

Serbian and Greek: A Long History of Lexical Borrowing*

Jasna Vlajić-Popović

Abstract

This paper offers diachronic insight into the influence of the Greek language on the Serbian lexicon in the domain of loanwords. After an overview of some historically and linguistically relevant factors, a systematisation of Serbian Grecisms is presented—and illustrated with selected examples. This is based on chronological stratification and formal criteria related to both registers, literary and vernacular (with a special stress on the most significant, medieval period), as well as geographic and genetic classifications of Serbian Grecisms. Finally, the complexity of the factors involved in this analysis is illustrated with some formal and/or semantic doublets originating from various periods and directions of borrowing Greek words into Serbian.

Keywords: Serbian language, loanword, Grecism, diachrony, etymology.

0. Among the many languages that have, in various ways, influenced Serbian throughout its history, Greek holds a **special place**. This

* The article results from research on the project Nr. 178007 “Etimološka istraživanja srpskog jezika i izrada *Etimološkog rečnika srpskog jezika*” which is fully financed by the Ministry of education and science of the Republic of Serbia.

is due to the fact that, in comparison to other languages,¹ the contact of Serbian with Greek² was the most long-lasting, thematically many-sided and spatially diversified. Our interest is limited to only one direction of this contact, from Greek to Serbian.³

0-1. This contact stretched, with interruptions, over a **period** of one or even two millennia (the latter reckoning originates from the Prot-Slavic era and lasts through the Middle Ages to the present day, cf. § 1., § 2., § 3., § 3-3.), covered almost all **aspects** of life (religion, culture, government, military, commerce, agriculture, everyday life, etc.) and arrived from nearly all **directions** (apart from Greek proper, it also came through Dalmatian, Turkish and European mediations—which implies not only Southern, but also Western, Eastern and even Northern sources of diffusion of Greek lexicon into Serbian).

0-2. It is noteworthy that over such a long timespan both languages **evolved** and also both went through many centuries of diglossia (Serbian from the origins of its literacy, at the beginning of the second millennium A. D.,⁴ till the 19th century—Greek even longer, from the Hellenistic

1 For Turkish, German, Hungarian and Albanian, cf. Škaljić 1974 (also Петровић 1993, Радић 2001), Striedter-Temps 1958, Hadrovics 1985, Станишић 1995 respectively.

2 Our topic is the historical contact of the two languages, but it should not be forgotten that they are also cognate on the Proto-Indo-European level.

3 The impact of Serbian on Greek, itself hardly discernable from the influences of other South Slavic languages (esp. Bulgarian and Macedonian), is left aside (in this respect, cf. the title of M. Vasmer's monograph *Die Slaven in Griechenland*, Berlin 1941; also www.promacedonia.org/en.mv Sept. 2, 2014).

4 Old Serbian literacy originated in the 11–12th century A. D. on the basis of Old Slavonic—which, in its turn, began in the mid-9th century through translations (of religious books and literary works) from Greek into the dialect of the Macedonian Slavs. The language of the first Serbian literacy, Serbian Slavonic, as one of the recensions of Old Church Slavonic, existed parallel to the spoken idiom, Old Serbian language (vernacular successor of the western South Slavic dialect of Proto-Slavic, and the direct predecessor of modern Serbian), which developed independently from the written idiom. Starting from the 18th century, as its heir in the capacity of the literary language, Russian Slavonic was used, after it Slaveno-Serpski, while the vernacular meanwhile spontaneously evolved

era⁵ till the last quarter of the 20th century), which is why literary and vernacular influences, reflected in written and spoken idioms, intersect and intertwine in this relationship.⁶

0-3. One peculiarity of the Greek influence is that it was **seldom unmediated**. Direct borrowing took place only in the learned domain (in Serbian Slavonic translations from Greek originals). But due to the lack of contact between Greek and Serbian vernaculars,⁷ Greek words mostly entered Serbian indirectly, mediated, not unlike the Proto-Slavic Grecisms (§ 1-1), by other languages: by Romance (Dalmatian) and Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian) during the Middle Ages, by Turkish in post-Byzantine times and eventually by modern West-European languages.

0-3-1. The few exceptions to this pattern were the short-lasting Nemanjić expansion of the Serbian state onto Greek lands (13–14th century), then a variety of influences onto the spoken idiom from the religious sphere (the clergy was originally Greek and occasionally later as well), and finally sporadic cohabitation with Graecophone Aromanians who were often identified with ethnic Greeks (cf. § 4-2-2-1.).

to the stage in which it was standardized in Vuk Karadžić's reform. Greek influence on Serbian literacy includes the creation of the script—the Serbian Cyrillic—based on the Old Church Slavonic Cyrillic script, itself an adaptation of the Greek alphabet.

5 More about the specific interaction of two other diglossias, Latin and Greek, cf. Binder 2000; for the phenomenon of diglossia, identified in Greek examples and introduced into 19th century linguistics by J. Psicharis—as well as C. Ferguson's definition of the term, cf. *ibid.* 55–57.

6 This basic division into literary and vernacular Grecisms in the course of time resulted in some other oppositions: modern vs. obsolete, standard vs. dialectal, etc. (cf. Влајић-Поповић 2009: 384–386).

7 It is a geographically conditioned fact that, as with other western South Slavic languages (Slovene, Croatian) the historical territory of Serbian (and its dialects), ever since the migration into the Balkans, has been to the north of Jireček's line (in the Latin zone of the Balkans), while the eastern South Slavic languages were to the south of Jireček's line (in the Greek zone of the Balkans), cf. § 2-1.

0-4. Save for Serbian literacy in general (cf. note 4), Greek also had a certain influence on Serbian **syntax**,⁸ partly on its word-formation,⁹ but it had the greatest and strongest impact on the Serbian **lexicon**.

0-5. The most numerous among Greek lexemes in Serbian are foreign words (i. e. contemporary internationalisms, like in other European languages, cf. § 3-2.). Also there are many calques¹⁰ and loan translations¹¹ (mostly of medieval origin), but here we shall focus on what is typically understood as **Grecisms**—Greek **loanwords** in Serbian. Among them, nouns by far outnumber verbs and other parts of speech.

0-6. Although Serbian Grecisms have been studied extensively and are, consequently, well investigated,¹² a definitive **description** and entire

8 For the Old Serbian period cf. Грковић-Мејџор 2007, 2013; for newer phenomena that originated within the Balkan Linguistic League (profiled primarily under the influence of Greek) which had a more intensive impact on southeastern dialects of Serbian, cf. Попов 1984; for the most conspicuous feature of analytisation of the case system, cf. Милорадовић 2003; for details on various morpho-syntactic characteristics, cf. Мишеска-Томић 2006: 108–125, 271–279, 361–369, 484–511.

