

Danilo Savić  
Institute for Balkan Studies  
Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts  
d.md.savic@gmail.com

811.1  
811.16'373.21  
COBISS.SR-ID 81747721

Orsat Ligorio  
Faculty of Philosophy  
University of Belgrade  
orsat.ligorio@gmail.com

## Illyrian and Slavic

*Abstract:* This paper analyses borrowings of possible Illyrian provenance in Slavic. Sections 1 and 2 describe previous attempts at defining the borders and characteristics of the Illyrian language. The Illyrian forms are classified according to the system of anthroponymic areas of Illyricum established by Radoslav Katičić. Thus, they are labelled as either Liburnian, Delmato-Pannonian, or Illyrian proper. The main part of the material, covered in sections 3 and 4, consists of 59 onomastic and lexical items generally held to be Illyrian borrowings into Serbo-Croatian and, to a lesser extent, into Bulgarian and Slovene, often with cognates in Albanian and Romanian. The Illyrian origin of 13 forms is rejected. Section 5 discusses another 16 Slavic forms of unclear origin. Section 6 discusses eight Illyrian toponyms that were not borrowed into Slavic, but are helpful for the reconstruction of Illyrian phonology attempted in section 7.

*Keywords:* Palaeo-Balkan languages, Illyrian, Slavic, etymology, language contact, onomastics.

### 1. Illyrian

The linguistic scope of the term “Illyrian” is difficult to define. There are no Illyrian texts. Traces of the language survive indirectly in a small number of glosses recorded by Greek and Roman authors, as well as in Illyrian personal and place names found in Greek and Latin literature and epigraphy. However, only four glosses are labelled explicitly as Illyrian by the ancient authors (KRAHE 1955: 38), while the attribution of various onomastic elements to Illyrian depends on how one defines the territorial extent of its speakers.

The use of the term “Illyrian” varied greatly in ancient sources (KATIČIĆ 1976a: 154–158, EICHNER 2004: 96–103, DZINO 2014, LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 117–124), having both political and ethnographic applications. In the earliest sources, “Illyrians” seem to originally designate a people, or a group of culturally related peoples on the north-western fringes of the Greek world, bordering Epirus and Macedonia.

Already in the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE, various tribes were dubbed “Illyrian”, e.g., Ταυλάντιοι βάρβαροι, Ἰλλυρικὸν ἔθνος – “barbarian Taulantians, an Illyrian people” (Thucydides 1.24). However, Illyrians also designated a political entity often called the “Illyrian kingdom” (see DZINO 2014: 57 for references), which reached its territorial peak during the 3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE, and lasted until the Roman conquest in 168 BCE. The Romans gradually extended the use of this term northwards, including a growing number of different tribes. Thus, for Appian (*Illyrian wars*, 1.1), the Illyrians are barbarians settled to the north and northwest of Epirus and Macedonia, bordering Thrace to the east, the Adriatic Sea to the west, and the Danube river and the Alps to the north and northwest. This delimitation mostly corresponds to the boundaries of Roman Illyricum (later divided into the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia), and to the parts of Roman Macedonia that lay between the Adriatic coast and the lake Ohrid.

The assumption that these areas share a common Illyrian language underlies the works of H. Krahe (1925, 1929, 1955) and of A. Mayer (1957, 1959), who compiled hundreds of onomastic entries, providing them with Indo-European etymologies and phonological rules. Their approach confirmed the existence of some Indo-European language(s) in the north-western Balkans. On the other hand, the idea of an undivided Illyrian linguistic entity, based solely on onomastic data, encountered methodological difficulties (KRONASSER 1965: 156–158, KATIČIĆ 1976a: 172–177, FALILEYEV 2020: 899–901). Later studies in Illyrian anthroponymy pursued the investigation of indigenous onomastic formulae and the geographic distribution of personal names, while avoiding the etymological approach altogether. This led to the division of “Illyrian” lands into several regions with characteristic anthroponymy. The development of this system is summarised in KATIČIĆ 1976a: 179–184. It remains generally accepted in recent literature (e.g., POLOMÉ 1982: 867–869, WILKES 1996: 70–87, GRBIĆ 2016, DE SIMONE 2018, FALILEYEV 2020: 900–914, LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 134–142). The anthroponymy of individual tribal communities formed under Roman rule has recently been classified according to this system in ГРБИЋ 2014. For the topic at hand, it should be noted that only two of these regions may be thought of as “Illyrian” in terms of language: the so-called “South-Eastern” or “Illyrian” region (KATIČIĆ 1962, updated by DE SIMONE 1993) and the “Delmato-Pannonian” region (KATIČIĆ 1963, 1964b, 1965, new material in ЛОМА 2003/04 and 2010a).

The notion of a single “Illyrian” language in the northwestern Balkans was effectively dissolved when the Liburnian anthroponymic area was established by RENDIĆ-MIOČEVIĆ (1955). Liburnia stretched on the Adriatic coast from the river Raša (ancient Arsia) in the north to the river Krka (ancient Titius) in the south according to Pliny the Elder (3.139). The Liburnian anthroponymic area mostly

coincides with this definition. It is distinct from the Delmato-Pannonian and the Illyrian regions in terms of both onomastic formulae and characteristic anthroponyms. Moreover, it seems to be closely related to the anthroponymy of Venetia and Histria (on which see UNTERMANN 1961). Katičić names this complex “North-Adriatic” (1976a: 179), but see PRÓSPER (2019) who advises against the use of this term. In any case, it is certain that the language spoken in Liburnia was different from the language(s) spoken in Delmato-Pannonian and Illyrian areas (KATIČIĆ 1976a: 183). One should not, however, consider this language to simply be Venetic, as shown by UNTERMANN (1970). Some Greek and Roman sources report a much larger extent of Liburnians in ancient times, which would cover much of the Adriatic coast, including the islands of Issa, Corcyra, and Ladesta, reaching as far as Epidamnus (DZINO 2014: 52–53). While these reports are probably exaggerated, one may not completely exclude the Liburnian origin of some Adriatic toponyms south of the Krka.

As is apparent from its name, the Illyrian region covers the south-eastern parts of Dalmatia, between the rivers Neretva (ancient Naro) in the North and Drin (ancient Drilon) in the South. Outside of Dalmatia, it extends further southwards along the coast of Roman Macedonia practically reaching Epirus. Therefore, it mostly coincides with the borders of the former Illyrian kingdom conquered by the Romans in 168 BCE. It is also home to the *Illyrii proprie dicti* mentioned by Pliny the Elder (3.144) and Pomponius Mela (2.55). The “Illyrians proper” may have been a *civitas peregrina* situated somewhere between Epidaurus and Lissus (so KATIČIĆ 1964a), but doubts do exist regarding the original meaning of this designation (PAPAZOĞLU 1965: 177–179). For these reasons the south-eastern indigenous anthroponymy is probably the most reliable source of Illyrian linguistic data. But, as emphasised by DE SIMONE (2018: 1869), the borders of an anthroponymic region do not necessarily match the territory of a historically attested language. Likewise, the anthroponyms well rooted in a certain area do not necessarily belong to its language.

The Delmato-Pannonian region covers the Dalmatian coast from Rider (present-day Danilo, near Šibenik) southwards to Salona (present-day Solin). It continues further inland, along the rivers Cetina and Krka, reaching as far northwards as the valleys of the rivers Una and Kupa (ancient Colapis), as well the southern bank of the Sava. It covers the territories of the Delmatae, of the Iapodes and of the Pannonian tribes settled south of the Sava. These peoples form an ethnic entity different from the Illyrians in the South-East (KATIČIĆ 1976a: 183), and it is ultimately impossible to determine whether they all shared one “Illyrian” language, or spoke two related but distinct languages. Furthermore, the Delmato-Pannonian onomastic repertoire is clearly distinct from the Illyrian one. Yet, some indigenous names such as *Bato*, *Epicadus*, or *Plator* seem to be well rooted in both areas. Names

derived from seemingly common roots appear in both areas as well. Such cases would be represented by names in *Anna-*, *Laid-/Laed-*, *Pin(n)-*, or by composite names with the first element *Tri-*. While far reaching conclusions cannot be drawn from this limited material, an inquiry into the context of these points of overlap between the two regions may bring useful results.

Another question that could benefit from further research is the presence of Illyrian and Delmato-Pannonian anthroponymy in the south-western part of the Roman province of Upper Moesia, formerly belonging to the pre-Roman Dardanian kingdom. It is possible that “an originally Illyrian anthroponymy was superseded by a Delmato-Pannonian stratum” (KATIČIĆ 1976a: 181), but the traces of an Illyrian onomastic layer there are rather thin, as shown by ЛОМА 2010a. PAPAZOGLU (1978: 210–218) has shown that the Dardanians were previously not distinguished from Illyrians in the ancient sources. Katičić’s remark on the onomastic changes in the area may therefore find some support in historical data. In any case, the question of the linguistic relation between the two regions remains open, although some authors prefer to limit themselves to the Illyrian region (DE SIMONE 2018, LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021). On the problems regarding linguistic affinities of the Delmato-Pannonian region see FALILEYEV (2020: 905–908, 911–914).

It should also be noted that Delmato-Pannonian names are found in exclaves outside of the area described above, generally due to Roman resettling of the indigenous population. The anthroponymy of the Azali, a tribe in northern Pannonia, surrounded by Celtic neighbours, presents a mixture of Celtic and Delmato-Pannonian names, although it has been recently argued that the Celtic component is predominant (GRBIĆ 2013). Delmato-Pannonian names are also found in *municipium S* in eastern Dalmatia (material in ЛОМА 2003/04), near present-day Pljevlja in Montenegro, as well as in Alburnus Maior in Dacia, present-day Roșia Montană in Romania (KATIČIĆ 1963, but see PISO 2004 for a detailed study).

As mentioned above, there are four glosses referred to as Illyrian in ancient sources. Hesychius records Δευάδαι· οἱ σάτ[υρ]οὶ ὑπ’ Ἰλλυριῶν – *Deuádai*, satyrs among the Illyrians”. Δευάδαι is usually compared with Skt. *dhūnóti* ‘shake’ and Gk. θύω ‘rush in, rage’ (KATIČIĆ 1976a: 170, EICHNER 2004: 93). The PIE root would then be *\*d<sup>h</sup>euH-* ‘rasch hin und her bewegen, schütteln’ (LIV<sup>2</sup> 149f). If accepted, this equation would show PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>* > Ill. *d*, PIE *\*eu* > Ill. *eu*. The scholion to Odyssey 5.281 notes: οἱ δὲ λέγουσιν Ἰλλυριοὺς ῥινόων λέγειν τὴν ἀγλύν – “They say that the Illyrians call mist *rhinós*”. A possible cognate is found in Alb. *re*, Gheg *rë* ‘cloud’ (DEMIRAJ 1997: 344, OREL 1998: 366, MATZINGER 2005: 36f). Here the Gheg nasalised vowel confirms an earlier *\*ren-*. The formal and semantic similarity of ῥινόος and *re* give solid ground for comparison, but their exact relationship, as well as further Indo-European cognates, remain to be determined. Demiraj proposes *re* < *\*h<sub>1</sub>reg<sup>h</sup>-neh<sub>2</sub>-*

cf. Gk. ἔρεμνός ‘murky, dark’, derived from PIE *\*h<sub>1</sub>regʰ-* ‘darkness’; further cognates are Gk. ἔρεβος ‘part of the underworld’, Arm. *erek* ‘evening’, Skt. *rájas-* ‘dust, mist’, etc. An extension of this etymology to ῥινός would be ad hoc. Orel’s etymology connects both words to Gk. ῥρίνω ‘excite, stir’ and Skt. *rináti* ‘set in movement’, but this does not seem semantically convincing. It is also questionable whether ῥρίνω and *rináti* are related; LIV<sup>2</sup> 305f derives them from *\*h<sub>3</sub>reiH-* ‘wallen, wirbeln’, while BEEKES 2010: 1103 suggests an equally plausible *\*h<sub>3</sub>r-i-* ‘set in movement’ for ῥρίνω, thus disconnecting it from *rináti*. Matzinger proposes a connection with *\*h<sub>3</sub>reiH-* as well, deriving Alb. *re* from *\*h<sub>3</sub>roi(H)-no-*, and ῥινός from the zero grade. Although it remains impossible to identify a precise geographic provenance of these two words, the South-Eastern anthroponymic area seems plausible at least in the case of ῥινός, in view of Alb. *re*. The attribution of the remaining two glosses to Illyrian is questionable, if not completely inaccurate (EICHNER 2004: 94, FALILEYEV 2020: 898f). Ammianus Marcellinus (26.8.2) mentions *sabaia* ‘a kind of beer’ consumed *in Illyrico*. Hieronymus in his commentary to Isaias 7.19, mentions the same beverage, under the form *sabaium* as it is called *in Dalmatiae Pannoniaeque provinciis gentili barbaroque sermone* – “in the pagan and barbarian speech of the provinces of Dalmatia and Pannonia”. It has been proposed (MAYER 1959: 96, KATIČIĆ 1976: 171) to connect *sabaia* with the Germanic words for ‘sap’, e.g., OHG *saf*, OIc. *safe*. Other cognates may include Lat. *sapa* ‘new wine boiled thick’ (> OE *saep*, Dutch *sap* ‘sap’), Skt. *sabardúh-* ‘dairy cow’, Arm. *ham* ‘sap’. A non-Indo-European origin cannot be excluded in this case, particularly in view of Skt. *b*, if the form is cognate. Regardless of this problem, one must note that *sabaia* is not exclusively related to the Illyrian anthroponymic region. On the grounds of Hieronymus, a connection with the Delmato-Pannonian region seems slightly more plausible. Still, its Illyrian origin is doubtful at best. Lastly, there is *sybina* ‘hunting spear, javelin’. It is attributed to Illyrian on grounds of *Paulus ex Festo* 453. *sybinam appellant Illyri telum venabuli simile*. *Ennius: Illyri restant sicis sybinisque fodentes* – “Illyrians call *sybina* a kind of a hunting spear. Ennius [sc. writes]: the Illyrians stand firm, fighting with daggers and javelins.” However, the passage of Ennius does not imply at all that the word is Illyrian. Furthermore, it is probably borrowed from Gk. συβίνη/σιβίνη ‘hunting spear, javelin’, and is ultimately of non-Indo-European origin (BEEKES 2010: 1327). Similar connections with Albanian have been attempted for other ethnonyms – *Dardani* was compared to Alb. *dardhë* ‘pear’, *Delmatae* to Alb. (Gheg) *delme* ‘sheep’ – but these are far too speculative (see DEMIRAJ 1997: 121, 127f).

One is therefore left with two Illyrian words, Δευάδαι ‘satyrs’ and ῥινός ‘mist’. The remainder of the material is drawn from onomastics – primarily from anthroponymy. Etymological reconstruction in these cases is generally difficult to apply, but an interesting case is provided by the name of the aforementioned Τυλάντιοι, an Illyrian tribe situated near Epidamnus (list of attestations in MAYER 1957: 331). A

similarity between their name and Alb. *dallëndyshe* ‘swallow’ has been noticed before (MAYER 1959: 112, EICHNER 2004: 107f). The Albanian form can be segmented as *dallënd-yshe*, where *-ysh* is a diminutive suffix seen e.g. in *këlysh* ‘animal cub’ (see DEMIRAJ 1997: 218f). Furthermore, Albanian *-a-* can continue an earlier *\*-au-*, as in Alb. *ag* ‘daybreak; dusk’ < *\*h<sub>2</sub>eug-*, cf. Gk. ἀύγή ‘light, ray of light’, or in Alb. *ar* ‘gold’ < Lat. *aurum* ‘id.’, while *-ë-* is a non-accented weakened vowel (on this see DEMIRAJ 1997: 46f). Albanian *-ll-* from an intervocalic *\*l* is also regular, as in Alb. *hell* ‘spit, icicle’ < *\*skōlo-*, cf. Gk. σκῶλος ‘pointed pole’, Lith. *kuõlas* ‘pole’, or in Alb. *sphellë* ‘cave’ < Gk. σπήλαιον ‘id.’ What appears to be a passage from *t* to *d*, remains to be explained. In any case, an Indo-European etymology of Alb. *dallëndyshe* is not ascertained, but see ÇABEJ 1976: 105f; the solution proposed by OREL 1998: 55 seems unlikely.

