

POLSKA AKADEMIA NAUK
INSTYTUT SLAWISTYKI

SLAVIA MERIDIONALIS

STUDIA LINGUISTICA
SLAVICA ET BALCANICA

1



WARSZAWA 1994

Komitet Redakcyjny

Jolanta Mindak (redaktor naczelny), Teresa Dąbek-Wirgowa,
Jolanta Sujecka, Hanna Dalewska-Greń, Irena Sawicka,
Adam Weinsberg, Krzysztof Wrocławski

Do druku opiniował
Leszek Bednarczuk

Cahier sponsorisé par
UNIVERSAL S.A.

Okładkę projektowała
Monika Handke

Skład i lamowanie
ZUK OMEGA

© Copyright by Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy
Printed in Poland

ISBN 83-901394-8-0
ISSN 1233-6173

Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy (SOW)
przy Instytucie Slawistyki PAN
Al. Ujazdowskie 18 m. 16
00-478 Warszawa

Druk: PIASTGRAF Piastówul. Warszawska 1

Table des matières

Avant-propos	7
Irena Sawicka (<i>Warsaw</i>), The phonetic shape of the Macedonian word	9
Marcel Cortiade (<i>Warschau</i>), Die Fließlaut-Systeme in den Balkan-Sprachen der Gegenwart — ein Studium in Areal- und Substrattypologie	23
Irena Sawicka (<i>Warsaw</i>), Some aspects of the phonetic development of Albanian in the Italian diaspora	47
Андрей Соболев (<i>Санкт Петербург</i>), Структура сербохорватского языкового пространства в балканском контексте	77
Алексей Сытов (<i>Санкт Петербург</i>), Диахронно-типологический параллелизм развития категории засвидетельствованности в албанском и балкано-славянских языках	95
Zuzanna Topolińska (<i>Skopje</i>), Factivity as a grammatical category in Balkan Slavic and Balkan Romance	105
Jolanta Mindak (<i>Varsovie</i>), Quelques remarques sur l'organisation diathétique des énoncés macédoniens et albanais (dans le contexte linguistique balkanique et néo-latin)	123
Victor A. Friedman (<i>Chicago</i>), The Slavic-Albanian Contacts and Early Polyglot Lexicons	139

Rozpatrywane są trzy typy zjawisk z tego zakresu: 1) gdy rozszerzenie walencji czasownika jest motywowane semantycznie i wiąże się ze wzbogaceniem jego znaczenia o informację o kauzacji (typ: maced. *Čovekot umre* vs. *Vojnikot go umre čovekot* 'człowiek umarł' vs. 'żołnierz zabił człowieka, tj. spowodował, że człowiek umarł'), 2) gdy rozszerzenie walencji ma motywację formalnoskładniową i wiąże się z tzw. awansowaniem argumentu (typ: maced. *Toj skokna preku granicata* vs. *Toj ja skokna granicata* '(On) skoczył przez granicę' vs. '(On) przeskoczył granicę'), 3) typ pośredni (maced. *Plačam* vs. *Go plačam drugarot* 'Płaczę' vs. 'Oplakuję przyjaciela').

Victor A. Friedman

**Slavic–Albanian Contacts
and Early Polyglot Lexicons:
The Albanian Lexicon of the Monk Arkádii,
A mid–nineteenth century manuscript
from the Hilendar Monastery on Mount Athos***

In 1978 I read a paper entitled "Gjorgji Pulevski, fjalorët e tij dhe rilindjet kombëtare shqiptare e maqedone" [Gjorgji Pulevski, his

*I wish to express my gratitude to the Hilendar Monastery on Mount Athos and to The Resource Center for Medieval Slavic Studies of The Ohio State University. Thanks to their generosity, I was able to examine the manuscript which constitutes the focus of this paper. I am especially grateful to Dr. Predrag Matejić, head of the Hilendar Research Project, who generously supplied me with a photocopy of the microfilm of the manuscript and other helpful information and materials. I also wish to acknowledge assistance from the University of North Carolina Research Council, which enabled me to examine relevant related materials at the Newberry Library in Chicago. I am grateful to the Center for Bulgarian Studies of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, which supplied me with materials on Bulgarian dialectology. I also wish to thank the American Council for Learned Societies for a Grant for East European Studies financed in part by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Ford Foundation, which enabled me to do some of the research for this paper. Moreover, I wish to thank Prof. Ronelle Alexander, Dr. Julia Alissandratos, Prof. Eric Hamp, Prof. Brian Joseph, Acad. Blaže Koneski, and Acad. Božo Vidoeski, all of whom supplied me with helpful comments and explanations concerning the manuscript. The responsibility for any errors in this article is of course entirely my own.

dictionaries, and the Albanian and Macedonian national renaissances] at a Conference in Honor of the 100th Anniversary of the League of Prizren, held in Prishtina, 6–9 June. In that paper I discussed problems with the representation of Albanian in Cyrillic orthography and his attempt to add Tosk features to his Geg base (Debar, with some Gostivar and Polog). That paper was already printed for publication in the Proceedings of the Conference (pp. 245–256), but in 1981 the publication was apparently permanently delayed. Since then, other scholars (e.g., Jašar–Nasteva 1984, Koneski and Jašar–Nasteva 1984) not knowing of that article have published on the themes I treated there. But Pulevski's was not the only nineteenth-century Cyrillic lexicon that Slavic–Albanian contacts in the Balkans. In a different part of the Balkans, on Mt. Athos, a monk named Arkádii produced a short Bulgarian–Albanian lexicon and translated a number of Eastern orthodox prayers into Albanian less than a decade before Pulevski published his first dictionary. It is this lexicon that I propose to discuss here. I shall argue that Arkádii was a speaker of a dialect related to but distinct from that of Mandrica and that of Devnja–Karakurt–the Ukraine and that his lexicon is therefore a precious record of a heretofore unattested dialect of Eastern Diaspora Albanian, i.e. those Albanian dialects that at the turn of the nineteenth century were spoken in Thrace and Moesia (and later also in Bessarabia, the Ukraine, and Aegean Macedonia). Moreover, it is Arkádii's bilingualism with Bulgarian that helps us locate the dialect his lexicon represents¹.

