

## THE NORTHERN COAST OF THE AEGEAN SEA: A LINGUISTIC OVERVIEW

PALOMA GUIJARRO RUANO

Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

### ABSTRACT

Recent archaeological and epigraphical surveys in the territory known as Aegean Thrace have brought to light new findings enhancing our knowledge in this area. New corpora of inscriptions, as well as prosopographical and onomastic studies, have been published in about the last 20 years. These contributions have boosted linguistic research on the different processes of language contact and acculturation that took place in this region. Additionally, further studies concerning Greek dialectology and the Thracian language have completed our previous understanding of the linguistic landscape of Aegean Thrace, but they have also challenged older tenets. Thus, this work attempts to provide an overall picture of the newly appeared linguistic evidence and an account of the linguistic approaches that this material has given rise to in modern scholarship.

**KEY WORDS:** Aegean Thrace, Thracian language, language contact, onomastics, Greek dialects, koineization.

Due to increasing scholarly interest in exploring the northernmost borders of Greece, bibliography concerning recent archaeological work, new historical and epigraphic publications, as well as linguistic and onomastic studies, has proliferated exponentially in the last decades<sup>1</sup>. This contribution operates in the framework of previous works that have addressed the need of gathering dispersed information about archaeological, historical or epigraphical aspects of the south-eastern part of the Thracian territories<sup>2</sup>. This is why an up-to-date revision of the main works that have contributed to defining

---

<sup>1</sup> In this respect, I only refer, by way of example, to the most recent monographic publications such as Zannis' (2014) on a general historical overview of the region, Andrianou's (2017) on funerary monuments, or Vlachopoulos, Tsiafaki's (2017) archaeological description of Macedonia and Thrace. I thank Elena Martín González for some of these references. My thanks are also due to Petros Tsagkaropoulos for correcting the English version of this paper.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to the proceedings of the different congresses of Thracology, see, for instance, Paliga's (2016) discussion on the methodological and terminological aspects concerning Thracian (Thracology vs. «Thracomania») and Dacian studies over the last decade. See also Muller (2010) on the interaction between Thracians and Greeks in Thasos; Fournier, Parissaki (2018) on the north-Aegean communities; Chryssanthaki-Nagle (2010) on recent archaeological research; Fournier, Hamon, Parissaki's (2015) updating of epigraphic evidence or Dana's (2015) and Sharankov's (2011) account of the epigraphic material dating to the pre-Roman period and Roman periods respectively.

the linguistic situation of these northern Greek areas seems imperative within the description of Greek dialects and language contact in this area<sup>3</sup>.

The aim of this study therefore consists of the collection, classification and analysis of the linguistic publications related to north Greece and, more precisely, the northern coast of the Aegean Sea, in the last twenty years<sup>4</sup>. Since a holistic examination of this vast area exceeds the limits of this study<sup>5</sup>, I have mainly focused on the so-called Aegean Thrace, including the Greek colonies situated on the northern Aegean coast. Overall, I have included in this account recent publications that have advanced our linguistic knowledge of these border areas or propose contrasting or new hypotheses as compared to earlier ones. Indeed, there remain numerous difficulties in determining some extra-linguistic issues which naturally determine linguistic approaches, such as the origin of the first Greek settlers, the relationship between *metropoleis* and colonies, the interaction between Greek and non-Greek populations, and the origins and later development of Macedonia. These questions also provide glimpses into the linguistic richness of this area.

Owing to space limitations, I shall not dwell on an account of the epigraphic novelties concerning the area in question. References to epigraphical publications will be made where clarification is needed.

## **1. General linguistic studies on ancient northern Greece**

Few general studies have dealt with the linguistic description of the northern border area of Greece in a broad sense<sup>6</sup>. After the early basic survey of Katičić 1976, *Ancient*

---

<sup>3</sup> This paper is part of the research HERA-project *Dialect contacts and Dialect Levelling in Ancient Northern Greece* (MuMIL-EU Madrid Research Unit). This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the grant agreement No 649307. One of its main purposes is to study phenomena of multilingualism in linguistic contacts in the northern borders of Ancient Greece by focusing on poorly documented minority languages and exploring different types of language contact.

<sup>4</sup> Because of space limitations, I do not include in this work bibliography prior to the year 2000. Earlier relevant works may occasionally be quoted when necessary.

<sup>5</sup> With regard to the linguistic description of the Greek colonies in Bulgaria, see mainly Slavova (2004) and the contributions by Slavova, Bechet and Tokhasiev in Vottéro (ed.) (2009) for the situation in the Greek colonies in the north-western coast of the Black Sea. More recently, del Barrio Vega (2018b) has also analysed dialect contacts between Megarian and Ionian colonies and linguistic influence of non-Greek languages in onomastics.

<sup>6</sup> The notion of Northern Greece is also a difficult one. In this connection, see Katičić's chapter «The Northern Border Area» in his influential essay *Ancient Languages in the Balkans* (1976, 98-127): «The border area in question belongs neither entirely to the Aegean nor to the northern continental world, but constitutes a transitional region with marked features of both. Politically it was organized, mostly under the rule of kings, into three more or less centralized confederations of tribes: Epirus, Macedonia and Paeonia» (*ib.* 1976, 99).

*Languages in the Balkans*, studies can be grouped into two categories: those interested in non-Greek languages and those primarily devoted to Greek and its dialects<sup>7</sup>. This distinction also applies for the differentiation between Thracian-based or Greek-based approaches. For the sake of clarity, this study preserves this bipartite classification.

This peripheral zone of Greece, north of the Aegean Sea, has thus remained largely unexplored<sup>8</sup>. Despite previous epigraphic and linguistic research carried out on south-eastern Thrace and the northern Aegean islands, such as Thasos and Samothracia<sup>9</sup>, access to their epigraphical inland material has been quite difficult for a long time. This is largely due to the modern division of ancient Thrace into different countries, since the publication of the regional epigraphic corpora mainly depends on the internal policies of the present-day countries (Greece, Bulgaria, Rumania and Turkey) that formerly belonged to Thrace, as well as on extra-linguistic factors<sup>10</sup>. Ancient Thrace was conventionally divided into four minor regions: inland Thrace, Aegean Thrace, Propontic Thrace and Asia Minor Thrace (Mysia-Bithynia)<sup>11</sup>. The so-called Aegean Thrace traditionally refers to the area between the Rhodope Mountains in the north and the Aegean Sea in the south, and from the western border with Macedonia (using the river Strymon as a natural boundary) to the river Hebros in the east<sup>12</sup>. Nevertheless, it must be kept in mind that frontiers were rather vague and depended on historical, political and cultural circumstances, especially in this part of Greece. Linguistic analysis should therefore be understood in terms of the existence of a *linguistic continuum* where interlinguistic (and cultural) contacts could also have taken place<sup>13</sup>. Despite evidence of multicultural phenomena of contact in such a vast region, no sociolinguistic research has been put forward yet. Significantly, the label *northern Greece* was not included in the important analysis of Bubenik 1989, although some limited reference was made in

---

<sup>7</sup> Giannakis (2018, 1-2).

<sup>8</sup> See the claims of Loukopoulou (1989, 25-27) at the end of the 80's with respect to the scattering of archaeological and epigraphic materials and the lack of systematic archaeological activity.

<sup>9</sup> Despite the importance of Thassos, we still lack a comprehensive and in-depth account of the Thassian dialect after Pouilloux' (1954) and Dunant, Pouilloux' (1958).studies.

<sup>10</sup> See, for instance, Panayotou (2007, 738); Dana (2014, xli).

<sup>11</sup> For further references, see Hansen and Nielsen (edd.) (2004, 810-923); and Bouzek and Graninger (2015, 12-15) and Dana (2014, lxiii-lxv) for onomastic regional divisions.

<sup>12</sup> A further internal (and artificial) division differentiates three areas within Aegean Thrace: (a) the regions between the Axios and Strymon rivers, common both to Macedonia and Thrace (cfr. Flensted-Jensen 2004), (b) between the Strymon and Nestos rivers, where most of the first Thassian *emporion* and colonies were founded (cfr. Loukopoulou 2004a, 584), and (c) between Nestos and Hebros (cfr. Loukopoulou 2014b). This latter traditional division is preserved, for instance, in *I. Aeg. Thrac.* or in Zannis 2014. See also Brixhe, Panayotou (1997, 183-184).

<sup>13</sup> See Slavova (2017).

his study of language contact in «Greek and other Palaeobalkan Languages» in the Brill *Encyclopaedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics* (Bubenik 2014). With respect to the existence of an ancient *Sprachbund* in the Balkans<sup>14</sup>, Pompeo's updating and reviewing (2014) of previous seminal works devoted to the Balkan *Sprachbund* should be quoted. Even though her interest lies in the role of Greek within this linguistic area, she mainly focuses on Medieval and Modern Greek linguistic evidence. The next step in this journey is Joseph's attempt (2018) to determine a plausible dialectological link between Albanian and Greek, a much debated issue. On the basis of a comparative approach that could reveal some structural and syntactic correlations, Joseph brings to light new linguistic matchings between Greek and Albanian. They can be classified as retentions from IE, borrowings or even innovations, although among the latter there would be only one certain case of a shared innovation (based on the linguistic treatment of IE *\*āmar* 'day')<sup>15</sup>. Joseph finds no definitive arguments to refuse linguistic contact in prehistoric times so that he does not exclude further dialectological links between both languages. As a matter of fact, an ancient *Sprachbund* cannot be ruled out on condition that these linguistic matchings could be proved to be the result of language contact. But for the moment, being deprived of positive evidence, nothing more can be said with certainty<sup>16</sup>.

