

Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century  
Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscan Texts

A thesis submitted for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

Florence Graham  
Lady Margaret Hall  
University of Oxford  
Trinity Term, 2015

Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Bosnian and  
Bulgarian Franciscan Texts

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
Florence Graham  
Lady Margaret Hall  
Trinity Term, 2015

**Short Abstract**

This dissertation analyses when, how and why Turkish loanwords became incorporated into Bosnian and Bulgarian, as seen in the writings of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscans. I analyse Bosnian works (religious and secular) by Matija Divković, Ivan Bandulavić, Pavo Posilović Mošunjanin, Mihovil Radnić, Stjepan Margitić Markovac, Lovro Bračuljević, Filip Lastrić, Nikola Marčinkušić Lašvanin, Marko Dobretić, Bono Benić, and Grgo Ilijić-Varešanin. As a Bulgarian counterpart, I analyse three eighteenth-century Bulgarian Franciscan manuscripts and the works of Petar Bogdan Bakšić and Filip Stanislavov.

The dissertation consists of eight chapters. The first chapter gives background information on Turkish presence in Bosnia and Bulgaria, the history of the Franciscans in Bosnia and Bulgaria, short biographies of each of the writers whose works are analysed, phonology and orthography. The second chapter focuses on the complications regarding establishing earliest attestations for turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. The third chapter discusses the nominal morphology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. This chapter analyses why turkisms developed the gender that they did when borrowed from a language that does not have gender as a category. Chapter four addresses the verbal morphology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. Verbal prefixes are discussed in detail, as are Turkish voiced suffixes in Bulgarian. The fifth chapter analyses adjectives and adverbs, with focus on gender and number agreement. The sixth chapter addresses the use of Turkish conjunctions. The seventh chapter looks at the motivation, semantics and setting of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. The conclusion addresses how morphology, semantics, motivation and setting of turkisms relate to their chronology in Bosnian and Bulgarian and how these areas differ from language to language.

Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Bosnian and  
Bulgarian Franciscan Texts

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
Florence Graham  
Lady Margaret Hall  
Trinity Term, 2015

**Long Abstract**

This dissertation analyses the extent and ways in which Turkish loanwords have been incorporated into the writings of the Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While there are numerous articles and a handful of monographs written on turkisms in South Slavonic languages, these works predominantly address Turkish influence seen in the modern languages. In this dissertation I attempt to determine when turkisms became part of Bosnian and Bulgarian, how they became integrated into the structure of each language and why certain words and structures were borrowed. The dissertation focuses on the morphology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian, as well as the semantic variation of these words in the two languages and their dialects. Phonology is briefly addressed but not in detail since the multiple orthographical variants make it impossible to determine the exact pronunciation of a word: within one manuscript a word, especially loanwords, may be spelled as many as five or six different ways.

I analyse the works of seven eighteenth-century Bosnian Franciscans: Stjepan Margitić Markovac (1650–1714), Lovro Bračuljević (1685–1737), Filip Lastrić (1700–1783), Nikola Marčinkušić Lašvanin (1703–1750), Marko Dobretić (1707–1784), Bono Benić (1708–1785) and Grgo Ilijić-Varešanin (Hiljić) (1736–1792). As a Bulgarian counterpart, I analyse three large (400+ pages) eighteenth-century Bulgarian Franciscan manuscripts. As a basis for mapping out the chronology and development of Turkish loanwords in the eighteenth century, I have also included works of four 17th-century

Bosnian Franciscans: Matija Divković (1563–1631), Ivan Bandulavić (1591– mid-17<sup>th</sup> c.), Pavo Posilović Mošunjanin (1600–1653), Mihovil Radnić (1636–1707); and two Bulgarian Catholics: Petar Bogdan Bakšić (1601–1674) and Filip Stanislavov (1614–1674).

While some of the works analysed in this dissertation, namely Stanislavov's *Abagar* and Lastrić's *Testimonium Bilabium*, have been analysed linguistically, theologically and historically, the other sixteen sources have received little if any scholarly attention. Apart from *Abagar*, all works analysed are Franciscan texts. In part, this is because seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian literature written in the local language was for the most part written by Franciscans. Their works are valuable sources for analysing the integration of Turkish loanwords since the Franciscans were less familiar with Turkish than Muslim converts and less familiar with the Orthodox Church literary language and terminology than the Orthodox community. Therefore, these texts offer a close reflection of the vernacular. The mix of religious and secular texts also reveals how deeply Turkish became incorporated into the local language. While the oral tradition is also valuable for analysing the vernacular, it has been excluded for several reasons: since it was first gathered and recorded in the second half of the nineteenth century, it is possible that it contains developments that were later than the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Also, because much of the oral tradition is in verse, metre might affect word choice and endings.

The dissertation consists of eight chapters. The first chapter, the introduction, gives background information on Turkish presence in Bosnia, the Order of the Bosnian Franciscans (Bosna Srebrena), Bulgaria and its Catholic communities, as well as short

biographies of each of the writers whose works are analysed and information about phonology and orthography.

The second chapter focuses on the complications regarding the chronology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. On the basis of the material analysed for this dissertation, one can only glean when and in what contexts turkisms were used in Bosnian and Bulgarian in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is also difficult to determine how long a turkism had already been present in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian. For example, Bosnian has *Rječnik hrvatsko-srpskog jezika*, the Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian equivalent of the Oxford English Dictionary, though this dictionary lacks entries for numerous turkisms. Bulgarian does not have an attestational dictionary. To compensate for this lack, I selected three *damaskini* (*Tixonravovski*, *Trojanski* (both 17<sup>th</sup> c.) and *Švištovski* (18<sup>th</sup> c.)), one historical account (*Sofronii's Žizneopisanie* (1798)) and the complete collection of Bulgarian scribal notes from the tenth to the end of the eighteenth century (Xristova, Karadžova, and Uzunova, 2004) to include as points of reference for the chronological analysis of the turkisms found in the manuscripts analysed.

The third chapter discusses nominal morphology in Bosnian and Bulgarian. Of all parts of speech, nominal morphology has the least amount of restriction in both languages; derivatives can develop immediately from nouns. There are also a handful of Turkish adjectives, especially in Bulgarian, that behave nominally. This chapter analyses why turkisms developed the gender that they did, since Turkish does not have gender as a category.

Chapter four addresses the verbal morphology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian: Bulgarian has far more verbs stemming from Turkish verbs. Verbal prefixes are discussed in detail: for the most part these prefixes are limited to Bosnian; in part, this is because Bulgarian can express imperfective aspect with the suffix *-ova-*. Lastly, the chapter looks at whether Turkish voiced suffixes are understood in Bulgarian.

The fifth chapter focuses on adjectives and adverbs: these can be derived from Turkish nouns or Turkish adjectives. In Bulgarian, Turkish adjectives have only number agreement with the nouns that they modify, while in Bosnian they show no agreement.

The sixth chapter addresses the use of Turkish conjunctions: there are far more Turkish conjunctions in Bulgarian than in Bosnian, but they are used in the same way in both languages; they are interchangeable with Slavonic conjunctions.

The seventh chapter looks at the motivation, semantics and setting of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. There is a greater range of vocabulary in Bulgarian because of the type of material. Because the Bulgarian texts are manuscripts, the audience was limited to the local area, where Turkish was prevalent.

The conclusion addresses how morphology, semantics, motivation and setting of turkisms relate to their chronology in Bosnian and Bulgarian and how these areas differ from language to language.

Though this dissertation is not a comprehensive analysis of turkisms in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian, it is a thorough analysis of turkisms found in Franciscan texts analysed from this period. It provides the earliest attestations for 360 Bosnian turkisms and 537 Bulgarian turkisms and is one of the few works to focus on Turkish loanwords in pre-nineteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian.

## Acknowledgements

While working on this dissertation I have been struck by the kindness, interest and expertise shared with me by scholars, some of whom I have never met. This project would not have been possible without the help of fra Ivan Nujić, who has been my faithful monastery chauffeur, has dug through monastery libraries with me and has helped photograph books, despite his numerous other obligations and projects. I also wish to thank Ekrem Čaušević, Jan Fellerer, Dolores Grmača, Laurent Mignon and Aida Vidan, who have all contributed valuable materials and advice. I am especially grateful to Margaret Dimitrova and Lejla Nakaš, not only for their expertise, but also for their kindness and devotion to helping students. I also express my appreciation to Kjetil Rå Hauge, who in addition to offering detailed feedback on the dissertation, has given me tutorials on linguistics, technology and format via email, Skype and in person. Deepest thanks go to Celia Kerslake for her careful reading, constructive criticism and cheerful support. My supervisor, Mary MacRobert, has been a propelling force behind this work; I am indebted to her for her thoughtfulness, conscientiousness and precision. I am also most grateful to my mother, Beatrice Graham, for reading through the dissertation to check for typos and sentences that give the impression that English is not my native tongue.

And lastly, I would like to thank the Order of Bosnian Franciscans, Bosna Srebrena, whose devotion to Bosnia, education and peace has been a constant comfort and inspiration in my studies and life; and my parents, Beatrice and Gregory Graham, for teaching me the joy and beauty of loving one's work, fostering my curiosity and loving and supporting me unconditionally.

I take full responsibility for any mistakes and weaknesses in this dissertation.

## Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	xiii
1.0 Chapter One: Introduction	1
1.1 Defining <i>loanword</i> and <i>borrowing</i>	1
1.2 Material selected	1
1.3 Overview	3
1.4 Historical background	6
1.4.1 Bosna Srebrena and the Ottoman Turkish occupation	6
1.4.2 Bosnian Franciscans	8
1.4.3 Bosnian works	12
1.4.3.1 Eleven religious works	12
1.4.3.2 Two chronicles	15
1.5 Bulgarian Catholics and Ottomans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries	17
1.5.1 Bulgarian Catholic communities	17
1.5.2 Bulgarian writers	19
1.5.3 Bulgarian works	21
1.5.3.1 Bulgarian supplementary material	23
1.6 Language, phonology and orthography	25
1.6.1 Defining the language	25
1.6.2 Phonology	30
1.6.2.1 G and <i>yumuşak ğ</i> (soft /g/)	33
1.6.3 Orthography	34
1.6.3.1 <i>Latinica</i>	35
1.6.3.1.1 Bosnian <i>latinica</i> texts	38
1.6.3.1.2 Length	43
1.6.3.2 Bulgarian <i>latinica</i>	44
1.6.3.2.1 MS778	46
1.6.3.2.2 MS779	46
1.6.3.2.3 MS780	48
1.6.4 Cyrillic	49
1.7 Conclusion	49
2.0 Chapter Two: Existing Studies and the Problem of Dating	51
2.1 Bosnian chronology	51
2.1.1.1 Knezević	51
2.1.1.2 Miklošić	52
2.1.1.3 Peco	52
2.1.1.4 Skok	52
2.1.1.5 Stachowski	53
2.1.1.6 Škaljić	53
2.1.1.7 Supplementary materials	54
2.1.2 Reliability of RHSJ	55
2.1.3 Stachowski and earliest attestations	58
2.1.4 Nakaš and earliest attestations	60

2.1.5 Reliability of written material for attestations	60
2.1.6 Pre-seventeenth-century attestations	62
2.1.7 Seventeenth-century attestations	63
2.1.8 Differences in words before the seventeenth century, in the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century	64
2.1.9 Dating Slavonic derivatives against roots	65
2.1.9.1 Verbal roots and nominal roots in verbs	71
2.1.10 General conclusion on dating derivatives against roots	71
2.1.10.1 Derivatives in RHSJ	72
2.2 Bulgarian chronology	73
2.2.1 Existing studies	74
2.2.1.1 Gerov	74
2.2.1.2 Grannes, Hauge and Süleymanoğlu	75
2.2.1.3 Pavlev and Živkov	75
2.2.1.3 Stachowski	76
2.2.1.4 Stamenov	76
2.2.1.5 Vljakov	77
2.2.2 Dating	77
2.2.2.1 Pre-eighteenth-century borrowings	78
2.2.2.1.1 Scribal notes: earliest attestations	79
2.2.2.2 Attestations in the seventeenth-century <i>damaskini</i>	80
2.2.2.3 Comparing Stachowski and scribal notes for pre-eighteenth and eighteenth-century turkisms	81
2.2.3 Types of pre-eighteenth-century borrowings	82
2.2.4 Parts of speech of pre-eighteenth century borrowings	82
2.2.4.1 Turkish suffixes in eighteenth-century borrowings	83
2.2.5 Difference in numbers between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century borrowings	84
2.2.6 Phonology and dating	85
2.2.7 Derivatives	85
2.2.7.1 Dating derivatives against their root	86
2.3 Comparing earliest attestations of turkisms that occur in both Bosnian and Bulgarian	88
2.4 Conclusion	93
3.0 Chapter Three: Morphology of Nouns	96
3.1 Bosnian Turkish loan nouns	96
3.1.1 Loan nouns ending in a vowel	96
3.1.1.1 Turkish cases and <i>-ija</i>	97
3.1.1.2 /i/ does not become <i>-ija</i>	97
3.1.1.3 Nominal suffix <i>čija/džija</i> < <i>-CĪ</i>	98
3.1.1.4 Turkish nouns ending in /a/	99
3.1.1.5 Gender distinction in <i>-a</i> nouns	100
3.1.1.6 Turkish nouns ending in /e/	101
3.1.1.6.1 Turkish /e/ > <i>-e</i>	102
3.1.1.7 Final Turkish vowel > consonant	103
3.1.2 Turkish nouns ending in consonants	103
3.1.2.1 Turkish final consonant + <i>-a</i>	104
3.1.3 Indeterminate gender	105
3.1.4 Additional vowels	106
3.1.5 Turkish suffixes in nouns	107
3.1.5.1 Non-productive suffixes	107

