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In 1978 I read a paper entitled “Gjorgji Pulevski, fjalorët e tij dhe rilindjet kombëtare shqiptare e macedone” [Gjorgji Pulevski, his
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 The Albanian Lexicon of the Monk Arkádii,
 A mid–nineteenth century manuscript
 from the Hilendar Monastery on Mount Athos
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I first learned of this lexicon a number of years ago from Boglanovici'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 ezikoznanje (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 dieresis. In order to distinguish the graphemes that correspond to the standard Cyrillic <ï> I shall use <i> for the Latin <i>. In the case of no or two dots, I shall use the same grapheme as in the manuscript. Arkadii makes extensive use of the pajarok (a superscript resembling an exaggerated vertical tilde) usually for <e/ê> or <n>, rarely for <i> 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:

- ë = front jus
- ĕ = back jus (one occurrence)
- ò = omega
- kis = kë

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 achieved in a single conference paper. I am therefore presenting

2K gives the pages in the following order: 18b-19a-21b-22a- 20b-21a-23b- 24a- 30b-31a-24b-23a-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
izmokri izmokre[n] wet
pdlnu pdlnu full
poznanie pozna[i] known
clstu bistrur clear
liego luki i leko (on p.50) light
procut proctut famous
lesno leno-trade[n] fragile (easily-broken)
slusatul slusatel listener
tjubizni ljubezna dear, kind
[Albanian Cyrillic] [Bulgarian/Standard Albanian]
regre ezur[e] thirst
ji[i] gjasje alive

have also noted 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 Gocë Delčev), who was known to have collaborated with other monks on many religious books. Based on this information and the fact that the Hildenar library also contains a Bulgarian–Greek dictionary dated 1880 and signed in Latin letters by "Pankratie monach chylandársky, Sava monach y Danyil monach. Svetoslav 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: Potrebni xesapı tuuka zabelëzvamü az[u] Arkadii Mo[n]ax (or Mo[nax] X(leindarski)?) 1864 jump 19. 'I am noting here necessary accounts, Monk Arkadìi (or Hildenar Monk Arkadìi) June 9' It was this monk Arkadìi, 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 1864.

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 Arkadìi in Bogdanović (1978:113), that of a hierodeacon from the Pakov district, who signed himself as the author of ms 225 (p.73a), the Orders of Ismail 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 Arkadìi. 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 Arkadìi of Pakov is faithful to Russian orthographic rules in his use of letters such as ikratkoj and jery, whereas the Arkadìi of our lexicon never uses ikratkoj (e.g. in his Russian and Albanian 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 Arkadìi of Pakov was already a hierodeacon by 1850 while our Arkadìi was still a monk in 1864.
hypothesis that Arkădii came from Devnja (Provadija district, Varma 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; Shuteri 1965:107). 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. Arkădii’s knowledge of Russian as demonstrated by his short Bulgarian-Russian lexic in the same ms.
3. The fact that a number of the Bulgarian entries in his Bulgarian-Albanian lexic display Russian influence.
4. The preposition of adjectives on the Slavic model, e.g. <teška bólesť -a re[n]d[e] smúrê> ‘serious illness’ (25b05).

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

However, none of Kacori’s arguments is conclusive, and there is ample evidence for arguing that Arkădii did not in fact come from Devnja but rather from one of the other Albanian villages which can be called the Eastern Diaspora. That Arkădii 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 Arkădii was an educated man who knew Greek and Church Slavonic as well as Albanian, Bulgarian, Russian

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 Arkădii’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; Miletić 1902:105,143).

With regard to Kacori’s attempt to assign a purpose to Arkădii’s work it is unclear why the Albanians of the Ukrainian diaspora should have needed a Bulgarian-Albanian lexic, since they were already bilingual with Bulgarian. Given the role of Russian as a language of education, a Bulgarian-Russian lexic 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 Arkădii was apparently unaware of those few publications that did exist, these translations might have been intended for any Albanophone audience. 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 Nevyarska (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, Bogdanovic 1978:210). There were no Albanian colonies in the region Galaktion came from, so Arkădii 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

---

4 The Albanian immigrants from Devnja founded the village of Karakurt (now Žovtenvo) between Ismail and Belgrad in Bessarabia in 1810-11. Bulgarians and Gagauz also emigrated to that region at the same time. The three villages of Garmovka (formerly the Tatar village Džandaran), Georgievka (Tjuski), and Devnenko (Tar) near the Azov Sea were founded in 1862 (Kotova 254-55).

