

From Latin phytonymy: etymologies of *ferula* ‘giant fennel’, *lolium* ‘darnel’, *rumex* ‘sorrel’ and *rūscus* ‘butcher’s broom’

Ranko Matasović

Razred za filološke znanosti HAZU

In this paper new etymologies of four Latin plant names are proposed. Lat. *ferula* ‘giant fennel’ is derived from **feselā*, from the PIE root **b^hes-* ‘to scrape’; Lat. *lolium* ‘darnel’ is argued to be a loanword from some Pre-PIE substrate and related to MW *ller* ‘darnel’; Lat. *rumex* ‘sorrel’ is derived from the PIE root **h₁rewg-* ‘belch, vomit’ and related to Lith. *rūgštỹnė* ‘sorrel’ (from the same root), and Lat. *rūscus* ‘butcher’s broom’ is compared to OIr. *rúsc* ‘bark’ and derived from the PIE root **(H)rewH-* ‘to scrape, scratch, tear off’.

Keywords: Latin etymology, Proto-Indo-European, *ferula*, *lolium*, *rumex*, *ruscus*

1. Latin *ferula* and the related words

Lat. *ferula* ‘giant fennel; stiff, slender branch, rod, staff, stick’ (attested since Varro) does not have an etymology (WH I: 487, EM 230, DV: 214). However, a derivation from an Italic root **fes-* and a connection with *festūca* ‘stalk, straw’ seems plausible both semantically and formally. *Ferula* would be derivable from **feselā*, while *festūca* (attested since Plautus) is formed with the unproductive suffix *-ūca/-ūco-* (Balles 2008: 57), attested also in *mandūcus* ‘glutton, greedy eater’, *albūcus* ‘asphodel (kind of onion), bulb of the asphodel’, *verrūca* ‘wart, steep place, excrescence’, *aerūca* ‘a kind of verdigris’, *carrūca* ‘cart’, *ērūca* ‘rocket, rucola’. However, like *ferula*, *festūca* does not have an etymology (WH I: 489, EM 231, DV: 216). We are thus left with the root *fes-* which can go back to PIE **d^hes-*, **g^{wh}es-* and **b^hes-*.

We propose a derivation from PIE **b^hes-* ‘to scrape’ (Skt. *bābhasti* ‘chews’, *bhāsma* ‘ashes’, EWA II: 257, IEW 145f.,¹ LIV s. v. **bhes-*), cf. Germ. *Besen* ‘broom’ (OHG

¹ Lat. *sabulum* ‘gravel, sand’ is probably unrelated with these words, *pace* IEW 146. It is rather probably a word of substratum origin, together with Gr. *psámmos* ‘sand’ and OHG *sant*, MHG *samt* ‘id.’.

besmo), Eng. *besom* ‘a broom made of sticks or straws’ from the same root. For the semantic connection cf. also Germ. *Gemeines Steckenkraut* ‘*Ferula communis*’ (from *Stecken* ‘stick’). The leaves of giant fennel actually look like a broom, or other instruments for scraping or dusting (the floor). Therefore, the original meaning of *ferula* was probably ‘the thing that scrapes’ or ‘a broom’, and the transfer of meaning to the plant was metaphorical.

The nominal derivatives of PIE **b^hes-* include the adjective **b^hoso-* ‘naked’ (< ‘scraped’) (OCS *bosъ* ‘barefoot’, Lith. *bāšas*, OHG *bar*, perhaps also Arm. *bok* ‘barefoot’ (presumably from **b^hoso-g^wh₂o-* ‘walking barefoot’, where **g^wh₂o-* is the same root as in Skt. *gāti* ‘goes’).

Possible cognates in Hittite are *pašihaezi* ‘rubs, squeezes, crushes’, *paššila-* (c.) ‘stone, pebble’, but note that Kloekhorst (EDHIL 650) doubts them, since the suffixes *-iha-* and *-ila-* are otherwise unattested.

However that may be, we believe that the etymological connection between Lat. *ferula* ‘giant fennel, rod, stick’ and *festūca* ‘stack straw’ is all but ascertained, and that the derivation of both words from the PIE root **b^hes-* ‘to scrape’ is plausible.