9 E. g. the suffix *-isati*, usually understood as Turkish, is of Greek origin (cf. Skok 1: 729).

10 Such as *nastavnik*, modelled after Gk. *epistátēs* ‘teacher (lit.: the one who stands above)’, *azbuka* (as a blend of the first two letters) modelled after Gk. *alfábēton*, cf. Крепаяц 1978: 77 ff.; for a series of Old Serbian creations cf. Zett 1970; for a view of those in Vuk Karadžić’s *Srpski rječnik*, cf. Slapšak 1988.

11 Such as Serb. *država* from Gk. *krátos* (Крепаяц 1978: 75–76).

12 In the course of the last century and a half, the major sources of studies on Greek lexicon have been Miklosich 1867, Vasmer 1944, Поповић 1953, 1955, Skok, Vinja; for details on the first reference, cf. Влајић-Поповић 2013, for comments on the rest, especially Vinja’s individual articles that preceded his etymological dictionary, cf. Влајић-Поповић 1986. Present studies are focused, on the one hand, on finding the rare instances of still unrecognized Grecisms in newly published dialect dictionaries of Serbian (the novelties being either entire words—which is not often the case—or only certain distinct forms or meanings, hitherto not recorded in Serbian yet clearly documented in Greek, cf. Влајић-Поповић 2011, 2014) or detecting them in newly “discovered” Old Serbian documents (e. g. Поломац 2007), and on the other hand, on finding new approaches to studying already known Grecisms: developing a methodol-

inventory are still **missing**. This is only partly due to the fact that new attestations of hitherto unknown Grecisms are still being discovered in new dialect dictionaries (cf. e. g. Влајић-Поповић 2014), and in a larger degree, to the **methodological ambivalence** in defining the classes of Grecisms to be included (standard, dialectal, archaic, obsolete; direct, indirect; primary, secondary, etc., cf. § 4-1.–4-2., § 5. ff.). In previous studies their number varies from 200 (by the most strict criteria, which exclude all obsolete and indirect Grecisms, cf. Поповић 1953: 200–201), up to the more realistic 900 to 1,200 (which is the sum of those registered by Vasmer 1944, Поповић 1953, 1955 and Skok). Among them there are some 550 completely obliterated items recorded by Vasmer (1944 *passim*, cf. Влајић-Поповић 2009: 386–387). Quantification is not a goal in itself, and it is not as important as the systematisation of principles for reaching those numbers in a diachronic perspective, i. e. establishing their chronology and the criteria for recognising them. That is what will be attempted here, while the establishment of a firmer methodological framework for studying Grecisms, which may yield a fuller overall picture, remains a task for the future.

0-7. If we leave aside the synchronically relevant divisions of Grecisms (cf. note 6), while still bearing in mind their classifications by semantic groups, it is only logical that we should present a **diachronic** review of Grecisms in Serbian. Although Vasmer divided them according to the ways of borrowing (the synchronic aspect he covered by sorting them into thirty three semantic groups), we have recently proposed a combined division of Grecisms which presents their analysis by three criteria: chronological, geographic and genetic (Влајић-Поповић 2009). The ways in which they can simultaneously be present in one and the same Serbian word is made clear in the **Table** (cf. § 7.) which shows in parallel how a single Greek word can take different guises in Serbian, depending on the time and ways of borrowing.

ogy for future more elaborate presentation of the body of Grecisms in Serbian which will pay more attention to clarifying semantic developments, recognizing secondary semantic adaptations and the like (cf. Влајић-Поповић 1996), and also rectifying the knowledge of intermediary languages (Лома 2000, Лома 2000), correcting chronology whenever possible. Sifting through this material has established an interesting class of pseudo-Grecisms (Влајић-Поповић 1995, Влајић-Поповић 2001).

1. Serbian being a Slavic language, **Proto-Slavic** Grecisms¹³ belong to the corpus of Serbian Grecisms too. Since they are dated in the **reconstructed** proto-language, none of them can claim Greek origin with absolute certainty, but they are identified on the basis of phonetic features—some of which are related to the history of Greek phonetics, and the others to possible Scythian-Sarmatian or Gothic mediations,¹⁴ hence they are indirect borrowings too. A few of these Grecisms were recognized as such long ago (cf. § 1-1., 1-3.), and a number of them only recently (§ 1-2.). It is only in this group that we refer to specific sources of respective etymologies, since they are relatively new and/or not commonly accepted. For all the rest, save for cases when specific details are referred to, it goes without saying that sources are Skok and Vasmer 1944 (with our periodisation observing their datation). Also, meanings are omitted for standard words (except when semantics is discussed) and included just for dialectal or obsolete ones.

1-1. Proto-Slavic Grecisms of **non-specific** mediation still do show features relevant for datation. On the Greek side it is betacism (Gk. $\beta >$ PSl. *b*, and not *v*) e. g. in *korablja* (< PSl. **korabl'ь* < Gk. *karábion*, cf. Vasmer 1944: 82–83; Skok 2: 152; ЭССЯ 11: 45–49 with an alternative solution), or in *koliba* (< PSl. **kolyba* < Gk. *kalýbē*, cf. Vasmer 1944: 79; Skok 2: 124; ЭССЯ 8: 15–17, 10: 162–164, for detailed discussion cf. OC EPCJ 45–46); in the case of *trem* < PSl. **trěmь*, **teremь* the absence of the word [Gk. *téremnon*] from Middle and Modern Greek (cf. Vasmer 1944: 144, while Skok 3: 502 renders it a Slavic word) is actually an argument for the supposition that it was borrowed in Antiquity. On the Slavic side, it is the transmission of Gk. $\alpha >$ PSl. *o* (although it allows for a vast time-

13 Due to the flexible timelines of the Slavic proto-language, some scholars treat them as Common Slavic (in German, they would be “gemeinslavisch” rather than “urslavisch”).

14 It occurred as a consequence of Greek colonisation of the northern shores of the Black Sea (6–5th century B. C.) when the speakers of Greek came close to—although not into direct contact with—the speakers of Proto-Slavic; the first neighbours of those Greek colonies were peoples of Iranian stock, Scythians and Sarmatians. In the age of the late Roman Empire the Germanic Goths, having settled on the northern shores of the Black Sea and in the Danube basin, became mediators between proto Slavs and the Mediterranean civilisation.

span—of some 1,500 years, as far as the end of the first millennium A. D.—to be supposed) probably in *komora* (< PSl. **komora* < Gk. *kamára*, cf. Vasmer 1944: 81; Skok 2: 24–25; Фасмер 2: 305).

