points in my article, I received Polomé’s comments, such as the following, as an encouragement I much needed at that moment: “The present paper, controversial as it may be in some of the issues it raises, tries to illustrate developments in the Balkans from the 7th millennium B.C. till the peak of Ottoman power in the 16th c. A.D. Although the author sometimes relies perhaps too much on such disputed views as those of Lahovary, Hubschmid and Furnée on the pre-Indo-European languages of ancient Europe, his discussion of the facts is both challenging and stimulating.” With due respect, I did not (and do not) think that the “disputed views” of the three authors mentioned by Polomé should be totally rejected. I consider that – for all their flaws, mainly in details – Lahovary 1963, Hubschmid 1960 and Furnée 1972 still deserve attentive study.

¹⁵ Actually, when I wrote my article of 1992 (in Chicago) I had no idea that, several years before, Marija Gimbutas had already founded (in 1989) a new interdisciplinary field that she designated as *archaeomythology*, as I will mention again below, with more details (see chapter VI).

linguist), whose views I considered to be worth observing. The last sentences of Poruciuc 1992 express my views on the Indo-European phenomenon and on certain approaches to it (p. 33):

While making use of the GMM main lines, we should also pay more systematic attention to the massive evidence of non-Indo-European substrate factors, in Southeast Europe and elsewhere. Methodologically, a constructive collaboration between GMM and Pisani's confluence-model could help us get (totally) away from the schematic-unreal *Stammbaum* model (i.e. from the vision of a compact glotto-ethnic block sliding from prehistory into history and smoothly dividing itself into blocklets of its own substance). But, at the same time, we must beware of the (more recent) autochthonist-immobilist extreme, with its unnaturally neat vision of internal development.

Important paragraphs of the article under discussion are about "patterns of historical behavior" manifest with Southeast European populations throughout eight millennia, and also about the organic ties that unite *language, culture and history*. To note is also my return to the distinctive-feature model, this time applied not to prehistoric implements, but to identity units of the *ethnos* type. The distinctive features (or factors) I took into consideration, in Poruciuc 1992: 13, were the following:

...(a) demographic-anthropological structure; (b) traditional culture (commonly comprising multiple-source elements [...]); (c) ideology (which, especially in recent times, may show a contrast between folk beliefs and literate-official, or activist-nationalist views); (d) religion (a very important factor for ethnic unity in prehistoric and early historical times); (e) territory (whose importance depended on differences in subsistence systems [...]); (f) language (a number-one factor [...]); as a rule, language-shift also implies change in ethnic identity).

In Poruciuc 1992, I chose the Romanian *ethnos* as an illustrative result of the complicated ethno- and glottogenetic development of Southeast Europe, between the Copper-Stone Age and the Middle Ages; and it was by Romanian examples that I demonstrated both the important role of substratal survivals and the efficiency of the approach that I would later regard as representing either archaeolinguistics or archaeomythology, or both.

As for "further research," I will go on by mentioning that in the summer of 1992 I returned to my home university, where I soon resumed teaching (improved versions of) my courses in medieval English and in Germanic philology, to which I added a course in Indo-European studies and another in history of writing. I republished the history-of-English course (Poruciuc 1992a) that I had taught, for one "quarter" of an academic year, at the University of Chicago (Department of English). Also, I resumed my collaboration with the Romanian Institute of Thracian Studies in Bucharest (*Institutul Român de*

Tracologie – IRT), in whose journal, *Thraco-Dacica*, I had already published an etymological article (Poruciuc 1990b, on the substratal origin of Romanian *codru*) before my leaving for Chicago. In the fall of 1992, the director of IRT, Prof. Petre Roman, offered me a linguist's half-post, which I then held until 2003 (when the Institute was institutionally absorbed by the Vasile Pârvan Institute of Archaeology in Bucharest).

My collaboration with IRT was fruitful and enjoyable, mainly since the institute was a truly interdisciplinary organization, with specialists in archaeology, history, linguistics, classical philology, ethnology, etc. In the reference list below I also included some of the articles I published in *Thraco-Dacica* during the period under discussion (see Poruciuc 1992b, 1993, 1995a, 1998b, 2000, 2001). It was during the same period that I participated in two International Congresses of Thracian Studies (Constanța 1996 and Sofia 2000), my two papers being published in subsequent volumes of proceedings (see Poruciuc 1997 and 2002, respectively). Actually, I remained in touch with the domain of Thracian studies (or “Thracology”) after 2003 too, as I contributed papers to two more recent congresses in the same domain (Komotini 2007 and Istanbul 2011). I mention those participations mainly because, in method, my last two congress-papers (like the one of Sofia 2000) belong to archaeomythology, as they all point out possibilities of connecting archaeological finds to historical records as well as to mythological and ethnographic facts of Southeast Europe.

The most notable result of my activity as a member of IRT is my volume *Archaeolinguistica* (1995), published as monograph IX of *Bibliotheca Thracologica*, a collection issued by IRT. As indicated by its subtitle (*Trei studii interdisciplinare*), my volume contains three methodologically interrelated studies, the first two of which represent revised and extended Romanian versions of two articles previously published in English (Poruciuc 1992 and 1990). As I will show in the following chapter, in my volume of 1995 I intended to do archaeolinguistics in a more programmatic manner.

II. Interdisciplinary features in *Archaeolinguistica*

In my foreword (in Romanian) as well as in my eight-page summary (in English) added to the text of my volume *Archaeolinguistica* (1995), I tried to define *archaeolinguistics* as an interdisciplinary enlargement of what I had learned (first from Gheorghe Ivănescu) as *palaeolinguistics*, that is, mainly, reconstruction of idioms spoken in the remote past. What I aimed to add to that domain was a more obviously interdisciplinary perspective. I opened my summary of the book by the following statements (p. 97):

Very much in this volume represents a domain generally known as palaeolinguistics. However, as a professional linguist and a self-taught archaeologist, I chose *Archaeolinguistica* as a general title. It is meant to suggest, from the very first cover, links with archaic languages and cultures, as well as the importance of archaeology as support for linguistic demonstrations [...]. The principal aim of this volume is, in fact, to demonstrate that coherent interdisciplinary studies are possible. During the last decade [that is, 1985-1994] I have often heard or read about the necessity of *real* collaboration between archaeology and linguistics. That prerequisite (much desired, but seldom observed, practically) is of utmost importance in a field like the one of Indo-European studies, which can exist *only* by interdisciplinary collaboration, comprising not only the two above-mentioned specialties, but also anthropology, ethnography, archaeometry, etc.

Although the quotation above indicates that my interests and arguments continued to have a linguistic basis, sustained by archaeological arguments, I also foreshadowed the enlarged methodological vision that was to become manifest in articles that I published after 1995.¹⁶

In the volume under discussion, the parts that appear as archaeolinguistic proper are the ones in which I start from certain appellatives or proper names that I interpret by reference not only to lingual matter, but also to non-lingual facts. For instance, I open my paragraph on Romanian *horă* ‘round dance’ (p. 32) by referring the latter to Ancient Greek terms (notably *χορός* ‘dance, group of dancers, chorus’ and *χώρα* ‘space reserved for certain actions’) which are as obscure etymologically as the Romanian term;

¹⁶ In the reference list of *Archaeolinguistica* 1995, names of well-known philologists and linguists (such as Autenrieth, Bechtel, Benveniste, Bergstässer, Bomhard, Buck, Chantraine, Dečev, Delitzsch, Devoto, Djakonov, Dorian, Fick, Friedrich, Gardiner, Hamp, Hasdeu, Iordan, Ivănescu, Lehmann, Martinet, Meillet, Mihăescu, Pisani, Poghiric, Pokorny, Pulgram, Rosetti, Ruijgh, Russu, Schaller, Shevelov, Simenschy, Sturtevant, Tagliavini, Vasmer, Vraciu, Walde, Wallis Budge, Zgusta) stand side by side with names of outstanding archaeologists and historians (such as Boardman, Comşa, Crossland, Delbrück, Deshayes, Dumitrescu, Gimbutas, Childe, Hencken, Iorga, Jovanović, Makkay, Mallory, Marinatos, Mellaart, Florescu, Nikolov, Oppermann, Piggot, Powell, Renfrew, Rolle, Sandars, Whittle, Wolfram). Besides all these, there also appear names of anthropologists, ethnologists, folklorists, mythologists, etc. (Boev, Caraman, Cavalli-Sforza, Charachidze, Cole, Durand, Eliade, Fol, Ilin, Ispirescu, Jettmar, Marazov, Kulišić, Milcu, Nilsson, Parrot, Sandu-Timoc, Ulansey and others).

I also refer to the variant *horo* in use nowadays, as name of a folk dance, in several Balkan regions (in Greece, Bulgaria and the European part of Turkey). In order to demonstrate that the Balkan term under discussion can be interpreted as a substratal element that originally referred to a ritual-cultural dance, I took into consideration not only traces of ritual features that survived to our days, in connection with the dance under discussion,¹⁷ but also archaeological finds¹⁸ that prove that such a dance has its roots in the prehistory and the early history of the Aegean-Balkan area as well as in the Near and Middle East.

Mainly linguistic is also the long paragraph on what I consider to be an “onomastic union,” which, in my opinion, has its roots in the regions of the Near East wherefrom Neolithic agriculture spread to Southeast Europe as well as to Mesopotamia, Palestine and Egypt. I still consider that I was right in my assumptions (p. 99) about the spectacular onomastic continuity in the area I took into account:

There is a very rich onomastic material showing what now appears as a Balkan *Namenbund*, comprising not only toponyms of incredible age, but also person-names coming from an obscure source of monomembers, sometimes extended by archaic suffixes. The roots of those monomembers occur in person-names recorded as Microasian, Mycenaean, (pre-)Greek, Illyrian, or Thracian.

I pointed out the striking similarities between two onomastic systems placed at chronological extremes, namely the ancient Microasian (as presented in Zgusta 1964), Ancient Greek, Illyrian and Thracian systems and the Romanian one, which, like other Balkan languages of today (Greek, Albanian, Bulgarian), contains a whole mass of etymologically obscure surnames. I insisted on names that show monoconsonantal bases, such as *An-*, *On-* and *Ok-*, from which numerous extensions were created, by means of archaic (most probably pre-Indo-European) suffixes such as *-eu*, *-ai*, *-ak*, *-ik*, *-uk*, *-it*, *-ot*, *-ut*, *-ya*: e.g. Microasian *Ana*, *Anna*, *Anake*, *Anita*, *Annakos*, *Annikas* ~ Micenaean *A-ne-a*, *A-ne-o*, *A-no*, *A-nota*, *A-nu-ko*, *A-nu-to* ~ Illyrian *Ana*, *Ankus*, *Annaeus*, *Annaia*, *Annea*, *Annia* ~ Romanian *Ana* (usually confused with the biblical feminine name), *Ancu*, *Ancău*, *Ancota*, *Ane*, *Anescu*, etc. In fact, the prehistoric roots of a very significant stock of Southeast European person-names of ancient and modern times represented one of my permanent interests, as visible in the reference list below (see Poruciuc 1992b, 1997, 1997a, 1998a, 2006).

¹⁷ In some parts of Romania *horă* refers a funeral song, whereas a round dance called *horă* is danced by inhabitants of certain villages around graves of their own relatives, on special days known as *Moși*, in which case we may observe an interesting connection with another Romanian substratal word, namely *moș* ‘old man, forefather, ancestor’, as well as with a deeply rooted cult of the dead (see p. 34).

¹⁸ A remarkable fact is that Romanian archaeologists (rather automatically) applied the term *horă* to each of a series of Neolithic-Chalcolithic pots (or “stands”) that represent, by cutouts, silhouettes of naked women united in a ritual dance (p. 33). On the same page I mentioned the fact that *horă* also designates the two semicircular lateral apses of typical Orthodox churches – one observation that I would resume in a subsequent article (Poruciuc 2000), as well as in my volume of 2010.

To return to the dominantly linguistic paragraphs of *Archaeolinguistica* 1995, they also include the one on Thracian *Rhesos* as based on an appellative that was related to Latin *rex* and Sanskrit *raj* ‘king’ (p. 54), as well as the paragraph in which I express some doubts about the mainstream etymology of Romanian *apă* ‘water’ as mere continuator of Latin *aqua*. (I pointed out that a term similar to Romanian *apă* may have existed in Dacian before the coming of the Romans, taking into into consideration that Dacian river-names such as *Apos* and *Axi-opa* were recorded in ancient times – p. 56.) In all such cases, however, I did not confine myself to linguistic arguments, but I repeatedly referred to the historical context within which one or another glottal phenomenon could occur. A similar interdisciplinary methodology is also manifest in the central paragraphs, which already reflect archaeomythology rather than archaeolinguistics.

The first chapter of *Archaeolinguistica* contains interpretations of Romanian pieces of ritual folklore, which I refer to traditions recorded in ancient times and to archaeological finds. I start with a Romanian (Transylvanian) reaping song (*hora secerii*), in which the central figure is the Holy Ox (p. 40). I continue with my comments on an even more archaic ritual song (now used as “Christmas carol”), in which a majestic young woman (whom I consider to be a true “Proto-Europa”) sits in a swing placed between the horns of a black wild bull (aurochs) that swims across a tumultuous river. I take into consideration the ample evidence of the very early signs of a bull-cult and of horn-symbolism. In regard to such issues of prehistoric cultural tradition, I drew a concise conclusion in the summary (p. 99):

Motifs such as the one of the aurochs-riding maid (with traces of proto-Mithraic sacrifice, as well as of a Proto-Europa myth), or the one of the flower-begetting Holy Ox in Romanian carols indicate undeniable Neolithic origins. The initial ritual implications of those motifs may become easier to understand in the light of certain archaeological finds, such as the ones found in the shrine of Parța, in W Romania.

On a more general plane, I included the aurochs-and-maid motif among a significant group of seemingly “Orientalizing” elements that occur very early in Southeast Europe and they are still to be found in the traditional culture of that area. Other such elements are the *dolf* (a sea-monster in a whole cycle of Romanian carols), the *zgripsor* (a Romanian relative of the fabulous creature known as γρόψ ‘griffin’ in Ancient Greek), and the lion, as a spectacular mythical figure in Romanian ritual folklore. About the *dolf* and the lion I was to write and publish quite much after 1995,¹⁹ not also about the *zgripsor* though.²⁰

Another paragraph of Poruciuc 1995 that deserved (and still deserves) extension is the one about the heroic lad designated as *june* ‘(unmarried) young man’ or *mire* ‘bridegroom’ in Romanian *colinde*

¹⁹ See Poruciuc 1997, 2002b, 2005, 2006a, 2010.

²⁰ I intend to include a special chapter on the *zgripsor* in what I plan to become a sequel to Poruciuc 2010 (*Prehistoric Roots*).

(‘carols’). In most of the ritual songs taken into consideration, the mythical young lad appears as a horseman, whose image strikingly resembles the figure known to historians and archaeologists as “Thracian Knight” (I prefer to call him “Thracian Horseman.”) Here are my summarizing comments on the heroic figure under discussion (p. 100):

The usual weapons (and emblems) of the Romanian carol-horseman are bow and arrow, spear and mace (the last one still being ritually-competitively thrown in the air during a Transylvanian horsemen’s festival called “Junii Braşovului”). The same hero usually has his hound(s) and his hawk(s) with him. The only source one can suppose for such a heroic-aristocratic prototype is the steppic world, which, through millennia, provided Europe with riding-and-hunting elites.

Such paragraphs in chapter I of *Archaeolinguistica* 1995 contain issues that best reflect my permanent preoccupations. The same can be said about chapter II, which is based on the resumption and extension of the earlier article Poruciuc 1990, the one on two types of prehistoric axes. After a series of linguistic, archaeological and ethnographic arguments that prove the remarkable spreading and persistence of those axes and of their symbolic implications, I ended with the following statement (p. 103):

As a general conclusion, both *topor* and *baltag* represent Early Metal Age developments along the axis connecting the Middle East and the Aegean-Balkan world. Whereas the former isogloss leads back to the very beginning of Copper in Iran as well as in Eastern Europe, the latter, implying a Sumerian-Balkan correspondence, seems to reflect the transition to Bronze, in practically the same part of the world.

Chapter III of the same volume is also based on one of my earlier papers, namely on the (unpublished) presentation that I had intended to deliver at an international congress in Freiburg (1988), in which, as I had actually expected, I was not allowed to participate. Although the subject of that paper may be considered to be risky and speculative, I still believe that many arguments I made use of in it are still worthy of consideration. In the main, as for the linguistic side, I observed the coincidence between certain designations of ethnic and/or social groups in Ancient Egyptian (*Fnkhw*) and Ancient Greek (*Phoinikes*) as well as in Slavic (*vojnik/bojnik*) and Romanian (*voinic/boinic*), all these showing a root that can be interpreted as Indo-European.²¹

Among my archaeological-historical arguments, in the case under discussion, most important are the ones that indicate penetrations (as early as the 4th millennium BC in Syria-Palestine and 2nd

²¹ I discussed (p. 85) the possibility of a connection with Old Irish *fian*, as designation of warlike outlaws, as well as with Latin *uenari* ‘to hunt’, usually referred to the root **wen-* ‘to desire, strive for’.

millennium BC in continental Greece) of groups of – possibly Indo-European – warriors that used horse-drawn chariots as well as bronze daggers in warfare. Here is a general vision of the issue (p.103):

The link I propose is, first of all, with the alien “civilizers” of pre-ancient Greece, the ones known as “Phoenicians” (though obviously preceding, by many centuries, the historically attested presence, in the Mediterranean, of “real” Semitic Phoenicians). Those legendary warriors, led by Kadmos, are said to have founded Thebes, and to have taught the natives how to use *phoinikeia*, i.e. alphabetic writing. The war-chariot seems to have been their main military advantage (and certain chariots presented as *ponikija* in Mycenaean were not called so – as some scholars asserted – simply because they were painted red!). It was the same warriors [...] who, according to Marinatos 1973, became rulers of pre-Mycenaean Greece after 2000 BC [...]. They must have based their regime, I believe, on a tributal system (i.e. payment for “protection”) from which the Greeks inherited the term *poine* (cf. Lat. *poena*), which I interpret as etymologically related to the very ethnonym *Phoinix* (cf. Lat. *Poenus*).

On the basis of both lexical arguments and conclusions drawn by archaeologists, I tried to reconstruct certain ethnogenetic evolutions in the Near East and in the Aegean-Balkan area before and during the 2nd millennium BC. An important background for those evolutions was represented by the probable contacts between Bronze-Age Indo-European intruders on the one hand and Semites, Egyptians and (eventually) natives of Southeast Europe on the other. Under those circumstances, a very significant aspect was the novelty of the very idea of small but well organized professional warriors who came to rule over native “producers.” In regard to the probable Southeast European developments of the 2nd millennium BC, I viewed them at the very end the volume (p. 104):

Some later heirs of those Levantine dagger-bearers (already Semiticized?) must have come to Greece as “Phoenicians” at the beginning of the 2nd millennium BC. One echo of that penetration certainly is the legend of Kadmos (the “Phoenician”) and the foundation of Thebes. Moreover, the new (and not very peaceful) presence in the Balkans must have had more than an echo, first of all since it brought with it a new reality and a new socio-political concept, namely the one of “ruling professional warrior” (to whom the enslaved population had to pay *poine*). Such facts account for the original meaning of Egyptian *Fnkhw* and Greek *Phoinix*, as well as for the Illyrian [...] toponym *Phoinike*, now *Finiq*, and for the Slavic-Romanian connection represented by *vojnik/bojnik* and *voinic/boinic*.

After the publication of Poruciuc 1995 I continued to be preoccupied with archaeolinguistics, in close connection with “classical” historical linguistics and with the field of onomastics, that is, with issues that regard both toponyms and anthroponyms of Southeast Europe, particularly in territories of today’s Romania.