2. Latin *lolium* and Middle Welsh *llor*

Latin *lolium* ‘kind of grass, darnel, *Lolium temulentum*’ is attested since Plautus. It does not have many derivatives (only denominal adjectives *loliāceus* and *loliārius*) and it does not have an etymology (DV: 348, EM 365). WH I: 819, followed by IEW (650), speculate that this word is somehow derived from the onomatopoeic root **lā-* (Skt. *rāyati* ‘bellows’, Lat. *lāmentum* ‘lament’, OCS *lajati* ‘belch’), but this is both formally and semantically unconvincing.

In European languages, there are several words for ‘darnel’ that are similar to Lat. *lolium*, but they are clearly Latin loanwords, e.g. Germ. *Lolch* < OHG *lollī* (KL 525) and Croat. *ljūlj* (ERHJ 577). Proto-Germanic **terwōn* ‘tares’ (ME *tare* ‘wild or cultivated vetch’, pl. ‘weeds growing in grain fields, darnel’, Du. *tarwe* ‘wheat’) is related to Skt. *dūrvā-* ‘a kind of grass, *Panicum dactylon*’ (EDPG 514), but it is formally too dissimilar for there to be any connection with Lat. *lolium*. In several European languages, the name of the plant *Lolium temulentum* is connected with adjectives meaning ‘drunk’ because of its intoxicating qualities (cf. Fr. *ivraie*² < Lat. *ebriācus*, Eng. *darnel*, which is probably related to Walloon *darne*, *derne* ‘stunned, drunk’, cf. also Ukrainian (*pažitnicja*) *p’janka*, Macedonian *pijanec* from PSL. **pɔjanъ* ‘drunk’), but this does not help us elucidate the etymology of Lat. *lolium*.

² Modern (and Colloquial) Welsh *efrau* ‘darnel’ was borrowed from Fr. *ivraie*. Albanian *egjër* ‘darnel’ has also been derived from Lat. *ebriācus* ‘drunk’ (Orel 1998: 86), but the reflex of *-gj-* for Latin *-b-* is unexpected (it might be due to the analogy with *egër* ‘wild’). The Albanian word for ‘flower’, *lule*, is more similar to Lat. *lolium*, and it does not have a clear etymology (Topalli 2017: 905). The change of Lat. *-o-* to Alb. *-u-* is possible in loanwords (e. g. Lat. *fossa* ‘ditch’ >> Alb. *fushë* ‘field’), but the semantic connection is difficult (darnel is not a flower).

However, the Latin word for ‘darnel’ has a hitherto undiscovered parallel in Celtic. We believe that Lat. *lolium* is related to MW *ller* pl. ‘darnel, cockle’ (singulative *lleren* f.). Since the meanings are identical, and the forms are rather similar, this hypothesis appears rather likely. However, the exact relationship between these two words is not immediately clear. GPC (s. v. *ller*) does not give any etymology of MW *ller*, and the word is not mentioned in EDPC.³ Was the Welsh word borrowed from Latin, like so many other words, or are we dealing with common inheritance? In principle, MW *ller* (attested since the 14th century) could be derived from earlier **l̥el* by dissimilation, but the vocalism of this word would still not match Lat. *lolium*. Welsh *e* cannot be derived from earlier **o* by the Brittonic vowel affection rules, since we would expect **y* (as in *pont* ‘bridge’ pl. *pynt*, or *corn* ‘horn’ pl. *cyrn* < **kornī*, Lat. *memoria* ‘memory’ >> W *myfyr* ‘meditation’). Latin short **o* is generally preserved in old Latin loanwords in Welsh, cf. Lat. *corpus* ‘body’ >> W *corff*, Lat. *columna* ‘column’ >> W *colofn*, etc. (Haarmann 1970: 136, Schrijver 1995: 258-260).⁴ Moreover, there are no indications that Lat. *lolium* was borrowed from Celtic, and even if it were, the problem of divergent vocalism would still remain. It is therefore more probable that both MW *ller* and Lat. *lolium* are inherited (or borrowed very early from some non-IE source), rather than that one of these words represents a borrowing (either from Latin into Brittonic, or from Celtic into Latin).

