

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΓΛΩΣΣΑ: ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΧΡΟΝΙΑ  
GREEK LANGUAGE: SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY

- 1 -

# Ελληνική ετυμολογία Greek etymology

Επιμέλεια

Χρ. Τζιτζιλής & Γ. Παπαναστασίου

Editors

Chr. Tzitzilis & G. Papanastassiou

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΤΕΛΕΙΟ ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΘΕΣΣΑΛΟΝΙΚΗΣ  
ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΝΕΟΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ  
[ΙΔΡΥΜΑ ΜΑΝΟΛΗ ΤΡΙΑΝΤΑΦΥΛΛΙΔΗ]

Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών  
(Ίδρυμα Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη)  
Αριστοτέλειο Πανεπιστήμιο Θεσσαλονίκης  
541 24 Θεσσαλονίκη  
<http://ins.web.auth.gr>  
e-Shop: <http://www.eshop.ins-auth.gr>  
e-mail: [ins@phil.auth.gr](mailto:ins@phil.auth.gr)

Institute of Modern Greek Studies  
(Manolis Triandaphyllidis Foundation)  
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
GR-541 24 Thessaloniki  
<http://ins.web.auth.gr>  
e-Shop: <http://www.eshop.ins-auth.gr>  
e-mail: [ins@phil.auth.gr](mailto:ins@phil.auth.gr)

© 2017 Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών

© 2017 Institute of Modern Greek Studies

ISBN 978-960-231-182-0

ISBN 978-960-231-182-0

Φιλολογική επιμέλεια  
Ειρήνη Κρίκη, Κική Τσαλακανίδου

Proofread and edited  
by Eirini Kriki, Kiki Tsalakanidou

Στοιχειοθετήθηκε  
από την Αθανασία Κοπανά  
στο Ινστιτούτο Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών

Desktop publishing  
by Athanasia Kopana  
in the Institute of Modern Greek Studies

Τυπώθηκε στη Θεσσαλονίκη  
από την Τριανταφύλλου mtrprint

Printed in Thessaloniki  
by Triantafyllou mtrprint

## Περιεχόμενα | Contents

<i>Πρόλογος</i>	9
<i>Preface</i>	21
Εισαγωγή (στην ελληνική ετυμολογία) ΧΡ. ΤΖΙΤΖΙΛΗΣ	33
Introduction (to Greek etymology) CHR. TZITZILIS	85
Bridges of war and tin routes: Once again on <i>πόλεμος</i> and <i>κασσίτερος</i> Α. LOMA	135
Etymology and realities M. MEIER-BRÜGGER	146
A new contribution to Greek etymology KR. T. WITCZAK	153
Ancient Greek etymology: Ex presente lux CHR. TZITZILIS	168
Optimality theory and etymology: The case of Greek labiovelars J. VIS	198
Η ετυμολογία: στόχοι, μέθοδοι, περιοχές Μ. ΣΕΤΑΤΟΣ	212
Το λεξιλόγιο της νέας ελληνικής: κατηγορίες προέλευσης Ε. Β. ΠΕΤΡΟΥΝΙΑΣ	240
Οι ετυμολογικές προτάσεις του <i>Χρηστικού Λεξικού της Νεοελληνικής Γλώσσας</i> της Ακαδημίας Αθηνών ΧΡ. ΧΑΡΑΛΑΜΠΙΑΚΗΣ	260
Ετυμολογία και διαλεκτική λεξικογραφία: η περίπτωση του <i>Λεξικού της διαλεκτικής ποικιλίας Κυδωνιών, Μοσχονησίων &amp; Βορειοανατολικής Λέσβου</i> και του διαδικτυακού “Τριδιαλεκτικού λεξικού για τις μικρασιατικές διαλέκτους της Καππαδοκίας, του Πόντου και του Αίβαλιού/Μοσχονησίων” Σ. ΤΣΟΛΑΚΙΔΗΣ, Α. ΡΑΛΛΗ & Δ. ΜΕΛΙΣΣΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ	294
Lexical archaisms in Modern Greek etymology TH. GIANNARIS & N. PANTELIDIS	310

Reconstructions and derivational models: Inherited forms or recent formations? G. PAPANASTASSIOU	320
Ανάγκη για πρωτογενή ετυμολογική έρευνα: παραδείγματα από το λεξιλόγιο ταμπού της νέας ελληνικής Γ. ΚΑΤΣΟΥΔΑ	357
Ετυμολόγηση λέξεων σε νοταριακά κείμενα του 16ου αιώνα Γ. ΓΙΑΝΝΟΥΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ε. ΚΑΡΑΝΤΖΟΛΑ & Κ. ΤΙΚΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ	372
Αλβανική και ελληνική: επισκόπηση της ετυμολογικής έρευνας, προβλήματα και προοπτικές Δ. Κ. ΚΥΡΙΑΖΗΣ	394
L'influence grecque sur le roumain M. SALA	417
Greek loanwords in Serbian: The lexicographic aspect J. VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ	425
Turkish loanwords in Serbian: Sorting out missing and misplaced parts of a still growing puzzle S. PETROVIĆ	448
The outcome of Greek loanwords into the present-day Romanian language: The case of expressive words A. M. SAPOVICI	462
Greek Y in Dalmatian Romance O. LIGORIO	472
Etymology and language contact: Remarks on Greek loanwords in Late Antiquity CHR. KATSIKADELI & I. FYKIAS	495
Ancient Greek in Ancient Hebrew: Unattested Greek loanwords in Post-Biblical Hebrew N. SHOVAL-DUDAI	513
Énigmes arithmétiques et alphabet chez Homère: de Bellérophon à Sargon II d'Assyrie FR. BADER	531
<i>Ευρετήριο   Index</i>	631



## Turkish loanwords in Serbian: Sorting out missing and misplaced parts of a still growing puzzle

S. PETROVIĆ

1. The study of Turkish loanwords in Serbian<sup>1</sup> has a long history, and significant results have been achieved. Although we can find some minor word lists from the 17th century, and glossaries from the first half of the 18th,<sup>2</sup> the year 1884 marks the beginning of the scientifically-based approach to the subject. In that year two important dictionaries were printed: *Turske i druge istočanske reči u našem jeziku* by Đorđe Popović (Поповић 1884), and the first volume of Franz Miklosich's famous "Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropaischen Sprachen" (Miklosich 1884–1890). To date, the list of works dealing with Turcisms in Serbian<sup>3</sup> has expanded to over 300 items, including articles, monographs, specialized and etymological dictionaries.<sup>4</sup>

2. The most important lexicographic manuals for Turcisms in the Serbian language are Miklosich (1884–1890), Knežević (1962), Skok (1971–1974), Škaljić (1985), *EPCJ* and Петровић (2012a).<sup>5</sup> These dictionaries differ in their methodological approach to organizing entries. The nest principle from the Turkish language perspective is applied in Miklosich (1884–1890) and Knežević (1962); the nest principle from the Serbian language perspective is used in Skok (1971–1974); the flexible lexeme principle is applied in *EPCJ* and Петровић (2012a), while Škaljić (1985) applies a strict lexeme principle from the Serbo-Croatian perspective. The Serbian lexical material

This article is the result of research on project no. 178007 "Etymological Research into the Serbian Language and Compilation of the *Etymological Dictionary of Serbian*" which is fully financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia.