## 2. The Greek language in the northern coastal colonies of Aegean Thrace

The thorough linguistic description and definition of the *northern* Greek dialects primarily started with the study of north-western dialects<sup>17</sup> and Macedonian<sup>18</sup>. In 1994 Panayotou published an article with the broad title *Ancient Greek Dialects in Northern*

---

<sup>14</sup> For an overall picture of the linguistic grounds for the existence of a *Sprachbund* in the Balkans see Joseph (2007; 2010); for further references, see Tomić (2006); Friedman (2011); Friedman, Joseph (2018); and Krapova, Joseph (2019). Ancient languages (Thracian or Ancient Greek) are only included in these studies from a diachronic perspective.

<sup>15</sup> Apart from archaisms inherited from IE, there seem to exist some shared structural features between Greek and Albanian regarding (a) syntax (cfr. IE negator *\*meH<sub>1</sub>* > Gr. μή and Alb. (*\*mek<sup>w</sup>id* >) *mos*, for introducing "tentative main-clause questions"), (b) verbal structure (the use of active endings in the past simple tenses of the passive voice), (c) prepositional usage of *me* meaning 'with' (cfr. Gr. με, Alb. *me*), (d) some other isoglosses (cfr. the prothetic vowel in Gr. ἀνήρ and Alb. *ayr* from *\*H<sub>2</sub>ner-* 'man') and, finally, (e) a common share innovation based on the existence of IE *\*āmar* 'day' in Gr. σήμερον 'today' and ἔτηρες 'year' (where *kjāmer-* > *sāmer-* took place) and Alb. *sot* 'today' and *sonte* 'tonight'. As in Greek, Albanian forms had a first element *so-* followed by *ditë* 'day' – a more recent form for 'day' – and *natë* (< *\*nok<sup>w</sup>t*) 'night'. This conclusion is based on the reanalysis of *\*kj-āmer-* into *\*kjā-mer-*. For more details, see Joseph (2018, 203-209) together with Veksina's critical remarks (2018).

<sup>16</sup> See Hajnal (2003) on the methodological aspects of this kind of linguistic research, and Paliga (2016, 142-145) on the analysis of the term *Balkansprachbund*.

<sup>17</sup> Most fully depicted by Méndez Dosuna (1985; 2014a); see also Bile (2006).

<sup>18</sup> On the Doric character of Macedonian, cfr. Méndez Dosuna (2012, 2014b). (2012, 2014b); Hatzopoulos (2007, 2018) and Crespo (2018); still questioned by Joseph (2018, 199).

Greece, although it only referred to Macedonian. As a matter of fact, it seems that before the publication of the monograph *Studies in ancient Greek dialects: from Central Greece to the Black Sea* edited in 2018 by Giannakis, Crespo and Filos, there did not exist a specific work on northern Greece as a whole, from Epirus until the Black Sea. This collaborative book is the result of various past research meetings and includes an enriched (English) version of papers gathered in a previous collective volume edited by Giannakis in 2015, entitled *Ο γλωσσικός χάρτης της κεντρικής και βόρειας Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαιότητα*<sup>19</sup>. Concerning the northern borders of Ancient Greece, here one can find overview studies on specific dialects, such as Hatzopoulos and Crespo's on Macedonian, del Barrio Vega's on the Ionic of the north Aegean -to be complemented by Alonso Déniz's on the Ionic of Paros and Thasos-, and on the Greek linguistic varieties displayed by the colonies in the Black Sea. Others are devoted to particular areas, such as Filos's on Epirus and Tselikas' and Méndez Dosuna's on the Dodona tablets. Also of interest are Striano's and Bubenik's studies on koineization.

As far as Ionic is concerned, before the contribution of del Barrio Vega 2018a, there existed no holistic analysis of the Ionic dialect(s) employed in Aegean Thrace, where coastal Greek colonies were founded by the Ionians. Thus, within the general classifications of Ionic (West, Central and East), there was no reference to the variety extant in the local inscriptions from the north Aegean<sup>20</sup>. Previously, material from the colony of Maroneia was incorporated into Mihailov's monograph of 1943, *La langue des inscriptions grecques en Bulgarie (phonétique et morphologie)*, although the data derives from outside modern Bulgaria and lacks new, important epigraphical findings<sup>21</sup>.

Del Barrio's work (2018a) was facilitated to a large extent by the publication in 2005 of the inscriptions of Aegean Thrace (*I. Aeg. Thrac.*)<sup>22</sup>. Even though the volume only covers the coastal region between the Nestos and Hebros rivers, it came to complement earlier epigraphic publications of inscriptions from other parts of Ancient Thrace

---

<sup>19</sup> It must be noted that in Giannakis, Crespo, Filos' volume (edd.) (2018) there is a number of contributions related to more general dialect issues, exceeding the geographical criteria expected from the title. For a review, see Veksina (2019).

<sup>20</sup> del Barrio Vega (2014).

<sup>21</sup> Following Mihailov, in 2004 Slavova took up again the analysis of Greek inscriptions found in present-day Bulgaria (dated between 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC and 4<sup>th</sup> c. AD), but exclusively from a phonological perspective. She focuses mainly on the spoken language, gathering principally «orthographical deviations» and taking into account sociolinguistic explanations for misspellings.

<sup>22</sup> Apart from the introductory chapters to each colony (and broader regions) in *I. Aeg. Thrac.*, further updated studies on Greek colonization in this area can be found in Loukopoulou (2004a, 2004b); Tréziny (2010, 201-276); Zannis (2014); Vlachopoulos, Tsiadaki (2017, 474-559) and Parissaki (2018).

originating from present-day Bulgaria, Romania and European Turkey<sup>23</sup>. With the aim of examining the Ionic dialect of the Greek colonies found between the rivers Strymon and Nestos, del Barrio Vega (2018a) analysed the whole corpus of *I. Aeg. Thrac.* and updated it with lacking material from Thassos, Samothracia and their respective colonies. In addition to a fresh account of much-debated issues or epigraphic material<sup>24</sup>, the author's main concern is to isolate local dialect features in each region and establish a chronology for the appearance of the earliest and latest traces of epichoric traits in the inscriptions. Epigraphic evidence from the Thassian colony of Stryme-Molyvoti only is numerous enough to yield an important amount of Thassian features<sup>25</sup>. Ionic features attested in Abdera and Maroneia seem to correspond to the dialect of their respective *metropoleis*, Teos<sup>26</sup> and Chios<sup>27</sup>. Much attention is paid to the Thassian psilosis: the dialect was psilotic since its earliest attestations, unlike that of its metropolis Paros<sup>28</sup>.

Moving on to Samothracia, only a scarce number of texts from Zone, its colony, are early enough (5<sup>th</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) to contain any dialectal features<sup>29</sup>. Unfortunately, available linguistic features from the Samothracian inland colonies, different from onomastic material, are limited to the use of genitives in -εος in the s-stem declension (although there exist early contracted forms)<sup>30</sup>. Regarding the origin of the first Samothracian settlers, no consensus has yet been reached by scholars. Despite the discovery of a new

<sup>23</sup> Cfr. the corpus of Greek and Latin inscriptions from Bulgaria (*IGBulg* I-V; Beševliev (1964) and *ILBulg*), whose latest volume, *IGBulg* IV, is expected to be published by Sharankov -see notice in Dana (2015, 263)-; from Scythia Minor (*IScM* I-V) and from the European Turkish part of ancient Thrace (Taşlıkloğlu 1961-1971). It also seems that Domaradzka (notice in Dana 2015, 263) is in charge of the publication of Greek graffiti from Thrace from the Classical and Hellenistic periods. For an accurate description of the epigraphic material, cfr. n. 2.

<sup>24</sup> Topics such as the relationship among these colonies or between colonies and their *metropoleis*, discussions of new inscriptions or on previously published inscriptions, (i.e., discussion of the Pistiros inscription, of epichoric alphabet traditions...), etc.

<sup>25</sup> Apart from psilosis, Thassian features listed by del Barrio Vega (2018a, 484-486) are the following: no reversion of /æ:/ after /r, i, e/, no third compensatory lengthening, no contraction of εο and εω, exchange of αο, εο and αυ, ευ spellings, preservation of -ηιο-, ιερ-/ίρ-, γίνομαι, analogies among genitives in -εω of masculine ā-stem declension and (-εος >) -ευσ of s-stems genitives, dat. pl. -η(ι)σι(v); ἦμισυ and εὐντ-forms from εἰμί.

<sup>26</sup> No reversion of /æ:/ preceded by /r/, /i/ nor /e/, no third compensatory lengthening, non-contracted -εο- nor -εω-, ιρο- and ιστ- forms, ā-stems masculine genitives in -εω (seldom contracted in -ω) when preceded by a consonant (cfr. Μεγάδω), -εος genitives in s-stems and τεσσαερ- forms (v. del Barrio Vega 2018a, 500). On problematic forms like <ΠΠΟΤΙΩ> and <ΗΤΑΙΡΟΙ> in *I. Aeg. Thrac.* 30, mid-6<sup>th</sup> BC, see del Barrio Vega (2018a, 501-505) and Alonso Déniz (2018, 549-550).

<sup>27</sup> Non-contracted -εο- nor -εω-, except when preceded by a vowel (cfr. Νεομηνίου); preservation of -ηιο- cluster, -εω singular genitives and -εων plural genitives in ā-stems alongside with -εος in s-stems and -ιος in i-stems. See del Barrio Vega (2018a, 503).

<sup>28</sup> V. del Barrio Vega (2018a, 478-484). Alonso Déniz (2018) reaches the same conclusion but on different grounds.

<sup>29</sup> Del Barrio Vega (2018a, 498-199).

