

Jasna Vlajić-Popović

On the etymology of S.-Cr. *лупар*. Idioglossy or Alloglossy

Балканско езикознание = Linguistique balkanique **41/1**

София **2001**

pp. 77–85.

Jasna VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ (Belgrade)

ON THE ETYMOLOGY OF SCR. ЛЪИНАР
IDIOGLOSSY OR ALLOGLOSSY*

Greek loan-words in the Balkans represent one of the largest layers of alloglottal lexicon in all the languages of the peninsula¹, vast not only by the number of words that have been loaned from Greek into the neighbouring languages, but also by the many semantic groups in which Grecisms are present. However, at times it seems that the factor of mixoglotty is over-estimated and that by inertia some terminologies that happen to be predominantly alloglottal by origin, are taken to be almost completely lacking in domestic lexicon, which is not the case.

Constant re-examination being the essence of progress in etymology (be it called “finding new avenues of approach”, “seeking for more economic solutions” or simply “reconsidering”², an attempt will be made in this paper to propose a new etymology for a word that was decades ago interpreted in a way that seems to be convincing and satisfactory, which it is not. The aim is not only to solve this particular problem, but to present an analysis adequate and reasonable enough to confirm the methodological value of some principles of etymological research established by eminent scholars, in the first place the one formulated by Kis that in cases of doubt, uncertainty, scarcity of data etc., preference should be given (and all arguments exploited) to interpreting unclear words as idioglottal, rather than alloglottal by nature (К и Ш 1969:69).

The SCr. malaconym *лѣнар* m. (less commonly *лѣнар*, *лѣнор*, *лѣмнар*, *лѣмнар*, *полумнар*, etc.) “limpet, seashell that adheres to the rocks. *Patella coerulea*” is recorded almost the entire length of the Eastern Adriatic (Boka, Stoliv, Dobrota according to Skok’s dictionary, but also further afield in Dubrovnik, Makarska, Korcula, Hvar, etc.). It was first recorded in the 16th century, and subsequently by all major lexicographers, from Mikalja and Belostenec to Stulli and Vuk (RJAZU). The term is very widespread although it designates not an economically relevant species

* A paper presented at the Symposium in memory of Vladimir Georgiev on the occasion of the 90th anniversary of his birth (Bankja, 1998).

(it is edible, yet not highly reputed in local diet), but just an omnipresent kind of maritime inhabitant that dwells on rocks, on the edge of the tidal flow³. The relative marginality of the realia proper is quite in disproportion to the etymological interest in the term that designates it.

In Skok's etymological dictionary this malaconym occurs twice, but with no interpretation. Once it is mentioned along with all its phonetic variants, in a separate lemma *lompar*⁴ where no solution is offered, and then one finds solely the variant *λῆναρ* elsewhere, under the entry *lub* (Skok II:322) where an explanation of how this form is related to numerous derivatives of the basic noun *lub* is completely missing. Also absent from this dictionary is Skok's much earlier reference to the term, which includes a hint on its possible domestic origin, but without any elaboration on that idea⁵.

The next author to have seriously got to grips with this word, was Vojmir Vinja (in his systematic studies of etymology and structuring the terms of Adriatic fauna). After claiming that the semantics of the names for *Patella coerulea* are most frequently based on the notions 'to adhere, to stick to smth.', 'to tear, pull out' and 'small bowl', he concludes that "one of the most frequent types of nomination is the opaque term *λῆναρ*, attested in a few variants, all undoubtedly continuing the Gk. *λέπας*, i.e. its latinized form created after Ace. Pl. *λεπάδας*" (Vinja 1986 II:151)⁶. The author proceeds by quoting a series of passages from ancient writers documenting that *λέπας* is an example of a mollusc of the subclass monothryra. On the basis of a locus in Aristophanes he reaches the unreserved conclusion that *λέπας* is nothing other than the present-day *Patella*, only to refrain from further delving into the original semantics and the ultimate etymology of the Greek malaconym, while pointing to the abundant references to this topic (Vinja *ibid.*). In principle, Vinja showed good thinking on this matter when assuming alloglottal etymology for an opaque (and, to his knowledge, isolated) term from a domain which, for extralinguistic reasons, abounds in loan-words.