The following is a non-exhaustive list of Illyrian names from the south-eastern anthroponymic region (drawn from ΚΑΤΙČIĆ 1963 and DE SIMONE 1993): *Annaeus*/Ανναιος, Βάρδουλ(λ)ις, *Clevatus*, Κλεβετος/Κλεβετα, *Epicadus*/Επικαδος, *Ettritus*, *Gentius*/Γενθιος, Λαιδιας, *Pinnes*, *Pleuratus*, *Scerdilaedus*/Σκερδιλαιΐδας, *Teuta*/Τεύτα, Τριτεύτα. Some of these names easily find their place within the Indo-European lexicon. *Teuta* is related to forms such as OIr. *túath* ‘tribe, people’, Lith. *tautà* ‘people’, Goth. *þiuda* ‘id.’ < *\*teut-eh<sub>2</sub>-*. In names like *Clevatus* and Κλεβετος the root *\*kleu-* ‘hören’ (LIV<sup>2</sup> 334) can be recognised. The frequently mentioned etymology of *Gentius* as a derivative of *\*ǵenh<sub>1</sub>-ti-s* (DE SIMONE 2018: 1870, FALILEYEV 2020: 902) is far less certain. It certainly doesn’t allow the assumption that Illyrian was a *centum* language as suggested by Falileyev; examples such as *Clevatus* could simply show *\*k<sub>1</sub>l-* > *\*kl-* as in Lith. *klausyti* ‘listen’, OAlb. *kluoj* ‘call’ (DEMIRAJ 1997: 63). An equally unreliable *satem* example is the derivation of Βάρδουλ(λ)ις from PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>reh<sub>1</sub>ǵ-* ‘bright, to shine’ (MAYER 1959: 19). It may also reflect a QIE *b<sup>h</sup>ar(s)d<sup>h</sup>-* ‘beard’. For a summary and analysis of arguments in favour of the *centum* or *satem* character of Illyrian, see POLOMÉ 1982: 870–875, and LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 157–159. The preservation of *\*eu* is found in *Pleuratus*, *Teuta* and *Clevatus*. The latter, along with Δευάδα, shows that intervocalic *\*u* was kept. While a significant attempt to systematise synchronic and diachronic traits of Illyrian is made in LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 144–160, this kind of data leaves little room for linguistic classification or an in-depth study of Illyrian. Thus, it remains one of the least known Indo-European languages.

## 2. Illyrian and Messapic

Additional knowledge of Illyrian is sometimes sought in Messapic, an epigraphically attested Indo-European language spoken in ancient Apulia between the 6<sup>th</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE. In the past, some have considered it to be an offshoot

of Illyrian, brought into Italy by “Illyrian” migrants who had crossed the Adriatic Sea. Such a view of Messapic is summarised in KRAHE 1955, who relies heavily on its inscriptions as a source of Illyrian phonological and lexical data. In his compendium of Illyrian onomastic data, MAYER 1957 also includes parallels with Messapic onomastics, where possible. There are ancient sources that provide reasonable grounds for the Balkan origin of Messapic (gathered and commented in KATIČIĆ 1976b and in BENAC 1988; also see LOMBARDO 2014: 40f). For example, Pliny the Elder (3.102) records, without any additional context, that the area around Brundisium was settled by Illyrians: *Novem adulescentes totidemque virgines ab Illyriis XII populos genuere* – “Nine young men and women from the Illyrians gave birth to twelve peoples.” Antoninus Liberalis (31.1) mentions Ἰλλυριοὶ <οἱ> Μεσσαπίου – “Illyrians of Messapius” who, along with Iapyx, Daunius and Peucetius crossed the Adriatic and settled in Apulia, expelling the native population. These names represent eponyms of peoples who inhabited Apulia in Graeco-Roman times: Messapians, Iapygians, Daunians, and Peucetians (LOMBARDO 2014: 36–40). In general, scholarly literature refers to all of them as Messapians and to their language as Messapic. On the questions regarding this term and on the general features language itself see most recently MARCHESINI 2020. For further details regarding Messapic grammar, particularly morphology, see MATZINGER 2019.

There are some six hundred Messapic inscriptions, written in an alphabet derived from the western Greek variant used at the time in Tarentum (MATZINGER 2019: 13). They have been most recently edited in *Monumenta Linguae Messapicae* (MARCHESINI & DE SIMONE 2002). The inscriptions are mostly short, containing little more than personal names. Their interpretation is often difficult – a significant number of inscriptions are damaged or lost, and many of them are written in *scriptio continua*. However, some etymologically transparent forms make it clear that Messapic is of Indo-European stock, cf. *apa* ‘from’ < \**h<sub>2</sub>ep-o*, *ma* ‘not’ (prohibitive particle) < \**meh<sub>1</sub>*, *deiva* ‘divine’ [dat.sg.f.] < \**dei-ueh<sub>2</sub>-i* (if not borrowed from Italic), *berain* ‘carry’ [3pl.opt.praes.] < \**b<sup>h</sup>er-o-ih<sub>1</sub>-nt* (MATZINGER 2019: 64 equates it to Gk. φέροιεν), *klaohi zis* ‘may Zeus hear’ [3sg.opt.aor.] < \**kle/ou-s-ih<sub>1</sub>-t* (MATZINGER 2019: 83–85). Some phonological traits can be inferred from these forms, e.g., loss of aspiration, loss of final \**-t*, intervocalic \**s* > *h*, retention of PIE \**e*, PIE \**o* > *a*, PIE \**eh<sub>1</sub>* > \**ē* > *a*, PIE (\**eu* >) \**ou* > *ao*. Note that diphthongs become monophthongs, as in *klohi* ~ *klaohi*, *diva* ~ *deiva*. The PIE diphthong \**eu* seemingly becomes \**ou* (as in *klaohi*), but this is not without counterexamples, on which see DE SIMONE 1964: 31–34. The examples of *klaohi* and *klohi* also show that *o* is used to write /u/. While probable, it is ultimately not known whether Messapic preserved the distinction between long and short vowels (MATZINGER 2019: 27). It is also disputed whether the language is *centum* or *satem*. The form *klaohi* is not probative, since it may be an instance of \**kl̥*- > \**kl*-. A “*satem*” example could be the

name *barzidihi* [gen.sg.m.], with *barz-* < \**b<sup>h</sup>ryǵ-* ‘high’, cf. Skt. *bṛhánt-* ‘great, high’, Av. *bərəz-* ‘id.’, OHG *berg* ‘mountain’. A “*centum*” example would be *kos* ‘whoever, anyone’ < \**k<sup>h</sup>os*, cf. Skt. *káh* ‘who’, Lat. *quis* ‘id.’, if it indeed shows \**o* > /u/ in a labial environment. Here one must also wonder about the relevance of forms such as the personal name *penkaheh[e]* [gen.sg.m.] if it is derived from PIE \**penk<sup>h</sup>e* ‘five’, cf. Gk. πέντε, Skt. *páñca*, Lith. *penki*, or such as the ethnonym Πευκέτιοι/*Peucetii* if it is correctly compared with Gk. πεύκη ‘pine’, Lith. *pušis* ‘id.’

In any case, the main source of Illyro-Messapic correspondences is to be found in anthroponymy. The parallels adduced in the works of Krahe and Mayer should be approached carefully, as significant advances in the study of Messapic (and Illyrian) have been made during the last several decades. However, some parallels are quite obvious. For example, Messapic *bosat* [nom.sg.m.], *baosztas* [gen.sg.m.] corresponds to Delmato-Pannonian *Beusas*, *Beusantis*. Similarly, the name *dazet* [nom.sg.m.], *daštast* [gen.sg.m.] finds its counterpart in *Dasas*, *Dasantis*, a frequent name in the Delmato-Pannonian area. This name is also present in the south-eastern area, most frequently in the Greek inscriptions of Epidamnus as Δαζιος or Δαζαιος. While the correspondence between Messapic and Delmato-Pannonian forms may be old, DE SIMONE 1993: 38–39 argues that the occurrences from Epidamnus are Messapic names recently integrated into the indigenous anthroponymy. Forms such as *Plator* or the names in *Laid-/Laed-* that appear in Delmato-Pannonian and in south-eastern regions are present in Messapic as well, cf. *plator* [nom.sg.m.], *polaidehias* [nom.sg.m.?] and *laidehiabas* [dat.pl.m.]. Such correspondences, along with the reports in ancient sources, have led scholars to believe that the speakers of Messapic originated from the Balkans, and that their language is related to Illyrian. This is not an improbable assumption in itself, but the exact relation between Messapic and the ancient Balkan languages remains to be studied (cf. LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 160f).

Outside of the domain of onomastics, lexical correspondences between Messapic and Albanian have been observed as well (on this subject see MATZINGER 2005 and 2015). Some notable examples are Mess. *bilía* ‘daughter’, *bilihi* [gen.sg.] ‘son’, cf. Alb. *bijë* ‘daughter’, *bir* ‘son’, or Mess. βρένδον ‘deer’ (cf. *Brundisium*/Βρεντέσιον) and Alb. *bri*, Gheg *brī* ‘horns, antlers (pl.)’ (on their derivation see MATZINGER 2005: 34–35). It should be pointed out that the Illyrian gloss ῥινός ‘mist’ has also been attributed to the Oenotrians, a people neighbouring the Messapians, although with the meaning ‘cloud’ (MATZINGER 2005: 36f, LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 126). These and other examples analysed by Matzinger stand on firmer etymological grounds than onomastic parallels, but are equally unrevealing for the relationship between the two languages. In view of the chronological distance between Messapic and Albanian, and of the fragmentary state of Messapic texts, they may indicate common areal traits, as well as a close genetic relationship.

### 3. Illyrian and Slavic

To reiterate, there are no texts in Illyrian and virtually no glosses; most of the evidence comes from names. Roughly, there are two kinds of Illyrian names: personal names and place names (including rivers names and mountain names). Personal names can be found carved into Greek and Latin inscriptions of ancient Dalmatia while place names can be found both in ancient sources (such as Greek and Latin inscriptions and texts) and in the form of borrowings in Greek, Latin, Dalmatian Romance and Slavic. In this section we survey a number of borrowings in Slavic that are usually considered to be Illyrian; the data referred to can be found in section 4 below which was largely compiled following MAYER 1959, ERHSJ, SKOK 1917–20, 1950, MATASOVIĆ 1995, ANREITER 2001, ŠIMUNOVIĆ 2005, IVŠIĆ 2013, and ERHJ.

Borrowed place names of supposedly Illyrian origin include pts. 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59. In most cases these can further be sorted according to the region they were originally situated in. Illyria proper: pts. 3, 31?, 32, 39, 42, 54, 59. Dalmatia: pts. 4, 14, 18, 24, 31?, 34?, 35?, 41, 43?, 44, 45, 49, 51, 55. Liburnia: pts. 1, 6?, 8?, 19, 21?, 22, 23?, 26, 28, 29, 30, 33, 34?, 37, 40, 43?, 46?, 50, 56. Histria: pts. 10, 36, 58.

Non-onomastic terms of supposedly Illyrian origin include pt. 2, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 20, 27, 38, 47, 48, 52, 53, 57. Like place names, these too can be sorted according to the original region. Illyria proper: pt. 7, 13, 27, 38, 47, 48. Dalmatia: pt. 7, 9, 15, 16, 17, 27, 38, 47?, 52, 53. Liburnia: pt. 5?, 7, 11?, 13, 15, 16, 52, 53. Histria: pt. 5?, 7, 11?. (Pt. 2, 12, 20, 57 are difficult to sort.)

Subjects covered by the non-onomastic terms fall into a relatively small number of categories. Terrain configuration: pts. 9, 12, 13, 15, 17, 38, 52, 53. Herding livestock: pts. 2, 11, 16, 48. Family and household: pts. 20, 47, 57. Animals: pt. 7. Plants: pt. 27. Weather conditions: pt. 5. The two most prominent categories are those associated with terrain configuration and herding livestock, suggesting that Slavs viewed Illyrians (or what was left of them) largely as shepherds.

Most Illyrian borrowings in Slavic are indirect borrowings and were first borrowed from Illyrian into Latin, then inherited from Latin into Dalmatian Romance, then borrowed from Dalmatian Romance into Common Slavic, and finally inherited from Common Slavic into Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian, and Slovene. This is roughly the case with pts. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 59.

The remaining, comparatively smaller portion of Illyrian borrowings appears not to be mediated by Latin and/or Dalmatian Romance; see ПОПОВИЋ 1955: 155.

This seems to be the case with pts. 2, 9, 12, 16, 20, 27, 38, 47, 48, 57. Many of these borrowings are dubious, but if at least some are accurate, it would indicate that, at one point, Slavs and Illyrians (or what remained of them) were in direct contact.

The majority of Illyrian borrowings in Slavic originate from Serbo-Croatian; see pts. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59. A smaller number comes from Bulgarian and a yet smaller one from Slovene; see pts. 12, 20, 27, 47, 48, 57 and pts. 7, 11, 12, respectively.

#### 4. Illyrian Borrowings in Slavic

1. SCr. PN arch. *Bäg*, gen.sg. *Bgä*. Lat. *Vēgium*, An. Rav. *Bigi*. A seaside town in present-day Croatia, *Karlò-bäg*, and originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Vēgium*, loc.sg. *Vēgū* > Rom. \**βēgi* (≈ *Bigi*) → Sl. \**bъgъ* > SCr. *Bäg*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU I 149, ERHSJ I 88, HOLZER 2011: 93, IVŠIĆ 2013: 323f.

2. SCr. *bälega*; Alb. *bajgë*, dial. *balgë* | *bagël* | *baglë*, Romn. *bálegă* | *báligă*. All forms ‘dung’. Romn. *bálegă* | *báligă* may be a borrowing from Albanian or Serbo-Croatian; if so, not Dacian? Not in Bulgarian; therefore, not Thracian. Originally, Illyrian/Albanian? Alb. *bajgë* is sometimes compared with Gk. βόλ(β)ιτον ‘dung’ but that word is now considered a Pre-Greek borrowing; if so, the comparison of the Greek and the Albanian form is untenable. Ref. RJAZU I 164, ERHSJ I 100f, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 92f, DEMIRAJ 1997: 86f, OREL 1998: 14, BEEKES 2010: 224f, ERHJ I 40.

3. SCr. PN *Bär* / *Bâr*; Lat. (*Anti*-)*Bārium*, It. *Tivari*. A seaside town in present-day Montenegro and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Lat. (*Anti*-)*Bārium* > Rom. \*(*Anti*-)*Bār'u* → Sl. \*(*Ūt̕*-)*Bārj̕* > SCr. (*U(d)*-)*Bär/Bâr*; Lat. loc. sg. *Antibārī* > It. *Tivari*. Lat. (*Anti*-)*Bārium* is identical to Lat. *Bārium*, an ancient city in present-day Italy, *Bari*, and originally in Messapic territory. Lat. *Bārium* is usually compared to Gk. βᾶρις ‘large, fortified house’, an alleged Illyrian borrowing, and Mess. gloss βαυρία ‘house’. According to NIL, Gk. βᾶρις (← Ill.) and Mess. βαυρία derive from PIE *b<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>2</sub>u-* ‘to be’; if so, SCr. *Bär* is ultimately rather a Messapic than an Illyrian borrowing. Ref. RJAZU I 180, ERHSJ I 46, EPCJ II 176f, MARCHESINI & DE SIMONE 2002: II 56, LIV<sup>2</sup> 98ff, NIL 46ff, BEEKES 2010: 202.

4. SCr. PN *Bäst*; An. Rav. *Biston* (= Lat. \**Bistum*). A village immediately to the north of Makarska (pt. 24) in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. \**Bistum* > Rom. \**Bęstu* → Sl. \**Bęstъ* > SCr. *Bäst*. Lat. \**Bistum* is usually compared to Lat. *Bistue*, an ancient settlement in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU I 193, SKOK 1950: 95, HOLZER 2011: 93f, IVŠIĆ 2013: 121f.

5. SCr. dial. *bersîna*; Vegl. *bersáina*. Both forms ‘hoarfrost’. SCr. *bersîna* is confined to

the dialects of present-day Istria and Kvarner; therefore, Histrian and/or Liburnian? Borrowed into SCr. via Dalmatian Romance; cf. Vegl. *bersáina*. SCr. *bersîna* and Vegl. *bersáina* are usually compared to Lat. *pruîna* 'hoarfrost' < \**prusuîna* and Skt. *pruṣṣvâ-* 'drop of dew, cool drop' and derived from PIE \**prus-u-* 'sprinkling, drop'. There are no cognates in Albanian. Due to \**prusuîna* ~ *bersîna*, the SCr. form appears to be Histrian rather than Liburnian; if so, not Illyrian. Ref. BARTOLI 1906: II 173, ERHSJ I 140, DE VAAN 2008: 494.

