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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.
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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, the contact of Serbian with Greek 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.

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., till the 19th century—Greek even longer, from the Hellenistic


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
era 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.

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, 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 definiton 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.
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0-4. Save for Serbian literacy in general (cf. note 4), Greek also had a certain influence on Serbian syntax, partly on its word-formation, 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 calques and loan translations (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, a definitive description and entire...

---

8 For the Old Serbian period cf. Грковић-Мејзор 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. Миšeska-Tomić 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).


11 Such as Serb. država from Gk. krátos (Crepajac 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. Vlajić-Popović 1996), and also rectifying the knowledge of intermediary languages (Лома 2000, Loma 2000), correcting chronology whenever possible. Sifting through this material has established an interesting class of pseudo-Grecisms (Влајић-Поповић 1995, Vla-jić-Popović 2001).
1. Serbian being a Slavic language, **Proto-Slavic** Grecisms\(^{13}\) 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. β > 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*, *teremъ* the absence of the word [Gk. *tēremnon*] 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).


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 \textit{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 $\ddot{a} > o$ in Gk. \textit{pappas} $>$ Serb. \textit{pop},

15 Gk. \textit{kassiteros} $>$ Serb. \textit{kositer, kositar}, also $\ddot{u} > y$ in Gk. \textit{eleousa} $>$ Serb. \textit{Leviša} (from an older \textit{Levys-ja}), or liquid metathesis (followed by SSlav. lengthening) $or > ro > ră$ in Gk. \textit{mármaros} $>$ Serb. \textit{mramor} (cf. also \textit{mermer} in § 4-2-1.).

2-1-2. On the Greek side, there is evidence of vitacism (Gk. $\beta$ as $[v] >$ PSl. $v$, and not $b$), hence \textit{koljivo}$^{16} <$ Gk. \textit{kól(l)ybon} (unlike \textit{korab, koliba}, cf. § 1-1.).

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 \textit{pasulj} $<$ Gk. \textit{phasoúlion}, or in anthroponyms like \textit{St(j)epan} $<$ Gk. \textit{Stéphanos} and \textit{Pilip} $<$ Gk. \textit{Philippos}, 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 \textit{popadija} ‘priest’s wife’ owes its $o$ in the first syllable to analogy with the older \textit{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.


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

18 Other instances like OSerb. \textit{panosь} ‘torch’ $<$ Gk. \textit{phanós}, or OSerb. doublets like \textit{kepalija: kefalija} ‘a military title’, \textit{pervarь: fērvarь} ‘February’, \textit{dapinovь} adj.: \textit{dafina/davina} f. ‘oleaster, silver berry, (Elaeagnus angustifolia)’ (from Gk. \textit{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 anđeo 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 rouphitò (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 civot vs. literary kivotь ‘feretory, reliquiary’, 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’, sinsklitiki ‘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, chartión, stoicheion (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 despote ‘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 harьnь 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’.

- 160 -
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) Gre-
cisms is the most numerous one and also the most important for the fur-
ther 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 do-
mestic ones (e.g. \(\text{a}k\text{sajb} \; 1/6\) of an ounce’, \(\text{parikb} \; \text{a settled peasant’, folb}\)
‘obulus, phollis’, \(\text{hitomb} \; \text{(under)robe’}\). 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
\(\text{bula /vula ‘}\text{seal, stamp’, diadima ‘diadem, crown’, despot ‘despot’, hris-
sovulja ‘chryssovolon’, kir ‘master, dominus’, nomik ‘notary’, pr(i)ćija
‘dowry’, pronija(ь) ‘feud(al peasant’), sevastokrator ‘title of the Great
Župan (corresponding to the one introduced in Byzantium by Alexios
Comnenos)’, \(\text{sindel ‘char}ta 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
\(\text{tropariti ‘}\text{to talk much’ (Crna Gora) is probably much younger than OSerb.
\text{troparб ‘a church song, short hymn’ (< Gk. troparion ‘id’) that it deriving from}
(cf. Влајић-Поповић 2013: 363, note 103).

