THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE SOUTH-EAST EUROPEAN SOCIETIES IN THE MIDDLE AGES — A LINGUISTIC VIEW

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to review several terms spread over a quite large area in South-East Europe. The starting point of our investigation is the Romanian language understood as inheriting an important Thracian vocabulary, specifically referring to the social and political structure of the Early Middle Ages. The terms discussed are not exclusively Romanian. In fact, they reflect — roughly speaking — the ancient extension of the Thracian speakers, i.e. the present-day territories of Romania, Bulgaria, Soviet Moldavia and parts of South- and South-West Ukraine, Slovakia, Hungary and Yugoslavia.

Speaking of the certain amount of Thracian words transmitted till modern times 'via Romanian' we must of course understand 'via Late-Latin/Proto-Romanian' in still confuse times when linguistic and cultural changes diffused without control. It was an age of fundamental changes but not without solid links with the previous cultural achievements. It is by no means our intention to over-estimate the importance of the Late-Latin/Proto-Romanian elements in South-East Europe, more or less affected by the Thracian substratum, but to point out that the only plausible manner of explaining these forms is to assume — even if only as a 'hypothesis of first-stage investigation' — a substratum influence quite homogeneous in its phonetic changes and, generally, in its linguistic phenomena.

We shall therefore focus on the following forms in Romanian together with their parallels in other neighbouring idioms: (1) ban\(^1\) 'overlord, master' and ban\(^2\) 'money, coin'; (2) cioban\(^1\) 'recipient, pot' and cioban\(^2\) 'shepherd'; (3) giupin /gupin/, later jupin 'master' (cf. ban\(^1\)); (4) stăpın 'master'. At a first sight, all these forms witness a common component: -ban, -pan > -pin, with the probable meaning 'master, leader'. Does this reflect a real old heritage or are we victims of an illusion? Or, otherwise put, do all these forms reflect a common origin, form one language

---

\(^1\) The same Mongolian-Turkik form bojan was sometimes invoked in explaining another confuse term: Rom. boier, S.-Cr. böjarin, pl. boljari, Hung. boijér, Russ. bojarin, etc. As we tried to prove in Byzantium, Ms. these Balkanic forms should be explained from the old Romanian form boier with two meanings: (1) herdsman, and (2) cattle-owner, hence 'rich, boyar'. This family should be therefore considered Late Latin/Proto-Romanian derived from bos, hence bouarius 'cattle-shepherd', Rom. bou, pl. boi 'ox', hence bouar 'herdsman' and boier, with its two meanings.

\(^2\) Gr. ἁπάζων 'pot, recipient' as well as ἄπρος 'orifice' are derived from ἀπο 'to spread out, to flow', cf. Chantraine 1968—1980: 316 and Frisk 1960. On another hand, Rom. ciubar, Czech. džber, Germ. Zuber are — of course — of Indo-European origin and to be discussed in the same context as cioban 'pot' (see the main text).
spoken in South-East Europe? How shall we explain the large diffusion of some of these terms?

Before giving a coherent answer it is imperious to reconsider these very forms.

(1) *Ban*. 'Overlord, master' and 'money, coin'.

The word was generally analyzed separately for these two meanings, as follows:

1.1. The sense 'overlord, master' has been interpreted as:

(a) Slavic heritage, now accepted by several scholars (Cihac 1870—1879, II: 8; Macrea 1958: 66; Rosetti 1978: 297, 431). This hypothesis was supported by the fact that similar forms are witnessed in Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Hungarian (*ban, bán*).

(b) A version of the previous hypothesis is that in Romanian the word should be explained as a Hungarian influence (Tiktin 1903—1916: 152; DA I: 471; Iorga 1905, I: 135; Șăineanu 1929: 52; Cioranescu 1960 ff.: 64, with hesitations; Tamás 1967: 90; Mihăilă 1974: 74).

(c) Slavic or Hungarian origin (Coteanu et al. 1975: 72). Such an undecided opinion was surely supported by the fact that in both Slavic and Hungarian the word is not satisfactorily explained. A very brief review of the etymological analysis from this 'non-Romanian' perspective is useful:

(a) For Miklosich the word is of Persian origin; from Persia it was transmitted into Europe by the Turks (Miklosich 1884, I: 11; 1886: 7; Matzenauer 1870: 103). It can be easily argued that such a hypothesis is feeble, as long as Turkish *ban* is a rare word. Besides, the Turkish influence was quite late and could not impose a term of social structure. On the other hand, Hung. *bán* is 'a governor at the frontier of Hungary' (Benkő et al. 1967); this detail is interesting but ignored, perhaps unvoluntarily.