1-2. Proto-Slavic Grecisms revealing typical characteristics of a **Scythian** dialect (with *d* > *l*, *f* > *x*) include *luk* ‘garlic, onion’ (< PSl. **lukъ* < Scyth. **lauka-* < Gk. *daûkos* ‘various kinds of Umbelliferrae plants; Athamanta Cretensis, candy carrot’, cf. Loma 2000: 347), *haluga* ‘fence, palisade’ (< PSl. **xaloga* < Scyth. **χālanga-* < Gk. *phálanx* ‘round piece of wood, trunk’, cf. Лома 2000), *koš* ‘basket’ (< PSl. **košъ* < Scyth. **kaxina* < **kafina* < Gk. *kóphinos* ‘basket’, cf. Loma 2000: 348), *talog* ‘dregs, lees, sediment’ (< PSl. **talogъ* < Scyth. **tāлага-* < Gk. *látax* ‘the drops of wine in the bottom of the cup’, cf. Loma 2002: 53–55). On the Greek side, the argument for this mediation is the preservation of digamma (probably to be ascribed to the Dorian colonists) in *kurva* ‘whore’ (< PSl. **kurъva* < Scyth. **kó(u)r(u)vā* < Gk. dial. (Doric) *kórva* / *kórrā* ‘girl, maiden’, cf. Loma 2004: 41; Skok 2: 245 without a solution).

1-3. Proto-Slavic Grecisms supposedly mediated by Gothic (or Germanic) are *crkva* (< PSl. **съркы*, *-ъve* < Goth. *kiriko* < Gk. *kyriakē* (scil. *stóa*), cf. Skok 1: 275; ЭССЯ 3: 198–199; SP 2: 94–95) and *daska* (< PSl. **дска* < PGmc. *disku-* (< Lat. *discus*) < Gk. *diskos*, cf. Vasmer 1944: 53; Skok 1: 408 s. v. *diskos*; ЭССЯ 5: 183–184; SP 5: 167–170; ESJS 160).

2. Medieval Grecisms started entering Serbian (i. e. its immediate, not yet differentiated South Slavic predecessor) after the Serbs had moved from their proto Slavic homeland into the **Balkans**—where they were subsequently Christianized and eventually adopted the eastern, Graecophone rite, based on Greek literacy and Byzantine cultural models.

2-1. In the first phase, lasting approximately from the arrival in the 6–7th century till 1000 A. D. (which can be characterized as Southern Slavic since individual **Southern Slavic** languages were not yet clearly profiled, except for the Eastern vs. Western dichotomy) relatively few Greek words were adopted. For geographic reasons, the direct Grecisms entered the eastern parts of the South Slavic dialectal territory and their

expansion went towards the North-West, including the Serbian lands. In the opposite direction travelled the Grecisms mediated through Latin or Dalmatian since a considerable number of the western South Slavs were exposed to Romance influences. In general, this was a **pre-literate** phase, relevant only for the vernacular—so we are still dealing with reconstructions, and not with written records.

2-1-1. In this phase there is evidence of phonetic changes typical of early Slavic, such as *ǎ* > *o* in Gk. *pappās* > Serb. *pop*,¹⁵ Gk. *kassíteros* > Serb. *kositer*, *kositar*, also *ū* > *y* in Gk. *eleōusa* > Serb. *Leviša* (from an older *Levys-ja*), or liquid metathesis (followed by SSLav. lengthening) *or* > *ro* > *rā* in Gk. *mármaros* > Serb. *mramor* (cf. also *mermer* in § 4-2-1.).

2-1-2. On the Greek side, there is evidence of vitacism (Gk. *β* as [v] > PSll. *v*, and not *b*), hence *koljivo*¹⁶ < Gk. *kól(l)ybon* (unlike *korab*, *koliba*, cf. § 1-1.).¹⁷

2-1-3. Latin and/or Dalmatian mediation in this phase is evident in cases when Serb. *p* < Lat. *ph* < Gk. *φ*, e. g. in the phytonym *pasulj* < Gk. *phasou̐lion*, or in anthroponyms like *St(j)epan* < *Stéphanos* and *Pilip* < Gk. *Philíppos*, etc.¹⁸

15 Some authors consider this important term not to be a Grecism but (through Gothic mediation) a Germanism in Slavic (cf. the earliest Miklosich 1867: 119, or newer Поповић 1955: 132, and implicitly Vasmer 1944 from which it is missing). However, the argument that *popadija* ‘priest’s wife’ owes its *o* in the first syllable to analogy with the older *pop* ‘priest’ we understand, on the contrary, as proof of the Greek origin of both words—at least for the Southern Slavs, while for the Slavic West, German mediation is quite likely.

16 For secondary semantic adaptations of initial ‘frumentum coctum’ cf. Vla-
jčić-Popović 1996: 111–112.

17 Instances of vitacism and itacism in hagionyms like *Vlasije*, *Varvara* and *Ilija* (among the Dalmatian Catholics too) reflect the presence of Byzantine clerical organisation in Serbian (partly also Croatian) lands.

18 Other instances like OSerb. *panosъ* ‘torch’ < Gk. *phanós*, or OSerb. doublets like *kepalija*: *kefalija* ‘a military title’, *pervarъ*: *ferъvarъ* ‘February’, *dapinovъ* adj.: *dafina* /*davina* f. ‘oleaster, silver berry, (*Elaeagnus angustifolia*)’ (from Gk. *kephalē*, *pherbários*, *daphnē* respectively, cf. Vasmer 1944 s. vv.) are of a later date, closer to the 14th century when they were actually recorded.

2-2. In the **second** phase, starting from the 11–12th centuries (hence it could be named **Old Serbian**), in the historical context of intensified relations with the Byzantine world, followed by the expansion of **literacy**, a massive Greek influence was exerted, at both learned and vernacular levels—which calls for the need to distinguish between the two. In other words, we need to distinguish between the literary Serbian Slavonic and the vernacular Old Serbian Grecisms (for this diglossia, cf. § 0-2., note 4).

2-2-1. The unquestionably **literary** Grecisms resulted from broad-scale translating activity. They can be recognized by the thematic groups they belong to (religion, law, philosophy, literature, etc.), and by the formal characteristics of the idiom they appear in. The **vernacular** ones originated from the direct Serbian-Greek contact in the period of the Nemanjić expansion of the Serbian state into Greek lands (13–14th century), and from mediation via other Slavic languages (later Turkish too, cf. § 0-3.).