3.1.5.2 Productive suffixes	108
3.1.5.2.1 Loan nouns from Turkish <i>-lĭ</i> nouns and adjectives	108
3.1.5.2.2 <i>-lĭk</i>	110
3.1.5.2.3 <i>-Cĭ</i>	111
3.1.6 Slavonic suffixes	112
3.1.6.1 <i>-in</i> and suffixes denoting persons of male gender	112
3.1.6.2 Diminutive suffixes	114
3.1.6.3 Suffixes denoting location	115
3.1.6.4 Plural suffixes	115
3.1.6.5 Deverbal endings	116
3.1.6.6 Abstract nominal suffixes	117
3.1.7 Prefixed Turkish loan nouns	117
3.1.8 Turkish <i>izafet</i> constructions	118
3.1.9 Morphological attraction	119
3.2 Bulgarian nominal morphology	120
3.2.1 Turkish loan nouns ending in /ĭ/	120
3.2.2 Turkish final consonantal nouns + <i>-ija</i>	122
3.2.3 Turkish nouns + final /e/	123
3.2.4 Turkish nouns ending in /e/	124
3.2.5 Turkish nominal suffixes	125
3.2.5.1 <i>-lEr</i>	126
3.2.5.2 <i>-lĭk</i>	126
3.2.6 Slavonic nominal suffixes	128
3.2.6.1 <i>-in</i>	128
3.2.6.2 <i>-ka</i>	129
3.2.6.3 Suffixes denoting location	129
3.2.6.4 Abstract suffixes	129
3.2.7 Compound nouns with <i>basc</i>	130
3.2.8 Turkish adjectives used nominally in Bulgarian	132
3.3 Conclusion	133
4.0 Chapter Four: Verbs	134
4.1 Bosnian verbs	134
4.1.1 Verbs stemming from Turkish nouns	134
4.1.2 Verbs stemming from Turkish verbs	135
4.1.2.1 Turkish verbs and <i>{-d, -t}isati</i>	139
4.1.2.1.1 Turkish past-tense third-person finite form in Bosnian	140
4.1.2.1.2 Turkish verbal suffixes	140
4.1.3 Noun-verb compounds	140
4.1.4 Verbal prefixes	141
4.1.4.1 Prefixes and <i>Aktionsarten</i>	143
4.1.4.1.1 <i>Aktionsarten</i> with one prefix	143
4.1.4.1.1.1 <i>u-</i>	145
4.1.4.1.1.2 <i>po-</i>	146
4.1.4.1.2 Verbal roots that are found with more than one prefix	148
4.1.4.1.3 Prefixes that create new verbs	149
4.1.4.1.4 Prefixal reinforcement	150
4.1.4.1.5 Verbs attested only with prefixes	153
4.1.4.1.6 Conclusion	156
4.2 Bulgarian verbs	157
4.2.1 Verb formation	158

4.2.1.1 Verbs with {-d, -t}-isa	158
4.2.1.2 Verbs with nominal roots	160
4.2.1.4 Prefixed verbs	161
4.2.2 Turkish verbal suffixes	162
4.2.2.1 Verbal voice (diathetical) suffixes	163
4.2.2.1.1 Causative	163
4.2.2.1.2 Passive	166
4.2.2.1.3 Reciprocal -(İ)y	167
4.2.2.1.4 Suffix indicating quickness: -(y)İver	168
4.3 Conclusion: Bosnian and Bulgarian verb formation	168
5.0 Chapter Five: Adjectives and Adverbs	170
5.1 Bosnian adjectives	170
5.1.2 Adjectives with the Slavonic suffix -ski	170
5.1.3 Slavonic past participial suffix	172
5.1.4 Adjectives with -ast	172
5.1.5 Pleonastic -ski?	173
5.1.6 Turkish derived adjectives	174
5.1.7 Turkish root adjectives	176
5.1.8 Morphophonological changes of <i>zengin</i> > <i>zendil</i>	178
5.1.9 Adjectival -IE	178
5.1.10 Word order with adjectives	179
5.1.11 Adverbs	179
5.1.11.1 Native Turkish adverbs	179
5.1.11.2 Slavonic adverbial suffixes	181
5.1.11.5 Word order and adverbs	182
5.2 Bulgarian adjectives and adverbs	182
5.2.1 Slavonic suffixes	183
5.2.1.1 -ski	183
5.2.1.3 -en	184
5.2.1.4 -an	185
5.2.2 Turkish adjectives	185
5.2.2.1 Turkish derived adjectives	185
5.2.2.1 Anomaly	188
5.2.2.2 Turkish derived adjectives with pleonastic -ski	188
5.2.3 Turkish root adjectives	188
5.2.4 Turkish adjectives and gender and number agreement	191
5.2.5 Placement of definite article	192
5.2.6 Adverbs	193
5.2.6.1 Adverbial phrases with Turkish oblique cases	194
5.2.6.3 Turkish nouns used as adjectives or adverbs	195
5.2.6.4 Adverbs related to time	195
5.3 Conclusion	196
6.0 Chapter Six: Conjunctions	198
6.1 Bosnian conjunctions	198
6.2 Bulgarian conjunctions	199
6.2.1 <i>Ama</i>	199
6.2.2 <i>Ja...ja</i>	199
6.2.3 <i>Hem (...hem)</i>	200
6.3 Subordinating conjunctions	201
6.3.1 <i>Sanki</i>	201

6.3.2 <i>Ciunki</i>	201
6.4 Conclusion	203
7.0 Chapter Seven: Motivation, Semantics and Integration of Turkisms	203
7.1 The Bosnian writers and turkisms	203
7.1.2 Four types of context	204
7.1.2.1 Turkish dialogue	204
7.1.2.2 Turkish context	205
7.1.2.3 Non-Turkish context	207
7.1.3 Core loan nouns and context	207
7.1.4 Context and core verbs	208
7.1.5 Semantic categories	211
7.1.5.1 Types of categories	211
7.1.5.2 Semantics in religious texts	213
7.1.5.2.1 Divković	214
7.1.5.2.2 Radnić	215
7.1.5.2.3 Margitić	216
7.1.5.2.4 Dobretić	217
7.1.5.2.5 Lastrić	217
7.1.5.2.6 Hapax legomena in religious texts	218
7.1.6 The motivation behind verbs with Turkish roots	220
7.1.6.1 Distribution of verbs in a Turkish setting – in dialogue, in writing, as participles, tenses	221
7.1.6.2 Distribution of verbs in a non-Turkish setting – in dialogue, in writing, as participles, tenses	222
7.1.7 Glossing	222
7.1.7.1 Glossing in chronicles	224
7.1.7.2 Glossing in religious texts	225
7.1.7.3 Turkish Bosnian synonymic compounds	228
7.1.7.3.1 Explanatory pairs	229
7.1.8 Core loans and connotations	229
7.1.8.1 <i>Čifut</i> : <i>Žudij</i>	229
7.1.8.2.2 <i>Udžera</i>	231
7.1.8.2.3 <i>Balija</i>	232
7.1.8.2.4 <i>Sahat</i> : <i>čas</i>	233
7.1.8.2.5 Semantic change	234
7.2 Bulgarian semantics	234
7.2.1 Writers and turkisms	234
7.2.2 Semantic categories	236
7.2.2.1 Core loans and cultural loans	238
7.2.2.2 Abstract core loans	239
7.2.2.3 Intimate loans	239
7.2.3 Cultural loans become integral	240
7.2.3.1 Military terms and titles	240
7.2.3.2 Islamic terms	241
7.2.3.3 Wise men and elders	242
7.2.3.4 Terms for ‘Jew’ and its derivatives	244
7.2.3.5 Turkish Holy Trinity	246
7.2.4 Frequency	247
7.2.5 Semantic extension	248
7.2.6 A different part of speech becomes a noun	250

7.2.7 Turkish vs. Bulgarian suffixes	251
7.3 Conclusion	252
8.0 Conclusion	254
Appendix I: Glossary of turkisms in Bosnian	259
Appendix II: Glossary of turkisms in Bulgarian	276
Appendix III: Earliest attestations of turkisms and their derivatives in Bosnian: RHSJ: Stachowski: dissertation sources	290
Appendix IV: Earliest attestations of turkisms in Bulgarian	310
Bibliography	329

## Abbreviations

Although many of these abbreviations are in the body of the dissertation, some of them occur only in the earliest attestation appendices. Because the abbreviations in these appendices are sources cited by RHSJ or Stachowski but are not in the dissertation, they are not included in the bibliography. Stachowski often provides incomplete bibliographical entries for his sources. Therefore, the bibliographical information listed under the abbreviations of his sources in this section is often incomplete.

**778** MS778 *Kniga na Paula Zarov. 1773*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite*. 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 469–470

**779** MS779 *Petar Carski's 1780 sbornik. 1779*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite* 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 471–474

**780** MS780 *Pavlikjanski sbornik*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite* 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 475–479

**ABL** ablative

**ACC** accusative

**ACT** active

**ADJ** adjective

**AR** Arabic

**BCS** Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian

**BE** Beniç, B. 2003. *Ljetopis sutješkoga samostana* (Sarajevo: Synopsis)

**BER** *Bãlgarski etimologiçen reãnik*. 1971–2011. (Sofia: BAN)

**BO** Bosnian

**BR** Braçuljeviç, L. 1730. *Uzao scerafinske (nascki) goruchiee gliubavi* (Budim: Ivan Georg Nottenstein)

**BU** Bulgarian

**CI** *Crnogorske isprave XVI–XIX vijeka*. 1964. T. Nikçeviç and B. Paviçeviç (eds.) (Cetinje)

**CS** Church Slavonic

**DAT** dative

**DI** Divković, M. 1611. *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski* (Venice: Petro Mario Bertani)

**DIM** diminutive

**DO** Dobretić, M. 1782. *Kratko skupgliegne sakramenatah* (Ancona: Petra Pavao Ferri)

**F** feminine

**GCR** Bogdan, D. 1946. *Glosarul cuvintelor românești din documentele slavo-române* (Bucharest)

**GEN** genitive

**Glasnik** *Glasnik društva srpske slovesnosti*. 1847–1971 (Belgrade: Srpsko učenog društva)

**GZM** *Glasnik Zemaljskog muzeja u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo)

**IL** Ilijić-Varešanin, G. 1798. *Epistola pastoralis* (Dubrovnik: Andreae Trivisan)

**INF** infinitive

**INSTR** instrumental

**IPF** imperfective

**IzvSSF** *Izvestija na Seminara po slavjanska filologija pri Universiteta v Sofija* (Sofia)

**JAZU** Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti

**JBf** Pranjković, I. 2005. ‘Jezik bosanskih franjevac’, in *Mønnesland 2005*, 227–258

**JF** *Južnoslovenski Filolog*. 1913–1971. (Belgrade: Institut za srpski jezik)

**KD** Miletić, L. 1908. ‘Koprivštenski damaskin, novobalgarski pametnik ot XVII vek’ *Balgarski starini*, 2

**KtID** Ivanov, P. 1921. ‘Kotlenski damaskin prepisan ot Stojko jerej na 1765 g.’, *IzvSSF*, 4: 49–85

**LA** Lašvanin, N. 2003. *Ljetopis* (Sarajevo, Synopsis)

**LN** Lastrić, F. 1765. *Nediglnik dvostruk* (Venice: Dominico Lovisa)

**LT** Lastrić, F. 1755. *Testimonium bilabium* (Venice: Domenico Lovisa)

**LjD** Argirov, S. 1895. ‘Ljubljanskijat balgarski räkopis ot XVII vek’, *SbNU*, 12: 463–560

- Ljet. Mat** *Letopis Matice Srpske, Srpska stara pisma* (17th–18th centuries), ed. M. Ludaić
- LOC** locative
- MA** Margitić, S. M. 1701. *Ispovid karstjanska* (Venice: Sebastian Coleti)
- M** masculine
- Mik.** Mikalja J. 1649. *Blago jezika slovinskoga ili slovník u komu izgovaraju riječi slovinske latinski i djački* (Lavreti)
- Mod. St. Cr.** modern standard Croatian
- Mon. Croat.** *Monumenta historica Slavorum meridionalium. Povijesni spomenici južnih Slavena* 1863. (Zagreb: Ivan Kukulević Sakcinski, Acta Croatica)
- Mon. Serb.** Miklošić, F. 1858. *Monumenta Serbica* (Vienna)
- N** neuter
- NOM** nominative
- NG** Gerov, N. 1975–1978. *Rečnik na bālgarskija ezik* (Sofia, Bālgarski pisatel) [Reprint of 1895–1908 edition]
- NP** Miletič, L. 1920. ‘Nedelni poučenijsa ot XVIII vek’, *Bālgarski starini*, 6: 1–70
- NRR** ‘Nastavak rada na rječniku’. 1976. *RHSJ*, 23: 13–14
- OB** Old Bulgarian
- OCS** Old Church Slavonic
- ORSBE** *Obraten rečnik na sāvremenija bālgarski ezik*. 1975.
- OSR** Stojanov, M. and X. Kodov. 1964. *Opis na slavjanskite rākopisi v sofijskata narodna biblioteka* 3 (Sofia)
- PAS** passive
- PCar.** Miletič, L. 1895. ‘Povest za padenieto na Carigrad v 1453 god. (2 pol. XVIII v.)’, *SbNU*, 12: 399–462
- PER** perfective
- Pje. Crn.** *Pjevania Cernogorska i hercegovačka sabrana Čubrom Čojkovićem* (Leipzig: 1837)
- PK** Argirov, S. 1894. ‘Edin bālgarski rākopis ot XVII vek v Pražkija muzej (= Pražki Katixisis)’, *Periodičesko spisanie na bālgarskoto knižovno družestvo v Sredec*, 44: 169–200

