

Sobolev, Andrei N., ed. *Malyi dialektologičeskii atlas balkanskikh iazykov: Serii leksičeskaia. Tom III: Životnovodstvo. Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 54, n.4, 2010, 740-742.

*Slavic and East European Journal*. Vol. 54, n.4, 2010, 740-742

The *Malyi dialektologičeskii atlas balkanskikh iazykov (MDABIA)* series under the leadership of Andrei Sobolev is continuing to produce useful volumes. The series covers twelve points in the Balkans: seven Slavic, two Greek, two Albanian, and one Romance. The villages are the following: Otok (Neo-Štokavian Ikavian, Sinj district, Dalmatia, northwestern Croatia), Kamenica (Timok, Knjaževac district, eastern Serbia), Zavala (Zeta-Lovćen, Piper tribe, Podgorica district, southeastern Montenegro), Ravna (Moesian, Provadija region, northeastern Bulgaria), Gela (with Široka Lăka; central Rhodopian, Smolyan district, southern Bulgaria), Gega (Pirin Macedonian, Petrič district, southwestern Bulgaria), Peštani, (western Macedonian, Ohrid district, southwestern Republic of Macedonia), Fushë Muhurr (henceforth Muhurr; west central Geg, Peshkopi district, west central Albania), Leshnjë (northern Tosk, Skrapar district, southeastern Albania), Erátyra (Macedonian Selce or Selsko; northern Greek, Kozani district, Aegean Macedonia, northwestern Greece), Kastélli (southern Greek, northern Peloponnesos, southern Greece), and Turia (Greek Kraniá or Kranéa; Pindus group, southern Aromanian, Grevena district, Aegean Macedonia, northwestern Greece). In addition to the four villages that are specified as being in Macedonia *sensu largo*, Muhurr, on the west bank of the Black Drin, was in the Ohrid *Kaza* for part of the nineteenth century. The atlas thus correctly concentrates on villages in the heartland of Balkan contact, although the villages themselves are monoglot, except for Turia, where Greek is now in the process of replacing Aromanian.

This third volume in the lexical series, like its two predecessors, *Leksika dukhovnoi kul'tury* (2005) and *Človek—Sem'ia* (2006), brings together material from the uniform *MDABIA* questionnaires that were used in all twelve villages. Also like its predecessors, it represents an important tool for comparison across the dialect descriptions, of which only Gela, Leshnjë, Muhurr, and Turia have appeared so far. Moreover, the material on this topic from Gela was not included in the dialect description. Pagination begins with the first title page. The contents (p. 6) give the nine major divisions of the atlas: small horned-cattle; sheep; goats; caring for cattle; pasturing cattle; rounding up cattle; constructions for cattle; cattle body parts and slaughtering; and cattle diseases and plagues. The basic map is given on pp. 10-11, and all dialect data are on even-numbered pages with maps on facing odd-numbered pages. Beneath the maps themselves are keys with etymological and other interpretive data. The maps proper begin on pp. 14-15 and continue to pp. 382-383 for a total of 185 maps. And additional 270 entries are given without cartography (pp.384-653) for a total of 455 entries. A list of the maps in numerical order is given at the end (pp. 654-658) thus enabling the reader to get a quick overview of the items that have been mapped. The total number of entries for this volume is almost 25% greater than the total number of entries for spiritual culture (220) and person—family (130) combined. From the viewpoint of a Balkan linguistic analysis of the lexicon, this emphasis is arguably worthwhile.

Animal husbandry is one of the most culturally interesting Balkan lexical fields

precisely because it involves different ecologies and movements relevant to language contact. Owing to the association of animal husbandry with various migrations to the Balkans, and then subsequent migrations within the Balkans (both retreat from later arrivals and the general practice of transhumance in mountainous regions), the vocabulary of animal husbandry has interesting implications for reconstructing historical aspects of sociolinguistic interaction. In terms of words shared by different language groups, all the relevant Balkan languages are represented as sources of shared vocabulary, but in varying degrees in different regions.