However, not all the talassoonymy in the Eastern Adriatic can be a priori considered to be of foreign descent. The geographic background and thematic group they belong to only allow the possibility that they are not autochthonous, but that possibility can by no means outweigh the arguments of phonetics, word-formation and geographic discontinuity which in this case oppose established alloglottal interpretation.

There are reasons for questioning the proposed explanation vis a vis a number of principles of etymological research. In our final considerations we shall check our results against those suggested by Szemerényi and Kis, for example. The pro et contra reconsiderations of this etymology will start with the contrast.⁷

The first shortcoming of Vinja's interpretation is found in the phonetic difficulty that arises from the assumed change of Gk. *-ε-* into SCr. *-u-*. Formally, it would have

been easier to suppose the development of Gk. *-o-* into SCr. *-o-* (which would then, locally, alternate with *-u-*), but although Middle Greek did witness a form *λοπάς*, *-άδος* with adequate (for this matter) vocalism, its meaning 'bowl' (S o p h o c l e s 721) has not been preserved in Greek up to this day. There is also no evidence of its transfer into Serbo-Croatian as early as the Middle Ages, which would have allowed the loanword with a general meaning to be specialised into a malaconym (which is a theoretically expected development). Therefore, the possibility of *λοπάς* being the model should not be even taken into account.⁸ These phonetic difficulties would not have been an absolutely unsurpassable obstacle⁹ (cf. Gk. *-ε* > Bulg. *-y-* in Д з и д з и л и с (1990:16) or in Т о д о р о в (1996:160–161) were it not for the other weak points of this interpretation.

Another very important element which Vinja leaves unexplained is the existence of the ending *-ar/-or*, which is not only absent from the Greek original, but could also not have developed from it, neither from the Nominative, nor from the oblique cases that discern a dental theme, *λεπαδ-*. This problem we find crucial and it cannot be overlooked. The possibility of this ending being the final part of the theme of the Greek word being discounted, it becomes evident that we are dealing here with a suffix, locally added to the verbal root, or onto a basic noun, in order to change its original meaning and function, in the process of domestic word-formation.¹⁰ This will be elaborated in due course.

Next occurs the problem of dating and, consequently, tracing the path of borrowing. The Gk. *λέπας* used to designate a limpet in Ancient Greek only (F r i s k 11:105–107, 137 svv. *λέπω*, *λοπός*, Liddell–Scott–Jones s.vv., Demetrakos s.vv., Strömberg 1943:30), but that meaning vanishes in the course of time, so that as early as the late Hellenistic period (up to the present day) the Gk. *λεπίς*, *-ιδος*, only means 'blade, razor'¹¹ and *λέπι(ον)* 'peels, rind, scales' respectively (S o p h o c l e s 710, D e m e t r a k o s s.vv.).¹² These objections regarding semantics and geography intertwined, and coupled with the fact that from all the available sources no evidence has been revealed of the Gk. *λέπας*, 'limpet' being loaned into any Balkan language (which leaves a slender chance of its being borrowed by Serbo-Croatian only¹³), introduce into our discussion the third principle stated by Kis, that of non-singularity, i.e. that words are loaned not into a single language, but, almost regularly, into a whole group of languages given equal circumstances (К и ш 1969:70).

Now that the weaknesses of the proposed alloglottal etymology have been pointed out, what remains to be done is to check the possibility that the malaconym *л̕ñāp* (and the like) be interpreted by domestic means, as an autochthonous word (before it ends up labelled as "unripe foretymology"¹⁴ or so).