<sup>1</sup> In this paper we use the terms *Serbian* and *Serbo-Croatian* as near synonyms, considering that the latter is a phase in the development of standard Serbian (and other successor languages of Serbo-Croatian).

<sup>2</sup> On manuscript dictionaries of Turkish loanwords see Stojaković (1980) and Čaušević (2016).

<sup>3</sup> Not always dealing with the Serbian language exclusively, but containing some Serbian material.

<sup>4</sup> For more detailed information about the history of the study of Turkish loanwords in Serbian and an overview of the main topics in this field, as well as the bibliography up to the year 1993, see Петровић (1993). In the meantime, the number of works has grown considerably, and it is impossible to mention all of them, but the most relevant ones will be cited later in this paper. The relevant references for other Balkan languages up to the year 1990 can be found in Tietze (1990).

<sup>5</sup> It is worthwhile mentioning yet another dictionary, *Rječnik posuđenica iz turskoga jezika* (Nosić 2005), comprising 22,000 entries of Serbo-Croatian Turcisms. The only reason this dictionary is not included in the list of main manuals is the fact that it lacks in scientifically based lexicographic data, such as cited literature and references, lexical resources, etc.

they deal with also varies, and depends both on the sources the authors had at their disposal and the applied methodological approach. The most complete lexical data can be found in *EPCJ*, including both standard and dialectal material from the entire Shtokavian region.<sup>6</sup> Škaljić (1985), Knežević (1962) and Skok (1971–1974) incorporated Serbo-Croatian words from the standard and literary language, with restricted dialectal material – Škaljić (1985) mainly from Bosnia and Herzegovina, whilst Knežević (1962) and Skok (1971–1974) added a number of sources from the Kosovo-Resava, Prizren-Timok and Chakavian dialects. Петровић (2012a) analyzes the Prizren-Timok dialectal words and compares them to the standard and literary material. With regard to comparative lexical material from other Balkan languages, these dictionaries can be divided into two groups: the first, observing Serbo-Croatian words within this broader context (Miklosich 1884–1890; Skok 1971–1974; *EPCJ*; Петровић 2012a), and the second, dealing only with the Serbo-Croatian material (Knežević 1962; Škaljić 1985).

3. From a starting point in the 19th century, over the past 130 years, many things have changed with regard to the study of Turkish loans in Serbian, as well as in other Balkan languages: (1) the corpus of Turkish loans in Serbian has grown considerably, mostly in dialectal data;<sup>7</sup> (2) the expansion of our understanding of the history and dialectology of the Turkish language has demanded new perspectives in finding adequate Turkish etyma; and (3) the development of Balkan studies has brought with it a new methodological comparative approach. Not all the studies of the Serbo-Croatian Turcisms have applied contemporary linguistic knowledge and methodology, but most of them are valuable resources in the fields of etymology, historical lexicography and Balkanology. The aim of this paper is not to give a complete, up-to-date survey of these studies, but to point out some key issues that are still missing or misplaced in research on Turkish loanwords in Serbian.<sup>8</sup>

4. *Chronology.* Defining the chronological strata of Turkish influence upon Serbo-Croatian is one of the fundamental issues in historical and etymological studies.<sup>9</sup> Locating Turcisms in time allows a better understanding of the borrowing process and gives us a starting point from which to trace their further dissemination through dialects and vernaculars in the Balkans. The long-lasting contact between Serbian and Turkish / Turkic languages can be divided into three major periods: the Pre-Ottoman period (6th or 7th–14th c.), the Ottoman period (14th–19th c.), and the Post-Ottoman period (20th c.).

<sup>6</sup> For a more detailed explanation of the methodology applied in *EPCJ* see Бјелетић, Влајић-Поповић & Лома (1997); Петровић (1997); *EPCJ* 3rd v., 5–6.

<sup>7</sup> In the past thirty years, nearly 200 new dialectal dictionaries from the Shtokavian region have been published.

<sup>8</sup> Six important aspects of the investigation of lexical borrowings in the Balkans that should be added to the classical comparative-historical method are pointed out in Sobolev (2009, 234–35).

<sup>9</sup> On the complexity of Turkish influence on different chronological levels in the Balkans see Hazai & Kappler (1999, 652–56).

4.1.1 During the first half of the Pre-Ottoman period, until the 11th century, the Serbian language was part of a still undifferentiated South-Slavic entity. After the 11th century began the period of diglossia between Old Serbian (the vernacular language) and Serbian Slavic (the literary language) which lasted, with certain changes to both varieties, until the 19th century. The lack of early attestations and the fragmentary nature of the written sources makes a more precise definition of the Serbian (Slavic) layer of contact virtually impossible, and therefore the initial form of the loanword and the context of its usage are inaccessible to us. There are no more than a few dozen loanwords from this period, for example *bubreg*, *kovčeg*, *klobuk*, *balvan*, etc. (Адамовић 1969; 1976; Dybo 2010).<sup>10</sup> Certain studies of the Serbo-Croatian Turcisms do not recognize this chronological level of borrowing, and treat such words as if they were of Ottoman-Turkish origin.<sup>11</sup> Some of these early loanwords, considered to be of Turkic origin, still lack a definite etymological explanation, having at least two interpretations of origin, for example the words *kvar* or *haluga* (Dybo 2010; Лома 2000). The majority of these words (sometimes falsely considered to be Proto-Slavic loanwords) were incorporated into Old Church Slavonic and spread into East and West Slavic languages through this literary language of the early Slavic world. They are usually considered to be of Bulgar-Turkic origin, and to have entered either directly, via the Danube Bulgar branch or the Volga Bulgar branch, or mediated by Hungarian. Significant progress has recently been made in this field with the revelation of new facts about the Proto-Turkic language group and contacts between Slavic and Hungarian languages in early mediæval times (Dybo 2010; Róna-Tas & Berta 2011).<sup>12</sup>

4.1.2 The main task in this field is to establish the first written attestation of a loanword and to define as precisely as possible the source language and paths of the borrowing process by comparing material from early Slavic and Hungarian written sources.