¹A note on transliteration: Due to the technical limitations on using Cyrillic in this text, a transliteration that, for the most part, follows the standard employed by Slavic linguists is used here in angled brackets. Thus for example <ja>, <ju>, stand for corresponding individual Cyrillic letters. Likewise the sequence <dž> represents the single letter found in modern Macedonian and Serbo–Croatian and <th> stands for theta. Since Arkádii never uses i–kratkoie, I have assigned <j> to front jer. In the case of some letters I have used different transliterations for Bulgarian and Albanian based graphic conventions associated with Bulgarian transliteration and Albanian orthography:

back jer = Bulgarian <ŭ>/Albanian <ë>

jat = Bulgarian <ě>/Albanian <je>

Similarly Bulgarian <č,š,ž,št,x> = Albanian <ç,sh,zh,sh,t,h>

In addition to the Cyrillic letter normally used for <i>, Arkádii uses three graphemes corresponding to the Latin <i>: one with no dot, one with one dot, and

I first learned of this lexicon a number of years ago from Bogdanović's (1978:263) catalogue. The first 17 leaves contain morning prayers in Greek, excerpts from the Paterikon in Church Slavonic, and some purchasing accounts in Bulgarian. There follows the Bulgarian–Albanian lexicon that is the focus of this study (18b–31b), a short Bulgarian–Russian lexicon whose ink is so faded in most places that it is almost completely illegible, notes on barometric readings, medicinal recipes, and four pages (37b–39a) of Orthodox prayers translated into Albanian, apparently from Church Slavonic (which is the language of the titles, e.g. Oče Naš Arnautski 'Albanian Our Father'). The material from these prayers is also included in our study. The last page (40a) contains a recipe for stopping diarrhea.

After working intermittently for several years on a critical edition of the Albanian texts, I discovered that my esteemed colleague Prof. Thoma Kacori had seen the original manuscript and published the text with a brief commentary in *Balkansko ezikoznanie* (Kacori 1984). His article did not preclude a detailed study, but the opportunity to be the first to publish the text was lost and I put my work aside. It was not until the occasion of this conference, however, that in preparation to write what I supposed would be a discussion of some details of the text I read Prof. Kacori's article carefully with my own notes and photocopy of the manuscript at hand.

It is with regret that I must report that were it not for the photograph of the first two pages of the lexicon appended to the end of Prof.

one with diaeresis. In order to distinguish the graphemes that correspond to the standard Cyrillic <i> I shall use <î> for the Latin <i>. In the case of no or two dots, I shall use the same grapheme as in the manuscript. Arkádii makes extensive use of the pajerok (a superscript resembling an exaggerated vertical tilde) usually for <ü/ë> or <n>, rarely for <î> or <j> or without apparent assignable value. In such cases I shall use square brackets and the appropriate letter. In case of uncertainty or where there is no sign at all indicating a letter, I shall use braces. The rest of the system is quite straightforward, but I should note the following:

ê = front jus

ô = back jus (one occurrence)

ö = omega

ks = ksi

Square brackets and slashes will be used in the text with their standard linguistic values of designating phonetic and phonemic transcription.

Kacori's article and Bogdanović's (ms 775;1978:263) description cited at the beginning, I would have been tempted to conclude that there were two versions of the manuscript, so many are the divergences between the published text and the photocopy of the manuscript I have been studying. Items and pages are cited out of order, and a number of entries have been misread or partially omitted. I can only conclude that Prof. Kacori did not have the manuscript in front of him when he prepared the final version of his article. The text must be supplemented and corrected as well as analyzed in detail. This material is so rich in data that a complete analysis and correction is more than can be archived in a single conference paper². I am therefore presenting

²K gives the pages in the following order: 18b-19a-21b-22a- 20b-21a-23b--24a- 30b-31a-24b-25a-26b-27a-22b-23a-25b-26a-19b-20a-28b-2a-27b-28a-29b-30a--31b. Five entries are out of order. For illustrative purposes I shall cite here some of the corrections to Kacori's version of page 29b (Kacori 1984:49):

[Bulgarian]	Should read	English
izmókri	izmókre[n]	wet
pólnu	pǔlnu	full
poznanĕ	poznátŭ	known
čistŭ	bistŭr	clear
lĕgo	lĕkŭ i leko (on p.50)	light
próčut	próčut	famous
lésno	lésno-tróše[n]	fragile (easily-broken)
slúšatŭ	slúšatel	listener
ljubizni	ljubézna	dear, kind
[Albanian Cyrillic]		
égurĕ	éçur[ĕ]	thrist
gĭjálĕ	gĭjálĕ	alive
[Bulgarian/Standard Albanian]		
nabŭrgo/shpejt	nabŭrçe[n]/zhubrosur	wrinkled (not <i>quickly</i>)
[Bulgarian-Albanian Cyrillic-Modern Albanian]		
pésũko	pústŭ	wretched(not <i>sand</i>)
a šúrtĕ	a škrét[ĕ]	
e shurtĕ	e shkretĕ	
mnógo i zrelŭ	mnógo izrjáde[n]/xubav	very beautiful
šum i bëirĕ	šum a bukurĕ	
shumĕ dhe i bërĕ	shumĕ e bukura	

here a prolegomenon to a detailed study of this unique document.