III. Archaeolinguistics and onomastics

My interest in proper names has been permanent, as manifest not only in my articles (in either Romanian or English) with titles expressly referring to onomastic issues, but also in the ones in which I used onomastic arguments in etymological demonstrations. Actually, my concern with proper names was already visible in the above-mentioned “primary article” (Poruciuc 1987), in which I analyzed a series of theonyms. Then, in the article by which I propounded a new etymology for Romanian *codru* (Poruciuc 1990b), I also tackled proper names, including both toponyms (such as Illyrian *Codrio*, Albanian *Shkodër* and Istro-Romanian *Sucodru*) and anthroponyms (such as Romanian *Codrea* and *Codrin*). I also dealt with onomastic material (namely with a series of ethnonyms) in the article in which I focused on terms (such as Latin *nemus*) that designated open-air sanctuaries (Poruciuc 1997d). In another article (Poruciuc 2000c) I dealt with what Albanian and Romanian have in common, in both appellatives and corresponding proper names.²²

I opened a discussion on the Microasian-Palaeobalkan “onomastic union” (*Namenbund*) in a presentation I delivered at an international symposium that took place in Ankara in June 1995 (“Thracians and Phrygians: Problems of Parallelism”). Three years thereafter that presentation was published as an article (Poruciuc 1998a) in the resulting volume of proceedings. Theoretically, what I presented in Ankara actually stood for a continuation of the onomastic paragraph included in Poruciuc 1992 (as well as in the first chapter of Poruciuc 1995 – see above), but with a special focus on Phrygian names that correspond not only to Ancient Greek and Thracian names, but also to Albanian, Bulgarian and Romanian ones. For instance (Poruciuc 1998a: 116-117), although the Phrygian anthroponym *Baba* has been presented as mere “nursery word” and Romanian *Baba* (family name) as mere reflection of the Romanian appellative *babă* ‘old woman’ (a probable Slavic loan), one must observe that there is a quite comprehensive *Bab*-series of Romanian names, of which many appear as derivatives that can hardly be explained as depending on *babă* (e.g. the Romanian family names *Baba*, *Babu*, *Babeu*, *Babaşa*, *Babei*, *Babeş*, *Babescu*, *Babet*, *Baboe*, *Băbuş*, plus toponyms such as *Baba*, *Babşa*, *Băbeni*, *Băbăeşti*, *Băbiciu*, *Băbueşti*). In my opinion, some *Bab*- names of Romanian can be based on *babă*, but certainly not all of them. One cannot overlook the reality of *Bab*- names recorded in Asia Minor as well as in the Balkans. The same thing can be observed (cf. Poruciuc 1998a: 117) in the case of the obvious correspondence between, on the one hand, the Phrygian names *Tates* and *Tetes* (most probably based on the Phrygian appellatives *tatos* ‘(grand)father’ and *tetos* ‘father’s brother (or father)’, respectively), and, on the other

²² I am among the ones who believe that the most important part of the lexical stock Albanian and Romanian have in common is not due to vicinity and exchange in historical times, but to a common Palaeobalkan substratum.

hand, the Romanian series represented by names such as *Tatu*, *Tatin*, *Tatoiu*, *Tatul*, *Tătic*, *Tătoiu*, and *Tetea*, *Tetelea*, *Tetiu*, *Tetoianu*, respectively – cf. Romanian *tată* ‘father’ (most probably from Latin *tata* ‘daddy’) as well as Romanian and Bulgarian *tete* ‘one’s own father, grandfather, uncle’; cf. also Bulgarian *Tato*, *Tatin*, *Tatul* and *Teto*, *Tetju*, *Tetov*, respectively. In the end of the article under discussion, I drew some conclusions:

There are tens (if not even hundreds) of such examples [...]. They all practically force us to conclude that an Anatolian-Aegean-Balkan proper-name community is not a vague possibility, but something quite obvious. It is also something deeply rooted and still alive in the area within which, by various turns of history, Thracian and Phrygian heritage came to be, at least partially, perpetuated by today’s inhabitants of Anatolia, the Aegean and the Balkans, no matter what idioms they speak at present.

It was actually the same general idea of continuity that I later strove to demonstrate, in my archaeomythological articles, by analysis not only of lingual but also of ethnographic matter, as I will show in another chapter below.

As part of my work for Institutul Român de Tracologie (IRT), I developed a line of study regarding Southeast European substratal elements, including both appellatives and proper names. The first notable article in that field was published in *Thraco-Dacica* (Poruciuc 1992b), followed by an article in English (Poruciuc 1997a), which was based on my presentation at the 7th International Congress of Thracology (1996). In Poruciuc 1997a, in resuming the ideas of my Ankara presentation of 1995, I assumed that just as there is a (much discussed) Southeast European *Sprachbund* (“glottal union”) there also is a vast *Namenbund* (“onomastic union”) which contains a stock of person-names whose antecedents are to be found in onomastic material recorded during the antiquity of both Asia Minor and the Aegean-Balkan area. What I also suggested was that such a *Namenbund* could be interpreted as resulting from a prehistoric situation:

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 and settled life when an Aegean-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* [...] fundamentally depending on the spreading of agriculture from the Near-East Fertile Crescent to the Aegean-Balkan world (as well as to North Africa). I insist: it was mainly the socio-historical context of the 6th-4th millennia BC which accounts for the

roots of an onomastic union manifest in hundreds of proper names still in use (however modified in shape, and in apparent reference) in the area under discussion.²³

For my illustrative examples, I resorted to onomastic material recorded as Microasian (Zgusta 1964), Egyptian (Wallis Budge 1978), Mycenaean (Landau 1958), Ancient Greek (Bechtel 1917, Dornseiff/ Hansen 1978, Fraser/ Matthews 1987), Thracian (Detschew 1957), Illyrian (Russu 1969), as well as many records of today's Balkan proper names (mainly Greek, Albanian, Bulgarian and Romanian). In my opinion, one can hardly consider that the following parallel forms of person-names represent mere coincidences (cf. Poruciuc 1997a): Microasian Βαβα, Γαγα, Δαδα, Λαλα, Νανα Παπα, Τατα ~ Romanian (family names) *Baba, Gaga, Dada, Lala, Nana, Papa, Tatu*. There also are numerous cases in which we can observe such “coincidences” not only in roots, but also in suffixation (loc.cit.): Microasian Νανας, Βαβης, Νανις, Πανις ~ Greek Νάννας, Βάβης, Νανίς, Πάνις ~ Romanian (family names) *Nanaş, Babeş, Naniş, Paniş*. Since such names show reduplication (which would seemingly make them all belong to a category traditionally labeled as “nursery words”), I brought Ancient Egyptian into discussion (Poruciuc 1997a: 221). In my opinion, it is in Ancient Egyptian where we can find earliest attestations of Fertile-Crescent language; more particularly, in that language we can find “a multitude of primeval meaningful monosyllables” from which derivatives were created by reduplication, as in the following cases: *ba* ‘soul, might, courage’ > *baba* ‘to use force’; *ga* ‘to see, to look’ > *gaga* ‘to ogle, to goggle’; *ta* ‘bread, loaf, cake’ > *tata* ‘sacrificial bread’ (all extracted from Wallis Budge 1978).

The final part of Poruciuc 1997a includes the following conclusive statements that would prove to be helpful in my subsequent investigations:

Whereas in previous articles I insisted on observation of links between Asia Minor and the Palaeobalkan domain [...], this time I added [...] references to Egyptian as continuator of primeval Fertile-Crescent language. I hope to make ready for publication, as soon as I can, quite a number of other arguments sustaining the existence of an Aegean-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.

²³ More recent research has pushed the spreading of agriculture to an even earlier period, that is, to the time “about 7000 BC” (Haarmann 2010: 18), when there still was a strip of land that represented a natural bridge between Asia Minor and Southeast Europe. That bridge was destroyed by the geological catastrophe (the Pontic Flood, ca. 6700 BC) which created the Bosphorus.

Actually, by that final passage I foreshadowed my research to-be in the field of what I was to present, more firmly, as the *Egyptoid* (non-Indo-European) substratum that is still visible in many European languages, from Greek and Romanian to German.

Observation of onomastic material has remained part of my research on substratal matters, on Old Germanisms as well as on archaeomythological issues. For instance, in 1995, in parallel with my publication of *Archaeolinguistica*, I also published an article in which I clarified the etymology of the Romanian city-name *Deva* (Poruciuc 1995a). In other articles I published in *Thraco-Dacica* (such as Poruciuc 2000a and 2001a) other proper names are also taken into consideration. And in practically all my articles on Old Germanic loans in Romanian (see reference list below), I used proper names as arguments in my demonstrations. Besides all these, I have also published articles that appear to fully belong to the field of onomastics, but with a background of archaeolinguistics. Such an article is Poruciuc 2006d (published in *Orpheus*, Sofia), which, to an important extent, represents a revised and extended English version of Poruciuc 1992b. My motivation for such resumption, at that moment, was the fact that the Romanian mainstream vision of typical Romanian surnames continued to ignore, or even openly rejected the possible preservation of pre-Roman surnames as part of the Romanian onomastic system.²⁴

Poruciuc 2006a contains a multitude of examples which demonstrate that Albanian and Romanian have a lot of surnames in common – see, for instance, the parallel series given on p. 74: Albanian *Bojk, Bukur, Bulaj, Dashe, Galea, Galan, Male, Mirja, Shuti, Zoto* ~ Romanian *Boicu, Bucur, Bulai, Dașu, Galea, Galan, Malea, Mirea, Șutea, Zotu*. Quite significant are the names which, in both languages, are transparently based on appellatives that may be regarded as Palaeobalkan vestiges: for instance, Albanian *Shuti* and Romanian *Șutea* can be referred to etymologically obscure appellatives meaning ‘hornless’ (cf. Albanian *shyt* and Romanian *șut, ciut*); in their turn, Albanian *Zoto* and Romanian *Zotu* can be referred to appellatives such as Albanian *zot* ‘lord, master’ and Aromanian *zot* ‘brave, valiant’, respectively. I pointed out (p. 75) the fact that Albanian and Romanian have in common not only roots of proper names, but also suffixes, as in the following two series of surnames (apparently both based on the Indo-European root **bhel-* ‘to shine, bright, white’): Albanian *Bala, Balak (Ballak), Balja, Baliq, Balince, Baloku, Ballosh, Balsha, Balaj* ~ Romanian *Bala (Bălă), Balac, Balea (Bălea), Balici, Balinț, Baloc, Baloș, Balșa, Bălaiu*. Last but not least, the names of the two series can be referred to ancient ones, such as Illyrian *Balles, Ballaios, Baloia* (extracted from Russu 1969) and Thracian *Βάλλα, Βαλας, Βαλης, Βαλοια* (extracted from Detschew 1957). Theoretically, I considered a certain theoretical passage (in Poruciuc 1992b: 21) to be worth translating into English (and worth including in Poruciuc 2006a: 75):

²⁴ More directly, I reacted (p. 69) to Christian Ionescu’s statement (1990: 243) according to which “hereditary names appeared in Romania only as late as the 17th century”, and also (p. 70) to Domnița Tomescu’s ironic comment (2001:18) that similarities between Thraco-Dacian and Romanian names “may stir the interest of amateurs of fanciful etymologies.”

When a Romanian hereditary name has obvious correspondents in at least two other modern Balkan languages, we may take into consideration the probability of a substratal origin in all three [...], if the forms and affixes do not indicate exchanges of a more recent date. But if credible ancient correspondents can be added to a modern Balkan triangle, then probability turns into certainty.

As I will mention in another chapter below, I was to observe the “square basis of certainty,” as principle, in my archaeomythological undertakings too. As for the most general conclusions of Poruciuc 2006a, they were directly inspired by Eliade’s ideas (1978: 48) about the perennial “edifice of the Neolithic” and by Burkert’s ideas (1985: 13) about “the inertial force of peasant traditions” (in Greece). Concretely, I concluded (p. 76):

I am positive that the impressive continuity of Southeast European rural life meant not only preservation of archaic traditions, but also preservation of ancient (and even prehistoric) anthroponyms, however opaque most of them may have remained (after the disappearance of the idioms that originally produced them). My conclusion is that those anthroponyms have been perpetuated – in spite of ever-changing officialdoms – due to the special strength of Southeast European peasant culture.

On Eliade, Burkert and “peasant culture” I was to dwell especially in Poruciuc 2010, in which I also turned to account my experience in the field of proper names. In regard to the latter, one of my latest articles, Poruciuc 2011a (in a collective volume of the BAR International Series, Oxford), is about “etymological and historical implications of Romanian place-names referring to salt.” The conclusive statements of the article appear on p. 218:

Today’s Transylvanian halotponymy displays the following main categories of situations [...]: (1) certain names were first recorded in mediaeval Latin translations, then in Hungarian, Romanian, and (in certain cases) German versions: for example, a *Villa Salis* recorded in 1236, was later called by local Romanians either *Sărata* or *Somfalău* (the latter representing an adaptation of Hung. *Sófalva* – literally, ‘salt-village’), whereas the German colonists of the same region called the village under discussion simply *Salz* (‘salt’); (2) other cases did not imply translation, but only adoption (and adaptation, in pronunciation and spelling) of place-names used in coterritorial languages: just as Romanians adopted Hung. *Sajó* and *Sófalva* as *Șieu* and *Somfalău*, respectively, Hungarians adopted Rm. *Sărata* (Sibiu county) as *Száráta* (or *Szarata*) and Rm. *Slatina* (Timiș county) as *Szlatina*. Wherever actual translation of earlier names took place, one major implication is a situation of bilingualism, such as the Romanian-Slavic one discussed by Shevelov [...]. Mere adoptions of toponyms (from coterritorial languages), followed by phonological and/or graphical adaptations, usually reflect shifts in officialdom. Taking such circumstances into account, I consider that

toponyms that mark salt sources can be profitably analyzed as reflections of earlier or more recent interethnic contacts in various regions of Romania. The examples given above demonstrate [...] that Romanian halotoponyms can be used as solid arguments not only in halological studies, but also in studies on coterritoriality, or on multilingualism.

The notion of “coterritoriality” – which I learned from Shevelov –²⁵ provided supplementary support for my earlier idea of “patterns of historical behavior.”

²⁵ Shevelov (1964: 160) made extensive use of the notion under discussion exactly in the chapter in which he commented on the coexistence of Romanians and Slavs in Transylvania, during the period that preceded the assimilation of the latter by the former.

IV. Archaeolinguistics and substrate studies

I got my early training as a historical linguist at a time during which, in Romania and elsewhere, there was much mistrust of substrate studies. I distinctly remember that, when I was a very young assistant professor, one of the most influential philologists at UAIC simply dismissed anyone who dared refer to substratal lexical elements in Romanian. In fact, at that time, the mainstream idea among Roman(ian)ists was that “Romanian is a Neo-Latin language, and that is enough.” Luckily, Ivănescu was among the few Romanian scholars (including Russu, Vraciu, Poghirc, Mihăilă, Brâncuș and several others) who would seriously address the issue of pre-Roman relics in the Romanian language.

It was against that background that I produced my earliest articles on a number of Romanian words of pre-Roman origins, such as *codru* (Poruciu 1990b) and *Deva* (Poruciu 1995a),²⁶ which were later extended into chapters of the volume Poruciu 1998 (*Confluente și etimologii*). In the first chapter of that volume I formulated my concepts of “diachronically structured polygenesis” (p. 23) – by starting from Pisani’s idea of *sistema idrico* – and of “partial continuity” (p. 24), in referring to vestigial Palaeobalkan elements preserved in the Romanian language. In regard to the “confluent” making of the latter, my vision was expressed as follows (p. 25-26):

The Roman factor was doubtlessly decisive in the formation of the Romance identity of the Romanian people, and Latin (not so much as “colonized” and imposed, but rather as adopted as a socially necessary *lingua franca*) certainly played the part of a defining formant in what was to become known as Romanian language. But that does not mean that Romanian could not also preserve (as functional items, not only as disparate fossils) pre-Roman Paleobalkan elements, whose perpetuation was due to the autochthonous demic basis subject to the process of Romanization.

In trying to clarify my position in regard to substratal elements in general and to the Palaeobalkan substratum in particular, I also touched the problem of the much discussed Balkan *Sprachbund* and of its origins. I was (and still am) among the ones who consider that such as “union” (as object of study for “areal linguistics”) cannot possibly be explained only by prolonged inter-language contact within a certain area, but also by a common substratal pool of glottal elements. My view on the latter is manifest in following passage (p. 25):

²⁶ Poruciu 1995a is based on the presentation I delivered at the UCLA Indo-European Conference in May 1991.

I consider that the term Palaeobalkan should not at all suggest the existence of any *unique* language in the Balkans of prehistory and antiquity, but only the existence of a common stock belonging to the ethnic-glottal conglomerate with historically manifest forms known as Ancient Greek (with a Mycenaean first-recorded form), Thracian, Illyrian, as well as a series of obscure *linguae minores*. That conglomerate, in fact, was structurally similar to today's Balkanic glottal union, which implies a significant degree of demic continuity, whose roots go as deep as the population boom produced by the "Neolithic revolution" in the area under discussion.

Along such a line, I was encouraged, by the IRT leadership and by my colleagues in that institute, to survey possibilities of drawing credible conclusions in regard to the kind of languages spoken by the earliest farmers of Southeast Europe. My approach was bound to be comparative-typological, but I also combined etymological interpretation with ethnographic facts and with archaeological finds, as I had done, in fact, in my earlier article on "red-dye rituals" (Poruciuc 1990a).

In several of the articles I published in *Thraco-Dacica* (during the period 1996-2001) I asked rhetorical questions about issues such as: (a) the type(s) of languages spoken in the Aegean-Balkan in pre-Greek and pre-Roman times; (b) possible connections between those languages with prehistoric and ancient ones of the Near and Middle East as well as with lost languages of the Circum-Mediterranean world; (c) glottogenetic mechanisms by which vestigial elements of those lost languages could survive into historical ones; (d) possible pre-Indo-European origins of certain Romanian words that still are marked by the label "unknown etymology" in Romanian dictionaries. Although I approached them cautiously enough, eventually I could not help observing that a number of earlier authors that had been sharply criticized by mainstream academia – such as the above-mentioned Lahovary, Furnée and Hubschmid – actually had expressed a significant number of interesting opinions²⁷ in regard to vestigial elements coming from pre-Indo-European, pre-Greek and pre-Roman times.

A very important step in my survey of Southeast European vestigial elements was my study of the Ancient Egyptian language (especially of the material included in Wallis Budge's dictionary and in Gardiner's grammar) and of the common Semitic vocabulary (as presented by Bergsträsser). I was surprised to discover that Egyptian has even more elements in common with Indo-European than Semitic has, and that a comparison with Egyptian can clarify a number of vestigial elements of Romanian and other Southeast European languages. That is why I began to apply the label "Egyptoid" to the kind of European substratal elements that Vennemann (2003, 2004) presents as "Semitidic." As for Semitic proper, I could confirm earlier observations on Southeast European substratal words (such as Ancient Greek βράθυ 'dwarf pine', Albanian *bredh* 'fir', Romanian *brad* 'fir') which correspond to Semitic

²⁷ I certainly will not assert that *all* the opinions expressed by those authors are credible and worth following.

words. Also (see Poruciuc 1995: 48), I reached the conclusion that Egyptian and Semitic material could clarify the rather awkward mainstream etymological explanations of European designations of the lion (such as Etruscan *lev*, Slavic *lev*, German *Leu*, *Löwe*, Romanian *leu*), which cannot possibly be all explained as Greek-Latin loans, but rather as substratal elements that correspond to terms in Semitic and Egyptian. (Actually, in several of my analyses and interpretations I had to go beyond the limits of etymology and archaeolinguistics, into the domain of archaeomythology, as I will point out in some of the following paragraphs.) I repeatedly warned against a possible misinterpretation of my notion of “Egyptoid” as meaning direct influence of dynastic-historical Egypt on Europe, when, in fact, what I meant was a common prehistoric source for a certain stock of glottal elements that survived, independently, in both Egypt and Europe, due to the early farmers that moved in the two directions from the Near-East part of the Fertile Crescent.

