

UDC 930.85(4–12)

YU ISSN 0350–7653

ACADEMIE SERBE DES SCIENCES ET DES ARTS

---

INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

# BALCANICA

## XXXIV

ANNUAIRE DE L'INSTITUT DES ETUDES BALKANIQUES

Rédacteur

LJUBINKO RADENKOVIĆ

Directeur de l'Institut des Etudes balkaniques

Membres de la Rédaction

FRANCIS CONTE (Paris), DIMITRIJE DJORDJEVIĆ (Santa Barbara),  
MILKA IVIĆ, DJORDJE S. KOSTIĆ, LJUBOMIR MAKSIMOVIĆ,  
DANICA POPOVIĆ, BILJANA SIKIMIĆ,  
ANTHONY-EMIL TACHIAOS (Thessalonique), NIKOLA TASIĆ,  
SVETLANA M. TOLSTAJA (Moscou), GABRIELLA SCHUBERT (Jena),  
KRANISLAV VRANIĆ (secrétaire)

BELGRADE  
2004



Jasna VLAJIĆ-POPOVIĆ  
The Serbian Language Institute, Beograd

THE WAYS OF SUFFERING IN THE BALKANS:  
*patior* and πάσχω intertwined

*Abstract:* The paper proposes a re-examination of the hitherto supposed Latin ancestry of Rum. *pǎṭi*, Arum. *pat*, Alb. *pësoj*, Bulg., *Патя*, Mac. *namu*, S.-Cr. *Pànumu*, all meaning „to suffer, endure, etc.“ and argues in favour of Greek πάσχω i.e. παθαίνω as the more probable common ultimate prototype, rather than VLat. *\*patire* < Lat. *patior*.

0. In the century behind us much has been achieved in Balkanology, especially in the study of lexicon, mostly systematically organized, often in larger corpora genetically or thematically profiled, ranging from smaller works to comprehensive monographs and extensive dictionaries<sup>1</sup> (some projects of the kind are still in progress). However, it appears that some particular problems of Balkan lexicology, i.e. etymology, seemingly successfully resolved decades, or even more than a century ago, actually do call for re-examination and redefinition.

1.0. Such is the case of a verb (or rather, verbs) present in all Balkan languages (save Turkish), in which it exhibits a great formal<sup>2</sup> and semantic similarity while presumably sharing a common ancestor: Rum. *pǎṭi*, Arum. *pat*, Alb. *pësoj*, Bulg. *пàтя*, Mac. *namu*, S.-Cr. *nànumu* are almost unanimously interpreted as loan-words from a reconstructed Vulgar Latin *\*patire*<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We shall refer to no titles here since listing only the monographs dealing with lexicon of a certain stock, say Greek, in all Balkan languages, would take up too much space (and each of these topics deserves a bibliographical study of its own). For a reasonably up-to-date general bibliography cf. Steinke/Vraciu 234-261.

<sup>2</sup> Certain outward differences are only due to the specific phonetics of individual languages.

<sup>3</sup> For Alb. *pësoj*, Meyer 335 supposes a Romance *\*patiāre* prototype, which is accepted by other scholars too, e.g. Orel 323-324 (obviously because Alb. *s* < *\*tj* (and not < *\*ti*), cf. Orel p. XX of the Introduction).

< Lat. *patior* „to suffer, endure“<sup>4</sup>. But one Balkan language, Greek, stands aside, in the specific position of having a verb of its own, *πάσχω* i.e. *παθαίνω*<sup>5</sup> „to experience (bad or good), endure, suffer, be ill, etc.“, continually present from antiquity into this day, only undergoing some changes of the original semantic span and certain shifts in the hierarchy of its meanings (for details cf. Liddell/Scott, Sophocles, AKNE, Frisk s.vv.). Although almost synonymous and partly even homophonous<sup>6</sup>, Lat. *patior* and Gk. *πάσχω* are not cognate<sup>7</sup>, so this absence of their etymological identity lies at the root of the problems we face in interpreting their presumed continuants in the Balkans.

1.1. It is our assumption that, at least in the major part of the Balkans, the donor language for the verbs in *pat-* „to suffer, etc.“ was not Latin, but Greek. Putting aside the peculiarities of phonetics (which are discussed within paragraphs dealing with each of the languages in question), general observations can be made about semantics, word geography and, to a lesser extent –dictated by the scarcity of historical dictionaries of the Balkan languages– about the chronology of loaning. Being mindful of what *patior* and *πάσχω* meant originally<sup>8</sup>, we should be aware of the semantic development each of them has undergone meanwhile. Some stages of those evolutions, especially those taking place in the Balkans and in the Middle Ages, must necessarily be reconstructed by speculation.

<sup>4</sup> For Serbian and Bulgarian Miklosich 233 proposed an Italian origin (later resolutely rejected in RJA s.v., and even less probable now, given the chronology of the first attestations, from 12th and 14th century Macedonian-Bulgarian and Serbian sources, cf. § 5.1.2., 5.2.3.); for later authors and other languages, cf. Tiktin III 45, Cioranescu 609-610, Papahagi 820, REW 6294, Meyer 335, Orel 323-324, BER 5:101-102, Argirovski 212, Skok III 691.

<sup>5</sup> For details on Gk. word-formation that already in antiquity yielded a parallelism of the original verb *πάσχω* (< \*πάθ-σκ-ω) and almost synonymous *παθαίνω*, a denominative from *πάθος* (itself a deverbative of *πάσχω*) cf. Frisk II 478-479. What matters for our story is that aorist forms for both verbs are the same: *έπαθα* (i.e. older *έπαθον*).

<sup>6</sup> In a presumed case of borrowing from Greek (which is so far proposed solely for Bulgarian, and only by some authors), the Gk. aspirated dental would be transmitted as plain *-t-* (in all languages except Arumanian), so phonetics cannot be employed as an argument for tracing present-day forms to one or the other prototype. Therefore, other aspects should be considered and evaluated.

<sup>7</sup> For the genetic diversity of the two verbs (each of them lacking quite certain and clear IE bonds), cf. Frisk II 478-479, Ernout/Meillet 864-865, Pokorny 641, 792-793.

<sup>8</sup> It would take a serious study to trace the influences these two verbs exerted on each other already in antiquity, before evolving into Vulgar Latin or Balkan Romance and Medieval (later Modern) Greek respectively. For the time being we rely on Liddell/Scott, Lewis/Short and standard etymological dictionaries (cf. note 7, also 9 and 11).

1.2. Although πάσχω basically meant „to have something done to someone; have something happen to one; feel, be affected, be in a certain state of mind“, grammarwise „be subject to changes; be passive“ (altogether, it is „to experience“ in the widest sense of the word, primarily neutrally, with adverbial specifications also good or bad, eventually shifting toward an implicitly negative<sup>9</sup> sense, so that the idea of suffering became very distinct, e.g. „suffer punishment, pay the penalty“ as early as the 4th c. B.C.), its very prominent meaning „to be ill (with specification of a part of the body or an illness)“ attested since 3rd-4th cc. A.D., was apparently conditioned by Latin semantics<sup>10</sup>, while its very close nuance „to be damaged, handicapped“<sup>11</sup> occurs much later, in the (late?) Middle Ages<sup>12</sup>.

1.3. On the other hand, Lat. *patior* „to bear, support, undergo, endure (pain, damage, evil, injustice, poverty, slavery, exile, etc.)“, „to suffer, meet with, be afflicted by (punishment, shame, shipwreck, disaster)“, (poet.) „to suffer, pass a life of suffering or privation“ actually had a narrower semantic range, but it underwent certain Greek influences very early, especially in some terminologies (thus both came to denote „passive“, as opposed to „active“, *pati* vs. *facere*, like πάσχειν, vs. δρᾶν, cf. Ernout/Meillet 864-865, Frisk II 478-479).

1.4. It was not before Christianity that Gk. πάθος „incident, accident; experience (good or bad)“, later „suffering“ too, acquired its synonymous counterpart in Lat. *passio*, as a word reserved for designating the Passion of Christ<sup>13</sup> – conspicuously absent from the Balkan languages today (the same is true of its Greek equivalent, save for Modern Greek) which is unlikely to

<sup>9</sup> So we read in Bauer s.v. πάσχω that in the New Testament it rarely comes in a positive sense, and never so without a closer re-inforcing determination. It occurs as positive only in Gal 3, 4, as neutral in Mt 17,15 (as κακῶς πάσχειν), while elsewhere, and always in the Septuagint, it means „to suffer, starve“ (with or without a determination, cf. πάσχειν σαρκί 1 Pt. 4 1a.b.; ὧς φονεύς 1 Pt 4, 15 „to be punished for manslaughter“).