With regard to the author of the notebook Bogdanović states: "There is no signature, only the ex libris of the monk Galaktion." He also notes that page 15a contains accounting notes dated 1864. Elsewhere Bogdanović (1978:239) identifies Galaktion as the religious name of one Joan Bardarević of Nevrokop (modern Goce Delçev), who was known to have collaborated with other monks on many religious book. Based on this information and the fact that the Hilendar library also countains a Bulgarian-Greek dictionary dated 1880 and signed in Latin letters by "Pankratye monach chylandárský, Sava monach ý Danyil monach. Svetoslaw Kozmyk". (Bogdanović 1978:231), Kacori suggests that the monk Danyil was the author of the 1864 lexicon, as this name is the most widespread among Albanian monks whereas the others are Slavic. In fact, however, the top of page 15a contains the following unambiguous sentence in the same hand as that which wrote the lexicon and the rest of the manuscript: Potřebni xesápi túka zabelězvamŭ az[ŭ] Arkádii Mo(na)x (or Mo(nax) X(ilendarski?) 1864 unŭ 19. 'I am noting here necessary accounts, Monk Arkádii (or Hilendar Monk Arkádii) June 9' It was this monk Arkádii, therefore who was the author of the lexicon, which he began, presumably, some time after 5 purchases of charcoal and 4 of wine that he first noted on 19 June 1864³.

Having identified the author, we can turn to the problem of where he was from. Both the Bulgarian and the Albanian texts display distinct dialectal traits. Kacori adduces four arguments in favor of his

³There is only one other mention of the name Arkádii in Bogdanović (1978:113), that of a hierodeacon from the Pskov district, who signed himself as the author of ms 225 (p.73a), the Orders of Isaiah the Anchorite. Dr. Predrag Matejić informs me that the endpapers for ms 225 are from ca. 1850, so the time frame allows for the possibility of this being the same Arkádii. From the copies of the pages of ms 225 that Dr. Matejić kindly supplied me, however, it is clear that this ms was written by a different hand. Not only are the shapes of the letters quite different, but Arkádii of Pskov is faithful to Russian orthographic rules in his use of letters such as i-kratkoe and jery, whereas the Arkádii of our lexicon never uses i-kratkoe (e.g. in his Russian and Bulgarian lexicon in the same manuscript he writes <junak-geroi>) and does not use jery in his church Slavonic texts. There is also the fact the Arkádii of Pskov was already a hierodeacon by 1850 while our Arkádii was still a monk in 1864.

hypothesis that Arkádii came from Devnja (Provadija district, Varna region), an Albanian village whose inhabitants emigrated to Bessarabia between 1809 and 1828–29, when Devnja was destroyed in a Russo-Turkish war. Some of these Albanians emigrated to the Azov region after the Crimean War, i.e. after 1856 (Deržavin 1933:506, 1948:156–57; Shuteriqi 1965:107)⁴. Kacori's points are the following:

1. The shift of /e/ to /a/ in the feminine nominative proclitic particle and in the preposition *ma* 'with'.
2. Arkádii's knowledge of Russian as demonstrated by his short Bulgarian–Russian lexicon in the same ms.
3. The fact that a number of the Bulgarian entries in his Bulgarian–Albanian lexicon display Russian influence.
4. The preposition of adjectives on the Slavic model, e.g. <teška bólesū – a ré[n]d[ě] smúre> 'serious illness' (25b05).

On the basis of these facts and the Albanian prayers at the end of the ms, Kacori argues that Arkádii must have come from the village of Devnja and intended his work for his fellow villagers who had emigrated to the Ukraine⁵.

However, none of Kacori's arguments is conclusive, and there is ample evidence for arguing that Arkádii did not in fact come from Devnja but rather from one of the other Albanian villages what can be called the Eastern Diaspora. That Arkádii knew Russian and that it influenced his Bulgarian can be accounted for by the fact that education in Russia was the choice of many Orthodox Slavs and also some Orthodox Albanians, especially those wishing to flee the domination of the Greek Church. Russian was thus an important vehicle of education for Orthodox Christians, and Arkádii was an educated man who knew Greek and Church Slavonic as well as Albanian, Bulgarian, Russian

⁴The Albanian immigrants from Devnja founded the village of Karakurt (now Žovtnevoe) between Izmail and Bolgrad in Bessarabia in 1810–11. Bulgarians and Gagauz also emigrated to that region at the same time. The three villages of Gammovka (formerly the Tatar village Džandaran), Georgievka (Tjuški), and Devnenskoe (Taz) near the Azov Sea were founded in 1862 (Kotova 254–55).

⁵Actually, K is inconsistent in that he states that the author was from Devnja (1984:38) but also that he was from one of the Ukrainian villages (1984:39). In view of the dates of the founding of these villages, this latter cannot have been the case.

and probably other languages. His knowledge of Russian therefore need not be connected with the Albanian emigration. Moreover, there was constant contact between the Hilendar monastery and Russia as well as Russian monks at the monastery. (cf. Urquhart 1839:159). This, too, could help to account for the Russisms in Arkádii's Bulgarian text. Moreover, some of those Albanians who founded Karakurt and later emigrated to the Ukraine came from Bulgarian villages other than Devnja (Kotova 1956:255; Miletič 1902:105,143).