As mentioned above, I turned my presentation at the conference of Balkan studies in Chicago (1992) into an article, Poruciuc 1997c, published in a special issue of *Balkanistica* (Vol. 10) dedicated to the memory of Zbigniew Gołąb. The article focuses on what I regard as “Paleobalkan elements in Macedo-Romanian.”²⁸ The main point is that, although Daco-Romanian and Macedo-Romanian share an important number of substratal elements (many of which have clear correlatives in Albanian), Macedo-Romanian also contains its own peculiar elements (words, formants, speech habits) which can be designated as substratal. I returned to some issues of Poruciuc 1992 (“Problems and Patterns”), and I found significant theoretical support (p. 325-326) in some of Gołąb’s views²⁹ on the stratum-substratum relationship as manifest in a more recent glottogenetic process, namely the making of Macedonian Slavic:

The Chicago scholar, while discussing the “Balkanization” of Macedonian, suggested that the process which led to the formation of the Balkan Sprachbund might not have been as simple as some people imagine. It appears that the Slavic now spoken in Macedonia contains, among other things, many patterns of manifest Balkan Romance origin, a fact that should not be viewed as due to mere borrowing (by intruding Slavs from Romanized natives). In keeping with Professor Gołąb’s train of thought, I consider Balkanization to mean (also) “perpetuation of pre-Slavic speech habits in the language of Slavicized Balkan populations.”

I believe that, in a similar way, the earlier process of Romanization also implied perpetuation of an important number of pre-Roman elements in the Romance idioms that appeared in Southeast Europe before the coming of the Slavs. Some of those vestigial elements (including even some pre-Indo-European ones) had the chance to survive only in Macedo-Romanian (also known as Aromanian or

²⁸ Not long ago I also published an enlarged Romanian version of the article (Poruciuc 2011

²⁹ I made use especially of Gołąb 1997.

Vlahic). The examples I chose to discuss in Poruciu 1997c are a number of Macedo-Romanian “alternative” pronunciations that strikingly resemble the pre-Greek ones discussed in Furnée 1972 (cf. Macedo-Romanian *cărkîn/hărkîn* ‘cancer’, *căsăbă/hîsîpă* ‘town’, *furnică/fornigă* ‘ant’, *cuptor/cuiftor* ‘oven’, *disagă/tisagă* ‘knapsack’, *mbărcăzon/părcăzon* ‘waistband’, etc., these words being of various origins, Latin included). In regard to lexical elements, I found arguments in favor of the idea that the following Macedo-Romanian terms are substratal (p. 329-331): *bragană* ‘currant’ and *braganeu* ‘currant shrub’ (which I present as a remote relative of Latin *fragum*), *băsilău* ‘king’ (which – unlike its synonym, *vasilă* – can hardly be interpreted as a Neo-Greek loan), *căstîniu/găstîniu* ‘chestnut-tree’ (as correlative of, but not as derived from Latin *castaneus*), *carabeu* ‘woodpecker’ (possibly related to both Latin *scarabeus* and Daco-Romanian *cărăbuș* ‘cock chafer’), *gună* ‘fur-lined coat’ (as correlative of Latin *gunna* ‘skin, fur’), *afîngă* ‘bilberry’ (as correlative of Daco-Romanian *afînă*, a word recorded in several Southeast European languages, but with no established etymology), *camă/gamă* ‘house, (good) family’, whose obvious relationship with *lăgamă* ‘descent, good family’ reveals the survival of a substratal prefix (most probably related to a pre-IE Anatolian *le-*). After discussing all these examples that appear to sustain “the idea of directly perpetuated Palaeobalkan features in Macedo-Romanian,” I suggested a perspective of a more general kind (p. 331-332):

However important the thresholds of Romanization and of Slavicization may have been for the ethnolinguistic fortune of the Balkans, an important number of Palaeobalkan elements (also manifest in Mycenaean Greek, Thracio-Dacian and Illyrian) remained intact and functional. Taking that into account, I suggest that Romanian in general and Macedo-Romanian in particular should be paid more attention to not only by Romanists and Balkanists, but also by specialists in general substrate problems and in anthropological linguistics.

In the 1998 issue of *Thraco-Dacica* in 1998, I published a “short introduction” (in Romanian) to the “domain of elements inherited by European languages from prehistoric idioms that had their origins in the Fertile Crescent” (p. 7). Whereas in my earlier approaches I focused mainly on lexical and onomastic aspects, in my article of 1998 I aimed to add observations on substratal elements belonging to categories such as speech habits, word formation and peculiar semantic fields. The background I took into consideration was represented, again, by the “idioms spoken by the Mediterraneans who brought early agriculture for the Orient to the Balkan-Danubian space, wherefrom the new system of subsistence subsequently spread, by both colonization and acculturation, practically over the whole continent.” By reacting against the excessive usage of the simplistic pedigree model (Schleicher’s *Stammbaum*) in interpretations of the Indo-European (IE) “family” of languages, I referred (p. 7-8) to the pre-IE vestigial elements that had been assimilated after the superposition of proto-IE speakers on various local substrata:

The Indo-European languages that were the first to be recorded in writing – that is, Hittite and Greek – already appeared as based on confluences of proto-IE elements and of pre-IE substratal ones, coming from local idioms (of Anatolia and Greece, respectively). Doubtlessly, both Hittite and Greek contain glottal material that corresponds to other historical IE languages, that material most probably representing the perpetuation of the proto-IE idioms spoken by the pastoral-steppic intruders, who – according to very serious scholars, such as Gimbutas, Mallory Martinet and others – began their expansion after the period of horse-domestication, around 4500 BC [...]. However, besides the inherited proto-IE stock, Hittite and Greek also contain a lot of elements – which are functional and well integrated structurally – coming from pre-IE anthropological ancestors, mainly from the local sedentary farmers [...] of Anatolia and Southeast Europe.

In order to sustain my Egyptoid theory (that is, the idea that the pre-IE population of the Anatolian-Aegean area and the one of pre-dynastic Egypt were of a similar kind), I began my series of illustrative examples (p. 8) with the ones that suggest perpetuation of substratal speech habits (that is, the ones that other specialists regard as manifestations of “substrate phonology”). I discussed, for instance, a number of “alternations” or “oscillations” of a kind quite similar to the ones presented by Furnée as “pre-Greek,” and I pointed out the existence of such aspect in Egyptian too – for example, certain consonantal shifts (similar to the ones of Germanic), or alternations such as voiced/voiceless (which has sometimes been presented as “indifference to voice,” as in the case of Hittite), or labial/nasal (*b/m*, as in the two versions of the Thracian theonym *Bendis/Mendis*), or *a/e* and *a/o* (which a number of scholars have observed in material recorded as Thracian too). All these aspects can be observed not only in ancient languages of “our world” (Egyptian, Hittite, Greek, Thracian, and – in some aspects – Latin), but also in vocabulary of obscure origins (possibly pre-IE) that survive in modern languages such as Greek, Albanian and Romanian, as well as in Germanic languages.

In regard to the most primitive vocabulary and the earliest signs of word-formation, I started from the simple assumption (p. 9) that whatever we can interpret as primeval words were monosyllables (or more precisely, monoconsonantal roots) to which basic meanings were attached. It was from such roots (or “bases”) that new words were created first by reduplication, and – in a more advanced stage – by composition and eventually by derivation (by turning of certain independent lexical elements – frequently used in compounds – into mere formants, that is, affixes). Examples illustrative of those early stages are most abundant in Ancient Egyptian: see, for instance Egyptian *ba* ‘strike, hit, smash, break, cut’, which, in course of time, produces both a reduplicative (“intensified”) term such as *ba-ba* ‘to use force’ as well as a term such as *bat* (that is, *ba-t*) ‘branch’, which looks like a derivative with a dental suffix. Taking into account the above-mentioned consonantal alternations (which appear to have been specific to both

Egyptian and pre-Greek), a word such as Egyptian *bat* has among its cognates *pet* ‘staff, scepter’, *petpet* ‘to beat down’ as well as *matu* ‘staff, stick’. And it so happens that the forms and meanings of such Egyptian terms strikingly resemble the ones of the Latin-Romance family based on Latin *battuere* ‘to beat’, as origin of Romanian *a bate* ‘to beat’ and of Old French *battre*, from which English has *batter* (possibly also *bat* and *bate*). But English also has *pat* (which cannot be explained as an Old French loan), and Romanian also has *băț* ‘stick’ and *bătă* ‘club, cudgel’, whose phonetic shapes can hardly allow one to explain them as inherited from Latin.

The terms that represent a lexical *bat*- family are not the only examples I presented (in Poruciuc 1998) as illustrative of significant ties between Egyptian and the pre-IE substratum of Anatolia and Europe. I discuss (p. 9) the obvious correspondence between the family of Egyptian *per* ‘house, dwelling, settlement’ and the one of Latin *paries*, *-etis* ‘wall’ (> Romanian *perete*), to which I tentatively added (p. 10) Thracian *-para* (in names of settlements, such as *Bessapara*, *Bendipara*, *Trasnupara*, etc.), which may have meant ‘settlement’. In connection with the same root *per*-/par-, I pointed out the quite probable connection between the Egyptian compound *per-nesu* (literally ‘house of the king’) and the famous Greek (obviously substratal) *Parnassos*, as name of a “house of gods,” which also had a correspondent in Anatolian (Luvian and Hittite), namely *Parnašša*. Several other such examples led to the following archaeolinguistic conclusions, which I summarized in the English abstract of the article under discussion (p. 12):

...[T]he fact that certain historical Indo-Europeans (especially of Europe) still use so many terms which have clear correspondents in Egyptian [...] should not be regarded as surprising. If we adopt the confluential model, and if we admit [...] that the bearers of proto-IE idioms were, originally, pastoralists, there remains for us to raise the question: Where and from whom did those pastoralists learn about domains (such as *farming*, *stable settlement*, *fertility rites*, *pottery*, *navigation*) of which they did not know in their original homeland? Mainly through archaeology, we know that, at the time of the earliest significant steppic penetrations towards the Balkans and Central Europe (ca. 4000-3000 BC), those proto-IE intruders had to cross [...] the vast Chalcolithic cultural complex known today as Cucuteni-Tripolye. We may then reasonably consider that it was mainly from Cucuteni-Tripolye farmers [...] that basic European agricultural terms (of which many have Egyptian correspondents) were borrowed by proto-IE speakers and perpetuated into historical languages.

I was to return to the “Cucutenians” and to the possibility of reconstructing their language (at least to some extent) in other articles, of which I will mention some below.

One of my aims in Poruciuc 1998 was to give several significant examples (p. 10-12) that indicate the existence of correlative roots in Indo-European languages (especially the ones of Europe) and

Ancient Egyptian. For instance, one can hardly interpret the following examples as mere coincidences: there are two seemingly separate IE roots reconstructed as **men-*, one meaning ‘to remain, stay’ (cf. Latin *manere* > Romanian *a mânea, a rămâne*), the other designating notions such as ‘thought, mind, spirit’ (cf. Latin *mens, -tis* > Romanian *minte*); quite similarly, Egyptian has two seemingly different terms *men*, namely *men¹* meaning ‘to stop somewhere, linger, persist’ and *men²* meaning ‘reckoning, thought’. Also, in regard to the above-mentioned farming terminology, European IE languages have terms based on a root **sē-* ‘to sow’³⁰ (as visible in Latin *serere*, German *säen, Saat* and English *sow, seed*) and Egyptian has *sa* ‘seed’, *sat* ‘earth, soil’ and *seth* ‘seed’.

For a particular etymological analysis, in an article I published in the next issue of *Thraco-Dacica* (1999), I demonstrated that two seemingly separate Indo-European roots, **per-* ‘to procreate’ and **per-* ‘to pass, to transport’ actually represent the same primeval root, and that the existence of an Egyptian *per* with meanings such as ‘to go out, to go forth, to proceed from, to be born, to arise from, to appear’ (as given in the Wallis Budge dictionary)³¹ cannot be regarded as mere coincidence. By starting from such realities, I could give better explanations not only for the element *-por(is)*, which occurs in a whole series of personal names recorded as Thracian (*Moukaporis, Raiskouporis, Mucapor, Zioporos, etc.*), but also for Egyptian *Pert* (as name of a festival) and for Latin *Partula* (as name of a divine power that was believed to protect child-birth). The final part of my 1999 article (in English) reads:

In conclusion, Thracian *-poris* could be of (Neolithic) pre-Indo-European origin in Palaeobalkan idioms, just as an ancestor of Latin *puer* may be said to have had a similar position in “proto-Italic.” As for how we should explain the rather large number of correspondences connecting Hamitic, Semitic, Dravidian and Indo-European (especially as regards the vast field of *fertility and farming*), that is a subject for a much more general discussion.

After 1999, my direct contribution to the “more general discussion” was a series of articles that I published in *Thraco-Dacica* and in several collective volumes. In those articles I pointed out that systematic resort to Egyptian could clarify not only lexical-etymological matters, but also structural aspects of European (and Indo-European) languages.

Poruciu 2000a is an article that contains mostly archaeolinguistic statements (focused on the same substratal issues), but also some observations that I would now interpret as contributions to archaeomythology. The main aim of the article was to point out the semantic shift of an Indo-European

³⁰ The original meaning of that root probably was ‘to strew, scatter’.

³¹ In regard to my Egyptian examples that contain *e*, in my articles I had to repeatedly mention that Wallis Budge used *e* as a conventional letter in cases in which Egyptians did not write any vowel but only the consonantal skeleton of the words of the category under discussion.

root **ar-* from primeval (Stone-Age) meanings such as ‘to make, arrange, order’ to meanings such as ‘to cultivate, till, plough’, the latter series being specific to words of European languages only (not also to Indo-Iranian ones). For European languages I pointed out (p. 5) a series of action-implement pairs (that is, terms for ‘to plough’ and ‘plough’), such as Greek *aroō – arotron*, Latin *arō – aratrum*, Old Norse *erja – arðr*, etc. And, again, I observed the existence of most probable Egyptian correlatives of IE terms based on **ar-*, in regard to both the pre-agricultural and the early agricultural meanings of that root: Egyptian has *ār* ‘to make, create, produce’, *āri* ‘worker, slave’, *ārit* ‘creature, human being’, as well as *ār* ‘measure of land’ and *ārit* ‘land, estate’. Actually, speaking of early-agricultural terminology, I had to expand the discussion on **ar-* from an Egyptian-(Indo-)European correlation to a Nostratic plane, taking into account, for instance, the obvious correspondence (observed by Pisani) between Greek *artos* ‘wheat-bred’ (a term of obscure etymology) and Persian *ard* ‘flour’, to which one can add the correspondence between the two Indo-European terms and Egyptian *āriti* ‘a kind of seeds’ as well as Basque *arto* ‘cornbread’.

As for mythology (p. 6-7), I observed that an important epithet used with reference to certain “over-active” Egyptian divinities was *Āri* (‘Maker’), which can be referred to Greek *Ares* (actually the name of a Thracian god of war), *Areus*, *Areios*, *Areia*, as well as to the Armenian theonym *Ara* or *Aray*. Since such names indicate derivation from the root **ar-* with its primeval meaning (‘to make, arrange, order’ – see the interconnection of Latin *ars*, *ōrdō* and *rītus*), I drew the conclusion that such theonyms were created in pre-agricultural times, whereas the above-mentioned appellatives referring to cultivated land and to farm produce reflect early Neolithic realities. My most general observations appear in the English abstract of the article:

It is obvious that European agricultural terms showing AR- have, practically, no correspondents in IE idioms of the Indo-Iranian branch, while having lots of correspondents in non-IE languages, most of which have something to do with the Fertile Crescent. From this situation as well as from other evidence, we may draw the conclusion that the proto-IE steppe pastoralists who are generally believed to have indo-europeanized Europe must have gotten “Egyptoid” AR- terms with agricultural meanings from non-IE autochthonous farmers whose Neolithic ancestors had, long before, come to Europe from the Orient.

The last article of the series I published in *Thraco-Dacica* was issued in 2001. In it I resumed and expanded some ideas I had expressed in two earlier articles, namely Poruciuc 1990 (on names of axes) and Poruciuc 1995a (on Dacian *dava/deva* and Romanian *Deva*). The focus of Poruciuc 2001 is on the relationship between certain appellatives (with meanings such as ‘stone, cliff, hill, top, protuberance’) and an isogloss TAPA/TABA comprising Bronze-Age toponyms that designated fortified settlements on hilltops. I could again point out striking similarities between a rich family of Egyptian terms and a series

of European (especially Germanic) terms, generally considered to be of etymologically obscure, which show forms and meanings strikingly similar to those of the Egyptian series.

In regard to the most remarkable Egyptian-Germanic correspondence, here are the most important examples: Egyptian *teb* ‘horn’, *tap* ‘cattle’, *teba* ‘finger’, *tep* ‘head, top, beginning’, *tepi* ‘principal, capital, chief’, *tepiu* (pl.) ‘tops of masts’, *teben* ‘helmet’, *tebteb* ‘to stab, kill’, *thab-t* ‘stick, staff’, *thebu-t* ‘part of a ship’, *s-tep* ‘to cut, kill’, *s-tep-t* ‘piece of meat (cut for offerings)’, *s-tef* ‘to cut, hack, slaughter (ritually)’, *s-tefu* ‘butcher’ ~ English *tap*, *tip*, *top*, (all representing a lexical family of obscure origins),³² *stab*, *stub*; German *Zapfen* ‘taper, (fir) cone, cork’, *Zipfel* ‘pointed end’, *Zopf* ‘tuft of hair’; *Topp* ‘top of a mast’ (a probable Dutch loan); *Stab* ‘staff’, *Stoppel* ‘prickle, spike’, *Stubbe* ‘stub’. Remarkable is also that many such works have evident correspondents among the Romanian words of substratal (Palaeobalkan) origin, such as *tapoiet* ‘pointed’, *tipie* ‘hill with a flattened top’, *toaipă* ‘a kind of axe used by carpenters’, *țap* ‘mail goat or deer’ (cf. Albanian *cap*, *cjap*), *țeapă* ‘pointed pole, spike’, etc. Such correlations (or, at least, many of them) should be interpreted, in my opinion, as reflections of the Old European substratum that had much to do with proto-Egyptian.

In 2005 I contributed an article to a volume published by the Cucuteni Culture International Research Centre of Piatra Neamț and the Institute of Archaeology of Iași. In that article I dealt, again, with the probable connection between what could be designated as “Cucutenian language” and what I envisaged as a “Euxine-Levantine-Egyptian connection.” As visible in the latter formula, at that time I already took into consideration the Euxine-Flood factor, since the writing of Poruciuc 2005 came after my participation in the *First International Symposium on the Interdisciplinary Significance of the Black Sea Flood*, Bogliasco, 2002 (to which I will refer in more detail in chapter VI below). Theoretically, I observed that the genetic evidence of Cavalli-Sforza 1997 (an article whose title expressly refers to the “genetic evidence supporting Marija Gimbutas’ work on the origins of Indo-European people”) can be used as support for the main statements of Ryan and Pitman’s book of 1998. The latter presents a seventh-millennium-BC geological catastrophe (namely the creation of the Bosphorus, which turned the fresh-water Euxine Lake into the salt-water Black Sea) as cause of spectacular migrations of early Neolithic farmers from flooded Circum-Euxine regions to other parts of the world, including Southeast Europe, the Levant and Egypt. Such demic expansions quite clearly coincide with what we can see on the map of “the Mediterranean genotype”³³ included in Cavalli-Sforza 1997. The conclusive statements of Poruciuc 2005 (p. 381) represent a step forward in my Egyptoid theory:

³² Cf. **tap-*, given in the Appendix of AHDEL (p. 1545) as “Germanic base of various loosely related derivatives: ‘plug, wad, small compact object, projecting part; to plug, to strike lightly’.”

³³ More concretely, in regard to a certain item of the map under discussion, I refer (Poruciuc 2005: 380) to “a panhandle-shaped prolongation that descends along the eastern Mediterranean shore towards Egypt.”