<sup>30</sup> Πολυχάρεος (*I. Aeg. Thrac.* 414, Zone, ca. 400-350 BC), Πολυκράτεος (*I. Aeg. Thrac.* 450, Zone mid-4<sup>th</sup> BC), but Θεογένους (*I. Aeg. Thrac.* 409, Zone, ca. 500-450 BC); see del Barrio Vega (2018a, 498-499).

archaic inscription (Dimitrova, Klinton 2003, 236, fig. 1, end of the 6<sup>th</sup> c. BC)<sup>31</sup>, there are no new conclusive proofs of the Samian (Ionic) origin of the first colonists, so that the debate still revolves around traditional arguments. One of them concerns the genitive τᾶς and the dative ἐόντεσσι attested in a decree of the mid-4<sup>th</sup> c. BC (*Samothrace* 2.1., no. 1, plate I, fig. 1), which has been used to argue for the Aeolian origin of the first Greek settlers. According to del Barrio Vega (2018a, 494-496), these forms could originate from an original Aeolian document, later reproduced in Samothrace, or rather explained inasmuch as Aeolicisms are present in Ionian coastal cities of Asia Minor too<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, the Ionic influence on the existence of the *Maimkaterion* month in the Samothracian calendar can alternatively be explained as Athenian influence. As a matter of fact, Athens, where this month was also attested, dominated this area from the 5<sup>th</sup> c. onwards.

However, the publication epigraphic evidence from the area located between Strymon and Nestos rivers is still missing. A partial solution for the linguistic examination of this non-covered area can be found in del Barrio Vega's 2018b, where she collects data from Thassian inland colonies (Galepsus, Berge, Oisyme, Neapolis...)<sup>33</sup>. In addition, the study of lexicon is a pending task. It has partially been examined by Slavova (2016) and with regard to Greek rare terms found in inscriptions from Bulgaria<sup>34</sup>. Finally, there is still insufficient available evidence of the process of koineization that took place in the Aegean Thrace. As a matter of fact, this region acted like a hinge between continental Greece and Asia Minor from the period of the Ionic revolts and the Greco-Persian wars and later expansion of the Macedonian Empire. Thereafter, it should be interesting to delve into the process of adoption and diffusion of Attic-Ionic koine in Aegean Thrace and to compare it with similar processes in neighbouring regions, such as Macedonia, inland Bulgaria or the Black Sea<sup>35</sup>.

### 3. Thracian in Aegean Thrace

<sup>31</sup> Its text is fragmentary: ΚΑΙΑΔ? | ΟΝΗΣ-. The form ΟΝΗΣ- instead of Ὀνάσ- and its alphabet have been interpreted as markers of an Ionian origin, but they can also be assigned to a foreigner speaker as well, since the precise origin of the inscription is not clear; v. del Barrio Vega (2018a, 493-494).

<sup>32</sup> Nevertheless, the author admits that -εσσι datives are not attested in Ionian Asia Minor cities. It should be noted that other Attic / koine forms appear in the text (gen. Ἐπικλέους, αὐτούς).

<sup>33</sup> See del Barrio's (2018a, 474) criticism on this scholarly gap and Thonemann's book review of 2006.

<sup>34</sup> Slavova 2016, 488: «Although the Greek inscriptions from Bulgarian lands found until 1989 are published by G. Mihailov [...] their vocabulary has not yet received its due place in the lexicographical reference books and dictionaries».

<sup>35</sup> In this respect, see Panayotou (1998) for Macedonia; Slavova (2009), Bechet (2009) and Tokhasiev (2009) for the Greek colonies on the west coast of the Black Sea and Slavova (2004) on Bulgaria (a summary can be found in pages 127-136).

Parallel with linguistic research on ancient Greek dialects runs the examination of the non-Greek languages attested in this vast area. Conventionally, Thracians are thought to have lived side by side with Greek speakers in the northern border of Ancient Greece. That said, the interpretation of the data is continuously hindered by particular methodological concerns that have influenced research activity from its beginnings<sup>36</sup>. On the one hand, this non-Greek language is usually presented within the conglomerate of fragmentary Indo-European languages (together with Illyrian, Phrygian(-Brygian), Venetic, Messapic, Lusitanian, Sicel, Elymian, Raetic, Lemnian and Macedonian). Nevertheless, there are unresolved questions concerning the linkage of Thracian to other Indo-European languages (as an independent branch or within a wider linguistic group) and further intra-linguistic/dialectal divisions, especially with regards to Dacian<sup>37</sup>. The answer to this question relies mainly on the evolution of PIE voiced aspirate stops (\*bh, \*dh, \*gh), on the *satem* character of the language and on the *Lautverschiebung* of voiced into unvoiced stops (\*d > t). Generally speaking, current Indo-European scholarship remains cautious at the time of establishing genetic linkages in connection with Thracian<sup>38</sup>. Indeed, their language remains undeciphered. Consequently, due to insufficient evidence, it is in effect impossible to make internal linguistic differentiations among those autochthonous inhabitants and their tribes (if not different populations)<sup>39</sup>. Likewise, it is generally assumed that Thracian falls under the broader label of *Sprachreste* such as Illyrian, or Paeonian further north. On the other hand, it should be noted as a *caveat* that the term ‘Thracian’ is arbitrary, since it is used as an ‘umbrella’ term for all the local non-Greek populations and their language(s). These languages, unknown to us, are directly tied with the label *Thracian* by default<sup>40</sup>. In

---

<sup>36</sup> As far as Thracian studies are regarded, access to Bulgarian scientific production is still difficult to follow since most of its publications are written in Bulgarian (occasionally with English abstracts) and/or in Bulgarian journals with relatively limited diffusion.

<sup>37</sup> For an extremely cautious view, see Fortson (2010, 464): «all attempts to relate Thracian to Phrygian, Illyrian, or Dacian (...) are likewise purely speculative. The notion of a ‘Thracio-Phrygian’ branch of IE had currency for some time but has fallen out of favour. Our knowledge of these languages is simply too limited for claims of this kind; even the notion that what the ancients called ‘Thracian’ was a single entity is unproven».

<sup>38</sup> Cfr. Woodward (2004, 9-15); Fortson (2010, 459-471); Mallory, Adams (2006, 36-37); and Klein, Joseph, Fritz M. (edd.) (2018, 1816-1872). They are also mentioned as Paleobalkan languages, see Blažek (2005). Under the auspices of the international AELAW research Project (Ancient European Languages and Writings <http://aelaw.unizar.es/>) and the Prensas de la Universidad de Zaragoza a new collection of monographs dedicated to these traditional *Restsprachen* is being published.

<sup>39</sup> Yanakieva (2016b; 2017a); Brixhe (2018, 1852); and Paliga (2018). See *infra*.

<sup>40</sup> Dana (2015, 244); Hálmagi (2015, 260).

addition, when classifying a term as *Greek* or *Thracian*, it is not clear whether deals with Greek cognates of Thracian words or Thracian borrowings into Greek<sup>41</sup>.

In essence, modern studies attempt to provide new methodological approaches, distanced from the discredited etymological method<sup>42</sup>, based rather on onomastics or comprehensive and comparative analyses. Recent up-to-date descriptions of the research status of Thracian have been carried out by linguists, such as Panayotou (2007), Tzitzilis (2014), Dana (2014, xliv-cxix) and Brixhe (2018)<sup>43</sup>. As a result, old -and disproportionate- theories, such as the existence of Thracian names in Linear B tablets, have been revised and dismissed<sup>44</sup>. Besides, scholars have isolated and scrutinised main linguistic evidence for the Thracian language from literary testimonies, mainly glosses,<sup>45</sup> and inscriptions<sup>46</sup>. Additionally, Tzitzilis (2014) has also explored possible connections between alleged Thracian words and Modern Greek dialects.

Apart from that, two milestones have determined the current development of linguistic approaches based on epigraphic surveys: further research on onomastics and the publication of new texts from Zone.

### 3. 1. Recent epigraphic discoveries and their alleged Thracian character

In 1998 a collection of ca. 300 inscribed texts dating from the 6<sup>th</sup> to the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC and written in Greek alphabet was discovered in a sanctuary of Apollo located in the ancient city of Zone, a Samothracian colony in the Aegean coast. Despite the importance of the discovery, the whole collection of texts was only published in 2015, in the first volume of *Αρχαία Ζώνη*<sup>47</sup>, although Brixhe had previously examined the most significant items

---

<sup>41</sup> See, for instance, Slavova (2005; 2006).

<sup>42</sup> Cfr. Tzitzilis (2014, 89). According to Fortson (2010, 459), this outdated analysis process consists in an attempt to «trying to etymologize the linguistic remains that we have in light of known forms in other languages»; still, see Hålmagi (2015, 266).

<sup>43</sup> These contributions are largely dependent on earlier works, mainly on Katičić (1976, 137-153) and Brixhe, Panayotou (1997). Due to the limits of this study, I do not discuss here these linguistic features assigned to Thracian; see mainly Panayotou 2007 and Tzitzilis 2014.

<sup>44</sup> Panayotou (2007, 739-740). A general account of the evolution of the so-called Thracology can be found in Dana (2014, xii-xli), but see Hålmagi's criticism (2015 *passim*) of his excessive disregard to Bulgarian and Romanian scholarship, and Paliga (2016).

<sup>45</sup> Cfr. Tzitzilis (2014) with earlier bibliography (mainly Velkova 1986). The author separates (a) those terms that are recognised as be Thracian (ἄλοχον, πέλεκυς, πέλιτη) from (b) those that can be explained in different ways (ρομφαία, σκάλμη, σάρπος), (c) those used by Greeks to refer to Thracians and probably unknown to the latter (καπρῶντες, ἀστραλίαν, καπνοβάτης) or (d) terms used within the area of Thrace (γαγίλα, μανδάκης).

<sup>46</sup> See Dimitrov (2009) with caution; see *infra*.