6. SCr. PN *Bjševo*; It. *Busi* (= Lat. \**Busia*?). An islet immediately to the southwest of Vis in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory? Lib. → Lat. \**Busia*? (≈ *Busi*) > Rom. \**Būs'a*? → Sl. \**Bjš-* > SCr. *Bjš-evo* (sc. *ostrvo* 'island'). Mayer compares Lat. \**Busia* with Pann. PN *Beusas* and Mess. PNs *bosat* and *Busia*. Etymology unknown. Ref. KRAHE 1929: 26, MAYER 1959: 25f, SKOK 1950: 222, ERHSJ I 158, MARCHESINI & DE SIMONE 2002: II 70, EPCJ III 355.

7. SCr. *blāvōr*, dial. *mulavâr* 'European legless lizard, Pseudopus apodus', Sln. *molâvar* 'dragon'; Alb. *bullâr* 'European legless lizard, Pseudopus apodus; slow worm, Anguis fragilis', Romn. *bălâur* 'dragon; monster'. SCr. *blāvōr* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia and Montenegro; therefore, Delmato-Pannonian and Illyrian proper? SCr. *mulavâr* is comparable to Sln. *molâvar* and confined to the dialects of Kvarner and Kornati; therefore, Liburnian and/or Histrian? Borrowed into Slavic and Romanian via Dalmatian Romance and Balkan Latin. SCr. *blāvōr* and Romn. *bălâur* point to Lat. \**ballaurus* while SCr. *mulavâr* and Sln. *molâvar* point to Lat. \**mallaurus*. Lat. *ballaurus* → Sl. \**bъlavorъ* > SCr. *blāvōr*. The variation \**ballaurus* / \**mallaurus* can perhaps be compared to a similar alternation between *b* and *m* elsewhere in Palaeo-Balkan material, cf. Βενδις / Μενδις (Thracian divinity), and Βάργος / Μάργος (river in Moesia, present-day Morava in Serbia). Not in Bulgarian; therefore, not Thracian. Originally, Dacian, Illyrian, and Liburnian and/or Histrian? Derivative in *-aurus*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU I 427, ERHSJ I 169f, ΚΑΤΙČIĆ 1976a: 144, ESSJ I 25, ΜΑΤΑΣΟVIĆ 1995: 94, OREL 1998: 41, ЛИГОРИО 2017, ERHJ I 64.

8. SCr. PN *Brâč*; Lat. *Brattia*, It. *Brazza*. An island opposite the town of Makarska (pt. 4.24) in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory? Lib. → Lat. *Brattia* > Rom. \**Brăta* → Sl. \**Brāčъ* > SCr. *Brâč*; Lat. *Brattia* > It. *Brazza*. Lat. *Brattia* is usually compared with Mess. gloss βρένδον 'deer' and βρέντιον 'head of deer' in view of the fact that in Greek it was also known as Ἐλαφοῦσσα (from Gk. ἔλαφος 'deer'); if so, further cognates would include Mess. gloss *brunda* 'head of deer' and Lat. PN *Brundisium*, a city in present-day Italy, *Brindisi*, and originally in Messapic territory. Mess. βρένδον and *brunda* are usually compared with Alb. pl. *bri* 'horns, antlers' and derived from PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>ren(d)-* 'stag'. (There is no dental in the Albanian form.) According to Kroonen, Elfd. *brinde* 'elk' is unrelated. The appurtenance of

Lith. *briedis* 'elk, deer' is questionable. The Liburnian (?) form on which Lat. *Brattia* is based could conceivably derive from PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>rond-ǵ-* or *\*b<sup>h</sup>rnd-ǵ-*. Ref. RJAZU I 574, SKOK 1950: 172, RIX 1954, MAYER 1959: 27ff, ERHSJ I 195, DEMIRAJ 1997: 110f, OREL 1998: 36f, HOLZER 2011: 95, KROONEN 2013: 77, IVŠIĆ 2013: 125f, DERKSEN 2015: 100.

9. SCr. dial. *br̃na* 'hill; shore, bank'; Alb. *brin(j)ë* 'high ground; shore, bank'. SCr. *br̃na* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina; therefore, Delmato-Pannonian? Originally, Illyrian/Albanian? Alb. *brin(j)ë* is usually compared with OP int.sg. *baršnā* 'height, depth' and derived from PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>rǵ<sup>h</sup>-n-* 'high'. The Illyrian form on which SCr. *br̃na* is based could conceivably derive from PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>reǵ<sup>h</sup>-n-*. However, SCr. *br̃na* can also be an Albanian borrowing provided it was borrowed after PIE *\*r* > Alb. *ri* took place; if so, not Illyrian. Ref. RJAZU I 650, ERHSJ I 211, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 94.

10. PN SCr. *Bùzet*, arch. *Blzet*; Gk. Πικουέντον (= Lat. *\*Piquentum*, *Piquentini*, CIL V 428), It. *Pinguente*. A town in Istria, present-day Croatia and originally in Histrian territory. If so, Histrian rather than Illyrian? Hist. → Lat. *\*Piquentum* > Rom. *\*Ping(u)ente* → Sl. *\*Bьlzętь* (≈ *Blzet*) > SCr. *Bùzet*; Rom. *\*Pinguente* > It. *Pinguente*. Derivative in *-nt-*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU I 751, ERHSJ I 246, IVŠIĆ 2013: 247.

11. SCr. dial. *càp*, Sln. *càp*; Alb. *cap* / *cjap* / *sqap*, Romn. *șap*, It. *zappo*, MGk. dial. τσάπος. All forms 'billy-goat'. MGk. τσάπος is an Albanian borrowing. Romn. *șap* may be a borrowing from Albanian; if so, not Dacian? Not in Bulgarian; therefore, not Thracian. SCr. *càp* is confined to the dialects of Istria; therefore, Histrian and/or Liburnian? Likely borrowed into SCr. via (Dalmatian) Romance; cf. It. *zappo*. Originally, Histrian and/or Liburnian and Albanian? The etymology of Alb. *cap* is disputed; usually, it is derived from MoP *čapiš* 'goatling, kid' vel sim. but an Iranian Wanderwort seems hardly probable. It is better to consider the etymology unknown. Ref. REW<sup>5</sup> 9599, ERHSJ I 251, ESSJ I 58, OREL 1998: 47.

12. Bulg. *чѹка* 'rocky hill; peak', SCr. *čũka* 'hill, hilltop', Sln. *čũklja* 'hillslope'; Alb. *çukë* 'peak, top', Romn. *ciúca* / *cióaca* 'hilltop', MGk. dial. τσοũκα 'hill; swelling on face'. MGk. τσοũκα is an Albanian borrowing. Romn. *ciuca* / *cióaca* may be a borrowing from Albanian or Slavic; if so, not Dacian. Originally, Thracian and/or Illyrian/Albanian? The etymology of Alb. *çukë* is disputed. Perhaps it is a borrowing from (P)Celt. *\*klukā* 'rock' (> OIr. *cloch* 'stone; rock', W *clog* 'cliff; rockface', Co. *clog* 'rock', MBret. PN *Cleguer*); if so, South Sl. *\*čuka* would be best explained as a Proto-Albanian borrowing. Alternatively, Sl. *\*čuka* could be inherited from PIE *\*keuk-* 'bend, arch' whence in turn 'hill; high'; cf. Ru. dial. *чук* 'top, peak'. If so, Alb. *çukë* would be best explained as a Slavic borrowing. Ref. RJAZU II 97, REICHENKRON 1966: 99–103, ERHSJ I 340, ESSJ I 91, ЭССР IV 131f, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 95, 2009: 210, OREL 1998: 53, ERHJ I 136f.

13. SCr. dial. *dèr* / *dër* / *dàra* ‘calcareous soil’; Medieval Lat. *derrus* ‘calcareous soil’, Alb. *djerr* ‘fallow land’. SCr. *dèr* / *dër* / *dàra* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia; therefore, Liburnian and Illyrian proper? Borrowed into Serbo-Croatian via Dalmatian Romance; Lat. *derrus* > Rom. \**dèrru*, whence Dalm. Rom. \**djerru* (→ SCr. *dèr*) > \**djarru* (→ SCr. *dàra*). Originally Liburnian and Illyrian/Albanian? The etymology of Alb. *djerr* is disputed. Ref. RJAZU III 4, ERHSJ I 392, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 95f, OREL 1998: 69, ЛИГОРИО 2018.

14. SCr. PN *Dúmno*; Gk. Δάλμιον, Lat. *Delminium*. A town in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Tomislavgrad*, and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. loc.sg. *Delminiū* > Rom. \**Delmeni* → Sl. \**Дѣлмънъ* > SCr. *Dúmn-o* (sc. *polje* ‘field’). A derivative in *-inium*. Like Lat. *Delmatae*, Lat. *Delminium* is usually compared with Alb. dial. *delme* ‘sheep’, Gk. θήλυς ‘female’ and derived from PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>eh<sub>1</sub>(-i)-* ‘suck, suckle’ whence in turn ‘female’, ‘sheep’, etc. The Delmato-Pannonian form on which Gk. Δάλμιον, Lat. *Delminium* is based could conceivably derive from the zero-grade \**d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-l-m-*. Ref. RJAZU II 886, MAYER 1959: 36ff, ERHSJ I 456f, DEMIRAJ 1997: 127f, LIV<sup>2</sup> 138f, IVŠIĆ 2013: 153ff.

15. SCr. dial. *gârma* ‘rock, crack in a rock’; Alb. *karmë* ‘rock’. SCr. *gârma* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia; therefore, Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian? Probably borrowed into Serbo-Croatian via Dalmatian Romance. In Serbo-Croatian, it is a relatively late borrowing judging from the absence of metathesis *-ar-* > *-ra-*. Originally, Liburnian and Illyrian/Albanian? According to Demiraj, Alb. *karmë* is a dialect variant of Alb. *karpë* ‘rock’; see pt.52. Ref. RJAZU III 108, ERHSJ I 553f, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 96, DERMIRAJ 1997: 213.

16. SCr. dial. *glîza* ‘curdled milk’; Alb. *gjizë* ‘cheese curd; cheese’. SCr. *glîza* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia and Herzegovina; therefore, Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian? Originally Liburnian and Illyrian/Albanian? Alb. *gjizë* is usually compared with Gk. γλοιός ‘any glutinous substance, gum’, PSl. \**glina* ‘clay’, etc. and derived from PIE \**gle(h<sub>1</sub>)i-* ‘form’ whence in turn ‘slime’, ‘clay’, etc. However, SCr. *glîza* can also be a Proto-Albanian borrowing provided it was borrowed before \**gli-* > *gji-* took place. Ref. ERHSJ I 570, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 96, DEMIRAJ 1997: 189.

17. SCr. PN *Grîpe*, a neighbourhood of Split in present-day Croatia and originally in Delamato-Pannonian territory, dial. *grîpa* ‘rock, crag’; Medieval Lat. PN *Criapis*, a cave above Kotor in present-day Montenegro and originally in Illyrian territory, It. dial. *creppo* / *grappa* ‘rock’. SCr. *grîpa* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia; therefore, Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian? Borrowed into SCr. via Dalmatian Romance; Ill. / DP → Lat. \**grepp-* / *crepp-* > Rom. \**grepp-* > \**grîepp-* → Sl. \**grěp-* > SCr. (Ik.) *grîpa*; Lat. \**grepp-* / *crepp-* > Rom. \**crepp-* > Dalm. Rom. \**crîep(p)-* > \**crîap(p)-* → Medieval Lat. *Criapis*; Lat. \**grepp-* / *crepp-* > It. *creppo*. Originally, Liburnian, Delamto-Pannonian and Illyrian? Likely cognate with SCr.

*škràpa*; see pt. 52. Lat. *Criapis* could in particular be comparable to SCr. Ek. PN *Crès* / Ik. *Crës*, a settlement and an eponymous island in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory, which is attested as *Crexi* in Medieval Latin and *Cherso* in Italian. Ref. RJAŽU I 821, ERHSJ I 618, Ivšić 2013: 146f.

18. SCr. PN *Ìmota*, a historic county in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory; Const. Porph. Ἡμοτα. Perhaps DP → Lat. ? > Rom. \**Ēmate* → Sl. \**Ĭmot-* (≈ Ἡμοτα) > SCr. *Ìmota*. Usually compared with It. An. (*H*)*aemate*, an ancient settlement in present day-Bosnian and Herzegovina and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. Derivative in *-atae*; cf. *Delm-atae*. Therefore, originally a tribe name? Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAŽU III 825, ERHSJ I 718, Ivšić 2013: 78.

19. SCr. PN *Ist* / *Jist*; Medieval Lat. *Gistum*. An islet immediately to the north of Molat (pt. 26) in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. It is unclear whether the *g* of Lat. *Gistum* is original or back-formed after the *j* of SCr. *Jist*. In either case, a derivative in *-(V)st-*? Etymology unknown. Ref. SKOK 1950: 95.

20. Bulg. *κòνελε* / *κòνιλε* 'lad, chap; bastard', SCr. *kòpile* 'bastard'; Romn. *copíl* 'child', Alb. *kopíl* 'lad, chap; bastard', MGk. *κοπέλος* 'stepson; servant'. MGk. *κοπέλος* could be a Slavic borrowing, probably from Bulgarian. Romn. *copíl* may be an Albanian borrowing; if so, not Dacian? Bulg. *κòνελε* / *κòνιλε* and SCr. *kòpile* need not be Illyrian borrowings; they can be Proto-Albanian borrowings instead. However, the accent of the Slavic forms does not appear to fit the accent of the Albanian form. The etymology of Alb. *kopíl* 'lad, chap; bastard' is disputed; most frequently, it is claimed that *kopíl* is a compound made of the prefix *ko-* 'ill-, bad' and the deverbative \**pil*, related to *pjell* 'beget, give birth to', hence 'ill-begotten, bastard'. Ref. RJAŽU V 298, REICHENKRON 1966: 112f, ERHSJ II 147f, БЕР II 614f, ЭССРЯ XI 30ff, OREL 1998: 190, ERHJ I 478f.

21. SCr. PN *Kòpist*; Lat. *Capista*. An islet immediately to the west of Lastovo (pt. 4.23) in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory? Lib. → Lat. *Capísta* > Rom. \**Kapísta?* → Sl. \**Kopístъ?* > SCr. *Kòpist*. A derivative in *-(V)st-*. Etymology unknown. SCr. *Kòpist* would seem to point to Lat. *Cápista* rather than *Capísta*; if so, the accent in Lat. *Cápista* would be as in Lat. \**Ládesta* → SCr. *Làstovo*. Ref. SKOK 1950: 222.

22. SCr. PN *Làbīn*; Lat. *Alvōna*, An. Rav. *Albōna*. A town in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Alvōna* > Rom. \**Alβūna* (≈ *Albōna*) → Sl. \**Lābŷnъ* > SCr. *Làbīn*. A derivative in *-ōna*.<sup>1</sup> Mayer compares Lat. *Albōna* with

<sup>1</sup> According to ЛОМА & ЛОМА 2011, the PN *Labun* (a hill near Olovo in Bosnia) belongs here too and derives directly from the form in *-ōna*; the Delmatae, resettled by the Romans, brought the toponym to the hinterland. The accent of *Labun* is apparently unknown, but is possibly identical to *Sòlūn* < *Salōna*; cf. pt. 44.

Lat. *albus* ‘white’, Gk. ἀλφός ‘whiteness, white leprosy’, etc. and derives it from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>elb<sup>h</sup>-* ‘white’. This would hold only if *Albōna*, not *Alvōna*, is the original variant but, in fact, *Alvōna* happens to be attested earlier than *Albōna*. Questionable. Ref. RJAZU V 860, MAYER 1959: 4, ERHSJ II 256, HOLZER 2011: 120, IVŠIĆ 2013: 83f.

23. SCr. PN *Lästovo*, arch. *Lasta*; Gk. Λάδεστα, Const. Porph. Λάστοβον, Ven. *Laesta*. An island in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory? Lib. → Lat. *\*Ládesta* > Rom. *\*La(d)sta* → SCr. *Lasta*, whence *Läst-ovo* (sc. *ostrvo* ‘island’) (= Λάστοβον); Lat. *\*Ládesta* > Ven. *Laesta*. A derivative in *-(V)st-*. Etymology unknown. The accent in Lat. *\*Ládesta* is conspicuously recessive, a trait found also in some Italian place names of Messapic origin; cf. e.g. It. *Brindisi* (pt. 8) next to Lat. *Brundisium*. Ref. RJAZU V 917, SKOK 1950: 219ff, HOLZER 2011: 121, IVŠIĆ 2013: 200f.

24. SCr. PN *Màkar-skā*; Lat. *Muccurum*, An. Rav. *Mucru*, Const. Porph. Μοκρόν. A town in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Muccurum* > Rom. *\*Μοκρου* (≈ *Mucru*, Μοκρόν) → Sl. *\*Μὲκρѣ* > SCr. *Makar*. An *r*-derivative? Mayer compares Lat. *Mucc-urum* with Gk. μυχός ‘innermost place, nook’ which is now considered a Pre-Greek borrowing. Skok on the other hand considers Lat. *Muccurum* a Mediterranean borrowing; if so, not Illyrian. Ref. RJAZU VI 398, MAYER 1959: 80, ERHSJ II 359, BEEKES 2010: 987, HOLZER 2011: 124, IVŠIĆ 2013: 220f.