With regard to Kacori's attempt to assign a purpose to Arkádii's work it is unclear why the Albanians of the Ukrainian diaspora should have needed a Bulgarian–Albanian lexicon, since they were already bilingual with Bulgarian. Given the role of Russian as a language of education, a Bulgarian–Russian lexicon could have been intended for any Bulgarophone audience. The Albanian prayers could clearly be claimed as intended for an Albanian audience, but in view of the paucity of religious materials in Albanian in the midnineteenth century and the fact that Arkádii was apparently unaware of those few publications that did exist, these translations might have been intended for any Albanophone audience⁶. Finally, there is the fact that the notebook is of such mixed contents. The accounts could only have been of interest within the monastery, and a recipe for stopping diarrhea is hardly appropriate for a dictionary or prayer book. A more likely explanation is that the entire note book was intended for the monk Galaktion whose *ex libris* appears in it. We know that he was from Nevrokop (Goce Delčev), that wrote in Bulgarian, and that he was a hierodeacon in the monastery in 1864 (ms 622, Bogdanović 1978:217). He was also a bibliophile who purchased books (ms 538, Bogdanović 1978:199) and to whom his fellow monks donated their work (ms 588, Bogdanović 1978:210). There were no Albanian colonies in the region Galaktion came from, so Arkádii could well have written the lexicon and prayers for the sake of Galaktion's intellectual curiosity and the recipes and accounts for his information.

Kacori's linguistic evidence is no less disputable. The word order

⁶As an example we can cite the New Testament translation published in Corfu in 1827 under auspices of Gregory Archbishop of Euboea and reprinted in Athens in 1858.

Adjective-head is shared by the dialect of Mandrica spoken south of Ivailovgrad (Orta Köy) in Bulgaria and its daughter village Mandres (Ambar Köy) southeast of Kilkis (Kukuš) in Aegean Macedonia. Whether a shared or parallel innovation, this fact invalidates the feature as diagnostic⁷. It is true that the change of clitic /e/ to /a/ does not occur in Mandrica or Mandres, but given the lack of any other evidence concerning Albanian dialects in Thrace and Moesia other than the fact that we know the names of some of the villages where they were spoken, we cannot know how widespread this feature may already have been in the nineteenth century. We should also note that while the feminine proclitic article consistently occurs as <a> in Arkádii's text, the one third singular accusative clitic occurs as <e> (31b13) and the preposition "with" occurs as <me> in two places (37b08, 38a06) although <ma> occurs in four (22b03, 25a17, 38a01, 38a06)⁸.

The remaining features cited by Kacori, e.g., preservation of <i> in positions such as those illustrated by, <gljuhë> 'tongue' [20a11], <uljkë> 'wolf' [20b06], <golj> 'mouth' [24b08], are also shared with other diaspora dialects as well as some dialects still spoken in Albania (Gjinari 1966:44). A careful comparison of Arkádii's text with Albanian materials from Bessarabia/the Ukraine and from Mandrica/Mandres (Deržavin 1933, 1934, 1948; Haebler 1959; Islami 1965; Kotova 1956; Voronina 1970, 1977; Hamp 1965, 1972; Sokolova 1972, 1977, 1983; Shuteriqi 1965)⁹ shows that while his dialect is clearly related to these, it is different. Here are some illustrative examples¹⁰:

Arkádii	The Ukraine	Mandrica	Standard	
çili (24a16)	çil'i	çili	çili	which
ni (19b05)	n'i	ni	një	one
likurë (29b02)	l'ikurën	lëkurë/l'ikur' ^{e11}	lëkurë	skin
mingës[e] (19a13)	minges	mëngjes	mëngjës	morning

⁷We can add here that Arkádii preserves the head-genitive word order in *biri perendisë* (37b04) 'son of God' whereas the Ukrainian dialects have the Slavic model: *jan'i janak'it pl'aka mëma* 'Jani Janaki's old mother' (Deržavin 1934).

⁸Moreover, both /e/ and /a/ occur for both 3rd sg acc pro and fem clitic even in a single speaker in Kotova's texts (1956:277-78).

⁹This list is not exhaustive, since several of the studies referred to in those works were not available to me.

¹⁰In those cases where my Ukrainian and Mandrican material did not supply an exact match, I cited the nearest form that occurred if there was one.

¹¹Mandrica: Shuteriqi 1985:162 / Mandres: Hamp 1965:151.

gljuhë (24b11) ga (20a11) juu (38a04) vshatë (20a08)	gluhë ga juja vshatë/fshatë	glufa nga asat fshat	guhë nga e tij fshat	tongue from his village
dë (19b08) iôtje (38b02) bjé djélë (19a08) lali re (24a06)	n'i inde bi d'il të ri botë	[n]dë, në jôte, jôtja bje djellë tëré xhako	në jote bie diell i ri, të rinj	in, on et thy falls sun <i>young</i>
kljúm()bështë (22a02) dimër[e] (19b09) (j)ëmbër[e] (22b09) ¹² /(j)ëmra (38b02) zëmbërë (25a04) thëmbërë (23b16) thtóthtë/thóthë /thóhsha (31a03/ 25b13/25b13)	kl'úmështë d'imbër jëmbër — ftóhkam	klúmështë dimërë/dimëri ëmërë/ëmra [Mandres] zëmrë/zëmra [Mandres] fëmërë/fëmra ftóftë	qumështë dimër emër zemër femër ftóhtë	milk winter name heart woman cold
mói (19b04) gró (27b07,16) pjési[3sg subj] (38b02) krië (24a19) fórtë (31a06) dëborë (19a02) dëb()jëturë (31a12) [j]étrëtë (38b08) babá (38b1)	múi gru pjÿs [1sg] kry hortë zbur jatr- táti	muój gruvë pjósë krúve hórtë zbóré zbjéré játrat táte	muaj grua pyesë krye fórtë dëborë bjerrë/vdjerr tjerët/tjerat baba, tatë	month woman asks head strong snow lost others father
ljúpë (23b12) ljútë (25a10) ¹³ çupéjtë (29b14) pëshkéj (26a14)	l'opë l'ot shpejt, hëzlë pël'qén	lopë lot shpejt pëlqyén	lopë lot shpejt pëlqej ¹⁴	cow tear soon like

¹²Arkádii never distinguishes initial sequences of [e] and [je] but always writes <e> in this position, e.g., <épi/épënë> (31b11, 39a04) 'give', <étë> (19a04) 'live/world', <é> (20a11, 38b01, 39a02) 'are, is'. In other positions he often uses jat to represent [je] although he also writes <ie> and <ie> (e.g., <pëkurë> (29b09) 'mature', <diëgurë> (30b07) 'burnt' <pïesk[e]> (21a03) 'peach'). We can infer from this that Arkádii had lost the distinction [e]/[je] in initial position and had generalized either [je] as in the Ukrainian dialects, or perhaps [e] under the influence of Bulgarian phonotactics.