Thus, for example, the word denoting ‘breed’ (sort, kind) is invariably borrowed from Turkish—*cins*, *soy*, or *damar*—except for the points in Dalmatia, Montenegro, and Gegëri, where the source is Italian—*raca*, *sorta*, this latter not represented on the map—(Map 1). A comparison of this map with Map 1 of *Čelovek—Sem’ia*, which is for *rod* in the sense of ‘family, clan, group of descendents of a common ancestor’, yields the interesting result that in Ravna *cins* is used for both humans and animals, but in the meaning ‘family, clan’ it is marked as archaic. In Eratyra, the Turkisms *soy* and *damar* are for people while *raca* is for animals. On the other hand, Kastelli uses all three Turkisms for animals but only *soy* and *damari* for people. The one Aromanian point uses a Turkism (*dāmār<sup>i</sup>*, etc.) for ‘breed’ but *soy* as well as a native formation based on the meaning ‘root’ for human descent group. The data for Albanian give only *fis* for the human unit, and indeed this word translates roughly ‘tribe’, as opposed to *vllazni* ‘clan’ (Geg) derived from *vlla* ‘brother’. The Slavic etymological equivalent of *vllazni*, however, *bratstvo*, is the term used for descent group in Zavala, where the usual Slavic *rod* is normally used for the bride’s family. Given that this usage occurs precisely in Montenegro, we can posit Albanian semantic influence. It is also interesting to note that while *cins* occurs for human descent group in the two Slavic villages with the strongest Turkish or Muslim contact, i.e. Ravna in northeast Bulgaria and Gela in the Rhodopes, both also have Slavic *rod* whereas the Greek points have no native term for either concept, and Turia has a native term for human descent group but not for animal breed.

This example illustrates both successes and problems of the project that has produced this volume and the others. On the one hand, we have a kind of cross-linguistic comparability not available in monolingual dialect atlases. On the other, with only one volume at hand, one cannot know if a term is human-specific, animal-specific, or general. Similarly, maps 27-29 give the words for animal genitalia, but we have no way of knowing if, for example, the Slavic form *pičkë* in Leshnja is the general word for female genitalia or specific to sheep and goats (Map 29 and p. 470), since body parts are not given in the human volume and this volume does not make the answer clear. The lack of any kind of alphabetical index is also a handicap.

Another problem is associated with the availability of modern technologies. As the current volumes stand, their usefulness is limited by the fact that researchers are burdened with the cumbersome methodology of the previous century. In order to compare, for example, the various terms that involve white coloring on small cattle—both goats and sheep—one must flip back and forth among pp. 124-137, 184-189, 433-436, and 482-487. This single example is of no small consequence, since it involves the extent and distribution of Slavic, Romance, and Albanoid roots, and turns out to have more interesting complexities than would be expected given the primacy of substrate theory in relationship to the terminology of animal husbandry. Thus, for example, in the

Peloponnesian point the Slavonicisms *<sup>m</sup>b'elo* and *<sup>m</sup>b'ela* are used for 'white ram or lamb' and 'white ewe', respectively (Map 56), the Latinism *fa'oro*, *fa'ora* for 'white goat' (Map 86) and the Albanoid terms *fa'ara* or *<sup>m</sup>b'artsa* for 'white-bellied goat' (Map 88). This particular question also brings out another limitation of *MDABla*'s methodology, since the Albanoid root turns up with the meaning 'white-bellied' in Turia for sheep (Map 58), in Gega for goats (Map 88), but is not recorded for Peštani despite being used in Standard Macedonian, albeit with yet another meaning not covered in *MDABla*, viz. 'sheep or goat with white spots on the head or body'.

A model for the useful dialect atlas of the twenty-first century is provided by Norbert Boretzky and Birgit Igla's *Komentierter Dialektatlas des Romani* (2004, Weisbaden: Harrassowitz), which comes with a CD ROM of the maps and data, or Martin Haspelmath et al.'s *World Atlas of Language Structures*, (2005, Oxford), which, for all its shortcomings, comes with a useful interactive reference tool on CD ROM. The *MDABla* would be able to make a much larger contribution to the advancement of Balkan linguistics and related disciplines if it would take up the modern practice of making its data available to researchers on a CD ROM accompanying the text. Nonetheless, the work as it stands is useful, interesting, and important.

Victor A. Friedman      University of Chicago.