\(^{24}\) Some of them were even recorded relatively frequently, e.g. \(\text{akintь ‘hy-
acinth’, alazonikь ‘boaster’, anagnostь ‘lower servant (in a church)’, andaga
drosato ‘aqua rosacea’, elefantь ‘elephant’, jepistolija ‘letter’, fina ‘a kind of
bird, eagle’, glikizmo ‘a sweet’, hartofilakь ‘archivists’, hitonь ‘(Christ’s) robe’,
idiozma ‘peppermint plant’, jehidna ‘viper, snake’, karkinь ‘crayfish, crab’, ki-
lion’, skinija ‘tent’, stiraksь ‘a kind of gum, storax’, tetragь ‘notebook, fascicle’,
topikь ‘a local, native person’, trikre ‘candlestick, candelabrum’, voithima ‘me-
dicament’, zimiosati ‘punish’, etc. (cf. Vasmer 1944 s.vv.).
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 arhiepiskop, arhijerej, arhimandrit, dohija, đakon, iguman, jerej, jeromonah, kaluđer, katastihь, ktitor, lavra, metoh, mitropolit, monah, paraklis, paroh, patrijarh, poksar, pop, popadija, prezviter, prota, skit, stavrofor; religious practice, like antifon, irmos, katizma, kondak, litija, liturgija, miro, miro, nafora, nomokanon, oktoih, polijelej, potirь /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, stasь /stasina; seafaring, like galija /golija, limenь, sidro—cf. note 28) and finally everyday life (in general, like diple, kamara /komora, kosi-tar, lipsati, misrsati, mustаč, pizma; stihija, stipsь /stipsa, temelj, trarь / trap, varvarь, zevgarь; specifically culinary, like cvekla, kondir, pirinь/piron, rovit, tr(a)peza; koljivo, kromid, mastiha, orizь, pras (later also hybrid praziluk), selin, sisamь, sfungato; schooling, like didaskalь, đak, hartija, pedepsati), also some zoonyms and phytonyms (aspida, kamila, oktapod / oktopod; dafina, krin, triandafilь), 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 /ratosiljati 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, piper, pita, skara, spanač, 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, metaforа, paradigma, paradoks, simbol, sistem, sferа, 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” dimotika instead of dimotika, or in toponyms, Halkidiki, instead of Halkidika (which complies with standard Serbian flection), Evija instead of traditional (yet literary) Eu beja, 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, čiler (also OSerb. kelarь), čuprija, dimije, dubre, đumruk, efendija, kalem, kalup, kantar, karanfil (also OSerb. kaloper), kesten, kondura /kundura, krevet, kukla, leđen (also OSerb. legens), liman (also OSerb. limень), majdanos, mengele, 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 occuring 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).
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paz, papazjanja, paraspur, peksimet (also OSerb. paksimadь), somun, sunder, susam (also OSerb. sisamь), 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. stomaхь), 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 čir (also standard kir, OSerb. кирь, čirь) in semi-compounds like Ćir-Toša, Kir-Janja, etc., and its appellative diminutive čirica ‘apprentice’, perhaps also ispolakati ‘to

---

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

\(^{27}\) This phytonym for ‘ocimum basilicum’ (< VLat. basilicum < Gk. basilikόν) is remarkable for numerous varieties, dialectisms vasleđen, velsagen, vesligen, fesligen, mesliden, mislodin, all mediated by Turk. fesliğen, feslichen (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.\footnote{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 Greekophone, hence their Grecisms could also be rendered as direct ones.}

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

4-2-4. The \textbf{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 \textbf{genetic} criterion refers to the distinction between the \textbf{primary} and \textbf{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 \textbf{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 \textbf{Hebraisms} mediated by Greek are predominantly Biblical names and concepts like \textit{Golgota}, \textit{Ilija}, \textit{Isus}, \textit{Jerihon}, \textit{Jov}; \textit{aliluja}, \textit{amin} or terms for concrete realia (mostly Mediterranean phytonyms) like \textit{bal-sam}, \textit{isop}, \textit{livany}.


5-3-1. Within the class of Romanisms, \textbf{Italianisms} could furnish a special group. However, studies indicate that their number is quite limited—save for the standard \textit{ambis}, \textit{ćempres}, see also dial. \textit{bastun} ‘walking
stick*30—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. mpastoúni < 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. kumerькь ‘tax, customs’ (12th c.) < MGk. koumérkion < Lat. commercium (Vasmer 1944: 86, 55)—as early as the late 15th c. also đumrukь < Turk. gümrük (Vasmer 1944: 55; Skok 2: 223).
7. The Table of Serbian Grecisms, their classification by three criteria, and Greek prototypes.\(^{32}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serbian</th>
<th>Chronological</th>
<th>Geographic</th>
<th>Genetic</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standard</td>
<td></td>
<td>direct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dialectal</td>
<td></td>
<td>indirect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obsolete</td>
<td></td>
<td>primary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proto-Slavic</td>
<td></td>
<td>secondary</td>
<td>ancient (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle Ages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medieval (M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modern era</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>modern (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>era</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korablja</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daska</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&lt; PGmc.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. diskos</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disk</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&lt; Engl.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papa</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&lt; intern.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>papaz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oktapod</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial. ahtapod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oktopod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; intern.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mramor(β)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mermer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Turk.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nafora</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anafora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. varsamo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balsam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Ital.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balzam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Germ.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obs. kumerky</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dumruk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Turk.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial. skara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial. škar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Dalmatian</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dial. škver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt; Ital. dial.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 This is a slightly modified version of the Table in Влаjić-Popović 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  SSslav.  South Slavic
Lat.  Latin  Turk.  Turkish
MGk.  Medieval Greek  Ven.  Venetian
MLat.  Medieval Latin
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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.