¹³But <p'liótë> (29b03) but also <plótë> (31a01) 'full'.

All three dialects share the change of [c] to [č] at least in the relative pronoun, and show a tendency to raise schwa in the environment of a palatal, although this tendency is stronger in Arkádii's dialect and the Ukraine (also, apparently in Mandres). Other features that Arkádii shares with Ukrainian dialects as opposed to Mandrica are the change of nga to ga (but elsewhere ng is preserved), the peculiar 3 sg masc possessive pronoun, preservation of [h] in 'tongue', and the form of 'village', which as a lexical item joins the words for 'snow' and 'lose' as one of the diagnostics separating all these dialects from Arvanitika (Hamp 1965).

On the other hand, Arkádii's dialect resembles Mandrica as opposed to the Ukraine in its locative preposition and the 2 sg fem possessive pronoun, in its preservation of [ié] as [je], and in its apparent generalization of the feminine form of 'young', used in the cited form to modify *lalë* 'older brother'.

The treatment of [-mërë] in Arkádii resembles but is distinct from both the Ukraine and Mandrica. Although epenthetic [b] occurs, as in the Ukraine, it does so only in feminines, a distinction that links the dialect with Mandrica. His word for 'milk' has an epenthetic [b] not shared by the others.

A possible environment for the development [f] > [θ] is before [e] & stops, but the corpus is too limited for this to be stated with any certainty. In all other places Arkádii consistently distinguishes etymological [f] and [θ], so this is not a matter of graphic confusion. His faithful preservation of /θ/ is a link with the Ukraine¹⁵. In any case,

¹⁴Some other interesting comparisons are the following:

Arkádii	Ukraine	Mandrica	Standard	English
shuptóshë (38b11)	shpëtonë	—	shpëto-	save
ksida (25a06)	këthizë	kërsizë (Mandres)	kërthizë	navel
ertië (19a17)	—	erëcírë	errësrë	darkness
shpjiurti (27a17)	shpirti	—	shpirti	spirit

In this last case, Arkádii's dialect agrees with Korçë shpyrti, and he usually uses <ju> for /y/. We know that the East Albanian diaspora came from the general region of Korçë, e.g. Vithkuq and Devoll. This example suggests that Arkádii's village may have come originally from Korçë itself or some place close by.

¹⁵Arkádii does not distinguish /d/ and /dh/, e.g., <dàrda> (21a01) = dardha 'the pear', <dë> (19b04)/dië (18b09) = dhe 'earth' vs <detë> (19a06) = det 'sea'/<diëgurë> (30b07) = djegur 'burnt'. Cf. also <dijámë> (30a02)/<djámë>

the second [θ] in 'cold' is surely arrived at via [f], which is closer to Mandrica than to the Ukraine.

The treatment of original [uo] diphthongs is similar to but distinct from the Ukraine and Mandrica and the treatment of original [ye] helps show that Arkádii's dialect is distinct from both these others. The remaining examples also differentiate Arkádii from the attested Eastern Diaspora Albanian dialects. In the first group, Arkádii is closer to the standard language, in the second he shows innovations not shared with the other dialects.

Space and time do not permit a complete systematic analysis of Arkádii's dialect here, that is the work of later study. Nonetheless, it should be clear from the foregoing that Arkádii's lexicon represents a distinct and heretofore unrecorded dialect of Eastern Diaspora Albanian.

How then are we to determine the provenience of Arkádii's dialect? First, let us consider the specific possibilities. We know from a variety of sources (e.g., Çabej 1975; Carnegie 1914; Çili 1967; Kacori 1967; MacFarlane 1850; Miletič 1902; Sokolova 1983; Shuteriqi 1965a) that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were scattered Albanian-speaking villages in Bulgaria and Eastern Thrace¹⁶. According to Miletič (1902:102-105,140-43), in addition to Devnja there were other Albanian or partially Albanian villages around Provadija, as well as near Varna, Razgrad, and Veliko Tŭrnovo. Some of these Albanians went to Bessarabia either directly or via Devnja at the beginning of the nineteenth century, but some were still in Bulgaria in Miletič's (1902:140) day (cf. Also Kacori 1967). Lejean (1861) shows a sizable

(21b18) = dhjamë 'fat' vs <dijath> (21b16) = djathë 'cheese'. In view of his consistent use of <th>, it seems unlikely that Arkádii had lost /dh/. It seems rather than for some reason he was unwilling to modify his Cyrillic in some way to accommodate /dh/. The one occurrence of <dië> noted here strongly suggests that he began with such an attempt but abandoned it. This entry is the first occurrence of a word containing /dh/ in the manuscript, and moreover the letter <i> is written over an <e>, i.e. Arkádii wrote <de> but changed it to <dië>, which suggests a conscious attempt to represent [dhe].

¹⁶Given the facts cited by those who have actually spoken with these villagers and their descendents and analyzed their speech, Marinov's (1960) attempt to prove that these were all Macedonian villages must be dismissed as wishful thinking.