<sup>47</sup> The other three volumes concentrate on different aspects of the archaeological remains: the fortification (*Αρχαία Ζώνη II*), the cemetery (*Αρχαία Ζώνη IIIa*) and the local minting (*Αρχαία Ζώνη IVa*).

in 2006<sup>48</sup>. More precisely, the collection consists of 291 graffiti on vases (6<sup>th</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> c. BC) and 9 inscribed stones (the 4<sup>th</sup> c. BC), one of them a bilingual public decree (n° IV ΑΓΚ 640 + 6143, late 5<sup>th</sup> – early 4<sup>th</sup>?)<sup>49</sup>. Almost 220 of them are written in a non-Greek language which the author identifies with Thracian dedications. According to Brixhe (2006a, 2008), this «epigraphical treasure»<sup>50</sup> shed some light on the description of the Thracian language, particularly if taken together with other dedications from Samothracia in an unknown language which Lehmann (1960, 8-19) previously called «the Samothracian language». It comprises 75 graffiti on vases (6<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> c. BC), one inscription on stone (5<sup>th</sup> -4<sup>th</sup> c. BC) from the sanctuary of the Great Gods<sup>51</sup> and 3 more graffiti from the sanctuary of Bendis, a Thracian deity<sup>52</sup>. Brixhe bases his research on the comparison between the dedicatory structure of these votive texts, found in sanctuaries, and their Greek cognates (name of the honoured deity and epithet, worshipper's name and verb of the dedication), searching for recognizable terms such as theonyms like Βενδι ~ Βενζι or Αβολο for Ἀπόλλων or Βένδις or anthroponyms like Απολλοδορε or Πιλαγε for Greek Ἀπολλόδωρος and Φιλαῖος. Thus, he identifies the rest of the words with no direct equivalent with other predictable elements, such as the epithet υνεσο(y), which occurs next to the theonyms Bendis or Apollo, or a verb κα(ι)ε<sup>53</sup>.

As a result of this analysis, he reconsiders ancient theories based on the *satem* character of Thracian, on the existence of consonant changes (\**d* > *t*) and on the question of the evolution of Indo-European voiced aspirated stops. As far as the consonants are concerned, forms like the dative Αβολο (cfr. gr. Ἀπόλλων) may indicate that other pairs

<sup>48</sup> This latter publication had previously been announced in several of his works; see Brixhe (2006a, 121-122; 2008, 216; 2018, 1852-1853). It is striking that in his last work on Thracian language (Brixhe 2018), the author does not include a single reference to the publication of this epigraphic corpus, intended to be his prime epigraphic publication. This is even more stunning in view of earlier Brixhe's statements: «Je me suis engagé à ne pas déflorer ce corpus avant sa publication, qui interviendra dans un ouvrage collectif sur les résultats des fouilles, sous la direction de M<sup>me</sup> Tsatsopoulou. Je me contenterai d'utiliser ici les seuls documents 'tombés dans le domaine public' sous la forme d'une photographie donnée par celle-ci en 1989, 1997 ou 2001» (Brixhe 2006a, 124).

<sup>49</sup> The designation is misleading; we cannot establish that it is a bi-version of the same text. The monument is quite fragmentary, but according to Brixhe-Zournatzi (Brixhe 2015, 266) both texts might have been written by the same hand. In the Greek part one can read [ἄ]σολίαν, but there is no piece of further information regarding the Thracian part.

<sup>50</sup> The whole section is entitled «ένας επιγραφικός θησαυρός» by the editors (2015, 209). The same analysis is presented in both versions, French and Greek (on the description of the corpus, see pp. 211-306 and 307-384 respectively) and Greek (*ib.*, 307-412).

<sup>51</sup> Already published in Lehmann 1960, 45sgg., nr. 1-75 (= Brixhe 2006, 125, nr. 1 and 4).

<sup>52</sup> First published in 2004 by Matsas. Images and linguistic interpretation are also available in Brixhe (2006, 124-125, 138), who gained access to the autopsy of the texts in 2005.

<sup>53</sup> The whole argumentation in Brixhe (2006a; partly in 2006b; 2008; 2015, 282-306 [French], 385-415 [Greek]; 2018, 1852-1853).

like Σατοκος ~ Σαδοκος do not correspond to a consonant shift but to the voicing of voiceless stops in intervocalic position<sup>54</sup>. This would mean that the Thracian language – at least this regional variant from the Samothracia-Zone area of influence– did not systematically change voiced stops into voiceless<sup>55</sup>. Instead, this change would be conditioned by the phonetic context. Furthermore, the pair Βενδι/Βενζι suggests that the graphic differentiation between -δ- and -ζ- (previously detected in anthroponyms built with a second element -ζενις equivalent to Greek -γένης and in different glosses)<sup>56</sup> also indicates a context-conditioned spirantization in the presence of a palatal vowel<sup>57</sup>. At this point, Brixhe also diverges from the traditional acceptance of the *satem* character of the Thracian language. Incidentally he also can align easily Thracian with Greek and Phrygian, considered *centum* languages<sup>58</sup>. With respect to the traditional hypothesis about the voiced outcome of the Indo-European aspirated plosives, the intended connection of Πιλαγε with a Greek anthroponym Φιλαϊος may point to borrowing from Greek, where *\*bh* > *ph*. In light of this, the rendering of Πιλαγε, along with the absence of aspirate consonants (θ, φ, χ), leads Brixhe (2006, 129, 137) to assume that Thracian lacks this sound<sup>59</sup>. In addition, this latter form also points to the loss of final consonants in Thracian, since it should be interpreted as the nominative form of the worshiper's name. Regarding vocalism, pairs like Πιλαγε - Φιλαϊος, Απολοδορε ~ Ἀπολλόδορος also suggest the reduction of final unaccented /o/ rendered as <E> (/o/ > [ə]), This phenomenon seems to be attested in a geographical area extending from Thessaly and Macedonia to Thassos<sup>60</sup>. In Brixhe's opinion, there would be a raising of mid-vowels in view of a possible connection between an epithet υνεσο(y) and a non-attested Greek form \*ὀνήσφ, equivalent to ὀνησίμφ, but his interpretation is not certain. Another local trait would be the tendency to eliminate the second element of i-diphthongs, as in καιε -

<sup>54</sup> Brixhe (2006, 131) explains the dative Αβολο by ways of morphological reduction in the light of forms like ac. Ἀπόλλω/Ἀπέλλω (cfr. LSJ *s.v.*) and pairs like Ποσειδῶνα ~ Ποσειδῶ. For the state of play of old and modern views on this issue, see Yanakieva (2016a, 512).

<sup>55</sup> According to Yanakieva's surveys on onomastics (2012) and on glosses (2016a), the fluctuation between *t* and *d* is to be taken as graphic variations used to render foreign sound not previously existent in the Greek (or in Latin) phonetic repertoire.

<sup>56</sup> The most important examples are collected in Katičić (1976, 143-144).

<sup>57</sup> Brixhe (2006a, 139). The problem is more complex than presented by Brixhe because, according to the testimonies of the accepted Thracian glosses, the palatalization of velar stops could also apply to original labiovelars (although there is no consensus on this point), see Katičić (1976, 143-144).

<sup>58</sup> For Phrygian, see Lugorio, Libotsky (2018, 1824).

<sup>59</sup> Already noted by Brixhe, Panayotou (1997, 199). According to Yanakieva (2016a, 516), the variation between τ/θ, κ/χ, π/φ in Thracian may be due to an intermediate articulation between voiceless and of voiced plosives.

<sup>60</sup> For the whole discussion, see Brixhe (2006, 133-134; 2008). Contrast with Méndez Dosuna (2012, 140-141), who criticises Brixhe's attempt to connect the areal phenomenon /o/ > [ə] with the existence of a non-final strong accent.

καε, υνεσοϋ ~ υνεσο<sup>61</sup>. Morphologically, there would not be verbal augment in light of forms like καε ~ καε, which, in accordance with his comparative method, should correspond to the verb in these dedicatory inscriptions (related to \*kau-iϝ:)<sup>62</sup>.

In short, the linguistic traits figuring in this new collection of epigraphic texts, especially the non-*satem* character of Thracian, leads Brixhe to conclude on the primitive existence of a linguistic community of the ancestors of Greeks, Phrygians and Thracians which was not linguistically differentiated<sup>63</sup>. Thus, Brixhe's hypothesis of a «linguistic conglomerate», though based on new linguistic data from Zone and Samothrace, revive the old idea of a common linguistic branch of Thracians and Phrygians previously put forward by Kretschmer (1896).

### 3.2. Thracian onomastic studies

The publication of the fourth volume of the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names IV (LGPN)* in 2005, which included names from Macedonia, Thrace and the Northern Regions of the Black Sea, came to fill an important gap in Greek and Thracian onomastics<sup>64</sup>. As a result of this, Parissaki's prosopographic study on Aegean Thrace saw the light in 2007<sup>65</sup>. In essence, she followed the same principles and methodology previously established by Loukopoulou (1989, 223-406), in her repertoire of anthroponyms from Propontic Thrace. Nonetheless, the issuing of D. Dana's *Onomasticon Thracicum* in 2014, a compendium of more than 1500 Thracian personal names attested in epigraphic and literary sources, marked a turning point<sup>66</sup>. It constitutes the accomplishment of a long-standing desideratum among Thracian scholars, namely, the updating of Detschew's (1957) study on Thracian names, now obsolete<sup>67</sup>. Since

---

<sup>61</sup> On a review of i-digraphs in Thracian, see Slavova (2005; 2015).

<sup>62</sup> Brixhe (2006a, 135-136, 141).

<sup>63</sup> More precisely, Brixhe connects Phrygian and Thracian by means of the lack of voiceless aspirates in both languages and by the use of a letter in Zone and Samothrace with y value, as in Paleo-Phrygian (v. Brixhe 2004).