<sup>10</sup> Stemming from the essence of the IE root *\*pē-* / *\*pō-* „to put away, damage“ which *patior* is deduced from (cf. Pokorny 792).

<sup>11</sup> Its first record in Italian as „to be ruined, damaged, scattered“ dates from 1550 (cf. DELI 892; for its absence from Venetian, cf. Boerio 482), while in modern Italian it comes only in transitive use, with *danno* as one of the objects the verb *patire* requires (also *patire la fame*, ~ *di sete*, ~ *scarezza di...*, ~ *un manco*, ~ *di mal di capo*, etc.).

<sup>12</sup> It is absent from both Bauer (cf. note 9) and Sophocles (cf. s.vv.), but it ranks high in the Modern Greek semantic hierarchy, cf. ΔΚΝΕ.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. „rare et tardif *passio*...“ etc. (Ernout/Meillet l.c.).

be accidental.<sup>14</sup> That speaks for the profane origin and ways of arrival of the prototype(s) of the verbs in \**pat-* in the Balkans.

1.5. On the other hand, another Greek deverbative, *πάθημα* „that which befalls one, suffering, misfortune“, „affection, feeling“; pl. „incidents or changes of material bodies“, etc. does appear in the majority of Balkan languages, Arumanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Rumanian (perhaps also in Albanian, cf. § 4.1., but certainly not in Serbo-Croatian), as a word for „suffering, misfortune“. However, it does not refer to Christ’s Passion<sup>15</sup>, but to ordinary, everyday human suffering. That would explain why in most dictionaries the respective continuants of *πάθημα* are marked as obsolete, popular, regional or dialectal (cf. e.g. BER, DLR, Tiktin, etc. as well as Rusek’s insisting on the colloquial character of both the verb and the noun in Bulgarian).

2.0. In modern R u m a n i a n there are two practically synonymous verbs, a primary one *păți* tr. „(er)leiden, erdulden, ausstehen, erfahren“ (first recorded in 1470 A.D.) interpreted as deriving from Lat. *patior* (Tiktin III 45, Cioranescu 609-610, also REW 6294) and a denominal *pătimi* tr. pop. „(er)leiden, erfahren“, intr. „leiden“ (since 1581) which derives from *patimă* f. „Leiden, Leidenschaft“ (since 1602), recognized as a Greek loan-word, from *πάθημα* „id.“ (Tiktin III 21, Cioranescu 610<sup>16</sup>, also REW 6291).

2.1. The situation with the Grecism being clear, we are actually re-examining only the primary verb, formally and semantically. To the best of our knowledge, the two themes have not been contrasted in terms of questioning the phonetic difference between them: the palatalized voiceless dental vs. the nonpalatalized one, which appears to be the only formal problem we are facing. The clue is certainly in the chronology of Rumanian palatalization, the details of which we cannot go into now.

2.2. For our purpose it matters that both verbs are today marked as obsolete and dialectal and/or provincial in scope, yet with a considerable number of derivatives (which seems to bear witness to their wider distribution and higher frequency in the past): *pățanie* / *pățenie* f. fam. „(schlimmes)

<sup>14</sup> We shall return to this fact later again, in arguing against Skok’s assertion that the verb has entered Serbo-Croatian through Christian mediation, cf. § 5.2.3.1., note 48.

<sup>15</sup> For designations by native terms, cf. S.-Cr. *муке Исусове, страдање Исусове* (similarly Mac. *маки Исусови*, Bulg. *страдания Господни*, CSl. *страсть*) related to verbs *мучити* (*ce*) < \**mōčiti* (*se*), *страдаму* < \**stradati* which are stylistically neutral synonyms of *nātimu*, *nāmu*, *nāтя*. Even in Modern Greek there is *τά πάθη του Χριστού* (unlike Middle Greek which had *παθήματα* for „Passion“, cf. Sophocles 829-830); cf. also Rum. *a pați o pațanie* „extreme suffering“, etc.

<sup>16</sup> He also cites Pascu’s judgement that derivation from Greek is impossible on the grounds of phonetics – without an elaboration of that stand or a comment of his own.

Erlebnis, Abenteuer“ (since 1868), *pățeala* f. pop. „id.“ (since 1868), *pățău* n. „id.“ including the postverbal *păț* „id“, *pățit* „der die (betreffende) Erfahrung gemacht hat, der vieles durchgemacht hat, mit allen Hunden gesatzt ist, erfahren“; and from *patimă*, besides *pățimi*, *-mesc*, also *compățimi*, *impățimi*, *pățimire* f., *pățimaș* adj. (1660), *pățimor* adj. (1679) (cf. Tiktin III 42, in greater detail DLR s.vv.).

2.3. The primary verb is not only earlier attested than the denominal, but also more present in literature. The contexts it appears in are almost regularly secular<sup>17</sup>, and –in case of transitive use– abundant in its variety of objects<sup>18</sup>. It is also noteworthy that when used intransitively, the verb means „to suffer in general (incl. amorous pains)“, but dominant is semantics such as „to experience, go through, happen, have something happen (to someone or somewhere), etc.“. Those events are usually unpleasant or bad, yet the object reinforcements that accompany the verb seem to testify to its originally neutral semantics – which is typical of the Greek verb and, at the same time, unknown to the Latin one (in both cases constantly, from antiquity into this day, i.e. Modern Greek and Italian).

2.4. Furthermore, Rumanian also shows a conspicuous absence of not only the typically Latin semantics of „damage, privation“ –present not only in medieval and modern Italian (cf. DELI 892), but also in Modern Greek (and Albanian!)– but also of the outstanding Greek notion „ill, physically handicapped“<sup>19</sup>. These semantic features are of no avail in tracing the origin or discovering new itineraries of the verb *păți* in Rumanian, therefore we must go back to its traditional interpretation as an indigenous verb, a continuant of VLat. *\*patire*. However, we ought to amend this by saying that *pați*, although formally developed in conformity with the rules of Rumanian phonetics, later underwent a strong influence of Greek semantics – much as in the case supposed for Arumanian (cf. § 3.0.), yet harder to explain in view of the geographic reality.

2.5. On the other hand, an ultimate Greek etymology seems equally possible. Since Rumanian does not discriminate between aspirated and nonaspirated dentals, theoretically Gk. *παθαίνω* i.e. *ἐπαθον* could also have

<sup>17</sup> A rare example from the 1688 Bible refers to suffering in general: „He started to learn that man’s son was to suffer greatly“ (DLR s.v.).

<sup>18</sup> Such as pain, trouble, malice, thirst, drought, defeat, shame, etc. Notable, as early as the 17th century, is the very frequent use of the syntagm *păți (multa) nevoie* „to suffer (much) trouble“ – the significance of the presence of a Slavic noun is hard to pass judgement about.

<sup>19</sup> Perhaps itself of Latin provenance, cf. § 1.2., which is of no consequence for the case of Rumanian.

yielded, with a loss of Gk. aspiration, Rum. *păți*. That would bring about the problem of conjugation, but it could also be bypassed with a conjecture that it was effected through immediate borrowing from a Slavic source, e.g. Bulg. *nătя* (dial. also *năтум*) i.e. Old Bulgarian **пѧти(ти)** (cf. § 5.1.2.), or Old Serbian **пѧтити** (cf. § 5.2.3.), which is formally a possible prototype, no less than VLat. *patire*<sup>20</sup>.

2.6. And finally, a comment should be made on linguistic geography: except for a folklore formula *a pați rușine* „to suffer shame“ which is located in Transylvania, all the other indications of dialectal background of the noun *patimă* (or some of its variations) refer to Muntenia, sometimes to SW Muntenia (cf. DLR s.vv.). This proves nothing, but it does support the idea that at least the noun *patimă* could be an immediate Slavic loan in Rumanian. So, if that road of loaning was open for one Greek word, what would keep it closed for the others?