Albanian group in the Rhodopes between Asenovgrad (Stanimaka) and Kŭrdžali, apparently centered at a place called Arnaut Kjoj¹⁷. In addition to the villages named or indicated in these sources, toponymy leads us to suspect that Rudnik (Arnautlar) north of Burgas, Elšica (Arnautkjoj) between Panagjurište and Pazadržik, Gugutka (Arnautkjoj) west of Mandrica, and Arnautito south of Stara Zagora may all have been Albanian-speaking at one time. The fact that the first three were included in the Bulgarian Dialectal Atlas (Stojkov and Bernštejn 1964 and Stojkov 1966,1975), however, suggests that they have been Bulgarophone for a significant period.

For Eastern Thrace we know from a number of sources (e.g. Hamp 1965, MacFarlane 1850, Sokolova 1983, Çabey 1975) that there were at least five Albanophone villages in addition to Mandrica in the Edirne (Odrin, Adrianople) region in 1864: Ibrik Tepe (Qytezë), Sultan Köy, Altın Taş, Pazar Dere (Azárderé in Sokolova [1983]), all of which spoke a dialect close to that of Mandrica (Sokolova 1983:5/223), and a village variously cited as Zalléf (Sokolova) 1983, Shuteriqi 1963), Zalúf/Zalouf (Hamp 1965/Carnegie 1914:134), Zallof/Zallof (Çili 1967/Hamp 1965), and Criza Zaliff (MacFarlane 1850:574). Moreover, Sokolova (1983:3) reports that Satı Köy (Lozengrad/Kirklareli/ Kırk Kilise Region), Bulgar Köy (Malgara region), and Tarfa (Istanbul region) were described as "Albanian" settlements before 1912. To this we can add the fact that Lejean (1861) shows three Albanian-speaking areas in Turkish Thrace. One is northwest of Çatalca near Istanbul (Tarfa?), one is at the site of modern Çerkesköy northeast of Çorlu, and one is around Malkara (Malgara; Bulgar Köy?).

Actually locating these Eastern Thracian villages is much more difficult than in the case of the Bulgarian villages, for which we have modern maps or reasonably precise descriptions. To the best I have been able to determine, only Ibrik Tepe can be located with certainty on a modern map (The Balkans, National Geographic Atlas Plate 39, February 1962), where its longitude corresponds to that of Edirne and its latitude to that of Istanbul. Sultan Köy is indicated on Peucker (1909; longitude = Dhidhimothikon [Dimotika]; La = Ibrik Tepe).

¹⁷Unfortunately, I only had access to a photoreproduction on which many place names were not clearly legible.

MacFarlane (1850:574) writes that "Criza Zaliff" is one and half hours from Yeni Köy in the direction of Baba Eskisi. This description appears to correspond to the location of modern Kırçasalılı. MacFarlane was told that Ibrik Tepe and Altın Taş were "on the other side of" Uzun Köprü, and Shuteriqi (1965a) cites a source locating Altın Taş east of the Marica (Meriç). The map appended to Baker (1877) shows a village called Altın Taş but it is on the east bank of the Hayrabolu river north of Uzun Köprü (longitude = Baba Eskisi latitude = Dhidhimotikhon [Dimotika]). I have not succeeded in locating [P]azar Dere.

Given this large number of Albanian colonies, is there any way of determining which one Arkádii may have come from? It is here that Albanian contacts with Slavic provide evidence. Arkádii was bilingual in Bulgarian and Albanian. The dialectal features in his Bulgarian entries indicate that while he was literate, he did not completely control the literary norm, and we can assume that the dialectal features usually represent the Bulgarian he learned in his native village. This dialect, in turn, was learned from the local Bulgarian population. Although contamination from the other Slavic languages and dialects that Arkádii learned and/or heard in the monastery must be allowed for and obviously occurred, nonetheless the preponderance of a given feature can be taken as indicative. Within the framework of Kočev (1988) and supplemented by Alexander (1981), we can describe the dialect of Arkádii's Bulgarian environment in terms of the following more or less consistently features:

1. The reflex of original jat under stress followed by a historically hard consonant is some sort of [e] or [ê], e.g. <bélo>, <golém>, <xléb[ũ]>, <mésto>, <umrélũ>, <sénka>¹⁸.

¹⁸There are total of 27 items representing 22 roots attesting a reflex of jat in this position. Of these, 19 items representing 15 roots have <e>, 5 items representing 4 roots have <ê>, and 3 items have <ja>. The items with graphic jat can be dismissed as opaque. The 3 items showing <ja> are <rjátku>, <izrjáde[n]> and <smjátienë>. The last has a Church Slavonicizing suffix and can be taken as a literary intrusion, but the first is clearly a colloquial form while the second might or might not be influenced by Literary Bulgarian. In view of the overwhelming preponderance of <e>, however, I propose that the forms with <ja>, especially <rjátku>, are due to the influence of speakers other than those from Arkádii's region. Perhaps even Galaktion himself influenced Arkádii, since [rjátku] is the

2. Unstressed /o/ and /e/ reduce to [u] and [i], respectively, e.g.: <dádux>, kulilá, pŭlnu>, <žítu>, <sínju>; <čírěši>, <čírvéno>, <sírěni>, <ziléno>, <pitél>, <dibeliná>¹⁹.
3. The reflex of *čr- is underlying /čer-/: <čírěši>, <čírvéno>, <čérno>.
4. Final stress in the words <ženà>, <sestrà>, and <glavà>/<glaví>.
5. The gloss for 'shirt' is <ríza>.
6. The gloss for 'sweet' is <slátkoto>.
7. The shape of the masculine definite article is <-o>, e.g., <svetó>, <červó>, <stráxo>, <méseco>.