(b) Berneker assumes that Slavic *ban* is of Mongolian origin, the original form being *bojan*, hence *ban* (Berneker 1908—1913: 42; Bezlaj 1976 ff.: 10). But the phonetic changes are not explained and they are not at all easy to be accepted as such.

(c) It is sometimes hypothesized that Slavic *ban* is of Persian origin, transmitted to Europe by the Avars (Onions 1969: 72). The reference to Persian *ban* cannot be avoided but how to explain the 'route' of the word to Europe? Are the Avars (or, according to another version, the Turks) responsible for the spread of the word in South-East Europe?
We basically doubt such a hypothesis. But before giving an answer to this question it is useful to review some opinions regarding the homophone *ban*' 'money, coin'.

1.2. *Ban* 'money, coin' (in Romanian, as vivid form; also Polish and Bulgarian dialectally, obsolete).

(a) Isolatedly, some linguists speak of 'a Slavic element' (Cihac 1870—1879, II: 8). It is, of course, a difficult point, as long as the meaning 'money, coin' is not at all specifically Slavic, on the contrary. The distribution of this meaning clearly proves that a discussion regarding the ultimate origin of this semantic field cannot start from Polish or Bulgarian.

(b) One of the most interesting explanations of this word was given a century ago: "*Ban* is the coin of the *Ban* /see first meaning discussed above/ just as the Italians call the coin of duke *ducato* and the English call the coin of the Sovereign *sovereign*" (Hasdeu 1887—1898: 2448). This explanation has been accepted by many other linguists (Tiktin 1903—1916: 151; Săineanu 1929: 52; Macrea 1985: 66). A version of this hypothesis is that the Romanian word is equally of Hungarian origin, an opinion much advocated by Hungarian linguists (Tamás 1967: 91; accepted, without arguments, in Rosetti 1986: 384). The word under consideration cannot by any means be of Hungarian origin for the simple reason that this meaning is absent in Hungarian (dialectal Transylvanian forms are not relevant because they may be — and are — under the Romanian influence).

(c) A particularly interesting and very original explanation, almost forgotten, is exposed by S. Pușcariu (DA I: 472; Pușcariu 1923) who considers that Rom. *ban* 'money, coin' should be explained together with Arumanian (Macedo-Romanian) verb *a bână* 'to live' (cf. Papahagi 1974: 191) as a heritage from a pre-Roman (i.e. Thracian) form *bann-* 'life — cattle — money', following the same change of meaning like Latin *pecus* 'herd' — *pecunia* 'money'.

According to this theory, there is no connection between the meanings 'overlord, master' and 'money', the similitude being therefore a result of hazard, in change the antiquity of the word becomes considerable, assumed of Thracian origin. It is what the author believes, but from completely other reasons and with other arguments (see below). It should be now observed that the Thracian reconstructed form *bann-* is completely unfounded nor is it supported by the testimonies in the Greek and Latin writers (cf. Dečev 1957).

(d) Finally, some scholars simply consider that the word is obscure (Cioranescu 1960 ff.: 65; Coteanu et al. 1975: 72). In the given circumstances this undoubtedly is a correct position.

1.3. It is our hypothesis that we can explain fairly well both the meaning
'overlord, master' and 'money, coin' in a wholesome way. Before referring to other forms, we hypothesize that the word really is of Thracian origin — as Puşcariu brilliantly observed — from a reconstructed form *bān- assumed akin to Persian bān 'master', also 'house' (Horn 1893: 40), and pān (p/b as an old Indo-European alternation, already analyzed by Benveniste 1962: 168 in the case of the root *pēHās > *pō- 'to drink'). The Indo-European root of these forms is quite clear: on the one hand *pā- 'to protect, to feed', on the other hand *pōi- 'to protect the cattle, to graze'. These two roots are separately analyzed by Pokorny (1959: 782, 839), also separately but noting their probable initial kinship in Morris et al. 1979: 1532, 1535.

Secondly, the meaning 'coin, money' of bān seems to have cognate parallels in Old Indian: paṇāh 'a kind of coin' (Mayrhofer 1953, II: 196), paṇ 'to honour, buy, negotiate', papa 'to play for winning; coin; house' (Monier 1976: 580).

Are these similarities simple hazard? They might be, though it is difficult to think so. In this perspective, it would be perhaps useful to revert to Hasdeu's opinion that 'the bān is the coin issued under the authority of a Ban', observing that the parallel 'lord, master' — 'coin' seems to be much older than Hasdeu thought, perhaps preserving a sense developed in the satem area. We suggest therefore to consider the double meaning of bān not as result of simple hazard but the preservation of very old parallel of sense 'overlord, master' — 'coin' (a third one 'house' is also witnessed by Old Indian and Persian). It is not the purpose of this paper to consider the beginnings of trade and coinage, but to draw attention on some interesting aspects.