3.0. Our evidence on Arumanian is exceedingly scarce, with regard to both synchronic and diachronic insights into its lexicon, so we can only note for this language too, the simultaneous presence of the verb *pat* impf. „patir, souffrir, endurer; arriver, devenir“ as well as the noun *pathimă* f., pl. *pathimate* „aventure, accident“. The former has been interpreted as deriving from VLat. *patire* and the latter from Gk. πάθημα (Papahagi 820, 822; N.B. that the noun even conveys Gk. plural). In addition to the definition of the verb, this standard Arumanian dictionary<sup>21</sup> gives a number of illustrations with a wider context – predominant among them are examples with the meaning „to happen“<sup>22</sup>, distinct as exclusively Greek (in terms that it is unknown to Latin). Coupled with the geographic factor of a direct contact with Greek, which has resulted in Greek being the most represented stock of foreign lexicon in Arumanian, a Greek etymology for Arum. verb *pat* could have been proposed, only if it were not for the phonetic obstacle standing

<sup>20</sup> Although contemporary Bulgarian semantics does not feature meanings like „to happen, experience (in a neutral or positive sense)“, there are traces of its earlier presence, e.g. in obsolete *năщам* (cf. OBulg. **кто добро твори добро да пѧти аѣже зло твори зло да пѧти**, v. Rusek 1983:38 and its presently archaic proverb *добро добро не паща, зло зло не хваща* in Gerov; cf. also RRODD s.vv.).

<sup>21</sup> The new one by Matilda Caragiu Marioțeanu, *Dicționar aromân (macedo-vlah)*, București 1997, of which we have only the first volume, comprises only letters A to D.

<sup>22</sup> Besides e.g. „While stallions fight, donkeys suffer“, or „He suffers from epilepsy“, there are such as: „Poor boys, what has happened to them“, „Where could he be – what has happened to him“, „What bothers him = what has happened to him“, etc.

in its way: the verbal theme in *-t-* differs from the nominal one in *-th-* which conveys the Greek distinction between dentals<sup>23</sup>.

3.1. Therefore, it seems most reasonable to presume for this verb the original Latin prototype and a later interference of Greek semantics, the form remaining the same, i.e. preserving the regular reflex of Latin phonetics. If we are to add any new ideas, we should suggest investigating the possibility, already mentioned above for Rumanian, that the verb and the noun do not belong to the same chronological layer of loan-words. That would account for the difference in phonetics, and at the same time allow respective Greek sources to be supposed for both *pat* and *pathimă*, which is suggested by all other factors except for synchronic phonetics. For the time being, we can make no further conclusions.

4.0. Judging from etymological dictionaries, the situation in Albanian partly resembles that in Arumanian and Rumanian: the verb *pësoj* intr./tr. „to suffer damage, be ruined; to experience; to feel“ is traditionally derived from Rom. *\*patiāre* < Lat. *patior* (Meyer 335, Orel 323-324)<sup>24</sup>. This is formally legitimate<sup>25</sup>, except that most of its semantics –namely meanings „to experience“, „to feel“– can only be of Greek provenance, while the meanings of damage and ruin, although present in Modern Greek, might as well indicate Romance/Latin i.e. Italian semantics (cf. § 1.2., note 11). So we could either suppose the original Latinism in Albanian to have adopted the semantics of the Greek homophone verb (for phonetic concerns, see below; for potentially analogous developments in Rumanian and Arumanian cf. § 2.4., 3.0.), or propose a thorough examination to be made, by specialists in the history of Albanian, in order to investigate more factors, linguistic and non-linguistic, which perhaps could allow establishing a Greek etymology for this Alb. verb. The latter is especially likely to be true if evidence can be provided that it is similar to the case of its cognate *pësim* f. „suffering, martyrdom“. This verbal noun, a nomen acti ending in a frequent suffix (?) *-im(i)*, is not

<sup>23</sup> Such is the case of Arum. *patumă* „etage“ < Gk. πάτωμα vs. Arum. *path* / *pathus* „affection“ < Gk. πάθος, cf. Papahagi s.vv.

<sup>24</sup> This interpretation has already been refuted – not elaborately, but just by including *pësoj* in the number of erroneously proclaimed Latinisms in Albanian, cf. Sytov 1987:184.

<sup>25</sup> Alb. *-s-* can reflect both *-t-* and *-th-* which could have entered a process of morphological jodization (*\*pat-jo* or *\*path-jo*, as in other unquestionable dental ending themes: *mas*, aor. of *mat* „to measure“ < *\*matja*, or *buzë* „lip, border“ < *\*budjā* (Orel p. XX), therefore no conclusions about the nature of the original dental can be made judging from the present phonetic form. However, isn't it possible, that Alb. *-s-* in *pësim*, *mësim* reflects directly Middle Greek *-θ-* /*p*/? In deriving Alb. forms from Greek, the point of departure should have been Gen./Dat. Sg. and/or Pl., with the stress on „eta“: μαθήματος, μαθήματα, etc.

discussed in Meyer or Orel loc., probably under the assumption that it is just a normal indigenous formation, like many others (domestic as well as borrowed, cf. *vrapim*, *imtësim*, *mëndhim*, *mërgim*, *punim*, etc.). However, the origin of that suffix, i.e. its IE relations not being clear (cf. Dini 2002:183), we cannot completely reject the possibility of its Greek source, especially if we are mindful of the fact that, unlike in other verbal nouns mentioned above, the semantics of *pësim* does not completely reflect that of the verb *pësoj*. Studying this noun would be additionally interesting in the light of its pair *mësim* m. „lesson, lecture, training, education, science“, fig. „advice, objection, moral, etc.“<sup>26</sup>, a derivative (also uncommented in etymological dictionaries) of the verb *mësoj* „to learn, find out; teach, train; persuade, suggest“, typically interpreted as stemming from Rom. *\*invitiare* (Meyer 276, Orel 263-264)<sup>27</sup>, although Vasmer derived it from Gk. *μανθάνω*, aor. *ἔμαθον*, the paradigm of which strikingly coincides with that of *παθαίνω*, aor. *ἔπαθον*; Çabej interprets it as a prefixal derivative of *pësoj* (for both cf. Orel l.c.). This multiplicity of solutions makes the whole story more interesting, yet definite conclusions harder to reach.<sup>28</sup>

4.1. Since we are unable to trace the source of Albanian *pathim* (as the alleged continuant of Gk. *πάθημα* mentioned in BER 5:94), as long as no further evidence on it is obtained, this record should not be taken into consideration.

5.0. Although the conventionally named „Balkan verb in *\*pat-*“ is present in all Balkan Slavic languages (but not all South Slavic ones, cf. § 5.3.),

<sup>26</sup> They are paired in the phrase *pësimet bëhen mësim* „no pains, no gains“, lit. „sufferings make lessons“, potentially reflecting Gk. *πάθημα* and *μάθημα*, the couple persisting from antiquity (τὸ δέ μοι παθήματα μαθήματα γέγονε cf. Liddell/Scott s.v. *παθαίνω*) into this day as a lapidary *τὸ πάθημα μάθημα* (cf. also a similar phrase in Serbian: *без муке нема науке* [no pains no gains, lit. no pains, no lesson] as well as *то је мени моја пара дала* [my suffering gave me that], cf also § 5.2.7., end of note 63).

<sup>27</sup> It is not insignificant that REW 4536 does not include any Albanian continuants of *\*invitiare*.

<sup>28</sup> As for problems of establishing rules of phonetic reconstruction – specifically in the case of Latin prototypes (and by analogy any other too) cf. Rusakov 1987:128: „... in determining the origin of one or the other Alb. word many authors depart from specific prejudices: either about their Latin origins (in the first place Meyer) or, on the contrary, Proto Albanian (Jokl, Çabej). However, because of the late literary fixation of Albanian, that question must, in many a case, remain open. ... Due to processes of intensive phonetic reduction, many Alb. words have rivaling and equally possible Lat. etymologies.“

its picture varies considerably from one language to another. With regard to the presence of this verb the whole Balkan Slavic territory could be divided into two entities – for this purpose we shall define them as South-eastern and North-western.