A complete analysis of Arkádii's Bulgarian must wait for a later study, but these seven features are already enough to limit the possibilities to a small number of regions. For Arkádii's dialect, feature 1 eliminates all but a few patches of eastern Bulgaria, and none of those patches are in the northeast²⁰. Combined with features 2-6, the only locations left are the following:

In modern Turkish Thrace:

- A. Two patches northeast of Çatalça
- B. A semicircle northwest of Lozengrad (Kırklareli, Kırk Kilise) going up to the Bulgarian border
- C. An oval from Edirne (Odrin, Adrianople) north to the Bulgarian border.

In modern Bulgaria

- A. Two regions due north of Plovdiv, the more northerly on a latitude with Panagjurište,
- B. Two regions west and southwest of Asenovgrad (Stanimaka)

When we add feature seven, we are left with the regions in eastern Thrace (cf. Conev 1937:201). Of our attested Albanian villages this leaves possibly Satı Köy or Tarfa, although there is also the possibility that Arkádii was from village whose name we no longer have (cf.

form of this word that is native to Nevrokop (Goce Delčev).

¹⁹Reduction /o/>[u] in 11 items, /e/>[i] in 10 items. The presence of graphic <o> and <e> in unstressed position is irrelevant, since that was the literary norm.

²⁰Even if we were to ignore this feature, there are many other differences that space and time do not permit us to cite here. One example is Arkádii's <žatva> as opposed to /žetva/ in all those villages near former Albanophone villages in northeastern Bulgaria as well as literary Bulgarian.

Shuteriqi 1965a:107-08)²¹. To be sure, the precise dialectal of features a century ago may have been different, and the maps in Kočev (1988) are lacking in any sort of detail. Nonetheless, given the detail of the maps available for Bulgaria proper (Stojkov and Bernštejn 1964, Stojkov 1966, 1975), it is almost certainly the case that Arkádii's dialect was spoken in what is now Turkish Thrace. Like the other attested Eastern Diaspora dialects, it appears to have its origins in the general region of Korçë and probably separated from the main Albanian speech area during the upheavals of the eighteenth century (Hamp 1965:138; Shuteriqi 1965a:107-08). Although it shows striking archaisms and innovations, some shared with the other attested Eastern Diaspora dialects and some not, Hamp's (1965) arguments concerning the relatively recent separation of Mandres/Mandrica from Southern Albania bear equally cogently on Arkádii's dialect.

Clearly there is much more to be said about this valuable document and I hope to be able to do so in future work. But I hope here to have established the author — a monk named Arkádii — and the provenience of his heretofore unrecorded Albanian dialect: modern Turkish Thrace. The lexicon also documents a Thracian dialect of Bulgarian, but owing to obvious interferences from other Slavic languages and dialects, this evidence is not always unambiguous. Among the suggestions we can make on the basis of this document concerning changes in Eastern Diaspora Albanian due to language contact is that the shift of Albanian word order under Slavic and Turkish influence began in head-adjective constructions and moved from there to head-genitive constructions, given the fact that the Ukraine and Mandrica display both shifts but Arkádii has only the former and unshifted examples of the latter. The treatment of possessive pronouns argues that Arkádii's dialect occupies an intermediate position between Mandrica and Devnja, but the development represented by lexical items such as <dëborë>, <krë>, and <špījurti> suggest that its origins may be closer to Korçë than others.

²¹Although we do not have a location for Pazar Dere, the fact that its dialect is among those felt by Mandricans to be close to theirs makes it a less likely candidate, depending, of course, on the meaning of "close".