<sup>64</sup> See Dana's critical review (2006c) of the *LGPN IV*.

<sup>65</sup> See reviews by Dana (2009) and Solin (2010). Tataki's (2018) observations on Thracian anthroponyms directly derives from the *LGPN IV*.

<sup>66</sup> His *Onomasticon Thracicum* is the result of previous works mostly devoted to the study of Thracian soldiers in Egypt (Dana 2013), the identification of Dacian names (Dana 2001-2003; 2003a; 2003b; 2004; 2006a; *ib.* 2014) and the influence of Latin on Thracian onomastics (Dana 2011b). Additionally, according to the announcement in the ANHIMA website, two further monographs are being prepared within Dana's framework: *Les Thraces dans l'Égypte hellénistique (papyrus, inscriptions, graffiti, sources littéraires)* and *Les Thraces dans le monde hellénistique* (<http://www.anhima.fr/spip.php?article2148&lang=fr>).

<sup>67</sup> Detschew's *Die thrakischen Sprachreste* (1957) collects the main literary, lexicographic and epigraphic testimonies associated with the Thracian language (to which later works have to be added, such as Vlahov [1963] and Velkova [1974]). However, it has become outdated not only because of the appearance of new

Dana's *Onomasticon* belongs to an ongoing project under the auspices of the French academy, this work, together with its updated appendix of 2018<sup>68</sup>, aims at supplementing and even superseding the data earlier collected by the *LGN*. Despite not being presented as a grammar, the first part of Dana's book (pp. lxiii-cxii), which includes a critical revision of the discipline of Thracology, acts as a linguistic study which grows out of the comprehensive analysis of the names collected in the following part (pp. 1-422). The onomastic repertoire of names arranged by lemmas constitutes his main contribution<sup>69</sup>.

New epigraphic evidence together with analyses on the distribution of personal names have revived older debates about internal linguistic differentiation within speech communities settled in the south-eastern part of the Balkans (see *supra* §3). Previous approaches to this issue, mainly those by Georgiev (1957), tried to demonstrate the existence of a linguistic variety north of the Danube, called Dacian, different from Thracian proper, which was located south of this river. In broad lines, the main argument for this linguistic division was not only based on the etymological analyses of the glosses, but also on the distribution of second compound toponymical suffixes: while *-bria*, *-para* ('town') and *-diza* ('fortress') predominate in Thrace, *-dava* and *-deva* ('town') appear more frequently in the northern regions of the Danube River<sup>70</sup>. D. Dana's onomastic project (2014, p. LXVI) supports the idea of internal differentiation, validating the aforementioned toponymic distribution, now based on anthroponyms. Thus, four main groups could be distinguished: Thracian, West Thracian, Dacian (or Daco-Moesian) and Bithynian<sup>71</sup>. Nevertheless, when deciding whether this differentiation is to be considered dialectal or linguistic (i.e., if Dacian and Thracian are different dialects or languages), Dana limits himself to talking about a certain degree of internal differentiation<sup>72</sup>. Similarly, Yanakieva (2014) further claims an internal

---

epigraphic onomastic evidence but also because of the misunderstandings and corrections in many alleged Thracian forms. Many of Dana's new interpretations are based on the revision of the linguistic tenets formulated by Bulgarian or Romanian scholars.

<sup>68</sup> It is a compendium of corrections, additions and emendations to the version of 2014, published online since the end of 2018 in the ANHIMA official website (<http://www.anhima.fr/spip.php?article1078&lang=fr>).

<sup>69</sup> For critical reviews of Dana's *Onomasticon Thracicum*, see primarily Hálmagi (2015).

<sup>70</sup> Further arguments concern the distribution and chronology of some phenomena. According to Georgiev (1977), other differentiating traits should be the preservation of stopped consonants *vs.* consonant shifts, as well as a u-development of Indo-European sonants *vs.* outcomes in *ri/ir* or *a*.

<sup>71</sup> V. Dana (2011a) as well.

<sup>72</sup> «Sans aller si loin que certains linguistes, qui parlent avec la plus grande assurance, et sur des bases linguistiques souvent mal choisies, d'une langue différente, le 'daco-mésien', une diversité au moins

dialectal division based on onomastic material (anthroponyms, theonyms, hydronyms, toponyms and ethnonyms). The author (2016b, 2017a) also rejects the linguistic differentiation between Thracian and Dacian, according to graphic variants and the rendering of (supposedly) similar proper names (2014), as well as the existence of an independent Getic language (2017b)<sup>73</sup>. Furthermore, Yanakieva's study (2009) on Thracian hydronyms constitutes an important milestone for Thracian diachronic linguistics<sup>74</sup>. Her work must be completed with the contributions of Serafimov (2007) and Paliga (2018). In essence, their analyses attempt to establish a connection between Thracian and other languages. Thus, the former holds the view that Slavs were an indigenous population in Thracia. The latter suggests that, according to the evidence of place names, Illyrian and Thracian should be close related, possibly in a «quite clear relation» with Balto(-Slavic) and Indo(-Iranic) linguistic groups.

Also exploring graphic variation in Thracian onomastics, Slavova (2005, 2006, 2015) addresses several methodological concerns when analyzing anthroponyms. Contrary to the comprehensive repertoire of Dana, her contributions remain crucial for the diachronic interpretation of Thracian anthroponomy<sup>75</sup>.

Besides Dana's contributions to this field, overview studies of Graeco-Thracian anthroponyms can be found in del Barrio Vega (2018a, 503-506), who attempts to isolate specific linguistic features that characterize Greek and Thracian names. More specific studies, arranged following the geographical criteria of «Black Sea and Thrace», can be found in Catling and Marchand's publication of *Onomatologos* in 2010<sup>76</sup>. Similarly, Thracian and North Aegean onomastics occupy some space in a recent reference publication on anthroponymy in which Dana (2018, 203-208) deals with the categorization of linguistic mechanisms for the *hellenization* of non-Greek names through the use of Greek suffixes (among them, Thracian names as well). Other works have tried to develop further connections between anthroponyms and the motif

---

dialectale à l'intérieur du complexe thrace est désormais prouvée par l'anthroponymie (en plus des toponymes et des gloses» (Dana 2011a, 226).

<sup>73</sup> See also Paliga (2015). The issue of the identity of Thracians (and Getae) is a much debated one. There are many further references that exceed the limits of this work; as an example of this, see the numerous contributions (Yanakieva) dedicated to this issue in Vagalinski, Raycheva, Boteva and Sharankov (eds.) (2018, 131-268), as well as other quoted works (Janouchová 2018).

<sup>74</sup> See Slavova's review (2011).

<sup>75</sup> It is important to note that she never quotes Dana's earlier work. For anthroponyms in Latin inscriptions from Bulgaria, see Minkova (2000).

<sup>76</sup> Most of them are related to the Black Sea; see especially Dana's and Dubois' contributions.

of the Thracian rider as an approach to examine the processes of Hellenization and/or Romanization, such as this of Boteva (2007)<sup>77</sup>.

### 3.3. Other important contributions

Other contributions deserve some attention, although their linguistic impact has not been as significant as that of the aforementioned works. In the first place, Dimitrov's publication from 2009 has made available the epigraphic texts found in present-day Bulgaria and traditionally considered as Thracian. Nonetheless, his alleged interpretation of some of these texts, together with his phonological and linguistic descriptions, go beyond the possibilities of interpretation that the epigraphic material at our disposal provides<sup>78</sup>. Specific linguistic studies have also been carried out in recent years, but only a few focus on particular phonological issues.

As far as bilingualism (or trilingualism) in Thracia is concerned, the field remains insufficiently studied<sup>79</sup>. Sharankov (2011), Dana (2015), Yanakieva (2018) and Camia (2019) have mainly contributed to our knowledge on language contact, by analysing epigraphic evidence<sup>80</sup>. However, their works are not specifically linguistic, since they delve into more cultural questions, such as literacy, ethnicity or acculturation processes. It seems that, on the one hand, Thracian was confined to an oral use, due to the absence of inscriptions written in Thracian language, especially from the 3<sup>th</sup> c. BC onwards. Also, epigraphic evidence may point to the existence of semiliterate Thracians before 46 AD<sup>81</sup>. Nevertheless, according to Yanakieva (2018), Thracian did not die out during the Roman period; conversely, it was preserved as a sign of «ethnic identity». On the other hand, Greek emerges as the main vehicle of communication, as a *lingua franca*, also during the Roman Imperial period. Even after the creation of the Roman province of Thrace in 46 AD, the region remained an «overwhelmingly Greek-writing area» (Dana 2015, 244), contrary to the Graeco-Latin bilingualism observed in other Thracian

---

<sup>77</sup> On the motif of the Thracian rider, see Andrianou (2017), where we can find some new epigraphic evidence that enriches *I. Aeg. Thrac.*

<sup>78</sup> The main criticism comes from Dana (2012); see for instance the divergent readings of the sequence <ΓΟΝΙΜΑΣΗΖΗΞΕΥΘΥΓΥΝΗ>: where Dimitrov (2009, 17-18) sees a bilingual text (in which ΓΟΝΙΜΑ ΣΗΖΗ has to be interpreted as the Thracian counterpart of Σευθ<ο>υ γυνή under very hypothetical assumptions), Dana (2014, s.v. Κοζιμασης; 2015, 246) reads a feminine noun with a verb (Γονιμαση ζῆ) following some other parallels of Γονιμα-names.

<sup>79</sup> Yanakieva (2018, 133).

<sup>80</sup> See Dana (2015) on pre-Roman Thrace; Sharankov (2011), Camia (2018) and Yanakieva (2018) for Roman Thrace (Yanakieva 2018 also for Late Antiquity). See also Janouchová (2018) and all the available (epigraphic) material available at the website <https://osf.io/fjnw5/> created by Janouchová within the framework of the *Hellenization of Ancient Thrace* Project.