2-2-2. **Formal** distinctions between the literary and vernacular Grecisms (with a general tendency of the former to remain close to the original and the latter to drift away from it) are related to phonetic features, morphological characteristics and semantic changes.

2-2-2-1. A prominent **phonetic** feature of medieval vernacular Grecisms in Serbian, as opposed to the typically unaltered literary ones, is the transmission of Gk. φ as Serb. *v* (i. e. neither identical to the original, as in literary words, nor as *p*—as in older loans, cf. § 2-1-3.), e. g. *Stefan*: *Stevan*, *Trifun*: *Trivun*, *nafora*: *navora*.¹⁹

2-2-2-1-1. In this phase, certain literary vs. vernacular doublets came about because the latter, unlike the former, had undergone phonetic changes typical of the vernacular idiom of Serbian, such as the change of *-l* final into an *-o* final (which occurred in the 14–15th century), evident in *andĕo* vs. literary *angel* (both from Gk. *ángelos*).²⁰

19 While the two names and the church-related term also have a third variation, reflecting the older transmission of Gk. φ as Serb. *p* (cf. *St(j)epan*, *Tripun*, *napora* respectively), the culinary term *rouphitó* (*augó*) > Serb. *rovito* (*jaje*) ‘soft-boiled (egg)’ shows only the change of Gk. φ into Serb. vernacular *v*.

20 This vernacular form also features palatalisation of the guttural before a front vowel, as in *ćivot* vs. literary *kivotъ* ‘feretory, reliquary’, both from Gk. *kivōtion*, etc.

2-2-2-2. The principal **morphological** criterion for distinguishing between the literary and vernacular Grecisms is the degree of morphological adaptation—which is minor or absent in the former (e. g. nouns preserve nominative forms, like in *afe(n)dronь* ‘anus’, *finiks* ‘phoenix’, *krambi* ‘sort of cabbage’, *sinьklitiki* ‘spouse’, etc.—for more of those cf. § 2-3-1.), and regular in the latter: typically, nouns alter the case and/or gender, so they appear in forms closest to the Greek accusative, e. g. *livada* ‘meadow’ or *hiljada* ‘thousand’ (not **livas* or **hiljas*) for Gk. *libás*, *-ádos* or *chiliás*, *-ádos* (perhaps already developed in Greek); the original neutra in the nominative plural become feminina in the nominative singular, such as *aspra* ‘an old coin’, *hartija* ‘paper’, *stihija* ‘element’ for original Gk. *áspron*, *chartíon*, *stoicheíon* (cf. Vasmer 1944: 34). Also typical of vernacular Grecisms, after they have been phonetically adapted, is their **productivity**. It includes not only derivation, e. g. femininum *despotica* ‘despot’s wife’ (with Serb. suffix *-ica* for motive pairs) vs. intact loanword in literary *despina* ‘id’—both as counterparts to the masculine *despotь* ‘despot (a ruler’s title)’ (< Gk. *despótēs*), but also crossing the borders of the parts of speech they were originally borrowed into, as in the creation of postverbals non-existent in Greek, e. g. *miris* ‘smell’ < *mirisati* ‘to smell’ (Gk. aor. *emýrisa* < *myrízō* ‘to smell’).²¹

2-2-2-3. **Semantics** of medieval Serbian Grecisms (along with or regardless of their formal features), can also be indicative of their learned or vernacular nature: the literary OSerb. *dijakь* ‘scribe’ is primary to the later vernacular *đak* ‘pupil, student’ (perhaps mediated by MLat. *diacus*, both from Gk. *diákos*). Similarly, literary *đakonija* ‘munus diaconi’ (< Gk. *diakonía* ‘id’) develops the vernacular meaning pl. ‘delicacies, dainties’.²² Also, literary *harьнь* adj. ‘thankful’, derived from *harь* f. ‘mercy, grace’ (< Gk. *cháris* ‘id’) stands apart from the later dialectal *aran* adj. ‘good, nice’. The fact that most vernacular meanings were not recorded

21 Likewise, dial. *parasina* ‘abandoned vineyard or field’ < *parasiti* ‘neglect’ (< Gk. aor. *pareíasa* < *pareáō* ‘let pass, neglect’, cf. Поповић 1953: 218).

22 The same semantic shift is evident in a couple of its denominals, semantically neutral *đakoniti* ‘to be ordained a deacon (*đakon*)’ and the expressive one *đakonisati* ‘to live in luxury’.

until modern times—due to the lack of sources—does not exclude the possibility that they came about centuries earlier, in the Middle Ages.²³

2-3. It can be concluded that the class of medieval (Byzantine) Grecisms is the most numerous one and also the most important for the further development of the Serbian lexical fund.

2-3-1. The majority of literary words, regardless of their degree of adaptation, completely fell out of use after the Middle Ages. The list of medieval Grecisms totally unknown to modern Serbian contains at least 550 items (which is Vasmer's score,²⁴ still to be enlarged by new evidence). They vanished mostly due to extralinguistic factors—either certain unnecessary, once prestigious, Greek words were replaced by domestic ones (e.g. *aksađb* '1/6 of an ounce', *parikb* 'a settled peasant', *folb* 'obolus, phollis', *hitonb* '(under)robe'). Those that had belonged to the vast administrative-legal and military terminologies were outdated by default after the fall of Byzantium (except for some historical terms like *bula* /*vula* 'seal, stamp', *diadima* 'diadem, crown', *despot* 'despot', *hrisovulja* 'chryssovolon', *kir* 'master, dominus', *nomik* 'notary', *pr(i)ćija* 'dowry', *pronija(rb)* 'feud(al peasant)', *sevastokrator* 'title of the Great Župan (corresponding to the one introduced in Byzantium by Alexios Comnenos)', *sindēl* 'charta episcopi sigillo munita', *sinklit* 'council, as-

23 The antiquity of vernacular semantics tends to be directly proportional to the size of the area it is attested on, hence e. g. regionally limited denominal *tropariti* 'to talk much' (Crna Gora) is probably much younger than OSerb. *troparb* 'a church song, short hymn' (< Gk. *troparion* 'id') that it derives from (cf. Влајић-Поповић 2013: 363, note 103).

