

## On Some Serbian Dialectal Turcisms\*

Snežana Petrović (Beograd)

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<sup>1</sup>. 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"<sup>2</sup>, and 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<sup>3</sup>. 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<sup>4</sup>. Since the Turcisms that belong to standard literary languages have already been noted and described, principal sources of potential new evidence are dialectal dictionaries<sup>5</sup> 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

\*A paper presented at the Symposium in memory of Vladimir Georgiev on the occasion of the 90<sup>th</sup> of his birth (Bankya, 1998).

<sup>1</sup> Inclusive with the year 1981, there are mentioned 65 books and 340 articles dedicated to the analysis of Turkish loan-words in Balkan languages (H a z a i 1989:212).

<sup>2</sup> For more details on this topic H a z a i (1983).

<sup>3</sup> For more details on systematisation of some principal problems of studying Turcisms in the Balkan languages and the methodological approach to this topic cf. T i e t z e (1983), M e n g e s (1983), H a z a i (1989).

<sup>4</sup> On the problem of reconsidering opinions about the importance of studying lexicon within the frame of Balkan linguistics, including the possibilities for its typological classification cf. Д е с н и ц к а я (1988).

<sup>5</sup> For the latest mention of importance of dialectal lexicon cf. З а й ц е в а (1998:37).

which are also present in other Balkan-Slavic languages. The first, *чимбар*, is a term taken from weaving and is registered: *чимбар* m. 'twofold metal lever with small holes for lengthening and shortening (the outer ends are cogged, and it is used for stretching and smoothing the cloth in weaving)' (Timok, Д и н и ћ; Pirot, Ж и в к о в и ћ); *чимбар* n. 'id.' (Pirot, Kragujevačka Jasenica, environs of Niš, PCA materials); *чимбари* 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 у к<sup>6</sup>; Kosovo, Е л е з о в и ћ; Fruška Gora, PCA materials); *чимбер* 'id.' (southern Serbia, PCA materials); *чембар* 'id.' (Zaplanje, PCA materials); *чимберѝк*<sup>7</sup> m. 'id.' (Leskovac, PCA materials); *чимбар* m. 'id.' (Vranje, PCA materials); *чимбар* m. 'id.' (Vranje, southern Serbia, PCA materials); *чимбари* m. pl. 'id.' (Kosovo, Е л е з о в и ћ; Niš, PCA materials); *чимбари* m. pl. 'id.' (Slavonija, PCA materials); *чимбар* m. 'blacksmith who forges *чимбар*' (Slavonija, PCA materials)<sup>8</sup>; *чимбар* m. 'a device for stretching cloth in the process of weaving' (Vranje, З л а т а н о в и ћ); Bulg. *чимбаре* pl. 'lever, bar with metallic, cogged edges for stretching the cloth on the loom' (Родопи, БД II:301); Bulg. *чимбер* m. 'id.' (Поповско, Archives of the dialectal word collection (БАН); Bulg. *чимбар* m. 'id.' (Кюстендилско, ТБД I:264); Bulg. *чембар* (F a l i њ s k a 1984:103); Bulg. *чимбар* m. 'id.' (Казанлъшко, БД V:146); Bulg. (Mac.) *чампара* f. 'id.', *чампаре* pl. (Граово, М а р т и н о в 1958:788).

2.1. The origin of these words has been discussed in almost all major etymological lexicographic works, from Miklosich to Skok, with the sole exception of Škaljić's dictionary. The way their origin was interpreted in those dictionaries reflects the methodological approach established by Miklosich; the etymology was explained indirectly, or rather, their origin was related, correctly, to more or less cog-nate Turcisms and Turkish words<sup>9</sup>. Thus Miklosich places Scr. *чимбари* 'kind of weaver's device for stretching cloth on the loom' under the lemma Turk. *çenber*<sup>10</sup> (M i k l o s i c h 1884:275). Elezović has an attestation of Scr. *чимбари* which he, like Miklosich, relates to Pers. *çenber* 'hoop, ring, counter on a shoe', and he further quotes the Turk. *çambar* 'metal spring with cogs on the ends for stretching cloth on

<sup>6</sup> The attestation 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 Turkish origin.

<sup>7</sup> In the PCA materials the title of the lemma is *чимберк*, probably due to hypercorrection of the semivowel.

<sup>8</sup> This is the only word that does not belong to weaving terminology. Its ending *-ar* is understood as a suffix for nomen agentis, maybe because in the same location the plural *чимбари* is used as a weaving term.