5.1. As Slavic South-eastern languages we understand Old Slavonic, Bulgarian and Macedonian.

5.1.1. Judging from the Old Slavonic dictionaries, modern and old alike, the verb **ПАТИТИ** „to suffer, endure“ is absent from that language (it is missing from the Prague dictionary<sup>29</sup> and Miklosich’s mention of it actually relies on Old Serbian 16th-17th century documents and just one Valacho-Bulgarian)<sup>30</sup>. No forms other than the verb proper have hitherto been found.

5.1.2. The oldest Bulgarian attestations of *nàтя* appear as **ПАТИТИ** in the „Bitola triod“<sup>31</sup>, dating from the second half of the 12th century<sup>32</sup>, and are shortly followed by a 1230 A.D. record in yet another secular document<sup>33</sup> – which is altogether very significant, not only for Bulgarian (since it shifts the previously existing chronology based on 15th-century Bulgarian documents, cf. BER 5:101), but also for other languages in the region, primarily Slavic ones. The quotes from the „Bitola triod“, predominantly in secular contexts (cf. note 31), can serve as a solid, reliable testimony relevant for tracing the continuity of the verb later and elsewhere. In Bulgarian proper, *nàтя* has been preserved, in the course of more than eight centuries, in colloquial and dialectal use, thus distinguished from its stylistically neutral synonym

<sup>29</sup> I.e. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnskeho / Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* I-IV, Praha 1960-1997.

<sup>30</sup> His three sources in *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum* (Vindobonae 1862-1865, 558 p.) are those bringing Old Serbian 16th-17th century texts, and one Bulgarian, published by Venelin (the one which Rusek 1983:38 mistakes as the single source of that lemma), so there are no grounds for considering the verb Old Slavonic.

<sup>31</sup> Not in the main body of the text, but in an addition to it, which justifies the conjecture that it was a part of colloquial language (expressed by Rusek 1983:38), as is indicated by the secular context it appears in: **пишем а цю си патихъ от мрѣза весь; also по много си како патисах ношж пишжце аще и грѣво не вьльнѣте**. This is a combined quote from both Rusek l.c. and Argirovski 212, who presents it as the oldest Macedonian record of the verb. Cf. also note 20.

<sup>32</sup> It can be understood from Rusek’s and Argirovski’s references that the manuscript of the „Bitola triod“ was published by Й. Иванов within a corpus „Български старини из Македония“, first in Sofia 1931 (and then as a phototypy in 1970), so it is obvious that Miklosich could not have had it.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. „и милость не цю имѣти нж великж имає оргиж патити от царства ми“ [there will be no mercy for him, but he will suffer the rage of my majesty] in the Dubrovnik charter, from the corpus of Charters of Bulgarian kings (cf. Rusek l.c.).

*стрѣдам* (for the latter observation, cf. Rusek 1983:39). Its lexical-semantic family comprises dozens of words, not only prefixed and infixes verbs such as: *изпàтя, изпàщам, испàтувам, испàтювам, напàтя се, напàщам се, напàщвам се, напàтувам се, опàтевам, опàтя, опатòсувам (си), опатòсам (си), попàтя, пропàтя, препàтя, препàтувам, препàтим, пàщам*, but also variously suffixed deverbals (mostly nomina acti and nomina agentis, meaning „suffering, anguish, misery“ and „sufferer“): *патìло, патенè, патèш, патìло, патынà, патлò, пàтмо, патосìя, патня, пàтница; пàталец, патилàн, патìлац, пàтник, патìлка, патилник, опатìa, злопатìa*, etc. (cf. BER 5:101 for details on gender, semantics and geography). It is noteworthy that the authorities do not agree as to the ultimate source of borrowing into Bulgarian: Miklosich 233 derives the Bulgarian verb (along with the respective Serbian one) from Ital. *patire* „to suffer, endure“, Mladenov 415 departs from VLat. *patire* „id.“ but he also mentions Gk. παθαίνω, while Filipova-Bajrova 139 has no doubts about its Greek origin. The most recent Bulgarian dictionary (BER 5:101-102) is undecided on this matter: it just reviews the existing interpretations – starting with „From Balk. Lat. *patior, patire...*“ and closing with „Compare from the same origin *пàтима, патолòгия, пàтос*“ which would imply siding with the Greek etymology. A separate lemma houses the noun *пàтима* „suffering, misery“, an indisputable Grecism (widely present in all Balkan languages – cf. BER 5:94, for comments cf. § 1.5. and § 4.1.).

This interpretation perpetuates an unnecessary dichotomy of the latter noun being of Greek provenance and the verb *пàтя* (along with its broad family) deriving from an unfathomable Balkan Romance source, although there are no phonetic, morphological, semantic or geographic obstacles to tracing it directly to a Gk. prototype.<sup>34</sup> The single occurrence of an *-s-* theme in Old Bulgarian *патисах* (cf. note 31) is obviously incidental, but we believe it should be interpreted as reflecting the scribe’s awareness of the Greek roots of the verb *патити* (hence his tendency to normalize it in accordance with the usual form of Greek loan-words), perhaps coupled with his insufficient command of Greek, and definitely as an argument against the original Lat.

<sup>34</sup> In other words, one cannot agree with the most recent assertion that there are phonetic impediments to deducing the Bulg. verb from Greek, such as the existence of Bulg. dial. *пàта, пàтам* or the absence of an *-s-* suffix in the verbal theme (Lekova 2003:60), which is misinterpreted as a deviation from the regularity of aorist themes being the basis for borrowing. On the contrary, borrowing from Greek would imply departing from the aorist *έπαθα* (i.e. older *επαθον*, cf. note 5), so it is perfectly regular (and does not need the present tense theme to be considered, as Lekova l.c. suggests arguing that the absence of the *-s-* suffix justifies principal doubts about a verb’s Greek origin).

provenance of the Bulg. verb. Nevertheless, the assumption of its Greek origin places Bulg. *пàтя* (at least this one, but potentially some other verbs in the neighbouring Balkan languages it was further loaned to), into a logical historical frame, among other Grecisms pertaining to various domains of life (cf. Filipova-Bajrova 16-20, esp. 16-17) but often stylistically marked, dialectal or local in use.<sup>35</sup> In a word, it is not easy, at least in the case of Bulgarian, to concur with the conclusion that „la presenza di derivati dal greco non può essere considerata come una prova contro la provenienza originaria del verbo dal latino balcanico“ (Lekova 2003:63).

5.1.3. The Macedonian language has preserved<sup>36</sup> the verb *пату* „to suffer (from hardship, illness, deprivation)“ unto this day, both in dialects and in literary language. Along with the prefixed forms of the verb *испату*, *напату* (*се*), *препату*, *пропату*; and other locally developed derivatives with the semantics of nomina agentis and nomina acti: *патник*, *патница*, *патнички*, *паталец*, *пателечка*, *патеник*, *патилка* (whose origin from Gk. πάσχω i.e. παθαίνω has never been questioned), there is also a direct loan-word from Greek, the abstract noun *патима* „suffering“ < πάθημα „id.“ (Argirovski 212, RMJ).

5.2. The Balkan Slavic North-West actually coincides with the territory of the Serbo-Croatian language.

5.2.0. Although Serbian (and even less Serbo-Croatian as a whole) does not fall in the number of first rank Balkan languages, it will be our focal point in examining the presumed continuants of Lat. *patior* in the Balkans. This is partly due to the position of this language – on the periphery of the central Balkan(ising) territory, yet cleft between the areas of irradiation of Latin and Greek, the rivalry of which constitutes the plot of the story we are trying to pursue in this paper. The other factor behind this choice is the fact that the most exhaustive material at our disposal comes from Serbian.

5.2.1. Relevant for Serbian are not **phonetics** or **morphology** (since *nàtumu* is formally deductible from both the Latin and Greek prototypes), but as elsewhere **semantics** and **chronology** (to the measure dictated by the

<sup>35</sup> This kind of distribution is not typical of the lexicon borrowed from Balkan Romance which, as a rule, used to cover gaps in the material culture of the Slavic settlers (including some features of the civilization new to them, such as OBulg. or OSerb. *коледа* „Christmas“, *кољкати* „to give or take communion“, *кољм(а)* „godfather, -mother“, *олтарь* „altar“, etc. (cf. the inventory in Lekova 2003, also Popović 1960:592) but regularly showing an overall and not local distribution within the respective language.