24 Some of them were even recorded relatively frequently, e.g. *akintb* 'hyacinth', *alazonikb* 'boaster', *anagnostb* 'lower servant (in a church)', *andaga* 'vessel', *anepbsei* 'nephew', *apomirizma* 'a healing preparation', *disb* 'West', *drosato* 'aqua rosacea', *elefantb* 'elephant', *jepistolija* 'letter', *fina* 'a kind of bird, eagle', *glidikzmo* 'a sweet', *hartofilakb* 'archivists', *hitonb* '(Christ's) robe', *idiozma* 'peppermint plant', *jehidna* 'viper, snake', *karkinb* 'crayfish, crab', *ki-knosb* 'swan', *lutro* 'bath', **mađer(ije)* 'kitchen', *migdalb* 'almond', *miriada* 'ten thousand', *bezoreksija* 'anorexia', *saharb* /*zaharb* 'sugar', *skimenb* 'young lion', *skinija* 'tent', *stiraksb* 'a kind of gum, storax', *tetrageb* 'notebook, fascicle', *topikb* 'a local, native person', *trikire* 'candlestick, candelabrum', *voithima* 'medicament', *zimiosati* 'punish', etc. (cf. Vasmer 1944 s.vv.).

sembly’, *sinor* ‘boundary’ or *domestik* ‘supreme commander’, *igemon* ‘(military) commander’, *kefalija* ‘a military title’, *pirg* ‘tower’, *stratilat* ‘magister militum’ respectively).

2-3-2. The Grecisms that have made it into modern standard Serbian (sometimes as slightly archaic words) are primarily terms of **religion** (*aliluja, amin, anđeo, anatema, demon, đavo, ipostas, jeres, jeretik, kanon, martir, metanija, Odigitrija, Panagija, pandokrator, sotona*) and **church** (related to its organization, like *arhiepiškop, arhijerej, arhimandrit, dohija, đakon, eparh, iguman, jerej, jeromonah, kaluđer, katastihъ, ktiitor, lavra, metoh, mitropolit, monah, paraklis, paroh, patrijarh, poklisar, pop, popadija, prezviter, prota, skit, stavrofor*; religious practice, like *antifon, irmos, katizma, kondak, litija, liturgija, mirosati, parastos, panagirikъ, parimija, sarandar / salandar, stihira, tropar*; or some concrete objects, like *amvon, apsida, đakonikon, epitrahilj, ikona, kandilo, kamilavka, minej, miro, nafora, nomokanon, oktoih, paterik, polijelej, potirъ / putir, prosfora, psaltir, ripida, sinaksar, tamjan, tipik, triod*), as well as **economy** in a broad sense (e. g. trade, like *aspra, dinar, hiljada, kamata, komad, litra, panađur, perper*; agriculture, like *livada, (v)lastar, stasъ / stasina*; seafaring, like *galija / golija, limenъ, sidro*—cf. note 28) and finally **everyday life** (in general, like *diple, kamara / komora, kositar, lipsati, mirisati, mustać, pizma; stihija, stipsъ / stipsa, temelj, trapъ / trap, varvarъ, zevgarъ*; specifically culinary, like *cvekla, kondir, pirunъ / piron, rovit, tr(a)peza; koljivo, kromid, mastiha, orizъ, pras* (later also hybrid *praziluk*), *selin, sisamъ, sfungato*; schooling, like *didaskalъ, đak, hartija, pedepsati*), also some zoonyms and phytonyms (*aspida, kamila, oktapod / oktopod; dafina, krin, triandafilъ*), etc.

3. Modern era Grecisms are those that started entering Serbian at the times marked by the fall of Byzantium and the beginning of the centuries of Turkish rule in the Balkans.

3-1. The Grecisms dating from the Modern era (post-Byzantine) are not learned but vernacular, nowadays mostly belonging to standard Serbian and just occasionally restricted to dialectal usage for traditional or regionally relevant concepts (they often fall into the number of the so-called Balkan Grecisms, which are common to all or at least the majority of the Balkan languages). They feature predominantly **profane**

lexicon from the realms of **trade** (*ćerd(is/os)ati, jeftino, kantar*), **agriculture**—especially viticulture (*đeram, mandra, parasina, paspalj, perivoj; jagurida, vunija*), **seafaring** (*igalo, katarka, plima*—although these three might well be much older), **everyday life** (*aratos /ratossiljati se, arnisati se, arizati, ispolakati, jektika, kalimera, mađija, malje, mangup, malaksati, mistrija, pangaloz, patos, podrum, pripsati, prokopsati, samar, skorija /zgura, stovna, sulundar, trimiriti, tronj, vapsati, varzilo, zauvar*), **culinary** (*avgutar, đakonija, mastika, marulja, mirođija, pip-er, pita, skara, spanać, tiganj*), schooling (*daskal, skamija*), as well as (maritime and continental) zoonyms (*ahtapod, jastog, kit, kamila, lamnja, magar(ac), pagar, palamida, parip*), phytonyms (*karavilje /karanfil*), interjections (*ela /jela, more /mori*), etc. In this period also belong words mediated through Turkish (cf. § 4-2-1.).

3-2. **Contemporary** Grecisms, being internationalisms common to the majority of modern **European** languages, do not belong to the class of loanwords proper but to foreign words (Germ. *Fremdwörter*)—yet they should be mentioned whenever the topic of Greek lexicon in Serbian is dealt with. They are standard language words (*antipod, dilema, fenomen, haos, kategorija, logika, metafora, paradigma, paradoks, simbol, sistem, sfera, teza, tom*), terms of certain sciences and mathematics (*atom, dijaliza, fotosinteza, kibernetika, morfologija, paralaksa, polimer, trigonometrija, zigot*), including social sciences (*dijalekat, dijalektika, idiom, prozodija*). Here also belong modern coinages based on Greek: *aerodrom, barometar, bioskop, gramofon, kosmonaut, telefon, termofor*.

3-2-1. Some **quite** modern problems arise nowadays from a direct transmission of Grecisms which disregards the traditional modes of adaptation of Greek words into Serbian: “crude” *dimotiki* instead of *dimotika*, or in toponyms, *Halkidiki*, instead of *Halkidika* (which complies with standard Serbian flexion), *Evija* instead of traditional (yet literary) *Eubeja*, the unrecognizable (English!) *Salonika* instead of traditional (and vernacular) *Solun* (cf. the historical *Solunski front*, the female anthroponym *Solunka*), etc.

4. The **geographic** criterion of classification refers to the stratification of Grecisms according to the immediate **source** of borrowing (hence they are named not by territorial designations—e. g. eastern, south-east-

ern or western, south-western although those are the directions they arrived from—but by ethnic terms, the way Vasmer did it, cf. note 25), which is determined by combining linguistic (phonetic, morphological, semantic) and historical facts. According to this criterion, there is a substantial difference between direct Grecisms (borrowed from Greek proper) and indirect Grecisms (mediated in some way).

