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1. The study of Turkish loan-words in the Balkan languages is like fitting pieces into the growing jigsaw of the collective work that arose on the basis of the fundamental dictionary by Franz Miklosich. A century after it was first published, the results of the joint work are, on the one hand, a corpus of Balkan Turcisms enlarged to the point of considering the idea of composing a "new Miklosich" and, on the other, the still huge number of problems related to an explanation of their origin and a series of questions accompanying the etymological approach, on the other. This situation presents us with two directions for further work on the etymological study of Turkish loan-words: first, to make as complete as possible a body of lexical material; and then to analyse that material according to modern theory and methodology. Since the Turcisms that belong to standard literary languages have already been noted and described, principal sources of potential new evidence are dialectal dictionaries and ethnographic records, in the first place words belonging to craft terminologies. Modern analysis of such a corpus includes respect for the mass of accumulated historical and dialectal knowledge, not only of the non-Turkish languages studied, but also of the Turkish language itself, as well as ethnolinguistics, semantics (semasiology and onomasiology), linguistic geography, etc.

2. Only some of the etymological problems and possibilities for solving them will be illustrated by the examples of three Serbian dialectal Turkish loan-words which are also present in other Balkan-Slavic languages. The first, чимбарн, is a term taken from weaving and is registered: чимбарн m. 'two-fold metal leverage with small stretching and smoothing the cloth in weaving' (Тимош, Динић, Pirot, PCA materials); чимбарн m. pl. 'parts of the loom, consisting of two pieces of iron which, when stretched, are linked in the middle by a flat iron ring, and on each end of the чимбар are two tips that are stuck into the edges of the woven cloth' (В. Ј. до 46; Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар 'id.' (Zaplanje, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Zaplanje, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Vranje, PCA materials); чимбар 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (Kosovo, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Slovenia, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (Kosovo, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Slovenia, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (Vranje, PCA materials). On the other hand, the term чимбар m. 'blacksmith who forges чимбар' (Slovenia, PCA materials); чимбар 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (Vranje, PCA materials; Österreichisches Wörterbuch 1884-1893); Bug. чимбар pl. 'id.' (Vranje, PCA materials); чимбар m. pl. 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Kosovo, PCA materials); чимбар м. 'id.' (Slovenia, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (Kosovo, PCA materials); чимбар м. pl. 'id.' (South, Serbia, PCA materials)

2.1. The origin of these words has been discussed in almost all major etymological lexicographic works, from Miklosich to Sok, with the sole exception of a dictionary that reflects the etymological approach established by Miklosich, the etymology was that of Turcisms and Turkish words. Thus Miklosich places Scr. чимбар 'kind of' (Miklošiĉ 1884-1875). Elezović has an attestation of Сcr. чимбар which he, like Miklosich, relates to Pers. чимбар 'hoop, ring, counter on a shoe', and he further quotes the Turk. чимбар 'metal spring with cogs on the ends for stretching cloth on

The attribution in Vuk’s dictionary is the oldest written record of this word, although it is not recognized as a Turcism and consequently marked by an asterisk, which was the rule with words of foreign origin.

*This is the only word that does not belong to weaving terminology. Its ending is understood weaving term.*

This is said by Novaković (1988), perhaps because in the same location the plural чимбар is used as a suffix for weaving, e.g. чимбар 'hoop' and 'weaving wheel' (Радош, Н. И. 1979).

2. I do not know the origin of the Turkish word proper that designates part of the weaving loom, in Bulgarian, called 'cog' and 'stretcher', respectively. It is also possible that there was an analogous *твърдо*.
the loom'. Skok interprets the SCr. "čimbar", "čimbar" s.v. "čimbar" from the Turk. "čimbar" without meaning, as descending from the Pers. čimbar 'hoop, ring, counter', and places it, like Miklošich, together with the SCr. "čimbar", "čimbar" s.v. "čimbar", "čimbar" 'claws of a crab'. The presence of the vowel -ě- instead of -a- in Serbian examples Skok explains as being influenced by the Persian form of the word (sic!). Knežević in his dictionary also places the SCr. "čimbar" s.v. the Turk. "čimber".

The methodological approach by which it is understood that loan-words are related to the etymon in a broader sense without more precise interpretation of semantic or, sometimes, phonetic differences, does not represent the best of what the linguistics at the turn of the 19th and the first half of the 20th century could offer and the application of the achievements of that time, conditioned by lexicographic sources, etc.

2.2. Etymological dictionaries that appeared in the second half of the last century, as well as a series of individual articles and studies discuss, to a greater or lesser extent, the problems of phonetic and semantic adaptation of Turcisms, not disregarding the historical development and dialectal features of the languages in question. What can be, also, done today in the study of Turkish loans is not only to link these loans with the cognate root or a group of words from the loaning language, but also to define more precisely the etymon, the particular word from which the loan originated. This is made possible by publishing new Turkish dialectal dictionaries, new Turkish and Serbian ethnographic sources as well as the fact that a whole new fund of knowledge about the history and dialectology of Turkish, as well as the theory of languages in contact, has become accessible. With this in mind (of course, not always in every single case), in etymological analysis of the above-mentioned word from Turkish to Serbian terminology can be determined whether it is a loan-word (in the narrowest sense of the word, with a phonetically and semantically adequate etymon), or it is a secondary semantic adaptation that might be typical of one or more languages in which that meaning has been attested, or a lexical (or semantic) Balkanism. This does not imply that words etymologically related on the level of the language they have been borrowed from, should not be connected with each other and studied as a specific entity, nor does it mean that the possibility of a general, or general semantic motivation in naming various objects, beings or states should be discarded.