<sup>36</sup> We can consider, along with Argirovski l.c., that the 12th century „Bitola Triod“ (cf. § 5.1.2. notes 31, 32) is a part of the Macedonian tradition too.

uneven continuity of historical records), as well as the variety of derivatives composing the **word-family** of S.-Cr. *nàmutu* and finally the areal **distribution** of its attestations.

5.2.2. The **semantic** picture of *nàmutu* as reflected in Serbo-Croatian dictionaries, standard and dialectal<sup>37</sup>, features various nuances of the meaning „to suffer“: in general, from hardship of life, and then specifically, from emotional or spiritual pain, as well as from protracted illnesses, defects, shortages, etc. Its semantics is also grammatically conditioned, since the verb can be both intransitive and transitive, active or reflexive, without or with an object (be it indirect or direct), often specified; if not an illness or a defect (expressed by nouns in the genitive or locative, e.g. suffer from headache; from evil eyes; in one’s arm, leg, etc.) those „reserved“ objects can be various shortages (of food, water, etc.), or evil, wrong, labour, effort<sup>38</sup>. It is replaceable by its neutral synonyms *тпнети* and *страдати*, occasionally also by *мучити(се)*, but those cannot always be substituted by *натумити* which, unless used for illness or emotional pain, is in most other situations felt as slightly expressive.

5.2.3. As regards chronology, the earliest Old Serbian attestations of the verb **ПАТИТИ** „to suffer, endure, etc.“ date from late 14th and 15th centuries: (1) Да кдань за другого не пати; (2) Яко к чловѣкъ лодоваль, нека моу пльть пати, а иманьк не криво; (3) Не к кмци платѣ и патѣ цо ви платили и патили речени соужни (RJA)<sup>39</sup>. In these examples, the verb **ПАТИТИ** does not seem to mean either suffering in general, or some indefinite and abstract suffering – nor is it concrete suffering from cold, hunger, etc.

<sup>37</sup> When it comes to dialects, we can never exclude the possibility of literary influence with certainty, yet when dialectal dictionaries’ lemmata include illustrative quotes, it helps support our conclusions. However, there are instances, especially in smaller dialectal dictionaries, when the verb proper is missing, while some of its (unusual) derivatives are recorded – which often signals nothing but the collector’s economizing with the extent of the dictionary or just the tradition of making dialectal dictionaries as differential, contrasting (in fact complementary) to Vuk’s *Српски рјечник*.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. *болест, бетег, труд, мука, зло* – hence could be the composite verb *злонатити се* „to suffer badly“ (for details cf. RJA s.v.), although it more likely reflects an identical Greek prototype (cf. § 5.2.4.1., note 53).

<sup>39</sup> (1) [One should not suffer for the other]; (2) [If a man has behaved foolishly, let his body suffer, and his property is not guilty], (3) [May the guarantees pay and suffer that which the mentioned prisoners would have paid and suffered] – (1) and (2) come from M. Rucić’s *Споменици српски ... с дубровачке архиве*, and (3) from Jireček’s *Споменици српски*, here quoted by RJA. Some of these examples (and those from MS later in this text) also in Daničić II 280.

as in the earliest Slavic (Bulgarian/Macedonian) texts<sup>40</sup>. Here it functions as a part of a formula **ДА ПЛАТИ И ПАТИ** „to pay and bear the consequences/ be punished/ atone“(?), especially in the latter sentence, as it is in the following quotes from *Monumenta serbica*: (1) **ТЬКМО КТО К ДЛЪЖЬНЬ ИЛИ ЧИМЬ КРИВЬ, ШНЬ ДА ПЛАТИ И ПАТИ**, (2) **ТЬКМО ТКО К ДЛЪЖАНЬ ИЛИ ЧИМЬ ХРИВЬ, ШНЬ ДА ПЛАТИ И ПАТИ**, (3) **ТЬКМО КТО К ДЛЪЖЬНЬ ИЛИ ЧИМЬ КРИВЬ, ШНЗИ ДА ПЛААКІА И ПАТИ**<sup>41</sup>. This formula appears to be a firm construction, representing a (legal) concept, the roots of which are not clear, while the two verbs employed to express it seem to be almost synonymous, with an obvious distinction between material compensation (**ПЛАТИТИ**) and corporal punishment (**ПАТИТИ**). Since historical lexicography cannot be helpful on this matter<sup>42</sup>, it is hard to say whether they were coupled locally, or used for calquing (perhaps semicalquing?)<sup>43</sup> a foreign prototype. Be that as it may, the fact remains that this phrase was „fashionable“ within a limited span of time, restricted to use by scribes at the Serbian court, and unrecorded ever after (as it had not been before).

5.2.3.1. From the 15th century on, this verb is in more or less continual use – by Dubrovnik writers and poets, and by various authors whose

<sup>40</sup> It goes without saying that the oldest Slavic record of **ПАТИТИ** in the 12th century „Bitola triod“ (cf. § 5.1.2. notes 31, 32), although not Old Serbian, should be taken into account in the study of Serbian **ПАТИТИ** since it comes from a territory that could have been transitional between Greek and Serbian. For some instances of Bulgarian mediation in Serbian borrowing from Greek, cf. Vasmer 1944:13.

<sup>41</sup> This reads: (1) [if someone owes something, or is guilty of something, he should pay and suffer] < 1405 A.D. Stephanus, Serbiae despotes, confirmat privilegia Ragusii; (2) [„idem“] < 1405 A.D. Gregorius et Georgius Branković ... confirmant privilegia Ragusii; (3) [„idem“, with slight orthographic differences between the three examples] < 1428 A.D., Georgius, Serbiae despotes, confirmat privilegia Ragusii concessa a prioribus Serbiae dominis, cf. MS 268, 271, 355.

<sup>42</sup> Striking is the absence of Lat. *patior* from medieval Latin documents on the territory of present-day Serbo-Croatian (cf. *Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi Iugoslaviae*, Zagreb 1978), so even the fact that Lat. *patior* comes with the object *poena* (cf. Lewis/Short s.v.) remains of no consequence in our case.

<sup>43</sup> Records of a similar legal use of the Ancient Gk. *πάσχω* „to suffer punishment, pay the penalty“ (cf. Liddell/Scott s.v. *πάσχω*) cannot be counted on as being loaned to Serbian 10-18 centuries later, yet they cannot be disregarded either. On the other hand, in the Venetian dialect of Italian (as recorded centuries later than the Branković charter), there is a trace of the concept of „one suffering for the other“: *Patisse el guisto per el peccator* transl. into Italian as: „Uno fa il peccato e l'altro la penitenza“, or „Il porco pati la pena di cano“ (Boerio 482), yet this is not enough for any firm conclusions, except a constatation that Venetian features the meaning of expiation for some misdeed.

language was close to the popular speech (from M. Marulić or M. Divković, to a number of 19th century writers, cf. RJA s.v.), although not with a steady ubication. It was present further to the west, in the works of Croatian lexicographers Micaglia, Della Bella, Belostenec, Stulli and translated as „patior, suffero, tolero; essere o stare addolorato; pati, perferre“, as well as in *Српски рјечник* by Vuk Karadžić who defines it as „leiden, patior“<sup>44</sup>. There are other examples from Serbian folk tradition, in proverbs and stories, also recorded by Vuk Karadžić: *Не зна чалма шта пати глава, Свекрва ... би је и глађу патила*<sup>45</sup> which are testimonies to its presence in the Eastern, or at least central, parts of the broader Serbo-Croatian territory. The above-mentioned meanings are present in different sources, and almost regularly in secular contexts, related to everyday life –except for a few instances regarding spiritual life, but not in a strictly religious use: *Spomeni se ... da si rođen da patiš, Ako je u čistilu, neka pati dokle god ne ispati što je zaslužio*<sup>46</sup>– this last example strongly resembles the OSerb. syntagm **ДА ПЛАТИ И ПАТИ**, only elevated from a profane to a spiritual level<sup>47</sup>. Our insisting on the scarcity of religious contexts (in Serbian, but elsewhere too) is actually an argument against Skok’s assertion that the verb was borrowed, through Christian mediation, from Balkan Romance (Skok II 621)<sup>48</sup>.

5.2.4. We should be mindful of the fact that in the course of centuries the verb *nàtumu* basically meaning „to suffer (difficulty in general, espe-

<sup>44</sup> Followed by an illustration with a proverb: *Ко много зна, много и пати* [who knows much, suffers much too]. This appears to be yet another echo of the couple *πάθημα* vs. *μάθημα*, in an inverted order, though.