<sup>81</sup> Sharankov (2011, 137-138).

regions, mainly in Lower Moesia<sup>82</sup>. Tellingly, indigenous language(s) used Greek alphabet(s) since the very first texts were written<sup>83</sup>. Linguistic contact must have existed even in inner Thrace as a result of undeniable cultural contact which also supports the diffusion of the epigraphical habit and literacy among local populations. The preservation, for instance, of Ionian forms in a series of graffiti from Vetren point to this direction, as do other epigraphical and archaeological finds in Seuthopolis, Kabyle, Alexandrovo or Rogozen<sup>84</sup>. As far as Latin is concerned, according to Sharankov (2011, 145), «there are almost 20 times more Greek than Latin texts» and the extant evidence shows that Latin «was used mainly by those who were obliged to speak it due to their position and/or social status», such as Roman officials or soldiers<sup>85</sup>.

Finally, I complete this section with a brief reference to the current lines of research. As seen during the last *13th International Congress of Thracology* held in 2017<sup>86</sup>, papers were consecrated to develop the proposed topic of the congress: «Ancient Thrace: Myth and Reality». In this sense, ancient issues were revisited, such as Yanakieva's revision of the history of the so-called Thracian linguistics or, more precisely, Paliga's contribution provided further discussion on the degree of relatedness between Thracian and Dacian, Falileyev's on toponymy or Mircheva and Mihaylova's studies of Thracian glosses<sup>87</sup>. Solely, Slavova's paper, «On the Thracian Syllable» seems to look towards new horizons.

#### **4. Conclusions**

As we have tried to show along these lines, our knowledge on Ancient Thrace has advanced by leaps and bounds in the last two decades. Gone are the days when Thracology was born and when research was chiefly carried out by Bulgarian and Rumanian scholars that provided the basis for future advances. Steadily, corpora see the

---

<sup>82</sup> Sharankov (2011, 139-145); Dana (2018, 244).

<sup>83</sup> According to Dana's account (2018, 245, with earlier bibliography), four different alphabetic varieties can be isolated, two in Bulgaria (at Kjolmen and in the area of Ezevoro-Duvanlij) and two in the area of Zone-Samothrace-Maronea (apart from those already mentioned as new texts from Zone, another variant consisting of a single inscription from Samothracia).

<sup>84</sup> Dana (2018, 247-251).

<sup>85</sup> See also Camia (2018, 2- 6) for the influence of Latin on Maroneia, Perinthos and Philippopolis.

<sup>86</sup> Dimitrov (2017), «The Thracian language and the epigraphical evidence». This congress, the last in a series of major international congresses devoted to the so-called Thracology discipline, took place in Kazanlak, Bulgaria in 2017; more information in <http://www.thracology2017.com/en/>.

<sup>87</sup> Yanakieva «Myth and Reality in Thracian Linguistics», Paliga «Thracian v. Dacian (Daco-Moesian). How many 'Thracian languages' were there spoken in the Antiquity?», Mircheva, Mihaylova «On the Etymology of some Thracian Glosses», and Falileyev «On the linguistic attribution of some geographical names in Thrace». The proceedings have not been published yet.

light and further linguistic studies generate from them. They try to be less reliant on etymology and more prone to innovate in their methodologies. Nonetheless, there is still much work to be done regarding the topic at hand: epigraphic collections are lacking, numismatic material should be up-dated and reconsidered within the linguistic analysis and comparative studies focused on linguistic contact and on the presence of Greek dialects among neighbouring areas in these less-known areas of Greece are still to be done.

## **Bibliography**

- Alonso Déniz, A. 2018: *The dialect of Thasos and the transmission of Archilochus' fragments*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 531-60.
- Andrianou, D. 2017: *Memories in stone: figured grave reliefs from Aegean Thrace*, Athens.
- Αρχαία Ζώνη I = Tsatsopoulou-Kaloudi, P., Brixhe, Cl. & Pardalidou, Ch. 2015, *Αρχαία Ζώνη I: Το Ιερό του Απόλλωνα*, Vol. 1, Κομοτηνή.
- Bechet, Fl. 2009: *Les colonies grecques du Pont gauche: histoire et langue*, in *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy 28-29 septembre 2007*, ed. G. Vottéro, Nancy, 81-118.
- Beševliev, V. 1964: *Spätgriechische und spätlateinische Inschriften aus Bulgarien*, Berlin.
- Bile, M. 2006 : *Le grec du Nord-Ouest: état des lieux*, in *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, edd. C. Brixhe, G. Vottéro, Nancy, 71-98.
- Blažek, V. 2005: *Paleo-Balkanian Languages I: Hellenic Languages*, «Sbornik praci Filozoficke Fakulty Brnenske Univerzity», 10, 15-33.
- Boteva, D. 2007: *Dedicators with Roman Names and the Indigenous Cult of the Thracian Horseman (a reprint)*”, «*Archaeologica Bulgarica*», 11, 75-89.
- Bouzek, J, Graninger, D. 2015: *Geography*, in *A companion to Ancient Thrace*, edd. J. Valeva, E. Nankov, D. Graninger, Malden (Massachusetts) - Oxford, 2015, 12-21.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2004: *Nouvelle chronologie anatolienne et date d'élaboration des alphabets grec et Phrygien*, «CRAI» (fasc. I), 271-289.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2006a: *Zôné et Samothrace: lueurs sur la langue thrace et nouveau chapitre de la grammaire commparée ?*, «CRAI», 150(1), 121-146.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2006b: *Situation, spécificités et contraintes de la dialectologie grecque. À propos de quelques questions soulevées par la Grèce centrale*, in *Peuplements et genèses dialectales dans la Grèce antique*, edd. C. Brixhe, G. Vottéro, Nancy, 39-69.

- Brixhe, Cl. 2008: *Un phénomène aréal: la substitution de < E > à < O > en finale en Thrace, à Thasos et en Thessalie*, in ΘΕΡΜΗ ΚΑΙ ΦΩΣ. LICHT UND WÄRME. Αφιερωματικός Τόμος στη μνήμη του Α.-Φ. Χριστίδη, ed. Μαρία Θεοδοροπούλου, Thessaloniki, 215-223.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2015 = cfr. *Αρχαία Ζώνη I*.
- Brixhe, Cl. 2018: *Thracian*, in *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics*, HSK 41.3, edd. J. Klein, B. Joseph, M. Fritz, Berlin-Boston, 1850-1854.
- Brixhe, Cl, Panayotou, A. 1997: *Le Thrace*, in *Langues indo-européennes*, ed. F. Bader, 179-203.
- Bubenik, V. 1989: *Hellenistic and Roman Greece as a sociolinguistic area*, Amsterdam.
- Bubenik, V. 2014: *Language contact*, «EAGLL», vol. 2, ed. G. K. Giannakis, 299-306.
- Bubenik, V. 2018: *North-West Doric koina and the issue of 'koinization': Sociolinguistic Concerns*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 149-166.
- Camia, F. 2019: *At the crossroads of different traditions. Social and cultural dynamics in Roman Thrace through the epigraphic practice*, in *Sprachen – Schriftkulturen – Identitäten der Antike. Beiträge des XV. Internationalen Kongresses für Griechische und Lateinische Epigraphik, Wien 28. August bis 1. September 2017*, vol. 1, edd. F. Beutler, T. Pantzer, Einzelvorträge, Wiener Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte online (WBAGon) 1, Wien 2019.
- Catling, R. W., Marchand, F. 2010: *Onomatologos: studies in Greek personal names presented to Elaine Matthews*, Oxford.
- Chryssanthaki-Nagle, K. 2010: *Bilan de la recherche archéologique en Thrace Égéeenne*, «Revue Archéologique. Nouvelle Série», 1, 204-214.
- Crespo Güemes, E. 2018: *The softening of obstruent consonants in the Macedonian dialect*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 299-328.
- Dana, D. 2001-2003: *Notes onomastiques daco-mésiennes*, «Il Mar Nero», 5, 77-89.
- Dana, D. 2003a : *Dékinais et Avézina. Précisions onomastiques sur deux noms historiques des Daces*, «Ephemeris Napocensis», 13, 143-147.
- Dana, D. 2003b : *Les daces dans les ostraca du désert oriental de l'Égypte morphologie des noms daces*, «ZPE», 143, 166–186.
- Dana, D. 2004: *Onomastique est-balkanique en Dacie romaine (noms thraces et daces)*, in *Orbis antiquus. Studia in honorem Ioannis Pisonis (Cluj-Napoca)*, edd. L. Ruscu, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, 430-48.
- Dana, D. 2006a: *The historical names of the Dacians and their memory: new documents and a preliminary outlook*, «Studia Universitatis 'Babeş-Bolyai'-Historia», 51(1), 99-125.