<sup>9</sup> Radlov relates the Turk. *чимбар* 'hoop' and 'weaving wheel' (Р а д л о в III/2:2002). Trying to stay clear from the origin of the Turkish word proper that designates part of the weaving loom, we think that it should be noted that we are talking about an object which is, due to its form, in Serbian and in Bulgarian, called 'cog' and 'stretcher', respectively. It is also possible that there was an analogous semantic motivation in Turkish, too.

<sup>10</sup> Under this lemma there is also the Scr. *чимбер* 'headscarf', *чимберли*, Ukr. *чимбар*, Gk. *τσειμλερι*. They are compared with the Scr. *чампар*, *чампара* 'a kind of chain, shackle for horse equipment'. Cf. also M i k l o s i c h (1887:22, s.v. *çenber*).

the loom'<sup>11</sup>. Skok interprets the SCr. *чѣмбѣри*, *чѣмбѣри* s.v. *чѣмпар* from the Turk. *çambar* without meaning<sup>12</sup>, as descending from the Pers. *çenber* 'hoop, ring, counter', and places it, like Miklosich, together with the SCr. *чѣмпар*, *чѣмпраза* 'claw', *чѣмбра* 'claws of a crab'. The presence of the vowel *-u-* 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. *чѣмбѣр(и)* s.v. the Turk. *çember*. 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) no doubt, represents 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 from. 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 nor in every single case), in etymological analysis of the above-mentioned word from weaving terminology it 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 universal, or general semantic motivation in naming various objects, beings or states should be discarded.

2.3. With respect to this fact for a Balkan-Slavic Turcism from the sphere of weaving terminology a more precise Turkish etymon can be identified which has not only identical meaning, but also an adequate phonetic form. The Serbian word *Stachowski* (1992) interprets the Turk. *çimbar*, *cimbar*, *cunbar*, *cinbar*, *çimbar*, *çimbar*, *cinbar*, *cinbar*, *çimbar*, *çinbar*, *çiçar*, *çinbar*, *çumbar* 'a device, cogged on both sides, used for stretching cloth on the loom' (DS). These attestations give us a more complete picture about the number, forms and distribution of this weaving term in Balkan-Slavic languages. Variations within the pair *ç-* / *ç-*, as well as *-a-* and *-e-* in

<sup>11</sup> The spelling of the Turkish word is, most likely to be Elezović's, so it is possible that the vocalism is not adequate. Since he does not quote his sources of the Turkish word, and in the Turkish lexicographic works there is no evidence of a combination of this form and meaning, it can be supposed to be a local development.

<sup>12</sup> Taking into account the references he exploited for writing that lemma, Skok probably incorporated this word (as well as its interpretation), from Elezović, but he did not consult Miklosich, although their explanations are basically the same.

the final syllable in Serbian forms may be interpreted as a reflection of the Turkish dialectal situation. The vowels *-e-* and *-a-* in the initial syllable of the Serbian words may be the consequence of inconsistency in the reflex of the Turkish semivowel. In the case of Bulg. and Mac. attestations with *-mn-* instead of *-mb-* the devoicing might have been influenced by the genetically close word *чѣмпра*<sup>13</sup>, although it is possible that such a Turkish dialectal form existed, too.

2.4. This word falls into the group of cultural-historical loans (Десницкаја 1988:134), which means that it was borrowed as a designation for part of a domestic weaving loom. It belongs partly to ethno-historical loans since its borrowing was followed by partial disappearance of the domestic word. The fact that a Turkish loan was substituted for an autochthonous word, the undoubted existence of which is confirmed by attestations of a considerable number of Slavic names for that object, leads us to the idea that the new term might have been understood as a narrowing, a specialization of the meaning of the old one, or that it came about as a consequence of a technological innovation in the sphere of manufacturing or in the design of the object itself<sup>14</sup>.

2.5.1. Records of this word cover a great deal of the Serbo-Croatian language territory<sup>15</sup>, from Slavonia in the West, via Srem, and further to central, southern and south-eastern Serbia, the attestations being most numerous in south-eastern Serbia, in a considerable part of Bulgaria, and in one location in Macedonia (Graovo)<sup>16</sup>.

2.5.2. As part of a weaving loom the Turk. *çimbar* has been recorded in Turkish Balkan vernaculars in north-eastern Bulgaria, too (Dall 1976:168).