4.2.1 *The Ottoman period* is by far the most important period for Serbian-Turkish language interference, and 99% of the Turkish loanwords were borrowed during these five centuries of constant and living contact. Škaljić's dictionary has 8,742 entries, and the number of Turcisms has subsequently risen to over 9,000, with the inclusion of new dialectal material. The corpus of Turkish loanwords and their status at different levels of Serbian have changed significantly over the past 60 years. On the one hand, due to vast and systematic dialectological research, the number of recorded lexemes, especially their phonetic and semantic variations, has substantially increased, whilst on the other, the proportion of the vocabulary of the standard language made up of such items has continued to decrease, and even those

<sup>10</sup> On the studies concerning Pre-Ottoman Turkish loanwords see Петровић (1993, 110–12).

<sup>11</sup> See for example *bubreg* (Knežević 1962, 63; Škaljić 1985, 150), *balvan* (Škaljić 1985, 119), *jarak* (Škaljić 1985, 362; Knežević 1962, 164).

<sup>12</sup> The importance of the early loanwords for the historical linguistics of the Turkic languages is very often stressed, and even accorded a key role in the reconstruction of certain features, because of the scarcity of recorded Turkic data from the Pre-Ottoman period (Dybo 2010, 21).

that remain in use are often relegated to the status of archaic, dialectal, stylistically colored lexical items.<sup>13</sup> According to recent research, only (up to) 10% of Turkish loans currently have active status (Ђинђић 2013). Turcisms belonging to this period are also the best studied, and form the main topic of interest of the above-mentioned dictionaries. Yet there are still a lot of missing or misplaced pieces to be discovered in this field of investigation. We will illustrate just one missing lexical piece of the puzzle, a newly discovered historical Turcism in Serbian – *dešerme*.

4.2.2 The word *dešerme* ‘recruiting Christian children during the Ottoman epoch’ is not recorded in a single dictionary of the Serbian language, descriptive or etymological, but it is attested in a manuscript from the early 17th century. The most adequate Turkish etymon is the older form *değşürme*, beside *devşirme* and *düşürme* (Петровић 2013b, 395–96). The discovery of this lexical archaism is important for two main reasons: (1) the Serbian word allows the possibility that the older Turkish form *değşürme* was alive and used throughout the 16th and possibly 17th centuries, together with the newer form *devşirme*, and (2) being already attested in Greek and Albanian with the same meaning, as *ντουσουρμές* and *devshirme* respectively, the existence of the Serbian word gives this Turkish loan the status of a lexical Balkanism, albeit an archaism (Петровић 2013b, 395–96).

4.2.3 The main tasks in this field are to discover new loanwords and new phonetic, semantic and morphological features from the dialectal sources and historical documents written in this period, to establish the difference between dialectal and literary loanwords from the perspective of both languages (which is discussed within the contact points problem, § 5), and to recognize the peculiarities of loanwords from different parts of the Serbo-Croatian territory and the directions of influence on the standard Serbian language.

4.3.1 *The Post-Ottoman period* has generally been almost invisible to research, and all the words of Turkish origin registered in the 20th century are considered to be part of the Ottoman legacy. Although Post-Ottoman Turcisms are not numerous, we will present one through the case of the word *jogurt*.

The analysis of the borrowing process of the Turkish word *yoğurt* ‘yogurt’ into Serbian offers a complex image of the paths taken by loans, as well as three different layers of the borrowing process: the Ottoman Turkish, the Non-Turkish, and the Post-Ottoman period. During the 19th century, the word was recorded in a few written sources exclusively as a non-adapted foreign word, and was provided with an explanation or translation as ‘sour milk’. This was a case of direct borrowing from the Ottoman period and, according to the linguistic data, the word *jogurt* cannot be considered a proper loanword at the time. In the middle of the 20th century the word reappears as the brand name for a dairy product with the meaning ‘a sort of dairy drink’. With that meaning the word entered directly into the standard

<sup>13</sup> For the status and methodological treatment of Turkish loanwords in two recent volumes of the *Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика* (Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian literary and popular language), see Ђинђић (2007) and Ђинђић (2015).



Serbo-Croatian vocabulary and has remained in everyday use ever since. Analysis showed that this was a case of borrowing a word of Turkish origin via French or German and a case of a non-Turkish direct loan. The most recent, Post-Ottoman borrowing layer is found in a proverb *Ko se jednom na mleko opeče taj i u jogurt duva*, being a calque from the Turk. *Sütten ağzı yanan yoğurdu (veya ayranı) üfleyerek yer (veya içer)* 'he who gets burned by milk blows on yogurt as well', with the word *jogurt* as a stable element. The proverb was not attested before the 1980s (Петровић & Ђинђић 2015).<sup>14</sup>

4.3.2 The main task is to discover the most recent layers in the borrowing process of Turkish loanwords by investigating Turcisms in Serbian not recorded before the 20th century.

5. *The contact point.* The task of understanding the circumstances in which a certain lexical unit was borrowed, by explaining its social context and functional linguistic levels, is very complex. One element of this broad picture is to determine, when possible, whether the contact occurred between literary idioms,<sup>15</sup> or dialects, or between one literary idiom and one vernacular. This problem should be observed from two perspectives.

5.1 *From the standpoint of the source language.* Neglect for the facts of the historical development and dialectal diversity of the Turkish language has been stressed many times as the weakest area in the study of Turcisms, not only in the Serbo-Croatian language, but in other Balkan languages as well.<sup>16</sup> Increasing knowledge in the field of Turkology, especially in dialectology, in the second half of the 20th century gave the opportunity to improve the etymological explanation of Turkish loanwords,<sup>17</sup> allowing, in the first place, the identification of a precise Turkish etymon, from both a formal and a semantic perspective.<sup>18</sup> For example, Serb. *zanat* 'craft' used to be explained as a loan from Turk. *sana(a)t* 'craft' (Skok 1971–1974, 3rd v., 642; Škaljić 1985, 645). But the attestation of both a dialectal and historical Turkish form *zanat* 'craft' enabled the establishment of a more appropriate etymon (Петровић 2012a, 138–39). Serb. *domazlak* 'stud, broad' was identified as a borrowing from Turk. *damızlık* 'stud, broad' (Skok 1971–1974, 1st v., 425; Škaljić 1985, 223). The Serbian form was explained as a result of interference with *dom* 'home, house', of Slavic origin, but the Turk. dial. *domazlık* offers a phonetically appropriate Turkish source (Петровић 2012a, 121). These cases, as well as many other similar ones, confirm that the borrowing process occurred between dialects in contact, often reflecting older Turkish word forms.<sup>19</sup>

<sup>14</sup> In favor of the explanation of the Serbian proverb as a calque stands the corresponding Greek phrase: *όποιος καεί στο χυλό, φυσάει και το γιαούρτι* (Петровић & Ђинђић 2015, 260–61).