25. SCr. PN *Mogorjelo*. Site of a Roman villa in present-day Herzegovina and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Ill. → Lat. *\*Magul-ella* » Rom. *\*Magurella* > *\*Magurjella* → Sl. *\*Mogorĕlo* > SCr. *Mogorjelo*. Lat. *\*Magul-ella* is usually compared to Alb. *magulë* ‘heap’ which is in turn comparable to Lith. *gāmalas* ‘lump; chunk’ and PSl. *\*gomo(ĭ)a* / *\*gomula* ‘lump’. Etymology unknown. Alb. *magulë* was likely borrowed into Slavic as *\*mogyla* ‘heap; mound’ (OCS *mogyla* ‘heap’, Ru. *mogila* ‘grave’, Cz. *mohyla* ‘heap; grave’) and Romn. *măgură* ‘hill; mound’; if so, there is no particular reason to consider these borrowings Illyrian. Ref. ERHSJ I 588, OREL 1998: 109, ЛИГОРИО 2018.

26. SCr. PN *Mòlat*; Lat. *Malāta*, Ven. *Melada*. An islet immediately to the north of Dugi Otok in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Malāta* > Rom. *\*Malāta* → Sl. *\*Molātъ* > SCr. *Mòlat*; Lat. *Malāta* > Ven. *Melada*. Lat. *Malāta* is usually compared with Lat. PN (Dacia) *Malvensis*, (*municipium*) *Malve(n)siatium* (in Bosnia), *Di-mallum* (in Albania), Alb. *mal* ‘mountain’, Romn. *mal* ‘bank, shore’. Perhaps PN *Καπό-μαλβα* (*castellum* in Dardania) belongs here too. The appurtenance of *Malavicus* (CIL III 10121, Rab) is questionable. It is a cognomen appearing in a Venetic context (cf. UNTERMANN 1961: 78, 125). The etymology of these forms is disputed; however, most often they are compared with Gk. βλώσχω ‘come, go’, Sl. *\*(po)molĕti* ‘stand out’, etc. and derived from PIE *\*melh<sub>3</sub>-* ‘appear’. The Liburnian form on which Lat. *Malāta* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade *\*molh<sub>3</sub>-*. Lat. *Malāta* is probably further comparable to SCr. PN *Mòlunat*,

-*ūnta* (Lat. *Maluntum*), a peninsula in present-day Croatia and originally in Illyrian proper territory, which likely reflects an *o*-grade root and a zero-grade *nt*-suffix, \**molh<sub>3</sub>-nt-*. The *ν* in Lat. *Malvensis*, *Malve(n)siatium* stems either from a *u*-stem, \**molh<sub>3</sub>-u-*, or from the incorrect analysis of a form such as *Maluntum*, i.e. *Maluntum* instead of *Mal-untum*. Ref. RJAZU VI 910, 920, MAYER 1957: 218, MAYER 1959: 73f, SKOK 1950: 94, ERHSJ II 450, 452 DEMIRAJ 1997: 244ff, LIV<sup>2</sup> 433f, ЛОМА 2010b: 286f.

27. Bulg. *молѹка* / *морѹка* ‘spruce tree’, *морѹква* ‘juniper berry’, SCr. *molika* ‘spruce tree; pine tree’, *omòrika* ‘spruce tree’; Romn. *molíd(f)* / *molít(f)* ‘spruce tree’, Alb. *molikë* ‘silver fir’. Romn. *molíd(f)* / *molít(f)* is a Slavic borrowing, from a *u*-stem such as \**moliky*, gen.sg. *molikъve*; cf. Bulg. *морѹква*. SCr. *omòrika* is confined to the dialects of present-day Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Dalmatia; therefore, Illyrian proper and Delmato-Pannonian? Originally, Thracian and/or Illyrian/Albanian? However, Alb. *molikë* may be a Slavic borrowing according to Demiraj; if so, then Illyrian and/or Thracian? There is no definite etymology. To PIE \**melh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘black’? The Illyrian form on which Sl. \**moliky* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade \**molh<sub>2</sub>-*. However, Bulg. *морѹк(Ѹ)а* and SCr. *omòrika* would have to be borrowed from a rhotacised reflex of that grade; cf. Alb. *Arbër* ‘Albanian’ next to Gk. Ἄλβανος ‘Albanian’? Ref. RJAZU VI 912, VIII 927, ERHSJ II 451, 555, BEP IV 243, DEMIRAJ 1997: 290f, ERHJ II 46.

28. SCr. PN *Mòsor*; Lat. *Massarum*. Two mountains, one overlooking Split in present-day Croatia and the other in the vicinity of Travnik in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina, both originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Massarum* > Rom. \**Massaru* → Sl. \**Mosorъ* > SCr. *Mòsor*. Mayer compares Lat. *Massarum* with Gk. μέγας ‘great, big’, OPhr. *mekas* ‘great, big’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**meg<sub>2</sub>-* ‘great, big’. Here also Delmato-Pannonian PN *Masaurus*, Maced. PN Μάζαρος? The Delmato-Pannonian form on which Lat. *Massarum* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade \**moǵ<sub>2</sub>-*. Ref. RJAZU VII 18, MAYER 1957: 220f. MAYER 1959: 76, ERHSJ II 459, HOLZER 2011: 129, IVŠIĆ 2013: 213f.

29. SCr. PN *Nàdīn*; Lat. *Nēdīnum*. A village in the vicinity of Zadar in present-day Croatia, originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Nēdīnum* > Rom. \**Nedīnu* → Sl. \**Nьdīnъ* > SCr. *Nàdīn*. Mayer compares Lat. *Nēdīnum* with Skt. *nādati* ‘sound, roar, howl’ and derives it from PIE \**ned-* ‘boom’, which is supposed to be in reference to a stream which once passed through the ancient Nedinum. (There is no such stream today.) The Liburnian form on which Lat. *Nēdīnum* is based could conceivably derive the long *e*-grade PIE \**nēd-*. Ref. RJAZU VII 272, MAYER 1959: 82f, ERHSJ II 497, LIV<sup>2</sup> 448, HOLZER 2011: 131, IVŠIĆ 2013: 229f.

30. SCr. PN *Nīn*; Lat. *Aenōna*, Const. Porph. Νῶνα. A seaside town in the vicinity of Zadar in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat.

(*Ae*)*nōna* (≈ Νῶνα) > Rom. \**Nūna* → Sl. \**Nŷnъ* > SCr. *Nīn*. A derivative in *-ōna*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU VIII 186, SKOK 1954, ERHSJ II 519, HOLZER 2011: 132f, IvŠIĆ 2013: 78ff.

31. SCr. PN *Nòrīn*; Lat. *Narōna*. A tributary of the Neretva river in present-day Croatia and originally on the border of Illyrian proper and Delmato-Pannonian territory. Ill. / DP → Lat. *Narōna* > Rom. \**Narūna* → Sl. \**Norŷnъ* > SCr. *Nòrīn*. Derivative in *-ōna*. Originally, Lat. *Narōna* referred to a settlement situated at the source of the river Norin and then came to designate the river. Mayer compares Lat. *Nar-ōna* with Lith. *nėrti* ‘dive’, OCS *-nrěti* ‘go deep into’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**nerH-* ‘sink’. The Illyrian form on which Lat. *Narōna* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade \**norH-*. Ref. RJAZU VIII 229, MAYER 1959: 83, ERHSJ II 524, LIV<sup>2</sup> 454, HOLZER 2011: 133f, IvŠIĆ 2013: 226f.

32. SCr. PN dial. *Òcinj*, OSerb. *Љџинь*; Lat. *Ulcinium*, It. *Dulcigno*, Alb. *Ulqin*. A town in present-day Montenegro, *Ūlcinj*, and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Ill. → Lat. *Ulcinium* > Rom. \**Ulkēn’u* → Sl. \**Љlcīnjъ* > SCr. *Òcinj*; Lat. loc.sg. *Ulciniū* > Rom. \**ulkēni* → Sl. \**Љlcīnъ* > OSerb. *Љџинь*; Lat. *dē Ulciniō* > It. *Dulcigno*. SCr. *Ūlcinj* is formally unclear; perhaps a cross between SCr. *Òcinj* and Alb. *Ulqin* or It. *Dulcigno*? Derivative in *-inium*. Mayer compares Lat. *Ulc-inium* with Gk. *λύκος* ‘wolf’, Alb. arch. *ulk* ‘wolf’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**ulkʷ-* ‘wolf’. Ref. RJAZU VIII 504, MAYER 1959: 120f, ERHSJ III 541, HOLZER 2011: 134.

33. SCr. PN *Plòmīn*; Lat. *Flanōna*. A village in the vicinity of Labin in present-day Croatia and originally on Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Flanōna* > Rom. \**Flamūna*? → Sl. \**Plomŷnъ* > SCr. *Plòmīn*. Derivative in *-ōna*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU X 82, ERHSJ II 688, HOLZER 2011: 140, IvŠIĆ 2013: 174.

34. SCr. PN *Promīn*; Lat. *Prōmōna*. An inland village, *Pròmīna*, in present-day Croatia and originally on the border of Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian territory. Lib. / DP → Lat. *Prōmōna* > Rom. \**Promūna* → Sl. \**Promŷnъ* > SCr. *Promīn*. A derivative in *-ōna*. Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU XII 356, ERHSJ III 50, IvŠIĆ 2013: 258f.

35. SCr. PN *Pset*. Also, Const. Porph. Πεσέντα. A historic county in present-day Bosnia and Herzegovina whose exact location is as yet unknown. Skok compares Gk. Πισσαντίνοι, name of an Illyrian tribe. (Not a Messapic tribe, as claimed in ERHSJ.) Derivative in *-ent-?* Etymology unknown. Ref. RJAZU XII 575, ERHSJ III 64.

36. SCr. PN *Pūlj*; Lat. *Pōla*. A city, *Pūla*, in present-day Croatia and originally in Histrian territory. If so, Histrian rather than Illyrian? Hist. → Lat. *Pola* > Rom. \**Pōla* → Sl. \**Pūljъ* > SCr. *Pūlj*; Lat. *Pola* > It. *Pola* (→ SCr. *Pūla*). Mayer compares Lat. *Pola* with Skt. *pura-* ‘city’, Gk. *πόλις* ‘city’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**tpolH-* ‘city’. Note PIE \**o* > Hist. \**o* as opposed to PIE \**o* > Ill. \**a*, DP \**a*; see sec 7.1. Ref. RJAZU XII 647, MAYER 1959: 94ff Ref. HOLZER 2011: 143, IvŠIĆ 2013: 250f.

37. SCr. PN *Ràb*; Const. Porph. Ἄρβη, Lat. *Arba*, It. *Arbe*. An island in present-day Croatia situated and originally in Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Arba* > Rom. \**Arba* → Sl. \**Rābъ* > SCr. *Ràb* (and *Râb*); Lat. loc.sg. *Arbae* (≈ Ἄρβη) > It. *Arbe*. Mayer compares Lat. *Arba* with OE *eorp* ‘dark’, Ru. dial. *rjabój* ‘speckled’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>erb<sup>h</sup>*- ‘dark’, which is supposed to be in reference to the pine woods that grow on the island. The Liburnian form on which SCr. *Ràb* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade \**h<sub>1</sub>orb<sup>h</sup>*-. Ref. RJAZU XII 829, SKOK 1950: 57, MAYER 1959: 12, ERHSJ III 98, HOLZER 2011: 143, IVIŠIĆ 2013: 278f.

38. SCr. *rîpa* ‘rock, cliff’; Alb. *rripë* ‘precipice’, Romn. *râpă* ‘ravine, precipice’. SCr. *rîpa* is confined to the dialects of present day Montenegro, Herzegovina and Serbia; therefore, Illyrian proper and Delmato-Pannonian? Possibly cognate with SCr. *grîpa* ‘rock, crag’; see pt. 17. Alb. *rripë* and Romn. *râpă* may be cognate with SCr. (*g*)*rîpa*; however, they may also derive from Lat. *rîpa* ‘river bank’ (as is sometimes assumed). If so, SCr. *rîpa* is exclusively Illyrian. Questionable. Ref. RJAZU XIV 30, ERHSJ III 145, OREL 1998: 386f.

39. SCr. PN *Rîsan*, -*sna*; Lat. *Risinium*. A town in present-day Montenegro and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Ill. → Lat. loc.sg. *Risinii* > Rom. \**Riseni* → Sl. \**Rîsъnъ* > SCr. *Rîsan*. A derivative in *-inium*. Mayer compares Lat. *Risinium* with Alb. *rrjedh* ‘flow, stream’ and derives it from PIE \*(*H*)*reǵ-* ‘flow’ whence in turn ‘river’, ‘stream’, etc. Ref. RJAZU XIV 34, MAYER 1959: 95f, ERHSJ I 456, LIV<sup>2</sup> 498.

40. SCr. PN *Sěnj*; Lat. *Senia*, It. *Segna*. A town in present-day Croatia and originally on Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Senia* > Rom. \**Sen’a* → Sl. \**Senjъ* > SCr. *Sěnj*; Lat. *Senia* > It. *Segna*. Mayer compares Lat. *Senia* with Skt. *sánaḥ* ‘old’, Gk. ἔνως ‘last year’s’ etc. and derives it from PIE \**sen-* ‘old’. Originally perhaps Lat. (sc. *Pola*) *Senia* ‘Old City’; see pt. 36. Ref. RJAZU XIV 852, MAYER 1959: 103, ERHSJ III 222, HOLZER 2011: 147, IVIŠIĆ 2013: 278.

41. SCr. PN *Sînj*, arch. *Vsînj*; Lat. *Osinium*. A town in the vicinity of Split in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Osinium* > Rom. \**Osēn’u* → Sl. \*(*Vъ*)*Sînjъ* > SCr. *Sînj*, arch. *Vsînj*. A derivative in *-inium*. Based on SCr. *Vsînj*, Skok extrapolates Lat. \**Vis-inium*; he compares Alb. *vise* ‘place’, Gk. οἶκος ‘house’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**ueik-* ‘settlement’. On the other hand, Anreiter compares Lat. *Os-inium* with OPr. *woasis* ‘ash-tree’, Lith. *úosis* ‘ash-tree’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**Heh<sub>3</sub>-s-* ‘ash-tree’. It is not obvious which etymology is to be preferred. Ref. RJAZU XV 43, ERHSJ III 239, 567 DEMIRAJ 1997: 419, OREL 1998: 508, ANREITER 2001: 96, IVIŠIĆ 2013: 239f.

42. SCr. PN *Skădar*, -*dra*, OSerb. *Скѡдръ*; Lat. *Scodra*. A city in present-day Albania and an eponymous lake, both originally in Illyrian proper territory. Ill. → Lat. *Scodra* > Rom. \**Skodra* → Sl. \**Skъdъrъ* (≈ *Скѡдръ*) > SCr. *Skădar*. Ref. RJAZU XV 185, ERHSJ III 253.

43. SCr. PN *Skrādīn*; Lat. *Scardōna*. A town at the confluence of Krka and Čikola rivers in present-day Croatia and originally on the border of Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian territory. Lib. / DP → Lat. *Scardōna* > Rom. \**Skardūna* → Sl. \**Skrādŷnъ* > SCr. *Skrādīn*. Derivative in *-ōna*. Lat. *Scardōna* is usually compared with Lat. *Scardus* / *Scordus* (sc. *mons*), Šar Mountain in present-day Albania, Macedonia, and Serbia and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Lat. *Scard-ōna*, Lat. *Scord-us* / *Scard-us* may derive from PIE \*(s)kerd<sup>h</sup>- ‘cut off’ or PIE \*(s)kerd- > (s)kerh<sub>1</sub>- ‘sever’. The Liburnian and Illyrian form on which Lat. *Scardōna*, *Scardus* / *Scordus* is based could conceivably derive from *o*-grade \**skord*<sup>(h)</sup>-. Ref. RJAZU XV 307f, MAYER 1959: 107, ERHSJ III 268, LIV<sup>2</sup> 558, HOLZER 2011: 14f8f, IVŠIĆ 2013: 274f.