3. The Serbian word *чѣмбар* 'upper, narrower part of a copper cauldron' (Piroš, Живковић) Stachowski derives from the same, above-mentioned Turkish etymon that stands for a weaving term, but with a certain reserve since he is aware that the Balkan word<sup>17</sup> and the Anatolian examples are phonetically identical, but show a substantial difference in semantics<sup>18</sup> (Stachowski 1992). This „substantial difference in semantics“ has initiated a quest for semantic equivalents of this word, in Serbian in the first place, but also in geographically close Slavic languages: SCr. *чѣмбер* m. 'edge of a dish, casserole', *чѣмберче* n. dem. (Vranje, Vlasotince.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Младенов (1941:679).

<sup>14</sup> A systematic study of Turcisms in weaving terminology might establish the mechanisms and motivation for borrowing new words for already existing realia belonging to a more or less coherent lexical subsystem.

<sup>15</sup> One of the tasks of studies of Turcisms in the Balkan languages, as proposed by Desnickaja (Десницкаја 1988:147) is to determine the areal distribution of Turcisms, firstly of those that are still in active use. The statement that this weaving term falls into that category, is certainly true when speaking of elderly people, since the word is mentioned in dictionaries whose material was collected over the past fifteen years. However, since weaving as a craft is inevitably disappearing from everyday life, the term is destined to become extinct.

<sup>16</sup> For the distribution of this term, and for the numerous attestations from Vojvodina, cf. Fališska (IV: map 107a). It is interesting that, so far at least, the weaving term has not been attested on the territories of Crna Gora, Lika and Bosnia and Herzegovina, which abound in Turkish loan-words.

<sup>17</sup> More precisely, he reconstructs the etymon as the Balkan Turk. \**cimbar*, while for its meaning, as well as for formal parallelism, he refers to the mentioned Anatolian dialectal variations.

<sup>18</sup> It is not quite clear whether we are dealing here with a reconstruction of the meaning of a Balkan Turkish dialectal variation based on the example from Piroš, or the meaning of the loan-word, on the one hand, is compared with the Turkish dialectal attestations, on the other.

Leskovac, PCA materials), 'rim i.e. bordering band of a copper cauldron' (Pirót, PCA materials); Mac. *чeмбeр* m. 'rim of a lid or another vessel' (Алeкcoвcки 1985:45)<sup>19</sup>; Bulg. *чeмбeр* m. 'rim of an object' (Софийcкo. БД II:11); Bulg. *чoмбeр* m. 'iron for rims; obs. bordering flat edge of a sahan, edge of a pan on scale' (Пирдопcкo, БД IV:151); Bulg. *чyмбeр* m. 'woman's headscarf; upper part of a vessel (usually copper)' (Карлoвcкo, 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<sup>20</sup>, 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 etymon of these words would be the Turk. *çember*<sup>21</sup> in the meaning 'hoop, ring'<sup>22</sup> with semantic specialisation to 'edge, rim of a dish, boarder'. This is confirmed by almost identical examples in attestations from Pirót: *цимбар* (*Напни кот'л до цимбар* 'Fill the kettle up to the ring'), and *чeмбeр* (*Кот'ля пни до чeмбeр, не прeплyј га* 'Fill the kettle up to the ring, do not overflow it'). It should be borne in mind that the example from Pirót with its initial *ç-* is a hapax legomenon so it could actually be the result of a merely local phonetic variation. On the other hand, it can be assumed that in the (Balkan) Turkish vernaculars there used to be parallel forms with *c-* and *ç-*<sup>23</sup>. 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 semantics 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 south-eastern Serbia, a single Macedonian attestation and central regions of Bulgaria.

4. The Serbian dialectal word *митит* 'a piece of wood or iron used for stretching cloth on the goathair weaving loom, *çimbar*' (Pirót, Rasina, 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' (Niš, Никoлић 1955:151; Ivanjica, Кнежевић 1955:260; Mrkonjić Grad, Дрљача 1957:55) is a term for the very object that is designated by *цимбар*, but it belongs to goathair weaving terminology. There are, also, two phonetic variants of the same word: *митин* m. 'id.' (Kosovo, Елeзoвић), *митун* m. 'id.' (Prizren, PCA materials). The same term is attest-

<sup>19</sup> The author states only that this word comes from the Turk. *çember*, without a meaning.

<sup>20</sup> The reliability of such explanations is certainly reinforced by a number of attested analogous semantic shifts ('weaving term' > 'edge of a vessel, rim') in the borrowing language itself, as well as in other unrelated languages.

<sup>21</sup> For more information on the Turk. *çember*, its meanings, attestations and origin cf. Stachowski (1998:47).