Summarizing the data available so far, it can be surmised that the Thracians has a form *bān 'master, overlord' and, very probably, a parallel form *bān 'money, coin'. Further facts should substantiate this hypothesis.

(2) Cioban /čoban/ 'recipient, pot' and 'shepherd'. (Meaning 'shepherd' spread over a large area in SE Europe).

As in the case discussed above, where the parallel 'master, lord' — 'coin' occurred, in this case another parallel awaits a proper consideration. The forms to start with are:

Rom. cioban /čobán/; common sense: 'shepherd', but also 'wooden pot, recipient' (Transylvania);

Hung. csobány 'wooden pot', also csobán(y) 'shepherd';

Old Czech čbán, mod děbán 'wooden pot'.

As we know, these reciprocally significant forms have never been considered together as an etymologically compact group, probably because they require complex investigations and, perhaps much more important, to abandon the deeply rooted preconceived idea that cioban, čoban 'shepherd' is a Turkish influence. The facts are, in our opinion, simple enough and do not require special devices of investigation. Anyway, a brief review of the topic is necessary.
In what concerns the Romanian forms, it was generally assumed that *cioban 'pot' is a Hungarian influence (DA II: 435), the Hungarian word being, in its turn, borrowed from Slovak with the specific phenomenon of svarabhakti: Slovak *čbán > Hung. csobán (Benkő et al. 1967: 545), with the observation that "probably there is no connection between csobán 'shepherd' and csobán(y) 'pot'" (id.), yet without any further attempt in explaining this strange similitude, be it a result of hazard or not.

On the other hand, the situation of the Slavic terms is equally obscure to the Slavists. The situation could be summarized thus:

(a) For Miklosich there should be a similitude of some terms like the already quoted Romanian and Hungarian forms, plus Rom. zbanca 'a recipient', Lithuanian izbonas, zbonas, uzbonas. This similitude is striking, yet zbanca may be considered a deformation of the Czech and Slovak džbán (how?), the situation — as a whole — remaining as confuse as before (Miklosich 1886: 37).

(b) For Berneker, the Slavic word is 'dunkel' (Berneker 1908—1913: 165).

(c) Referring to the Baltic forms, a Polish or White-Russian origin is suggested (Pol. dzban, zban, WRuss. žban), which is very probable but is no solution to the problem as a whole (Fraenkel 1955—1965: 188).

(d) V. Machek reconstructs an Old Slavonic form *č6van' and even a common Slavic č6ban' /??!!/, approaching the forms to Greek κυβος (Machek 1971: 138). Though the Czech scholar makes a bold attempt in explaining these facts and suggests a radical solution (the common Slavic origin) his hypothesis is feeble and completely unfounded, including the approach to džber 'a recipient', Rom. ciubăr /čubăr/, German Zuber, which are considered 'pra-evropsky' (pre-Indo-European?).

The facts could be therefore summarized thus:

(I) In Hungarian both csobán 'pot' and csobán(y) 'shepherd' are borrowings; the topic cannot be therefore solved starting from this point.

(II) The bizar parallel 'pot, recipient'/ 'shepherd' is preserved only in Romanian and Hungarian, but as long as the latter cannot be the lending idiom, it is feasible that some brighter perspectives may arise referring to the Romanian forms.

These preliminary conclusions are, in our opinion, obvious and generally not contradicting the suggestions presented by some prominent scholars. It should be also observed that a sense of borrowing of the type Slovak>Hungarian>Romanian is hardly conceivable. Furthermore, it is observable that the Slavic forms represent
an assimilation (autochthonization) of a foreign word heard *čoban or *čuban (ćuban in Macedo-Rom., cf. Flora 1985: 89).

These observations will be reconsidered after reviewing the situation of the homophone cioban 'shepherd' in Romanian. First of all it is to observe that many other synonyms are used, e.g.:

(1) pačurar — Lat. pecurarius, from pecus;
(2) pastor — Lat. pastor, akin to pasco, pascere;
(3) oier, derived from oïe, pl. oi — Lat. ovis;
(4) mocan — unknown origin, very probably old archaic autochthonous term;
(5) baci — unexplained (further discussions in the sense of a pre-Indo-European relic in Byzantion, ms);

(6) cioban — considered, in general, as a Turkish influence (Cihac 1870—1879, II: 565; Tiktin 1903—1916: 354, 'balkanisches Wort'; Löbel 1894: 32; Săineanu 1900, II: 128; 1929: 130; Puşcariu et al. 1916 ff., II: 435, with the precious observation that the word occurs rarely in Macedo-Romanian; Puşcariu 1976: 313, 347; Macrea et al. 1958: 145; Cioranescu 1960 ff.: 185; Coteanu et al. 1975: 151).