<sup>15</sup> The term *literary* is used in a broader sense, to denote written or administrative, often of official forms of communication.

<sup>16</sup> For the role of Turkish dialects in the borrowing process, and the importance of defining a precise Turkish etymon in Greek and other Balkan languages, see Tzitzilis (1997).

<sup>17</sup> For detailed bibliography on Balkan Turkish dialects, see Tryjarski (1990).

<sup>18</sup> For more details concerning Serbian Turcisms, see Петровић (1997, 118–19).

<sup>19</sup> Turkish dialectal forms have been explained by the development of the Rumelian dialects



5.2 *From the standpoint of the borrowing language.* Research on Turkish loanwords in Serbian has not always paid enough attention to the importance of the peculiarities of different parts of the Serbo-Croatian territory, dialectally and historically, and their influence on the standard Serbian language.<sup>20</sup> The example of the Serbian word *da(h)ija* shows how semantic and phonetic differences can be explained by differences in dialectal contact points and historical facts at the level of the Serbian language. The noun *dahija* is present in Serbian primarily as a title of characters from the popular epic poetry and literature of the 19th century, meaning 'head of the janissaries; tyrant', and its usage in the standard language is very restricted. On the other hand, a dialectal form *daija* is attested only in the region of Kosovo and Metohija, but with the opposite meaning 'hero, knight'. Both forms are borrowed from the Turk. *dayı* 'hero; a title of high administrative rank in the Ottoman empire'. The semantic difference between two Serbian words can be explained by the fact that the borrowing region of the form *dahija* 'head of the janissary; tyrant' was the Pashaluk of Belgrade, notorious in the late 18th and early 19th century for the cruelty of its local administrators, i.e. *dahijas*. Borrowed there, initially as an administrative title, the term gained a very negative appellative meaning, not attested in Turkish, due to the tyranny of the Ottoman high officials.<sup>21</sup> In addition, in the popular epic poetry of the South-West region of Serbia, East Herzegovina and Bosnia, a non-etymological *-h-* was frequently added to the original form *daija*, as a consequence of hypercorrection in Turkish loanwords, characteristic for this Serbian dialectal base. In contrast, the Serbian dialectal form *daija*, with the meaning 'hero, knight', was borrowed directly from the Turkish dialectal appellative in the region of Kosovo and Metohija, in appropriate phonetic form and preserving the original meaning. Dialects from this area generally do not have the phoneme *h*, and show no tendency toward hypercorrection of Turkish loans under the influence of Standard Serbian. Thus the word was preserved in the original form until the late 20th century.<sup>22</sup>

6. *Etymology.* All the topics discussed in this paper form part of a comprehensive

and differences between Eastern and Western Rumelian. However, the influence of local South Slavic dialects on the latter, stressed in Siegel (2010), should also be considered, but with much more caution, and relying on exhaustive and up-to-date dialectological facts. Sometimes it is also hard to define which chronological layer within the donor language was the precise source, and to separate archaic features from dialectal ones, as these are very often of the same origin. For example, Serb. dial. form *јанглиш* 'wrong' < Turk. *yanğlış*, reflects both dialectal and archaic features (Петровић 2012a, 157).

<sup>20</sup> Very few studies of Turkish loanwords have so far offered a picture of the areal distribution of Turkish loanwords and their separate features (semantic, phonetic, etc.). However, it has been shown that the analysis of lexical material from this perspective can contribute considerably to establishing areas of concentration of certain lexical types and possible diffusion zones for these forms (Соболев 2004a, 64; 2004b, 211).

<sup>21</sup> The importance of reconstruction of extralinguistic conditions in order to better understand borrowing processes was discussed in Sobolev (2009, 235–36).

<sup>22</sup> For a more detailed explanation of Serb. *da(h)ija* see Петровић (2010).

etymological explanation. Here we will point out another dimension, particularly important for etymological lexicography – how deep into etymon origin do we go?<sup>23</sup> Turkish (i.e. Ottoman) vocabulary was exceedingly genetically diverse, and the Turkish language, besides the autochthonous lexis, included words from Arabic, Persian, Greek, Latin, and other languages. The methodological approach to this question taken in the majority of etymological studies and dictionaries is to give brief comments on the origin of a Turkish etymon only in the case of loanwords, noting its Arabic, Persian, Greek, Latin, or other source word.<sup>24</sup> This practice of giving a deeper etymological explanation of Turcisms confronts the author of an etymological dictionary with the highly exacting task of writing a kind of ‘chained’ etymological dictionary (or entry) of different languages instead of an etymological dictionary (or entry) of one single language – a task sometimes very difficult to fulfil. The question arises of whether such a goal can be achieved by the non-specialist in Turkish etymology, and what value these etymological remarks have for the users. ‘Digging deeper’ is absolutely necessary when understanding that the etymology of a Turkish word demands the identification of the correct origin of a loanword. One such example is provided by two Serbian homonyms of Turkish origin, *ašik* ‘lover’ and *ašik* ‘lamb bone used as a vessel in a children’s game’. In Skok’s dictionary, both words are nested under the same entry, thus implying their derivation from the same Turkish etymon, from the Arabic word *‘ašiq* ‘lover’ (Skok 1971–1974, 1st v., 69–70). However, a more thorough investigation of the etymology of the Turkish word reveals the existence of a pair of homonyms in Turkish too, one borrowed from the abovementioned Arabic word, and the other a common Turkish word meaning ‘lamb bone; a vessel in various games’ (*EPCJ* 1st v., 252–53; Петровић 2012a, 57–58). In search of the optimal solution, and balancing between the impossibility of offering expert etymological remarks in every single case (thus possibly repeating the errors of previous authors), and the danger of depriving the users of existing etymological solutions, in the first three volumes of the *EPCJ* the authors adopted the approach of registering a Turkish word as an etymon, and discussing its origin only when this has a direct impact on the etymological explanation of the Serbian word. This methodological standpoint was modified in Петровић (2012a) by always referring to relevant references concerning the etymology of the Turkish etymon, including Proto- and Common Turkish words, as well as loanwords. This approach will be applied in a shorter form in the future volumes of *EPCJ*.