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Срп. *чeмбeр* (besides 'cloth, fabric; a kind of woman's scarf') also 'hoop, frame, ring' from the Turk. *çember* Škaljić.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. the varying of the Turk. *c-ç* in the examples like: *çember, çamber, çemper, çember; çember, çenber, çambar* etc. 'woman's headscarf' (DS), as well as the above-mentioned examples of the Turkish names for parts of the weaving loom. Variations of vocalism in the first syllable in Bulg. attestations are also explicable on the basis of the Turkish dialectal forms. For the shift *-o- > -u-*, cf. Bulg. dial. *кyнaцимaк, чyдaк, кyмaт* (Карлoвcкo, БД VII).

ed in Bulgarian too: *митит* 'cogs, teeth – term from goathair weaving craftsmanship' (Дебнево, Троянско, БЕР 4:136); *метит* 'id.' (Вeнeдиктoвa 1953:89); *менит* 'id.' (Лoзeнгpaд, Вeнeдиктoвa 1953:91)<sup>24</sup>.

4.1. In the БЕР the Bulgarian word is supposed to be Greek by origin, from *μύτη* 'razor blade; end, point (of a needle and the like); nose' (БЕР 4:136), the arguments for this interpretation being found in the analogy of the semantic motivation of the domestic term 'cogs, teeth'<sup>25</sup>. However, if we are looking for the etymology of a technical term, other elements in the same terminology should be borne in mind: it is most likely that the majority of those terms share a common origin (Киш 1969:68). An advanced technology for goathair processing as well as the organization of the goathair weaving craft was introduced into the Balkans by the Turks, who were the first to practise it<sup>26</sup>. Therefore, a considerable number of terms from this crafts is furnished by Turcisms, which makes it very likely that both the Serbian and the Bulgarian words *митит* come from the Turk. dial. *mitit*<sup>27</sup> 'device used for stretching cloth in goathair weaving' (Çanakkale, SDD), 'device used for stretching cloth on a weaving loom' (Tokat, Çanakkale, DS)<sup>28</sup>. The origin of the Bulg. *менит* and *менит* could be related to this Turkish goathair weaving term, although their phonetic form is not identical to the etymon<sup>29</sup>.

4.2. This word belongs to urban loan-words, as part of the heritage of urban economy, which used to be developed in old centers of craftsmanship. It's geographic distribution includes southern and south-western Serbia and Bosnia<sup>30</sup>, and central and south-eastern Bulgaria<sup>31</sup>. The word cannot be considered a loan-word in the proper sense, but rather an ethnographism, a part of professional vocabulary used by a certain, narrow circle of people, which never 'left' the professional domain, nor was it used outside the sphere of that craft. The first mention of this word cannot be established with

<sup>24</sup> The author notes that this word is a loan from Greek and he relates it to the Modern Gk. *μυτώσερα* which designated a part of a loom (Вeнeдиктoвa 1953:92).

<sup>25</sup> For details concerning this explanation, cf. Димитрова-Тодорова (1989).

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

<sup>27</sup> 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 Grecism in major studies by authors who had at their disposal the cited Turkish dialectal corpus (Тietze 1955, Tzitzilis 1987).

<sup>28</sup> 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 *цимбар* which belongs to the female code, so that their borrowing and distribution could have been influenced by that circumstance too.

<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> Goathair weaving was spread in Lika and Krbava, but there is no evidence of the existence of this term, cf. Дрљача (1957:47-48).

<sup>31</sup> 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 have almost completely disappeared (cf. Никoлић 1955).

certainty, but the first written record of goathair weaving in southern Serbia falls into the 16th century and in 18th century in city of Niš (Николитс 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 etymon 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 etymon 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 minutious 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<sup>32</sup>.