Although Ryan and Pitman's vision now has its own supporters (Haarmann and myself among them), it is still far from being generally known and accepted. I am convinced, however, that more and more arguments will come to support the basic assumptions of that vision. What I can do, in that respect, is to continue to publish comments on Southeast European substratal terms that correspond with Egyptian ones. Such terms may have their roots in Neolithic idioms, such as the ones spoken by the Cucutenian cousins of pre-dynastic Egyptians. Many of those terms were to be taken over by superposed proto-Indo-Europeans, so that many historical Indo-European (especially European) languages contain a significant number of words that are hardly analyzable without sufficient knowledge of Ancient Egyptian.

Even if, after 2005, I have had many other things to write about (see next chapter), I have remained interested in substratal matters and I have published at least two articles that are worth mentioning here. The former is Poruciu 2009, included in the volume published in honor of Nicolae Ursulescu (a professor of my University, and one of the best-known specialists in the field of the Neolithic-Chalcolithic cultures discovered on the territory of today's Romania). I consider that article to be a synthetic presentation of my views on the Old European substratum in general, mainly because, as a background, I express my own views on Egyptoid substratal elements in comparison (and contrast) with Vennemann's views on "Semitic" substratal elements visible in West European idioms, mainly Germanic and Celtic.

I consider that many of the statements and examples to be found in Vennemann's articles that I know (see especially Vennemann's 2004a) are worthy of consideration; nevertheless, I had to express (Poruciu 2005: 2006) several critical opinions in regard to Vennemann's ethnic ascriptions and to his chronology:

Personally, I find it hard to believe that, as late as the 5th-4th centuries BC, "Semitic acculturation" (or "massive linguistic and cultural Semitic influence" – Vennemann 2004a: 455) could eventually produce Proto-Germanic in the European North. Germanic, like other European idioms (including ancient and present ones of the Balkans), does show structural correspondence with Hamito-Semitic (or call it even Afroasian), but the roots of such correspondence look substratal (rather than adstratal), and they go much deeper than the historical age of Phoenician navigation along the Atlantic coasts of Europe.

In resuming some of the ideas and examples of my previous articles representing the same line of study, pointed out the importance of the correlations between Indo-European and Hamito-Semitic, not only in words proper, but also in word-formation patterns.³⁴ Among other things, I observe that Indo-

³⁴ In regard to word-formation, in Poruciu 2009: 298-299 I expanded the assumption I had expressed in footnote 5 of Poruciu 2005: 381 about the obvious correspondence between IE *sek- (as base of terms such as Latin *secō* 'I

European (especially European) languages have in common many monoconsonantal and biconsonantal roots, but some tri- or even quadri-consonantal roots are also worthy of consideration, especially since they have something to do with animal and plant domestication. In that respect, I discuss (p. 299-230) the existence of a base KRN that refers to horns and horned animals (cf. Latin *cornū* and English *horn*, which are obviously similar to Hebrew *qeren* and South Arabic *qarn*) and of a base SPLT that refers to certain cereal plants (cf. Latin *spelta*, English *spelt* and German *Spelz*, which I consider to be correlatives of Hebrew *šibboleth* and Aramaic *šebbeltā*).

Remarkable about the base SPLT is that it can be analyzed as an extension of a biconsonantal base PL, to which two well-known (and very productive) formants were added, namely S- and -T. As I indicate in a footnote (p. 300), such features become obvious by a mere survey of the material given in the AHDEL Appendix under **pel-* ‘to thrust, strike, drive’, which accounts for Latin *pellere* ‘to push, drive, strike’ as well as for Old English *felt* (which already shows extension by a dental suffix), and under **spel-* ‘to split, break off’. It is under the latter where the authors of the Appendix make the quite relevant observation that the name of the cereal plant designated by Germanic terms such as Middle Dutch *spelte* (‘wheat’) and English *spelt* probably referred to “the splitting of its husk at threshing.”³⁵

The general conclusion of Poruciuc 2009 (p. 300) reflects an enlargement of my earlier vision on the Fertile Crescent phenomenon by the addition of the new perspective provided by Ryan and Pitman’s new theory of the Flood:

In regard to the early Neolithic spreading of agriculture, whether we adopt the classical Fertile-Crescent theory, or the more recent vision of a spreading whose initial impulse was the Euxine Flood of the 7th millennium BC, we can turn to good account the results of archaeolinguistic investigations. By “digging” into lingual matter, as deep as we can (down to primeval monoconsonantal bases), we are bound to find clues to the forms and contents of prehistoric idioms, which did not simply vanish without leaving traces in historical (“classifiable”) languages.

Finally, in Poruciuc 2010a, my article on *keramos* (included in a volume published in honor of Attila László, an outstanding archaeologist and professor of the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași), I adopted a manner similar to the one of my article on Thracian *-poris* (Poruciuc 1999). More precisely, I analyzed a single illustrative example as to make it appear as representative for my general views on the

cut’, and Old Icelandic *sax* ‘knife’) and a whole family of Egyptian words, including *saq* ‘to cut, destroy’, *seq* ‘to smite, strike’ and *seksek* ‘to smite, strike’. It so happens that all these terms, whether Indo-European or Egyptian, show a causative prefix *s-*, and they all can be referred to the IE-Egyptian connection that reflects the primeval root AK- ‘sharp, pointed’ that I had discussed as early as Poruciuc 1992.

³⁵ The rather curious thing is that the authors of the Appendix indicate no connection between *spelt* and *split*, the latter term being referred to a seemingly independent root, **splei-* ‘to splice, split’. In my opinion, both *spelt* and *split* represent the same primeval base SPLT, as extension of a base PL, whose main meaning was ‘to strike’.

Egyptoid substratum, more particularly on the categories of vocabulary that appear to be based on vestigial elements borrowed by proto-Indo-Europeans from autochthonous idioms of Old Europe. My choice was Greek *keramos*, also because it is a term that represents the base of the now international derivative *ceramic*, which has a special significance in archaeology.

Greek *keramos* is a rather singular word, since Indo-European specialists have found very few possible correlatives for it: the AHDEL Appendix, under **ker-* ‘heat, fire’, indicates that Germanic **herthō* (> English *hearth*) and Latin *carbō* ‘charcoal, ember’ and *cremāre* ‘to burn’ are possibly related to Greek *keramos* (as propounded in the Indo-European dictionary Pokorny 1959, under 2. *ker-*). Nevertheless, there is no reference to *keramos* in dictionaries such as Enout and Meillet 1985, under Latin *carbō* and *cremāre*, respectively, or Pfeifer 2004, under German *Herd* ‘hearth’. Worth mentioning is that Chantraine (1990, s.v. κέραμος) presents the Greek word under discussion as a “technical term without an established etymology.” As for the idea of a possible relation to Latin *cremāre*, the same author objects to it, in observing that “pottery is baked not burned, and there also are difficulties of form in the case of that reference.”

By taking into consideration all these uncertainties in regard to *keramos*, from an Indo-European standpoint, I propounded a connection between that Greek term and a whole family of Egyptian words that show a QR or KR base: for instance, *qerr* ‘to bake pottery’, *qerr* ‘oven, furnace’, *qerr* ‘drinking pot’, as well as *qerr* ‘to make an offering by fire’ and *kerr* ‘burned offering’. I pointed out (p. 454) that the meanings of such Egyptian words have to do “not only with pottery making (that is, with clay baking), but also with ritual practices,” and also that the connection between pottery and cult “is quite visible in both Egypt and Greece.” I completed my view on Greek *keramos* (as an Old European rather than Indo-European term) in the last footnote of the article (p. 455):

I will not exclude the possibility of a correspondence, on a Nostratic plane, between the proto-Indo-European (PIE) root **ker-* and the root I take into consideration in the case of Greek *keramos* and of its Egyptian correspondents. I must observe, however, that PIE **ker-* is somehow more “primitive” (that is, “pre-ceramic”) in its reference to the basic notions of “heat” and “fire”, whereas Egyptian *qerr* and Greek *keramos* reflect a more refined kind of civilization, in which people would bake clay into pottery, and they would also use pots in rituals.

Such facts enabled me to draw the conclusion that “Greek *keramos*, like so many other substratal Greek words of pre-Indo-European origin, points back to early Southeast European farmers and pottery makers, who were close relatives of the Mediterranids that brought the Neolithic way of life to the Nile.” As for a general conclusion for this chapter, I consider that my selection of ideas and examples extracted from a particular series of the articles I published throughout the last two decades or so stands for sufficient proof

of the fact that linguistic assumptions regarding substratal features can be credibly confirmed by archaeological finds.

V. Archaeolinguistics and the domain of Old Germanic loans

As I have already mentioned above, in chapter I, my activity as a historical linguist actually started in 1983, when I began to teach three main courses: History of English, Germanic Philology and Comparative Germanic Grammar. For a time I just stuck to the curricular requirements and to the ways of mainstream Germanic studies. But gradually I developed my own manner of presenting Old Germanic issues, as visible in the several editions of my coursebook on the history the English language (which I also taught, for a “quarter,” at the University of Chicago).³⁶ It was during the same period that I included elementary Gothic, Old Norse and Old High German in my seminars of comparative Germanic; also, for several years I taught an optional Indo-European course for undergraduates in philology and history.

My own manner is, however, more visible in two volumes (Poruciuc 1995b and 1999b) in which, so to say, I made history appear as “live” by presentations of well selected passages of Old and Middle English documents first-time translated by me into Romanian. The kind of approach I adopted for the writing of the two volumes under discussion is concisely presented in the preface of the former (p. 5):

For the title of this book, *History Written in Old English [Istorie scrisă în engleza veche]*, I took into account two main aspects: first of all, *history* could be recorded only by means of *language*; and language, in its turn, is *by itself* a store of history. In considering these aspects, I especially translated and commented upon fragments from documents that reflect moments of special importance for Anglo-Saxon history. But, at the same time [...], I strove to point out the historical significance of the very forms and meanings of Old English words [...]. Important socio-historical conclusions can be drawn directly from the terminology of those times...

Although, from that perspective, I had to focus on historical documents, I did not neglect archaeology, especially in the chapter on the documentary importance of the Anglo-Saxon poem *Beowulf*: I referred the information provided by the poem to archaeological finds that revealed significant aspects in regard to Old Germanic ships (p. 29), dwellings (p. 30) and burials (p. 32-36).

I consider, however, that my really personal contribution to Old Germanic studies is represented by a series of articles I published after 1996. It was in that year when, as a Germanist, I was stirred into action by the insistence of certain scholars (mainly Romanists of Germany and of Romania) on the fact that, in their opinion, Old Germanic loans are “totally absent” from Romanian. To be more precise, 1996

³⁶ The latest version of the coursebook is Poruciuc 2004.

was the year in which, after a lecture (on “the making of the Romanian language”) which I delivered at the Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, I was, politely but firmly, criticized by Professor Gottfried Schramm³⁷ for the fact that, in presenting evidence of *Old Germanisms in Romanian* (OGRs), I went against mainstream academia. The result was that after 1996 I even more systematically set about detecting and discussing Romanian words that can be etymologically clarified *only* as based on Old Germanic terms borrowed (1) into the pre-Roman substratum of Romanian, or (2) into Vulgar Latin, or even (3) into early Romanian proper.³⁸

Actually, my articles on the Old Germanic elements preserved in Romanian constitute a particular line, which I could (and most probably I will) turn into a separate habilitation paper. Therefore, in the following paragraphs I will refer only to passages that are, methodologically, representative for my own idea of archaeolinguistics and of archaeomythology, respectively.

Practically, my first published article of Old Germanic interest was Poruciu 1990a (on Romanian *teafăr* as a probable Old Germanic loan – see chapter I above). Then, after the turning point of 1996, I began to publish articles regarding the “thorny issue” of Romanian words based on Old Germanic loans, the first attempt being represented by my “re-introduction” to that neglected field (Poruciu 1997b, in Romanian). The article under discussion presents a series of Romanian words that I interpreted as Old Germanisms (*holm, tală, a hultui, holtei, rîncă, scrînciob* and several others). It was also in 1997 that I participated in a *Eurologistik* symposium (Jagdschloß Glienicke, Berlin); my presentation (subsequently published in the volume of proceedings – see Poruciu 1999) resumed the main arguments of Poruciu 1997b. Truly archaeolinguistic, in method, is my article on Romanian *bardă* ‘broadax’ and *budă* ‘seasonal dwelling in the woods’ (Poruciu 2000b), in which I combine etymological arguments with references to the archaeology and history of the contact between Old Germanic intruders and Southeast European natives. Poruciu 2000b actually prefigures the methodology I was to apply, more definitely, in the series of articles that were published in the period 2005-2011, mainly in *The Mankind Quarterly* (MQ) and *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* (JIES) – cf. Poruciu 2008a, 2009b, 2009c, 2011.

Since I go against the grain (that is, against mainstream dogmas) in my interpretations of OGRs, I have had to publish several explanatory articles in order to present the history of the problem and the

³⁷ During the 80s of last century, Schramm had published a series of articles on what he regarded as the “fortunes” (*Schicksale*) of the Romanians, those articles subsequently becoming a chapter of a volume by the same author (1997). Among other things, Schramm expressly furthered the main points of the theory by which Roesler (*Romänische Studien*, 1871) wanted to demonstrate the South-Danubian origin of all Romanians. The above-mentioned “absence” of Old Germanic elements from Romanian was one of the main points of Roesler’s theory (see details in Poruciu 2005: 374-375).

³⁸ The sources of OGRs are, in my opinion, Old Germanic idioms spoken during, approximately, the period between the 3rd century BC and the 7th century AD, that is, between the motion of Elbe-Germanic tribal units (such as the ones recorded as Bastarnae and Peucini) to Carpathian-Danubian-Pontic regions and the assimilation of Goths, Gepids and Langobards in the Roman/Romanized parts of Europe.

range of vocabulary taken into consideration by my predecessors and by myself (Poruciuc 2005b, 2009d, 2011b and 2012a). As for analyses of particular cases, I consider that Poruciuc 2008a best represents what I mean by archaeolinguistics as an interdisciplinary field in which arguments provided by archaeology, history, linguistics and ethnography can lead to *convergent conclusions*. The article under discussion (22 pages, in JIES) presents the importance of two Romanian related terms – *tureci* ‘bootlegs’ and *cioareci* ‘peasant’s trousers’ – for both general Indo-European studies and the relationship between Old Germanic intruders and Southeast European natives. I begin (p. 163) by references to the prehistory of the “thing” (that is, of riding breeches):

Probably the earliest representation of the Indo-European horsemen who came to dominate the Iranian plateau towards the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. appears on a seal unearthed at Tepe Sialk. According to Jettmar (1983: 237), the clothing of those invaders is “unspecific”. (Nevertheless, the checked cloth of their knee-long breeches is a quite remarkable feature - see Fig. XXiii in Jettmar’s book.). What the horsemen on the Tepe Sialk seal clearly indicate is that riding-breeches were worn by second-millennium Indo-European invaders of Iran. As for Europe, [...] some general facts and assumptions regarding Celto-Germanic trousers of the Iron Age [are] presented in Owen 1966: 116.

I continue by a presentation of the complicated etymological relationship between, on the one hand, such Romanian words as *brace* ‘drawers’, *brăcinar* ‘belt’ and a *îmbrăca* ‘to put on (clothes)’, which all represent Latin heritage – their basis being Latin *bracae* ‘breeches’, generally considered to be a borrowing from the Celtic of Gaul into Latin – and, on the other hand, Romanian *cioareci* and *tureci*, which prove to be both based on an Old Germanic compound meaning ‘thigh-breeches’ (cf. Wulfilian Gothic *þiuhbrōks* and Old High German *thiohpruach*). Notably, the same compound appears to have been the Old Germanic loan on which Medieval Latin *tubrucus*, Old French *trebu*, Provençal *trebuc*, North Italian (dialectal) *travüš*, as well as Albanian *tirk* are based.

After a taking into consideration a multitude of arguments (including ethnographic ones, regarding *tureci* and *cioareci* as designations of distinct pieces of the Romanian traditional man’s costume),³⁹ I formulate the following final assumptions:

My conclusion is that the Romanians are the only European people who preserved two distinct words based on an Old Germanic compound that originally meant ‘thigh-breeches’. As I suggested above, Romanian *tureci* (with correspondents in West Romance and in Albanian) may have come from Gothic via Vulgar Latin, whereas the more archaic *cioareci* (now exclusively Romanian) appears to come from a pre-Roman context. For *cioareci* we should assume contacts between early Germanic intruders and Carpathian-

³⁹ I found much support in Zamfira Mihail’s volume (1978) on the terminology of the Romanian traditional costume.

Danubian natives. As regards form, a remarkable aspect is that both *tureci* and *cioareci* reflect very early Germanic mutated plurals, with i-Umlaut. Taking such aspects into consideration, the etymological analysis of Rmn. *tureci* and *cioareci* proves to be relevant for Germanic proto-history, as well as for the *Romania-Germania* relationship in general.

I made use of a very similar methodology in two other articles published in *The Mankind Quarterly*, namely the ones on the lexical families of Romanian *ban* and of Romanian *gard*, (Poruciu 2008 and 2009c, respectively). In the first case, I had to object to a series of earlier etymologies and to point out that Romanian has not only *ban*¹ ‘feudal high rank’ (generally, and mistakenly, regarded as a Hungarian loan) and *ban*² ‘coin, currency’, but a whole lexical family, including *bănat*, *băni*, *bănu*, *Banat* (plus Aromanian *bană* ‘life, peace’), whose earlier meanings all recall a proto-feudal juridical system that appears to have much to do with temporary Old Germanic dominance in certain regions of Southeast Europe. Here are some of my main conclusions in the case under discussion (Poruciu 2008: 389-390):

What results from the demonstration above is, first of all, that Germanic *bann* terms [cf. German *Bann*] developed from primitive Indo-European ones that referred to very archaic religious-judicial notions. Such terms were specific to times in which commandments and laws were believed to be transmitted by divinities to humans, through the voice of exceptional (or professional) individuals. In course of time, such individuals were in turn medicine men, prophets, priest-kings, and tribal magistrates. The last two stages represent the times during which the actual Germanic *Völkerwanderung* began. When mere destruction and plunder was replaced by profitable conquest and occupation, Germanic tribal magistrates (probably still having some religious prestige too) came to dominate not only the life of their own tribes, but also the life of non-Germanic populations that came under Germanic control. Such was the period in which non-Germanic people of Central-East Europe became familiar with Germanic juridical terms of the *bann* family.

It was to the same historical context to which I returned (in order to gather historical and archaeological arguments) in my demonstration of the Old Germanic origin of Romanian *gard* ‘fence, weir, garden’ (as well as of Albanian *gardh* ‘fence, dam’ and Old Church Slavonic *gradъ* ‘city’),⁴⁰ in which case I made use of much more archaeological-historical as well as ethnographic material, as

⁴⁰ One aim of my demonstration was to confirm an earlier etymological assumption, namely Diez’s proposition (in his *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*) of an Old Germanic origin for both Albanian *gardh* and Romanian *gard*. Also, I pointed out that Baltic and Slavic languages contain inherited terms such as Lithuanian *žardas* ‘hurdle work, pen’, Latvian *zards* ‘hurdle work’ and Russian *zorod* ‘shed, enclosure for haystacks’ as well as etymologically related terms whose shapes indicate Old Germanic origins, such as Lithuanian *gardas* ‘pen, fence, enclosure’, Old Church Slavonic *gradъ* ‘city, garden’ and Russian *gorod* ‘city’.

support for the etymological demonstration. And, just as I did in my demonstration of the Old Germanic origin of the Romanian *ban* family of words (an etymological assumption that is consistently sustained by the existence of such Old Germanic loans as French *bannir*, *banal*, *banlieu*, etc.), I found much support in a multitude of Old Germanic loans (of the *gard* type) preserved in West Romance languages – cf. Old French *jart*, French *jardin*, Italian *giardino*, etc. Again, as in the case of Poruciuc 2008a, I came to realize that what I had to deal with was significant not only for Romance and Balkanic studies, but also for the emerging field of *Eurolinguistics*. In the final part of Poruciuc 2009c I present the historical context in which Old Germanic terms of the *gard* family entered non-Germanic languages (p. 63):

Convergent arguments indicate that – in various regions and at various moments of the period approximately between the 3rd century BC and the 6th century of our time – Old Germanic tribal units proved to possess the necessary (mainly military) means by which they could implant their own “enclosures” as power-centers in territories inhabited by non-Germanic populations of East and Central-East Europe. One effect of the numerous early Germanic intrusions was that non-Germanic populations (including the Proto-Slavs) became familiar with typical Germanic settlements. That historical context accounts for the Germanic loans of the *gard* family that survived with their original meanings in Baltic languages, as well as in Albanian and Romanian. In its turn, Slavic reflects a peculiar double development: on the one hand, some Slavic languages preserved a number of terms with original Old Germanic meanings, as visible in Ukrainian *horoža* ‘enclosure’, Polish *grodz* ‘enclosure’, or Slovak *hrada* ‘plot of land, garden’; on the other hand, practically all Slavic languages (which developed their distinct identities after the expansion of the 6th-7th centuries) contain Old Germanic loans of the *gard* family that show the semantic shift ‘enclosure’ > ‘manorial seat’ > ‘fortified settlement’ > ‘city’.