To begin with, one might simply argue that if *прилипак*, the most widespread name for *Patella coerulea*, is an undoubted Slavic term, there is no reason why that

could not be the case with *лѹнар* too. Further, the principle should be borne in mind (discussed, for example, by V i n j a 1978:4) that the number of (synonymous) terms for a maritime creature is indirectly proportional to its economic significance and value – in other words, commercially relevant species have quite a few or just one name (not only within one language, but often common to a number of them, cf. e.g. *sardela*, *tuna*, etc.) while, on the other hand, the more insignificant the species is, the probability increases that in every other village it will be named differently, with various motivations, by anecdote, etc. The edibility of the limpet ranks fairly low, so that names for it fall into the category of moderately dispersed terms. Therefore, extralinguistic factors do allow the possibility of autochthonous formation for a word that is, within the standard phonetic variability, sporadically present on a major part of the Eastern Adriatic.

Going back to formal phonetics we see that in the sequence of forms *лѹнар*, *лѹнар*, *лѹнор*, *лѹмнар*, *лонар*, *лѹмнар* those with the radical vocalism *-u-* should be rendered as basic (while the *-o-* vocalism would be secondary by origin, cf. ichthyonymic pairs *локарда* : *лукарда*, *лојна* : *лујна*, *ломбрак* : *лумбрак*). The less frequent SCr. forms *лѹмнар*, *лѹмнар* can be explained as expressive variations, with a nasal infix, which often occurs on both sides of the Adriatic, cf. the ichthyonym *лубин* > *лумбијо* (S k o k II:323)¹⁵. Two of the five variants of the basic *лѹнар* are actually ghost-forms (not really ghost words): *лѹнар* in Vuk's dictionary is most likely to contain a mistake in accent, as has been discussed in RJAZU, while *лѹнор* is not an example of a varying suffix, but the product of regular Čakavian *ō* < standard *ā*.¹⁶

Further thinking is directed by the suffix *-ar*. It was important in arguing against Greek etymology, and it is crucial in the autochthonous interpretation that follows.

To begin with, we shall see that the few terms for limpet we are dealing with are not at all isolated in Serbo-Croatian but, on the contrary, related to some words of obvious semantic proximity, phonetically equal or very similar, and they also share the "problematic" suffix *-ar*, in other words, etymologically cognate. They are all motivated by the common feature of having a shell or pod, and therefore formed as derivatives of basic, postverbal nouns that designate that object: SCr. *лѹн* m. 'nutshell' (Istra, PCAHY), or its counterpart with the voiced final labial *лѹб* m. 'part of an animal shell or armour' (with examples referring to the anatomy of seashells and turtles), 'bark (on a tree), rind'¹⁷ Such derivatives *лѹбар* zool. 'a kind of insect from the Coleoptera family'; bot. 'a kind of plant used in popular medicine'¹⁸, then a doublet with already noted, standard alternation *-u-/-o-*: *лѹнар*, *лѹнар* m. 'a kind of maritime crab, *Lepas anatifera*, from the order of Cirripedia, that lives stuck to the surface (of rock or algae), and still another talassozoonym', *лѹнара* f. 'a kind of oyster'. Therefore, *лѹнар* should be understood as a nomen qualificativum, meaning 'one having *лѹн*', derived from the basic noun by employing the suffix *-ar* (continuing the PS1. *-arъ*

that specialises in denominal derivation¹⁹, rather than *-ar'ь* which is practically reserved for verbal derivation, in the first place nomma agentis²⁰), after the same formation pattern as in *лъска* > *лъскаp(u)* ('shell' > 'animal(s) with a shell', i.e. mollusca), *зѹба* 'scab, a swelling, bulge' > *зѹбар* 'gypsy moth' or *κònumo* > *κònumap* 'hoof' > 'hoofed animal' (it is noteworthy that all these terms belong to zoonymy). This relatively recent formation (certainly later than Proto-Slavic), has no complete formal-semantic parallels in other Slavic languages, but only formal counterparts, individually developed in those languages from the original **lupъ/*lubъ*, thus continuing some of the originally multiple semantic aspects of the basic noun, and not necessarily the one conveyed by the SCr. malaconym. This is, for example, the case with the Bulg. *л̕ñap* 'melon' whose onomasiology probably derives from the distinctive feature of its rind.²¹