<sup>45</sup> [The turban does not know what the head is suffering], [Mother-in-law hated her ... so she would torture her with hunger] cf. RJA s.v.

<sup>46</sup> [Remember ... that you are born to suffer], [If he is in purgatory, let him suffer until he expiates what he has deserved] the latter from M. Divković’s *Besjede*, cf. RJA s.v.

<sup>47</sup> This very example, *neka pati dokle god ne ispati*, also opens the way to re-examining the existent interpretations of the widespread verb *исна́тити* impf. „to expiate, repent and atone“, hitherto considered an intensivum from *исно́стити* < *пост* „fasting“ (cf. Skok III 15), yet it deserves a separate study which should not disregard Bulg *пáщам* „пáтя“, cf. BER s.v. *пáтя*.

<sup>48</sup> „Posudenica posredstvom kršćanstva iz balkanskog latinитета“ as he puts it, at the same time allowing that our word could also be cognate with the Latin one, i.e. sharing the same IE root *\*pē-* / *\*pō-* „weh tun, beschädigen“ with it (Skok I.c.), which is not likely in view of the fact that the verb cannot even qualify for the status of a South Slavic dialectism (due to its absence from Slovenian, cf. § 5.3.), let alone it has any further Slavic relations. Such parallelisms between Latin on one side, and an isolated (or even an accidental group of) genetically distant Slavic language(s) on the other, are quite improbable.

cially a hard life, but often referring to spiritual or emotional pain)“ (cf. also § 5.2.2. for more meanings), has generated a fairly large lexical-semantic **word family**, consisting of prefixed verbal and derived nominal forms, nomina abstracta or nomina agentis, rarely adjectives and adverbs, such as: *испатити*, *испаитити*, *напатити* (*се*), *препатити*, *пропатити*, *злопатити* (*се*); *патња*<sup>49</sup>, also *пáта* „suffering“ (attested only in the RSA materials, cf. note 63), *злопата*<sup>50</sup>, *злопатно* adv., *злопатња*, *злопаћа*, *злпапаћа*, *патење*<sup>51</sup>, *патлук*, *патеж*, *патник*, *злопатник*, *злопатнички* (adj. + adv.), *сапатник*, *патница*, *злопатница*, *сапатница*, *патеник*, *патеништво*, *паћеник*, *паћеница*, *злопаћеница*, etc. (cf. RSA and RJA s.vv.).

5.2.4.1. Deserving special comment is the compound verb *злопатити* (*се*) impf. „to suffer badly“ (< *зло* „bad(ly)“ + *патити*, incl. respective derivation). Although it appears to be an indigenous formation (cf. note 38), it is much more likely to be a direct translation (in fact semitranslation) of Gk. *κακοπαθέω* / *κακοπαθείνω* „to be in ill plight, be in distress“ (also *κακοπάθεια* „distress, misery, strain, stress“ and a number of other nominal derivations, dating from Ancient Greek into this day). It is first attested in 16th century Dubrovnik poetry,<sup>52</sup> while the earliest lexicographic record, *zlopaćenstvo* „patimento, il patire“ comes from Della Bella’s dictionary (early 18th c.). However, they are all preceded by a literal translation of Gk.

<sup>49</sup> Although presently most frequent, this abstract noun was first recorded only in Vuk’s *Српски рјечник*: *Слепоћа је тешка мука, тешка патња* [Blindness is a great trouble, great suffering], also later in S. M. Ljubiša: *јер су му додијале душевне патње, више но тјелесне болести* [he was annoyed by spiritual suffering, more than by physical illnesses], *Vrućina patnju, a studen smrt zadaje* [Heat causes suffering, while cold causes death] Bosnia and Herzegovina, cf. RJA.

<sup>50</sup> First recorded by Vuk, cf. examples in authors from Slavonia and Serbia: *Страшне муке и злопате ... невољу и злопату; У оваквим мукама и великој злопати*, etc. in RSA.

<sup>51</sup> This verbal noun is not recorded in dictionaries earlier than RJA (i.e. its 9th volume published in 1927), which gives a few examples from the late 18th century Ikavian writers Rapić and Tomiković (Budapest 1762, Osik 1797), e.g. *Valja da zagrlj trpljena i patenja na svitu ovome* [he should embrace endurance and sufferings in this world], but also a sentence from fra Grga Martić (a priest from Herzegovina, known for his use of colloquial language): *Sve se selo na ispite svijta, i prvjenci predaju patenju* [the whole village is gathered for **trials**, and the leaders are exposed to **torture**] which is apparently a description of torture and not of general suffering as in previous examples. This semantic moment will be referred to later, cf. § 5.2.7.

<sup>52</sup> Such as M. Držić, Dž. Držić, Vetrančić, Pavić, Kačić, Dositej Obradović, fra Grga Martić, S. M. Ljubiša, M. P. Šarčanin, M. Đ. Miličević, Nović, etc. and other modern writers, incl. dialectal notes from Sinj and Lika, cf. RJA and RSA.

κακοπάθεια.: the OSerb. **злострадание** „calamitas“ from the Karlovački letopis (ca. 1503)<sup>53</sup>, reflecting a likely earlier date of semantic translation of the Gk. prototype, since it occurs in an original historical text, and not in some translation from Greek. It is a curiosity that in Bulgarian, to the best of our knowledge, such compounds are not attested, save for a most westward dialectal record *злонатиа* „suffering“ (Kjustendil, cf. BER 5:101). On the other hand, a translation or semitranslation from some Latin, i.e. Romance source is not an option since respective compound verbs are not attested for those languages<sup>54</sup>.

5.2.4.2. At the same time, nomina agentis *сапатник*, *сапатница* are probably newer indigenous denominal formations stemming from *патник* etc. (after the model *сапутник* < *путник* „traveller“, *сарадник* < *радник* „worker“) since they are –so far at least– lacking verbal origin in a prefixed Serb. *\*sapatiti*<sup>55</sup>.

5.2.4.3. It is noteworthy that the abovementioned words are more or less intensively and evenly present, not only in literary Serbian and Serbo-Croatian but also in the dialects, Štokavian as well as Čakavian and Kajkavian.

5.2.5. The geographic **distribution** of the word family of *namumu*, frequency of its use, abundance and contents of phraseology, as well as semantics pertaining to one region or the other, does allow a certain demarcation to be made between, roughly speaking, eastern and western parts of the entire Serbo-Croatian territories. It is in the sources from Dalmatia and the Adriatic islands that *namumu* means „to suffer (hardship and/or shortage)“, in Montenegro it is more or less the same (with a noticeable dominance of nominal forms), while in Serbia, central and especially SE Serbia, general and abstract meanings are rare, felt as belonging to the literary language, and very frequent is the use of *namumu* for illnesses, defects and the like,

<sup>53</sup> In a passage on Stephan, the son of despot Đurađ Branković, who had two sons, Đurađ and Jovan, and after many miseries approached the end of his life: **роди два сына ... и по мнозѣхъ злостраданихъ конецъ жизни прїемакъ** (cf. Daničić I 385 s.v. **злострадание**, after Šafarik's 1851 Prague edition). However, an expected *\*zlostradanije* is not found in the section in Zett 312-316 containing compounds with *zlo-*.

<sup>54</sup> Although such formations do exist, cf. Lat. *maledico*, *malefacio*, *malefio* (also nominals *maletractio* f., *malevolens* adj., etc.) or Ital. verbs *maledire*, *malessere*, *malmenare*, *maltrattare*, etc.

<sup>55</sup> Its prototype would have been hard to trace with certainty since both Lat. *comparior* and (its model, cf. Ernout/Meillet l.c.) Gk. *σμπάσχω* could be the sources of borrowing into Serbian.

which includes more colourful phraseology, ironical use, etc.<sup>56</sup> The dozens of sources cannot be quoted here<sup>57</sup> in detail<sup>58</sup> nor mapped either, so we are leaving this task for some future occasion.