**PL** plural

**PMR** Conev, B. 1919. ‘Pop Metodijev raskaz (XVII v.)’, *Istorija na bǎlgarskij ezik*, 1: 309–310

**PO** Posilović, P. 1682. *Naslađenje duhovno* (Venice)

**PPTSJ** Skok, P. 1937–1938. ‘Prilozi proučavanju turcizama u srp.-hrv. jeziku’ *Slavia* 15: 166–190; 336–366; 481–501

**PR** Conev, B. 1929. ‘Edin pavlikjanski rǎkopic ot vtorata polovina na XVIII vek, *Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet, Istorikofilologičeski fakltet*, 25: 6.

**RHSJ** *Rječnik hrvatsko-srpskog jezika*. 1880–1956. (Zagreb: Južnoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti)

**RP** Radnić, M. 1683. *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* (Rome)<sup>1</sup>

**RR** Radnić, M. 1683. *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye* (Rome)

**RSat.** Reljković, M. A. 1762. ‘Djela’, *Satir iliti divlji čovjek*: 271–401

**RSI.** *Romanoslavica*. 1958–1971. (Bucharest: Asociația Slaviștilor din Republica Populară Romîna)

**RUNS** Kačić, A.M. 1956. *Razgovor ugodni naroda slovinskoga* (Zagreb)

**S** Slavonic

**SbNU** *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina*. 1890–1971. Sofia

**SG** singular

**SN** Xristova, B., D. Karadžova, and E. Uzunova. 2004. *Beležki na bǎlgarskite knižovnici X–XVIII vek* (Sofia: Narodna biblioteka ‘Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij’)

**Sof.** Dylevskij, P., M. Robinson, and A. Nikolaevic. 1976. *Sofronij Vračanskij: Žizneopisanie* (Leningrad: Nauka)

**SP** simple past

**SSZN** *Stari srpski zapisi i natpisi*. 1902–1926. Lj. Stojanović (ed.) 1–6 (Belgrade)

**St** *Starine*. 1869–1967. Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti

**SvD** Miletić, L. 1923. ‘Svištovski damaskin, novobǎlgarski pametnik ot XVIII vek (1753)’, *Bǎlgarski Starini*, 7

**Sviš.** *Svištovski damaskin* 1923. L. Miletić (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite)

---

<sup>1</sup> The name of publisher is provided nowhere in the two works by Radnić.

**T** Turkish

- TD I** Lavrov, R. 1893. 'Fragment Damaskinu Tixonravova s XVII v.', in *Obzor zvukovyx i formalnyx osobennostej bolgarskogo jazyka* (Moscow): 15–37
- TD II** Lavrov, R. 1893. 'Fragment Damaskinu Tixonravova s XVIII v.', in *Obzor zvukovyx i formalnyx osobennostej bolgarskogo jazyka* (Moscow): 38–52
- TEv** Miletič, L. 1920. 'Tärlinsko evangelie ot 1861 god.', *Bälgarski starini*, 6: 7–176
- Tix.** *Tixonravovski damaskin*. 1971. A. Demina (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bälgarskata akademija na naukite)
- TrD** Ivanov, A. 1967. *Trojanski damaskin*. *Bälgarski pametnik ot XVII vek* (Sofia)
- Troj.** *Trojanski damaskin*. 1967. A. Ivanova (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bälgarskata akademija na naukite)
- TrvD** Miletič, L. 1901. 'Trevnenski (Stojanov) damaskin', *SbNU*, 18: 56–61
- WMBH** *Wissenschaftliche Mitteilungen aus Bosnien und der Herzegovina*. 1896. (Sarajevo)
- ZR** *Zakon o rudnicima despota Stefana Lazarevića (1412)*. 1962. N. Radojčić (ed.) Belgrade

## **1.0 Chapter One: Introduction**

### **1.1 Defining Turkish loanword and borrowing**

This dissertation focuses on loanwords borrowed from Turkish into Bosnian and Bulgarian in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as seen through Catholic, namely Franciscan, texts. For the purpose of this dissertation, an Turkish loanword, i.e. a *turkism*, is defined as a word that entered Bosnian and Bulgarian via Turkish. The word might be native to Turkish or a borrowing within Turkish from another language, e.g. Arabic or Persian. The term *borrowing* is defined as ‘all kinds of transfer or copying processes’ adopted by speakers of the recipient language and/or imposed by non-native speakers onto the recipient language (Haspelmath, 2009: 36).

### **1.2 Material selected**

I have limited this research to Catholic texts for several reasons. The Bosnian Franciscan Order, which was the only Catholic order to remain in Bosnia under Ottoman rule, has a rich literary tradition (Pranjković, 2005a: 6). Until the nineteenth century, the majority of the books published in Bosnian were written by the Bosnian Franciscans, in part because the Franciscans were among the limited literate community. Bosnian Muslim scholars tended to write in Arabic since it was the language of Islamic science (Zubčević, 2013: 20–21) and the language of literate Serbs had Church Slavonic influence. Similarly, in Bulgaria, Orthodox writing had heavy Church Slavonic influence. Because I analyse the extent to which Turkish penetrated the Bosnian and Bulgarian vernaculars, it is necessary to look at texts that best represent them. While the texts I study are certainly not equivalent to the spoken language, they are some of the closest documentations of the vernacular of the time.

One might argue that the oral tradition is an even better representation. Though it certainly is rich in colloquialisms, including *turkisms*, I chose not to include

it in the main set of texts for several reasons. First, the anthologies of the oral tradition were not compiled until the nineteenth century. Since I wanted to limit this study to pre-nineteenth-century works – to a period before the quest for national identity began to influence language – I could not include these anthologies since some of the poems might represent nineteenth-century language. The second reason is that the oral tradition primarily consists of ballads written in strict metre. Therefore, rhythm played a significant role in the choice of words and their forms used in these ballads.

Although many of these Bosnian Franciscan works have been analysed in an historical and religious context, and there are a few articles discussing Franciscans and turkisms, a detailed analysis of the Franciscans' usage of turkisms and of the development of these words over time does not exist. There are even fewer works on Bulgarian Catholic texts and little to nothing about Turkish influence in these works.

The Bulgarian texts were initially included as a point of linguistic comparison, though the Bulgarian Catholics have a much smaller literary tradition. Apart from Stanislavov's *Abagar* ('Abgar'), all the Bulgarian texts analysed are also Franciscan. *Abagar* was included because it is the first published Early Modern Bulgarian book and has been the source of much linguistic debate regarding its place in the history of Bulgarian (Rajkov, 1966).

There is a significant disparity regarding the amount of material analysed for each language: there are twelve Bosnian texts analysed but only five Bulgarian ones.<sup>1</sup> In part, this is because the Bosnian Franciscans had a more established literary tradition than the Bulgarian Catholics, as already mentioned; it is also because I had access to all Bosnian Franciscan libraries and monasteries, which have managed to protect many of their historical works. The Bulgarian sources are held at the Saint

---

<sup>1</sup> I include four non-Franciscan contemporary works as points of comparison, but these works are supplementary (1.4.3.1).

Cyril and Methodius National Library of Bulgaria in Sofia. Even though there are far fewer Bulgarian sources included, the three Bulgarian manuscripts alone are rich enough to be material for one dissertation. Though I initially thought the Bulgarian texts would be only a point of comparison and the main focus of the dissertation would be on the Bosnian texts, the significance of the Turkish in the Bulgarian texts soon changed these texts from being a point of comparison to having equal weight to the Bosnian texts.

### **1.3 Overview**

I analyse the works of seven eighteenth-century Bosnian Franciscans: Stjepan Margitić Markovac (1650–1714), Lovro Bračuljević (1685–1737), Filip Lastrić (1700–1783), Nikola Marčinkušić Lašvanin (1703–1750), Marko Dobretić (1707–1784) Bono Benić (1708–1785) and Grgo Ilijić-Varešanin (Hiljić) (1736–1792). For a Bulgarian counterpart, I analyse three large (150–400+ pages) eighteenth-century Bulgarian Franciscan manuscripts. As a basis for mapping out the chronology and development of Turkish loanwords in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, I have also included works of five seventeenth-century Bosnian Franciscans: Ivan Bandulavić (1591–mid-1600s), Matija Divković (1563–1631), Pavo Posilović Mošunjanin (1600–1653), Mihovil Radnić (1636–1707); and two Bulgarian Catholics: Petar Bogdan Bakšić (1601–1674) and Filip Stanislavov (1614–1674).

The dissertation consists of eight chapters. The first chapter, the introduction, gives background information on Turkish presence in Bosnia, the Order of the Bosnian Franciscans (Bosna Srebrena), Bulgaria and its Catholic communities, as well as short biographies of each of the writers whose works are analysed.

The second half of the introduction deals with language background: defining the local language, phonology and orthography. There is not a separate chapter that

discusses phonology in detail for several reasons: 1) one cannot be sure of the exact Turkish dialects present in the area; 2) because none of the texts analysed was written in a standard orthography and there are many spelling variants even within one text, one cannot be entirely sure of the pronunciation of a word. It would be unsound to draw anything more than tentative conclusions on the basis of the material analysed.

The second chapter focuses on the complications regarding the chronology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. These complications are different for each language: e.g. Bulgarian lacks an attestational dictionary. To compensate for this lack, I selected three *damaskini*:<sup>2</sup> *Tixonravovski damaskin*, *Trojanski damaskin*, both of which are from the seventeenth century and *Švištovski damaskin*, which is from the eighteenth century; one historical account: *Žitie i stradanija grešnogo Sofronija* ('The Life and Suffering of Sinful Sofronij') (1798); and the complete collection of Bulgarian scribal notes from the tenth to the end of the eighteenth century (Xristova et al., 2004) to include as points of reference for the chronological analysis of the turkisms found in the manuscripts analysed.

The third chapter looks at nominal morphology in Bosnian and Bulgarian. Among other things, this chapter analyses why turkisms borrowed from a language where gender is not a category developed the genders that they did.

Chapter four addresses the verbal morphology of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. It discusses aspect, Slavonic verbal prefixes, verbal roots and Turkish voiced suffixes.

---

<sup>2</sup> The *damaskini* were originally sixteenth-century translations of the works by Dameskonos Studites from Greek into Church Slavonic and Bulgarian. Later, the term came to refer to other translated religious works, often written in the vernacular.

The fifth chapter focuses on adjectives and adverbs: Turkish root adjectives and adverbs, derived adverbs and adjectives and their agreement with the nouns that they modify are discussed.

The shorter sixth chapter addresses the use of Turkish conjunctions in formal vs. informal writing in Bosnian and Bulgarian.

The seventh chapter looks at the motivation, semantics and setting of turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. A section of this chapter also addresses semantic issues limited to Bulgarian, namely pleonasm and turkisms whose grammatical function changes when borrowed into Bulgarian.

The conclusion addresses how the morphology, semantics, motivation and setting of turkisms relate to their chronology in Bosnian and Bulgarian and how these points differ from language to language. It also provides suggestions for further study.