If we are to disregard the difference in derivation, i.e. the choice of suffix, reconstruction of the term *л̕ñāp*, as a derivative of the term *л̕ñ* 'shell, pod' can be etymologically paralleled (while still remaining in the domain of thematically close ichthyonymic terminology), elsewhere in the Slavic world: the geographically closest term is the Bulg. dial. *л̕ñabeц, л̕ñàвица* 'river carp' or 'fish with scales; the fish whose meat is flaky' (БЕР 3:515) happens to be formally most different²², but there is also Pol. *łupacz* 'haddock, fish *Melanogrammus aeglefinus*', Upper Lusatian *łupač*, Lower Lusatian *łupac* 'id.', and further the Czech *lupač* 'fish' (Jungman), Slovenian *lupač* 'Schell-fisch, gadus aeglefinus' (in Pleteršnik only, but absent from Bezljaj's dictionary), perhaps the Russ. dial. *лунірка* 'tiny fish *Cyprinus virba*' as well, etc. It should be noted that Słowski (5:319–320) does not recon with the semantics 'peel, peeling', which is in БЕР 3:515 advocated for the Polish ichthyonym as well as for the Bulgarian one, but with a calque from the German *Schellfisch* – a statement that is strongly supported by arguments of linguistic geography – all those languages border on German. Słowski is probably right, but the possibility of local, deverbal formation should not be completely discarded as unmotivated.

In stating this, we have in mind the theoretical possibility that our malaconym *л̕ñap* is a deverbal by origin. This idea is based on the fact that the action of collecting limpets is described in Serbo-Croatian by phrases, varying from location to location, that sound much like *figurae etymologicae*. "Na Korčuli se *lupare* para, na Visu se *lupare* lupā, a u Prvić-Sepurini se prilipke tuče" (Vinja 1986:151). Limpets are not only beaten (SCr. *л̕ñamū*), but also torn (SCr. *л̕ñnumū*) from the rocks, the latter corresponding exactly to the second frequent onomasiology of terms for *Patella*, listed by Vinja above. Such an interpretation, however, involves a serious problem of unparalleled function of the suffix *-ar* in forming a *nomen objecti* (*л̕ñamū* 'beat; peel' > *л̕ñap* 'one that is beaten; one that is peeled'). If we assume the usual function of the suffix *-ar* as forming a *nomen agentis*, that would involve further formal objections to an explanation which would have to depart from the meaning 'to stick

to smth., to snuggle up to smth.], attested to only in prefixed form *прилубити*: (cf. the same meaning in equally prefixed verbs with the basic meaning 'beat, hit': *прибити*: *бити*, *прилетѣти*: *залетѣти* 'hit, spank' (Brusje), *лѣпнути* 'hit'), and not as simplex forms (compare the same prefix in Čak. *прили(је)нак* < *л(у)јенуми*, etc.).

Finally, it is not very likely, but not beyond reason either, that the term *лѹнар* is motivated in Serbo-Croatian, as in Latin (autonomously, and not by calquing), by the semantic 'bowl, dish'. It is a fact that the primary noun *лѹб* 'bark' has derivatives (with suffixes originally diminutive or augmentative-perjorative by function, but in the course of time neutralized) denoting various objects made from it, in the first place 'a container, dish or basket': *лѹбура* 'dish, basket', dial. *лунка* 'wooden dish with a lid' (ЭССЯ 16:186) (not to mention the fact that continuants of PS1. **lubъ* in Polish and Old Russian, for example, also mean 'basket, dish' cf. ЭССЯ 16:156–157).