- Dana, D. 2006b: *Les noms de facture thrace dans LGPN IV: les noms fantômes et d'autres corrections*, «ZPE», 157, 127–142.
- Dana, D. 2009: *Maria-Gabriella G. Parissaki, Prosopography and Onomasticon of Aegean Thrace, Athènes, 2007 (Meletēmata 49)*, «RA», 47, 2009 (1), 107-108.
- Dana, D. 2010, *La préhistoire du nom de Saint Sébastien: onomastiques en contact*, in *Onomatologos*, edd. R. W. Catling, Marchand, Oxford, 390-397.
- Dana, D. 2011a: *La différenciation interne de l'onomastique thrace*, in *Personal Names in the Western Roman World*, ed. T. Meißner, Berlin, 16-18.
- Dana, D. 2011b : *L'impact de l'onomastique latine sur les onomastiques indigènes dans l'espace thrace*, in *Les noms de personnes dans l'Empire romain. Transformations, adaptation, évolution*, ed. M. Dondin-Payre, Paris, 37-87.
- Dana, D. 2012: *Peter A. Dimitrov, Thracian Language and Greek and Thracian epigraphy*, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, 2009, «Ancient West & East», 11, 344-347.
- Dana, D. 2013: *Les Thraces dans les diplômes militaires: onomastique et statut des personnes*, in *Thrakika Zetemata II. Aspects of the Roman Province of Thrace*, ed. M. G. Parissaki, Athens, 219-269.
- Dana, D. 2014: *Onomasticon Thracicum: répertoire des noms indigènes de Thrace, Macédoine Orientale, Mésies, Dacie et Bithynie*, Athens.
- Dana, D. 2015: *Inscriptions*, in *A companion to Ancient Thrace*, edd. J. Valeva, E. Nankov, D. Graninger, Malden (Massachusetts) - Oxford, 243-264.
- Dana, D. 2017: *Hellénisation par suffixation : noms non grecs et suffixes grecs*, in *La suffixation des anthroponymes grecs antiques (SAGA). Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 17-19 septembre 2015, Université Jean-Moulin–Lyon 3*, edd. A. Alonso, L. Dubois, Cl. Le Feuvre, S. Minon, 201-223.
- Dana, D. 2018: *The Project Onomasticon Thracicum Supplementum (OnomThracSuppl)* [retrieved from <http://www.anhima.fr/spip.php?article1078&lang=fr>]
- Del Barrio Vega, M<sup>a</sup> L. 2014, *Ionic*, «EAGLL», vol. 2, ed. G. K. Giannakis, 260-267.
- 2018a: *The Ionic of North Aegean (from the River Strymon to the River Hebrus)*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 473-510.
- 2018b: *The Greek Language in the Black Sea*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 511-530.
- Detschew, D. 1957: *Die thrakischen Sprachreste*, Wien.
- Dimitrov, P. A. 2009: *Thracian language and Greek and Thracian epigraphy*, Newcastle.
- Dimitrova, N. M., Klinton, K. 2003: *An Archaic inscription from Samothrace*, «Hesperia», 72, 235-239.

- Dunant, Ch., Pouilloux, J. 1958: *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos. II. De 196 avant J.-C. jusqu'à la fin de l'Antiquité. (Études thasiennes 5)*, Paris.
- Filos, P. 2018: *The dialectal variety of Epirus*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 215-248.
- Flensted-Jensen, P. 2004: *Thrace from Axios to Strymon*, in *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, edd. M. H. Hansen, Th. Nielsen, Oxford, 810-853.
- Fortson, B. W. 2010, *Indo-European language and culture*, Chichester.
- Fournier, J., Hamon, P., Parissaki, M. G. 2015: *Recent epigraphic research in Thasos, Aegean Thrace & Samothrace (2005-2015)*, «Archaeological Reports», 61, 75-93.
- Fournier, J., Parissaki, M. G. 2018: *Les communautés du nord Égéen : au temps de l'hégémonie romaine : entre ruptures et continuités*, Athens.
- Friedman, V. A. 2011: *The Balkan languages and Balkan linguistics*, «Annual Review of Anthropology», 40, 275-291.
- Friedman, V. A, Joseph, B. 2018, *The Balkan Languages*, Cambridge.
- Hansen, M. H., Nielsen, Th. (edd.) 2004: *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, Oxford.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1957: *Trakijiskijat ezik (The Thracian language)*, Sofia.
- Georgiev, Vl. 1977: *Trakite i texnijat ezik*, Sofia.
- Giannakis, G. K. (ed.) 2015: *Ο γλωσσικός χάρτης της κεντρικής και βόρειας Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαιότητα*, Thessaloniki.
- Giannakis, G. K. 2018: *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea: introductory remarks*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 1-26,
- Giannakis, G. K., Crespo, E., Filos, P. (edd.) 2018: *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, Berlin – Boston.
- Hajnal, I. 2003: *Methodische Vorbemerkungen zu einer Palaeolinguistik des Balkanraums*, in *Languages in Prehistoric Europe*, edd. A. Bammesberger; Th. Vennemann; M. Bieswanger; J. Grzega, Heidelberg, 117-145.
- Hálmagi, D. 2015: *Dan Dana, Onomasticon Thracicum. Répertoire des noms indigènes de Thrace, Macédoine Orientale, Mésies, Dacie et Bithynie*, «Studia Antiqua et Archaeologica» 21(2), 259-271.
- Hatzopoulos, M. B. 2007: *La position dialectale du macédonien à la lumière des découvertes épigraphiques récentes*, in *Die altgriechischen Dialekte: Wesen und Werden. Akten des Kolloquiums Freie Universität Berlin 19.-22. September 2001*, ed. I. Hajnal, Innsbruck, 157-176.

- Hatzopoulos, M. B. 2018, *Recent research in the Ancient Macedonian dialect: consolidation and new perspectives*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 299-328.
- I. Aeg. Thrac. = Loukopoulou, L. D., Parissaki, M.-G., Psoma, S., Zournatzi, A. (2005), *Inscriptiones antiquae partis Thraciae quae ad ora maris Aegaei sita est (praefecturae Xanthes, Rhodopes et Hebri) = Ἐπιγραφὲς τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἑβρου (Νομοὶ Ξάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἑβρου)*, Athens.
- IGBulg I-V = Mikhailov, G. 1958–1997: *Inscriptiones graecae in Bulgaria repertae*, Sofia.
- ILBulg = Gerov, B. V. 1989: *Inscriptiones Latinae in Bulgaria repertae (inter fluvios Oescum et Iatrum)*, Sofia.
- IScM I-V = 1980-2015: *Inscriptiones Scythiae Minoris*, Bucarest.
- Janouchová, P. 2018: *Thracians, Greek or Romans? The Inhabitants of Ancient Thrace and their Identity Based in Funerary Inscriptions*, in *Reflections on Roman Imperialisms*, edd. M. A. Jancović, Vl. D. Mihajlović, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, 288-306.
- Joseph, B. 2007: *Broad vs. localistic dialectology, standard vs. dialect: The case of the Balkans and the drawing of linguistic boundaries*, in *4th international conference on language variation in Europe : University of Cyprus 17-19 June 2007*, 119-134.
- Joseph, B. 2010: *Language contact in the Balkans*, in *The handbook of language contact*, ed. R. Hickey, Chichester – Malden (Massachusetts), 618-633.
- Joseph, B. 2018: *Linguistic contact in the Ancient Balkans: A Sprachbund, or something else ?*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 197-211.
- Katičić, R. 1976: *Ancient languages in the Balkans*, The Hague - Paris.
- Klein, J., Joseph, B., Fritz M. (edd.) 2018: *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics, HSK 41.3*, Berlin-Boston.
- Krapova, I., Joseph, B. 2019: *Balkan syntax and (universal) principles of grammar*, Berlin-Boston.
- Kretschmer, P. 1896 : *Einleitung in die Gesichte der griechischen Sprache*, Göttingen.
- Lehmann, K. 1960: *Samothrace 2, 2, The inscriptions on ceramics and minor objects*, London.
- LGPN IV = Fraser, P. M. & Matthews, E. 2005: *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names IV: Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Regions of the Black Sea*, Oxford.
- Ligorio, O., Lubotsky, A. 2018: *Phrygian*, in *Handbook of comparative and historical Indo-European linguistics, HSK 41.3*, edd. J. Klein, B. Joseph, M. Fritz, Berlin-Boston, 1816-1831.
- Loukopoulou, L. 1989: *Contribution à l'histoire de la Thrace propontique durant la période archaïque. Meletemata 9*, Athens.
- Loukopoulou, L. 2004a: *Thrace from Strymon to Nestos*, in *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, edd. M. H. Hansen, Th. Nielsen, Oxford, 854-869.

- Loukopoulou, L. 2004b: *Thrace from Nestos to Hebros*, in *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis*, edd. M. H. Hansen, Th. Nielsen, Oxford, 854-869.
- Mallory, J. P., Adams, D. Q. 2006: *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*, Oxford.
- Matsas, D. 2004: *Η Σαμοθράκη στην Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου*, in *Το Αιγαίο στην Πρώιμη Εποχή του Σιδήρου* (= *Actes du Colloque International, Rhodes 1<sup>er</sup>-4 nov. 2002*), edd. N. Chr. Stamboulides, A. Giannikouri, Athens, 227-257.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. 1985: *Los dialectos dorios del noroeste*, Salamanca. 1985
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. 2012: *Ancient Macedonian as a Greek Dialect: A Critical Survey on Recent Work*, in *Ancient Macedonia: Language, History, Culture*, ed. G. K. Giannakis, Thessaloniki, 133–145.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. 2014a: *Northwest Greek*, «EAGLL», vol. 2, ed. G. K. Giannakis, 518–524.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. 2014b: *Macedonian*, «EAGLL», vol. 2, ed. G. K. Giannakis, 392-397.
- Méndez Dosuna, J. V. 2018: *The language of the Dodona oracular tablets: The Non-Doric Inquiries*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filios, Berlin - Boston, 265-296.
- Mihailov, G. 1943: *La langue des inscriptions grecques de Bulgarie. Phonétique et Morphologie*, Sofia.
- Minkova, M. 2000: *The Personal Names of the Latin Inscriptions in Bulgaria*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Muller, A. 2010: *D'Odonis à Thasos. Thraces et Grecs (VIIIe–VIe s.): essai de bilan*, in *Grecs et indigènes de la Catalogne à la Mer Noire: Actes des rencontres du programme européen Ramses 2 (2006-2008)*, ed. H. Tréziny, Paris, 213-224.
- Paliga, S. 2015: *Ethnic and linguistic distinctions in the ancient Balkan area. How many languages were there in the Antiquity?*, in *Балканските езици, литератури и култури. Дивергенция и конвергенция [Languages, Literature and Culture in the Balkans. Divergences and Convergences]*, edd. П. Асенова, Р. Станчева, В. Алексова, Р. Бейлери, Sofia, 37-43.
- Paliga, S. 2016: *Linguistic Thracology and the Balkansprachbund: are they synonyms? Some thoughts on the use and abuse of terminology*, «Linguistique Balkanique», LV, (2-3), 135-148.
- Paliga, S. 2018: *The substratum (Thracian) place names in Romania and Bulgaria. Some thoughts regarding methodology and deontology*, «Romanoslavica», LIII (3), 137-156.
- Panayotou, A. 1994: *Ancient Greek Dialects in Northern Greece*, in *Themes in Greek Linguistics: Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading*,