Because of the 80,000 word limit<sup>3</sup> for theses, turkisms are not glossed. The reader should refer to Appendix I and II for the meanings of turkisms. Other Slavonic and Turkish terms, whose meanings are not given in the glossaries, are glossed, apart from examples given when discussing orthography. Textual examples and citations in Slavonic languages are translated. For the convenience of readers from disciplines other than Turkology, and to be able to see as closely as possible the phonological and morphophonological changes that occurred when Turkish words were borrowed into Bosnian and Bulgarian, Turkish words are spelled in modern Turkish, not according to the transliteration practices for Ottoman Turkish.

---

<sup>3</sup> I have a 12,000-word extension for appendices.

## 1.4 Historical background

### 1.4.1 Bosna Srebrena and Ottoman Turkish rule

The first Franciscans arrived in Bosnia and Herzegovina from Italy in 1291 and founded Bosna Srebrena, the Franciscan Order of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Although many Catholics either left Bosnia or converted to Islam during the Ottoman Turkish rule, in 1463, at the beginning of the rule, the custos of Bosna Srebrena, fra Andeo Zvizdović, convinced Sultan Mehmed II to issue the capitulation which permitted the Franciscans to continue their work and Catholics to remain in Bosnia (Gavran, 2007: 47). Despite this capitulation, the life of the Franciscans was under constant duress: through capitulations, arson and abuse, the Turks stripped the monasteries of any financial means:

[...] okrutnost silnika toliko nas je pritisla da smo po sultanovu (magni Turcae) pismenom nalogu bili vezani, bačeni u tamnicu, batinani, opljačkani, a dvojica od nas ostali su jedva napola živi...Nikako nam ne dopuštaju boraviti u samostanima, ako prije ne isplatimo tri hiljade groša. Stoga, da se u ovim krajevima ne bi sasvim utrnula iskra vjere, obraćamo se papi, kraljevima, knezovima, vojvodama, velikašim i svim kršćanima i ponizno molimo za pomoć budući da mi nemamo odakle da to isplatimo

‘[...] the violence of the tyrants was so oppressive that under a written command of the sultan (magni Turcae), we were fettered, thrown into prison, beaten, robbed and two of us barely remained alive...They do not allow us in any way to remain in the monasteries unless we pay out three thousand *groš*. Thus, in order for the spark of faith not to be entirely quenched in these regions, we address the pope, kings, princes, grand dukes and all Christians and we humbly ask for help as we have no means for this payment’ (*Acta Bosnae* in Gavran, 2007: 63)

Pomoću toga uzdržavaju svoje samostane, plaćaju nepravedne turske namete, hrane turske putnike, koji mnogo puta dolaze samo da napune trbuh u samostanu...Ako ih dobro ne pogoste, postupaju s fratrima tako kako se među kršćanima ne bi postupalo s magarcima. To sam vidio s vlastitim očima dok sam – promatrajući njihovu skupštinu – kroz tri tjedna boravio u fojničkom samostanu

‘Thanks to that, they [the Franciscans] have maintained their monasteries, pay the unjust Turkish taxes, feed the Turkish travellers, who come many times only to fill their bellies in the monastery...If they [the Franciscans] don’t host them [Turkish travellers] well, they treat the friars as Christians would not treat donkeys. I have seen this with my own eyes – observing their meeting – during the three weeks which I spent at the monastery in Fojnica’ (*Starine J.A.* in Gavran, 2007: 71)

Nevertheless, the Bosnian Franciscans managed to create a distinct existence within the politically and culturally hostile situation in which they found themselves:

To je karakter franjevačke tradicije, koja tvori ‘posebni svijet’ unutar duhovne i kulturne povjesti žitelja bosanskohercegovačkog tla, kao umijeće zajedničkog življenja u izrazito nepogodnim povijesnim okolnostima, ‘jer u samoj srži franjevačke filozofije i poslanja leži upravo to: izgrađivati mogućnost života tamo gdje je to teško moguće, izgrađivati život u njegovim raznoobličnim mogućnostima tamo gdje uniformnost znači smrt’

This is the character of the Franciscan tradition – to create a ‘special world’ within the spiritual and cultural history of the inhabitants of the land of Bosnia and Herzegovina; they [the Franciscans] have been capable of living in especially inclement historical circumstances, ‘because that is what is at the very heart of Franciscan philosophy and ministry: to create the possibility for life where it is difficult to do so, to create life in its myriad forms where uniformity signifies death’ (Karamatić, 2006: 73)

With the Austro-Hungarian defeat of the Turks in the Great Ottoman-Turkish War (1683–1698), much of Croatia, Dalmatia and Hungary was liberated from Ottoman Turkish rule. This resulted in large migrations: Catholics moved to non-occupied territories and Muslims moved to Ottoman Turkish-occupied Bosnia (Gavran, 2007:97). Though the Franciscans remained in Bosnia, their province was broken up into three regions: Dalmatia, Northern Croatia and Bosnia, a break-up that would eventually divide the province about half a century later. The changes in population did nothing to improve the treatment of the Franciscans by the Turks in Bosnia. In the second half of the seventeenth century, the Turks introduced *džulus* < *cülus*, a tax required to carry out religious rituals, which was paid annually or any time a new vizier arrived, which could be three to four times a year (Gavran, 2007: 98). In addition to the monetary sum, a monastery was required to give the vizier one ram, two *okas* of sugar, twenty loaves of bread, twenty bars of soap, two candles, each having two *okas* of wax (Gavran, 2007: 98).

Because of the minimal education in Bosnia and Herzegovina until the end of the nineteenth century,<sup>4</sup> Bosna Srebrena sent its seminary students abroad to Italy.<sup>5</sup> The Franciscans were highly educated, sometimes more fluent in Latin or Italian than in their native tongue (Gavran, 2007: 77). Because of this, a significant number of their works, including non-religious works, such as chronicles, were written in Latin and/or Italian until the Illyrian movement (Gavran, 2007: 77). Bilingual works (Latin and/or Italian and Bosnian) were also not uncommon. What is notable about the works analysed for this dissertation is that: a) they are in the local language; b) despite the harsh treatment the Franciscans experienced at the hands of the Turks, they still incorporated Turkish words into their writing.

#### **1.4.2 Bosnian Franciscans**

**Fra Matija Divković** (1563–1631) was born between Olovo and Vareš (Pranjković, 2005a: 15). Divković most likely was a pupil in the Olovo monastery before going to Italy to study philosophy and theology. Upon returning to Bosnia, he was the chaplain in Sarajevo, where he finished writing *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski* ('Christian Doctrine for the Slavonic People') in 1609. It was published in Venice in 1611. His other published works are: *Sto čudesa* ('One Hundred Miracles') (1611), *Besjede* ('Speeches') (1616) and *Nauk krstjanski s mnozijemi stvari duhovnijemi* ('Christian Doctrine with Many Spiritual Things') (1616).

**Fra Ivan Bandulavić** (second half of sixteenth century – middle of the seventeenth century) was born in Skoplje (now Gornji Vakuf/Uskoplje). There is little information about Bandulavić: it is thought that he was a pupil at the monastery in Fojnica and that he later studied theology and philosophy somewhere in Italy

---

<sup>4</sup> At the end of the nineteenth century, around 90% of all citizens of Bosnia and Herzegovina were illiterate, and around 99% of all Catholics were illiterate (Grbić, 1994: 102; Zirdum, 2003: 32).

<sup>5</sup> At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the order also began sending their students to Croatia, Austria and Hungary.

(Pranjković, 2005a: 17). In Bologna in 1613 he published *Pisctole i evangelya* ('Epistles and Gospels'), which is the first Bosnian Franciscan work published in *latinica* 'Latin script'.

**Fra Pavao Posilović Mošunjanin** (1600–1653) was born in Glamoč and was most likely killed with other friars at the Rame monastery by Turks (Pranjković, 2005a: 23). He was probably schooled in Visovac and later studied in Italy. After Bishop fra Bartol Kašić died in 1642, Posilović oversaw the Makarska bishopric, in addition to his own Skradin bishopric (Pranjković, 2005a: 23).

His written works, which are mainly moral-didactic texts, were popular among the people and were published numerous times, sometimes in both *bosančica* 'Bosnian script' and *latinica* (Pranjković, 2005a: 23). He is especially known for his retelling of biblical events, as well as his allusions to classical philosophy, namely Plato and Aristotle (Pranjković, 2005a: 23). His published books include *Cvijet od kriposti* ('Flower of Fortitude') (1647) and *Naslađenje duhovno* ('Spiritual Delight') (1639).

**Fra Mihovil Radnić** (1636–1707) was born in Kaloča and died in Budim. He studied in Rome, where he began teaching philosophy even before he became a priest (Pranjković, 2005a: 26). In 1664 he returned to Bosnia, where he was the guardian of the monastery in Olovo. In 1678 he became secretary of the province, was custos from 1681 to 1684 and provincial from 1685 to 1690 (Pranjković, 2005a: 26). During the Great Ottoman-Turkish War (1683–1698), many monasteries were destroyed and many Catholics fled across the Sava during Radnić's mandate. He appealed to Venice for aid against the Turks and was then imprisoned until he managed to flee (Pranjković, 2005a: 27). Despite the harsh treatment that he experienced at the hands of the Turks, his writings have the most turkisms of the seventeenth-century Bosnian

texts. His works include *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* ('Inveighing against the Frivolity of the World') (1683) and *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye* ('Devotional Reflections on Divine Love') (1683).

**Fra Stjepan Margitić Markovac** (1650–1714) was born in Jajce. It is thought that he was schooled in the Fojnica monastery and went to Italy for his higher education. Apart from his religious writings, his other significant contribution to Bosna Srebrena was his visit to the patriarch in Istanbul in 1682 to defend Bosna Srebrena and Bosnian Catholics from the patriarch's jurisdiction (Pranjković, 2005a: 28). He wrote for the local people in the variety of Bosnian native to Jajce. He comments on the mix of Turkish words in his own writing and wrote in the register of language that would be most understood by the common people (Pranjković, 2005a: 29).

**Fra Lovro Bračuljević** (1685–1737) was born in Budim, where he also died. He most likely studied in Italy and was one of the first professors at the Franciscan university in Budim (Pranjković, 2005a: 35). He was well respected and was the province's envoy to Vienna to represent the province in a conflict with the Bishop Gabrijel Patačić,<sup>6</sup> as well as the general inspector for Franciscan monasteries in Bulgaria. He wrote numerous works in both Bosnian and Latin.

**Fra Filip Lastrić** (1700–1783) was born in Očevija close to Vareš. He was a pupil at the Kraljevska Sutjeska monastery until he went to Italy to study philosophy and theology. Lastrić was provincial of Bosna Srebrena from 1741 to 1745. During Lastrić's time, Bosna Srebrena was undergoing tumultuous changes, many brought on by the political developments in the area. He was the last provincial of Bosna Srebrena before it split into Bosnian, Croatian and Hungarian territories. Lastrić is

---

<sup>6</sup> For more on this conflict, see Gavran (2007).

considered to be among the most educated, productive and well-rounded writers of Bosna Srebrena in the entire history of the order (Karamatić, 2006: 42). His writings are predominantly theological and his homilies are still considered to be some of the best among all Croatian and Bosnian homilies for their complex and erudite use of the local language.

**Fra Nikola Marčinkušić Lašvanin** (1703–1750) was born in Lašva, close to Jajce. He was a pupil in the Fojnica monastery and completed his higher education in theology and philosophy, most likely in Italy. In 1748 he travelled with fra Filip Lastrić to the emperor in Vienna to seek financial and political support on the behalf of Bosnian Catholics (Karamatić, 2006: 44). His only written contribution is his chronicle, much of which is based on Vitezović's *Kronici* ('Chronicles') (Karamatić, 2006: 44), though it also includes Lašvanin's first-hand accounts. It seems the purpose of this chronicle was to maintain a record of events relating to Bosna Srebrena for the members of the order.

**Fra Marko Dobretić** (1707–1784) was born in Brnjići, close to Jajce. He completed his primary education at the Fojnica monastery and secondary education in Dalmatia and Florence. He continued to live in Italy, where he taught philosophy, dogma and moral theology, for seventeen years. He then returned to Bosnia where he was provincial from 1758 to 1762 and again from 1768 to 1771 (Karamatić, 2006: 44). He concentrated on the history of Bosna Srebrena in addition to his religious writing, which was directed to his fellow clergymen in Bosnia and abroad.

**Fra Bono Benić** (1708–1785) was born in Čatici (close to Kakanj) and joined Bosna Srebrena in Kraljevska Sutjeska in 1723. He studied philosophy and theology in Cremona, after which he returned to Bosnia. He was provincial of Bosna Srebrena from 1765 to 1768 and again from 1774 to 1777. Benić was active in fighting for the

rights of Catholics, which were encroached upon both by the Orthodox patriarch at the time<sup>7</sup> and the ruling Ottomans. He was imprisoned twice by the Turks. Benić knew the Turkish language, which he frequently used in his own writing (Karamatić, 2006: 12).