5 Actually, K is in consistent 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.

6 As 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 Koy) in Bulgaria and its daughter village Mandres (Ambar Koy) southeast of Kilkis (Kukus) in Aegean Macedonia. Whether a shared or parallel innovation, this fact invalidates the feature as diagnostic. 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 prolocutive article consistently occurs as <a> in Arkadzii's text, the one third singular accusative clitic occurs as </> (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 </> in positions such as those illustrated by, <gluhë> 'tongue' [20a11], <ulljeka> 'wolf' [20b06], <golj> 'mouth' [24b08], are also shared with other diaspora dialects as well as some dialects of Albanians (Gjinari 1966:44). A careful comparison of Arkadzii's text with Albanian materials from Bessarabia/the Ukraine and from Mandrica/Mandres (Derzavin 1933, 1934, 1948; Haebler 1959; Idrimi 1965; Kotova 1956; Voronina 1970, 1977; Hamp 1965, 1972; Sokolova 1972, 1977, 1983; Shuteriki 1965)9 shows that while his dialect is clearly related to these, it is different. Here are some illustrative examples10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arkadzii</th>
<th>The Ukraine</th>
<th>Mandrica</th>
<th>Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cili (24a16)</td>
<td>cili</td>
<td>cili</td>
<td>cili which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni (19b05)</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>një one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>likurë (29b02)</td>
<td>likurë/L'ikurë</td>
<td>mëngjes</td>
<td>likurë skin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minges [19a13]</td>
<td>mëngjes</td>
<td>mëngjes</td>
<td>mëngjes morning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1We can add here that Arkadzii preserves the head-genitive word order in bëri perendisë (37b04) 'son of God' whereas the Ukrainian dialects have the Slavic model: jani tanak't pitsa mëma 'Jani Janaki's old mother' (Derzavin 1984).

2Moreover, both /e/ and /a/ occur for both third sg acc pro and fem clitic even in a single speaker in Kotova's texts (1956:277-78).

3This list is not exhaustive, since several of the studies referred to in those works were not available to me.

4In 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.


---

**Slavic-Albanian Contacts and Early Polyglot Lexicon...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>gluhë (24b11)</th>
<th>gluhë</th>
<th>glufi</th>
<th>gluhë</th>
<th>tongue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gluhë (20a11)</td>
<td>gâ</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juli (38a04)</td>
<td>juja</td>
<td>asat</td>
<td>e tij</td>
<td>his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>veqate (20a08)</td>
<td>veqate/feqate</td>
<td>feqat</td>
<td>feqat</td>
<td>village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de (19b08)</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>n'dë, n'ë</td>
<td>në</td>
<td>in, on et</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qe [38b02]</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>jët, jëla</td>
<td>jë</td>
<td>joke, joke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>djelë (19a08)</td>
<td>d'il</td>
<td>bie</td>
<td>bie</td>
<td>fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lali re (24b06)</td>
<td>t'er botë</td>
<td>t'er xhako</td>
<td>t'er xhako</td>
<td>sun, rain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| klumëshehtë (22a02) | klumëshehtë | klumëshehtë | klumëshehtë | milk |
| dëmëre (19b09)     | dimbër | dimbër/dimêri | dimbër/dimêri | winter |
| (l)dëmêri [22b09]  | dëmëri | [Mandres] | dëmëri | name |
| (l)dëmëri [38b02]  | dëmëri | dëmëri | dëmëri | winter |
| zëmmëre [25a04]    | zëmëri/zëmëra | [Mandres] | zëmëri | name |
| thëmëre [25b16]    | thëmëre | fëmëre/fëmëra | fëmëre | woman |
| thëmëre [25b13]    | thëmëre | fëmëre/fëmëra | fëmëre | woman |
| mëri (19b04)       | múri | muoi | muoi | month |
| grò (27b07, 16)    | grëve | grëve | grëve | woman |
| pjës [38b02]       | pjës [19g] | pjës | pjës | asks |
| krë (24a19)        | krëve | krëve | krëve | head |
| forte [31a05]      | fortë | fortë | fortë | strong |
| débërë [19a02]     | zbërë | zbërë | zbërë | snow |
| débërë [31a12]     | zbërë | zbërë | zbërë | snow |
| jëtërcë [38b08]    | jëtërcë | jëtërcë | jëtërcë | snow |
| bëli (38b01)       | táli | táli | táli | father |
| jëpe (23b12)       | l'opë | l'opë | l'opë | cow |
| jëtu [25b10]       | lot | lot | lot | cat |
| qëpëtë [29b14]     | shpejtë, shëtë | shpejtë, shëtë | shpejtë, shëtë | soon |
| pëlqënë [26b14]    | pëlqënë | pëlqënë | pëlqënë | like |
All three dialects share the change of [c] to [ç] 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 Arkádií’s dialect and
the Ukraine (also, apparently in Mandres). Other features that Arkádií
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, Arkádií’s dialect resembles Mandrica as op-
posed to the Ukraine in its locative preposition and the 2 sg fem po-
ssessive 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 Arkádií 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 Arkádií consistently distinguishes etymo-
logical [f] and [θ], so this is not a matter of graphic confusion. His
faithful preservation of /θ/ is a link with the Ukraine. In any case,
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 Arkádií’s dialect is distinct from both these others.
The remaining examples also differentiate Arkádií from the attested
Eastern Diaspora Albanian dialects. In the first group, Arkádií 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
Arkádií’s dialect here, that is the work of later study. Nonetheless, it
should be clear from the foregoing that Arkádií’s lexicon represents a
distinct and heretofore unrecorded dialect of Eastern Diaspora Alba-
nian.