- September 1993, edd. I. Philippaki-Warburton, K. Nicolaidis, M. Sifianou, Amsterdam, 421-426.
- 1998: *L'Atticisation de la Macédoine: l'une des sources de la koine*, «Verbum», 11, 245-260.
- 2007: *Greek and Thracian*, in *A history of Ancient Greek. From the beginnings to Late Antiquity*, ed. A.-Ph. Christidis, Cambridge, 745–775.
- Parissaki, M. G. 2007, *Prosopography and onomasticon of Aegean Thrace*, Paris.
- Parissaki, M. G. 2018: *Search of territories in Southwestern Thrace: The Peraia of Samothrace, the strategy of Korpilike and the Civitas of Traianopolis*, in *Proceedings of the First International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference (Plovdiv, October 2016)*, edd. L. Vagalinski, M. Raycheva, D. Boteva, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 13-20.
- Pouilloux, J. 1954: *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos. De la fondation de la cite a 196 avant J.-C. (Etudes thasiennes 3)*, Paris.
- Serafimov, P. 2007: *Etymological analysis of Thracian toponyms and hydronyms*, in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Topical Conference, Origin of Europeans, Jutro, Ljubljana*, ed. A. Perdih, Ljubljana, 134-154.
- Sharankov, N. 2011: *Language and Society in Roman Thrace*, in *Early Roman Thrace. New Evidence from Bulgaria (JRA Suppl. Ser. 82)*, ed. I. P. Haynes, Portsmouth (Rhode Island), 135-155.
- Slavova, M. 2004: *Phonology of the Greek Inscriptions in Bulgaria*, Stuttgart.
- Slavova, M. 2005: *Transliteration of Thracian names through the resources of the Greek alphabet: <i> digraphs in the Thracian names*, in *Thrace in the Graeco-Roman World. Proceedings of the 10th International Congress of Thracology. Komotini/Alexandroupolis*, ed. A. Iakovidou, Athens, 18-23.
- Slavova, M. 2006: *Thracian names written through Greek and Latin letters: a philological approach*, «ORPHEUS. Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies», 16, 79-89.
- Slavova, M. 2009: *The Greek Language on the Bulgarian Coast of the Black Sea in Antiquity (6th cent. BC-1st cent. BC)*, in *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy 28-29 septembre 2007*, ed. G. Vottéro, Nancy, 195-220.
- Slavova, M. 2011: *Thracian Hydronymy by Svetlana Yanakieva*, «ORPHEUS. Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies», 18, 89-92.
- Slavova, M. 2015: *The Thracian diphthong /oi/ revisited*, in *Studia classica Serdicensia, Vol. 4. In Honour of Prof. Boris Gerov (1903– 1991)*, edd. Z. Gocheva, M. Slavova, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 139–151.
- Slavova, M. 2016: *Άπαξ εἰρημένα and Other Lexical Rarities in the Greek Inscriptions on the Bulgarian Coast of the Black Sea in Antiquity*, in *Studia Classica Serdicensia V, Monuments*

- and texts in antiquity and beyond essays for the centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915–1991)*, edd. M. Slavova, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 488-511.
- Slavova, M. 2017: *A melting pot of Thracian, Greek, and Roman culture*, in *A handbook to classical reception in Eastern and Central Europe*, edd. D. Dutsch, D. LaCourse Munteanu, Z. Martirsova Torlone, Malden (Massachusetts) - Oxford - Chichester, 396-410.
- Solin, H. 2010: *M. G. Parissaki, Prosopography and Onomasticon of Aegean Thrace (2007)*, «Historische Zeitschrift», 291, 477-479.
- Striano Corrochano, A. 2018: *Koiné, Koiná, Koinaí: Are we Talking About the Same Thing?*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 131-148.
- Taşlıklioğlu, Z. 1961-1971: *Trakya'da epigrafya araştırmaları [= Epigraphic Researches in Thrace]*, 2 vols., Istanbul.
- Tataki, A. B. 2018: *On some personal names of Thrace*, in *Proceedings of the First International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference (Plovdiv, October 2016)*, edd. L. Vagalinski, M. Raycheva, D. Boteva, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 161-167.
- Thonemann, P. J. 2006: *Loukopoulou, L.D., Parissaki, M.G. G., Psoma, S. & Zournatzi, A. (2005), Ἐπιγραφὲς τῆς Θράκης τοῦ Αἰγαίου μεταξὺ τῶν ποταμῶν Νέστου καὶ Ἐβρου (Νομοὶ Ἐάνθης, Ροδόπης καὶ Ἐβρου), Αθήνα*, «The Classical Review», 56 (2), 458-459.
- Tokhasiev, S. R. 2009: *De nouvelles données sur l'histoire des formes les plus anciennes de la koiné dans le nord de la Mer Noire*, in *Le grec du monde colonial Antique: Le N. et N.-O. de la Mer Noire. Actes de la table Ronde de Nancy 28-29 septembre 2007*, ed. G. Vottéro, Nancy, 33-49.
- Tomić, O. 2006: *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic Features*, Dordrecht.
- Tréziny, H. 2010: *Greco et indigènes de la Catalogne à la Mer Noire: Actes des rencontres du programme européen Ramses 2 (2006-2008)*, Paris.
- Tselikas, S. 2018: *The Doric dialects in the corpus of the oracular tablets from Dodona*, in *Studies in Ancient Greek dialects. From Central Greece to the Black Sea*, edd. G. K. Giannakis, E. Crespo, P. Filos, Berlin - Boston, 249-264.
- Tzitzilis, Chr. 2014, *Greek and Thracian*, «EAGLL», vol. 2, ed. G. K. Giannakis, 83-89.
- Veksina, M. 2019: *Georgios K. Giannakis, Emilio Crespo, Panagiotis Filos (ed.), Studies in Ancient Greek Dialects: From Central Greece to the Black Sea. Trends in classics, Supplementary volumes, 49. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2018*, «Bryn Mawr Classical Review», 2019.02.12. [retrieved from <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2019/2019-02-12.html>]
- Velkova, Ž. 1974: *Nachträge zu den Thrakischen Sprachresten (1957-1972)*, «Linguistique balkanique», 17 (2), 55-76.
- Velkova, Ž. 1986: *The Thracian glosses. Contribution to the study of Thracian vocabulary*, Amsterdam.

- Vlahov, K. 1963: *Nachträge und Berichtigungen zu den Thrakischen Sprachresten und Rückwörterbuch*, «Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Fac. phil.», 57, 219-372.
- Woodward, R. D. 2004: *Introduction*, in *Cambridge encyclopedia of the world's Ancient Languages*, ed. R. D. Woodward, Cambridge, 1-18.
- Yanakieva, S. 2009: *Тракийската Хидронимия [Thracian Hydronymy]*, «Studia Thracica», 12, Sofia. [In Bulgarian with English summary]
- Yanakieva, S. 2012: *Тракийските експлозивни съгласни. I. Ономастичният материал, Thracia 20, in honour of the 40th anniversary of the Institute of Thracology*, 331–349.
- Yanakieva, S. 2014: *Thrakisch und Dakisch–Sprachen oder Dialekte?*, «ORPHEUS. Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies», 21(1), 21-37.
- Yanakieva, S. 2016a: *Thracian Plosive Consonants. II. The Glosses*, in *Studia Classica Serdicensia V, Monuments and texts in antiquity and beyond essays for the centenary of Georgi Mihailov (1915–1991)*, edd. M. Slavova, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 512-518.
- Yanakieva, S. 2016b: *120 years Thracian linguistics. Stages and prospects*, «Journal of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences», 2, 13-17. [In Bulgarian with English abstract]
- Yanakieva, S. 2017a: *Thracian onomastics and the issue of semantic motivation*, «Bulgarian Language», 64, 4, 46–5. [In Bulgarian with English abstract]
- Yanakieva, S. 2017b: *Did a Getic language exist?*, «ORPHEUS. Journal of Indo-European and Thracian Studies», 23-24, 5-15.
- Yanakieva, S. 2018: *Language and Ethnic Identity of the Thracians during the Roman Age and Late Antiquity*, in *Proceedings of the First International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference (Plovdiv, October 2016)*, edd. L. Vagalinski, M. Raycheva, D. Boteva, N. Sharankov, Sofia, 131-139.
- Vagalinski, L., Raycheva, M., Boteva, D., Sharankov, N. 2018: *Proceedings of the First International Roman and Late Antique Thrace Conference (Plovdiv, October 2016)*, edd. L. Sofia.
- Vlachopoulos, A., Tsifaki, D. (eds), 2017: *Αρχαιολογία IV – Μακεδονία και Θράκη, Εκδόσεις Μέλισσα, Αθήνα 2017 / Archaeology IV – Macedonia and Thrace, Athens.*
- Zannis, A. G. 2014: *Le pays entre le Strymon et le Nestos: géographie et histoire (VIIe-IVe siècle avant J.-C.)*, Athens.