By comparing MW *ller* and Lat. *lolium* we can posit a proto-form **le/oL-*, where **L* stands for a liquid resonant (either **l* or **r*). However, there are no parallels in the other IE languages (except, as mentioned earlier, those words for ‘darnel’ that were borrowed from Latin, such as Croat. *ljúlj*). Hence, it appears probable that Italo-Celtic **le/oL-* ‘darnel’ is an early borrowing from some pre-IE substratum language of Western Europe. This is all the more likely in view of the fact that a root with two liquids would contradict the rules of root-formation in PIE. Moreover, if Lat. *lolium* were inherited, it would have been dissimilated to **lorium* by the “liquid dissimilation rule” (Meiser 1998: 127), cf. *populāris* ‘people’s, popular’ (from *populus* ‘people’) vs. *amicālis* ‘friendly’ (from *amicus* ‘friend’). The relationship of Lat. *lolium* to MW *ller* is reminiscent of the one between Lat. *lilium* ‘lily, *Lilium candidum*’ to Gr. *leirion* ‘id.’. These words are also of probable substratum origin (EDG 845, Chantraine 629 compares Coptic *hrêri*, *hlêli*, ‘lily’). Both in the case of

³ The Old Irish word for ‘darnel’, *dithen* gl. *lolium*, is certainly unrelated to W *ller*, but it also does not have a clear etymology. The same can be said for Bret. *dreogenn* f. ‘darnel’.

⁴ In MW *elin* < PCelt. **olinā* ‘elbow’ (OIr. *uilenn*) there is “internal i-affection” caused by **ī* or **j* in the penultimate syllable (Schrijver 1995: 259). The same process would not affect Lat. *lolium*, since we have MW *dyn* ‘man’ from PCelt. **donyos* (OIr. *duine*) and MW *ceirch* ‘oats’ from PCelt. **korkyo-* (OIr. *corce*). This means that we would expect either **l̥yr* or **l̥eir* (not *ller*) if the MW word for ‘darnel’ were affected by the “internal i-affection”. By the time of the contact between Brittonic and Latin, *-i-* in *lolium* was no longer syllabic (i. e. the pronunciation of *lolium* was [loljum], cf. Lausberg 1967-69, I: 104-5, 207), hence the conditions for “internal i-affection” in Brittonic were not met (*-o-* rather than *-i-* was in the penultimate syllable).

lolium and *lilium* it seems that either there was an assimilation in Latin (**l...r* > *l...l*), or the donor language had a sound which was adopted as *-l-* in Latin, but as *-r-* in another language.

Although it cannot be absolutely ruled out that MW *ller* ‘darnel’ was borrowed from Lat. *lolium*, and underwent subsequent irregular sound changes, we think it is much more probable that both Lat. *lolium* and MW *ller* were borrowed from some pre-Indo-European substratum language of Western Europe. Words for weeds and plants with little economic value are often of substratum origin.⁵

3. Lat. *rumex* ‘sorrel’

Lat. *rumex* ‘sorrel, *Rumex patientia*’ does not have an etymology. It is not mentioned in DV, and WH II: 450 implausibly connect it to Lat. *rūta* ‘a bitter herb, rue’ (which is a Greek loanword) and/or to OHG *sūr* ‘bitter’. EM 581 frankly say ‘sans étymologie’.

The word *rumex* is attested since Plautus (*apponunt rumicem, brassicam* ‘they add sorrel, cabbage’, *Ps.* 815). It is otherwise a rare word, but it appears in Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 11.18). Its reflexes in the Romance languages include Fr. *ronce*, It. *romice* and Sp. *romaza*. No derivatives of *rumex* are attested in Classical Latin, but some are attested in Romance languages, e.g. Fr. *ronceux* ‘surrounded by thorn-trees’, *roncière* ‘place abundant in brambles’, etc.

The suffix *-ix/-ex* is very common in Latin plant names (cf., e.g. *ilex* ‘holm oak’, *filiX* ‘fern’, *cārex* ‘rush, sedge’, cf. Balles 2008: 50, Matasović 2016), but the root *rum-* is not attested in other plant names in Latin.

In light of the fact that leaves of sorrel are very sour, the phytonym meaning ‘sorrel’ is derived from the adjectives meaning ‘sour’ in most European languages: cf., e.g., Eng. *sorrel* < OFr. *surele* from a Frankish adjective related to OHG *sūr* ‘sour’, Croat. *kiselica* ‘sorrel’ vs. *kiseo* ‘sour’, Fr. *oseille* < Lat. *acidula*; therefore, we propose to derive Lat. *rumex* from PIE **h₁rewg-* ‘belch, vomit’. This PIE root is reflected in the Lithuanian name of sorrel, Lith. *rūgštynė* (Smoczyński 2007: 523), but also in the verb *rūgti* ‘get sour’, Gr. *ereúgomai* ‘belch out, vomit’, Lat. *irūgīre* ‘roar’, *ērūgere* ‘disgorge noisily, belch’, Russ. *rygát* ‘belch’, Croat. *rīgati* ‘belch’, Po. *rzygać* ‘throw up’, etc. (EDSIL 441f., IEW 867). The reconstruction of the palatalized **g* in the root is somewhat problematic in light of the Balto-Slavic reflexes, but these could be due to secondary depalatalization, whereas Arm. *orcām* ‘belch’ (if it comes from **orucām* < **erucām*) points to the root **h₁rewg-* with the palatalized velar.