This rich synonymy in Romanian, unique perhaps in Europe, is not a simple hazard but reflects the importance of this activity among the Romanians. If so, a serious question arises: why should have the Romanians borrowed a Turkish word for denoting an activity in which they were perfect specialists all over the Balkans (the word Vlach is often synonymous with 'shepherd') and for which their own language offered and offers many other equivalents? Did the Romanians like the Turkish word so much that they simply wanted un de plus? It seems that this aspect passed ignored by all those who studied this topic, though it appears to us of the highest importance. But not only the synonymic aspect has been ignored, but also the historical facts: could the late Ottoman influence impose such a word which belongs to the basic vocabulary? And, important as well, how should we explain the sense 'pot, recipient'?

Among all these hypotheses — unacceptable as we can see — one remarkable exception: B. P. Hasdeu, who firstly assumed a pre-Roman, Thracian origin of the word akin to Avestan fšu-bān 'herdsman' (Hasdeu 1973, II: 95—141; the study had been initially published in 1874). He later abandoned this brilliant hypothesis replacing it by an opinion suggesting a rather Tartar origin (Hasdeu 1887—1898: 2298). It is no better solution, but it reflects his preoccupation of finding a plausible explanation, realizing that the Turkish (Ottoman) influence is impossible.

The facts can be therefore summarized as follows:

(a) Rom. cioban 'shepherd' is surely non-Turkish;
(b) Rom. cioban should be explained in its double meaning: 'pot, recipient' and 'shepherd'.
If this is correctly understood, the problem is theoretically solved, the real difficulty consisting in finding the primitive connection between the two spheres of meaning, which is:

- 'shepherd' understood as PROTECTOR of livestock;
- 'recipient' understood as PROTECTOR of liquids,

both derived from a primitive root meaning 'to cover, to protect', hence 'to graze, to contain'. Given the correspondences already observed between the Balkanic terms and Persian, it is understandable that we must look for a primitive root in the Indo-European heritage, where two roots could be considered:

(a) IE *kadh- 'to cover, to protect', preserved in forms like
   (1) helmet, hat: Lat. cassis (*kadh-tis), OHG huot, etc.
   (2) care, defence: OHD huota Germ. Hut, f.
   (3) to graze, shepherd: MHG hüeten, OHG huoten, huoten Germ. Hüter
   'shepherd', behüten 'to graze'.
   (Forms in Pokorny 1959: 516; Morris et al. 1979: 1520).

(b) IE *(s)keu- 'to cover', in forms like
   (1) roof, protection, cover: OlInd. ku-kūla 'a pod', pāṃsu-kūla 'priest garment', Arm. čiw 'roof, shelter';
   (2) room, house: Arm. xuč 'room', Oir. cūl 'shelter';
   (3) genitals: Latvian kūja, Gr. κῦδος 'female genitalia', Cymric cwd 'Hodensack';
   (4) pot, recipient: OlInd. kōśa, kušapa-, kušayā-;
   (Pokorny 1959: 951; Morris et al. 1979: 1540).

It is clear now that Rom. cioban /čoban/ together with its Persian correspondent forms čuban, čoban, šupan, which are for long known as the origin of the Turkish word čoban 'shepherd' must be explained as a compound with the first part IE *(s)keu- 'to cover, to protect' and the second part bän analyzed above, with the expected treatment of IE group *keu- to č in Persian and Thracian; from the latter language the word spread throughout the Balkans where it surely is much older than its Turkish equivalent of Persian origin.

The Turkish origin of the Balkanic term 'čoban' should be considered obviously impossible. The confusion was produced by the similar forms existing from Persia to South-East Europe. But this cannot confuse us and lead to an erroneous analysis. It should be equally reminded that Turkish čoban is a bookish word (Red-

---

3 The difficult and much disputed aspects connected to the Thracian phonetic changes cannot be discussed here. It should be anyway observed that an evolution IE *(s)keu- 'to cover' > Thr. č, Pers. č, Slavic č/č/č is normal.