5.2.6. In a word, it is not impossible that the present-day situation actually reflects the results of various ways of borrowing different verbs from multiple sources: from Italian *patire* (which was already Miklosich's idea for Serb. and Bulg. verbs, resolutely rejected by Maretić in RJA s.v., but actually worth reconsidering) that could have influenced not only the Adriatic coast, but also a certain part of its hinterland (perhaps Montenegro too), while in the eastern regions we are dealing with continuants of a –more or less early– loanword from Gk. *πάσχω*. In fact, it might well be that Greek is the source of all the historically documented traces of this verb, in Old Serbian and in the Dubrovnik literature (perhaps even further to the west), which could qualify the verb *namumu* in Serbo-Croatian for joining the stock of the Byzantine Greek lexical heritage, conventionally referred to as „western Grecisms“<sup>59</sup>. Such an interpretation would make it easier to avoid the so far futile search for firm evidence of a Romance source (as Skok has suggested, v. note 48, cf. also Lekova 2003:60), not only for our verb, but in wider Balkan surroundings too. At the moment, Romance origin seems much less likely than it was considered before, at least for some Balkan languages, yet it can never be totally rejected.

5.2.7. And finally, in continuation of the previous idea of multiple sources of borrowing, we could make a bold **hypothesis** that there might

<sup>56</sup> E.g. *нати му глава* lit. „his head aches“, iron. „he is conceited“ or *нати од величине* „he suffers from grandeur, i.e. he is conceited“, etc.

<sup>57</sup> Although they are well-known to researchers of Serbian dialectology, who are familiar with the last decades' production of *Српски дијалектолошки зборник* (from G. Elezović's Kosovo and Metohija to the latest Dubrovnik dictionary by Bojanić and Trivunac), *Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik*, and some standard monographs describing lexicon from the Adriatic (mostly Čakavian), also from Montenegro (Boka Kotorska, Uskoci, Prošćenje, etc.), as well as from Leskovac, Vranje, Piroć, Timok, etc.

<sup>58</sup> Such hapax legomena as *namucamu* impf. „to work without a break“ (Banija and Kordun, D. Petrović 1978, p.153), probably resulting from a corruption, or misunderstanding of the original negated verb, *не namucati* < *namucati* „to cease, stop doing something“ (rather than an intensivum of *namumu* „suffer“) cannot always be kept record of, but they do not effect the general picture anyway.

<sup>59</sup> Such as *хар, нарун, неденца, перивој*, etc. cf. Skok and Vasmer 1944 s.vv. – it is noteworthy that the latter does not include *patiti* in his dictionary of Greek loans in Serbo-Croatian.

also be an array of forms and meanings of the verb *namumui*<sup>60</sup> that can be interpreted as native in origin since they are distinct by consistently appearing in transitive form, in a single meaning „to torture, put to torture“ in a technical sense (partly synonymously with *мучити*, yet employed to deliberately break the possible figura etymologica *мучити* would be making with its productive noun *мука*), and on a clearly delineated territory<sup>61</sup>. The RSA materials we have insight into<sup>62</sup> have given rise to such an idea<sup>63</sup>, but it would take a meticulous elaboration before anything could be concluded with certainty. We are aware that these examples might well be the result of analogy with *мучити* tr. „to torture“ and *мучити се* intr. „to suffer“, yet this specific semantics –which happens to be unparalleled by respective forms elsewhere in the Balkans– could lead us to the domestic *\*r̥titi* (in ablaut with *\*pytati* impf. „to ask, investigate, try, etc.“ which is continued, inter alia, in Russ. *пытать* impf. „to torture“, *пытка* f. „a torment, torture“,

<sup>60</sup> Totally beyond our present discussion remains the meaning of Serb. *nàtumu* impf. „to breed, cultivate“, earlier interpreted as identical to *nàtumu* „to suffer“ (cf. Skok II 621), but recently recognized as homonymous to it and offered a separate etymological solution (cf. Vlajić-Popović 2004).

<sup>61</sup> It is an area holding a central position in the present-day map of Serbo-Croatian, away from the zones of immediate influence from either Romanic or Greek sides.

<sup>62</sup> We cannot present it all here, but the verb *namuti* is expected to appear not in the forthcoming 17th, but in the following, 18th volume of RSA.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. in RSA so far (among the prefixed forms) only once *злонати* tr.: *Тако би злонатили и мучили глађу једну марву...* [So they would torture and starve poor cattle...] (Herzegovina) and as *испати* pf. „exhaust, wear out“ in a few literary passages, e.g.: *Њу сте испатили, сад мене још да мучите* [You have worn her out, now you should torture me]. Here also belongs *Свекрва би је ... и глађу патила* (cf. § 5.2.3.1., note 45). In RSA materials we find: *А сељаке тако по које покупише, поваташе све, те их стадоше бичевати и патити* [They caught the peasants... and started flogging them and torturing them], or *Судија наложи да их пате и муче* (Slavonija) [The judge ordered them tortured and tormented], *Бог т' убио момак јабанџијо, зашто патии такога ајвана* [God damn you, foreigner, why are you torturing such an animal], *Хоћемо те жива уфатити, патити те смрћу свакојаком* [We want to catch you alive and torture you with all kinds of death] (Bosnia), *Ми све знамо ... па кад знате, зашто патите и дете и мене* [We know everything ... if you do, why are you torturing the child and myself]; *Нанатише нас, браћо, ове сеоске путине – патимо и марву и себе* [These country roads have worn us out – we are torturing both the cattle and ourselves] etc. In the central area of the wider Serbo-Croatian territory, namely in Bosnia (also Banija, Baranja) there is a noun *nāta* f. unparalleled by form or meaning elsewhere (synonymous to the widespread *патња* „suffering“), illustrated by examples of plain text that exclude the chance of alternations metri causa, due to rhyme or the like: *Ко је то тебе научио? – Пата моја*. [Who taught you that? My suffering did.] or *То је јед, то је пата*. [That is bitterness, that is suffering].

cf. Fasmer III 421), the accented PSl. semivowel yielding a S.-Cr. *-a-* in the root.<sup>64</sup> But that calls for a Slavistic study (since that verbal theme is poorly attested in the Slavic South, and the meaning is restricted to Russian, even excluding its westward dialects) so for the time being this question must be put aside.

5.3. And last, but not least, against the theory of the Latin origin of Balkanic, at least Balkan Slavic verbs, there is an argument of linguistic geography, a negative find, the value of which is not to be ignored. To the best of our knowledge, Slovenian is the only South Slavic language this verb is unknown to<sup>65</sup> and that is not irrelevant for our discussion. What distinguishes Slovenian from its other three Southern cognates, in the domain of lexical borrowing, is the fact that throughout history it fell into the sphere of influence of the Western Church, and consequently the Latin language (which includes all its varieties and heirs, even the dialects of Italian –in which the verb *patire* „to suffer, endure“ is very present and quite productive– especially in the zones of direct contact between the two languages, from Istria to the Alps). Had the source of irradiation been Latin, i.e. its late vulgarized form or Balkan Romance successor, it would have been unlikely to avoid only Slovenian and spread throughout the Balkans, among the Slavic and non-Slavic languages alike, all of which (except for most of the western parts of Serbo-Croatian, and to a limited extent Albanian too), on the other hand, are (or used to be, until the Ottoman invasion) in the domain of the Eastern Church – which implies a strong influence of the Greek language, varying from active bilingualism to various degrees of borrowing or calquing, be they lexical, phraseological, semantic or syntactic.

5.3.1. We should also bear in mind that although among the early borrowings from Balkan Romance into Slavic languages, there are several terms pertaining to religion in a wider sense (such as *КОУМ*, *ОЛТАРЬ*, *ПОГАНИН*, *КОЛЕДА*, cf. § 5.1.2. esp. note 35), the verb in *\*pat-* does not fall in that number<sup>66</sup>, since it was not borrowed through Christian mediation – this is especially true of the Balkan Slavic languages, Macedonian, Serbian, Bulgarian, since the christianisation of their speakers was performed in their native tongue(s) (i.e. Old Slavonic which later evolved into various redactions,

<sup>64</sup> For more about this phonetic feature cf. Ivić 1974:37 ff.

<sup>65</sup> This fact has been noticed before (e.g. in Rusek 1983:38), and it is confirmed by the absence of *\*patiti* or a like verb from the respective volume of F. Bezlaj's *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika*, Ljubljana 1995.