**Fra Grgo Ilijić-Varešanin** (1736–1818) was born in Vareš and died in Kraljevska Sutjeska. He was a pupil in Kraljevska Sutjeska and then studied philosophy and theology in Italy. When he returned to Bosnia, he worked in the Kraljevska Sutjeska seminary and was the parish priest for several churches. From 1774 to 1777 he was the provincial secretary. In 1797 he became bishop of Makarska (Karamatić: 2006, 17). He wrote several works concerning pastoral practices.

### 1.4.3 Bosnian works

#### 1.4.3.1 Eleven religious works

The eleven religious texts analysed are:<sup>8</sup> Divković's *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski* ('Christian Doctrine for the Slavonic People') (1611), Bandulavić's *Pisctole i Evangelya* ('Epistles and Gospels') (1613), Posilović's *Naslađenje duhovno* ('Spiritual Delight') (1639), Radnić's *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* ('Inveighing against the Frivolity of the World') (1683) and *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye* ('Devotional Reflections on Divine Love') (1683), Margitić's *Ispovid karstjanska* ('Christian Confession') (1701),<sup>9</sup> Bračuljević's *Uzao scerafinske (po nascki – goruchie) gliubavi* ('A Knot of Seraphic (in Our Language – Fiery) Love') (1730), Lastrić's *Testimonium bilabium* ('Two-Lip Testimony') (1755) and *Nediglnik dvostruk* ('Two-part Weekly') (1766), Dobretić's *Kratko skupgliegne sakramenatah* ('A Small Collection of Sacraments') (1782) and Ilijić's *Epistola pastoralis cum aliis*

---

<sup>7</sup> For more, see Gavran 2007.

<sup>8</sup> Works written in *bosančica* are given in modern BCS spelling. Titles in *latinica* are written in their original spelling.

<sup>9</sup> The edition consulted for this dissertation is from 1779 and is in *latinica*.

*nonnullis litteris circularibus*<sup>10</sup> ('Pastoral letter with a few other encyclicals') (1797 and 1798).

Divković's *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski* is the first Bosnian Franciscan work published in the local language in the *bosančica* script. It consists of 309 pages of reflections directed to the clergy on the Ten Commandments, the Catholic mass and sacraments, as well as prayers (Pranjković, 2005a: 16).

Bandulavić's *Pisctole i evangelya* (1613) is different from the other religious works analysed as it is predominantly a new version of Bernardin Splićanin's 1495 Latin-Croatian lectionary,<sup>11</sup> rather than religious reflections and homilies. At the end of the work there are two poems. This work does not contain any turkisms, most likely because it depended heavily on Splićanin's language. *Pisctole i evangelya* is nevertheless included in this dissertation because it was one of the works most used in Bulgarian Franciscan education (Miletič, 1884: 78) and provides a point of departure for analysing the orthography of Bulgarian Catholics.

Posilović's *Naslađenje duhovno* was published four times: in 1639 and 1682 in *bosančica* and in 1705 and 1756 in *latinica*. The edition that is analysed in this dissertation is from 1682. This work consists of 410 pages and contains four turkisms. *Naslađenje duhovno* focuses on how a Christian must live in order to die well and the temptations that might prevent one from doing so.

Radnić's *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* (566 pages) and *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye* (403 pages) were both published in 1683 in Rome in *latinica*. These works were written earlier when Radnić was in Bosnia, but not published until he went to Italy for church matters. His first work discusses the

---

<sup>10</sup> Though this title and *Testimonium bilabium* are in Latin, the work is written in Bosnian.

<sup>11</sup> Bandulavić most likely did not work from the original work but from the 1543 version published by Benedikt Zborovičić in Venice (Pranjković, 2005a: 17).

dangers of frivolity and the importance of following God's commandments while the second work focuses on the essence and fruits of God's love.

In his *Ispovid karstjanska* Margitić interprets the catechism and includes some of his own homilies and songs. The work is approximately 200 pages. Although he lived in the seventeenth century, thus earlier than Dobretić, he uses far more turkisms.

Bračuljević's *Uzao scerafinske (po nascki – goruchiee) gliubavi* (593 pages) discusses morality, dogma, church history, Franciscan history and church law. The book is divided into three sections: the first section focuses on religious obligations, the second on the fruits of faith, and the third on the relationship between these two. Despite having blatant animosity for the Turks, Bračuljević employs a number of turkisms.

Dobretić's *Kratko skupgliegne sakramenatah* consists of thirty-one chapters (580 pages) discussing Catholic sacraments and the dangers to which one is subjected when one abuses them. He is not writing for the common people but for his brothers and other religious: he borrows many words from Latin, cites papal letters and glosses Bosnian terms with Latin.

Lastrić's *Testimonium bilabium* (545 pages) is a bilingual (Latin and Bosnian) collection of homilies and other religious writings. In the introduction to his *Dvostruk Nediglnik* (440 pages), he mentions that after writing *Testimonium bilabium*, he was asked to write another work with shorter homilies:

U parvomu dillu, kojefam dao na svitlošt 1755. pod imenom *Testimonium Bilabium*, gdifu nikah Govoregnja latinski, pàk istá i Slavo-Bofanski; biofam pokaran zaradi duxxiné, ponikovan, pače moglen od Paštirah duhovni púka priproftitoga, da ućinim jedan Godishgnjak cio s' kratkim govoregni: S' ovim dakle ottiofam gnima ugoditi

'I was reprimanded for the length of the first work entitled *Testimonium Bilabium*, which I had published in 1755, in which there are sermons in Latin as well as in Slavo-Bosnian, and the spiritual pastors of the common people humbled me into writing an almanac with short sermons: I have tried to satisfy them with this' (Lastrić, 1766: 2)

This comment suggests that his works were read aloud and were written for both religious and laymen.

Ilijić's *Epistola pastoralis cum aliis nonnullis litteris circularibus* and *Epistola pastoralis* are short overviews discussing the proper behaviour of the clergy and Catholics (Ilijić, 1798: 44). The rules that he lists refer to Catholic sacraments and to commentary on them, namely by Dobretić and Divković. He also warns that Catholics will lose favour in God's eyes to Muslims if Catholics do not abide by these rules: 'Vidite svaki dan, kako Turci klagniaju, o Boguse molæ i brez piitja, i brez oruxja, i brez ikakva csàs mora, odkud onnichenas prid Bogom priitt, akomuse nebudemo pristojno moliti' ('You see every day how the Turks pray, how they pray to God, without a moment's rest, without drink and arms, that's why they will surpass us before God if we don't pray dutifully.') (Ilijić, 1797: 15).

#### **1.4.3.2 Two chronicles**

Lašvanin's and Beniç's chronicles were published in 2003 as part of a five volume set of Franciscan works. The original language of these two texts is maintained but the spelling has been transliterated from *bosančica* into modern Croatian *latinica*. I consulted Beniç's manuscript to check his original against the published transliterated work, which is accurate. Unfortunately, Lašvanin's manuscript is missing from the Fojnica monastery and has yet to be located.

The term chronicle does not describe the works of Lašvanin and Beniç accurately (Gavran, 2003a: 12). Both these works present a chronology of events, sometimes annual, sometimes monthly, but they also include a collection of different works by each of these authors. Lašvanin's chronicle consists of eight sections, five of which I analyse: *Opći ljetopis od početka svijeta do 1690* ('General Chronicle from the Beginning of the World up to 1690'); *Bosanski ljetopis od 1682–1750* ('Bosnian

Chronicle 1682–1750’); *Građa za chronicle Bosanske franjevačke provincije od 1523–1771* (‘Material for the Chronicle of the Bosnian Franciscan Province 1523–1771’); *Posebni ljetopis od 1300–1679* (‘The Special Chronicle 1300–1679’); *Turske poslovice i izreke* (‘Turkish Proverbs and Expressions’). The three sections that I do not use are in Latin: *Kako Bosna pala u ropstvo* (‘How Bosnia Fell into Slavery’), *Dva dekreta* (‘Two Decrees’) and *Građa za ljetopis bosanskih biskupa i Smrt fra Petra Lašvanina* (‘Material for the Chronicle of Bosnian Bishops and the Death of fra Petar Lašvanin’).<sup>12</sup> Benić’s chronicle consists of similar components:<sup>13</sup> 1) a concise general history from the year 730; 2) a history of Bosna Srebrena until 1751 and the history of its major monasteries until the beginning of the eighteenth century and; 3) by far the largest section (70%) (Gavran, 2007: 9), the events pertinent to Bosnia and Lašvanin’s monastery (Kraljevska Sutjeska) during his lifespan. I analyse all three of these sections but not the several testaments and agreements written in Latin. Both friars express a love for their order and country: they write in the local language with regionalisms and many Turkish loanwords that would only be understood in Bosnia, not among their brothers in Dalmatia or abroad: e.g. ‘Esabite, bratjo, što su činili siromaši!’ (‘Imagine, brothers, what the poor people did!’) (Benić: 129). Their chronologies of the world prior to their records focus on historical events that affected their lives, namely, the expansion of the Ottoman empire and the Kingdom of Hungary, as well as on biblical events. These records of their lives recount their struggles against plagues, fires, Ottoman Turkish taxes and the often violent implementation of Ottoman Turkish decisions and policies. The friars also describe the friends they found in certain Ottoman Turkish officials who enabled them to maintain and rebuild their monasteries and communities. Both Benić and Lašvanin

---

<sup>12</sup> In the edition of Lašvanin that I have, these titles are only given in Bosnian.

<sup>13</sup> Benić does not provide titles for each section of his chronicle.

kept these records as much for themselves as for future generations of Bosna Srebrena and Bosnians.

## **1.5 Bulgarian Catholics and Ottomans in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries**

### **1.5.1 Bulgarian Catholic communities**

The sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Bulgarian Catholic communities were centred in Čiprovci (until the Čiprovci uprising in 1688), the area around Plovdiv, the region of Banat and other larger cities (Dimitrova, 2008: 744; Telbizov, 1981: 121; Večeva, 1988: 113). Until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), these communities consisted of Saxon miners and tradesmen from Western Europe, including Dalmatia, who had arrived as early as the fourteenth century (Dimitrova, 2008: 744; Frazee, 1983: 108–109; Georgiev, 2010: 77–78; Miletič, 1903: 121; Telbizov, 1981: 122; Večeva, 1988: 113).<sup>14</sup>

There was also a group of Christians who were not part of either the Western or the Eastern church in the area around Plovdiv and in some regions of northern Bulgaria. These Christians, who called themselves Paulicians, left the border regions of Armenia and Byzantium because of persecution and arrived in Bulgaria during the seventh and eighth centuries (Frazee, 1983: 108; Georgiev, 2010: 77). By 1365 a few thousand Paulicians in the area around Plovdiv had been converted to Catholicism by eight Franciscan friars (Miletič, 1884: 66).<sup>15</sup> Because of an insufficient number of clergymen, many of these newly converted Catholics returned to their Paulician practices.

The Čiprovci Catholics, however, maintained stronger ties with Rome, in part because they were closer to Hungary, where, under King Ludwig, the Bosnian

---

<sup>14</sup> For more on the Catholic communities of Bulgaria, see Frazee (1982: 108–110); Georgiev (2010: 77–84).

<sup>15</sup> For more on the Bosnian Franciscans in Bulgaria, see Miletič (1903: 8–21).

Franciscans had established several monasteries (Miletič, 1884: 66). After the Council of Trent, the Bosnian Franciscans were directed to come to Bulgaria in order to look after and encourage the small pockets of Catholics throughout Bulgaria (Telbizov, 1981: 121). In a short period of time, the Bosnian Franciscans managed to convert Bulgarian non-Catholics, especially the Paulicians around Plovdiv and the Danube (Miletič, 1884: 66; Telbizov, 1981: 121). In 1595 the Bosnian Franciscan Petar Zlojustrić (Solinat) came to Bulgaria and became the first bishop of Sofia (1601–1612) (Dimitrova, 2008: 744) and led the Northern Paulician mission (Dimitrova, 2008: 745; Georgiev: 2010: 83 Miletič, 1903: 21). The conversion then spread farther north as Catholic propaganda became particularly strong under Pope Urbanus in 1624 (Miletič, 1884: 69; Miletič, 1903: 21). Franciscan monasteries and schools were founded to educate Bulgarian boys for the priesthood. After primary education, a handful of boys<sup>16</sup> were sent either to the University of St. Clement in Rome or to the Illyrian colleges in Loreto and Fermo to become priests (Večeva, 1988: 115). Upon receiving their higher education, these Bulgarian priests returned to Bulgaria, where they served the Catholic communities and were often politically active in fighting for Bulgaria's liberation (Večeva, 1988: 117).