7. Some *challenging features* which should receive special attention in studies dedicated to investigating Turkish influence on Serbian and other Balkan languages have already been noted in many studies (Hazai & Kappler 1999). Our aim is to

<sup>23</sup> An important question for the etymology of Balkan Turcisms is the identification of the immediate etymon. Etymological dictionaries show considerable differences in their treatment of, for example, Turcisms of Greek origin. Only comparative research on words with multiple etymologies will offer a picture of applied methodological patterns.

<sup>24</sup> This is the case of Skok (1971–1974), Knežević (1962) and Škaljić (1985).

stress here some recent contributions dealing with Serbian Turcisms, taking into account five main aspects of these features.

7.1 *Phonetics*. This topic mainly deals with the phonetic adaptation of Turkish words into Serbian.<sup>25</sup> The phonetic form of a loanword depends on various elements, and all of them should be considered while investigating their origin.<sup>26</sup> Recent etymological research has made considerable efforts in the direction of a more thorough analysis of the phonetic shape of Turcisms, and distinguishing autochthonous changes from those loaned during the borrowing process. For example, the consonant *-k-* in Serb. *bakšiš* 'tip' used to be explained as an adaptation of Turk. *-h-* (Škaljić 1985, 31). However, new Turkish dialectal material offers a more accurate perspective – the Serbian word form should be explained as a reflex of the Turkish dialectal and archaic form *bakşiş* (EPCJ 2nd v., 113; Петровић 2012a, 63–64). A similar approach is applied for the Serb. *beng*, *benk* 'birthmark' (Петровић 2004), and for phonetic doublets *kavaz/gavaz*, *kumrija/gumrija*, *kolsuz/golsuz* (Петровић 2008b).

7.2 *Morphology*. The problems of the morphological adaptation of Turcisms, as well as the role of Turkish suffixes as derivational units used with non-Turkish words in Serbian, have been very well investigated (Петровић 1993, 102–9). However, a few recent studies in this field should be mentioned: one dealing with Turkish suffixes (Радић 2001), one dealing with the derivational analysis of Turcisms (Ђинђић 2013), and one dealing with specific verbal word formation in the Montenegrin dialects (Петровић 2012b).

7.3 *Semantics*. Semantic analysis of Turcisms in Serbian has usually been limited to dividing specific material into a certain number of semantic groups (Петровић 1993, 109; Петровић 2012a, 350–56).<sup>27</sup> More interesting features, such as semantic differences between loanwords and their source forms, or independent semantic developments in the source language, have not been systematically analyzed so far. A study of the specific semantic development of the verb *bitisati* 'to perish' and 'to exist' is offered in Петровић (2008a). One of the problems in defining the semantic characteristics of a loanword is to observe its usage in a specific context. For example, sometimes elements of a phrase develop a certain meaning only in some specific idiomatic unit – a meaning slightly different from the one attested for the individual word – and dictionaries, both descriptive and etymological, do not always note that difference. The Serbian word *aber* 'information' is also defined as 'knowledge', although the second meaning is attested exclusively in the phrase *imati / nemati abera* 'to have / not to have knowledge of something', which is a semi-calque from Turkish *haberim var / yok* (Петровић 1999).

7.4 *Calques*. Calques in Serbian have usually been investigated alongside mor-

<sup>25</sup> A more detailed survey is offered in Петровић (1993, 92–102).

<sup>26</sup> One is the contact point, as we saw in the examples of *dahija* and *daija* in § 5.2.

<sup>27</sup> A comprehensive study of horse breeding terminology in Serbian that includes all Turkish loanwords belonging to this semantic field is given by Ђинђић (2009).

phological or semantic features.<sup>28</sup> Some remarks on calques in the Serbian dialect of Prizren were made in Петровић (2012a, 357–59). For the study of one potential calque in Serbian, *otvoren* ‘open; light in color’ see Петровић (2001).<sup>29</sup>

8. *Conclusion.* The study of Turkish loanwords in Serbian is only a part of the wider field of research into Turkish influence upon the Balkan languages and their lexis. The modern scientific approach to this topic started with the capital synthetic work of Miklosich, and developed many analytic branches, including those dealing with particular features in individual languages, resulting in a significant number of linguistic studies and etymological dictionaries. It has been stressed more than once that there is a need for a new synthesis (Hazai 1989). Bearing in mind the immensity of the Turkish linguistic legacy in the Balkans, and the new perspectives and tasks proposed in the field of the study of Balkan Turkish loanwords,<sup>30</sup> the path that lies ahead towards a broader synthesis still seems very long. At this point, the collection of as many individual results as possible seems to be the right direction to take if we are eventually to reach this destination.<sup>31</sup> One of the aims of this paper, along with pointing out the most important issues regarding Turcisms in Serbian that still remain open to more thorough research, is to present some significant references on this topic, as a contribution to a better understanding of Turkish loanwords in the broader, Balkan context.

## References

- Адамовић, М. 1969. “Турске позајмице неосманског порекла”, *Наш језик* 17(5), 284–98.  
 —. 1976. “Турске позајмице неосманског порекла”, *Наш језик* 22(1–2), 24–34.

<sup>28</sup> The same situation obtains in other Balkan languages, except for the study of calques in Macedonian (Јашар-Настева 1962–1963). The systematization of different types of calques is given by Hazai & Kappler (1999, 667–68).

<sup>29</sup> On semantic borrowings and the phenomenon of interlingual isosemy, see Sobolev (2009, 240–44).

<sup>30</sup> For example, Tzitzilis (1997, 101) reflects on various questions associated with defining and compiling a common Balkan lexical corpus. Соболев (2004b, 217–18) proposes three main tasks in this field: (1) detailed description of semantic, areal distribution and historical-linguistic characteristics of each word; (2) analysis of whether the formal and semantic variations of a certain word are caused by features of the source or recipient language, and whether they are local creations or could be attributed to a wider region and thus be a result of the influence of various, nonrelated Balkan dialects; (3) detailed description of the status of each Turkish loanword in the lexical system of every Balkan dialect. Kahl (2014, 326–28) stresses the importance of a comparative diachronic approach in studying common Balkan lexis, bearing in mind the historical context, as well as the focus on differences in the presence of various *-isms* in the standard Balkan languages today in comparison with those vernaculars serving as a basis for standardization in the 19th century.

<sup>31</sup> In 2007 the project “Туркизми в языках Юго-Восточной Европы” was presented, and the methodological approach described and illustrated with a few lemmata (Сухачев & Гирфанова 2009). The outcome of this ambitious assignment is still to be seen, but the results will partly depend on how comprehensive the data collection from all kinds of linguistic sources will be.