Leskovac. PCA materials; 'rim i.e. bordering band of a copper cauldron' (Piroz, PCA materials); Мас. чекер m. 'rim of a lid or another vessel' (Алексовски 1985:45)19; Bulg. чекер m. 'rim of an object' (Софийско, БД. II.11); Bulg. чекер m. 'iron for rims; obs. bordering flat edge of a sahn, edge of a pan on scale' (Пирдопско, БД. IV.151); Bulg. чекер m. 'woman's headscarf, upper part of a vessel (usually copper)' (Карловско, БД. VIII.181).

3.1. The question arises in such cases as to what should be given preference: should we depart from the referential phonetic form and then suppose a semantic shift toward the attested meaning?20 or should we allow that the very meaning of the word is the key to its interpretation, and that the phonetic features were subsequently altered. If we accept the latter view, the etymology of these words would be the Turk. чекер21 in the meaning 'hoop, ring'22 with semantic specialisation to 'edge, rim of a dish, bordere'. This is confirmed by almost identical examples in attestations from Piroz. чекер (Нјић Розова 1955:151) and чекер (Колковский 1955:260). It is possible that this was used as a secondary semantic adaptation motivated by the very semasiology of the words обруч 'rim, wooden or metal hoop around a tub' and обод 'rim of a hat, flower, sieve, drum, etc.' in the Serbian language.

3.2. Geographic distribution of this word, i.e. this specialized meaning, is limited to the Balkan Turkish vernaculars there used to be parallel forms with c- and z-23. The semantic specialization 'hoop > rim, edge, the final strip of a copper vessel, lid or plate' might have come about as a secondary semantic adaptation motivated by the very semasiology of the words обруч 'rim, wooden or metal hoop around a tub' and обод 'rim of a hat, flower, sieve, drum, etc.' in the Serbian language.

4. The Serbian dialectal word чекер 'a piece of wood or iron used for stretching cloth on the goathair weaving loom, чимбар' (Piroz, Рузин, PCA), 'goathair weaving device composed of two pieces of wood, one of which is cut through lengthwise, and the other is flat and it penetrates the pierced part which it is tied to by a small wooden wedge' (Нић Николов 1955:151; Иванка, Кнежевић 1955:260; Михаил Панов 1957:55) is a term for the very object that is designated by чакъ. It belongs to goathair weaving terminology. There are also, two phonetic variants of the same word: чекер m. 'id.' (Косово. Елознић 1955:260; Михаил Панов 1957:55). The origin of the Bulg. чакъ and чекер could be related to this Turkish goathair weaving term, although their phonetic form is not identical to the etymology.

24 The author notes that this word is used in Greek and to it he relates it to the Modern Greek ζετέοριον which designated a part of a horn (Венедиктов 1953:92).

25 For details concerning this explanation, cf. Дмитриев-Тодоров (1889).

26 The word was later to be largely adopted by the local population. According to ethnographic records from Pirin, dating from the beginning of last century which include a list of crafts, among the less known, so-called Serbian guilds there is also the goathair weaving craft.

27 We do not want to ponder the question of the origin of the Turkish word. Its relation with the mentioned Greek words seems to be an interesting topic for analysis. However, it has not been recognized as a Greekism in major studies by authors who had in their disposal the cited Turkish dialectal corpus (Тешич 1955; Тезиллис 1987).

28 It is obvious from semantic definitions that the Turkish word is used as a term in goathair weaving, as well as in domestic weaving terminology, while in the Serbian and Bulgarian languages it was restricted to the goathair weaving terminology only. It is noteworthy that this term belongs to the so-called male code, unlike the term which belongs to the female code, so that their borrowing and distribution could have been influenced by circumstances too.

29 In the absence of a more reliable etymological solution, one must depart from the fact that when it comes to technical terms, nomination according to the code which had been taken over should be considered primary in relation to all other potential solutions.

30 Goathair weaving was spread in Lukan and Крьево, but there is no evidence of the existence of this term, cf. Д. Радич 1957:7-48).

31 After the law which prohibited rearing goats was introduced in the aftermath of WW II. In southern Serbia this craft was first transferred from urban communities into the rural ones, only to be almost completely disappeared (cf. Николов 1955).
certainty, but the first written record of goatherd weaving in southern Serbia falls into the 16th century and in 18th century in city of Niš (Ни́ш) (1955).

5. These examples have only touched the surface of some questions relevant for the methodology of studying Turcisms in the Balkan languages; determining, whenever it is possible, the precise etymology of the Turkish loan-word, grouping and viewing the sum of attestations of a word, initially within the framework of every individual language and, with that knowledge, defining the areal distribution of the loan-word; gaining insight into overall semantics of a Turcism, which implies that differences between the etymology and the loan-word may bear witness to a potential Balkan Turkish dialectal meaning, or of secondary semantic adaptation in one or more Balkan languages; the study of loan-words as elements of thematic or terminological systems, etc. Since the study of Turcisms in the Balkans in general, as well as in every individual language, happens to be something between a synthesis and systematization of knowledge on the one hand, and a more minutiae analysis of the lexical corpus on the other, the most interesting discoveries will occur not so much in the field of unveiling new facts, as in looking at things with different eyes.12
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