How then are we to determine the provenance of Arkádií’s dia-
lect? 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; Miletiç 1902; Sokolova 1983; Shuteriç 1965a)
that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there were scattered
Albanian–speaking villages in Bulgarìa and Eastern Thrace. According
to Miletiç (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 Tûrnovo. Some of these Albanians
got to Bessarabia either directly or via Devnja at the beginning of
the nineteenth century, but some were still in Bulgaria in Miletiç’s
(1902:140) day (cf. Also Kacori 1967). Lejan (1861) shows a sizable

---

14 Some other interesting comparisons are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arkádií</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Mandrica</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>shupertóshë (38b11)</td>
<td>shpetonë</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>shpeto-</td>
<td>save</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksidă (25a06)</td>
<td>këthiçë</td>
<td>kërësiç (Mandres)</td>
<td>kërtihë</td>
<td>navel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eartiç (19a17)</td>
<td>erëcirë</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>erësirë</td>
<td>darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shpijurtë (27a17)</td>
<td>shpirti</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>shpiirti</td>
<td>spirit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

15 Arkádií does not distinguish /d/ and /dh/, e.g., <dárda> (21a01) = dardha
‘the pear’, <diç> (19b04)/diê (18b09) = dië ‘the earth’ vs <detë> (19a06) = det
‘sea’/<dişqëre> (30b07) = djegur ‘burnt’. Cf. also <dijâmë> (30a02)/<djâmë>

16 Given the facts cited by those who have actually spoken with these vili-
gers 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 Kõrdžali, apparently centered at a place called Arnaout Kjoji17. In addition to the villages named or indicated in these sources, toponymy leads us to suspect that Rudnik (Arnaoutkjoj) north of Burgas, Eliska (Arnaoutkjoj) between Panagjuriste and Pazardziku, Gugulka (Arnaoutkjoj) west of Mandrica, and Arnaoutico 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 Bernschein 1964 and Stojkov 1966,1975), however, suggests that they have been Bulgarianised for a significant period.