4 Persian words in the neighbouring languages are considered by Deeters (in Deeters, Solta and Inglisian 1963: 34), where Rom. cioban is viewed rather as a related term to Persian than a Turkish influence. On the other hand, a root Šp, Šup, Šw, Šuw- was suggested for the Persian word (Horn 1893: 171). This hypothesis is hardly acceptable.
another detail proving that the Balkanic words cannot be derived from Turkish but, quite precisely, from Thracian, like all the other forms considered in this paper. This will be clearer if referring to other examples.

(3) Cioban, čoban 'shepherd' and giupin, župan, jupin, župan 'master, lord'. The following solutions were offered in explaining the origin of the word:

(a) In Romanian it is assumed that the term is of Slavic origin (Cihac 1870—1879, II: 161; Tiktin 1903—1916: 880; Dragomir 1921: 147, 165; Săineanu 1929: 351; Rosetti 1978: 318, 344), though is sometimes pointed out that the oldest Romanian form witnesses the phonetic structure with g: giupin /gupin/, which is a 'difficult' detail, showing that this form is older than that with ž /j/, in Romanian. It was suggested that this detail would witness 'an immediate borrowing from the Slavs' (Skok 1936: 34; Popović 1960: 609; Mihăilă 1971: 360). But the hypothesis of an 'immediate borrowing' does not clarify the problem in its complexity.

(b) For other linguists the origin of the word is unknown (Giuglea 1922: 361; Pușcaru 1976: 256; Cioranescu 1960 ff.: 458; Coteanu et al. 1975: 482). This undoubtedly is a correct interpretation of the available data but still does not solve the topic.

(c) Even a Latin origin was once suggested, namely a Late Latin form *giupanus < Gr. gypē + -ānus (Giuglea 1923: 604; reconsidered in Diculescu 1927). The hypothesis is obviously impossible, but is interesting by showing that some linguists somewhat felt the necessity for another explanation.5

In our opinion, Rom. giupin and Slavic župan should anyway be discussed closely connected with cioban, čoban, as long as the two groups show a similar composition: čo-, ču- as compared to gu- (The Romanian phonetism is surely the oldest) or žu- in the Slavic area also later in Romanian, in the latter case the phonetic evolution being explainable either as a normal change from ģ /spelled gi/ to ţ /spelled j/ (following the same phonetic rules like the Latin elements, e.g. Lat. jocus > *gocu > joc, cf. It. giuoco) or a Slavic influence supported (and supporting) the normal internal evolution. This is a secondary aspect, a definite answer being possible after a general consideration of the forms.

The context in which these words are discussed leads to the reconstruction of a Thracian prototype *gupan-, possibly also *gupăn-, if we accept the idea that Thracian had a neutral phoneme /ə/. As compared with the previously discussed form

---

5 It is not useless to note — no matter the ultimate etymon may be — that the Czech-Polish form pán, pan 'master, gentleman' is also derived from župan. The phonetic changes took place in the Czech-Slovak area and can be reconstructed like župan > *spán > pán by compensatory lengthening of the vowel for the loss of ū (Brückner 1970: 393). Machek's explanation Czech pán from župy pán > župan is totally unconvincing, just like the alternative župa + -an > *župan (Machek 1971: 731).
*čoban- (in Thracian) — developed later into modern forms like Rom. cioban, Alb. čoban, Hung. csobán(y), etc. — it is quite clear that both forms support one another and should be anyway analyzed together. If our hypothesis is accepted, we face a quite interesting detail of Thracian (probably, more exactly, Late Thracian) phonetic alternance: *čo-ban, *ču-bân- as compared to *gu-pân-, *gu-pən-, i.e. č / ğ and bân-/ pân-, pən-. The author has no miraculous solution in explaining this particular phenomenon but facts are quite clear (see infra).

(4) Stâpin 'a master', Slavic *stopan'b 'id.'.

After the previous discussions, it has become hopefully clear that this word should be discussed in this context. But not always happened so:

(a) It is generally assumed that the word is of Slavic origin in Romanian (Cihac 1870—1879, II: 351; Tiktin 1903—1916: 1483; Şâineanu 1920: 613; Rosetti 1978: 320; 1986: 287). Indeed similar parallels are present among Slavic speakers but is the word Slavic?

(b) A Latin origin was also suggested, from *stipanus < stips 'a small coin' + -ānus (Giuglea 1923, reconsidered by Puşcariu 1976: 283). It is also the solution advocated for the previous case giupfn (supra).

(c) Latin origin as well but from hospitanus (Barić 1919: 93-4).

(d) Unknown origin (Coteanu et al. 1975: 189).