44. SCr. PN *Sòlīn*; Lat. *Salōna*. A town in the vicinity of Split in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Salōna* > Rom. \**Salūna* → Sl. \**Solŷnъ* > SCr. *Sòlīn*. Derivative in *-ōna*.<sup>2</sup> Mayer compares Lat. *Salōna* with Lat. *saliō* ‘leap’, Gk. ἄλλομαι ‘leap’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**sel-* ‘leap’, which is supposed to be in reference to the river Salon passing through Salona. However, *Salōna* could also derive from PIE \**sh<sub>2</sub>l-* ‘salt’ (whence in turn possibly ‘sea’ and the like). If the former is true, the Delmato-Pannonian form (or Liburnian?) on which Lat. *Salōna* is based could conceivably derive from *o*-grade \**sol-*, and if the latter is true, it could derive from zero grade \**sh<sub>2</sub>l-*. Ref. RJAZU XV 907f, MAYER 1959: 97f, ERHSJ III 304f, LIV<sup>2</sup> 527f, HOLZER 2011: 149.

45. SCr. PN EK. *Srēm* / Ijek. *Srĭjem*; Lat. *Sirmium* / *Sermium*. An area between the Sava and the Danube in present-day Serbia, and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory? DP → Lat. *Sirmium* > Rom. \**Sermu* → Sl. \**Srēmъ* > SCr. *Srēm* / *Srĭjem*. Mayer compares Lat. *Sirmium*, *Sermium* with Skt. *sarā-* ‘flowing, liquid’, Lat. *serum* ‘whey’, etc. and derives it from PIE \**ser-* ‘run, flow’. Compare pt. 46 below. Ref. XVI 305f, RJAZU MAYER 1959: 103, ERHSJ III 320, HOLZER 2011: 151, IVŠIĆ 2013: 288ff.

46. SCr. PN Ik. arch. *Srim-ač*. An island, *Murter*, in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory? Lib. → Lat. *Sirm-* > Rom. \**Serm-* → Sl. \**Srēm-* > SCr. Ik. *Srim-*. SCr. *Srim-* is identical with SCr. Ek. *Srēm* / Ijek. *Srĭjem*; see pt. 45 above. Ref. RJAZU XVI 308, SKOK 1950: 146, ERHSJ III 320, VULETIĆ 2010: 339.

47. SCr. *stòpan-in*, Bulg. *stòpan-in*, both forms ‘master’; Ge. *sthëpâ* (pl. *sthëpanj*) ‘head shepherd’, Romn. *stâpân* ‘master’. SCr. *stòpan-in* is confined to the dialects of present-day Herzegovina and Montenegro; therefore, Delmato-Pannonian and Illyrian proper? SCr. *stòpan-in* and Bulg. *stòpan-in* point to Sl. \**stopanъ*. Romn. *stâpân* is likely a Slavic borrowing. It cannot be excluded that Ge. *sthëpâ* is a Slavic borrowing as well. Thracian cannot be excluded. If so, Thracian and Illyrian? The

<sup>2</sup> According to JOMA & JOMA 2011, the PN *Sòlūn* (a village near Olovo in Bosnia) belongs here too. The historical context is similar to that of *Labun*; cf. pt. 22. *Sòlūn* also directly continues the form in *-ōna*.

etymology is disputed; sometimes, it is derived from PIE *\*steh<sub>2</sub>(-p)*- ‘stand’. Ref. RJAZU XVI 628, ERHSJ III 339, BEP VII 477, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 97, OREL 1998: 438.

48. SCr. dial. *strùga*, Bulg. *stràga*; Alb. *shtrungë*, Romn. *strungă*, MGk. στρούγγα. All forms ‘sheepfold, pen in which sheep are milked’. MGk. στρούγγα is a Romanian borrowing. Romn. *strungă* may be an Albanian borrowing; if so, not Dacian? SCr. *strùga* and Bulg. *stràga* point to Sl. *\*stroga*. SCr. *strùga* is confined to the dialects present-day Serbia and Montenegro; therefore, Illyrian proper? Originally, Illyrian/Albanian? However, Sl. *\*stroga* may also be a Thracian borrowing; cf. Gk. Στρούγγες, a Thracian tribe. If so, then Thracian and Albanian rather than Illyrian/Albanian? The etymology of Alb. *shtrungë* is disputed. Ref. RJAZU XVI 774, ERHSJ III 348, BEP VII 510, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 97, OREL 1998: 443, LIV<sup>2</sup> 604.

49. SCr. PN *Stupin*; Lat. *Stolpōna*. A village in the vicinity of Rogoznica in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Stolpōna* > Rom. *\*Stolpūna* → Sl. *\*Stǫlpŭnъ* > SCr. *Stupin*. Derivative in *-ōna*. Mayer compares Lat. *Stolpōna* with Lith. *stulpas* ‘pillar’, Ru. *столн* ‘pole, column’ etc. and derives it from PIE *\*stulp-* ‘beam, log’. Ref. MAYER 1959: 110, ERHSJ III 353, Ivšić 2013: 300.

50. SCr. PN arch. *Sulet*; Lat. *Sōlenta*, It. *Solta*. An island, *Šolta*, in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. Lat. *Sōlenta* > Rom. *\*Solenta* → Sl. *\*Sǫlētъ* > *Sulet*. It. *Solta* (→ SCr. *Šolta*) is unclear. Derivative in *-ent-*. Lat. *Sōl-enta* is usually compared with Lat. *Sal-ōna* < PIE *\*sel-* ‘leap’; see pt. 44 above. The Liburnian form on which Lat. *Sōlenta* is based could conceivably derive from the long *o*-grade *\*sōl-*. Ref. RJAZU XVI 928, SKOK 1950: 167, ERHSJ III 359, Ivšić 2013: 293ff.

51. SCr. PN *Škarda*. An islet immediately to the south of Silba in present-day Croatia and originally in Liburnian territory. *Škard* of SCr. *Škard-a* is identical to *Scard-* of Lat. *Scard-ōna*; see pt. 43 above. However, SCr. *Škarda* is a later borrowing than Lat. *Scardōna* > SCr. *Skràdīn* because it does not show metathesis *-ar-* > *-ra-*; cf. pt. 15. Ref. SKOK 1950: 95, ERHSJ III 268, Ivšić 2013: 276.

52. SCr. dial. *škràpa* ‘crack in a rock’; Alb. *karpë* ‘rock’. SCr. *škràpa* is confined to the dialects of present-day Dalmatia; therefore, Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian? Likely borrowed into SCr. via Dalmatian Romance. Originally, Liburnian and Illyrian/Albanian? Alb. *karpë* derives from PIE *\*(s)korp-* ‘cut’; cf. Lith. *kerpù*, *kiřpti* ‘chop, cut’. The shift from ‘cut’ to ‘rock’ as in pt. 43 and 53. Likely cognates include SCr. *grīpa* ‘rock, crag’ and *rīpa* ‘rock, cliff’; see pt. 17, 38 above. Further cognates may include Gk. Καρπ-άτης (sc. ὄρος), Carpathian mountains, and It. dial. *carparu* ‘building stone’ (Salento), a borrowing of allegedly Messapic origin. The Delmato-Pannonian form on which SCr. *škràpa* is based could conceivably derive from *o*-grade *\*skorp-* and the Liburnian form either from *o*-grade *\*skorp-* or zero-grade *\*skrp-*. Ref. RJAZU XVII 667, ERHSJ I 553f, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 96, DEMIRAJ 1997: 213, 363f, LIV<sup>2</sup> 559.

53. SCr. PN *T̃mor*, pasture land in present-day Herzegovina and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory, dial. *t̃mor* ‘rock, rocky terrain’. SCr. *t̃mor* is confined to the dialects of present day Dalmatia and Herzegovina; therefore, Liburnian and Delmato-Pannonian? Likely borrowed into SCr. via Dalmatian Romance. Derivative in *-aurus*. Originally, Illyrian? No definite cognates in Albanian. Skok compares SCr. *t̃mor* with Lat. *tumeō* and derives it from PIE *\*tuem-* ‘swell’. Rather from PIE *\*temh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘cut’? For the shift from ‘cut > ‘cut off’ to ‘rock; mountain’ in Illyrian cf. pt. 43. Ref. RJAZU XVIII 331, ERHSJ III 470, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 97, LIV2 625, 654.

54. SCr. PN *T̃vat*, *T̃vta*. A town in present-day Montenegro and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Skok compares SCr. *T̃vat* to Ill. PN *Teuta* and derives it from PIE *\*teut-* ‘people, tribe’ but Ligorio prefers to derive it from Lat. *tēctum* ‘roof’, which is supposed to be in reference to Vrmac, a distinctly triangular hill overlooking Tivat; cf. Lat. *tectum* > Rom. *\*Tektu* → Sl. *\*Tek̃t̃t̃* > Čak. *Tihat* (> *Tijat*), gen.sg. *Tihta* (> *Tijta*), an likewise distinctly triangular islet in present-day Croatia. If so, SCr. *T̃vat* would rather be a Latin borrowing than Illyrian. Ref. RJAZU XVIII 359, ERHSJ III 475f, LIGORIO 2016 (in *Stellingen*).

55. SCr. PN *Tr̃lj*; Lat. *Tilūrium*. A town in the vicinity of Split in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory. DP → Lat. *Tilūrium* > Rom. *\*Tilūr’u* → Sl. *\*T̃r̃l̃’b* > SCr. *Tr̃lj*. Mayer compares Lat. *Tilūrium* with Lat. *tellus* ‘earth, ground’, SCr. *tl̃ō* ‘ground’ etc. and derives it from PIE *\*telh<sub>2</sub>-* ‘ground’, which is supposed to be in reference to the *Pōns Tilūrī*, the bridge of Tilurium, which was a way to cross the river *\*Centōn* (→ SCr. *C̃etina*). Lat. *Tilūrium* is potentially comparable with Lat. *Tilagus*, a settlement on present-day Dugi Otok in Croatia and originally on Liburnian territory. Ref. RJAZU XVIII 664, MAYER 1959: 117, ERHSJ III 477f, HOLZER 2011: 156, IVŠIĆ 2013.

56. SCr. PN *Tr̃sāt*; Lat. *Tarsatica*, It. *Tersatto*. A hill overlooking Rijeka in present-day Croatia and originally on Liburnian territory. Lib. → Lat. *Tarsatica*. SCr. *Tr̃sāt* and It. *Tersatto* point to Lat. *\*Tarsatum*, not *Tarsatica*. Lat. *\*Tarsatum* > Rom. *\*tarsātu* → Sl. *\*t̃rsāt̃?* > SCr. *\*Tr̃sāt* | *Tr̃sāt*; SCr. *\*Tr̃sāt* → It. *Tersatto*. Anreiter compares Lat. *\*Tarsatum* with Lat. *terra* ‘earth, ground’, OIr. *tír* ‘ground; land’ etc. and derives it from PIE *\*ters-* ‘dry, dry up’ whence in turn ‘dry land, land’. The Liburnian form on which Lat. *\*Tarsatum*, *Tarsatica* is based could conceivably derive from the *o*-grade *\*tors-*. Ref. RJAZU XVIII 776, ERHSJ III 509, ANREITER 2001: 135, IVŠIĆ 2013: 302ff.

57. Bulg. *ṽampa*, SCr. *ṽatra*, both forms ‘fire’; Alb. *vatër* (def. *vatra*), Gh. *votër*, Romn. *vatră*, all forms ‘hearth, fireplace’. SCr. *ṽatra* and Bulg. *ṽampa* are Romanian borrowings. Romn. *vatră* may be a borrowing from Alb. *vatra*; if so, not Dacian? Thracian cannot be excluded. Originally, Thracian and/or Albanian? The etymology of Alb. *vatër* is disputed; most often, it is compared with Av. gen.sg. *āθrō* ‘fire’, Lat. *ātrium* ‘reception hall’, etc. and derived from PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>-tr-* ‘fireplace’. Certainly, Alb. *vatër*,

*votër* points to older \**otr-*; cf. Lat. *orphanus* ‘orphan’ > Alb. *varfër* ‘poor’, Gh. *vorfën* ‘poor’ or Lat. *oleum* ‘oil’ > Alb. *vaj* ‘oil’, Gh. *voj* ‘oil’. However, it is as of yet unclear whether *v*-prothesis is the expected outcome in the reflex of PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>-tr-*. Ref. RJAZU XX 624ff, ERHSJ III 569, BEP I 123f, GLUHAK 1993: 663f, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 98, DEMIRAJ 1997: 410ff, OREL 1998: 495f, ERHJ II 541.

58. PN SCr. *Vizače*; Lat. *Nesactium*. A village in the vicinity of Pula in present-day Croatia and originally in Histrian territory. If so, Histrian rather than Illyrian? Hist. → Lat. *Nesactium* > Rom. \*(*I*)*n-Ezaktú?* → Sl. \**Vž-Ezáčĕ* > SCr. *Vizače*. Lat. *Nesactium* could conceivably be analyzed as *Nes-actium*; if so, *-actium* would be comparable to Gk. ἀκτῆ ‘cape’ and could be derived from PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>(e)k-* ‘sharp’. Ref. IvšIĆ 2013: 231ff.

59. SCr. PN *Zèta*; Lat. *Genta*. A tributary of the Morača river and an eponymous historic county in present-day Montenegro and originally in Illyrian proper territory. Ill. → Lat. *Genta* > Rom. \**Genta* → Sl. \**Zĕta* > SCr. *Zèta*. Lat. *Genta* is usually compared to Ill. PN *Gentius* and derived from PIE \**ǵen<sup>h</sup><sub>1</sub>-* ‘beget, give birth to’ whence in turn ‘son’, ‘child’, etc. Ref. RJAZU XXI 798f, ERHSJ III 652.

## 5. Notes on Section 4

Perhaps rather Thracian (or Thracian and Illyrian) than Illyrian are the borrowings cited in pts. 47, 48, 57. Further also: 60. Bulg. *бѹзопѹ* ‘tufa’, SCr. dial. *bigar* ‘tufa’ (in Serbia; cf. Alb. *bigorr* ‘tufa’; RJAZU I 288, ERHSJ I 147, BEP I 46, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 93); 61. Bulg. *бун-ѹѹе* ‘dump’, SCr. *bùn-ina* ‘dung’ (RJAZU I 736, ERHSJ I 237); 62. Bulg. *бѹс*, *бѹс-еп* ‘turf’, SCr. *būs*, *būs-ēn* ‘turf’, (RJAZU I 743f, ERHSJ I 242f, BEP I 92, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 95, ERHJ I 98).

Perhaps rather Thracian or Dacian than Illyrian borrowings include: 63. Bulg. *бач*, SCr. *báč*, both forms ‘head shepherd; cheese maker’, PN *Báčka*, an area in present-day Serbia and originally in Pannonian territory (cf. Romn. *baci* ‘head shepherd; cheese maker’; RJAZU I 141, 143, BEP I 37, ERHSJ I 85, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 93).

Perhaps rather Messapic than Illyrian is the borrowing cited in pt. 3.

Perhaps rather Albanian than Illyrian are the borrowings cited in pts. 9, 16.

Perhaps rather Histrian than Illyrian are the borrowings cited in pts. 5, 10, 36, 58.

Perhaps rather Romance or Slavic than Illyrian borrowings include: 64. Bulg. *брѹва* ‘lock’, SCr. *bràva* ‘lock’ (to PCelt. \**barr-* ‘top, end’ → Lat. \**barra* ‘bar’ or to PSl. *brǫvǐ* ‘log, block of wood’; RJAZU I 611, ERHSJ I 203, BEP I 72, GLUHAK 1993: 198, ERHJ I 91)

Perhaps rather Celtic than Illyrian borrowings include: 65. SCr. dial. *kiljan* ‘border stone’ (to PCelt. ? > W. *caill* ‘stone’;<sup>3</sup> RJAZU IV 9452, ERHJS II 80, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 96).

<sup>3</sup> Pace LOMA 2009, who derives it from Lat. *columna* ‘column, pillar’.

Perhaps rather Latin and/or Dalmatian Romance than Illyrian is the borrowing cited in pt. 54.

Rather Germanic than Illyrian borrowings include: 66. SCr. *grāba* ‘ditch’, Sln. *grāpa* ‘ditch’ (to OHG *grabo* ‘ditch’; RJAZU III 351, ERHSJ I 599, ESSJ I 171, GLUHAK 1993: 242, SNOJ 2016: 216, ERHJ I 291).

Rather Slavic than Illyrian is the borrowing cited in pt. 12. Further also: 67. Bulg. *бѣрна* ‘lip (of an animal)’, SCr. *bŕnjica* ‘muzzle’, Sln. *bŕna* ‘muzzle’ (to PSl. *\*bŕna* ‘lip’; RJAZU I 664, ERHSJ I 215, ESSJ III 130, BEP I 103, MATASOVIĆ 1995: 95, ERHJ I 87); 68. SCr. dial. *kŭn* ‘maple tree’ (in Montenegro; to the zero grade of PSl. *\*klenŭ* ‘maple tree’; RJAZU V 782, ERHSJ II 94f, ЭССЯ IX 194f, KROONEN 2013: 232, ERHJ I 447).