- Бјелетић, М., Ј. Влајић-Поповић & А. Лома. 1997. “Нивои етимолошке анализе и сегментација одредница у ЕРСЈ”, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 40(1), 9–19.
- Čaušević, E. 2016. “Miloš Mandić i njegov rječnik turcizama (О првоме рјечнику турцизама у повјести туркологије)”, in K. Jurčević, O. Ramljak & Z. Hasanbegović (eds), *Hrvatska i Turska. Povjesno kulturni-pregled*. Zagreb: Srednja Europa; Institut društvenih znanosti Ivo Pilar, 85–92.
- Dybo, A. 2010. “Bulgars and Slavs: Phonetic features in early loanwords”, in E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld & B. Podolak (eds), *Studies on the Turkic World. Festschrift in Honour of Stanisław Stachowski*. Krakow: Jagiellonian University Press, 21–40.
- ЕРСЈ = *Етимолошки речник српског језика*. 2003–. Belgrade: Институт за српски језик САНУ.
- Hazai, G. 1989. “Die Turzismen in den Sprachen Südosteuropas: Erfassung, Bedeutung, Status”, in H. G. Majer (ed.), *Die Staaten Südosteuropas und die Osmanen*. Munich: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft, 205–14.
- Hazai, G. & M. Kappler. 1999. “Der Einfluss des Türkischen auf die Sprachen Südosteuropas”, in U. Hinrichs (ed.), *Handbuch der Südosteuropa-Linguistik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 649–75.
- Јашар-Настева, О. 1962–1963. “Македонските калки от турскиот јазик”, *Македонски јазик* 13–14(1–2), 109–72.
- Kahl, T. 2014. “Dynamics of the common Balkan lexemes: New research perspectives and desiderata in the field of Balkan Linguistics”, *Die Welt der Slaven* 59, 310–31.
- Knežević, A. 1962. *Die Turzismen in der Sprache der Kroaten und Serben*. Meisenheim am Glan: Slawisch-Baltisches Seminar der Westfälischen Universität Münster.
- Лома, А. 2000. “Праслав. \*xalǫga < др.-греч. φάλαγγ- и скифский переход f > χ”, *Этимология 1997–1999*. Moscow: Наука, 87–96.
- Miklosich, F. 1884–1890. “Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen”, *Denkschriften der philologisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 34 (1884), 239–326; 35 (1885), 105–92; 37 (1889), 1–88; 38 (1890), 1–194.
- Nosić, M. 2005. *Rječnik posuđenica iz turskoga jezika*. Rijeka: Maveda.
- Петровић, С. 1993. “Историјат и стање проучавања турцизама у српскохрватском језику”, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 36(2), 71–127.
- 1997. “Турцизми у Етимолошком речнику српскохрватског језика”, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 40(1), 117–24.
- 1999. “Ни абера нема”, *Наш језик* 33(1–2), 90–98.
- 2001. “Отворено и затворено као ознаке за светлу и тамну нијансу боја”, *Кодови словенских култура* 6, Боје, 32–41.
- 2004. “За произхода на два турцизма: сѐрб. бенг ‘младеж’, болме ‘тѓнѓк зид, преграда’ и техните паралели в балканските езици”, *Бѓлгарски Език* 51(4), 89–94.
- 2008а. “Битисати – ‘нестати’ или ‘постојати’? Историјски развој, лексикографски третман и савремена пракса”, *Научни састанак слависта у Вукове дане* 37(1), 431–40.
- 2008b. “О турцизмима гаваз/каваз, голсуз/колсуз, гумрија/кумрија”, *Зборник Института за српски језик САНУ* I, 429–34.
- 2010. “Дахија и даија – ‘насилник’ и ‘јунак’”, *Јужнословенски филолог* 66, 373–86.
- 2012а. *Турцизми у српском призренском говору* (Монографије 16). Belgrade: Институт за српски језик САНУ.



- 2012b. “Турцизми у црногорским народним говорима (2)”, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 55(2), 183–92.
- 2013a. “О Миклошичевим Турцизмима у језицима источне и југоисточне Европе и српском лексичком материјалу у њима”, in J. Грковић-Мејдор & А. Лома (eds), *Miklosichiana bicentennaria. Зборник у част двеста година од рођења Ф. Миклошича*. Belgrade: Институт за српски језик САНУ, 369–80.
- 2013b. “О значају проучавања турцизама из предвуковског периода на материјалу *Старих српских записа и натписа Љубомира Стојановића*”, *Јужнословенски филолог* 69, 391–99.
- Петровић, С. & М. Бинђић. 2015. “Културна позајмљеница – српски јогурт између Истока и Запада”, *Јужнословенски филолог* 71(3–4), 251–65.
- Поповић, Ђ. 1884. *Турске и друге источанске речи у нашем језику* (Гласник Српског ученог друштва 59). Belgrade.
- Радић, П. 2001. *Турски суфикси у српском језику са освртом на стање у македонском и бугарском* (Библиотека Јужнословенског филолога, нова серија 17). Belgrade: Институт за српски језик САНУ.
- Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика САНУ*, 19 v. 1996–. Belgrade: Српска академија наука и уметности, Институт за српски језик.
- Róna-Tas A. & A. Berta. 2011. *West Old Turkic: Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schaller, H. 1999. “Die Lehnwortbeziehungen der Sprachen in Südosteuropa”, in U. Hinrichs (ed.), *Handbuch der Südosteuropa-Linguistik*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 463–85.
- Siegel, A. 2010. “Resolving an anomaly in Balkan lexical borrowing: Turkish loanwords in Serbian/Croatian”, *Osmanlı Araştırmaları / The Journal of Ottoman Studies* 35, 245–59.
- Škaljić, A. 1985. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*. Sarajevo: Svjetlost.
- Skok, P. 1971–1974. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*, 4 v. Zagreb: JAZU.
- Соболев, А. 2004а. “Опыт исследования тюркизмов в балканских диалектах (I)”, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 40(1), 61–91.
- 2004б. “Опыт исследования тюркизмов в балканских диалектах (II)”, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 40(2), 206–29.
- Sobolev, A. N. 2009. “On the importance of borrowing in the languages of the Balkan linguistic area”, in Н. Н. Казанский (ed.), *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований* 5(1). St Petersburg: Наука, 234–65.
- Stojaković, M. 1980. “Un recueil inédit des turcismes en langue serbocroate”, *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju* 30, 403–19.
- Сухачев, Н. Л. & А. Х. Гирфанова. 2009. “О работе над сводным словарем *Тюркизмы в языках Юго-Восточной Европы*”, in Н. Н. Казанский (ed.), *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana. Труды Института лингвистических исследований* 5(1). St Petersburg: Наука, 266–74.
- Tietze, A. 1990. “Der Einfluß des Türkischen auf andere Sprachen (Die Veröffentlichungen seit etwa 1950)”, in G. Hazai (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 119–45.
- Tryjarski, E. 1990. “Balkan Dialects”, in G. Hazai (ed.), *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 414–53.
- Tzitzilis, Ch. 1997. “Die türkischen Elemente im Neugriechischen verglichen mit der türkischen Elemente in anderen Balkansprachen”, *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 33(1), 101–12.