We lack supporting evidence from historical dictionaries older than the 16th century, but it does make sense to depart from à **лубар* 'bowl' > **лубар* 'Patella' and then suppose that the verbs designating the action of collecting limpets, SCr. *лунати*, *лунити*, *напати*, could have influenced the phonetic change in the malaconym (apparently unnecessary devoicing of the labial, no longer in the final position), the presence of those verbs assuring not only establishment, but also conservation (from the first written record) of the unvoiced variant.

The order in which interpretations of the SCr. malaconym *лѹнар*, etc. 'limpet, Patella coerulea' has been arranged motivation-wise can, and should, be the subject of further scholarly dispute (as well as any other aspect of its formal or semantic explanation). However, it appears obvious that the term is not a loan-word, but a domestic one, not of Proto-Slavic stock, but a Serbo-Croatian innovation, geographically restricted to the Adriatic Coast, semantically strictly limited to a single denotatum, and relatively diversified in phonetics only. It is not isolated, but belongs to a word-family, that of the verb *лунати* / *лунити*, which is only enlarged and enriched by addition of this branch, hitherto not recognized as being related to it.²³

The arguments offered in this paper against the alloglottal origin of the term are in complete accordance with the principles of etymologising foreign words proposed by Kis (К и Ш 1969:69–70) and with the first three principles of etymological research formulated by Szemerényi (1977:294, 297, 306).

It is almost a paradox, after the analysis offered, that after originally praising the author of the alloglottal interpretation for deliberately not delving into the etymology of the Greek model he supposed to have been loaned into Serbo-Croatian, we should now object to his refraining from pondering the model word, since this would have led him to the correct conclusion – that the Serbo-Croatian and Greek words are actually cognate, and probably exhibit the same, or very similar, onomasiology.

NOTES

¹ Rivalled by Turkish loan-words only.

² Cf., for example, Mal'k i e l (1977) or Szemerényi (1977).

³ In terms of scientific, zoological taxonomy, it is in fact a snail with no lid, but since this mollusc is popularly believed to be a kind of seashell (and is therefore described as such in standard dictionaries), we shall not alter this long established lexicographic definition, cf. for more details V i n j a (11:147, 133). Things are made even more complicated by old lexicographers who define *lyñap* also as a seafish, obviously having in mind simply 'sea creature', since there are no fish among the Latin names they give, but there is, besides *Patella*, another mollusc, the true shell *Spondylus gaederopus* (usually called *κόνιτο*, *κόνιψακ*), much bigger than a limpet and also of poor edibility (for extralinguistic facts, cf. G r u b i š i ć 1990:202, 210).

⁴ Which, as often happens with this author, presents not the basic form of the word in question, but on the contrary, the one furthest from the original, cf. S k o k (11:317).

⁵ "U porodici morskih puževa imademo i lijevih narodnih izraza kao što su *priljepak*, *volak*, možda i *lupar*, ako je ova posljednja riječ u vezi sa našom lupina." = "In the family of sea snails we have fine popular terms too, such as *priljepak*, *volak*, perhaps also *lupar*, if this last word is related to our *lupina* '[shell, pods, peels, etc.]' (S k o k 1933:56), thus conveying the supposition, given earlier in RJAZU by Budmani: "Probably related to *lupina*".

⁶ It was also some twenty years earlier, that is prior to the appearance of Skok's dictionary (but, some 30 years after Skok's monograph on the Adriatic Slavs, cf. the quote from S k o k (1933) in the previous end note), that the same author first came up with the idea that this term is a Grecism found on the Adriatic coast (V i n j a 1967:216).

⁷ The only pro could be the equality of *-y-* / *-o-* / *-e-* in the case of the Bulg. *lynūda* 'razor', cf. note 11 further in this text.

⁸ Since the word in Modern Greek designates neither seashell limpet, nor 'peels, rind, husk', as *λοπάς* originally did, there is only *λόπια* with the latter semantics narrowed into "beans", cf. F r i s k, S o p h o c l e s, D e m e t r a k o s s.v.