References

- Alexander, Ronelle. 1981. *External and Internal Change in Balkan Slavic. Studies in Balkan Linguistics to Honor Eric P. Hamp on His Sixtieth Birthday* („Folia Slavica” 4, 2-3), ed. by Howard I. Aronson and Bill J. Darden, 188-97. Columbus: Slavica
- Baker, James. 1877. *Turkey*. New York: Holt
- Bogdanović, Dimitrije. 1978. *Katalog ćirilskih rukopisa manastira Hilandara*. Beograd: Srpska Akademija Nauka i Umetnosti, Narodna Biblioteka SR Srbije
- Bradaska, Franz. 1869. *Die Slaven in der Türkei*. „Petermann's Mittheilungen aus Justus Perthes' Geographischer Anstalt”, 15. 449-458. Gotha: Justus Perthes
- Çabej, Eqrem. 1975. *Ngulimet shqiptare jashtë atdheut*. „Studime gjuhësore” V, 56-62. Prishtinë: Rilindja
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. 1914. Report of the Internal Commission to Inquire into the Causes and Conduct of the Balkan Wars*. Washington, D.C.: The Endowment
- Çili, Perikli. 1967. *Mandrica, një fshat shqiptar në Bullgari*. „Studime filologjike” 21 (5), 3. 197-202
- Conev, Benjo. 1937. *Istorijska na bŭlgarskija ezik*, tom 3. Sofia: Pridvorna pečatnica
- Deržavin, I.S. 1933. *Iz issledovanij v oblasti albanskoj immigracii na territorii b. Rossii i USSR. Sbornik v čest na Prof. L. Miletič: Za sedemdesetgodišnata ot roždenieto mu* pp. 504-512. Sofia: Makedonski naučen institut
- Deržavin, I.S. 1934. *Jàni jànaki. Sergeju Fedoroviču Ol'denburgu: K pjatidesjatiletiju naučno-obščestvennoj dejatel'nosti 1882-1932* pp. 181-183 Leningrad: AN SSSR
- Deržavin, I.S. 1948. *Albancy-arnauty na Priazov'e Ukrainskoj SSR*. „Sovetskaja Ètnografija” 156-169
- Desnickaja, A.V. 1968. *Albanskij jazyk i ego dialekty*. Leningrad: Nauka
- Domi, Mahir and Dh. S. Shuteriqi. 1965. *Një vështrim mbi të folmen shqipe të Mandricës*. „Studime filologjike” 19 (2), 2. 103-17
- Gjinari, Jorgi. 1966. *Dialektologjia shqiptare*. Prishtina: Enti i teksteve
- Haebler, Claus. 1959. *Zu den Pronomina im ukraino-albanischen Dialekt*. „Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft” 15. 85-100
- Hamp, Eric P. 1961. *On the Arvantika Dialects of Attica and the Megarid*. „Balkansko Ezikoznanie”, 3, 2. 101-106
- . 1965. *The Albanian Dialect of Mandres*. „Die Sprache” 9, 1/2. 137-54
- . 1972. *The Diphthongs of Mandrica*. „Balkansko Ezikoznanie” 14, 2. 21-25
- Islami, Selim. 1965. *Materiel linguistique des colonies albanaises d'Ukraine*. „Studia Albanica” 2, 2. 165-186
- Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. 1984. *Za rečnicite na Ğorĝi Pulevski i albanskata paralela vo niv*. „Prilozi, Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite, Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka” 9, 2. 43-56
- Kacori, Thoma. 1967. *Rreth disa gjurmë ngulimesh shqiptare në Bullgari e llapapësh të tyre*. „Studime filologjike” 21 (5), 3. 163-66
- . 1984. *Un dictionnaire bulgaro-albanais et quelques textes religieux datant de 1864 découverts au Monastère de Hilandar*. „Balkansko ezikoznanie” 27, 3. 35-53
- Kočev, Ivan (ed.) 1988. *Bŭlgarski dialekten atlas: Obobštavašt tom, vstŭpitelna čast*. Sofia: BAN
- Koneski, Blaže. 1984. *Za jazikoi na Pulevski (grafiski, fonetski i fonološki osobnosti)*. „Makedonski jazik” 35. 7-16
- Koneski, Blaže and Olivera Jašar-Nasteva. 1984. *Balkanski jazični paraleli vo rečnicite na Ğorĝi Pulevski*. „Prilozi, Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite, Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka” 9, 2. 57-63
- Koneski, Blaže. 1985. *Beleški za Pulevski*. „Prilozi, Makedonska Akademija na Naukite i Umetnostite, Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka” 10, 1. 75-79
- Kotova, N.V. 1965. *Materialy po albanskoj dialektologii (albanskije govory Ukrainy)*. „Učene zapiski Instituta slavjanovedenija AN SSSR” 13. 254-287
- Lejean, G. 1861. *Carte ethnographique de la Turquie en Europe et états vassaux autonomes. Paternmann's Mittheilungen aus Justus Perthes' Geographischer Anstalt*, 6: supplement. Gotha: Justus Perthes
- MacFarlane, Charles. 1850. *Turkey and Its Destiny*, vol.2. London: John Murray
- Miletič, L. 1902. *Staroto bŭlgarsko naselenie v severoiztočna Bŭlgarija*. Sofia: Bŭlgarsko Knizovno Družestvo
- Marinov, Vasil. 1960. *Minaloto na s. Devnja, Provadijsko, s ogled na "Arnautite" v severoiztočna Bŭlgarija Ezikovedsko-etnografski izsledvanija v pamet na akademik Stojan Romanski*, pp. 592-617. Sofia: BAN
- Peucker, Karl. 1909. *Sŭdost-Europa* [Map]. Vienna: Waldheim
- Ristovski, Blaže, ed. 1974. *Ğorĝija M. Pulevski: Odbrani stranici*. Skopje: Makedonska kniga
- Shuteriqi, Dhimitër S. 1965b. *Fjalorth i të folmës shqipe të fshatit Mandrice (Bullgari)*. „Studime filologjike” 19 (2), 2. 153-67
- Širokov, O.S. 1964. *O sootnošenii fonologičeskoj sistemy i častotnosti "fonem" (na materiale albansko literaturnogo jazyka i ego bessarabskogo narečija)*. „Voprosy jazykoznanija” 13, 1. 53-60
- Sokolova-Dimitrova, Bojka. 1967. *Observations et matériaux ethnographiques du village de Mandrica*. „Études balkaniques” 5, 1. 63-82
- Sokolova, Bojka. 1977. *Quelques particularités de la langue albanaise parlée dans le village de Mandrica. Akten des internationalen albanologischen Kolloquiums*. („Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft — Sonderheft” 41) pp. 583-594. Innsbruck: AMÖ

- 1983. *Die albanische Mundart von Mandrica*. („Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen“, Band 6). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz
- Stojkov, St. and S.B. Bernštejn (eds.). 1964. *Bülgarski dialekten atlas I: Jugoztočna Bülgarija*. Sofia: BAN
- Stojkov, St. (ed.). 1966. *Bülgarski dialekten atlas II: Severoztočna Bülgarija*. Sofia BAN
- Stojkov, St. (ed.). 1975. *Bülgarski dialekten atlas III: Jugozapadna Bülgarija*. Sofia BAN
- Urquart, D. 1839 [2nd ed.]. *The spirit of East*, vol. 2. London: Colburn
- Voronina, I. I. 1970. *Sintaksičeskie funkcii prilagatel'nogo v govore albancev Ukrainy*. *Balkanskaja filologija*, ed. A.V. Desnickaja, pp. 16–24. „Učenyje zapiski LGU“ No. 343, Serija filologičeskix nauk, vyp.73
- Voronina, I. I. 1977. *Die Erforschung der Mundart der ukrainischen Albanier*. *Akten des internationalen albanologischen Kolloquiums*, („Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft — Sonderheft“ 41), pp. 619–22. Innsbruck: AMGE