Perhaps rather Mediterranean than Illyrian is the borrowing cited in pt. 24. Further also 69. SCr. *krās*, Sln. *krās*, both forms ‘karst’, Sln. PN *Kras* (It. Carso, Germ. *Karst*), a region in present-day Slovenia and originally on the verge of the Venetic territory (to e.g. Fr. PN *Gars*; RJAZU V 465, ERHSJ II 179f, ESSJ II 82, SNOJ 2016: 344, ERHJ I 495).

And lastly, there are several borrowings that are occasionally thought to be Illyrian but are in fact etymologically difficult and / or ambiguous; these include: 70. SCr. *bran* ‘traditional garment’ (in Montenegro; cf. Alb. *brez* ‘girdle, sash’, Romn. *brâu* ‘girdle, belt’; RJAZU I 583, ERHSJ I 197f); 71. SCr. *bŕnje* ‘juniper berries’, PN *Srebrŕno* (Lat. *Sub-brenum*), a village near Dubrovnik in present-day Croatia and originally in Illyrian proper territory, Sln. *bŕnje* ‘juniper berries’ (RJAZU I 653, ERHSJ I 211, ESSJ I 44); 72. SCr. *duliba* / *doliba* ‘dale valley’ (RJAZU I 607, 883, ERHSJ I 419); 73. SCr. *dŭmača* ‘ravine’ (RJAZU II 884, ERHSJ I 456); 74. Bulg. *puđ* ‘hill’, Mac. *puđ* ‘hill’, PN *Ōxpud*, city and eponymous lake in present-day North Macedonia and originally in Illyrian proper territory, SCr. *hrŭd* ‘cliff’ (RJAZU III 694f, ERHSJ I 687, BEP VI 249, GLUHAK 1993: 226, ERHJ I 336); 75. Bulg. *uyŭma* ‘foliage, leaves’, SCr. *šŭma* ‘forest’ (RJAZU XVII 873, ERHSJ III 422f, ERHJ II 441), etc.

Consequently, we forego further discussion of pts. 3, 5, 9, 10, 12, 16, 24, 36, 47, 48, 54, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75 for the moment.

## 6. Other Considerations

Place names of supposedly Illyrian origin which were not borrowed into Slavic but have a plausible or tenable etymology include: 76. Tab. Peut. *Ancus*, an ancient settlement in Lika in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian (?) territory (to PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>enk-* ‘bend; hook’, cf. e.g. PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>onk-o-* > Gk. ὄγκος; MAYER 1959: 7); 77. It. An. *Au-rupium*, an ancient settlement in Lika in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian or Liburnian territory (to

PIE *\*Hreup-* ‘break’ whence ‘rock, cliff’, cf. e.g. PIE *\*Hreup-i-* > Lat. *rūpēs* ‘rock, cliff’; MAYER 1959: 69); 78. Lat. *Cocconae* and *Cuccium*, ancient settlements in Slavonia in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*keuk-* ‘bend’ whence ‘hill; high’, cf. pt. 12; Mayer 1959: 67); 79. Lat. *Pituntium*, a settlement near Split in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*petH-* ‘fall’; MAYER 1959: 91); 80. Tab. Peut. *Saldis*, an ancient settlement in Slavonia in present day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*sh<sub>2</sub>-el-d-* ‘salt’, cf. e.g. Go. *salt* ‘salt’; ANREITER 2001: 118); 81. Lat. *Straviana*, ancient settlement in present-day Croatia and originally in Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*sreu* ‘flow’; MAYER 1959: 104); 82. Lat. *Tariōna*, an ancient settlement near *Scardōna* in present-day Croatia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*tord-* > *\*torh<sub>1</sub>-* ‘rub, drill’ whence ‘sharp’, cf. e.g. Gk. *τορός* ‘piercing’; MAYER 1959: 111f); 83. Lat. *Ulcirus*, a mountain on the border of present-day Croatia and Bosnia and originally in Delmato-Pannonian territory (to PIE *\*ul<sup>h</sup>ʷ-* ‘wolf’, cf. pt. 32; SKOK 1920: 33).

River names present a particular challenge. In the ancient Balkans, they can either be of Palaeo-Balkan or ‘Old European’ origin (KRAHE 1954, 1964, SCHMID 1995, BROZOVIĆ-RONČEVIĆ 1995), and often it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish between the two; IVŠIĆ 2013: 371. For that reason we have excluded from this consideration a number of such names: Lat. *Argaona* (→ SCr. *Dragonja*), Lat. *Arsia* (→ SCr. *Riša*), Lat. *Bacuntius*, *Basante* (→ SCr. *Bòsut*), Lat. *Colapis* (→ SCr. *Kūpa*), Lat. *Danubius* / *Danuvius* (→ SCr. *Dùnāv*), Lat. *Dravus* (→ SCr. *Dráva*), Lat. *Drinus* (→ SCr. *Drína*), Lat. *Narentus* (→ SCr. *Nèrèṭva*), Lat. *Narō* (~ *Narōna*, pt. 4.31), Lat. *Nestos*, Lat. *Salon* (~ *Salōna*, pt. 4.44), Lat. *Savus* (→ SCr. *Sáva*), Lat. *Ulca* (→ SCr. *Vūka*), as well as SCr. *Bòsna*, *Kòrana*, *Ràma*, etc.

## 7. Reconstructing Illyrian

Finally, we can attempt to reconstruct Illyrian based on the remaining data which includes pts. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59 above.

And yet, not every one of these cases has a straightforward etymology. To the best of our knowledge, the etymology is credible or at least feasible in pts. 8, 14, 15, 17, 27, 28, 29, 32, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, dubious in pts. 20, 22, 26, disputed in pt. 13, and unknown in pts. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 18, 19, 21, 23, 26, 30, 33, 34, 35.

As a result, the amount of data available for the reconstruction of Illyrian is fairly limited, but some additional material can be adduced by referring to pts. 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, and the data presented in sec. 1.

## 7.1. Proto-Indo-European Vowels in Illyrian

PIE \**e* > Ill. \**e* / \**i*, DP \**e* / \**i*; cf. Alb. (j)*e*, Mess. *e*, Lib. \**e*.

PIE \**-en-i-* > Ill. → Lat. *-ini-*, sec. 7.6.

PIE \**ǵenh<sub>1</sub>-t-* > Ill. → Lat. *Gent-ius*, sec. 1.

PIE \**Hreǵ-* > Ill. → Lat. *Ris-inium*, pt. 39.

PIE \**kleu-* > Ill. → Lat. *Clev-atus*, sec. 1.

PIE \**-en-i-* > DP → Lat. *-ini-*, sec 7.6.

PIE \**petH<sub>1</sub>-nt-* > DP → Lat. *Pitunt-ium*, pt. 79.

PIE \**ser-m-* > DP → Lat. *Serm-ium* / *Sirm-ium*, pt. 46.

PIE \**telh<sub>2</sub>-* > DP → Lat. *Til-ūrium*, pt. 55.

PIE \**temh<sub>2</sub>-* > DP → SCr. *Țm-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \**temh<sub>2</sub>-* > DP / Lib. → SCr. *Țm-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \**sen-* > Lib. → Lat. *Sen-ia*, pt. 40.

PIE \**ser-m-* > Lib. → \**serm-* (> SCr. \**srēm-*), pt. 46.

For the moment, it is not clear whether the apparent split of PIE \**e* (> Ill. \**e* / \**i*, DP \**e* / \**i*) is conditioned (e.g. by accent) or not.

PIE \**o* > Ill. \**a*, DP \**a*; cf. Alb. *a*, Mess. *a*, Lib. \**a*?

PIE \**molh<sub>3</sub>-nt-* > Ill. → Lat. *Malunt-um*, pt. 26.

PIE \**norH-* > Ill. / DP → Lat. *Nar-ōna*, pt. 31.

PIE \**h<sub>2</sub>onk-* > DP → Lat. *Anc-us*, pt. 76.

PIE \**moǵ-h<sub>2</sub>-* > DP → Lat. *Massa-rum*, pt. 28.

PIE \**sol-* > DP → Lat. *Sal-ōna*, pt. 44.

PIE \**srou-* > DP → Lat. *Strav-iana*, pt. 81.

PIE \**torh<sub>1</sub>-* > DP → Lat. *Tar-iona*, pt. 82.

PIE \**skord<sup>(h)</sup>-* > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scard-ōna*, pt. 43.

PIE \**skor-p-* > DP / Lib. → Sl. \**skarp-* (> SCr. *škrāp-a*), pt. 52.

PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>rond-ǵ-?* > Lib? > Lat. *Bratti-a*, pt. 8.

PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>orb<sup>h</sup>-* > Lib. → Lat. *Arb-a*, pt. 37.

PIE \**molh<sub>3</sub>-* > Lib. → Lat. *Mal-āta*, pt. 26.

PIE \**skord<sup>(h)</sup>-?* > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, pt. 51.

PIE \**tors-* > Lib. → Lat. *Tars-atica*, pt. 56.

According to Matzinger, only the accented PIE \**o* yields Ill. *a*, while the unaccented PIE \**o* is preserved; see LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 154f.

PIE \**o* > Lib. \**a* is possibly contradicted by Liburnian and Histrian personal names in *Apl-* that are comparable to Delmato-Pannonian names in *Apl-*. Both of these have been derived from PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>ep-* ‘ability, force’ (MAYER 1959: 9), with a presumably formal equivalent in Germanic words for ‘strength, power’, such as ON *afl*, OE *afoł* < PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>ep-lo-*. Furthermore, the majority of Delmato-Pannonian attestations of *Apl-* are concentrated in Rider (KATIČIĆ 1963: 262–263), a municipium in Delmato-Pannonian territory on the border with Liburnia, where Liburnian influence on local onomastics has been noted (KATIČIĆ 1963: 290–291). Therefore, one cannot exclude that DP *Apl-* became particularly popular in Rider due to this influence, or even that it was borrowed from Liburnian at an early date. It is also preferable not to have divergent outcomes of PIE \**o* in Histrian and Liburnian materials, in view of their affinities towards Venetic mentioned in sec. 1. Therefore, the Liburnian examples for Lib. *a* < PIE \**o* given above may in fact continue PIE zero grades (PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>r̥nd-ǵ-*, \**h<sub>1</sub>rb<sup>h</sup>-*, \**m<sub>1</sub>h<sub>3</sub>-*, \**sk<sub>3</sub>rd<sup>(h)</sup>-*, \**tr̥s-*) rather than full *o*-grades (PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>rond-ǵ-*, \**h<sub>1</sub>orb<sup>h</sup>-*, \**molh<sub>3</sub>-*, \**skord<sup>(h)</sup>-*, \**tors-*).

QIE \**a* > Ill. \**a*.

QIE \**b<sup>h</sup>ard<sup>h</sup>-* > Ill. > Gk. Βάρδ-υλ(λ)ις, sec. 1.

PIE \**ē* > Ill. ?, DP ?; cf. Alb. *o* / *va*, Mess. *a*, Lib. \**ē*?

PIE \**nēd-* > Lib. → Lat. *Nēd-inum*, pt. 29

PIE \**ō* > Ill. \**ō*, DP \**ō*; cf. Alb. *e*, Mess. *u*, Lib. \**ō*?

PIE \**-ōn-* > Ill. / DP → Lat. *-ōn-*, sec. 7.6

PIE \**-ōn-* > DP → Lat. *-ōn-*, sec. 7.6.

PIE \**-ōn-* > Lib. → Lat. *-ōn-*, sec. 7.6.

PIE \**sōl-* > Lib. → Lat. *Sōl-enta*, pt. 50.

## 7.2. Proto-Indo-European Non-Syllabic Resonants in Illyrian

PIE \**m* > Ill. *m*, DP \**m*; cf. Alb. *m*, Mess. *m*, Lib. \**m*.

PIE \**molh<sub>3</sub>-nt-* > Ill. → Lat. *Malunt-um*, pt. 26.

PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-l-m-* > DP → Lat. *Delm-inium*, pt. 14.

PIE \**móǵ-h<sub>2</sub>-* > DP → Lat. *Massa-rum*, pt. 28.

PIE \**ser-m-* > DP → Lat. *Serm-ium* / *Sirm-ium*, pt. 46.

PIE \**temh<sub>2</sub>-* > DP → SCr. *T̃m-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \**temh<sub>2</sub>-* > DP / Lib. → SCr. *t̃m-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \**molh*<sub>3</sub>- > Lib. → Lat. *Mal-āta*, pt. 26.

PIE \**ser-m-* > Lib. → Sl. \**serm-* (> SCr. \**srěm-*), pt. 46.

PIE \**n* > Ill. \**n*, DP \**n*; cf. Alb. *n*, Mess. *n*, Lib. \**n*.

PIE \**ǵenh*<sub>1</sub>-*t* > Ill. → Lat. *Gent-ius*, sec. 1.

PIE \**h*<sub>3</sub>*ri(H)-n-* > Ill. → Gk. ῥίπ-ός, sec. 1.

PIE \**norH-* > Ill. / DP → Lat. *Nar-ōna*, pt. 31.

PIE \**h*<sub>2</sub>*onk-* > DP → Lat. *Anc-us*, pt. 76.

PIE \**nēd-* > Lib. → Lat. *Nēd-īnum*, pt. 29.

PIE \**sen-* > Lib. → Lat. *Sen-ia*, pt. 40.

PIE \**r* > Ill. \**r*, DP \**r*; cf. Alb. *r* / *rr*, Mess. *r*, Lib. \**r*.

QIE \**b*<sup>h</sup>*ard*<sup>h</sup>- > Ill. → Gk. Βάρδ-υλ(λ)ις, sec. 1.

PIE \**Hreǵ-* > Ill. → Lat. *Ris-inium*, pt. 39.

PIE \**h*<sub>3</sub>*ri(H)-n-* > Ill. → Gk. ῥίπ-ός, sec. 1.

PIE \**norH-* > Ill. / DP → Lat. *Nar-ōna*, pt. 31.

PIE \**tr-i-* > Ill. → Lat. *Tri-teuta*, sec. 1.

PIE \**Hrup-* > DP → Lat. *Au-rup-ium*, pt. 77.

PIE \**ser-m-* > DP → Lat. *Serm-ium* / *Sirm-ium*, pt. 46.

PIE \**torh*<sub>1</sub>- > DP → Lat. *Tar-iona*, pt. 82.

PIE \**sk(o)rd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scardōna*, pt. 43.

PIE \**sk(o)r-p-* > DP / Lib. → Sl. \**skarp-* > *škrǎp-a*, pt. 52.

PIE \**ser-m-* > Lib. → Sl. \**serm-* (SCr. > \**srěm-*), pt. 46.

PIE \**l* > Ill. pr. \**l*, DP \**l*; cf. Alb. *l* / *ll*, Mess. *l*, Lib. \**l*.

PIE \**kleu-* > Ill. → Lat. *Clev-atus*, sec. 1.

PIE \**molh*<sub>3</sub>-*nt-* > Ill. → Lat. *Malunt-um*, pt. 26.

PIE \**ulk*<sup>u</sup>- > Ill. → Lat. *Ulc-inium*, pt. 32.

PIE \**d*<sup>h</sup>*h*<sub>1</sub>-*l-m-* > DP → Lat. *Delm-inium*, pt. 14.

PIE \**sol-* > DP → Lat. *Sal-ōna*, pt. 44.

PIE \**sh*<sub>2</sub>-*el-d-* > DP → Lat. *Sald-is*, pt. 78.

PIE \**stulp-* > DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

PIE \**telh*<sub>2</sub>- > DP → Lat. *Til-ūrium*, pt. 55.

PIE \**ulk*<sup>u</sup>- > DP → Lat. *Ulc-irus*, pt. 80.

PIE \**molh*<sub>3</sub>- > Lib. → Lat. *Mal-āta*, pt. 26.

PIE \**sōl-* > Lib. → Lat. *Sōl-enta*, pt. 50.

PIE \* $\mu$  > Ill. \* $\nu$ , DP  $\nu$ ; cf. Alb.  $\nu$ , Mess.  $\nu$ , Lib. \* $\nu$ .

PIE \* $d^h eu(H)$ - > Ill. → Gk. Δεύ-άδαί, sec. 1.

PIE \* $k^h leu$ - > Ill. → Lat. *Clev-atuus*, sec. 1.

PIE \* $srou$ - > DP → Lat. *Strav-ianae*, pt. 81.

PIE \* $\mu ik-i$ - > DP → Lat. \**Vis-inium*, pt. 41.

PIE \* $i$  > Ill. ?, DP ?; cf. Alb. *gj* /  $\emptyset$ , Mess. ?