⁹ Although strictly speaking, these phonetic problems, insoluble on the grounds of either the giving or the borrowing language, bring this explanation into collision with Szemerényi's first principle which states that "If a given etymon, though fundamentally evident, involves phonological difficulties, the researcher should seek for a more economic solution." (S z e m e r é n y i 1977:294).

¹⁰ This fact actually collides with the second principle proposed by Szemerényi, claiming that "If a given etymon, though fundamentally evident, is at variance with the rules of word formation, the researcher should seek for a more economic solution" (S z e m e r é n y i 1977:297).

¹¹ This form has undoubted continuants in the Bulg. *lynūda* 'knife for plane, grater', dial. *λονūδα* 'dagger without a handle; dull knife' (БЕР 3:518, Т о д о р о в 1995:160–161).

¹² These semantic problems boil down to Szemerényi's third principle which says that "If an etymon involves the assumption of an unusual semantic development, the researcher must re-examine the phonological and morphological aspects of the derivation" (S z e m e r é n y i 1977:306).

¹³ Not to be mistaken as being related to the SCR. malaconym is an almost homophonous ichthyonym well attested in the northeastern Mediterranean (which designates more than one kind of fish, cf. ПСНЖ 254, pgf. 6801–6803): Turk. *lüfar* 'bluefish, Pomatomus saltatrix', further loaned into Russian as *лүфарь* 'small fish, similar to herring, Lichia amia' (Ф а с м е р II:536 with doubtful zoological classification), Ukr. *лүфарь* 'Pomatomus Lacépède', all descending from Mod. Gk. *λονφάρι* < Mid. Gk. *λιπάρι* (ЕСУМ 3:313).

¹⁴ This is how Skok used to conclude his lemmas on words with material not sufficient enough to reach a solid etymological judgement.

¹⁵ This feature can also be observed in the Italian terms for limpet: *pantalena*, *pantanela*, *lampatena* < *patella* (cf. V i n j a 1986:152, although he does not use this phonetic detail in his argument).

¹⁶ Like in *mōjka* < *mājka*, *glēdōn* < *glēdām*, *mōli* < *māli*, etc. (cf. ČDL s.vv.).

¹⁷ Both of Proto-Slavic antiquity and extensively paralleled in all Slavic languages, cf. ЭССЯ 16:156–158, 186. They are independent words on the PSI. level, but ultimately postverbal nouns from (or, at least, corradical with) the verb **lupiti* etc. ‘to peel (off), to fleece, to strip’.

¹⁸ This lexicographic definition should be questioned since the quote: “Ситно исечен лубар стави се у водену чашу заједно са медом и добро утуцаним жутиим шећером” = “Finely cut *lubar* is placed into a glass together with honey and well ground yellow sugar” (Batočina near Kragujevac, РСАНУ) does not make clear that *лубар* is a plant, and not simply bark (*луб*).

¹⁹ Reputed as being more or less limited in range and, due to the heterogeneity of the material it occurs in, it is hard to define precisely – which indicates a secondary formation, cf. Sławski (1976:20–21).

²⁰ Cf. Sławski (1976:21–23).

²¹ We find the feature “rind” more likely to have provided the onomasiological motivation for the term than the verb *луня* ‘to peel’, although an inverse order of priorities has been suggested in БЕР (3:517). Such an explanation would also lead to formally determining the word as a nomen qualificativum (cf. the above analysis of the word-formation of SCr. *malaconym*), leaving out the complications of explaining its transformation from an original nomen agentis in *-ar*.

²² A complete formal-semantic parallel to the Bulg. ichthyonym *лунѡвица* is furnished by the SCr. *кѡравица* ‘minnow, *Phoxinus laevis*; *Squalius Turskyi*’, literally ‘scaled fish, fish with scales’ (formally a univerbisation of the original *кѡрава риба* < *риба са кѡром*.) It is interesting that this term, too, is an example of a pseudo-Grecism in Serbo-Croatian (cf. Влајић – Поповић 1995), as we are trying to prove for *лунар*.