The most significant liberation act in which Bulgarian Catholics were involved was the Čiprovci uprising of 1688.<sup>17</sup> Anticipation and preparation for the uprising lasted at least ten years, but the impetus for the uprising was the 1688 Austrian siege of Belgrade, which was under Ottoman rule at the time. Because the Bulgarians were defeated by the Ottomans in the uprising, much of the Catholic community was forced to leave and relocated to Transylvania and Banat (Večeva,

---

<sup>16</sup> Scholars differ on the exact number: Miletič suggests six (Miletič, 1903:14); Telbizov suggests ten (Telbizov, 1981: 122).

<sup>17</sup> For more on the Čiprovci Uprising of 1688, see: Grigorov (2008); Parčević (1924).

1988: 118). Until 1675, the Bulgarian Franciscans in Bulgaria were under the supervision of Bosna Srebrena; in 1675, they became an independent province (Telbizov, 1981: 124).

Though there is a significant amount of secondary literature on the Bulgarian Catholics, literature regarding the relationship between the Bulgarian Catholics and the occupying Turks is for the most part limited to the Čiprovci uprising and the suffering experienced during and after it. Nikolova (2006: 33) points out that Christian communities were tolerated under Islamic law during the Ottoman rule and these communities had contact with Ottoman administration, as well as with Turkish communities living in Bulgaria, especially in border regions. Without a doubt, Bulgarians suffered under the Ottomans, but given the amount of Turkish influence on the language and the continuous existence of the Paulician Catholic communities, the relationship between Ottomans and Catholics seems more complex than mere oppression vs. liberation, as Nikolova mentions. Nevertheless, in contrast to the Bosnian Franciscans, who often acted as mediators between the Ottomans and the Bosnian common people, it seems Bulgarian Catholics were more active in rebelling against the Ottomans until the Čiprovci uprising than in finding a middle ground. After the defeat of the Čiprovci uprising and the expulsion of the majority of Čiprovci Catholics to Wallachia and Banat in 1688, there is limited information on Bulgarian Catholic-Ottoman Turkish relations, albeit the Paulician Catholic communities remained on Bulgarian Ottoman Turkish territory and their works are rich in turkisms.

### **1.5.2 Bulgarian writers**

**Petar Bogdan Bakšić** (1601–1674) was a prolific writer and perhaps the most influential Bulgarian Catholic in the Bulgarian movement in the seventeenth century (Grigorov, 2008: 15). He translated works into Illyrian and composed his own poems.

He wrote several travel essays, including a description of Bulgaria, in Italian (Stančev, 1988: 7). In contrast to several other notable Catholics of his time (e.g. Parčević, Pejčić, Knežević, Sojmirović), Bakšić was not born into the nobility but was the son of a poor miner in Čiprovci (Dimitrov, 1988: 172; Dimitrov, 2009: 20; Grigorov, 2008: 13). He studied at the University of St. Clement in Rome between 1620 and 1630, along with nine other young Bulgarians (Dimitrov, 1988: 173; Dimitrov, 2009: 26; Dimitrova, 2008: 747; Grigorov, 2008: 14). In Italy, he became acquainted with humanism, which inspired him to promote Bulgarian independence from the Ottoman Empire (Dimitrova, 2008: 747).<sup>18</sup> In 1631 Bakšić was appointed guardian of the Bulgarian Franciscan custody (Dimitrov, 2009: 30; Grigorov, 2008: 14) and in 1642 he became the archbishop of Sofia (Grigorov, 2008: 14). Three years later he organised the Bulgarian participation in the Cretan War.<sup>19</sup> In 1673 he appealed to Venice from Čiprovci for help against ‘težko ropstvo’ (‘cruel slavery’) (Grigorov, 2008: 14) under the Ottomans. In 1649, Bakšić stopped the Catholics’ effort to instigate a political rebellion against the Ottoman authorities because he feared that their endeavours would not be successful (Dimitrov, 1988: 178).

**Filip Stanislavov** (1614–1674) was born in Nikopolsko and later graduated from the Illyrian College in Loreto (Dimitrova, 2008: 750; Grigorev, 2008: 17). He became Bishop of Nikopolsko in 1647 but was removed from this office in 1663 as he was the leader of a Bulgarian conspiracy (Miletič, 1903: 19; Grigorov, 2008: 17). He is the author of the first published Bulgarian book, *Abagar*, which was published in 1643 (Miletič, 1903:16). *Abagar* was disseminated in all of Bulgaria, as well as in Moldavia and Walachia and contributed to the unification of Catholics.

---

<sup>18</sup> For more see Dimitrov (2009).

<sup>19</sup> For more on the Bulgarian role in the Cretan War, see Dimitrov (2012: 171–191).

**Petar Kovačev** (1745/1746–1795), also known as Petar Fabri, was born in Davadžovo near Plovdiv. He was the vicar of Sofia from 1776–1795. He is the author of several works extant in manuscript (Magdalena Abadžieva, personal communication).

### **1.5.3 Bulgarian works**

For this dissertation five works of Bulgarian Catholics are analysed: two published works: Bakšić's *Meditationes S. Bonaventurae, To yeft Bogoglivbna razmiscglianya od Otayftva Odkuplienya Covičanskoga* ('Saint Bonaventura's Meditations, That is God-Loving Reflections on the Mystery of the Redemption of Mankind') (1638), Stanislavov's *Abagar* ('Abgar') (1651) and three religious manuscripts from the end of the eighteenth century held at the National Library of Bulgaria in Sofia: MS778, MS779 and MS780. The two published works contain no turkisms while the manuscripts have a total of 628 turkisms among them. In part, this might be due to the later date of the manuscripts (the three manuscripts are at least one hundred years younger than the two published Bulgarian works), though it seems unlikely that there was such a dramatic increase in the use of turkisms in little more than one hundred years. The audience for which these works were written most likely also played a role in the number of turkisms used. The two published books are directed to a learned audience, most likely fellow clergymen or seminarians. In the case of *Abagar*, Church Slavonic had a significant influence (Rajkov, 1979: 26–27). The three manuscripts were never published and are designed for a local audience, possibly young seminarians or laymen. Kovačev in MS779 states, 'assamse macil sedem meseza dai ubarna od Talianski jezik na Balgarski, da moxisc ti Sinco da vidisc, i da poznaisc, cacoi storil Gospod za horata' ('I have laboured seven months to translate it [the Bible] from Italian into Bulgarian, so that you, dear boy, can see and come to know

what the Lord did for people') (779: 2). It is also possible that these works were read aloud to laymen in the writers' communities. All three manuscripts consist of the retelling of biblical stories in the vernacular, the importance of confession and how one should confess, as well as religious songs and poems.

**Bakšić's *Meditationes S. Bonaventuræ: To yest Bogoglivbna razmiscglianya od Otayftva Odkuplieny Coviçanskoga*** (1638) is a two-hundred-fifteen-page translation into Croatian of Saint Bonaventura's *Meditations*. His work was directed at Bulgarian Catholic seminarians. Since the language of the seminary in Bulgaria at the time was Croatian, Bakšić's choice of language is not unexpected and exhibits little Bulgarian influence. Following the translation, there is a poem in two parts written by Bakšić. The poem is written in Croatian and is his earliest original work (Stančev, 1978: 6–7).

***Abagar*** (1651), which was published in Rome by Filip Stanislavov, is regarded as the first printed book in Early Modern Bulgarian (Rajkov, 1966: 29, 52). It consists of ten pages: the first part of the book is a collection of apocryphal writings, including the legend of King Abgar, and the second half is made up of prayers from the Catholic tradition. The book's mix of language – Church Slavonic, Croatian and Bulgarian – has been a source of debate, both regarding its place in the history of Bulgarian and in defining its language. Naturally, the texts which it imitated influenced its language. The story of Abgar and other apocrypha have Serbian Church Slavonic elements, as Orthodox texts were Stanislavov's sources (Rajkov, 1979: 28); the rite of the mass and other Catholic prayers show Croatian elements because Stanislavov was Catholic and schooled among Croats. The text contains no turkisms.

**MS778: *Kniga na Paula Carov*** 'Paul Carov's Book' (1773) is by Petar Kovačev, *Imperiali quondam Fabri*, in 1773. It is a translation from Italian consisting

of ‘koje rabote trebe da znaj kristianin Cilek, ako iska da nameri spasenie na onzi svet’ (‘the things that a Christian needs to know if he wants to be saved in the afterworld’) (1a). The rudimentary beliefs of Christianity are outlined, followed by the responses given in Latin at mass, followed by common prayers in Bulgarian. Several songs of praise to the Virgin Mary are given before the New Testament is retold. The summary of the New Testament makes up the greater part of the text: of the 144 folia (19 x 14 cm), it occupies 101. Following it are various calendars listing the days of the saints. It is the oldest Paulician manuscript in Bulgarian (Stančev, 1975: 67).

**MS779: *Casso Iscazovane od Sveto Pismo*** ‘A Short Retelling from the Holy Gospel’ (1779) is translated by Petar Kovačev, Imperiali. It has a more detailed retelling of the Old and New Testaments than MS778 does and also includes a short guide to confession, reflections for each of the seven days in the week, songs of praise to the Virgin Mary and a brief summary of the Old and New Testaments. It consists of 458 pages (19x14cm). The page numbering is in Ottoman Turkish.

**MS780: *Pavlikjanski sbornik*** ‘Paulician Collection’ (end of 18th century) is a collection of prayers, reflections and songs, as well as several secular songs/poems from former Paulicians. It consists of 180 pages, of which the first forty-eight are missing. The manuscript contains numerous illustrations, both religious and secular. There is no information provided about the writer.

### **1.5.3.1 Bulgarian supplementary material**

For the chapter on chronology (chapter two), several supplementary works are analysed. The chronological analysis of Bulgarian turkisms differs significantly from that of Bosnian turkisms for several reasons: Bulgarian does not have an equivalent of RHSJ, which, like the OED, lists the earliest attestations of words and the texts in

which they occur. While the Bosnian Franciscan texts are principal works in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian (and Croatian), the Bulgarian Catholic works that I analyse, in particular the manuscripts, are not. They are one small part of a larger corpus of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Early Modern Bulgarian literature, which mainly consists of *damaskini*. Unfortunately, because of time availability and word limits, I was not able to analyse all of the *damaskini* to see how their turkisms compare chronologically to those in the three manuscripts. Thus, I selected three *damaskini* (*Tixonravovski*, *Trojanski* (both 17th c.) and *Švištovski* (18th c.)), one historical account (*Žitie i stradanija grešnogo Sofronija* ‘The Life and Suffering of Sinful Sofronij’ (1798)) and the complete collection of Bulgarian scribal notes from the tenth to the end of the eighteenth century (Xristova et al., 2004) to include as points of reference for the chronological analysis of the turkisms found in the manuscripts analysed. I consulted the *Tixonravovski* and *Trojanski damaskini* – both large and significant works among the *damaskini* – because they are from the seventeenth century, thus predating by a century the manuscripts that I analyse. The *Švištovski damaskin* (1753) also offers attestations earlier than those of the Catholic manuscripts. Since there are Bosnian secular texts as well as religious, I include *Žitie i stradanija grešnogo Sofronija* (1798) as a secular Bulgarian counterpart. All of these works have been published, contain supplementary analyses of the manuscripts and are available at Oxford; the *Trojanski damaskin* also includes an index of every word in the text.

Perhaps the most important supplementary text is the collection of Bulgarian scribal notes (Xristova et al., 2004), ranging from the Old Bulgarian period to the Early Modern period. These notes can be both religious and secular. Because they are notes rather than formal writing, they have aspects of the vernacular:

- (1) [...] katu pisax tuj damaskino na ton agnon pateron [na svetite otci] ta stana zima, ta mi zmrazna milaniu [mastiloto]...Ta či padna idni snak ta napalni sukadžite ta ne možexa xorata da izlezat van'  
'As I wrote this *damaskin* on the feast day of the holy fathers, it became cold and my ink froze. So much snow fell that it filled the streets and people could not go out' (SN: 103)

All of this supplementary material is used to make a general comparison regarding the chronology of turkisms in Bulgarian and Bosnian.

## 1.6 Language, phonology and orthography

### 1.6.1 Defining the language

Throughout this dissertation I refer to the vernacular of the Bosnian Franciscans as Bosnian and the language of Bulgarian Catholics as Bulgarian (apart from the language of Bogdan Bakšić's work, which is in Croatian with limited Bulgarian influence). During the time frame in which these texts were written (1611–1799), the concept of an Illyrian language<sup>20</sup> – 'a single Slavic language which, while distinct in its various dialects, was the common language of all the Slavs' (Iovine, 1984: 104) – was prevalent. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the term *Illyrian* was used by Croatian Glagolites, Bosnian Franciscans, Croatian Catholics in Croatia, in Russia, in Wallachia and in Bulgaria, as well as by Bulgarian Catholics in Bulgaria, Rome and at the royal courts of Austria and Poland, as a term to refer to their South Slavonic variety (Iovine, 1984: 103).