On the formal side, we could think of the derivation from PIE **h₁rug-sm-ek-*; the consonant group **-gsm-* was reduced to *-m-* in Latin, e.g. in *iūmentum* ‘draught

⁵ For example, in Proto-Celtic we find several such words for which a substratum origin is probable (EDPC 441-3): **yoyni-* ‘rushes, reed’, **wimonā* ‘sea weed’, **smēro-* ‘berry’, **ninati-* ‘nettle’, etc. Italo-Celtic **le/oL-* fits well into this type of substratum words.

animal, beast of burden' < **yowgs-men-to* (from the root of *iungo*), cf. *IOUXMENTA* (CIL 1). A similar development occurred in *lūna* 'moon' < **lowksneh*₂ (from the root of *lūx* 'light') and, probably, *strēnuus* 'active, vigorous' < **streg-sno-*, cf. OIr. *trén* 'strong', Szemerényi 1989: 23f.). However, this development was associated with a compensatory lengthening before consonant groups involving *s and a nasal (e.g. in *cōmis* 'friendly' < *cosmis*), *aēnus* 'made of bronze' < **aenos* (cf. *aes* 'bronze'), *ēmergō* 'emerge' < **eks-mezgō*, (Meiser 1998: 118, Weiss 2010: 178), cf. also *tēmō* 'pole or yoke-beam of a cart or plough' < **tenksmen-* (OHG *dīhsala* 'thill', DV 610). Therefore, we would expect PIE **h₁rug-sm-ek-s* to develop as **rusmek*s > **rūmex*.⁶ However, short -u- in *rumex* is assured, e.g., by Virg. *Mor.* 73: *fecundusque rumex malvaeque inulaeque virebant* ("(Here) throve rich sorrow, mallows and elecampane"). It follows that either *rumex* cannot be derived from PIE **h₁rewg*'-⁷ with the suffix *-sm- (and the common phytonymic suffix -ex), or the original long *-ū- was for some reason shortened in the Latin word for 'sorrel'.

The latter might indeed be the case. Unattested **rūmex* 'sorrel' could have developed to *rumex* by analogy with the homophonous noun *rumex* 'a kind of spear or javelin, hunting spear'.⁸ The analogy may have been facilitated by the fact that leaves of sorrel are javelin-like in form, so the word for 'sorrel' and the word for '(a kind of) javelin' may have been connected by folk etymology.

Lat. *rumex* 'a kind of spear or javelin, hunting spear' is a rare word, but it is attested in Lucilius (1315) and Aulus Gellius (10.25.2). Its origin is uncertain, but one might speculate that this word is derived from the same root as *ruō* 'to rush, tumble down' < PIE **h₁rew-* 'hurry, rush, strike' (OIr. *rúathar* 'assault', Alb. *ra* [3sg. aor] 'strike, hit', Gr. *oroúō* 'hurry', EM 582f. According to De Vaan (DV 530), from this root we also have *rūna* 'a kind of weapon' (attested since Naevius). If *rūna* is from **h₁rew-neh*₂, *rūmex* can be built to a parallel (but unattested) derivative **rūma* < **h₁rew-meh*₂. For the pattern, cf. *caudex* 'tree-trunk' from *cauda* 'tail' (DV 99).

Furthermore, the short -u- in *rumex* may be due to analogy with another word with which it was often associated, either in syntagms, or conceptually. One possibility would be the adjective *ruber* 'red' (with short -u-), since stems and flowers of certain kinds of sorrel (e.g. sheep's sorrel, *rumex acetosella*, also known as "red sorrel") are indeed red.

⁶ This development also occurred in Lat. *rūmen* 'throat, first stomach of a ruminant', if this is derived from **h₁rewg-smen-* (from the same root **h₁rewg*'- 'belch, vomit' as in *rūgiō* 'belch' above (DV 529). Lat. *rūma* 'teat, nipple' and its synonym *rūmis* are semantically quite different from these words, but one cannot exclude the possibility that they were also derived, respectively, from **h₁rewg-smeh*₂ and **h₁rewg-smis*.