## References

- Dallı, H. 1976. *Kuzeydoğu Bulgaristan Türk Ağzları üzerine Araştırmalar*. Ankara, 1976.
- Falińska, B. 1984. *Polskie słownictwo tkackie na tle słowiańskim*, IV, 1, 2. Wrocław, 1984.
- Hazai, G. 1983. Die Balkanologie braucht einen neuen „Miklosich“. – *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik*, Beiträge zur Tagung vom 2. – 6. März 1981 in Berlin, Band 8, Berlin, 1983, 99–103.
- Hazai, G. 1989. Die Turzismen in den Sprachen Südosteuropas: Erfassung, Bedeutung, Status. – *Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die Osmanen*. München, 1989, 205–214.
- Knežević, A. 1962. *Die Turzismen in der Sprache der Kroaten und Serben*. Meisenheim am Glan, 1962.
- Menges, K. H. 1983. Türkisches Sprachgut im Süd-Slavischen. – *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik*, Beiträge zur Tagung vom 2. – 6. März 1981 in Berlin, Band 8, Berlin, 1983, 132–145.
- Miklosich, F. 1884–1890. *Die Türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen*. 1–2. Nachtrag I, 2. Wien, 1884–1890.
- Skok, P. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. I–IV. Zagreb, 1971–1974.
- Stachowski, S. 1992. *Türkische Lehnwörter im serbischen Dialekt von Pirog*. Prace językoznawcze 111. Kraków, 1992.
- Stachowski, S. 1998. Osmanlı Türkçesinde Yeni Farsça Alıntılar Sözlüğü. İstanbul, 1998.
- Škaljić, A. 1979. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo, 1979.
- Tietze, A. 1955. Griechische Lehnwörter im anatolischen Türkisch. – *Oriens*, 8, 2. Leiden, 1955, 204–257.
- Tietze, A. 1983. Die Probleme der Turzismenforschung. – *Ziele und Wege der Balkanlinguistik*, Beiträge zur Tagung vom 2. – 6. März 1981 in Berlin, Band 8, Berlin, 1983, 237–244.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Hazai (1989:211).

- Tzitzilis, Ch. 1987. *Griechische Lehnwörter im Türkischen (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der anatolischen Dialekte)*. Wien, 1987.
- Алексовски, Д. 1985. *Службени зборови во кривовошкиот говор*. Скопје, 1985.
- Венедиктова, В. 1953. Мутафчийският занаят в България. – *Известия на Етнографския институт с музей*, I, София, 1953, 71–94.
- Десницка, А. В. 1988. Типы лексических взаимосвязей и вопросы образования балканского языкового союза. – *Славянское языкознание. X Международный съезд славистов*. Москва, 1988.
- Димитрова-Тодорова, Л. 1989. Балканские заимствования в болгарском языке. – *Балканско езиковедие*, XXXII, 1, София, 1989, 73–76.
- Динић, Й. 1988. *Речник тилочког говора*. – СДЗБ, XXXIV, 1988, 7–335.
- Дрљача, Д. 1957. Мутапчије у Мркоњић Граду. – *Гласник Земалског Музеја Сарајево, Историја и етнографија*, в. серија XII. Сарајево, 1957, 47–67.
- Елезовић, Г. 1932, 1935. *Речник косовско-метохијског дијалекта*. – СДЗБ, IV, 1932; VI, 1935.
- Живковић, Н. 1987. *Речник пиротског говора*. Пирот.
- Зайцева, С. В. 1998. Из опыта системного изучения штокавской лексики. – *Малый диалектологический атлас балканских языков. Материалы второго рабочего совещания*. Санкт-Петербург, 19 декабря 1997. Санкт-Петербург, 1998, 37–48.
- Златановић, М. 1998. *Речник говора Јужне Србије*. Врање, 1998.
- Киш, Л. 1969. О некоторых принципах этимологизирования заимствованных слов. – *Этимология* 1967. Москва, 1969, 68–70.
- Кнежевић, С. 1955. Мутапчије – „козопреди“ у Ивањици. – *Зборник Филозофског факултета*, III, Београд, 1955, 253–266.
- Мартинов, А. П. 1958. Народнописни материали от Граово. – *Сборник за народни умотворения и народопис*, XLIX, София, 1958, 773–789.
- Митровић, Б. 1984. *Речник лесковачког говора*. Лесковац, 1984.
- Младенов, Ст. 1941. *Етимологически и правописен речник на българския книжовен език*. София, 1941.
- Николић, Ј. 1955. Мутапчије Ниша и околине. – *Гласник Етнографског музеја*, 18. Београд, 1955, 137–156.
- Радлов, В. 1905–1911. *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий*. I–IV. Санкт-Петербург, 1905–1911.

## Abbreviations

- DS *Türkiye'de halk ağzından derleme sözlüğü*. I–IX. Ankara, 1963–1977.
- SDD *Türkiye'de Halk Ağzından Söz Derleme Dergisi*. I–IV. İstanbul, 1939–1949.
- БЕР *Български етимологичен речник*. София, 1971–.
- БД *Българска диалектология. Проучвания и материали*. София, 1962–.
- Вук В. Стефановић-Караџић. *Српски рјечник*. Београд, 1898<sup>3</sup>.
- РСА *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног и народног језика*. Београд, 1959–.
- СДЗБ *Српски дијалектолошки зборник*. Београд.
- ТБД *Трудове по българска диалектология*. София, 1965–.