The idea of one unifying Balkan Slavonic language had been present in the area before the seventeenth century, having gained momentum after the Council of Trent (1545–1563) and later, with the Catholic *Congregatio de propaganda fide*.<sup>21</sup> The purpose of establishing Illyrian as a unifying language was both to convert the Orthodox Christians in the Balkans to Catholicism and to form a Christian coalition in

---

<sup>20</sup> Distinct from the original Illyrian language of the Illyrian people present in the Balkans until the Slavonic invasions in the sixth and seventh centuries (Iovine, 1984: 102).

<sup>21</sup> For more on Catholic propaganda, see Miletič (1884); Stanchev (1981).

the Balkans against the Turks (Iovine, 1984: 105). This concept of Illyrian was the precursor to the Croatian Illyrian movement (cir. 1835–1848),<sup>22</sup> an endeavour to unify the South Slavs both politically and linguistically.

Numerous Illyrian dictionaries and grammars sponsored by the Catholic Church were published between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries and were used in Illyrian colleges and seminaries that trained Catholic missionaries in the Balkans (Iovine, 1984: 111). These include Bartol Kašić's *Institutiones linguae illyricae* (1604), Giacomo Micaglia's *Blago jezika slovinskoga... Thesaurus linguae illyricae* (1649), Tomaš Babić's *Prima grammaticae institutio pro Tyronibus Illyricis accommodata* (1712), among others. As exemplified in these titles, Croats, as well as foreigners, employed the term Illyrian to describe Bosnian/Croatian when writing in Latin. However, in their native language, they often used the term *slovinski* (Iovine, 1984: 114). Thus, *slovinski* was synonymous with *lingua illyrica*. The Bosnian writers included in this dissertation who mention their language use the following terms to describe it: *Boffanska, illiti farbska* 'Bosnian or Serbian' (Bračuljević), *iezikū slovinski* 'Slavonic language' (Divković), *nafc slàvnih, illiti Illiričkih Jezik* 'our language, or the Illyrian language' (Dobretić), *Slavo-Bosanški* 'Slavo-Bosnian', *nashki* 'ours' (Lastrić), *slovignski iezik* 'Slavonic language' (Radnić).

Bulgarian Catholic priests refer to their literary language as Illyrian: e.g. Bakšić writes of his 'Meditationes de latino in bulgaro, che è un dialetto della lingua illyrica' (Radonić, 1949: 142 in Iovine, 1984: 115). Because Bulgarian Franciscans and Catholic priests were usually trained at the Illyrian College in Loreto or at the Clementine University in Rome, they requested religious textbooks 'nella lingua Illyrica che si stampano a Venetia nel carattere latino' (Fermedžin, 1887: 209; Iovine,

---

<sup>22</sup> For more on the Illyrian Movement, see Moguš (1993: 138–156); Vince (2002: 121–284).

1984: 116). Here, Illyrian refers specifically to religious books published in Croatian. Bandulavić's *Pisctolje i Evangelja* was especially desired, since such books '[...] dosad u Slovinski jezik manjkahu' ('[...] up until now have been missing from the Slavonic language') (Miletič, 1884: 78). Bulgarian priests were accustomed to using Croatian as their literary language and an Illyrian dialect – in this instance Croatian – was easier for Bulgarians to understand than Latin (Dimitrova, 2008: 746). The first Catholic university in Bulgaria, which was opened in Čiprovci in 1624 by Ilija Marinov, used the language of the Bosnian Franciscans and the *bosančica* script as its academic language (Dimitrova, 2008: 745; Miletič, 1903: 15). Other colleges in Koprivec as well as in Železna used Croatian as their literary language (Miletič, 1884: 81).

Because the Bulgarians were educated in Croatian while the spoken language was Bulgarian, numerous Bulgarian Catholics, including M. Grozdič, K. Pejkič, F. Stanislavov and other members of the Čiprovci school, wrote in a mix of the two languages (Miletič, 1884: 65). It was common for these friars to use Bulgarian constructions and forms in Illyrian. Likewise, because Bulgarian lacked some of the religious terminology, Illyrian terminology was borrowed into Bulgarian (Telbizov, 1981: 123). Illyrian therefore might refer to Croatian/Bosnian with or without Bulgarian influence or Bulgarian with Croatian influence. Though Bakšić employs *lingua slava* and *lingua illirica* interchangeably to describe the language of church books, which could be in any of the above language combinations, according to Iovine (1984), Bakšić distinguishes this language from the *lingua vernacula*, which has no Croatian influence (Miletič, 1903: 132).

The language(s) of the Bulgarian texts analysed support Iovine's view. The two published works, Bakšić's *Meditationes S. Bonaventurae. To yest bogoglivbna*

*razmiscglianya od otaystva odkupglienya covicanskoga* and Stanislavov's *Abagar*, show significantly greater Croatian influence than the three manuscripts. Bakšić's text is in fact written in Croatian while *Abagar* is written in a mix of the Bulgarian vernacular, Church Slavonic and Croatian (Rajkov, 1979: 29): e.g. Stanislavov uses both Church Slavonic/Old Bulgarian cases as well as Croatian cases: 'blaženago (CS/OB) Vicentia, i Spovednika tvoga (Croatian)...od dasvakoga (Croatian)...Sinu Boga' ('of blessed Vincent, and your confessor...of everyone...the Son of God') (Rajkov, 1979).<sup>23</sup> The genitive is used rather than 'na' phrases, suggesting Church Slavonic or Croatian influence. The use of the infinitive: e.g. 'da od duxa Svetago zaide, nositi, poroditi i odxraniti' ('that enter from the holy Spirit to carry, to bear, to nurture') (Rajkov, 1979), which is also attested among other seventeenth-century Bulgarian writers, is most likely used in an effort to be conservative, thus in keeping with the Church Slavonic tradition.

On the other hand, Croatian influence is more limited in the manuscripts. It is most apparent in religious terminology: e.g. adjectives decline according to the Croatian declensional pattern: e.g. 'svetoga duha' (779); and the first-person plural verbal suffix is *-mo* rather *-me* in: e.g. 'falimo' (779). These Croatian declensional and conjugational patterns are limited to religious terminology. Perhaps the most significant and widespread Croatian influence in these manuscripts is the orthography, which is *latinica* (1.6.3).

The language of the three manuscripts is nevertheless the Bulgarian vernacular, not Illyrian: 'da' clauses are prevalent:

- (2) [...] ciunki nemoxeha da razberat, kak scetesce da bade тази работа  
 '[...] because they could not understand what this business would be like'  
 (778: 35a)

---

<sup>23</sup> In Rajkov's facsimile of *Abagar*, there are no page numbers.

Prepositional phrases have replaced cases:

- (3) a. [...] od тази работа  
'[...] of this work' (6b)
- b. [...] sas drughi  
'with others' (6b)
- c. [...] umre na 43 godini  
'[...] he died at 43 years' (6b)
- d. [...] osahat dadoha haber na zar Faraun  
'[...] at that moment they gave king pharaoh the news' (7a)

The definite article is common, as are all Bulgarian verb forms and tenses, including the renarrative and the future in the past; there is not one example of the infinitive:

- (4) a. [...] iska IssuKras damo kaxi  
'[...] he wanted Jesus Christ to tell him' (779: 90a)
- b. [...] trebovasce da jadat negovoto mесо, jedni razbraha, ci steha damu jadat messata.  
'[...] they needed to eat his flesh, some understood that they would eat his flesh.' (779: 74a)

The manuscripts show Bulgarian dialectal influence to different degrees: unstressed /a/ can become /e/ (*bairət*),<sup>24</sup> /e/ can become /i/ (*mighdan*) and /o/ can become /u/ (*ut* 'from'). MS780 has the greatest dialectal influence, with most unstressed vowels raised; MS779 shows more dialectal influence at the end of the manuscript than in the beginning: *jedin* 'one' occurs at the beginning while *idin* occurs at the end. MS778 has examples of unstressed vowels raised but Kovačev seems more aware of his Bulgarian dialect in this manuscript than in MS779.

### 1.6.2 Phonology

The Turkish dialect present in Bosnia and Bulgaria (excluding the area of Western Roumelia) during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was largely *orta türkçe*

---

<sup>24</sup> In most Bulgarian dialects unstressed /a/ is /ə/.

‘middle Turkish’, which was spoken by the common people (Mollova, 1967: 115). This Ottoman Turkish language was different from Ottoman proper (*fasih türkçe* ‘eloquent Turkish’), which was limited to the high courts of Istanbul and from *kaba türkçe* ‘raw Turkish’, a term used to describe the dialects of Anatolia and of the common people (Mollova, 1967:116). Although one sees trends in the orthography in the Bulgarian and Bosnian texts which might point to a variety of Ottoman Turkish, influence of other Ottoman Turkish varieties cannot be entirely excluded: even if the Turks in Bosnia and most of Bulgaria were for the most part speakers of middle Ottoman Turkish, there were also Turks who spoke other varieties of Turkish, even if only in small pockets.

One must assume that Turkish words when borrowed into Bosnian and Bulgarian were often pronounced using Slavonic phonemes. The table below displays the most common correspondences represented by each language’s modern graphemes. The Bulgarian graphemes are transliterated. Exceptions as well as other phonological developments are briefly addressed following the table.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> For more on phonology, see Škaljić (1989), Mollova (1962), Schmaus (1955).

Turkish	Bosnian	Bulgarian
a	a	a
b	b, p	b
c	dž	dž
ç	č	č
d	d	d
e	e	e
f	f	f
g	g (+ a, o, u), ğ (+ e, i)	g
ğ	g or j	j or g
h	h or omitted	h or omitted
ı	ı, u, a	ă, u
i	i	i
k	k (+ a, e, i, o, u), c (+ e, i)	k
l	l	l
m	m, n	m, n
n	n, m	n, m
o	o	o
ö	o, ju	jo, ju
p	p, b	p, b
r	r	r
s	s, z	s, z
ş	š	š
t	t	t
u	u	u
ü	u, i	ju
v	v, f	v, f
z	z	z

Turkish consonantal sounds that had close equivalents in Bosnian and Bulgarian usually remained the same when borrowed into the two languages. The obstruents sometimes alternated between their voiced and unvoiced counterpart. In Turkish, if an unvoiced consonant in stem-final position is followed by a suffix beginning with a consonant that may be realised both as unvoiced and voiced, it remains unvoiced: e.g. *kalp* ‘heart’. If this word takes a suffix that begins with a vowel, the consonant becomes voiced: e.g. *kalbim* ‘my heart’. While Bulgarians tended to use the stem form of the word with the unvoiced consonant, Bosnians used both forms interchangeably.

The phonemes /k/ and /g/, which are palatal plosives when followed by front vowels in Turkish, are realised as /ć/ and /đ/ respectively in Bosnian: *kitap* > *ćitab*; *köprü* > *ćuprija*; *geçirme* > *dečerma*; *gümrük* > *đumruk*. Otherwise, they are velar plosives and remain so in Bosnian.

Other sounds are slightly different in Turkish than in Bosnian or Bulgarian: e.g. Turkish /l/ is [l] – a palatalized post-alveolar lateral when adjacent to front vowels (‘soft l’) – and [ɮ] – a velarized dental lateral when adjacent to back vowels (‘hard l’). In both Bosnian and Bulgarian hard and soft /l/ are distinct phonemes. The Turkish allophone [ɮ] became hard /l/:  $\tau$ *bula* >  $\text{BO}$ *bula*. The Turkish allophone [l] became /lʲ/ when occurring with front vowels:  $\tau$ *bölübaşı* >  $\text{BO}$ *buljuk-baša*.

Turkish vocalic phonemes not existing in Bulgarian and Bosnian (e.g. /ɯ/, /ö/, /ü/) sometimes became the phoneme that most closely resembled the Turkish phoneme: e.g. /ɯ/ is an unrounded, high back vowel in Turkish. In Bulgarian and Bosnian it is usually realised as a low, back and unrounded vowel (Grannes, 1970: 51) e.g.  $\tau$ *karşılık* >  $\text{BU}$ *karscialak*;  $\tau$ *bakır* >  $\text{BO}$ *bakar*. Turkish /ü/ is a rounded, high front vowel. In Bosnian and Bulgarian, it is realised as a rounded high back vowel and preceding non-palatalised Turkish consonants become palatalised in Bulgarian: /u/: e.g.  $\tau$ *bütün* >  $\text{BO}$ *butum*;  $\tau$ *düzen* >  $\text{BU}$ *djuzen* (Grannes, 1970: 49). The phoneme /u/ in this Bulgarian example has a fronted allophone: [u̟].