4-1. The **direct** Grecisms which, in their turn, can be genetically primary or secondary (cf. § 5 ff.) comprise the majority of those borrowed in the direct Graeco-Slavic contact in the Balkans in either the first or the second phase (cf. § 2-1-2., 2-2. ff.), hence excluding the Grecisms from Antiquity (borrowed outside this region cf. § 1.-1-3.).

4-2. The **indirect** Grecisms are those borrowed through mediation of another language, typically non-Slavic. It was exactly according to this criterion that Vasmer classified Serbian Grecisms, although his grouping does not quite coincide with the one proposed here.²⁵

4-2-1. The **Turkish** Grecisms are originally Greek words borrowed immediately from Turkish—by chronology they are all Modern era loanwords (cf. § 3-1.). Although initially vernacular, most of them now belong to the literary language too, e. g. *abonos*, *argatin*, *argatovati*, *avlija*, *biber*, *ćiler* (also OSerb. *kelarь*), *ćuprija*, *dimije*, *đubre*, *đumruk*, *efendija*, *kalem*, *kalup*, *kantar*, *karanfil* (also OSerb. *kaloper*), *kesten*, *kondura* /*kundura*, *krevet*, *kukla*, *leđen* (also OSerb. *legenь*), *liman* (also OSerb. *limenь*), *majdanos*, *mengeler*, *mermer* (also OSerb. *mramorь*, cf. § 2-1-1.), *mislođin* (also *bosiljak*, cf. note 27), *mušmula*, *palamar*, *pa-*

25 Besides the Osmanli-Turkish and Latin-Romance “Entlehnungsweg,” he mentions the group named “Bulgarian mediation.” Without getting into the name of this last one (his “altbulgarische Kirchensprache” is actually Church Slavonic with elements of Bulgarian recension, only sporadically occurring and restricted to theological texts and some documents). He concludes with an appeal for further detailed studies in word history, word geography and accentology in order to determine how wide the Bulgarian mediation used to be (Vasmer 1944: 13). He was right, but from this standpoint more promising seems to be delving into Old Church Slavonic, and the present-day state of Paleoslavistic knowledge is promising in this respect, especially Czech lexicography (cf. the almost completed ESJS and the references it is based on).

paz, *papazjanja*, *paraspur*, *peksimet* (also OSerb. *paksimadъ*), *somun*, *sunder*, *susam* (also OSerb. *sisamъ*), *tefter*, *trpan*, *fenjer*, *furuna*,²⁶ *šećer*, *šinik*, etc. Membership of this class can be traced through written sources, although an important factor of their recognition is phonetics, seldom morphology, with usually unaltered semantics (cf. Škaljić, Skok s.vv.).

4-2-2. The **Romance** Grecisms are originally Greek words mediated through some of the descendents of Latin in the Eastern Adriatic (including all of them, from Vulgar Latin and Dalmatian to Italian and its dialects). With regard to chronology they are sometimes ancient, but mostly medieval and rarely Modern era Grecisms, predominantly provincialisms (e.g. *ankora* ‘anchor’, *bajo* ‘fish Uranoscopus scaber’, *bastah* ‘porter’, *cipal* ‘fish Mugil cephalus’, *felija* /*vilija* ‘piece, chunk’, *igalo* ‘seashore’, *pipun* ‘melon’, *trigla* /*trilja* ‘fish Mullus barbatus’), but also standard i.e. literary language words like *ambis*, *bosiljak*,²⁷ *đak*, *jastog*, *komostre*, *mantija*, *plima*, *sidro*,²⁸ *sipa*, *stomak* (also OSerb. *stomahъ*), *tunj*, etc.

4-2-2-1. Emerging as a potentially separate entity among the Romance Grecisms are those borrowed from the Aromanian language. To this group certainly belong the onomasticized *ćir* (also standard *kir*, OSerb. *kyрь*, *ćirъ*) in semi-compounds like *Ćir-Toša*, *Kir-Janja*, etc., and its appellative diminutive *ćirica* ‘apprentice’, perhaps also *ispolakati* ‘to

26 This standard word for ‘furnace’ has a dialectal (Jablanica, Leskovac, Vranje, Piroć) counterpart in *urnja* ‘a batch of bread; furnaceful of wood’ (borrowed from Modern Gk. *phourniá* ‘idem; generation, etc.’), with later metonymical ‘furnace; bakery’ (cf. Влајић-Поповић 2014: § 2-8.).

27 This phytonym for ‘ocimum basilicum’ (< VLat. *basilicum* < Gk. *basilikón*) is remarkable for numerous varieties, dialectisms *vasleden*, *velsagen*, *vesligen*, *fesligen*, *mesliden*, *mislođin*, all mediated by Turk. *fesliĝen*, *fesliĝen* (Vasmer 1944: 147; Skok 1: 116 s. v. *basilek*).

28 While the earliest traces of Romance mediation are reflected in phonetics (cf. § 2-1-3.), in later stages they are also detectable by elements of semantics and/or linguistic geography (e. g. Serb. *sidro* ‘anchor’), recorded since the 15th century, undoubtedly goes back to Gk. *sidero(n)* ‘iron’, yet it has never been attested with this specific meaning which is hence supposed to have originated in a Romance intermediary (meanwhile extinct?, e. g. Dalmatian, as it is supposed by Skok 3: 229—for an alternative tracing it directly to Byzantine pl. ‘chains’, cf. Поповић 1955: 127).

say a toast, cheer'. But introducing this category remains problematic in a number of ways.²⁹

4-2-3. The **Germanic** Grecisms are originally Greek words mediated by Gothic, like *crkva*, *daska* (cf. § 1-3.). Chronology-wise, they belong to Antiquity.

4-2-4. The **international** Grecisms are those mediated by some modern, usually non-neighbouring, European language (cf. § 3-2). They are not loanwords but foreign words dating from the last couple of centuries.

5. The **genetic** criterion refers to the distinction between the **primary** and **secondary** loanwords from Greek, that is originally Greek words and those of foreign stock (mostly from Hebrew and Latin, or one of its heirs).

5-1. Among the **originally Greek** words belong most of those mentioned in § 1-1.–1-3., as well as § 2-3, 3-1, even 3-2.

5-2. The **Hebraisms** mediated by Greek are predominantly Biblical names and concepts like *Golgota*, *Ilija*, *Isus*, *Jerihon*, *Jov*; *aliluja*, *amin* or terms for concrete realia (mostly Mediterranean phytonyms) like *bal-sam*, *isop*, *livanь*.