<sup>66</sup> Abstract or more sophisticated lexicon was „imported“ only later, in conditions of bilingualism or at least intensive trading contacts (for terms such as *луитрат*, *замиритат*, *бандуњат*, *абатит*, etc. cf. Popović 593).

further profiled into modern languages), although it took place under Greek patronship. Arumanian was exposed and remained open to Greek influence, while Rumanian, in spite of its Romance roots and foundations, was open to a strong Slavic influence, which eventually resulted in its adopting Greek lexicon via Slavic mediation.

6.0. The aim of this paper was not to reach any final *c o n c l u s i o n s*, but to draw attention to the problem of various etymologies of Rum. *pǎți*, Arum. *pat*, Alb. *pësoj*, Bulg. *пàтя*, Mac. *namu*, S.-Cr. *nàtumu*, to shed some new light onto the Serbian material, examine it, bearing in mind the meagre (and uneven) evidence from other Balkan languages. The aim was also to appeal for a detailed investigation of all sources at the disposal of local linguists, taking into consideration all the dialectological and facts of linguistic geography that can be obtained, thus making it possible to conduct an overall study of the problem which would, in contrasting the facts of each language with those from the others, finally reward every individual Balkan language with a clear picture about the etymology of its own verb in *\*pat-* „to suffer, endure, etc.“.

## REFERENCES

Argirovski

Аргировски, М.: *Грцизмите во македонскиот јазик*, Скопје 1998.

Bauer

Bauer, W.: *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament 6.*, völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage von Kurt und Barbara Aland, Berlin / New York 1988.

BER

*Български етимологичен речник 1–*, София 1971–.

Boerio

Boerio, G.: *Dizionario del dialetto veneziano*, Venezia 1856<sup>2</sup>.

Daničić

Даничић, Ђ.: *Рјечник из књижевних старина српских I–III*, Београд 1863–1864.

DELI

Cortelazzo, M., Zolli, P.: *Dizionario etimologico della lingua Italiana 1–5*, Bologna 1979–1988.

Dini 2002

Дини, П.: *Балтийские языки*, Москва [transl. of: P. Dini, *Le lingue baltiche*, Firenze 1997.]

DLR

*Dicționarul limbii Române VIII/1*, Р-пăзui, București 1972.

Ernout/Meillet

Ernout, A., Meillet, A.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine I–II*, Paris 1951<sup>2</sup>.

Fasmer

Фасмер, М.: *Этимологический словарь русского языка 1–4*, Москва 1986–1987.

Filipova-Vajrova

Филипова-Байрова, М.: *Гръцки заемки в съвременния български език*, София 1969.

Frisk

Frisk, H.: *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch I–III*, Heidelberg 1973–1979<sup>2</sup>.

Ivić 1974

Ивић, П.: О условима за чување и испадање полугласа у српскохрватском, *Зборник Матице српске за филологију и лингвистику XVII/2*, Нови Сад, 37–47.

Lekova 2003

Lekova, T.: Latinismi balcanici e loro presenza nelle miscellanee slavo-meridionali, *Studi in onore di Riccardo Picchio* (offerta per il suo ottantesimo compleanno, Napoli, 27–69.

Lewis/Short

Lewis, C. P., Short, C.: *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1975. [1st ed. 1879.]

Liddell/Scott/Jones

Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S.: *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1968<sup>9</sup>.

ΛΚNE

Λεξικό τής κοινής νεοελληνικής γλώσσας. Θεσσαλονίκη 2001.

Meyer

Meyer, G.: *Albanesisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Strassburg 1891.

## Miklosich

Miklosich, F.: *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Wien 1880.

## Mladenov

Младенов, С.: *Етимологически и правописен речник на българския книжовен език*, София 1941.

## MS

*Monumenta serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*, edidit Fr. Miklosich, Vindobonae 1858 – Graz 1964<sup>2</sup>.

## Orel

Orel, V.: *Albanian etymological dictionary*, Leiden etc. 1998.

## Papahagi

Papahagi, T.: *Dicționarul dialectului aromân, general și etimologic*, I–II, București 1963.

## Pokorny

Pokorny, J.: *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern 1959.

## Popović

Popović, I.: *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*, Wiesbaden 1960.

## REW

Meyer-Lübke, W.: *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg 1992<sup>6</sup>.

## RJA

*Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* I–XXIII, Zagreb 1880–1975.

## RMJ

*Речник на македонскиот јазик* (со српскохрватски толкувања), ред. Б. Конески, Скопје 1986.

## RRODD

*Речник на редки, остарели и диалектни думи в литературата ни от XIX и XX век*, ред. Ст. Илчев, София 1974.

## RSA

*Речник српскохрватског књижевног и народног језика* 1–, Београд 1959–.

## RSA mater.

The materials exploited in the composition of RSA.

Rusakov 1987

Русаков, А. Ю.: К вопросу о фонетической адаптации латинской лексики в албанском языке, [in:] *Romano-balcanica* (Вопросы адаптации латинского языкового элемента в балканском ареале – сборник научных трудов), отв. ред. А. В. Десницкая, Ленинград, 127–144.

Rusek 1983

Русек, Й.: Из старобългарската лексика, *Palaeobulgarica / Старобългаристика* VII/4, София, 34-51.

Skok

Skok, P.: *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* I–IV, Zagreb 1971–1974.

Sophocles

Sophocles, E. A.: *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (From B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100), New York 1887.

Steinke/Vraciu

Steinke, K., Vraciu, A.: *Introducere în lingvistica balcanica*, Iași 1999.

Sytov 1987

Сытов, А. П.: Латинские элементы в глагольной системе албанского языка, [in:] *Romano-balcanica* (Вопросы адаптации латинского языкового элемента в балканском ареале – сборник научных трудов), Отв. ред. А. В. Десницкая, Ленинград, 171–201.

Tiktin

Tiktin, H.: *Rumänisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* I–III, 2. überarbeitete und ergänzte Auflage von P. Miron, Wiesbaden 1986–1989.

Tolstaja 1998

Толстая, С. М.: Труд и мука, [in:] *Язык. Африка. Фульбе*: сборник научных статей в честь А. И. Коваль, Ст.-Петербург, 22–28.

Vasmer 1944

Vasmer, M.: *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Serbo-Kroatischen*, Berlin.

Vlajić-Porović 2004

Влајић-Поповић, Ј.: Не(пре)позната континуанта псл. *\*рѣтати* (*\*рѣтати*) на словенском југу, *Rocznik Slawistyczny* LIV, Warszawa, 23–35.

Zett

Zett, R.: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Nominalkomposita im Serbokroatischen. Die altserbische Periode*, Köln / Wien 1970.

Јасна Влајић-Поповић  
 ПУТЕВИ СТРАДАЊА НА БАЛКАНУ:  
 испреплетаност *patior* и  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$

Р е з и м е

У раду се предлаже преиспитивање досад претпостављаног латинског порекла рум. *păți*, арум. *pat*, алб. *pësoj*, буг. *pătja*, мак. *namu*, с.-х. *pātiti*, који сви значе „патити, трпети, страдати и сл.“ и образлаже се зашто је, за већину тих балканских глагола, гр.  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\omega$  тј.  $\pi\alpha\theta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$  вероватнији крајњи предлозак него влат. *\*patire* < лат. *patior*.

У раду се даје преглед савремене ситуације у сваком језику тако што се констатује обим лексичко-семантичких породица одговарајућих глагола и разматрају се формални, семантички, хронолошки, лингво-географски и други нелингвистички фактори од потенцијалног значаја за утврђивање извора позајмљивања. Анализа је усредсређена на српски језик (тј. српско-хрватски) који се –иако није типичан балкански језик– захваљујући релативном обиљу расположивих података, показао као користан и за општа разматрања, будући да је у њему, по свему судећи, дошло до вишеструког позајмљивања античког пара глагола од њихових различитих наследника у различитим периодима.

У раду се не доносе коначни закључци, будући да је циљ био само да се скрене пажња на проблем различитих етимологија горепомнутих глагола у балканским језицима и боље осветли српски материјал, не губећи ни у једном тренутку из вида његово балканско окружење. И најзад, у раду се позива на спровођење детаљних истраживања свих извора који су доступни локалним лингвистима, што би омогућило збирно сагледавање читавог проблема и затим, унакрсним поређењем чињеница сваког језика, довело до коначне слике о етимологији глагола на *\*pat-* „трпети, страдати итд.“ у сваком балканском језику понаособ.