It is interesting enough to observe that only this word was tentatively explained as a Thracian heritage though — obviously enough — the other forms are also eloquent in this respect. This solution — firstly suggested by Philippide — is undoubtedly the only feasible. It is now reconsidered in the light of the data presented here. The closest parallels are in Sanskrit: staphāti, sthāpana 'to stay, to maintain', sthā-pin 'image-maker', etc. (cf. Monier 1976: 1262). It is clear therefore that the first of the compound reflects IE *sta- 'to be, to stay' (Pokorny 1959: 1004; Morris et al. 1979: 1542). The second part -pîn (in Romanian), -pan (among the Slavic speakers) clearly reflects the already analyzed form -ban, -pan 'master, lord, leader'.

(5) Early attestations of the Thracian forms

A decisive proof of our hypothesis would be the ancient witnesses, the written testimonies. As long as the Thracian did not write (at least according to present-day
knowledge) the situation seems desperate. Yet, there are precious Thracian words — mainly place-names and personal names — preserved in the Greek and Latin writers. Are these useful to our purpose? Surely yes, but before analyzing such Thracian forms in Greek or Latin spelling an important observation: Greek, like Latin, had no special graphic sign for a series of phonemes like č, ĭ, Ž, š and others, specific — even inevitable — in a satem language like Thracian. If a Thracian word had such a specific phoneme, it is clear that the Greeks could not spell it correctly, deforming it more or less. Of course, the Greek (or Latin writers) cannot be blamed for this, as their purpose was not to offer a scientific notation of the words heard (such a notation would have been impossible anyway), neither could they foresee the extraordinary importance of their clumsy notations. They simply aimed at informing their co-nationals about an ethnic or geographic reality. If these preliminary observations are correctly understood, some Thracian forms in Greek or Latin spelling are of paramount importance to us.

Thus, the reconstructed Thracian word *ban- and *pan-, possibly also *p n- is attested in some personal names ending in -paneus, -πανεζ, -πανες, -anes (Devčev 1957: 42, with reference to the IE root *pə - 'to graze', see supra). These forms should be discussed together with Illyrian Panes (Russu 1969: 231).

It is an interesting to observe that some b-forms (witnessing that the postulated b/p was real in Thracian) appear with the meaning 'fortress' (cf. the sense 'house' v. 'master' in Persian), e.g. place-name Bavič; in Dacia mediterranea, also personal name Bačtov (Dečev, 1957). The same meaning appears with p-spelling in Pánov, a city in Propontis, with the corresponding ethnikon Πάντες, if these forms are really Thracian, possibly also Scythian or 'Scythoid' (Zgusta 1964: 355).

Giupin, for which we expect a Thracian prototype *gupan-, also *gupa n- is abundantly attested in somewhat unexpected spellings like Diuppanes, Dio-panes, Διουπανες, Διουπανες, Διουπανες, Diurpanes, Diurpaneus (Dečev 1957: 141, 150; Russu 1967: 104). The name is mainly known as that of a Dacian king Duras-Diurpaneus (in our hypothesis, a real pronunciation *Duras- Ġupan-, see infra), mentioned to have reigned between the death of Burebista and the advent of Decebalus, i.e. first century A.D. It is for us obvious that the oscillations in spelling diu-, dio-, dyr-, dor-, etc. are but desperate attempts in noting a phoneme inexistent in Greek: ġ. In this view, r in some these spellings does not reflect any actual sound /r/ but a pseudo-spelling. The word should have been pronounced *gupan, *gupan n-, as the parallels clearly show.

--

6 See also Alb. banik 'sheath', bánē, banésē 'dwelling' (cf. Pers. bán 'house'). The connection to Macedo-Romanian a bôna 'to live', bánă 'life, peace' is very obscure and, arguably, as a mere result of hazard (cf. Papahagi 1974: 191).

7 The opinion that Thracian personal names Diuppanes, Diurpaneus, etc. should be explained from IE *derep- 'to see' (Russu 1967: 104) is of course impossible.

8 Further discussions and details in our Byzantion.
Cioban, čoban, with a reconstructed Thracian prototype *čoban-, čuban­
is identifiable in the form Κυβείνον / Κυβείνον στρος / Κώμη (Dečev 1957: 269), with the spelling ky- instead of ču-, čo-, for which Greek had no graphic equi­valent.

Stāpin, Sl. stopanb seemingly has no witness in the Greek and Latin writers; yet the co-radical place-name Στένης is attested in the Thracian territory (Procopius, De aedificiis 4,4), for which cf. Rom. stīnā 'sheepfold' with Balkanic parallels. The absence of this form in the Greek or Latin writers dealing with Thracian realities should not impede the correct understanding of the word as Thracian. It is interesting though that despite this detail, this was the only word — out of all analyzed in this paper — for which the Thracian origin has lately become accepted by several scholars. It should be anyway viewed in the light of the other parallels with the similar meaning 'master, leader'.