My latest published study in the field of OGRs is Poruciuc 2011 (in JIES), in which I demonstrate the Old Germanic origin of two Romanian terms, *a ateia* ‘to dress up’ (in Banat) and *brândușă* ‘crocus’. In the former case I confirmed, by supplementary arguments, an Old Germanic etymology propounded by Diculescu and by Gamillscheg, whereas in the case of *brândușă* I was, as far as I know, the first to formulate such an etymology. In both cases, I pointed out the existence of numerous West Romance terms of Old Germanic origin that appear as clear cognates of the two Romanian terms: see especially Spanish *ataviar* ‘to arrange, adorn, dress up’ (most probably based on a prefixed derivative from Gothic *taujan* ‘to prepare’) and Old French *brant* ‘sword’ (from Frankish *brand* ‘sword’), respectively. In regard to both etymologies, I made some conclusive statements in the final paragraph:

...I consider that the regional use of Rm. *ateia*, in Banat (that is, in a territory once controlled by the Gepids), indicates a most probable Gepidic origin for the Romanian word under discussion. Therefore I will sustain the solution proposed by Diculescu and subsequently reinforced by Gamillscheg. By contrast to

ateia, the term *brândușă* is a word of earlier attestation and of general Romanian use, as well as a word that represents the appellative base of quite a number of Romanian proper-names. There are many arguments [...] in favor of a development of Romanian *brândușă* from an Old Germanic loan, namely *brand* (or *branda*), which designated a certain type of sword. It would, however, be quite difficult for anyone to indicate precisely from which Old Germanic idiom and into which non-Germanic Central-Southeast European idiom that term was first borrowed. Taking into consideration (1) the archaic character of *brand* (word-and-thing) in Germanic, (2) the probably substratal origin of the Romanian suffix *-ușă*, and (3) the very early occurrence of the shift /an/ > /ən/ in the history of Romanian, I will not exclude the possibility that Rm. *brândușă* could represent a borrowing from Old Germanic into a pre-Roman substratal idiom from which Romanian inherited *brândușă* as designation for plants with swordlike leaves.

During the post-1996 period I published articles on OGRs not only abroad, but also in Romanian journals and collective volumes. One example is Poruciuc 2005c, in which, in regard to the most probable Old Germanic origin of Romanian *găman* ‘cowherd, glutton’, I find confirmation in recorded Germanic terms such as Gothic *gaman* ‘fellow man, partner’ and English *yeoman* ‘free-holding farmer’, which can both be clarified as based on an Old Germanic compound **gau-mann* ‘member of a rural community’ (cf. German *Gau* ‘district’ and *Mann* ‘man’).⁴¹ Worth mentioning are the following final observations:

The respectable age of *găman* [...] is indicated not only by its similarity to Gothic *gaman*, but also by the fact that it produced a multitude of Romanian place names and family names. In that respect, to what Jordan said on the *Găman* onomastic series, I may add that I counted 69 *Găman* family-names included in the telephone directories of five Romanian bigger cities (Craiova – 33, Brașov – 13, Iași – 10, Sibiu – 4, Timișoara – 9). Besides those, there are variants such as *Gaman*, *Gamen*, *Gamănă*, *Gămana*, as well as specific Romanian derivatives such as *Gămănescu* and *Gămăneață*. Such anthroponymic richness imposes the idea that *găman* is not just a rare and obscure word in Romanian. We can understand the form and the semantic evolution of that word only if we regard it as an Old Germanic loan that was already present in the earliest stage of Romanian as a distinct Romance language (that is, during the 6th-7th centuries).

I made similar use of both Germanic and Romanian lexical material in Poruciuc 2008d, an article on the cognates of Romanian *gospodă* and *gospodar*, which I analyze within a more general frame (both Indo-European and interdisciplinary). First of all I reject the mainstream etymology of Slavic *gospod* ‘the Lord’ as based on the same (hardly clear) Indo-European compound that is generally believed to account for Latin *hospes*, *-itis* (as derived from an earlier compound that has been considered to be based on Latin *hostis* ‘stranger, guest’ + *potis* ‘master’). My etymological solution is much simpler and, I believe, more

⁴¹ I explain the semantic shift – which occurred in the transfer of the word from Old Germanic into Romanian – as an effect of the “ironic filter” that marks the way in which intruders are viewed by natives.

credible: Slavic *gospod* as well as Romanian *gospodă* ‘uproar’ and *gospodar* ‘well-off peasant’ reflect a very early Old Germanic loan, *gōd-spōd* ‘good-fortune’ that is exactly the compound that survived in the English well-wishing formula *Godspeed*. (As for the phonetic contraction of the compound under discussion, a clearly similar evolution is shown by another English term, *gospel* < Old English *gōd-spell* ‘good news’, as translation of Latin *evangelium*, from Greek *euangelion*.) My conviction in that respect is expressed in the last paragraph of the article:

To go back to my main argument above, I have absolutely no doubt that Slavic *gospod* has its origin in Old Germanic *gōd-spōd* (‘good-fortune’). That archaic compound was borrowed by Proto-Slavs from dominant Old Germanic intruders, in pre-feudal times, that is, at a time when those intruders could be just better-off peasants (like Ohthere [the ninth-century Scandinavian narrator of an Old English text]), not real feudal lords. It was only when the heirs of those early Germanic intruders began to grow into actual masters that *gospod* gradually developed the meaning of ‘lord’ (then ‘the Lord’) and *gospodar* came to mean ‘prince’ in the Carpathian area. But, unlike Slavic, Romanian preserved the old rustic meanings of its own *gospodar*; and the meaning of Romanian *gospodă* suffered a peculiar “semantic degradation” into ‘uproar’. Such peculiarities indicate that the two Romanian words may not be Slavic loans (as traditionally believed), but are based on two terms borrowed from Old Germanic at a very early age, possibly even from Old Germanic into the pre-Roman substratum of Romanian.

Whereas *gospodar* can be regarded as a term of general Daco-Romanian use,⁴² and whereas *găman* – although felt to be obsolete at present – is sustained by a multitude of onomastic material, there are also OGRs which are of restricted dialectal use, but which deserve attention mainly due to their reference to specific realities of certain regions. Such a Romanian term is *huscă* ‘salt obtained by evaporation of salt water’, which I analyze in Poruciuc 2007a. What I assume is, basically, an etymological connection between Germanic cognates of English *husk* ‘outer envelope of certain fruits and seeds’ (cf. Low German *huske*, a diminutive of *hus* ‘house’) and an interesting Romanian lexical family that includes not only the above-mentioned *huscă* (which, in Romanian, appears to have originally referred to the salt crust formed around sources of natural brine, of the *slatină* type), but also several less visible cognates of the latter, which are mentioned in the quotation below (from the conclusive paragraph of Poruciuc 2007a):

In conclusion, the Romanian language (apparently together with certain Carpathian-Slavic idioms) has preserved a lexical family quite evidently related to that of Engl. *husk*. Remarkable, from an etymological standpoint, is the quite relevant (but so far overlooked) inner-Romanian relationship between, on the one hand, *huscă* ‘salt obtained by evaporation of salt water’, *huște* ‘bran’, *a huști* ‘to remove grains from cobs’,

⁴² I say Daco-Romanian, since *gospodar* has not also been recorded in Aromanian (as indicated by the absence of such a term from the comprehensive Aromanian dictionary Papahagi 1974).

and, on the other hand, *huști* ‘huts’. This newly “reunited” family constitutes solid support for the etymological correspondence between Engl. *husk* and L.Germ. *hūske*. By taking into consideration such relationships, it is quite easy to reconstruct a semantic shift going from the notional field of “cover, shelter, house” to “dry outer covering of some fruits and seeds”, and eventually to “dry crust of salt”. As for the last stage of the shift under discussion, I can formulate the following historical-linguistic hypothesis: when some early Germanic people, who were basically farmers and cattle-breeders, came to settle in Carpathian areas (as was archaeologically proved in regard to the Bastarnae of the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C.) they came upon a peculiar local method of salt exploitation. And, in order to have a transparent term for the dry-crust salt (obtained by natural evaporation or by boiling), those Germanic newcomers simply added a figurative meaning to their own agricultural term **huska*, which probably designated the familiar bran made of cereal husks. With its new meaning, that Germanic term was subsequently adopted by speakers of proto-Slavic and proto-Romanian (or, possibly, pre-Romanian – see below). Anyway, as already suggested above, a phonetic evolution such as /huska/ > /huske/ > /husče/ > /hušče/ > /hušte/ (and further /hušt’/, that is, Romanian *huști*) shows very old age on Romanian ground.

For etymologists and specialists in semantics, most interesting is the above-mentioned shift from ‘dry outer covering of some fruits and seeds’ to ‘dry crust of salt’. Archaeologists and ethno-archaeologists, in their turn, may get interested in the fortune of Romanian *huscă* as a very significant indicator of the earliest penetrations of Germanic farming populations into Carpathian regions in which salt water had been exploited since prehistory. The fact that certain regional terms of Northeast Romania have relatives in *West* Germanic languages (namely English and Low German) may account for the fact that the earliest Germanic tribal units that came to settle in the area under discussion were of a Suebic-Bastarnic type directly related to the Germaic grouping now generally referred to as Elbe-Germanic. Taking such facts into account, I included the following statements in the same final part of Poruciuc 2007a:

Since the earliest Bastarnic intrusions in Northeast Carpathian regions occurred in the 3rd-2nd centuries B.C. (that is, three-four centuries before Roman Dacia, and seven-eight centuries before the Slavic expansion), we cannot possibly imagine any penetration of an Old Germanic **huska* directly into Romanian, simply since there was no Romanian at that time.⁴³ Under such circumstances we should assume that **huska* was first borrowed by speakers of (Carpian-Dacian?) idioms that were to represent the local substratum of (Daco-)Romanian,⁴⁴ and possibly of Carpathian-Slavic too.⁴⁵ What is very clear – etymologically,

⁴³ According to outstanding specialists, “the formation of the Romanian language” (that is, the passage from “Balkan Latin” to Romanian proper) took place during the 5th-7th centuries (cf. Ivănescu 2000: 179).

⁴⁴ I take into account the fact that *huscă* (like *gospodă* and *gospodar*) is absent from the Aromanian dictionary Papahagi 1974.

semantically, and phonetically – is that the lexical family represented by *huscă*, *a huști*, *huște* (< *husce*) and *huști* became Romanian at a quite early date. And, no matter how late those terms were to be recorded in documents, they offer clues to some interesting aspects of the Romanian ethno- and glottogenesis.

As I will mention in the final chapter of this paper, not only are there many other terms that can be interpreted as OGRs, but there also are supplementary arguments, which I detected after the publication of the above-quoted articles and which substantially sustain my etymological assumptions of the kind presented in this chapter.

⁴⁵ I will not exclude the possibility that, as late as the 6th-7th centuries, lingering Old Germanic communities in Carpathian regions could come in touch with (and be assimilated by) proto-Romanians and/or proto-Slavs. It is also as part of such a process that the transfer of a “technical” term such as Old Germanic **huska* may be clarified.

VI. Archaeomythology enlarged by archaeolinguistics in *Prehistoric Roots*

The first moment at which I actually became, rather suddenly, aware of the many significant things that can be said about the Romanian ritual folklore was during my first conversations with Marija Gimbutas, and especially during the interview she gave me in 1984 (see Poruciuc 1985),⁴⁶ a text whose English translation was to be published almost three decades later, in the 2011 special issue of the *Journal of Archaeomythology* (JAM). Gimbutas had more than sufficient arguments to persuade me that perpetuation of prehistoric traditions throughout millennia *is* possible and provable, by specialists who know enough about both archaeology and traditional culture. As the title of the interview indicates, the main topic of our conversation was “archaic cultures.” More precisely, we focused on possibilities of drawing credible conclusions about prehistoric cultures by both archaeology and study of vestigial folklore. Such issues subsequently represented also the dominant thematic line of our intermittent correspondence (see Poruciuc 2011c, published in the above-mentioned JAM issue).

As I suggested in the first chapter of this paper, when I wrote my article on *teafăr* (Poruciuc 1990a) I was not aware of the fact that I was doing archaeomythology too. It was only after Gimbutas kindly sent me a copy of her 1989 volume (*The Language of the Goddess*) that I first learned about her briefly formulated definition of the field under discussion (Gimbutas 1989: xviii):

This volume is a study in archeomythology, a field that includes archeology, comparative mythology, and folklore, and one that archeologists have yet to explore.

Rather curiously, Gimbutas – who quite often resorted to language arguments in her basic volumes and articles – did not also include linguistics among the disciplines that she presented as possible “collaborators” in the newly defined field of archaeomythology. In course of time, I was to become convinced of the fact that historical linguistics *must* be expressly mentioned in any definition of archaeomythology. My opinion was to be confirmed by other specialists (see the 2000 moment presented below).

⁴⁶ In 1984 acted as her translator during the Iași conference on the Cucuteni civilization (see Gimbutas 1987), on which occasion she also gave me the interview that was subsequently published in a local magazine (*Cronica* – see Poruciuc 1985). It was as late as 1991 that I could meet Gimbutas again, in person, when (as a Fulbright visiting scholar) I had the chance to participate in the annual UCLA Indo-European Conference and I could visit her at her home of Topanga Canyon.

Worth mentioning, for the sake of this habilitation paper, is an episode of my stay at the University of Chicago (UC). In the spring of 1991 I came to meet with Ioan Petru Culianu, who held a post at the Divinity School of the UC, that is, at the department where Mircea Eliade had taught until his death (1986). During our first conversation (which then also proved to be the last),⁴⁷ I told Culianu about my interest in the Romanian ritual folklore, in the archaic traditions of Southeast Europe and in what Eliade had regarded as “the Neolithic edifice” still visible in such traditions. Culianu proposed that I give a talk on such topics during one of the monthly meetings of the Divinity School staff and students. My talk was subsequently scheduled for the meeting of May Day 1991. It was for that special occasion that I made my first translations of Romanian pre-Christian *colinde* (“carols”) into English, and I was happy to see that those texts, by their very contents, stirred quite a lot of interest in the audience.

About one year after my return to Romania (1993), some of Gimbutas’s Californian disciples announced their intention of organizing a special Indo-European conference in Vilnius, in her honor. What the organizers envisaged was a triumphant “return of the native,” since the Lithuanian/American scholar had come to be regarded as a national hero in her native country, especially after Lithuania got out of the Soviet pen. Unfortunately, the conference of September 1994 (to which I contributed a presentation that was to become Poruciuc 1996, included in the volume of proceedings) turned into an academic gathering *in memory* of Marija Gimbutas, who had passed away in February 1994. What I can say about post-Gimbutas developments is that – for all the loud critical voices that rose against her ideas, before and after her death – the founder of archaeomythology left a legacy that was not easy to shatter. Among other things, in 1998 some disciples and admirers of Marija Gimbutas founded the Institute of Archaeomythology (IAM) in Sebastopol, California. About eight years later, I became a Fellow of that Institute, which also published my volume of 2010 (see below).

When I wrote my first article on the Romanian *dolf* (Poruciuc 1997, included in yet another collective volume published in honor of Marija Gimbutas), I already was aware of the fact that the combination of (1) archaeology-history, (2) comparative mythology, (3) folklore studies (as part of ethnography) *and* (4) historical linguistics should and must be regarded as a quite safe interdisciplinary basis for archaeomythology. The article in which I definitively applied an archaeomythological methodology of my own was Poruciuc 2000 (on “the shape of sacredness”), which happened to be published in the very issue of *ReVision* that was meant to represent a reinforcement of the methodological basis first propounded by Gimbutas. Here is a fragment of the article “Introduction to Archaeomythology” by which Joan Marler (2000: 2) opened the *ReVision* issue that presented Gimbutas’s vision as well as possible expansions of it:

⁴⁷ Less than a month after that conversation, Culianu was shot to death in the very building of the Divinity School. The identity of the murderer has remained unknown to this day.

Archaeomythology was developed by Lithuanian/American archaeologist Marija Gimbutas in order to expand the boundaries of archaeological interpretation of prehistoric cultures, with an emphasis on ideology, social structure and symbolism (see Gimbutas 1989, 1991). In the absence of written texts, an adequate understanding of the nonmaterial aspects of culture is not possible by describing artifacts alone. Archaeomythology combines archaeology, ethnology, folklore, historical linguistics, comparative religion, and information from historical documents in order to provide an expanded basis for cultural interpretation.

After the 2000 moment, which meant much for the development of both archaeomythology and my own career as a researcher, I continued to publish articles and to deliver papers on archaeomythological aspects, especially on the ones manifest in Romanian and Southeast European traditional culture (see reference list below). Several of those articles and presentations were to become part of my volume of 2010. Also, in regard to my activity in association with the Institute of Archaeomythology (see also the IAM site), a first concrete step was my participation in the international symposium on the Black Sea Flood (Bogliasco 2002). There followed the expeditions organized by the IAM leadership to major archaeological sites and to ethnographically significant areas of Serbia and Bulgaria (2004), and the series of international symposiums focused on the prehistoric Danube Script (Novi Sad 2004, Sibiu 2009, Cluj-Napoca 2010, Coronini-Pescari 2011), in which I gave talks that were subsequently published in IAM collective volumes. Much of the materials of those symposiums also became part of the optional course in history of writing that I held for several years at the Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Faculty of Letters.