²³ An additional advantage of the idioglottal interpretation is that, along with the word in focus, it also “automatically” takes care of some other so far isolated, or supposedly “insoluble” problems, removes doubt, etc. In our case it is the word *ломнар* ‘some sort of fish’ on which Skok comments that “the meaning is certainly mistaken” (Skok 11:317), but in the light of the analysis offered (especially with respect to other Slavic ichthyonyms), it could be a part of the same word-family as *лунар*.

REFERENCES

- Frisk, H. 1960–1970. Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. I–II. Heidelberg.
- Grubišić, F. 1990. Ribe, rakovi i školjke Jadrana. Zagreb.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H.S. 1968. A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford.
- Mal'kic, Y. 1977. Etymology and general linguistics. – In: Etymologie. Wege der Forschung, Band CCCLXXIII. Herausgegeben von R. Schmitt. Darmstadt, 347–376.
- Skok, P. 1933. Od koga naučiše jadranski Jugosloveni pomorstvo i ribarstvo. Split.
- . 1970–1974. Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. I–IV. Zagreb.
- Sławski, F. 1952–. Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego. I–. Kraków.
- . 1976. Zarys słowotwórstwa prasłowiańskiego. Słownik prasłowiański II. Wrocław.
- Sophocles, E.A. 1887. Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100). New York.
- Strömberg, R. 1943. Studien zur Etymologie und Bildung der griechischen Fischnamen. Göteborg.
- Szemerényi, O. 1977. Principles of etymological research in the Indo-European languages. – In: Etymologie. Wege der Forschung, Band CCCLXXIII. Herausgegeben von R. Schmitt. Darmstadt, 286–346.
- Vinja, V. 1967. Le Grec et le Dalmate. – Zeitschrift für Balkanologie. V, 2. Wiesbaden, 203–223.
- . 1978. Antroponimi u ihtionimiji. – Onomastica Jugoslavica. Zagreb, 3–25.
- . 1986. Jadranska fauna. Etimologija i struktura naziva. I–II. Split.

- Влајић – Поповић, Ј. 1995. О неким псеудогрецизмима у новијој српскохрватској етимолошкој литератури. – Јужнословенски филолог. XL. Београд, 197–202.
- Дзидзилис, Хр. 1990. Фонетични проблеми при етимологизуване на гръцките заемки в българския език. София.
- Киш, Л. 1969. О некоторых принципах этимологизирования заимствованных слов. – Этимология 1967. Москва, 68–70.
- Тодоров, Т. Ат. 1994. Етимологични етюди. София.
- Фасмер, М. 1986. Этимологический словарь русского языка. II. Москва.

ABBREVIATIONS

- | | |
|------------|---|
| Demetrakos | Δημητράκου, Δ. Νέον ὀρθογραφικὸν ἐμπνευτικὸν λεξικὸν. Αθήναι, 1970. |
| ČDL | Čakavisch-deutsches Lexicon. Von M. Hraste, P. Šimunović, unter Mitarbeit und Redaktion von R. Olesch. – Slavistische Forschungen, 25,1, Koln–Wien, 1979. |
| RJAZU | Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. I–XXIII. Zagreb, 1880–1974. |
| БЕР | Български етимологичен речник. 1–. София, 1971–. |
| ЕСУМ | Етимологічний словник української мови. 1–. Київ, 1982–. |
| ПСНЖ | Пятиязычный словарь названий животных (рыбы). Латинский-русский-английский-немецкий-французский. Ред. В.Е. Соколов. Москва, 1989. |
| РСАНУ | Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика. 1–. Београд, 1959–. |
| ЭССЯ | Этимологический словарь славянских языков. 1–. Москва, 1974–. |

Autor's adresse:

JASNA VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ
Institut za srpski jezik SANU
Knez-Mihailova 35/I
11000 Belgrade
Yugoslavia
email: etym@bib.san.ac.yu