⁷ This was not appreciated in Matasović 2016, so this paper is a correction of the etymology first proposed there.

⁸ It is also possible that the plant *rumex* '*Rumex patientia*' was named after the weapon *rumex*, with which it bears some similarity. If that were the case, the etymology of the plant name proposed here (the derivation from **h₁rewg*'- 'belch, vomit') could not be maintained.

The least likely, but not utterly impossible, explanation of the short vowel in *rumex*, would be to assume that it was generalized from forms where the geminate was simplified by “*mamilla* rule” (Meiser 1998: 127), i.e. in pretonic positions (cf. the diminutive *mamilla* vs. the base word *mamma* ‘teat’ where the geminate was preserved after the accented syllable). Such forms could have been the diminutive **rumicilla*, or the derivatives such as **rumicōsus* (*locus*) ‘a place where sorrel grows’. Since *rumex* is a rare word in Latin text, it is not unusual that its derivatives are not attested, but their reflexes exist in Romance languages such as French (as mentioned above).

The most plausible hypothesis, perhaps, is to derive *rumex* from **rug-m-Vk-*, i.e. without **-s-* separating the velar from the nasal. Apparently the cluster *-gm-* is preserved in *tegmen* ‘cover’ and *agmen* ‘stream, crowd’ (Meiser 1998: 121); however, as these words are obvious derivatives from the verbal roots *tegō* ‘cover’ and *agō* ‘drive’, respectively, they may have restored the consonant *-g-* by analogy with the verbs (in *tegmen* the noun *tegimen* ‘cover’ could also have played a role). A different development of the cluster *-gm-* can be apparently be observed in *flamma* ‘flame’ (from the root of *flagrō* ‘burn’) and, perhaps, in *ammentum* (besides *amentum*) ‘thong or loop’ (DV: 30). The geminates in those words can be due to *littera*-rule, in which case they can also be derived from **flag-sma* and **ag-smen-tom* respectively. Therefore, if *tegmen* and *agmen* have *-g-* restored by analogy, nothing stands in the way to deriving Lat. *rumex* ‘sorrel’ from **h₁rug-m-Vk-* regularly.

Be that as it may, in light of the overwhelming number of semantic parallels, we believe that Lat. *rumex* ‘sorrel’ is a derivative of PIE **h₁rewg-* ‘belch, vomit’, just like Lith. *rūgstỹnė* ‘sorrel’ is.

4. Lat. *rūscus* ‘butcher’s broom’

Lat. *rūscus* [o m] ‘butcher’s broom, *Ruscus aculeatus*’ (also *rūscum* [o n]) is attested since Virgil;⁹ its derivative *rūscus* ‘coloured like the berries of butcher’s broom’ is attested since Cato; there is also the adjective *rūscārius* (with a variant *rustārius*, which seems to be secondary) ‘of or for butcher’s broom’ (also attested since Cato). The word *rūscus* (*rūscum*) does not have an etymology (DV 530, WH II: 454f., EM 583. However, its exact formal equivalent is attested in Celtic: both Lat. *rūscus* and PCelt. **rūsko-* (OIr. *rúsc* m. gl. *cortex*, ‘bark’, MW *risgl*, W *rhisg* m. ‘bark’, EDPC 317)¹⁰ can be derived from PIE **(H)ruH-s-ko-*, probably from the root

⁹ The length of the root vowel is somewhat uncertain. OLD and Lewis-Short write *ruscus*; de Vaan (DV 530) follows EM (583) and writes *rūscus*, which seems to be assured by the Romance forms such as Sp. *rucio* < **rūscidus* ‘of the colour of a butcher’s broom, gray, dapple (of horses)’, REW 7458 (from **ruscidus* we would expect Sp. *rocio*). The noun occurs in metrical texts, such as Virgil’s *Eclgae* VII 42 (*horridior rusco, proiecta uilior alga*), but we cannot be sure whether *-u-* in *rusco* there and in similar verses is long *positione* or *natura*.