5-3. The **Latinisms /Romanisms** mediated by Greek are, e.g. *aru-la* 'altar', *aspra* 'an old coin', *kelija* 'cell', *kelarь* 'cellar' (cf. § 4.2.1. for *ćiler*), *klisura* 'gorge', *kumerькь* 'customs' (cf. § 4.2.1. for *đumruk*, for details fn. 31), *kursorь* 'runner', *lakimija /laćimija* 'herd of horses', *marulja* 'lettuce', *pondila* 'section of a house used as a stable', *porta* 'gate', *spanać* 'spinach', *tavla* 'table, board', *tugla* 'brick', *vula* 'seal, stamp', etc., mostly medieval in origin (cf. §3.1.).

5-3-1. Within the class of Romanisms, **Italianisms** could furnish a special group. However, studies indicate that their number is quite limited—save for the standard *ambis*, *čempres*, see also dial. *bastun* 'walking

29 These Grecisms constitute an insufficiently distinctive lexical group, on phonetic and sociolinguistic grounds. Although their language is of Romance stock, it is Hellenised to such an extent that the Aromanians are practically Greaphone, hence their Grecisms could also be rendered as direct ones.

stick³⁰—although it might increase in the future with detailed investigation of historical sources on both sides and elaboration of phonetic criteria of distinction.

6. A striking feature of Grecisms as a whole (almost unknown to other kinds of loanwords), is the existence of **doublets** (even triplets) of words borrowed from Greek in various periods or ways, so that they differ in form and/or semantics, yet share the same ultimate etymology. Apart from those mentioned in § 2-2-2-3. and in footnotes 26, 27, 30 (*vurnja*, *bosiljak*, *bastun*), some illustrative examples are presented graphically in the following Table.³¹

30 This from Modern Gk. *mpastóini* < Ital. dial. (Ven.) *bastun* (EPCJ 2: 230). The same word was borrowed directly from Venetian *bastun* > *baštun* ‘pole, baton; wood on the ship’s prow’ (ibid. 285–286).

31 For details cf. Vasmer 1944, Skok s. vv.; for digested interpretations cf. Влајић-Поповић 2009: passim, where they are explained e. g.: OSerb. *kumerьkь* ‘tax, customs’ (12th c.) < MGk. *koumérkion* < Lat. *commercium* (Vasmer 1944: 86, 55)—as early as the late 15th c. also *đumrukь* < Turk. *gümruk* (Vasmer 1944: 55; Skok 2: 223).

7. The Table of Serbian Grecisms, their classification by three criteria, and Greek prototypes.³²

Serbian standard dialectal obsolete	Chronological				Geographic		Genetic		Greek ancient (A) medieval (M) modern (N)
	Proto-Slavic	Mid- dle Ages	Mod- ern era	Con- tem- porary era	direct	indirect	pri- mary	second- ary	
<i>korablja</i>	+					+	+		<i>karávion</i>
<i>daska</i>	+					+	+		<i>diskos</i>
obs. <i>diskosъ</i>		+			+		+		<i>diskos</i>
<i>disk</i>				+		+	+		<i>diskos</i>
<i>pop</i>		+			+		+		<i>pappās</i>
<i>papa</i>			+			+	+		<i>pappās</i>
<i>papaz</i>			+			+	+		<i>pappās</i>
<i>oktapod</i>		+			+		+		NG. <i>oktapódē</i>
dial. <i>ahtapod</i>			+		+		+		NG. <i>ahtapódi</i>
<i>oktopod</i>				+		+	+		AG. <i>oktōpoūs</i>
<i>mramor(ъ)</i>		+			+		+		<i>mármaros</i>
<i>mermer</i>			+			+	+		<i>mármaros</i>
<i>nafora</i>		+			+		+		<i>anáfora</i>
<i>anafora</i>				+			+		<i>anáfora</i>
obs. <i>varsamo</i>		+			+		+		<i>bársamon</i>
<i>balsam</i>			+			+	+		<i>bálsamon</i>
<i>balzam</i>				+		+	+		<i>bálsamon</i>
obs. <i>kumerькъ</i>		+			+		+		<i>koumérkion</i>
<i>đumruk</i>			+			+	+		<i>koumérkion</i>
dial. <i>škara</i>			+		+		+		NG. <i>skára</i>
dial. <i>škar</i>		+				+	+		MG. <i>skarion</i>
dial. <i>škver</i>			+			+	+		AG. <i>eskhárion</i>

32 This is a slightly modified version of the Table in Влајић-Поповић 2009: 398.

Abbreviations

dial.	dialectal	obs.	obsolete
Engl.	English	OSerb.	Old Serbian
Germ.	German	PGmc.	Proto-Germanic
Gk.	Greek	PSl.	Proto-Slavic
Goth.	Gothic	Scyth.	Scythian
Hebr.	Hebrew	Serb.	Serbian
Ital.	Italian	SSlav.	South Slavic
Lat.	Latin	Turk.	Turkish
MGk.	Medieval Greek	Ven.	Venetian
MLat.	Medieval Latin		

References

- Binder Vera. 2000. *Sprachkontakt und Diglossie: lateinische Wörter im Griechischen als Quellen für die lateinische Sprachgeschichte und das Vulgärlatein*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Crepajac Ljiljana. 1978. „Prilog proučavanju grčkih semantičkih pozajmljenica i prevedenica u srpskohrvatskom“. *Živa antika / Antiquité vivante* XXVIII/1–2: 75–84.
- ESJS: *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (red. Eva Havlová). T. 1–. Praha / Brno: Academia / Tribun EU. 1989–.
- Hadrovics László. 1985. *Ungarische Elemente im Serbokroatischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Loma Aleksandar. 2000. „Skythische Lehnwörter im Slavischen“. In: I. Janyšková, H. Karlíková (eds.), *Studia etymologica Brunensia* 1, Praha: Euroslavica, 333–350.
- Loma Aleksandar. 2002. „Aus der skythisch-sakischen Lehnwortforschung: (1. Slav. *talogъ* ‘Bodensatz’; 2. Gr. *λάταξ* ‘Biber’; 3. Gr. *βόνασος* ‘Wisent’; 4. Die türkische Pferdebezeichnung *alaša*)“. *Studia Etymologica Cracoviensia* 7: 53–65.
- Loma Aleksandar. 2004. „‘Geliebte’, ‘Herrin’, ‘Henne’ oder ‘Mädchen’?“. *Rocznik Slawistyczny* LIV: 37–43.
- Miklosich Franz. 1867. „Die Fremdwörter in den slavischen Sprachen“. *Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*. Philosophisch-historische Classe. Fünfter Band, Wien, 73–140.
- Mišeska-Tomić Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund. Morpho-syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.