A similar situation connected to the approximative spelling of the Thracian words is found in the Mediaeval attestation of giupfnl giupanl župan. In this respect a particular consideration should be given to an interesting testimony in an Avar text found in Sinnicolau-Mare (Romanian Banat, West Romania). This testimony is sometimes considered as the earliest witness in the Middle Ages of a term connected to the social and political structure of South-East Europe. It is true that the term was interpreted as an Avar influence, but this was in accordance with the largely spread conceptions concerning the Balkanic civilization (Machek 1971). Here is the text:

BOYAA • ZOAIIAN • TECH • ΔΥΓΕΤΟΙΓΗ
BOTTAOYA • ZOAIIAN • ΤΑΙΓΠΟΙΓΗ • ΤΑΓΖΙΓΗ • TAICH

Buila zoapan tāsi dūgātugi
Butaul zoapan tayruyi ičigi tāsi
"Buila-župan made the cup, (this) cup
'which Butaul-župan ordered to be adapted for being hung".

This text was analyzed by J. Németh (1932) who assumed that the forms ZOA­IIAN and ZΩAIIAN should be read *čaban, so Buta-ul čaban would mean 'son of Bota/ from the breed of/ čaban', Buila-čaban would mean 'Buila/ from thr breed of/ čaban'. Németh is inclined to find a support of his hypothesis in Constantin Porphyrogenetos (De adm. imp. 37); in this view, the forms have nothing to do with Slavic župan.9

9 "ZΩAIIAN hat also mit dem sl. župan nichts zu schaffen. Wir haben es hier mit einem türkischen Worte zu tun, wie auch alle übrigen Wörter der Inschrift türkisch sind. Wenn aber so ist, so können wir den Buchstaben z in ZΩAIIAN nur als dž, č lesen, da der laut z im Türkischen im Anlauten nicht vorkommt". We agree with Németh that the original sound was č and/or dž but from other reasons and with other arguments.
Following our hypothesis, it is most probable that the forms \( \text{ZOAnAN}, \text{ZQAAnAN} \) are nothing else than \( \text{župan/ župan} \) as terms referring to the social and political structure of the newcomers. This changes fundamentally 'classical' conceptions which view early South-East European civilization as a result of important Oriental (Avar or Turkik in general) influences. In our view, the newcomers borrowed civilizational terms from the autochthonous inhabitants who anyway had more complex social organization. Indeed no Oriental influence can be postulated in either case of those analyzed in this paper.

DISCUSSION

The words analyzed in this paper represent an old Indo-European heritage transmitted until modern times via Thracian to the whole South-East area. We started our investigation from Romanian, considered here as reflecting conservative aspects of the Thracian substratum influence. The terms considered as Thracian fill an important gap in our knowledge regarding the social political structure of the Thracian society, a structure preserved later in the Middle Ages throughout the Balkans. The significant spread of the terms in modern times roughly corresponds to the territory inhabited by Thracians. Linguistically, the situation can be summarized thus:

(a) IE \( *pā-, \) also \( *pōi- \) 'to protect; to graze'

Thracian \( *bān-, \) 'overlord, master', also \( *pān \) (seemingly only in compounds)\(^{10}\).

Rom. \( \text{ban, bán} \) (undoubtedly a Romanian influence, not vice-versa), Serbo-Croatian \( \text{ban} \) 'overlord' (a specific term of the political structure). Meaning 'coin' is seemingly derived from that of 'master, overlord', possibly at a very early time (late Proto-Indo-European preceding the expansion) as shown by the Old Indian forms (supra).\(^{11}\)

\(^{10}\) Once explained the origin and meaning of the Thracian form \( *bān, pān \) (with its parallels) it is not useless to approach to the Greek name of the god \( \text{Pan,} \) unexplained so far satisfactorily (Chantraine 1968—1980: 855; Frisk 1960: 470). In our hypothesis, the name of the Greek god of shepherds simply means 'shepherd' as a heritage from the Indo-European vocabulary, eventually via Thracian, as the forms analyzed strongly indicate. But this is only a digression, yet useful to the topic as a whole.