¹⁰ MLat. *rusca* > Fr. *ruche* ‘beehive’ is usually derived from a Gaulish reflex of this PCelt. etymon. MBret. *rusquenn*, Bret. *rusk* ‘bark’ point to a pre-form **rusko-* with short **-u-*, which is unexplained (perhaps borrowed

of ON *rýja* ‘shear (of sheep)’, OCS *ryti* ‘dig’, *rɔvati* ‘tear’, Lat. *ruo* ‘rush down, tumble down’, ToB *ru-* ‘pull out’, Skt. *rāvati* ‘wound’, Lith. *rājuju*, *ráuti* ‘pluck, weed out’ etc. (LIV 461, IEW 868). The form **(H)ruH-s-ko-* seems to have been built by adding a nominal suffix **-ko-*¹¹ to a verbal s-stem (where **-s-* may have originally been a present-stem forming suffix); such an s-stem is indeed found in Balto-Slavic, e. g. OCS *rušiti* ‘destroy, damage’ (also Croat. *rüšiti*, Russ. *rúšit*’ ERHJ II: 313), Lith. *raūsti* ‘scratch, dig’ (with unexpected circumflex), *rūsas* ‘a hole dug out for winter potatoes’ (Smoczyński 2007: 507), perhaps also ON *rúst* ‘chipped off pieces, ruins’ and ON *rysja* ‘to flay’ (EDPG 418).

The problem with this etymology is, admittedly, in the semantic connection between the plant name (Lat. *rūscus*) and the meaning of the alleged cognates (‘bark’ in Celtic and the verbal meanings of the root **(H)rewH-* stretching from ‘dig, dig out’ and ‘tear’ (in Slavic) to ‘shear’ (in Old Norse), ‘pluck’ (in Lithuanian) and ‘pull out’ (in Tocharian). It is obvious that the root **(H)rewH-* denoted a (potentially violent) physical action, and most, if not all, of the attested meanings can be derived from ‘to scratch, to tear off’ or ‘to sweep’. From this it is easily understandable that the meaning ‘bark’ could develop in the nominal derivative **rū-s-ko-* in Celtic, as ‘bark’ is precisely that which is scratched, or torn off trees. The meaning of Lat. *rūscus*, on the other hand, becomes understandable if one considers the English name of the plant, ‘butcher’s broom’, as branches of *Ruscus aculeatus* were traditionally used as brooms (not only in butcher’s shops),¹² i.e. for sweeping. Its sharp leaves can also be used for other similar physical actions, such as scratching or whipping, hence its Croatian names *mètlika* (from *mètla* ‘broom’) and *jéževina* (a derivative of *jêž* ‘hedgehog’).¹³ The original meaning of Lat. *rūscus* would have been ‘the sweeper’ or something similar, and, in that case, the meaning ‘butcher’s broom, *Ruscus aculeus*’ is metaphorical.

from Gaulish or VLat?). Alb. *rrhushkull* ‘a kind of thorny plant’ is usually considered to be a Latin loanword, perhaps from a deminutive **rūsculus* built to *rūscus* ‘butcher’s broom’ (Orel 1998: 391), but we cannot exclude the possibility that it is a cognate, rather than a loanword (especially in light of the fact that Latin *-ū-* is usually borrowed as Albanian *-y-*, not *-u-*, cf. Alb. *natyrë* ‘nature’ << Lat. *nātūra*).

¹¹ The suffix **-ko-* was a very common nominal suffix in PIE; in Latin, there are some plant names ending in *-cus*, *-cum*, but admittedly they are mostly loanwords, e. g. *crocus* ‘saffron’, *sambucus* ‘elder’ (all from Greek), *ficus* ‘fig’ (from some substratum language); *verbascum* ‘mullein’ might be a native word and contain the suffix **-ko-*, if it is related to *verbēna* ‘foliage’, or irregularly corrupted from **barbascum* (from *barba* ‘beard’).

¹² Butcher’s broom contains some antibacterial compounds, which may have facilitated its use among butchers for clearing butchering blocks.

¹³ Also instructive is Modern Irish name of ‘butcher’s broom’, *giolcach nimhe*, a derivative of *giolcadh* ‘caning, beating’.