As I have already suggested above, my so far most notable achievement in the field of archaeolinguistics in my volume *Prehistoric Roots of Romanian and Southeast Europe* (2010), in which several of my previously published articles were expanded into thematically integrated chapters, which I will present in some detail below. The preface of the volume deserves special attention, as it is signed by Miriam Robbins Dexter (UCLA), who is also Executive Editor of IAM. Here are some glimpses of her view on the volume under discussion:

In excavating the rich treasure of the Romanian folksongs, the *colinde*, Adrian Poruciuc gives very important evidence for the survival of prehistoric, indigenous roots in Southeast European and particularly Romanian folk material. [p. vi]

Many of the *colinde*, such as the ritual songs about the apple-stealing *dolf*, carry pre-Indo-European substrate information, evidence of the tremendous antiquity of some components of the songs. In fact, according to Poruciuc, the womb-temple of Delphi – and the dolphin as womb-like creature, and the apple

eating *dolf* of Romanian carols – lead us as far back as the Upper Paleolithic and the Mesolithic of Southeastern Europe. [p. VII]

In his unique and essential contribution to the field of archaeomythology, Adrian Poruciu has given us an essential piece of the archaeomythological puzzle: the Romanian evidence. His work is a treasure for linguists, Indo-Europeanists and non-Indo-Europeanists alike. [p. IX]

The period during which I processed the material for Poruciu 2010 was marked by many hesitations and doubts of my own, mainly in regard to the mechanisms by which prehistoric ritual-cultural elements and folk motifs originally expressed in long dead languages could survive in Romanian, as a Romance language that shaped its own distinct identity as late as the middle of the first millennium of our time. Eventually, with much help from opinions of outstanding scholars such as Eliade, Gimbutas, Nilsson, Burkert, Caraman and others, I was able to assume that the long lasting “peasant culture” and its ways of transmitting traditional culture by word of mouth, from generation to generation, are factors that *can* account for the spectacular survivals taken into consideration in my book. These are the main assumptions that I formulate in my *Introduction*, whose first paragraph presents aspects that are not exactly in keeping with the mainstream vision of European civilization (p. XI-XII):

Traditionally, “European civilization” appears to be a complex edifice made of urban-literate values, an edifice that began with the earliest forms of the Greek *polis* and then expanded mainly due to the huge vehicle of the Roman Empire (which, eventually, also made possible the success of Christianity and of Judeo-Christian values). In the West, even the populations (mainly the Germanic tribes) that directly contributed to the fall of the Empire chose to make use of what was left of the imperial administrative structure, and to ensure some continuity of urban civilization. Not so in the East. [...] The withdrawal of the Romans meant general and rapid collapse of whatever urban civilization had evolved in Dacia. Within about a century, the natives (many of whom had adopted Latin) remained with only their villages and their archaic pre-Roman customs, of which many had their origins in prehistory. Practically, in most territories of the northern part of the Balkan Peninsula rural-illiterate life remained dominant through the Middle Ages and the beginning of modern times. But illiteracy did not imply impossibility of cultural continuity. On the opposite, oral transmission from generation to generation - without any real prohibitions or prescriptions (except the rather mild ones of the Eastern Christian church) - actually accounts for the spectacular preservation of pre-Christian, pre-Roman, and even pre-Indo-European elements in Romanian folklore, as outstanding part of Balkan traditional culture. For a comparison, as regards Neolithic vestiges in Greece, here is Burkert’s general observation: “The inertial force of peasant culture and peasant custom must always have maintained a certain continuity of religion on Greek soil” (1985: 13). Much of this book is about the “force of peasant culture.” However, I will neglect neither classical “legends,” nor archaeological finds.

What I aimed to write was a volume with a truly interdisciplinary basis, represented by mutual confirmation among the data provided mainly by archaeology-history, comparative mythology, ethnology and linguistics. By taking into account the materials and conclusions of predecessors such as the ones mentioned above, I intended to approach folklore and traditional culture along a line that I suggested in the final statements of my *Introduction* (p. XIV):

My analyses of Romanian folk productions also led me to the conclusion that archaic ritual-cultural patterns preceded mythologies, theogonies and theologies, and that, instead of hurrying to go “beyond the motif analysis,” we should stay there as long as we can, as to reveal the original nuclei of both myths and religion. Among other things, as I will demonstrate below, the diversely named maiden riding a wild bull in many Romanian “carols” is a motif obviously older than the legend (or myth?) of classical Europa. Similarly, the Romanian talking and dancing lion (defeated by a hero of other “carols”) is older than the Nemean lion strangled by Herakles. The outlines of what was to become classical mythology can be perceived in prehistoric items unearthed by archaeologists, but such outlines also appear to be (paradoxically, from a chronological standpoint) “foretold” in folk productions recorded only as late as modern times. And just as certain features of prehistoric shrines eventually evolved into basic parts of Christian churches (as I will show in one chapter of this book), much of what we know as mythology derived, more or less directly, from the ritual-cultural life of prehistoric peasants.⁴⁸

As I have already mentioned above, I expanded several of my archaeomythological articles published between 1997 and 2005 (see reference list) into chapters of Poruciuc 2010. In fact, Chapter One (“The Romanian *dolf* ‘sea-monster’ in connection with a Greek lexical family and with early signs of Eurasian religion”) stands for a synthesis of the materials I had analyzed in several articles, published in either English or Romanian. In establishing a connection between the Romanian *dolf* carols and the prehistoric boulder cult (spectacularly represented not only on the Danubian site of Lepenski Vir, but also in the Far East, on the banks of the Amur), I present the fabulous sea-monster as well as its substratal name as extremely old manifestations of religious beliefs specific to a certain “Euro-Siberian axis.” It is an assumption that I synthetically formulate at the end of the chapter under discussion (p. 13):

I will [...] hypothesize that a boulder-cult already existed in the period between the end of the last Ice Age and the appearance of the first real forests in “boreal” regions of Eurasia. Just as figurative and non-figurative (geometric) patterns of the initial carved boulders and stone slabs were later transferred to wood and other materials, many of the religious meanings of early carved stones were then transferred to sacred

⁴⁸ I can be only glad that important Romanian ethnologists have chosen (during the last two decades or so) to pay direct attention to archaeology and to possibilities of Neolithic perpetuations in rituals, motifs and ornaments. And I am also glad that there are now Romanian ethnologists (notably Ghinoiu 2001) who make direct use of Marija Gimbutas’s statements on Old European traditions.

wooden posts, such as the later ones of pre-Christian Germanic and Slavic tribes. Under such circumstances, we may understand why Slavic has preserved obviously related terms that could refer to boulders, to wooden posts, or to idols. [...]. Even if the terms that I consider to be substratal⁴⁹ may have entered autochthonous pre-Romanian idioms independently, and from various sources, I am positive that, ultimately, those sources belonged to the same Euro-Siberian axis, just as I am positive that the above-mentioned Greek, Baltic, Slavic and Romanian terms referring to full-round shapes (with magic implications) have common origins that are earlier than the Indo-European phenomenon proper.

In the arrangement of Poruciuc 2010 I observe a chronological order (or, rather, stratification), therefore in Chapter Two – “The Sea and the sea-flood motif in Romanian folklore” – I move from the sacred boulders of Upper Paleolithic hunters (some of whom later became Proto-Indo-European horse-breeders) to forms of religion and culture that I consider to be of more recent origins (basically Neolithic and post-Neolithic). From a geographic standpoint, my focus remains on the Black Sea (former Euxine Lake), that is, on the “habitat” of the Romanian *dolf*, a mythical entity that had the Lepenski Vir “Fish Goddess” among its ancestors.⁵⁰ I focused on the persistent Romanian folk motif *vine marea mare* literally, “comes the sea hugh”), especially as included in “maid’s carols” that present a kind of “Proto-Europa” carried over a sea-flood (sometimes a river-flood) by a wild bull (aurochs) or a stag. I also dedicated a special subchapter to another, even more archaic motif, “the shepherd and the sea,” and I eventually referred both Romanian motifs to various versions of the flood myth and to archaeological-historical facts. In the last paragraph of Chapter Two I draw conclusions of more general interest (p. 32):

I have come to think that certain Romanian carols, as obscure as they may look now, contain prehistoric matter that is worth analyzing by specialists interested in the roots of Southeast Europe, and of Europe in general. And, also as a linguist (preoccupied with glottogenetic matters), I will make this conclusive statement: Romanian, as a historical Romance language born of Latin (during the fifth-sixth centuries of our time), is certainly much more recent than the motifs of the carols presented above. Under such circumstances, what we should assume is that the perpetuation of such mythical-ritual productions was ensured by a Southeast European continuity that was not exactly lingual, but rather demic-and-cultural. It

⁴⁹ My hypothesis is that the Greek terms *delphis/belphin* ‘dolphin’ and *delphus/dolphos* ‘womb’ and the quite obviously related Romanian terms *dolf* ‘fabulous sea-monster’, *dolofan* ‘plump, prosperous’ and *bolf* ‘boulder’ are autochthonisms remotely related to the family represented by Russian *bolvan* ‘idol’ and Romanian *bolovan* ‘boulder’, which reflect a more recent contribution of the Euro-Siberian axis.

⁵⁰ The boulder cult specific to Lepenski Vir and other sites of the same area and period (that is, the transition from Mesolithic to early Neolithic) may prove to be even more important for the history of human civilization, if we take into consideration some more recent discoveries. I have in mind especially the “three sacrificial objects” (actually three river boulders) discovered at Vlasac, not far from Lepenski Vir. At the international symposium “Signs of Civilization” (Novi Sad, May 25-27, 2004), Borislav Jovanović presented “object number 3” of Vlasac, an “egg-like” boulder with mysterious letter-like signs engraved on it.

was due to that kind of continuity that autochthonous populations translated (and repeatedly re-translated) primeval ritual songs from local dwindling idioms into newly adopted or imposed ones (as Latin was, in the case of Romanians to-be).

Chapter Three, entitled “The shape of sacredness – from prehistoric temples to Neo-Byzantine churches,” is directly related to Chapter One, since I resume my presentation of the implications of the *delphis-delphus-Delphoi-dolf-dolofan* connection and I point out the existence of another probable connection, namely the one between that family of words and certain persistent patterns of lobular edifices with religious-cultural functions in Europe. Basically, such patterns are visible from prehistoric shrines and multigenerational tombs built in the shape of a Great Mother to Neo-Byzantine churches whose choir sector (the one called *horă* in Romanian) show two lateral semicircular apses (Romanian *sânuri*), which, together with the apse of the altar, constitute a trefoil plan. By making use of ample archaeological information, I point out that the real beginnings of such conceptions of sacred architecture are represented by prehistoric pentalobular temples such as those of Malta. As in other instances, I return to (and reinforce) Gimbutas’s and Eliade’s visions, as I do on p. 33:

Since the publication of Marija Gimbutas's later works (1989, 1991), consensus has been mounting that the designs of prehistoric temples and collective tombs such as those on Malta or Ireland actually represent the outline of the Great Mother's body. Furthermore, the etymological connection between the Greek term *delphys* 'womb' and the name of the celebrated oracular (Apollonian) site of Delphi becomes obvious in the light of prehistoric womb-shrines, which mortals entered in order to be initiated and symbolically "reborn." On Delphi, the distinguished Romanian scholar Mircea Eliade made the following comments (1978: 271): “Delphi had a prehistory as an oracular site long before Apollo. Whatever its etymology may have been, the Greeks connected the name with *delphys* 'womb'. The mysterious cavity was a mouth, a *stomion*, a term that also designates the vagina. The *omphalos* of Delphi was also documented from the pre-Hellenic period. Symbol of the navel, it was laden with genital meaning, but it was above all a 'center of the world' [...].”

In presenting the way in which certain prehistoric architectural patterns and religious-cultural practices not only survived but also were enriched by new meanings in Christian times, I conclude that there are sufficient proofs of a perennial kind of symbolism projected into peculiar patterns of European sacral architecture of practically all times. In that respect, I end the chapter in a synthetic-metaphorical manner:

My intention was not to demonstrate that there is nothing new in Christian symbolism. Nevertheless, it would be hard for anyone to overlook the fact that the organizing phase of Christianity imposed a supreme syncretism, which implied mainly reshuffling and reinterpretation of deeply rooted signs and structures

coming even from prehistory. These included architectural forms that existed long before the birth of Jesus. In regard to the particular subject of this article, I am not implying that the sacred trefoil motif has always been *consciously* felt to be representative of a Great Mother's body. However, deeply rooted metaphors such as those of the church-as-mother and church-as-bride appear to be perennial motifs dear to the European *homo religiosus*. It is unlikely that earlier Romanians would use the term *sânuri* 'breasts' as name for the semicircular apses of their churches simply because the shape of those apses recalled certain parts of a woman's body. The Great-Mother mode of thought comes to us the way a river springs in mysterious, remote lands then it goes underground, for geo-logical reasons, only to reappear in an unexpected place, and quite possibly under a new name.

"Demeter as 'Earth Mother' and Dionysos as 'Earth Bridegroom'" is the title of Chapter Four, in which my aims were (1) to bring new arguments in favor of an earlier etymology of the theonym *Demeter* and (2) to propound an entirely new etymology for another fundamental theonym, namely *Dionysos*. In the first case I demonstrated that the opinion shared by several earlier scholars (notably Müller and Kretschmer) in regard to the compound *De-meter* as literally meaning 'Earth-Mother' is well sustained not only by linguistic arguments, but also by archaeological finds and historical documents. As for *Dionysos*, my arguments lead to the conclusion that the mainstream interpretation of it as 'Zeus's Son' is just a folk etymology fixed by the Greek patriarchal tradition. Actually, there are very important linguistic and archaeological proofs indicating that the name of the mythical figure that we may label as Proto-Dionysos literally meant 'the Earth-Goddess's Bridegroom', a fact that is also sustained by certain Neolithic representations of a Great Mother embracing her son-and-lover (see p. 59, fig. 9). The final conclusions of Chapter Four are to be found on p. 61:

The arguments presented above can lead to a better understanding of the process of Indo-Europeanization undergone by Old Europe, in both religion and language. Certainly, we should not forget that the shift from the Neolithic goddess & paramour to Demeter & Dionysos took several millennia. But, for all losses and alterations on the long way, a significant amount of the primeval mythical-religious substance appears to have survived in the functions and names of the two classical divinities interpretable, in my opinion, as "Earth-Mother" and "Earth's Bridegroom." And, as suggested by other materials in this volume, the ritual incest implied by the relationship of the two divine figures discussed above is not an unusual feature within the context of archaic Southeast European forms of culture.

My incipient views on fabulous creatures such as the *dolf*, the *zgripsor* ('griffin') and the lion – as characters in Romanian folkloric texts – were first expressed in Poruciuc 1992 (my study on Southeast European "problems and patterns"). After one decade, in Bulgaria, I published an extensive article on the Romanian lion-carols (Poruciuc 2002a); it was the article that grew as Chapter Five (the longest and

richest in illustrative examples, that is, Romanian ritual songs that I translated into English). The main point of my demonstration is that, far from being just an “Orientalizing” addition to Southeast European traditional culture, lion symbolism had prehistoric roots in the area under discussion. Also, ties with the Near East are visible not only in representations of symbolic lions, but also in the very name on the real beast (p. 63-64):

...Romanian *leu* ‘lion’ poses its own problems, the main one being its not being interpretable as Latin heritage. As regards other European languages, etymological dictionaries generally indicate that it was Greek *leon* ‘lion’ that, mainly through the intermediation of Latin *leo*, *-nis* (itself regarded as a very early borrowing from Greek), appears to be the ultimate source of a multitude of European variants: for instance, Old High German *lewo* (> Middle High German *lewe*, *lebe*, *leu* > German *Löwe*, *Leu*), Albanian *luan*, and Slavic *lev*. (As far as I know, nobody has observed that the Slavic term under discussion perfectly coincides with Etruscan *lev* ‘lion’ – as given in Bonfante 1995: 201.) Several outstanding etymologists, including Buck and Chantraine, have pointed out that the origin of Greek *leon* (Mycenaean Greek *rewo*) remains obscure. Far from being a word belonging to the Indo-European common core, that Greek term resembles only some terms recorded in Semitic languages. However, neither Akkadian *labu*, nor Ugaritic *lb’*, nor Hebrew *labi* can be regarded a direct source of Greek *leon* (therefore Chantraine preferred to present *leon* as “borrowing from an unknown language”).

Besides their peculiar name for lion the Romanians have also preserved a cycle of ritual songs that are quite unique. Such songs, about the confrontation between a brave young man (usually presented as *june* or *mire*), have not survived just as fossilized relics, but as part of living rituals, since they have been integrated in the Christmas celebrations of certain Romanian regions. In that respect, it is notable that there hardly is any Christian element in the basic plot of a typical lion-carol, whose principal features make it appear as more archaic than the Olympian legend about Herakles and the Nemean lion. First of all, unlike Herakles (and unlike biblical Samson), the Romanian *june* will not kill the lion, but only capture it alive and take it “down to the country” as proof of his bravery. The immediate connections in the past are ancient Thracian and Macedonian representations (notably the one on a Thracian silver appliqué which shows “a primitive Herakles with a subdued lion” – p. 63, fig. 11). I draw the most general conclusion of Chapter Five on p. 91:

The quite archaic type of lion-symbolism to be found in both Thracian artistic representations and Romanian carols (such as the ones presented above) appears to have much to do with primeval sources. Such an idea is supported, among other things, by the fact that the Mesopotamian-Egyptian-Southeast European triangle – that is, the vast area within which (with successive reinforcements and overlappings), the symbolism under discussion has fully manifested itself – coincides with the area within which archaic LB/LW terms for ‘lion’ have been recorded, in various idioms. Under such circumstances, I will assume

that Thracian gold and silver lions (or, rather, what they meant) and Romanian lion-carols stand for extremities of a Southeast European segment of a phenomenon whose roots go as deep as the demic and cultural expansion of the Fertile Crescent during the Neolithic and the Chalcolithic periods.⁵¹

Chapter Six is dedicated to Orpheus, a mythical figure that may also be regarded – side by side with Demeter and Dionysos – as a projection of archaic Southeast European mentality and ideology. What I focus on is not exactly the urban-literate kind of religion known as “Orphism,” but rather the complex of prehistoric folk beliefs out of which that religion developed. As in the case of the lion, I first deal with etymological problems, taking into account that rather divergent scholarly views have been expressed in regard to the name *Orpheus*. My option is to join and develop the opinions according to which the name under discussion is etymologically related to terms such as Greek *orphanos* ‘orphan’ and Latin *orbis* ‘deprived of’, as well as to a whole series of other terms, recorded in Indo-European languages as well as in Finno-Ugrian and Turkic languages (where such terms appear to be very early Indo-European loans). By bringing into discussion linguistic, archaeological-historical and mythological arguments, I was able to reconstruct the following evolution of the mythical figure under discussion (p. 104):

It was very probably in Thrace where Orpheus grew towards the figure we know from Greek legends. In Thrace, Orpheus (already known under that name) entered a complex process of syncretism, by which Hyperborean shamanic features fused together with autochthonous ones. The religious (and social) environment in which Hyperborean proto-Orpheus gradually became Thracian Orpheus was dominated by the figures of the Great Mother Goddess, of her divine son-and-lover (a solar divinity similar to Greek Apollo), and, last but not least, of “the Orphic king, who is a priest, prophet and teacher of his own position” (Fol 2002: 706). From that religious-cultural environment, Orpheus moved even further south [...]. In extreme-southern regions, Orpheus’s figure became associated with those of autochthonous sacred slaves known to Mycenaeans as *teojo doero*. Undeniably, even after his Hellenization, Orpheus preserved much of his original magic power, very similar both to Óðinn’s *seiðr*, and to the *kudos* (κῦδος), “royal or heroic,” discussed by Benveniste in a whole chapter (1973: 346-356). Although, in popular variants of a mythical plot, Orpheus was reduced to the figure of a lonely singer mourning after his lost wife, the survival of his truly religious side was ensured by his position as Apollo’s “slave” (or even “son”). What was left of his original magic-oracular substance remained visible in certain aspects of Orphism. Part of that substance rather secretly flowed into Christianity; or it flowed, in a simpler and more direct way, into Balkan folklore (see next chapter).

In the announced Chapter Seven, entitled “Folk-orphic survivals and Christianized variants,” I try, theoretically, to define “folk Orphism” as a vein of prehistoric beliefs still visible in Romanian ritual

⁵¹ What I originally meant by “Fertile-Crescent expansion” may now (after the publication of Ryan and Pitman’s theory of the Black Sea flood) turn out to have had its beginnings in the post-deluge (seventh-millennium BC) expansion of the population that had to flee from areas around the fresh-water Euxine Lake flooded by the waters of the Mediterranean after the geological catastrophe that created the Bosphorus (see Chapter Two of Poruciuc 2010).

folklore (of which I translated several pieces). By consideration of facts provided by archaeology and epigraphy as well as ethnology and folklore, I point out the striking coincidences between ancient Orphic tablets (with “road maps” for the use of human souls that move to the netherworld) and a peculiar kind of southwestern Romanian funeral songs, which belong to the cycle known as *Zorile*. In a special subchapter I refer to a number of “Christian adjustments” visible in a number of variants of such funeral songs. After a detailed presentation (and translation) of a very long variant of that kind, I make some brief statements of general interest:

This rather imperfectly Christianized piece, like other Romanian folk productions of the kind discussed in this chapter, contains a whole series of obviously pre-Christian elements. Among those, several folk-Orphic items (*road-choice, fountain of forgetfulness, nether-world judge, no-return spell*) remain quite evident.