For Eastern Thrace we know from a number of sources (e.g. Hamp 1965, Macfarlane 1850, Sokolova 1983, Çabes 1975) that there were at least five Albanophone villages in addition to Mandrica in the Edirne (Odrin, Adrianople) region in 1864: Ibrik Tepe (Qytezi), Sultan Köy, Altın Taş, Pazar Dere (Azârder in Sokolova [1983]), all of which spoke a dialect close to that of Mandrica (Sokolova 1983:5/223), and a village variously cited as Zallif (Sokolova) 1983, Shuteriqi 1963), Zalif/Zalouf (Hamp 1965/Carnegie 1914:134), Zallov/Zalof (Cili 1967/Hamp 1965), and Criza Zalif (Macfarlane 1850:574). Moreover, Sokolova (1983:3) reports that Sati Köy (Lozengrad/Kirkilareli/ Kirk Kilise Region), Bulgar Köy (Malgara region), and Tarfa (Istambul region) were described as “Albanian” settlements before 1912. To this we can add the fact that Lejjan (1861) shows three Albanian-speaking areas in Turkish Thrace. One is northwest of Çatalca near Istambul (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 Istambul. Sultan Köy is indicated on Peucker (1909; longitude = Dhidhimothikon [Dimotika]; La = Ibrik Tepe).

MacFarlane (1850:574) writes that “Çriza Zalif” is one and half hours from Yeni Köy in the direction of Baba Eski. This description appears to correspond to the location of modern Kirsakalik. MacFarlane was told that Ibrik Tepe and Altun Taş were “on the other side of” Uzun Köprü, and Shuteriqi (1965a) cites a source locating Altun Taş east of the Marica (Merec). The map appended to Baker (1877) shows a village called Altun Taş but it is on the east bank of the Hayrabolu river north of Uzun Köprü (longitude = Baba Eski latitude = Dhidhimothikon [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 Arkàdii may have come from? It is here that Albanian contacts with Slavic provide evidence. Arkàdii 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 Arkàdii 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 Kocev (1988) and supplemented by Alexander (1981), we can describe the dialect of Arkàdii’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 [i], e.g. <bêlo>, <golêm>, <xleblî>, <mêsto>, <umrêli>, <soêka>.18

---

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

18There are total of 27 items representing 22 roots attesting a reflex of jat in this position. Of these, 19 items representing 13 roots have [e], 5 items representing 4 roots have [i], and 3 items have [j]. The items with graphic jat can be dismissed as opaque. The 3 items showing <ja> are <rjatzku>, <rjazdêjî> and <smjatene>. The last has a Church Slavonic 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 [j], especially <rjatzku>, are due to the influence of speakers other than those from Arkàdii’s region. Perhaps even Galaktion himself influenced Arkàdii, since [rjatzku] is the
2. Unstressed /o/ and /e/ reduce to [u] and [i], respectively, e.g. 
<čádu>, kulilá, plnù>, <žitù>, <šinju>, <čiréši>, <čirénó>. 
<sréni>, <žilénó>, <pitél>, <díbeliná>19.
3. The reflex of *čr- is underlying /čer-/: <čirési>, <čirénó>, <čer-
no>.
4. Final stress in the words <ženà>, <sestrà>, and <glavà>/<glaví>.
5. The gloss for 'shirt' is <ríza>.
6. The gloss for 'sweet' is <sláktó>.
7. The shape of the masculine define article is <o>, e.g., <svétó>. 
<červó>, <stráxo>, <mésoço>.
A complete analysis of Arkádií’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 Arkádií’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 north-east of Plovdiv, the more northerly on a latitude 
with Panagjuriste,
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 Sati Köy or Tarfa, although there is also the possibility 
that Arkádií 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 isArkádií’s <četva> 
as opposed to /četva/ 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 (Stojkof and Bernštejn 1964, Stoj-
kov 1966, 1975), it is almost certainly the case that Arkádií’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 gene-
ral 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 archai-
sms 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 Arkádií’s dialect.

Clearly there is much more to be said about this valuable do-
cument and I hope to be able to do so in future work. But I hope 
here to have established the author — a monk named Arkádií — and 
the provenience of his heretofore unrecorded Albanian dialect: mo-
dern Turkish Thrace. The lexicon also documents a Thracian dialect 
of Bulgarian, but owing to obvious interferes from other Slavic lan-
guages and dialects, this evidence is not always unambiguous. Among 
the suggestions we can make on the basis of this document concern-
ing changes in Eastern Diaspora Albanian due to language contact 
is that the shift of Albanian word order under Slavic and Turkish in-
fluence 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 Arkádií has only the former and 
unshaped examples of the latter. The treatment of possessive pron-
ouns argues that Arkádií’s dialect occupies an intermediate position 
between Mandrica and Devnja, but the development represented by 
lexical items such as <dëboré>, <kric>, and <šipjurti> 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”.
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