- Skok Petar. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. T. I–IV. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Slapšak Svetlana. 1988. *Vukov rječnik i prevedenice sa grčkog*. Novi Sad: Književna zajednica Novog Sada.
- SP: *Słownik prasłowiański* (red. Franciszek Sławski). T. 1–. Wrocław etc.: Ossolineum. 1974–.
- Striedter-Temps Hildegard. 1958. *Deutsche Lehnwörter im Serbokroatischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Škaljić Abdulah. 1974. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Šetka Jeronim. 1976. *Hrvatska kršćanska terminologija*. Split: Knjižnica „Marija“.
- Vasmer Max. 1944. *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Serbo-Kroatischen*. Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften (= Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jg. 1944, Phil.-hist. Klasse, Nr. 3).
- Vinja Vojmir. 1998–2004. *Jadranske etimologije*. T. I–III. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Vlajić-Popović Jasna. 1996. „Semantic Evolution of Some Greek Loans in Serbo-Croatian“. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 32/1: 109–116.
- Vlajić-Popović Jasna. 2001. „On the Etymology of S.-Cr. *lupar*. Idioglossy or Alloglossy“. *Балканско езикознание / Linguistique balkanique* XLI/1: 77–85.
- Zett Robert. 1970. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nominalkomposita im Serbokroatischen* (Die altserbische Periode), Wien / Köln: Böhlau.
- Браунинг Роберт. 2005. *Средњовековни и савремени грчки језик*. Лозница: Карпос.
- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 1986. Досадашње стање етимолошке обрађености гречицама у српскохрватском језику. Београд, 135 p. (unpublished MA thesis, www.ibis.mi.ac.rs)
- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 1995. „О неким псеудогречицима у српскохрватском“. *Јужнословенски филолог* LI: 197–202.
- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 2009. „Гречицима у српском. Оврт на досадашња и поглед на будућа истраживања“. *Јужнословенски филолог* LXV: 375–403. also available as:
“<http://www.sanu.ac.rs/Izdanja/Prilozi/JuznoslovenskiFilologLXV.pdf>”
- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 2011. „Гречицима у српским народним говорима (на територији Војводине)“. *Јужнословенски филолог* LXVII: 197–216.
- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 2013. „Миклошич и позајмљенице—о гречицима“. In: J. Грковић-Мејџор, А. Лома (eds.) *Miklosichiana bicentennialia*. Зборник у част двестоте годишњице рођења Франца Миклошича. Београд : САНУ, 343–367. also available as:
“<http://www.sanu.ac.rs/Izdanja/Elizdanja/PosebnaIzdanja674.pdf>”

- Влајић-Поповић Јасна. 2014. „Српска етимологија у ишчекивању *Дигиталног дијалекатског речника српских народних говора* — пример грецизама у Јабланици“ *Годишњак за српски језик* 13, Ниш, 125–140.
- ЕРСЈ: *Етимолошки речник српског језика* (ур. А. Лома). Т. 1–, Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ. 2003–.
- ЭССЯ: *Этимологический словарь славянских языков* (ред. О.Н. Трубачев). Москва. 1974–.
- Лома Александар. 2000. „Праслав. **xaloga* < др.-греч. *φάλαγγ-* и скифский переход *f > χ*“. *Этимология 1997–1999*. Москва: Наука, 87–96.
- Милорадовић Софија. 2003. *Употреба надежних облика у говору Параћинског Поморавља*. Београд: Етнографски институт САНУ.
- Михајловић Велимир. 1972–1974. *Грађа за речник страних речи у преддуковском периоду*. Т. I–II. Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- ОС ЕРСЈ: *Огледна свеска*. Етимолошки одсек Института за српски језик САНУ. Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ (= *Библиотека Јужнословенског филолога* 15). 1998.
- Петровић Снежана. 1993. „Историјат и стање проучавања турцизама у српскохрватском језику“, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику* XXXVI/2: 71–127.
- Поломац Владимир. 2007. „Два незабележена грецизма у старосрпском језику (глаголи *гарепсати* и *утаксати*)“. *Наш језик* XXXVIII/1–4: 65–70.
- Попов Бојан. 1984. „Положај српскохрватског језика у балканском језичком савезу“. *Јужнословенски филолог* XL: 21–43.
- Поповић Иван. 1953. „Новогрчке и средњегрчке позајмице у савременом српскохрватском језику“. *Зборник радова С.А.Н.* XXVI, Византолошки институт. књ. 2: 199–233.
- Поповић Иван. 1955. „Грчко-српске лингвистичке студије II. Грчке позајмице у савременом српскохрватском језику“: 111–115; „Грчко-српске лингвистичке студије III. Проблем хронологије византских и новогрчких позајмица у савременом српскохрватском језику“: 117–157. *Зборник радова С.А.Н.* XLIV. Византолошки институт. књ. 3.
- Радић Првослав. 2001. *Турски суфикси у српском језику. Са освртом на стање у македонском и бугарском*, Београд: Институт за српски језик САНУ (= *Библиотека Јужнословенског филолога* 17).
- Станишић Вања. 1995. *Српско-албански језички односи*. Београд: Балканолошки институт САНУ.
- Фасмер Макс. 1986–1988. *Этимологический словарь русского языка*. Т. 1–4. Перевод и дополнения О.Н. Трубачева. Москва: Наука.

Ясна Влаич-Попович

Сербский и греческий: длинная история лексических заимствований

Резюме

В работе подается диахронное обозрение влияния греческого языка на сербскую лексику в сфере заимствованных слов. После обзора отдельных, важных с точки зрения истории и лингвистики, фактов излагается — иллюстрированная избранными примерами — систематизация сербских грецизмов, основанная на хронологической стратификации и формальных критериях, которые относятся к обоим регистрам сербского языка, литературному и обиходному (с особым учетом самого важного — средневекового периода). В работе также представлена классификация грецизмов по географическому и генетическому принципам. В завершительной части статьи сложность и сплетение фактов, входящих в этот анализ, представлены несколькими формальными и/или семантическими дублетами, происхождение которых связано с разными путями и периодами проникновения в сербский язык заимствованных греческих слов.

Ключевые слова: сербский язык, заимствованное слово, грецизм, диахрония, этимология.