It is in the final part of Chapter Seven in which I discuss yet another Orphic item, namely the classical funeral cypress that clearly corresponds to the funeral fir of the Romanians. Not surprisingly, the Oriental-European lion isogloss (discussed in Chapter Five) coincides to a great extent with the more-than-Indo-European isogloss of obviously related tree names such as Ancient Greek *brathu*, Albanian *bredh*, Romanian *brad* as well as a series of similar Semitic terms, of which “Hebrew *beroš*, [...] Chaldean *berat*, Aramaic *brot* ‘cypress’” had been indicated (in connection with Albanian *bredh*) as early as Meyer’s first etymological dictionary of Albanian (1891). My conclusion (p. 116) is the following:

In regard to fir-symbolism, we may safely assert [...] that autochthonous pre-Romanians did not have to wait for the Romans to tell them about symbolic-funerary coniferous trees. The function of such trees – some of which are still known in the Balkans under substratal names such as *brathu*, *bredh*, or *brad* – should be regarded as part of a stock of traditions genetically related to those of the Near East. It is, in my opinion, from prehistoric idioms of that part of the world that, in their turn, historical Semitic languages inherited terms for ‘cypress’ that strikingly resemble the above-mentioned terms designating coniferous trees of the Balkans. As regards symbolism, it is a well-established fact that Dacian forefathers of the Romanians decorated much of their pottery with the “little fir” motif [...]. The Romanian funerary fir, as such, is inseparable from the cosmic fir of the dirges that contain what I regard as folk-Orphic elements. Both those elements and the term *brad* ‘fir’ must come from a common prehistoric source. Of the same source, in classical times, Orphism was born. That form of mystery-religion is the one reflected in the funeral plates designed to help the souls of the dead to find the right way in the nether world.

The volume is closed by a micro-chapter entitled “Instead of an epilogue” (p. 117). In it I present my endeavor as an attempt at fulfilling, at least partially, a desire expressed by Eliade (1985: 228) in

regard to the need of “a hermeneutic adequate to such rural traditions.” I also state my intention of publishing a similar book (volume II, under the same title) in the near future. The final sentence of the volume contains an invitation:

...I invite others to join in this kind of interdisciplinary study that may contribute to the firm establishment of what Marija Gimbutas founded as *archaeomythology*.

VII. Envisaged progress

Besides my “unprovoked” intention to continue my own research in the joint fields of archaeolinguistics and archaeomythology, I have also been encouraged in that direction by other specialists’ opinions on my books and articles so far published. To begin with, it was the late Serbian scholar Bogdan Brukner, who, in an article on the “pre-Thracian horizon” (1996: 413), declared himself in favor of my concept of archaeolinguistics.⁵² Also, I found out that my views of the Palaeobalkan “onomastic union” (*Namenbund*, as defined in my volume *Archaeolinguistica*) was considered to be fully acceptable by Harald Haarman (2003: 41). Finally, many comments included in several reviews of my volume *Prehistoric Roots* of 2010 (PR-1) were quite embracing.⁵³

More detailed information about other authors’ references to my works is given in the second reference list below. Here I will mention (somewhat chronologically) only the names and countries of the ones whose views on my opinions really meant something for my own evolution: Marija Gimbutas (USA), Edgar Polomé (USA), Bogdan Brukner (Serbia), Harald Haarmann (Finland), Cristina Biaggi (USA), Alexandr Falileyev (Russia/UK), Marius Alexianu (Romania), Luminița Fassel (Germany), Janine Canan (USA), Ana Radu Chelariu (USA), Miriam Robbins Dexter (USA), Robert Moss (Australia), Cornelia-Magda Lazarovici (Romania). An additional list should include specialists (philologists, archaeologists, historians) with whom I made fruitful exchange of ideas, either by direct conversation or by correspondence: Cicerone Poghirc (Romania/France/Germany), Stelian Dumistrăcel (Romania), Hans-Martin Gauger (Germany), Kostas Kazazis (USA), Anthony Buccini (USA), Eric Hamp (USA), Zbigniew Gołąb (USA), Martin Huld (USA), Victor Friedman (USA), Marco Merlini (Italy), Gheorghe Lazarovici (Romania), Ivan Marazov (Bulgaria), Alexander Fol (Bulgaria), Numan Tuna (Turkey), Petăr Dimitrov (Bulgaria), Victor Spinei (Romania), Dan Monah (Romania), Nicolae Ursulescu (Romania).

To continue along the line suggested by the title of this final chapter, I will say that I certainly am not the only early-third-age specialist who has become acutely aware of how many of his own ideas have remained without a “body,” that is, without materialization in published articles and/or volumes. In that

⁵² Not long afterwards Brukner also became a Fellow of the newly established Institute of Archaeomythology.

⁵³ In fact, the only totally negative review (on PR-1) that I know about was published in *Folklore*, Vol. 122, Issue 3, 2011. It so happens that the author of that particular assessment is from my native city: Adina Hulubaș, a member of the ethnologic team of *Institutul de Filologie Română „Alexandru Philippide”* of Iași). I have not yet found a public opportunity to comment on that review, which I consider to be entirely out-of-place.

respect, the most pressing thing for me to do is to give a final form to the material for *Prehistoric Roots*, volume 2 (PR-2), which has been already recorded, as forthcoming, in the Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication and it already has its own ISBN (978-0-9815249-3-1). I intend to expand several of my already published articles into chapters of the forthcoming volume. The chapters that I have already brought to a final form are the ones based on Poruciuc 2005a (on “magic maidens”), Poruciuc 2007 and 2009a (both on the Thracian-Romanian “horse-hound-hawk-hunter” symbolism), Poruciuc 2009 (on the “old fairy” as judge in the netherworld), Poruciuc 2010a (on the prehistoric “bull-and-butterfly” symbolism and its connection with the Danube Script), and Poruciuc 2011 (on possible echoes of the Old European script in Germanic runes), respectively. Other chapters will be based on materials I have presented at various academic gatherings: for example, my talks on the Romanian Wood-Mother – *Muma Pădurii* (Rila, Bulgaria, 2004), or the ones on net symbolism and on horn symbolism, which I delivered at symposiums organized in Iași (Muzeul Unirii), in 2011 and 2012, respectively. Also, I intend to resume some issues that were not fully developed in *Archaeolinguistica* (for example, the interpretation of the fabulous figure of the Romanian *zgripsor*) or in PR-1 (for example, the perennial symbolism of “sleeping beauties”). Theoretically, what I will have to observe in PR-2 are further developments in the field of archaeomythology, whose applicability to Romanian and Southeast European folk traditions I will demonstrate in the pages of the forthcoming volume.

Certainly, I will also resume and develop many of the opinions I have expressed, in course of time, as a specialist in historical linguistics and archaeolinguistics. In degree of urgency, next to the publication of PR-2, there stands the material on Old Germanic elements in Romanian, a material which, in order that it should turn into a volume, needs just a preface, a coherent arrangement into chapters, a set of final conclusions, and an index. What I take into consideration in this latter case is only the material that has already been published as a series of thematically connected articles (see chapter V above), not also the bulk of unprocessed material (on a whole series of probable Old Germanisms of Romanian – OGRs) that I have in store. As I demonstrated in my most recently published articles on OGRs, archaeolinguistic principles – the one that are jointly sustained by linguistics and ethnology as well as by the archaeological-historical domain – can be proved to be both functional and productive.

Finally, I hope to find some time to resume my ideas on European substratal elements that I consider as belonging to an Egyptoid stock. In that respect, although I consider that the achievements of the Nostratic trend in linguistics are worthy of consideration, I personally try to avoid – as much as I can – resorting to abstract roots that cannot really lead back to particular ages and areas. I prefer to deal with matters such as the Cucutenian-Egyptian connection, since it is something that can be concretely sustained by archaeology and anthropology as well as by whatever we can deduce from the striking (and

numerous) lexical similarities between Ancient Egyptian and the important stock of Old European elements that have survived in many historical European languages.

On the whole, what I wanted to demonstrate by the “general report” above is that interdisciplinarity is not only possible, but also desirable, if done not as mere parallel presentation of data from various domains (on one and the same issue), but rather as *mutual confirmation*, a formula that I have repeatedly used in the pages of this paper. Today’s academic background appears to be encouraging, now that more and more specialists show themselves ready to become representatives of fields such as “ethno-religion” or “ethno-archaeology.”⁵⁴ Under such circumstances, not only linguistics proper, but also the archaeological-historical field as well as the one of cultural studies can benefit from the achievements of archaeolinguistics and archaeomythology. I consider that the two fundamentally interdisciplinary domains are methodologically valid, and that they are worthy of being approached by young researchers who feel ready to embark upon thorough investigations in the above mentioned domains. As for myself, I certainly am ready to provide good guidance for such scholars-to-be. In that respect, what we should promote is first of all *real* institutional collaboration among various faculties of Romanian universities, as well as among various institutes of the Romanian Academy, such as (concretely) the Institute of Archaeology, the Institute of History and the Institute of Romanian Philology in Iași. I know I can contribute much to such a line of development, provided that the doctoral schools of such institutions remain open to actual interdisciplinary approaches.

⁵⁴ In recent years, I myself have contributed several papers (see especially Poruciuc 2007a, 2008c and 2010b) to the domain of *halology* (“salt studies”), whose interdisciplinary character has become quite obvious.

References

1. Selected volumes, studies and articles by Adrian Poruciuc

- 1985. „Interviu cu prof. dr. Marija Gimbutas despre culturile arhaice”. *Cronica* (Iași), 1 februarie (p. 10).
- 1987. “The ‘Japhetic Connection’ as Suggested by Etymologic-Mythologic Correspondences: Hittite *Istanus* ~ Hungarian *Isten* and Old Norse *Thunarr* ~ Turkish *Tanrı*.” *Analele Științifice ale Universității “Al. I. Cuza” din Iași* (AUI), Tom XXXIII, Lingvistică, 27-32. [ISSN: 1221-8448]
- 1988. “Gheorghe Ivănescu’s Contribution to the Study of Indo-European.” *Analele Științifice ale Universității “Al. I. Cuza” din Iași* (AUI), Tom XXXIV, Lingvistică, 82-92. [ISSN: 1221-8448]
- 1990. “TOPOR and BALTAG - Two Lexical Relics from the Copper-Bronze Age.” *Kurier*, 15 (Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer), No. 15: 195-208. [ISSN 0344-4503/ ISBN 3-88339-796-2]
- 1990a. “Lexical Relics (Rom. *teafăr*, Germ. *Zauber*, Engl. *tiver*) - A Reminder of Prehistoric Red-Dye Rituals.” *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, D.C.). Vol. XXX, No. 3, 205-224. [ISSN 0025-2344]
- 1990b. „Rom. CODRU explicat pe teren indoeuropean-balcanic”. *Thraco-Dacica*, XI, No. 1&2, 193-208. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1992. “Problems and Patterns of the SE European Ethno- and Glottogenesis (ca. 6500 BC - AD 1500).” *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, DC). Vol. XXXIII. No. 1, 3-41. [ISSN 0025-2344]
- 1992a. *A Concise History of the English Language*. Chicago: Kinko (copy-center), republished in 1994, București: TIMS (copy-center).
- 1992b. „Observații asupra filonului paleobalcanic din antroponomia românească”. *Thraco-Dacica*, Tom XIII, No. 1&2, 15-23. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1993. „Observații asupra scrierii și a relației pronunție-scriere (cu referire specială la limbile indoeuropene)”. *Thraco-Dacica*, XIV, No. 1&2, 5-12. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1995. *Archaeolinguistica*. București: Bibliotheca Thracologica (IX). Institutul Român de Tracologie. [ISBN 973-95349-13-9].
- 1995a. “The etymology of Dac. *deva* in connection with Gk. *Thebai* and with Palaeobalkan phonology.” *Thraco-Dacica*, XVI, No. 1&2, 275-283. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1995b. *Istorie scrisă în engleza veche*. Iași: Editura Moldova. 144 pp. [ISBN 973-572-029-9].
- 1995c. „Marija Gimbutas, 1921-1994”. *Arheologia Moldovei*, XVIII, 361-364. [ISSN 0066-7358]
- 1996. “*Wulfstan* - An Old English Document and Its Indo-European Implications.” In: *The Indo-Europeanization of Northern Europe (247-254)*, eds Karlene Jones-Bley and Martin E. Huld. Washington, DC: Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 17. [ISBN: 0-941694-52-6]
- 1997. “The Romanian *Dolf* and the Greek *delphis-delphys-Delphoi* problem.” In: *From the Realm of the Ancestors - An Anthology in Honor of Marija Gimbutas* (130-134), ed. Joan Marler. Manchester CT: Knowledge, Ideas & Trends. [ISBN-13: 978-1879198258]
- 1997a. “Aegeo-Balkan onomastics and Fertile-Crescent roots.” In: *The Thracian World at the Crossroads of Civilizations, I - Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Thracology, Constanța-Mangalia-Tulcea, 20-26 May 1996* (218-235), eds Petre Roman et al. The Romanian Institute of Thracology. Bucharest: Vavila. [ISBN: 973-98334-0-3]
- 1997b. „O propunere de re-introducere în domeniul elementelor vechi germanice păstrate în limba română”. In: *Volum omagial Vasile Arvinte, Analele științifice ale Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași*, XLIII, 207-225. Iași: Editura Universității. [ISSN: 1841-916X]
- 1997c. “Paleo-Balkan Elements in Macedo-Romanian.” *Balkanistica*, No 10 - *Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Zbigniew Gołąb* (325-334), ed. D.L. Dyer. The SE European Studies Association. [ISSN 0360-2206]

- 1997d. “Implications of an etymologic relationship: Gk. *nemos* - Lat. *nemus* - Gaul. *nemeton* and European *NEM(ET)* ethnonyms.” *Studia antiqua et archaeologica*, Nos 3&4, 161-164. [ISSN 1224-2284]
- 1998. *Confluente și etimologii*. Iași: Polirom. 133 p. [ISBN 973-683-040-3].
- 1998a. “Phrygian and the Aegeo-Balkan *Namenbund*.” In: *Thracians and Phrygians - Problems of Parallelism* (115-118), eds Numan Tuna, Zeynep Aktüre and Maggie Lynch. Ankara: METU, Faculty of Architecture Press. [ISBN: 975-429-118-7]
- 1998b. „Scurtă introducere în domeniul elementelor moștenite de limbi europene din idiomuri preistorice egiptoide avându-și originea în Semiluna Fertilă”. *Thraco-Dacica*, Tom XIX, No. 1&2, 7-14. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1999. “The Significance of Old Germanic Elements Preserved in Romanian.” In: *Eurologistik - Ein Schritt in die Zukunft* (175-190), ed. Norbert Reiter. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. [ISBN: 3-447-04072-6]
- 1999a. “On Indo-European and Egyptoid (Fertile-Crescent) Correspondents of Thracian *-poris*.” *Thraco-Dacica*, XX, Nr. 1&2, 13-16. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 1999b. *Limbă și istorie engleză - Între William Cuceritorul și William Caxton*. Iași: Polirom. 138 p. [ISBN 973-683-193-0].
- 1999bc. *A History of Medieval English*. Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg. 150 p. [ISBN 973-98902-2-9]
- 2000. “The Shape of Sacredness: From Prehistoric Temples to Neo-Byzantine Churches.” *ReVision* (Washington, D.C.), Vol. 23, No. 1 (27-37). [ISSN: 0275-6935]
- 2000a. „Radicalul AR- ‘a (se) face, a alcătui’ > ‘a cultiva, a ara’ în limbi indoeuropene și ne-indoeuropene”. *Thraco-Dacica*, XXI, No. 1&2, 5-12. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 2000b. „Probleme ridicate de vechi germanisme păstrate în română – cazurile *bardă* și *budă*”. *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* (LI, 2, 395-417) – *Omagiu lui Gheorghe Mihăilă, la a 70-a aniversare*. Editura Academiei Române. [ISSN: 0039-405X]
- 2000c. „Antroponime și apelative în cadrul raporturilor lingvistice albano-române”. *Fonetica și dialectologie*, XIX – *Omagiu lui Andrei Avram, la a 70-a aniversare* (267-273). Academia Română. Institutul de Fonetica și Dialectologie.
- 2001. “Demeter as ‘Earth-Mother’ and Dionysos as ‘Earth’s Bridegroom’.” *Orpheus – Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies* (Sofia), No. 11 (53-63). [ISSN: 0275-6935].
- 2001a. „Corespondențe egipto-(indo)europene în vocabularul legat de toponimele isoglosei TAPA/TABA și de radicalul **tap-*”. *Thraco-Dacica*, XXII, No. 1&2, 5-14. [ISSN: 0259-1081]
- 2002. “Orphic Relics and Christianized Perpetuations in Romanian Folklore.” In: *Thrace and the Aegean – Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Thracology, Sofia-Yambol, 25-29 September, 2000*. Vol. II (747-756), ed. Alexander Fol. Sofia: International Foundation Europa Antiqua/ Institute of Thracology – Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. [ISBN: 954-90714-6-4]
- 2002a. “Thracian Lions and Romanian Lion-Carols.” In: *Πιτών– Studia in honorem Prof. Ivani Marazov* (188-208), eds R. Gičeva and K. Rabadžiev. Sofia: Anubis. [ISBN 954-426-431-0]
- 2002b. „Observații asupra modelului confluencial și asupra genezei limbii române”. In: *Identitatea limbii și literaturii române în perspectiva globalizării* (81-92), eds O. Ichim and F.-T. Olariu. Academia Română, Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”. Iași: Editura Trinitas. [ISBN: 973-8179-12-2]
- 2003. “Orpheus – Name and Function.” *Thracia XV – In Honour of Alexander Fol’s 70th Anniversary* (197-211), eds K. Jordanov, K. Porozhanov and V. Fol. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy, Institute of Thracology. [ISSN 0861-9387]
- 2003b. “The Orphic sanctuary of Littlecote and its correspondents.” *Strabon – Bulletin d’information historique* (Iași), Tome I, No. 2, 83-88. [ISSN: 1841-1800]
- 2004. *A Concise History of the English Language*. Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg. 129 p. [ISBN 973-8076-70-6].