\(^{11}\) In a recent study concerning an ancient token system, precursor to numerals and writing (Denise Schmandt-Besserat, Archaeology 39, 6, Nov.-Dec., 32—39) we read that the Sumerians had two grain measures: (1) \( \text{ban,} \) equivalent to c. 1 liter, and (2) \( \text{bariga,} \) equivalent to c. 1 bushel. Should there be any connection between Sumerian \( \text{ban,} \) and Thraco-Balkanic \( *bān \) 'money, coin' and 'overlord'? The similarity could be one of simple hazard and thus the problem is solved. But if the similarity reflects an old equivalent of exchange, can we assume an old borrowing from a non-Indo-European idiom into Proto-Indo-European? It is not the purpose of this paper to answer such a difficult question but this perspective might prove full of important consequences. For the time being we limit to showing that the terms analyzed are not Turkish (or Turkic) and this must become the fundament to further investigations, including the possibility of non-IE (possibly pre-IE) terms in Proto-Indo-European.
(b) IE *(s)keu- 'to cover, to protect'

(1) Thracian *ču-bān-, čo-bān- 'shepherd'; ču-forms seem the oldest reflecting the treatment IE *eu — Thr. ā (further discussions and examples in our Byzantion, Ms.).

Rom. cioban 'shepherd' also 'recipient', a parallel witnessing an early development of the meaning 'to cover' — (1) 'to graze sheep, shepherd' and (2) 'cover, recipient'. Meaning recipient is preserved only in Hungarian and Czech/Slovak as an obvious Romanian influence. Meaning 'shepherd' preserved throughout the Balkans: Bulg. čoban, čobanin, S.-Cr. čoban, čobanin, Alb. čoban, Mod. Gr. τιμωνις; Turkish coban should be regarded as a Persian influence. The Turkish word made the analysis difficult as many linguists were inclined to consider the South-East European words of Turkish origin. It is obvious that the Turks could not influence these languages as long as pastoralism was very developed in this area and could not be influenced in a way or another by the Turks or the Turkish language respectively.

(2) Thracian *gu-pān-, ġu-p an- 'a lord, master', reflected in Rom. giupin /ġupin/, later jupin, also among Slavic speakers in the form župan.

(c) IE *stā- 'to stay, to be'

Thracian *stā-pān-, probably also *stā -pān-, stā -p an 'master', with second element like in *ban, *čoban-, *gupan- and their modern preserved equivalents.

Rom. stāpin 'master' and Slavic reconstructed form *stopani (with the observation that the form is by no means proto-Slavic). Compound built up as giupin, jupin, župan.

In the light of the facts presented in this paper, we assume that both phonetic changes from Proto-Indo-European via Thracian till modern times and the semantic field do not allow to replace 'affinities' by 'borrowings from', e.g. from Turkish or another oriental language. Obviously enough, the words considered are not 'Oriental' or Slavic (in the sense of Proto-Slavic). The presence of these forms on a large area in South-East Europe is normal, reflecting a common cultural pattern (Thracian) and cultural diffusion.

An interesting question arises: if Romanian may be assumed as preserving a substratum influence how should we regard the forms in the Slavic languages? Are they 'Proto-Romanian' or 'late Thracian' terms? An answer to this question implies an answer to another important question: until when was Thracian spoken? Did the first Slavs still hear Thracian spoken? These are complex aspects which require complex investigations. These questions will not be answered here. We expect further
discussions to our paper and further consideration of the beginnings of early South-East European civilizations.
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Povzetek

**SOCIALNA STRUKTURA DRUŽB V JUGOVZHODNI EVROPI. JEZIKOSLOVNE PERSPEKТИVE**

Avtor skuša kritično analizirati dozdaj postavljene hipoteze za etimološki vir nekaterih besed, ki jih lahko imamo za temeljne, ker razkrivajo družbenopolitično strukturo evropskega vzhoda. Analiza zadeva predvsem oblike v romunskem jeziku, gre pa za besede, ki so na Balkanu splošno razširjene. *Ban*¹ 'lokalni veljak, gospodar' (podobno srbohrvaško in madžarsko) in *banë* 'denar, srebro' (podobno poljsko in narečno bulgarsko), *cioban*² 'posoda' (podobne oblike madžarsko in slovaško) in *ciobană*² 'pastir' (splošnobalkansko), *giupin, potem jupin* 'gospodar' (župan v različnih slovanskih jezikih, in končno *stăpin* 'gospodar, posestnik' (*stopan*⁶, rekonstruirana oblika v slovanskih jezikih).

Avtorjeva hipoteza je ta, da ni traški samo *stăpin*, ampak da so iz traškega substrata vse tiste besede, ki odražajo socialno strukturo na Balkanu. Samo taka hipoteza lahko razloži izredno razširjenost teh besed po vsem polotoku, nikakor pa ne neki vzhodnjaški vpliv (npr. turški), kar se včasih trdi iz neznanstvenih razlogov.