PIE \* $h_1$  > Ill. ?, DP ?; cf. Alb.  $\emptyset$ , Mess.  $\emptyset$ , Lib.  $\emptyset$ .

PIE \* $h_1 orb^h$ - > Lib. → Lat. *Arba*, pt. 37.

PIE \* $h_2$  > Ill. ?, DP  $\emptyset$ ; cf. Alb.  $\emptyset$ , Mess.  $\emptyset$ .

PIE \* $h_2 onk$ - > DP → Lat. *Anc-us*, pt. 76.

PIE \* $sh_2-el-d$ - > DP → Lat. *Sald-is*, pt. 80.

PIE \* $h_3$  > Ill.  $\emptyset$ , DP ?; cf. Alb.  $\emptyset$ , Mess.  $\emptyset$ .

PIE \* $h_3 ri(H)-n$ - > Ill. → Gk. ῥίπ-ός, sec. 1.

PIE \* $H$  > Ill.  $\emptyset$ , DP  $\emptyset$ ; cf. Alb.  $\emptyset$ , Mess.  $\emptyset$ , Lib.  $\emptyset$ .

PIE \**Hreg*- > Ill. → Lat. *Ris-inium*, pt. 4.39.

PIE \**Hrup*- > DP → Lat. *Au-rup-ium*, pt. 77.

Note that: 1. PIE non-syllabic laryngeals apparently drop in Illyrian as in most other IE language groups, i.e. PIE \* $h_2$  > DP  $\emptyset$  and PIE \* $h_3$  > Ill.  $\emptyset$ ; 2. PIE laryngeals in word-initial *Hr*-clusters do not vocalise (no Lex Rix) and drop, i.e. PIE \* $h_3 r$ - > Ill. \* $r$ , PIE \**Hr*- > Ill. \* $r$ , and PIE \**Hr*- > DP \* $r$ . Note also that laryngeal coloring takes place as usual, i.e. PIE \* $h_2 e$  > DP \* $a$ .

### 7.3. Proto-Indo-European Syllabic Resonants in Illyrian

The evidence for Proto-Indo-European syllabic resonants is generally scarce.

PIE \* $\eta$  > Ill. *un*, DP *un*; cf. Alb. *a*, Mess. *an*, Lib. *a*?

PIE \**molh<sub>3</sub>-nt*- > Ill. → Lat. *Malunt-um*, pt. 26.

PIE \**petH-nt*- > DP → Lat. *Pitunt-ium*, pt. 79.

PIE \**b<sup>h</sup>rnd-i*-? > Lib? → Lat. *Bratti-a*, pt. 8.

PIE \**r* > Ill. ?, DP ?; cf. Alb. *ri*, Mess. ?, Lib. *ar*?

PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>rb<sup>h</sup>*- > Lib. → Lat. *Arba*, pt. 37.

PIE \**skrd<sup>(h)</sup>*- > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, pt. 51.

PIE \**tr̥s-* > Lib. → Lat. *Tars-atica*, pt. 56.

PIE \**i* > Ill. \**i*, DP ?; cf. Alb. *i*, Mess. *i*, Lib. \**i*.

PIE \**h<sub>3</sub>ri(H)-n-* > Ill. → Gk. ῥίτι-ός, sec. 1.

PIE \**tr-i-* > Ill. → Lat. *Tri-teuta*, sec. 1.

PIE \**uik̥-i-?* > DP → Lat. \**Vis-inium*, pt. 41.

PIE \**u* > Ill. \**u*, DP \**u* / \**o*; cf. Alb. *u*, Mess. *u*.

PIE \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- > Ill. → Lat. *Ulc-inium*, pt. 32.

PIE \**Hrup-* > DP → Lat. *Au-rup-ium*, pt. 77.

PIE \**kuk-* > DP → Lat. *Cucc-ium*, pt. 78.

PIE \**kuk-* > DP → Lat. *Cocc-ōnae*, pt. 78.

PIE \**stulp-* > DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

PIE \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- > DP → Lat. *Ulc-irus*, pt. 83.

PIE \**h<sub>1</sub>* > Ill. ?, DP \**a* / \**e*; cf. Alb. *a*, Mess. ?

PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>h<sub>1</sub>-l-m-* > DP → Lat. *Delm-inium* / *Dalm-ium*, pt. 14.

There is no evidence for PIE \**ṛ*, \**ḷ*, \**h<sub>2</sub>*, \**h<sub>3</sub>*. Some adduce PIE \**m̥rs-* > DP → Lat *Mursa* as evidence for PIE \**r* > DP \**ur* and Matzinger proposes PIE \**R* > Ill. *uR* as a general rule on the basis of PIE \**-ṛt-o-* > Ill. → *Dil-untum*, PIE \**-ṛt-i-o* > DP → *Pet-untium*, and PIE \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- > Ill → *Ulc-inium*; see LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021: 156. Here then also PIE \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- > Ill. / DP → *Ulc-irus*. But cases in which PIE \**ḷ* apparently yields Ill. *ul* and DP *ul* work only if PIE \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- was indeed vocalised as \**uḷk<sup>u</sup>*- in Illyrian and not as \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*-; cf. \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- > OIr. *olc* or \**ulk<sup>u</sup>*- » \**luk<sup>(u)</sup>*- > Gk. λύχ-ος.

#### 7.4. Proto-Indo-European Sibilant in Illyrian

PIE \**s* > Ill. ?, DP \**s*; cf. Alb. *sh* / *gj*, Mess. ?, Lib. \**s*.

PIE \**ser-m-* > DP → Lat. *Serm-ium* / *Sirm-ium*, pt. 46.

PIE \**sh<sub>2</sub>-el-d-* > DP → Lat. *Sald-is*, pt. 80.

PIE \**sol-* > DP → Lat. *Sal-ōna*, pt. 44.

PIE \**stulp-* > DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

PIE \*sk(o)rd<sup>(h)</sup>-? > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scard-ōna*, pt. 43.

PIE \*sk(o)r-p- > DP / Lib. → Sl. \*skarp- (> SCr. *škrǎp-a*), pt. 52.

PIE \*sen- > Lib. → Lat. *Sen-ia*, pt. 40.

PIE \*ser-m- > Lib. → Sl. \*serm- > \*srēm-, pt. 46.

PIE \*skrd<sup>(h)</sup>- > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, pt. 51.

PIE \*sōl- > Lib. → Lat. *Sōl-enta*, pt. 50.

PIE \*trs- > Lib. → Lat. *Tars-atīca*, pt. 56.

All examples come from analut and clusters; there are no examples of intervocalic \*s.

## 7.5. Proto-Indo-European Stops in Illyrian

The evidence for Proto-Indo-European stops is uneven. PIE \*p, \*b<sup>h</sup>, \*t, \*d, \*d<sup>h</sup>, \*k, \*k̑, \*ǵ, \*k<sup>h</sup> are well represented in the data, but there is no evidence at all for PIE \*b, \*g, \*g<sup>h</sup>, \*ǵ<sup>h</sup>, \*g<sup>u</sup>, \*g<sup>u</sup><sup>h</sup>.

PIE \*p > Ill. ?, DP \*p; cf. Alb. *p*, Mess. *p*, Lib. \*p.

PIE \*Hrup- > DP → Lat. *Au-rup-ium*, pt. 77.

PIE \*petH-ŋt- > DP → Lat. *Pitunt-ium*, pt. 79.

PIE \*stulp- > DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

PIE \*sk(o)r-p- > DP / Lib. → Sl. \*skarp- (SCr. > *škrǎp-a*), pt. 52.

PIE \*b<sup>h</sup> > Ill. *b*, DP ?; cf. Alb. *b*, Mess. *b*, Lib. \*b.

QIE \*b<sup>h</sup>ard<sup>h</sup>- > Ill. → Gk. Βάρδ-υλ(λ)ις, sec. 1.

PIE \*b<sup>h</sup>rnd-ǵ- > Lib? → Lat. *Bratti-a*, pt. 8.

PIE \*h<sub>1</sub>rb<sup>h</sup>- > Lib. → Lat. *Arba*, pt. 37.

PIE \*t > Ill. \*t, DP \*t; cf. Alb. *t*, Mess. *t*, Lib. \*t.

PIE \*-ŋt- > Ill. → Lat. *-unt-*, sec. 7.6.

PIE \*teut- > Ill. → Lat. *Teut-a*, sec. 1.

PIE \*tr-i- > Ill. → Lat. *Tri-teuta*, sec. 1.

PIE \*-ŋt- > DP → Lat. *-unt-*, sec. 7.6.

PIE \*petH-ŋt- > DP → Lat. *Pitunt-ium*, pt. 79.

PIE \*stulp- > DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

PIE \*telh<sub>2</sub>- > DP → Lat. *Til-ūrium*, pt. 55.

PIE \*temh<sub>2</sub>- > DP → SCr. *Tīm-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \*torh<sub>1</sub>- > DP → Lat. *Tar-iōna*, pt. 82.

PIE \**temh*<sub>2</sub>- > DP / Lib. → SCr. *tīm-or*, pt. 53.

PIE \**trs*- > Lib. → Lat. *Tars-atīca*, pt. 56.

PIE \**d* > Ill. ?, DP \**d*; cf. Alb. *d*, Mess. *d*, Lib. \**d*.

PIE \**sh*<sub>2</sub>-*el-d*- > DP → Lat. *Sald-is*, pt. 80.

PIE \**sk(o)rd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scard-ōna*, pt. 43.

PIE \**nēd*- > Lib. → Lat. *Nēd-īnum*, pt. 29.

PIE \**skrd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, pt. 51.

PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>* > Ill. *d*, DP \**d*; cf. Alb. *d*, Mess. *d*, Lib. \**d*.

QIE \**b<sup>h</sup>ard<sup>h</sup>*- > Ill. → Gk. Βάρδ-υλ(λ)ις, sec. 1.

PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>eu(H)*- > Ill. → Gk. Δευ-άδαί, sec. 1.

PIE \**d<sup>h</sup>l<sub>1</sub>-l-m*- > DP → Lat. *Delm-inium*, pt. 14.

PIE \**sk(o)rd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scard-ōna*, pt. 43.

PIE \**skrd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, pt. 51.

PIE \**k* > Ill. ?, DP \**k*; cf. Alb. *k*, Mess. *k?*, Lib. \**k*.

PIE \**h*<sub>2</sub>*onk*- > DP → Lat. *Anc-us*, pt. 76.

PIE \**kuk*- > DP → Lat. *Cucc-ium*, pt. 78.

PIE \**kuk*- > DP → Lat. *Cucc-ium*, pt. 78.

PIE \**sk(o)rd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scard-ōna*, 43.

PIE \**sk(o)r-p*- > DP / Lib. → Sl. \**skarp*- > *škrāp-a*, 52.

PIE \**skrd*<sup>(h)</sup>- > Lib. → SCr. *Škard-a*, 51.

PIE \**k̑* > Ill. \**k*, DP ?; cf. Alb. *th*, Mess. ?

PIE \**k̑leu*- (> \**k̑leu*-?) > Ill. → Lat. *Clev-atūs*, sec. 1.

PIE \**ǵ* > Ill. \**g* / \**s*, DP \**ss*; cf. Alb. *dh*, Mess. *z?*

PIE \**Hreǵ*- > Ill. → Lat. *Ris-inium*, pt. 39.

PIE \**ǵenh<sub>1</sub>-t* > Ill. → Lat. *Gent-ius*, sec. 1.

PIE \**moǵ-h<sub>2</sub>*- > DP → Lat. *Massa-rum*, pt. 28.

PIE \**k<sup>h</sup>* > Ill. \**k*, DP \**k*; cf. Alb. *k*, Mess. *k*.

PIE \**ulk<sup>h</sup>*- > Ill. → Lat. *Ulc-inium*, *Ulc-irus*, pt. 32, 80.

In general, we can observe: 1. that the attested PIE mediae aspiratae seem to deaspirate, i.e. PIE  $*b^h >$  Ill.  $*b$ , PIE  $*d^h >$  Ill.  $*d$ , DP  $*d$ ; and 2. that nothing can decidedly be said of the reflex of PIE palatovelars because the evidence is both scarce and conflicted, i.e. PIE  $*ǵ >$  Ill.  $*g / *s$  (?), DP  $*ss$ ? There is no unambiguous evidence for  $*k̑$  and no evidence for  $*ǵ^h$  at all. We can also observe that the evidence for PIE labiovelars is very scarce, only PIE  $*kʷ >$  Ill.  $*k$ , DP  $*k$ .

Illyrian, Messapic and Albanian seem to share the developments  $*b^h > b$ ,  $*d^h > d$ , and  $*kʷ > k$ , which is not sufficient to indicate any kind of special relationship between these three.

## 7.6. Proto-Indo-European Diphthongs and Clusters in Illyrian

The evidence for Proto-Indo-European diphthongs and innovative clusters is generally scarce.

PIE  $*eu >$  Ill.  $*eu$ , DP  $eu$ ,<sup>4</sup> cf. Alb. *e*, Mess.  $*ou?$   $> au > u$ .

PIE  $*d^h eu(H) >$  Ill.  $\rightarrow$  Gk.  $\Delta\varepsilon\nu\text{-}\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\iota$ , sec. 1.

PIE  $*teut- >$  Ill.  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *Teut-a*, sec. 1.

PIE  $*k̑j >$  Ill.  $?$ , DP  $*s$ ?

PIE  $*uik\text{-}j\text{-}? >$  DP  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *\*Vis-inium*, pt. 41.

PIE  $*sr- >$  Ill.  $?$ , DP  $*str-$ .

PIE  $*srou\text{-} >$  DP  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *Strav-iana*, pt. 81.

Illyrian and Thracian seem to share the development  $*sr- > *str-$ ; cf. Gk.  $\Sigma\tau\rho\acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu$ , a river in present-day Bulgaria and Greece and originally in Thracian territory.

## 7.7. A Note on Word Formation in Illyrian

There is evidence for a number of recurring suffixes in Illyrian.

Ill.  $?$ , DP  $*-at$   $<$  PIE  $?$

DP  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *Delm-atae*, sec. 1.

DP  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *(H)aem-atae*, pt. 18.

Ill.  $*-aur-$ , DP  $*-aur-$   $<$  PIE  $?$ ; cf. Lib.  $-aur-$ .

Ill. / DP  $\rightarrow$  Lat. *\*ball-aurus*, pt. 7.

DP  $\rightarrow$  SCR. *T̃m-or, t̃m-or*, pt. 53.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g. PN *Beusas* in sec. 1.

Lib. → Lat. \**mall-aurus*, pt. 7.

DP \*-*ent-* < PIE \*-*ent-*; cf. Lib. \*-*ent-*.

DP → SCr. *Ps-et*, pt. 35.

Lib. → Lib. *Sōl-enta*, pt. 50.

Ill. \*-*ini-*, DP \*-*ini-* < PIE ?

Ill. → Lat. *Ris-inium*, pt. 39.

Ill. → Lat. *Ulc-inium*, pt. 32.

DP → Lat. *Delm-inium*, pt. 14.

DP → Lat. *Vis-inium*, pt. 41.

Ill. \*-*ōn-*, DP \*-*ōn-* < PIE \*-*ōn-*; cf. Lib. \*-*ōn-*.

Ill. / DP → Lat. *Nar-ōna*, pt. 31.

DP → Lat. *Cocc-ōnae*, pt. 77.

DP → Lat. *Sal-ōna*, pt. 44.

DP → Lat. *Stolp-ōna*, pt. 49.

DP / Lib. → Lat. *Prōm-ōna*, pt. 34

DP / Lib. → Lat. *Scrad-ōna*, pt. 43

Lib. → Lat. *Alb-ōna*, pt. 22.

Lib. → Lat. *Aen-ōna*, pt. 30.

Lib. → Lat. *Flan-ōna*, pt. 33.

Additionally, we find \*-*aur-* in Lat. *Epidaurus*, *Medaurus*; \*-*ent-* in *Bolentium*, *Colentum*, *Epilentium*, *Narentus*, *Sibenton*; \*-*ōn-* in Lat. *Arauzōna*, *Blandōna*, *Erōna*, *Sidrōna*, *Tariōna*, etc. (The etymology of these personal, place and river names is disputed.)

Still, we can observe that \*-*at-* occurs in tribe names, \*-*aur-* in personal names, place names and non-onomastic terms, \*-*ent-* in place names (supposedly affixed to verbal roots), and \*-*ōn-* in place names affixed to both nominal and verbal roots.

Typically Liburnian is the (*V*)*st*-suffix found in some place and island names: cf. Lib. → Gk. Λῆδ-εστρα in pt. 23, Lib. → SCr. *Ist* in pt. 19, and Lib. → SCr. *Kōp-ist*, in pt. 21.