- Ђинђић, М. 2007. “Турцизми у седамнаестом тому Речника САНУ”, in С. Танасић (ed.), *Шездесет година Института за српски језик САНУ. Зборник радова II*. Belgrade: Институт за српски језик САНУ, 45–51.
- . 2009. “Терминологија коњарства у српском језику с посебним освртом на турцизме”, in А. Митровић (ed.), *Истоци и утоци. Сећање на Славољуба Ђинђића*. Belgrade: Филолошки факултет, 229–352.
- . 2013. *Турцизми у савременом српском књижевном језику (семантичко-деривациона анализа)*. Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Belgrade University.
- . 2015. “Лексика турског порекла у 19. тому Речника САНУ”, in М. Ковачевић & В. Поломац (eds), *Путевима српских идиома. Зборник у част проф. Радивоју Младеновићу поводом 65. рођендана*. Kragujevac: Филолошко-уметнички факултет Крагујевац, 479–88.

## Περίληψη

### Τουρκικά δάνεια στη серβική: αποκαθιστώντας τα κενά και τα παρατοποθετημένα κομμάτια ενός παζλ

Η μελέτη των τουρκικών δανείων στη серβική έχει μακρά ιστορία με σημαντικά αποτελέσματα. Οι εργασίες που ασχολούνται με τους τουρκισμούς στη серβική είναι μέχρι σήμερα περισσότερες από 300 (βλ. στο κείμενο σημ. 3).

Τα πιο σημαντικά λεξικογραφικά εγχειρίδια για τους τουρκισμούς στη серβική γλώσσα είναι τα εξής: Miklosich (1884–1890), Кнежевић (1962), Skok (1971–1974), Škaljić (1985), *EPCJ* και Петровић (2012a).

Κατά τη διάρκεια των τελευταίων 130 ετών το σώμα των τουρκικών δανείων στη серβική γλώσσα έχει διευρυνθεί σημαντικά, κυρίως με διαλεκτικά δεδομένα, και η βελτιωμένη κατανόηση από μέρος μας της ιστορίας της τουρκικής γλώσσας και της τουρκικής διαλεκτολογίας ανοίγει νέες προοπτικές στην εξεύρεση ικανοποιητικών τουρκικών ετύμων, ενώ η ανάπτυξη των βαλκανικών σπουδών έχει ως αποτέλεσμα μια νέα μεθοδολογική συγκριτική προσέγγιση. Σκοπός της εργασίας αυτής είναι να αναδείξει ορισμένα κρίσιμα ζητήματα, ελλείψεις ή αστοχίες που συνεχίζουν να χαρακτηρίζουν την έρευνα για τα τουρκικά δάνεια στη серβική.

Η μακρόχρονη επαφή μεταξύ της серβικής και της τουρκικής / των τουρκικών γλωσσών μπορεί να χωριστεί σε τρεις μείζονες περιόδους: την προοθωμανική (6ος–14ος αι.), την οθωμανική (14ος–19ος αι.) και τη μεταοθωμανική (20ός αι.).

Η έλλειψη πρώιμων μαρτυριών και η αποσπασματική φύση των γραπτών πηγών από την προοθωμανική περίοδο καθιστά πρακτικά αδύνατο τον ακριβέστερο καθορισμό του серβικού (σλαβικού) στρώματος της επαφής. Στο πεδίο αυτό έχει συντελεστεί σημαντική πρόοδος, με την αποκάλυψη νέων δεδομένων για την ομάδα της πρωτοτουρκικής γλώσσας και τις επαφές ανάμεσα στη σλαβική και τις συγγενικές γλώσσες κατά τους πρώιμους μεσαιωνικούς χρόνους (Dybo 2010· Róna-Tas & Berta 2011). Βασικό ζητούμενο είναι ο εντοπισμός της πρώτης γραπτής μαρτυρίας κάθε δανείου και ο όσο το δυνατόν ακριβέστερος προσδιορισμός της δανείστριας

γλώσσας και της διαδρομής της διαδικασίας δανεισμού, μέσω της σύγκρισης υλικού από τις πρώιμες σλαβικές και ουγγρικές γραπτές πηγές. Το 99% των τουρκικών δανείων έγιναν αντικείμενο δανεισμού κατά την οθωμανική περίοδο. Οι τουρκοισμοί που ανήκουν σε αυτή είναι οι καλύτερα μελετημένοι και αποτελούν το κύριο αντικείμενο των λεξικών που αναφέρθηκαν παραπάνω. Ωστόσο, υπάρχουν ακόμη πολλές ελλείψεις και αστοχίες που μένει να εντοπιστούν σε αυτό το πεδίο, και μία από αυτές είναι το παράδειγμα ενός ιστορικού τουρκισμού που ανακαλύφθηκε πρόσφατα: σερβ. *dešerme* 'στρατολόγηση παιδιών χριστιανών κατά την οθωμανική εποχή'. Κύρια επιδίωξη για αυτή τη χρονική περίοδο είναι η ανακάλυψη νέων δανείων και νέων φωνητικών, σημασιολογικών και μορφολογικών χαρακτηριστικών, η διάκριση ανάμεσα στα διαλεκτικά και στα γραμματειακά δάνεια από τη σκοπιά και των δύο γλωσσών καθώς και η αναγνώριση των ιδιαιτεροτήτων που παρουσιάζουν τα δάνεια από διαφορετικές περιοχές της σερβοκροατικής επικράτειας.

Η μεταοθωμανική περίοδος δεν είχε απασχολήσει σχεδόν καθόλου τους ερευνητές. Το παράδειγμα της παροιμίας *Ko se jednom na mleko oreče taj i u jogurt duva*, που αποτελεί μεταφραστικό δάνειο από το τουρκ. *Sütten ağzi yanan yoğurdu* (*veya ayranı üfleyerek yer* (*veya içer*), αποδεικνύει την ύπαρξη και αυτού του στρώματος (Петровић & Ђинђић 2015). Βασικό ζητούμενο είναι ο εντοπισμός των πιο πρόσφατων στρωμάτων κατά τη διαδικασία δανεισμού τουρκικών λέξεων μέσω της εξέτασης των τουρκισμών που δεν καταγράφονται στη σερβική πριν από τον 20ό αιώνα.