- 2004a. “English *child* and its East and West European correspondents.” *Orpheus – Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies* (Sofia), No. 13&14, 23-28. [ISSN: 0861-9387].
- 2005. “The Romanian *dolf* ‘sea monster’ in connection with a Greek lexical family and with signs of early Eurasian religion.” *Journal of Archaeomythology* (Sebastopol, CA), Vol. 1, Nr. 1 (12-24). [ISSN: 0275-6935].
- 2005a. “Magic Maidens and Heroic Horsemen.” In: *The Rule of Mars: The Origins, History and Impact of Patriarchy (175-186)*, ed. Cristina Biaggi. Manchester, CT: Knowledge, Ideas & Trends. [ISBN: 1-879198-31-2].
- 2005b. “Lexical relics that reflect close contacts between Old Germanic and autochthonous populations in Southeast Europe.” In: *Ethnic Contacts and Cultural Exchanges North and West of the Black Sea from the Greek Colonization to the Ottoman Conquest (369-381)*, ed. V. Cojocaru. Iași: Editura Trinitas. [ISBN: 973-7834-37-2]
- 2005c. “Romanian *găman* explained through Gothic *gaman* and English *yeoman*.” In: *Tradition, Modernity and Postmodernity – International Conference, Iași, 26-29 March, 2003* (340-345), eds O. Blumenfeld and R. Andriescu. Iași: Universitas XXI, 2005. [ISBN 973-7889-00-2]
- 2006. “The Sea and the Sea-Flood in Romanian Folklore.” *Journal of Archaeomythology* (Sebastopol, CA), Vol. 2, No. 1, 65-76. [ISSN: 0275-6935]
- 2006a. „Contribuția lui Gheorghe Ivănescu în domeniul studiilor indoeuropene”. *Hermeneia*, special issue (96-104), ed. Ș. Afloroaei. Iași: Axis. [ISBN: 10973-7742-32-x]
- 2006b. „Aspecte arhaice implicate de rom. *dolf* și de corespondentele sale etimologice”. In: *Comunicare interculturală și integrare europeană* (245-252), eds Elena Dănilă et al. Academia Română, Institutul de Filologie Română “A. Philippide”. Iași: Editura Alfa. [ISBN (10) 973-8953-21-9]
- 2006c. „Observații asupra unor elemente pre-homerice perpetuate în tradiții românești și sud-est europene”. In: *Identitatea culturală românească în contextual integrării europene (711-720)*, eds M.-R. Clim, O. Ichim, L. Manea, F.-T. Olariu. Academia Română, Institutul de Filologie Română „A. Philippide”. Iași: Editura Alfa [ISBN (13) 978-973-8953-21-5]
- 2006d. “Palaeo-Balkan Elements in Romanian and Southeast European Anthroponymy.” *Orpheus – Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies* (Sofia), 16, 69-7. [ISSN: 0861-9387].
- 2007. “Survivals of the Thracian Horse-Hawk-Hound Symbolism.” In: *Thrace in the Graeco-Roman World – Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Thracology, Komotini-Alexandroupolis, 18-23 October 2005* (504-506), ed. Athena Iakovidou. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation. [ISBN: 978-960-7905-38-3].
- 2007a. “Romanian *huscă* (‘salt obtained by evaporation of salt water’) explained as an Old Germanism.” In: *L’exploitation du sel à travers le temps* (pp. 319-324), eds D. Monah, G. Dumitroaia, O. Weller and J. Chapman. Centre International de Recherche de la Culture Cucuteni – Piatra Neamț/ Institut d’Archéologie Iași. Piatra Neamț : Editura Constantin Matasă. [ISBN : 978-973-7777-03-4].
- 2007b. „Întru amintirea lui Alexander Fol (1933-2006)”. *Arheologia Moldovei*, XXX, 487-490 [ISSN 066-7358].
- 2008. “Two Romanian terms (*tureci* and *cioareci*) based on Old Germanic designations of leg-coverings.” *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* (Washington, DC), Vol 36, Numbers 1&2, 163-184. [ISSN 0092-2323]
- 2008a. “Historical Implications of a Romanian Lexical Family of Old Germanic Origin (*ban*, *banat*, *băni*, *bănu*, *bântui*).” *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, D.C.), Vol. 48, No. 3, Spring (pp.353-395). [ISSN 0025-2344]
- 2008b. „Problema vechilor germanisme păstrate în limba română”. In: *Lucrările primului simpozion internațional de lingvistică: București, 13-14 noiembrie 2007* (105-130), eds N. Saramandu, M. Nevaci, C. I. Radu. București : Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti”, Editura Universității din București. [ISBN 978-973-737-542-1].

- 2008c. „Denumirile sării și implicațiile lor în plan (indo)european”. In: *Sarea - de la prezent la trecut* (133-148), ed. Gheorghe Dumitroaia, Dan Monah. Institutul Arheologic Iași/ Centru Internațional de Cercetare a Culturii Cucuteni. Piatra-Neamț: Editura „Constantin Matasă”.
- 2008d. „Termenul regional românesc *huscă* (sare obținută prin evaporarea apei sărate) explicat ca vechi germanism”. *Arheologia Moldovei*, XXXI, 253-25. [ISSN 066-7358].
- 2008e. “From Old Germanic *gōd-spōd* to Slavic *gospod* and Romanian *gospodă*.” *Analele Științifice ale Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași – Limbi și Literaturi Străine*, XI, 117-126. [ISSN: 1841-916X]
- 2009. “The Old Fairy, Pen in Hand, in the Netherworld.” In: *Signs of Civilization – Neolithic Symbol System of Southeast Europe* (213-219), eds Joan Marler and Miriam Robbins Dexter. Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Novi Sad Branch/ Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol, CA. [ISBN 0-9815249-1-5]
- 2009a. “A Thracian Relic in Romanian Folklore: the Hunter-Horse-Hound-Hawk Formula.” *Analele Științifice ale Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași – Limbi și Literaturi Străine* (AUI), XII, 5-14. [ISSN: 1841-916X]
- 2009c. “Linguistic-Historical Implications of an Old Germanic Loan – Romanian *gard* ‘fence, enclosure, weir, garden’.” *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, DC), Vol. L, Nos 1&2, 25-70. [ISSN 0025-2344]
- 2009d. “An Opening to Remember: Meyer-Lübke’s Outlook on Old Germanisms in Romanian.” In: *Das Rumänische und seine Nachbarn* (pp. 217-231), ed. Thede Kahl. Berlin: Frank & Timme. [ISBN 978-3-86596-195-2/ ISSN 1896-0394]
- 2010. *Prehistoric Roots of Romanian and Southeast European Traditions*, preface by Miriam Robbins Dexter (UCLA), 172 p. Sebastopol, CA: Institute of Archaeomythology. [ISBN 978-0-9815249-2-4]
- 2010a. “From bull-and-butterfly to *alpha* and *psi*.” *Journal of Archaeomythology* (Sebastopol, CA), Nr. 6, 41-45. [ISSN: 0275-6935].
- 2010b (with I. Sandu, M. Alexianu, R.-G. Curcă, O. Weller). “Salt and Human Health: Science, Archaeology, Ancient Texts and Traditional Practices of Eastern Romania”. *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, DC), Vol. L, No. 3, 225-256. [ISSN 0025-2344]
- 2010c. “The Greek term *keramos* (‘potter’s clay, earthenware’) as probably inherited from a pre-Indo-European (Egyptoid) substratum.” In: *Signa Praehistorica. Studia in honorem magistri Attila László septuagesimo anno* (451-557), eds N. Bolohan, F. Mățău, F. A. Tencariu. Iași: Editura Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza.” [ISBN 978-973-703-581-3]
- 2011. “Two Old Germanisms of East Romance (Romanian *ateia* ‘to dress up’ and *brândușă* ‘crocus’) confirmed by West Romance cognates”. *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* (Washington, DC), Vol. 39, Numbers 3&4, 355-379. [ISSN 0092-2323]
- 2011a. “Etymological and Historical Implications of Romanian Place Names Referring to Salt.” In: *Archaeology and Anthropology of Salt. A Diachronic Approach – Proceedings of the International Colloquium, 1-5 October, 2008, “Al. I. Cuza” University (Iași, Romania)* (215-218), eds Marius Alexianu, Olivier Weller and Roxana-Gabriela Curcă. Oxford: BAR International Series 2198. [ISBN 978-1-4073-0754-1]
- 2011b. „Faza timpurie a relației Romania-Germania reflectată la nivelul elementelor vechi germanice păstrate în limba română”. In: *Romanizarea – Impunere și adeziune în Imperiul Roman* (255-275), ed. Alexander Rubel. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza.” [ISBN 978-973-640-647-8]
- 2011c. “Interview and Correspondence – Adrian Poruciu and Marija Gimbutas.” *Journal of Archaeomythology*, Vol 7, 8-22. [ISSN: 2162-6871].
- 2011d. “Old European Echoes in Germanic Runes?” *Journal of Archaeomythology*, Vol. 7, 8-22. [ISSN: 2162-6871].

- 2011e. “Elemente de substrat paleobalcanic în aromână.” In: *Studia linguistica et philologica – Omagiu Profesorului Nicolae Saramandu* (689-699), ed. Manuela Nevaci. București: Editura Universității din București. [ISBN 978-606-16-0055-7]
- 2012. “A new view on the Latin origin of Romanian (*f*)*sat* ‘village’, Aromanian *fsat* ‘ditch’ and Albanian *fshat* ‘village’.” In: *Balkanismen heute – Balkanisms Today – Балканизмы сегодня* (221-243), eds. Thede Kahl, Michael Metzeltin, Helmut Schaller. Wien/Berlin: LIT Verlag. [ISBN 978-3-643-50388-6]
- 2012a. “Old Germanisms in the Balkans and in Other Parts of Europe.” *Philologica Jassyensia*, VIII, 1, 181-194. [ISSN: 1841-5377].

2. A selection of other authors’ references to Adrian Poruciuc’s publications and activities

- 1989. Marija Gimbutas, *The Language of the Goddess* (San Francisco: Harper & Row), p. 115: quotation of a personal communication from A.P., regarding some prehistoric elements preserved in Romanian folklore.
- 1990. Robert Kaplan, “Bloody Romania,” *The New Republic* (6 August): A.P. presented as “an expert in Romanian folklore.”
- 1992. Edgar Polomé (signed E.P.), in *The Mankind Quarterly* (Washington, DC), XXXIII, 1. 40-41: editorial note (with both positive and critical comments) placed after the article Poruciuc 1992 published in the same MQ issue.
- 1993. Robert Kaplan, *Balkan Ghosts* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 132-133): presentation of (and a short interview with) “Adrian Poruciuc, an assistant professor at Cuza University and an expert on Romanian folklore.”
- 1996. Bogdan Brukner, “The Pre-Thracian Horizon and the Central - Balkans in the Aeneolithic” (p. 413), in *The 7th International Congress of Thracology - Reports and Summaries* (București: Institutul Român de Tracologie): expresses his approval (and adoption) of the definition of archaeolinguistics propounded in the volume Poruciuc 1995 (*Archaeolinguistica*).
- 1997. Joan Marler (ed.), in the addendum of “Contributors” to the volume *From the Realm of the Ancestors*, Manchester, CT (p. 91-92 and 635-636, respectively), makes a short introduction to the article Poruciuc 1997 (on Romanian *dolf*) and a biographical note (“Adrian Poruciuc”).
- 2000. Joan Marler, in her article “Introduction to Archaeomythology” (*ReVision*, Vol. 23, Nr. 1, 2-4), concisely presents (p. 3-4) the article Poruciuc 2000 (“The Shape of Sacredness”) that was included in the same special issue, dedicated to the domain of archaeomythology.
- 2000a. Ruxandra Alaiba, „Simboluri sacre ale culturilor pre- și indo-europene. Cultul bourului (bovideelor). Simbolismul universal al mitologemului antic al Europei”, *Thraco-Dacica*, Tom XXI, No.1-2, 295-308, refers to (and turns to account of) some ideas in Poruciuc 1995a.
- 2003. Harald Haarmann, *Geschichte der Sintflut – Auf den Spuren der frühen Zivilisationen* (München: Beck), makes use of quotations, in German translation (p. 27, 41, 80, 112), from Poruciuc 1992, 1995, 2001, 2003, respectively.
- 2005. Cristina Biaggi, as editor of the volume *The Rule of Mars: The Origins, History and Impact of Patriarchy*, Manchester, CT: Knowledge, Ideas & Trends. (“Acknowledgements” – p. 6), expresses thanks to A.P. for his contribution to the volume (Poruciuc 2005a).
- 2006. Aleksandr Falileyev, *Vostochnye Balkany na karte Ptolemeja* (München: Biblion Verlag):, quotes (p. 32) from Poruciuc 1995a (on the etymology of Romanian *Deva*) and includes the article in the reference list of his volume.
- 2007. Luminița Fassel, „Romania Germanica vetus/ Romania Germanica nova. Für eine Romanistik des XXI. Jahrhunderts”, in *Estudios Filológicos Alemanes* (Sevilla), 14, 193-206, appreciatively comments on Poruciuc’s articles on Old Germanisms preserved in Romanian (quotations from Poruciuc 1998 and 1999).

- 2009. Marius-Tiberiu Alexianu, “Adrian Poruciu la 60 de ani”, *Arheologia Moldovei*, XXXII (410-411).
- 2010. Haarmann, Harald, *Einführung in die Donauschrift*, Hamburg: Buske, quotes (p. 135) from the volume Poruciu 2010 (*Prehistoric Roots*).
- 2010a. Janine Canan, review of Poruciu 2010: “*Prehistoric Roots of Romanian and Southeast European Traditions* by Adrian Poruciu, 173 pages, Institute of Archaeomythology, Sebastopol CA, 2010,” *Journal of Archaeomythology*, Vol. 6, 105-106.
- 2010. Ana Radu Chelariu. Review-article (on the volume Poruciu 2010): “Colinde, Colinde: Studying the Prehistoric Roots of Romanian Carols” (I-II). *Vetiver – Portalul Scriitorilor Româno-Americani din New York/ Romanian-American Writers in New York* (17 Dec. 2010), <http://vetiver.weblog.ro/2010/12/17> ; the article was also published in the *Journal of Archaeomythology*, Vol. 6, 101-104.
- 2010b. Miriam Robbins Dexter/ Victor H. Mair, *Sacred Display – Divine and Magical Female Figures of Eurasia* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press), with thanks to A.P. and quotations from several of his works (p. 152-153).
- 2010c. Harald Haarmann, *Die Indoeuropäer* (München: Beck), includes Poruciu 1995 and Poruciu 2010 in his list of references (see also quotation on p. 56).
- 2010d. Harald Haarmann, „Alteuropa – Eine interdisziplinäre Expedition zu den Ursprüngen der sprachlichen und kulturellen Vielfalt Europas“, in *Europa – Europäisierung – Europäistik : Neue wissenschaftliche Ansätze, Methoden und Inhalte* (p. 39-74), eds. Michael Gehler and Silvio Vietta, Wien: Böhlau, quotes from Poruciu 1995 (*Archaeolinguistica*), which is also included in the reference list of Haarmann’s article.
- 2011. Harald Haarmann, *Das Rätsel der Donauzivilisation* (München: Beck), includes three works by A.P. in his reference list, namely Poruciu 1995, 2001, 2010; from the last one Haarmann translates a whole passage (p. 260) into German.
- 2011a. Harald Haarmann, *Writing as Technology and Cultural Ecology* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), includes two works by A.P. (Poruciu 2006 and 2010) and quotes from the former (p. 97).
- 2011b. Robert Moss, “The Goddess, Her Bridegroom and a Romanian Word-Magician,” a review-article on the volume Poruciu 2010 (The Robert Moss BLOG, mossdreams.com, May 30, 2011); the article was also published in *Journal of Archaeomythology*, Special issue, Vol. 7, 236-237.
- 2011c. Cornelia-Magda Lazarovici, review of the volume Poruciu 2010 (*Prehistoric Roots*), in *Arheologia Moldovei*, XXXIV, 321-323. Vol 7, 8-22.

3. Other authors’s works quoted in the text of this thesis

- AHDEL (ed. 1973). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (with an Appendix of “Indo-European Roots”), ed. William Morris. Boston: American Heritage Publishing Co. and Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Bechtel, F. 1917. *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Bergsträsser, G. 1983. *Introduction to the Semitic Languages*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Bonfante, G. and L. 1995. *Limba și cultura etruscilor*, transl. D. Slușanschi. București: Editura Științifică.
- Brukner, B. 1996. “The Pre-Thracian Horizon and the Central - Balkans in the Aeneolithic.” In: *The 7th International Congress of Thracology - Reports and Summaries* (413-416). București: Institutul Român de Tracologie.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, transl. J. Raffan. Harvard U.P.
- Caraman, P. 1988. *Studii de folclor*, II, ed. V. Săvulescu. București: Minerva.

- Cavalli-Sforza, L. 1997. "Genetic Evidence Supporting Marija Gimbutas' Work on the Origins of Indo-European People." In: *From the Realm of the Ancestors – An Anthology in Honor of Marija Gimbutas* (93-101), ed. Joan Marler. Manchester, CT: Knowledge, Ideas and Trends.
- Chantraine, P. 1990. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Detschew [Dečev], D. 1957. *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*. Wien: Rohrer.
- Dornseiff, F. and B. Hansen 1978. *Reverse-Lexicon of Greek Proper-Names*. Chicago: Ares.
- Eliade, M., 1978 (I), 1982 (II), 1985 (III). *A History of Religious Ideas*, transl. W. R. Trask. University of Chicago Press.
- Ernout, A. and A. Meillet 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Fraser, P. M. and E. Matthews 1987. *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names – The Aegean Islands, Cyprus, Cyrenaica*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Furneé, E. 1972. *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Gardiner, A., 1957. *Egyptian Grammar*. Oxford: Griffith Institute.
- Ghinoiu, I. et al. 2001. *Sărbători și obiceiuri – I. Oltenia*. București : Editura Enciclopedică.
- Gimbutas, Marija, 1987. "Old European Deities. With an Emphasis on Images from the Cucuteni Culture." In: *La civilisation de Cucuteni en context européen – Session scientifique dédiée au centenaire des premières découvertes de Cucuteni (Iași – Piatra Neamț, 24-28 septembre 1984 (99-124)*, eds M. Petrescu-Dîmbovița et al. Iași: Université « Al. I. Cuza ».
- Gimbutas, Marija, 1989. *The Language of the Goddess*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Gimbutas Marija, 1991. *The Civilization of the Goddess*, ed. Joan Marler. San Francisco: Harper.
- Gołąb, Z. 1997. "The Ethnic Background and Internal Linguistic Mechanism of the So-Called Balkanization of Macedonian." *Balkanistica*, 10, 13-19.
- Haarmann, H. 2003. *Geschichte der Sintflut – Auf den Spuren der frühen Zivilisationen*. München: Beck.
- Haarmann, H. 2010. *Die Indoeuropäer – Herkunft, Sprachen, Kulturen*. München: C.H. Beck.
- Hubschmid, J. 1960. *Mediterrane Substrate*. Bern: Francke.
- Ionescu, C. 1990. „Numele de familie românești”. *Limba română*, 3, 243-248.
- Jordan, I. 1983. *Dicționarul numelor de familie românești*. București : Editura Științifică.
- Ivănescu, G. 2000. *Istoria limbii române²*, ed. M. Paraschiv. Iași : Junimea.
- Jettmar, K. 1983. *Arta stepelor*, transl. C. Petrescu. București: Meridiane.
- Lahovary, N. 1963. *Dravidian Origins and the West*. Bombay: Orient Longmans.
- Landau, O. 1958. *Mykenisch-Griechische Personennamen*. Göteborg: Almqvist & Wiksells.
- Mallory, J. P. 1989. *In Search of the Indo-Europeans*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Marler, Joan 2000. "Introduction to Archaeomythology." *ReVision*, Vol. 23, Nr. 1, 2-4.
- Martinet, A. 1986. *Des steppes aux océans – L'indo-européen et les 'Indo-Européens'*. Paris: Payot.
- Meyer, G. 1891. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Mihail, Zamfira, 1978. *Terminologia portului popular românesc în perspectivă etnolingvistică comparată sud-est europeană*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Nilsson, M. P. 1972. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*, ed. E. Vermeule. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Owen, F. 1960. *The Germanic People: Their Origin, Expansion and Culture*. New Haven: College & University Press.
- Papahagi, T. 1974. *Dicționarul dialectului aromân (macedo-român)*. București: Editura Academiei.
- Pfeifer, W. et al. 2004. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Deutschen*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Pokorny, J. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Russu, I. I. 1969. *Illirii*. București: Editura Academiei.

- Ryan, W. and W. Pitman 1998. *Noah's Flood: New Scientific Discoveries about the Event that Changed History*. London: Simon & Schuster.
- Schramm, G. 1997. *Ein Damm bricht – Die römische Donaugrenze und die Invasionen des 5.-7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern*. München: Oldenbourg Verlag.
- Shevelov, G. Y. 1964. *A Prehistory of Slavic – The Historical Phonology of Common Slavic*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Simenschy, Th./ G. Ivănescu, 1981. *Gramatica comparată a limbilor indoeuropene*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Tomescu, D. 2001. *Numele de persoană la români – Perspectivă istorică*. București: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Vennemann, Th. 2004a. "Phol, Balder and the birth of Germanic." In: *Etymologie, Entlehnungen und Entwicklungen – Festschrift für Jorma Koivulehto zum 70. Geburtstag (439-458)*, eds Irma Hyvärinen et al. Helsinki: Société Néophilologique
- Wallis Budge, E. A. 1978. *Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary*. New York: Dover.
- Zgusta, L. 1964. *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prag: Akademie.