Illyrian and Messapic seem to share the *ent*-suffix whereas Liburnian and Messapic seem to share the (*V*)*st*-suffix; cf. Mess. PN *Uzentum* and *Basta*, respectively.

However, some of these suffixes are not exclusive to the languages of Illyricum. They may also be found e.g. in Istria and Northern Italy; cf. e.g. PN *Aguntum*, *Piquentum*, *Tergeste*, etc.

### Abbreviations

*	(reconstructed form)	→	is borrowed as
>	yields	←	is borrowed from
<	comes from	~	related to
Alb.	Albanian	MBret.	Middle Breton
An. Rav.	Anonymus Ravennas	MGk.	Modern Greek
arch.	archaic	MoP	Modern Persian
Arm.	Armenian	OCS	Old Church Slavonic
Av.	Avestan	OE	Old English
Bulg.	Bulgarian	OHG	Old High German
Celt.	Celtic	OIc.	Old Icelandic
Co.	Cornish	OIr.	Old Irish
Const. Porph.	Constantine Porphyrogenitus	ON	Old Norse
Cz.	Czech	OPhr.	Old Phrygian
Čak.	Čakavian	OPr.	Old Prussian
Dalm. Rom.	Dalmatian Romance	OSerb.	Old Serbian
dial.	dialectal(ly)	Pann.	Pannonian
DP	Delmato-Pannonian	PAlb.	Proto-Albanian
Ek.	Ekavian	PCelt.	Proto-Celtic
Germ.	German	PIE	Proto-Indo-European
Gh.	Gheg	PN	place name
Gk.	Greek	QIE	Quasi Indo-European
Hist.	Histriian	Rom.	Romance
Ijek.	Ijekavian	Romn.	Romanian
Ik.	Ikavian	Ru.	Russian
Ill.	Illyrian proper	SCr.	Serbo-Croatian
It.	Italian	Skt.	Sanskrit
It. An.	Itinerarium Antonini	Sl.	Slavic
Lat.	Latin	Sln.	Slovene
Lib.	Liburnian	Tab. Peut.	Tabula Peutingeriana
Lith.	Lithuanian	Vegl.	Vegliot
Mac.	Macedonian	Ven.	Venetian
Maced.	Macedonian (Ancient)	W	Welsh
Mess.	Messapic		

## Bibliography

- ANREITER 2001 = Anreiter, Peter. *Die Vorrömischen Namen Pannoniens*. Budapest.
- BARTOLI 1906 = Bartoli, Matteo Giulio. *Das Dalmatische: Altromanische Sprachreste von Veglia bis Ragusa und ihre Stellung in der Apennino-Balkanischen Romania*, I–II. Wien.
- BENAC 1988 = Benac, Alojz. Iliri u Apuliji. *Godišnjak Centra za balkanološka ispitivanja ANUBiH* 26:1988, 43–67.
- BEEKES 2010 = Beekes, Robert S. P. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek* I–II. Leiden.
- BROZOVIĆ-RONČEVIĆ 1995 = Brozović-Rončević, Dunja. “Staroevropska” hidronimija. *Filologija* 24/25:1995, 81–86.
- ÇABEJ 1976 = Çabej, Eqrem. *Studime etimologjike I*. Prishtina.
- DEMIRAJ 1997 = Demiraj, Bardhyl. *Albanische Etymologien*. Amsterdam.
- DERKSEN 2015 = Derksen, Rick. *Baltic Inherited Lexicon*. Leiden – Boston.
- DZINO 2014 = Dzino, Danijel. ‘Illyrians’ in ancient ethnographic discourse. *Dialogues d’histoire ancienne* 40, 2:2014, 45–65.
- EICHNER 2004 = Eichner, Heiner. Illyrisch – die unbekannte Sprache. *Die Illyrer. Archäologische Funde des 1. Vorchristlichen Jahrtausends aus Albanien*, 92–117. (Ed. L. Bejko. Asparn-Zaya, 2004.)
- ERHJ = Matasović, Ranko (ed.). *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskog jezika* I–II. Zagreb, 2016–21.
- ERHSJ = Skok, Petar. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* I–IV. Zagreb, 1971–74.
- ESSJ = Bezljaj, France & al. *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika* I–IV. Ljubljana, 1977–2005.
- FALILEYEV 2020 = Falileyev, Alexander. The silent Europe. *Palaeohispanica: Revista sobre lenguas y culturas de la Hispania antigua* 20, 2:2020, 887–919. <<https://doi.org/10.36707/palaeohispanica.voi20.372>> (28.03.2021.)
- GLUHAK 1993 = Gluhak, Alemko. *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb.
- GRBIĆ 2013 = Grbić, Dragana. Antroponimija Azala. *Lucida Intervals* 42:2013, 119–142.
- GRBIĆ 2016 = Grbić, Dragana. Greek, Latin and Paleo-Balkan Languages in Contact. *Rhesis* 7,1:2016, 32–41. <<https://www.rhesis.it/issue/linguistics-and-philology-7-1/>> (28.03.2021)
- HOLZER 2011 = Holzer, Georg. *Glasovni razvoj hrvatskog jezika*. Zagreb.
- IVŠIĆ 2013 = Ivšić, Dubravka. *Predslavenski sloj u hrvatskoj toponimiji*. Rijeka. (PhD Thesis.)
- KATIČIĆ 1962 = Katičić, Radoslav. Die illyrische Personennamen in ihrem südöstlichen Verbreitungsgebiet. *Živa antika* 12:1962, 95–120.
- KATIČIĆ 1963 = Katičić, Radoslav. Das mitteldalmatische Namengebiet. *Živa antika* 12:1963, 255–292.
- KATIČIĆ 1964a = Katičić, Radoslav. Illyrii proprie dicti. *Živa antika* 13/14:1964a, 87–97.

- KATIČIĆ 1964b = Katičić, Radoslav. Suvremena istraživanja o jeziku starosjedila-  
ca ilirskih provincija : Die neusten Forschungen über die einheimische Sprach-  
schicht in den illyrischen Provinzen. *Simpozijum o teritorijalnom i hronološkom*  
*razgraničenju Ilira u praistorijsko doba održan 15. i 16. maja*, 9–58. (Ed. A. Benac,  
Sarajevo, 1964b.)
- KATIČIĆ 1976a = Katičić, Radoslav. *Ancient Languages of the Balkans*. The Hague,  
1976a.
- KATIČIĆ 1976b = Katičić, Radoslav. Illyro-Apenninica. *Jadranska obala u protohisto-*  
*riji : Kulturni i etnički problemi*, 177–183. (Ed. M. Suić. Zagreb, 1976b.)
- KRAHE 1925 = Krahe, Hans. *Die Alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen*.  
Heidelberg.
- KRAHE 1929 = Krahe, Hans. *Lexikon altillyrischer Personennamen*. Heidelberg.
- KRAHE 1954 = Krahe, Hans. *Sprache und Vorzeit : Europäische Vorgeschichte nach*  
*dem Zeugnis der Sprache*. Heidelberg.
- KRAHE 1955 = Krahe, Hans. *Die Sprache der Illyrier : Erster Teil, Die Quellen*. Wies-  
baden.
- KRAHE 1964 = Krahe, Hans. Vom Illyrischen zum Alteuropäischen. *Indogermanische*  
*Forschungen* 69:1964, 201–212.
- KRONASSER 1965 = Kronasser, Heinz. Illyrier und Illyricum. *Die Sprache* 11:1965, 155–  
183.
- KROONEN 2013 = Kroonen, Guus. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*. Leiden  
– Boston.
- LIGORIO 2016 = Ligorio, Orsat. *Serbo-Croatian Accent Retraction*. Leiden. (PhD  
Thesis.)
- LIPPERT & MATZINGER 2021 = Lippert, Andreas, Matzinger, Joachim. *Die Illyrer :*  
*Geschichte, Archäologie und Sprache*. Stuttgart.
- LIV<sup>2</sup> = Rix, Helmut (ed.) & al. *Lexicon der indogermanischen Verben*. Wiesbaden,  
2001<sup>2</sup>.
- LOMBARDO 2014 = Lombardo, Mario. Iapygians: The indigenous populations of  
Ancient Apulia in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E. *The Italic People of Ancient*  
*Apulia. New Evidence from Pottery for Workshops, Markets, and Customs*, 36–68.  
(Ed. T. H. Carpenter. Cambridge UK.)
- MARCHESINI 2020 = Marchesini, Simona. Messapico. *Palaeohispanica : Revista*  
*sobre lenguas y culturas de la Hispania antigua* 20, 1:2020, 495–530.  
<<https://doi.org/10.36707/palaeohispanica.v0i20.378>> (15.04.2021.)
- MARCHESINI & DE SIMONE 2002 = Marchesini, Simona, Carlo de Simone. *Monumen-*  
*ta Linguae Messapicae I–II*. Wiesbaden.
- MATASOVIĆ 1995 = Matasović, Ranko. Skokove ‘ilirske’ etimologije. *Folia onomastica*  
*Croatica* 4:1995, 89–101.
- MATASOVIĆ 2010 = Matasović, Ranko. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*. Lei-  
den – Boston.

- MATZINGER 2005 = Matzinger, Joachim. Messapisch und Albanisch. *International Journal of Diachronical Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 2:2005, 29–54.
- MATZINGER 2019 = Matzinger, Joachim. *Messapisch*. Wiesbaden.
- MAYER 1957 = Mayer, Anton. *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier : Band I, Einleitung, Wörterbuch der illyrischen Sprachreste*. Vienna.
- MAYER 1959 = Mayer, Anton. *Die Sprache der alten Illyrier : Band II, Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Illyrischen, Grammatik der illyrischen Sprache*. Vienna.
- NIL = Wodtko, Dagmar, Britta Irslinger, Carolin Schneider. *Nomina in indogermanischen Lexikon*. Heidelberg, 2008.
- OREL 1998 = Orel, Vladimir. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden.
- PAPAZOGLU 1965 = Papazoglu, Fanula. Les origines et la destinée de l'Etat illyrien. *Historia* 14:1965, 143–179.
- PAPAZOGLU 1978 = Papazoglu, Fanula. *The Central Balkan Tribes in Pre-Roman Times*. Amsterdam.
- POLOMÉ 1982 = Polomé, Edgar. Balkan languages. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. (Ed. J. Boardman. London, 1982.)
- PRÓSPER 2019 = Prósper, Blanca María. Language change at the crossroads : What Celtic, what Venetic, and what else in the Personal names of Emona? *Вопросы ономастики* 16:2019, 33–73.
- REICHENKRON 1966 = Reichenkron, Günter. *Das Dakische : Rekonstruiert aus dem umänischen*. Heidelberg.
- RENDIĆ MIOČEVIĆ 1955 = Rendić Miočević, Duje. Onomastičke studije s teritorija Liburna. *Glasnik Instituta za historijske nauke u Zadru* 1:1955, 125–144.
- REW<sup>5</sup> = Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg, 1972<sup>5</sup>.
- RIX 1954 = Rix, Helmut. *Bruttii, Brundisium und das illyrische Wort für 'Hirsch'*. *Beiträge zur Namenforschung* 5:1954, 115–129.
- RJAZU = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika I–XXIII*. Zagreb, 1976.
- SCHMID 1995 = Schmid, Wolfgang. Alteuropäische Gewässernamen. *Name Studies : An International Handbook of Onomastics*, 756–761. (Ed. E. Eichler et al. Berlin – New York, 1995.)
- DE SIMONE 1993 = de Simone, Carlo. L'elemento non greco nelle iscrizioni di Durazzo ed Apollonia. *Grecs et Illyriens dans les inscriptions en langue grecque d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia d'Illyrie : Actes de la Table ronde internationale (Clermont-Ferrand, 19–21 octobre 1989)*, 35–75. (Ed. Pierre Cabanes. Paris, 1993.)
- DE SIMONE 2018 = de Simone, Carlo. Messapic. *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European linguistics* 3, 1839–1850. (Ed. J. Klein & al. Berlin, 2018.)
- SKOK 1917–20 = Skok, Petar. Studije iz ilirske toponomastike. *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine* 29:1917, 117–143; 31:1919, 151–159; 32:1920, 29–45.
- SKOK 1950 = Skok, Petar. *Slavenstvo i romanstvo na jadranskim otocima : Toponomastička ispitivanja*. Zagreb.

- SKOK 1954 = Skok, Petar. Postanak hrvatskog Zadra. *Radovi Instituta Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Zadru* 1:1954, 37–68.
- SNOJ 2016 = Snoj, Marko. *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana.
- ŠIMUNOVIĆ 2005 = Šimunović, Petar. *Toponimija hrvatskoga jadranskog prostora*. Zagreb.
- UNTERMANN 1961 = Untermann, Jürgen. *Die venetischen Personennamen*. Wiesbaden.
- UNTERMANN 1970 = Untermann, Jürgen. Venetisches in Dalmatien. *Godišnjak centra za balkanološka ispitivanja* 7: 1970, 5–21.
- DE VAAN 2008 = de Vaan, Michiel. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden – Boston.
- VULETIĆ 2010 = Vuletić, Nikola. Problem stare romanske toponimije u murterskom otočnom skupu. *Toponimija otoka Murtera*, 335–341. (Ur. V. Skračić. Zadar, 2010.)
- WILKES 1996 = Wilkes, John J. *The Illyrians*. Oxford.
- БЕР = Георгиев, Владимир (съст.) & al. *Български етимологичен речник I–VIII*. София, 1971–2018.
- ГРБИЋ 2014 = Грбић, Драгана. *Племенске заједнице у Илирику : Предурбане административне структуре у римским провинцијама између Јаграна и Дунава (I–III век)*. Београд.
- ЕРСЈ = Лома, Александар (ур.) & al. *Етимолошки речник српској језика I–III*. Београд, 2003–08.
- ЛИГОРИО 2017 = Лигорио, Орсат. Сх. блавор : Из балканског латинитета XI. *Зборник Мајнице српске за филологију и лингвистику* 60, 1:2017, 13–37.
- ЛИГОРИО 2018 = Лигорио, Орсат. Дифтонгација у далматороманским реликтима латинског суфикса -ELLU, -A. *Јужнословенски филолоџ* 74,1/2:2018, 31–60.
- ЛОМА 2009 = Лома, Алесандар. Киљан ‘пободен камен’ – далматоромански остатак на тлу Црне Горе. *Јужнословенски филолоџ* 65, 2009: 89–99.
- ЛОМА 2003/04 = Лома, Светлана. Домаће становништво муниципија S. у светлости нових епиграфских сведочанстава. *Сџаринар* 53/54:2003/04, 35–63.
- ЛОМА 2010a = Лома, Светлана. Домородачко становништво Косова и Метохије у римско доба у светлу антропонимије. *Косово и Мешохија у цивилизацијским ѿковима : Међународни ѿемајски зборник (3)*, 19–40. (Ур. М. Атлагић. Косовска Митровица, 2010a.).
- ЛОМА 2010b = Лома, Светлана. Клаудије Гал и Северови нови сенатори. Београд.
- ЛОМА & ЛОМА 2011 = Лома, Александар, Лома, Светлана. Два средњобосанска топонима: Солун, Лабун и топографски динамизам римске Далмације. *Ономајолошки ѿрилози* 21:2011, 1–14.
- ПОПОВИЋ 1955 = Поповић, Иван. *Историја српскохрватској језика*. Нови Сад: Матица српска.
- ЭССЯ: Трубачёв, Олег Н. (ред.) & al. *Этимологический словарь славянских языков I–XXXIX*. Москва, 1974–.

Данило Савић  
Балканолошки институт  
Српска академија наука и уметности  
d.md.saiv@gmail.com

Орсат Лигорио  
Филозофски факултет  
Универзитет у Београду  
orsat.ligorio@gmail.com

## **Илирски и словенски**

*Айспиракџи:* У овом раду анализирамо позајмљенице могућег илирског порекла у словенским језицима. Први и други одељак описују претходне покушаје дефинисања граница и одлика илирског језика. Илирски облици класификовани су у складу са системом именских области Илирика који је установио Радослав Катичић. Према томе, облици су означени као либурнски, делмато-панонски, или илирски у ужем смислу. Главнина материјала, коју покривају трећи и четврти одељак, састоји се од 59 ономастичких и лексичких облика који се обично сматрају илирским позајмљеницама у српско-хрватском и, ређе, у бугарском и словеначком језику, а који често имају когнате у албанском и румунском. Одбацује се илирско порекло 13 облика. У петом одељку разматра се 16 словенских облика нејасног порекла. У шестом одељку разматра се још осам топонима који, мада нису позајмљени у словенском, доприносе покушају реконструкције илирске фонологије у седмом одељку.

*Кључне речи:* палео-балкански језици, илирски, словенски, етимологија, језички контакти, ономастика.