Η κατανόηση των περιστάσεων υπό τις οποίες μια συγκεκριμένη λεξική μονάδα έγινε αντικείμενο δανεισμού, της ερμηνείας των κοινωνικών συμφραζομένων και των λειτουργικών γλωσσικών επιπέδων είναι μια περίπλοκη διαδικασία. Ένα από τα ζητούμενα είναι να καθοριστεί, όποτε αυτό είναι δυνατό, αν η επαφή συνέβη ανάμεσα σε γραμματειακές ποικιλίες, ή σε διαλέκτους, ή ανάμεσα σε μια γραμματειακή και σε μια προφορική ποικιλία. Αυτό το πρόβλημα μπορεί να εξεταστεί: (α) *Από τη σκοπιά της δανείστριας γλώσσας*. Η αγνόηση των δεδομένων που αφορούν την ιστορική ανάπτυξη και τη διαλεκτική ποικιλότητα της τουρκικής γλώσσας έχει τονιστεί πολλές φορές ως η πιο αδύναμη πλευρά της μελέτης των τουρκισμών. Η ανάπτυξη της επιστήμης της τουρκολογίας, και ειδικά της τουρκικής διαλεκτολογίας, έδωσε τη δυνατότητα να βελτιωθεί η ετυμολογική ερμηνεία των τουρκικών δανείων, όσον αφορά τον εντοπισμό ενός κατάλληλου έτυμου, τόσο από μορφική όσο και από σημασιολογική άποψη. (β) *Από τη σκοπιά της γλώσσας που δανείζεται*. Η έρευνα των τουρκικών δανείων στη σερβική δεν έχει δώσει αρκετή προσοχή στη σπουδαιότητα που έχουν οι ιδιαιτερότητες των διαφορετικών περιοχών της σερβοκροατικής επικράτειας, από διαλεκτολογική και ιστορική άποψη, και η επίδρασή τους στην πρότυπη σερβική γλώσσα (βλ. σημ. 19). Το παράδειγμα της σερβικής λέξης *da(h)ija* ('αρχηγός των γενίτσαρων· τύραννος') δείχνει με ποιον τρόπο οι διαφορές των σημείων επαφής των διαλέκτων και των ιστορικών δεδομένων της σερβικής γλώσσας μπορούν να ερμηνεύσουν τις σημασιολογικές και φωνητικές διαφορές ανάμεσα στο έτυμο και το δάνειο ή τα δάνεια.

Όλα τα ζητήματα που μας απασχολούν σε αυτή την εργασία αποτελούν τμήμα

μιας ολοκληρωμένης ετυμολογικής ερμηνείας, και ένα σημαντικό ερώτημα που τίθεται, ειδικά στον τομέα της ετυμολογικής λεξικογραφίας, είναι το χρονικό βάθος στο οποίο πρέπει να φτάσουμε κατά την αναζήτηση του ετύμου.

Πρόσφατες συνεισφορές στην αντιμετώπιση των σερβικών τουρκισμών λαμβάνουν υπόψη πέντε κύριες περιοχές, οι οποίες θα πρέπει να προσεχθούν ιδιαίτερα σε μελέτες αφιερωμένες στην εξέταση της τουρκικής επίδρασης στη σερβική:

(1) Φωνητική. Η πρόσφατη ετυμολογική έρευνα έχει κάνει σημαντικά βήματα προς τη βαθύτερη ανάλυση της φωνητικής μορφής των τουρκισμών και τη διάκριση μεταξύ αλλαγών που έχουν συμβεί στη γλώσσα προέλευσης και αλλαγών που προκύπτουν κατά τη διαδικασία του δανεισμού.

(2) Μορφολογία. Διάφορα προβλήματα μορφολογικής προσαρμογής των τουρκισμών, καθώς και ο ρόλος των τουρκικών επιθημάτων ως παραγωγικών μονάδων σε μη τουρκικές λέξεις της σερβικής, έχουν μελετηθεί επαρκώς (Πετροβιћ 1993, 102–9). Αναφέρουμε λίγες πρόσφατες σχετικές εργασίες: Радић (2001), Ђинђић (2013) και Πετροβιћ (2012b).

(3) Σημασιολογία: Μερικά ενδιαφέροντα χαρακτηριστικά, όπως οι σημασιολογικές διαφορές ανάμεσα στον τουρκικό πρόδρομο και στον τουρκισμό της σερβικής, ή η ανεξάρτητη σημασιολογική εξέλιξη στη δανείστρια γλώσσα, δεν έχουν αναλυθεί συστηματικά ως τώρα. Αναφέρουμε δύο εργασίες, μία που ασχολείται με τη δευτερογενή σημασιολογική εξέλιξη (το ρήμα *bitisati* ‘χάνομαι’ και ‘υπάρχω’) και μία που ασχολείται με το πρόβλημα του καθορισμού των σημασιολογικών χαρακτηριστικών ενός δανείου, τα οποία συνδέονται με συγκεκριμένες ιδιωματικές λέξεις (η λέξη *aber* ‘πληροφορία’ και ‘γνώση’).

(4) Μεταφραστικά δάνεια. Τα μεταφραστικά δάνεια στη σερβική εξετάζονται συνήθως μαζί με μορφολογικά και σημασιολογικά χαρακτηριστικά. Παρατηρήσεις για τα μεταφραστικά δάνεια στη σερβική διάλεκτο του Πρίζρεν κάνει η Πετροβιћ (2012a, 357–59). Με τη μελέτη του πιθανού μεταφραστικού δανείου *otvoren* ‘ανοιχτός, ανοιχτόχρωμος’ ασχολείται η Πετροβιћ (2001).

Αν λάβουμε υπόψη το τεράστιο εύρος της τουρκικής γλωσσικής κληρονομιάς στα Βαλκάνια και τις νέες προοπτικές και τα έργα που προτείνονται στον τομέα της μελέτης των βαλκανικών τουρκικών δανείων, ο δρόμος που απομένει προς μια ευρύτερη σύνθεση δείχνει ακόμη πολύ μακρύς. Με αυτή τη στόχευση, η έως τώρα συλλογή όσο το δυνατόν περισσότερων μεμονωμένων αποτελεσμάτων φαίνεται να είναι προς τη σωστή κατεύθυνση. Ένας από τους στόχους αυτού του κειμένου, εκτός από τη διερεύνηση των πιο σημαντικών ζητημάτων που παραμένουν ακόμη ανοιχτά όσον αφορά τους τουρκισμούς της σερβικής, είναι να παρουσιάσει μερικές σημαντικές εργασίες για το θέμα αυτό, ως συνεισφορά στην καλύτερη κατανόηση των τουρκικών δανείων στο ευρύτερο βαλκανικό πλαίσιο.