References

- BALLES, IRENE. 2008. "Nominale Wortbildung des Lateinischen", in: Rosemarie Lühr (ed.) *Nominale Wortbildung des Indogermanischen in Grundzügen. Band 1: Latein, Altgriechisch*, bearbeitet von Irene Balles. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- BEEKES, ROBERT S. P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, Leiden: Brill.
- DERKSEN, RICK. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Slavic Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.
- DV = DE VAAN, MICHEL. 2007. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the other Italic Languages*, Leiden: Brill.
- EDPC = MATASOVIĆ, RANKO. 2009. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Celtic*, Leiden: Brill.
- EM = ERNOUT, A. & MEILLET, A. 1967. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine*, Paris.
- ERHJ = MATASOVIĆ, R. ET AL. 2016. *Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga jezika. Svezak I: A-NJ*, Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje.
- EWA = M. MAYRHOFER. 1992-2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des altindoeuropäischen*, Heidelberg.
- GPC = *Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru*. Aberystwyth: University of Wales Press, 1950-2002.
- HAARMANN, HARALD. 1970. *Der lateinische Lehnwortschatz im kymrischen*, Bonn: Romanisches Seminar der Universität Bonn.
- IEW = J. POKORNY. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Bern: Francke.
- KL = KLUGE, FRIEDRICH. 1989. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- KROONEN, GUUS. 2013. *Etymological Dictionary of Proto-Germanic*, Leiden: Brill.
- KLOEKHORST, ALWIN. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden: Brill.
- LAUSBERG, HEINRICH. 1967-1969. *Romanische Sprachwissenschaft (3. Ausgabe), I-II*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- LEUMANN, MANU. 1977. *Lateinische Grammatik. Laut- und Formenlehre, Syntax und Stilistik*, München: Beck.
- LIV = H. RIX ET ALII. 2003. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- MATASOVIĆ, RANKO. 2016., "Latin tree and plant names with the suffix *-ix, -ex*", in: Nikolai N. Kazanskij (ed.), *Indo-evropejskoe jazykoznanie i klassičeskaja filologija XX*, Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka, 587-596.
- MEISER, GERHARD. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- OLD = GLARE, P. W. (ED.). 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- OREL, VLADIMIR. 1998. *Albanian Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden: Brill.
- REW = MEYER-LÜBKE, WILHELM. ⁵1972. *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- SCHRIJVER, PETER. 1995. *Studies in British Celtic Historical Phonology*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- SMOCZYŃSKI, WOJCIECH. 2007. *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas.

SZEMERÉNYI, OSWALD. 1989. *An den Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes*. Innsbruck: Innsbrücker Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft.

TOPALLI, KOLEC. 2017. *Fjalor etimologjik i gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë: Qendra Studimeve Albanologjike.

WEISS, MICHAEL. 2010. *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*, Ann Arbor: Beech Stave Press.

WH = A. WALDE & J. B. HOFMANN. 1938. *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Heidelberg: Winter.

ABBREVIATIONS: Alb. = Albanian, Arm. = Armenian, Bret. = Breton, Croat. = Croatian, Du. = Dutch, Fr. = French, Germ. = German, Gr. = Greek, Hitt. = Hittite, Lat. = Latin, ME = Middle English, MLat. = Medieval Latin, MW = Middle Welsh, OCS = Old Church Slavonic, OFr. = Old French, OHG = Old High German, OIr. = Old Irish, ON = Old Norse, PCelt. = Proto-Celtic, Po. = Polish, PSl. = Proto-Slavic, Russ. = Russian, Skt. = Sanskrit, Sp. = Spanish, ToB = Tocharian B, W = Welsh.

Iz latinske fitonimije: etimologije fitonima *ferula* „divlji komorač, obična firula“, *lolium* „ljulj“, *rumex* „kiselica“ i *rūscus* „veprina“

Sažetak

U ovom se radu predlažu etimologije četiriju latinskih fitonima. Fitonim *ferula* „divlji komorač, obična firula“ izvodi se iz praoblika **feselā*, od indoeuropskoga korijena **b^hes-* „strugati“; za fitonim *lolium* „ljulj“ tvrdimo da potječe iz nekoga neindoeuropskog supstrata iz kojega je i srednjovelški *ller* „ljulj“; latinski *rumex* „kiselica“ izvodimo iz indoeuropskoga korijena **h₁rewg^ʰ-* „povraćati“ i povezujemo s litavskim *rūgštynė* „kiselica“ (iz istoga indoeuropskoga korijena); latinski *rūscus* „veprina“ povezujemo sa staroirskim *rúsc* „kora (drveta)“ i izvodimo iz indoeuropskoga korijena **(H)rewH-* „derati, guliti“.

Ključne riječi: latinska etimologija, indoeuropski prajezik, *ferula*, *lolium*, *rumex*, *ruscus*