Other vowels preceding or following a vowel might influence the pronunciation of vowels elsewhere in the word through vocal assimilation (Grannes, 1970: 57–58): e.g.  $\text{BU}$ *karscialak* <  $\tau$ *karşılık*; or might not:  $\text{BU}$ *duramagilik* <  $\tau$ *duramagılık*. However, these representations might not be accurate because of the lack of orthographical norms in eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian.

In the Bulgarian texts there are some examples where the pronunciation of a turkism has changed from the Turkish because of Bulgarian dialects: *mighdan* is as common as *meghdan*, which has the same vocalism as in Ottoman; in both the Turkish and Bulgarian pronunciation of this word the stress falls on the second syllable, but only in Bulgarian does this stress affect the pronunciation of the initial vowel. In some eastern Bulgarian dialects when /e/ is not stressed, it becomes /i/.

### 1.6.2.1 G and *yumuşak ğ* (soft /g/)

The term *yumuşak ğ* translates to ‘soft ‘g’ in English. The phoneme /g/ split into /g/ and /ğ/. The phoneme /g/ is a voiced velar plosive [g] before back vowels /a/, /ı/, /o/, /u/ and a voiced palatal plosive [j] before front vowels /e/, /i/, /ö/, /ü/. Apart from in some loanwords, it does not occur in word-final or syllable-final position (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 6). In modern Turkish /ğ/ occurs between and after vowels; ‘if it occurs in word-final position or syllable-final position, it lengthens the preceding back vowel...but may be pronounced as a palatal glide when following a front vowel’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 7). When it occurs between two front vowels or two rounded vowels, it is either inaudible or pronounced as a glide. Similarly, the sequence of /a + ğ + ı/ can be pronounced either as /a + ı/ or as long /a:/, while the sequence /ı + ğ + a/ is always pronounced as /ıa/ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 8). On the basis of orthography, one might infer there was inconsistency in both eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian pronunciation (though more so in Bulgarian) of /g/ : /ğ/. In Bulgarian, both *eglendže* and *ejlendže* ‘amusement’, *dejnek* and *degnek* ‘cane’, *djujme* and *djugme* ‘button’ are attested (Schmaus, 1955: 110). The examples with the graphemes <g> and <j> suggest pronunciations of a voiced plosive or a glide, respectively. Examples with <g> might suggest earlier borrowings while those with

<j> might suggest later ones. On the other hand, this pronunciation might also be due to contact with Ottoman Turkish dialects that had preserved /g/ as a voiced velar fricative: [ɣ]. In the Bosnian texts studied, it seems modern Turkish /ğ/ was pronounced as hard /g/ ([g] or [j]) since the grapheme <g> is used in these instances, though there are exceptions: e.g. *bejendisova* (from *beğenmek* ‘to like’). The pronunciation of Turkish /ğ/ as hard /g/ ([g] or [j]) is characteristic of West Roumelian dialects. These phonological changes are inferred on the basis of orthographical practices in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in Bosnia and Bulgaria. Because Bosnia and Bulgaria did not have standard orthographies at the time, these conclusions are only approximate.

### 1.6.3 Orthography

Apart from Divković, Posilović and Stanislavov and the writers of the supplementary materials (who wrote in Cyrillic),<sup>26</sup> all of the writers included in this dissertation wrote in *latinica*. Catholic works composed in the Illyrian language were often written in the Latin alphabet because *latinica* was the script of the Catholic Church. Since Bulgarian Catholics – for the most part Franciscans – were schooled either in Loreto at the Illyrian College, at the University of St. Clement in Rome, in Fermo, in Dubrovnik or in colleges in Bulgaria where Croatian/Bosnian was the academic language, Catholics in Bulgaria frequently adopted a form of *latinica* orthography borrowed from Croatian. For this reason, the discussion on orthography is broken into two sections by alphabet – *latinica* and Cyrillic – rather than by language. The Cyrillic section contains both the western Bosnian (*bosančica*) and eastern Bulgarian traditions of the

---

<sup>26</sup> Several secondary sources state that *Abagar* is written in *bosančica* (Rajkov, 1979: 28–29), though the work contains no Cyrillic graphemes that are characteristic only of *bosančica*: e.g. *ō, v, u*.

alphabet. Although these two writing systems have some variation, the overall orthography is the same, as it is with the various *latinica* varieties of orthography. Within each section, the texts analysed are subdivided by language.

### 1.6.3.1 *Latinica*

*Latinica* first began being used for Croatian in the fourteenth century<sup>27</sup> but did not become common until the fifteenth century (Vince, 2002: 77). In contrast to Cyrillic, which was created with Slavonic phonology in mind, *latinica* orthographies lacked graphemes representing Slavonic specific phonemes, especially palatal consonants.<sup>28</sup> /č/, /ć/, /dž/, /đ/, /lj/, /nj/, /š/, /ž/. The two Western orthographical systems that became prevalent in Croatian/Bosnian were Italian and Hungarian. Because of Dalmatia's Italian connections, writers there borrowed Italian orthography, while northern Croatia borrowed from Hungarian as a result of its political and religious connections to Hungary (Vince, 2002: 77). While many Croatian phonemes could be represented in Italian and Hungarian *latinica*, others posed difficulties. Maretić in his *Istorija hrvatskoga pravopisa latinskijem slovima* 'History of Croatian Orthography with Latin Letters' (JAZU, 9: 1889 quoted by Vince, 2002) finds eighteen ways for representing /č/ in Croatian *latinica* and twenty-two for /š/ (Vince, 2002: 77). Despite the variation, conventions emerged:

---

<sup>27</sup> The oldest known Croatian texts written in *latinica* are *Red i zakon sestara dominikaniki u Zadru* ('The Order and Law of the Dominican Sisters in Zadar') (1345) and *Šibenska molitva* ('Šibenik Prayer') (14th c.) (Vince, 2002: 76).

<sup>28</sup> I use *latinica* symbols instead of IPA symbols for convenience and easy associations with modern (phonemic) Bosnian orthography.

<b>Modern Croatian</b>	<b>Northern (Hungarian influence)</b>	<b>Southern (Italian influence)</b>
c	cz	z
č	cs/ch	ci, ce
ć	ch/cs	ch
đ	dy	gi
j	y	i
k	k	c
lj	ly	gl
nj	ny	gn
s	sz	s
š	s/sh	sc
z	z	z
ž	x/s	x

Both of these orthographies used digraphs to represent phonemes. These digraphs were often part of the borrowed orthographical tradition: e.g. <cz> (Hungarian). In contrast to their usage in Hungarian or Italian, these digraphs sometimes posed ambiguities in Croatian: *glava* can be pronounced /ljava/ or /glava/; *vidi* can be pronounced /vidi/ or /vidi/.

Because of these ambiguities, there were numerous orthographical reforms, as early as the sixteenth century. These first reforms were propelled by the counter-reformation, namely through *Ilirska akademija* and *Congregatio de propaganda fide* (Vince, 2002: 79). Individuals – for the most part Catholic priests and friars – who proposed reforms include Šime Budinić (1583), who borrowed graphemes with diacritics from Czech (Vince, 2002: 79). Rafael Levaković (1597-1649) also proposed diacritics over digraphs. Bartol Kašić in his 1640 grammar mentions that a standard *latinica* orthography does not exist and proposes that one grapheme or digraph should represent only one phoneme (Vince, 2002: 80). Rajmund Đamanjić (1639) suggested a ‘prilično jednostavan i dosljedan sistem grafije konsonanata’ (‘a relatively simple and consistent system for the graphic representation of consonants’): /c/ = <z>, /č/ = <ci>, <ce>, <ci> + back vowel, ć =

<ch>, /đ/ = <di>, /j/ = <y>, /lj/ = <gl> (distinct from /g +l/, which is <g'l>, /nj/ = <gn> (distinct from /g+n/ = <n'g>), /s/ = <f>, /š/ = <sc>, /z/ = <z>, /ž/ = <fc> (80). However, he created an equally complicated system of accents to indicate stress and length (80). In 1703, Pavao Vitezović, like Kašić, designed an orthography in which there is only one phoneme per grapheme, which sometimes has diacritics: e.g. /c/ = <c>, /č/ = <č̇>, /ć/ = <c'>, /đ/ = <đ̄>, /j/ = <j>, /lj/ = <l'>, /nj/ = <ñ̄>, /s/ = <ḟ>, /š/ = <s>, /ž/ = <z> or <x>.

Numerous writers outlined their own orthographical system in introductions to their works. Some of these writers whose works are not analysed in this dissertation include: I. Velikanović, Š. Starčević, J. Mulih, A. Kanižlić, I. Grličić and N. Kešić (Vince, 2002: 85). Jerolim Lipovčić's orthography (1750) became particularly widespread: /c/ = <c>, /č/ = <cs>, /ć/ = <ch>, /dž/ = <cs>, /đ/ = <g>, /gj/ = <g>, /lj/ = <lj>, /nj/ = <nj>, /r/ = <er>, /s/ = <s>, /š/ = <ss>, /z/ = <z>, /ž/ = <x> (Vince, 2002: 86). His orthography, which the majority of Franciscans in Slavonia used, became the norm<sup>29</sup> in Slavonia (though /š/ was sometimes <sh> instead of <ss>).

Debates concerning the standardization of orthography became common. The lexicographer Joakim Stulli came to Vienna from Dubrovnik in 1782 to discuss the publication of his dictionary. Those assessing the dictionary considered it the best extant dictionary but deemed its orthography inadequate (Vince, 2002: 87). As a result, Joso Krmpotić convinced Stulli to adopt Slavonian (Lipovčić's) orthography. In 1798 the dictionary was finally published in Slavonian orthography.<sup>30</sup>

This Slavonian orthography was a mix of both the southern Italian system and the northern Hungarian: the Franciscans brought the southern Italian system to

<sup>29</sup> In Reljković's 1762 edition of *Satira*, he uses <gy>, <ny> and <ly> for /đ/, /nj/, and /lj/ but already in his 1779 edition he has begun to use Lipovčić's orthography: <gj>, <nj>, <j> (Vince, 2002: 85).

<sup>30</sup> For more on the debate regarding Stulli's dictionary, see Vince (2002: 87–89).

Slavonia while the Jesuits from the north, especially where kajkavic was spoken, brought the Hungarian system. Through Franciscan writings and schools, the Slavonian spelling system spread north to Budim and throughout Bosnia.

#### **1.6.3.1.1 Bosnian *latinica* texts**

Bračuljević, Margitić, Lastrić (in both his 1755 and 1766 works) and Dobretić begin their works with comments on their orthography. Bračuljević provides his reader with a detailed explanation of the orthography that he uses in this work in his section, ‘Opomena za pravo, dobro, i lako sc̆titi ove kgnighe’ (‘Note for the correct, proper and easy reading of this book’). His choice of graphemes and digraphs influenced the orthography of the Bosnian Franciscans, especially in the area of Budim (Pranjковиć, 2005a: 36). Nevertheless, his orthography is not a new system: he himself states that he took much of his orthography from his predecessors, especially Radnić: ‘[...] i takofuše fluxili nasci stari, kakoše vidi u kgniga, kojefu na sc̆tampu dali, navlastito u *Pogargiegniu Svita* O.M.P. fra Mihe Radnichia’ (‘[...] and as our predecessors used [earlier spellings] as is seen in books which have been printed, especially in *Pogargiengie Svita* of O.M.P. fra Mihael Radnić’) (Bračuljević, 1730: i).

In contrast to the 1701 edition, the 1779 edition of Margitić’s work is written in *latinica*. He comments on the difficulty he had writing in *latinica*: ‘Veoma mučno bilomje u ova slova pisati; jer nemogu nike riči slovinske latimskim [sic] slovim [sic] izrechise s’onom lasnostju s’kojomse izgovoraju slovmi slovinskim’ (‘It was very painful for me to write in this alphabet; because some Slavonic words cannot be pronounced with Latin letters with that ease with which they are pronounced with Slavonic letters’) (Margitić, 1779:9). He continues by saying that, ‘nisam nike riči jednako na svakomu mistu upisao’ (‘I did not write some words the same in every place’) but that he tried to use fewer letters for Slavonic sounds so that the text is

easier to read, especially for his audience: ‘siromasi, koji soviim kgnixiczam najvisce sluxichiese’ (‘poor people, who will use this little book the most’) (Margitić, 1779: 9).

In his foreword to *Testimonium Bilabium*, Lastrić gives examples of the two types of Bosnian orthography – Italian and Hungarian – with ‘latinskim slovma ujezik nashki’ (‘with Latin letters in our language’) (Lastrić, 1755: 2). He continues by saying that even within each orthographical system, writers differ in how they represent Slavonic sounds. Lastrić, who is in favour of variety (‘quot capita, tot sententiæ: kolliko gliudij, tolliko chiudij’ (‘quot capita, tot sententiæ: there are as many opinions as there are men’) (2), uses both systems: ‘[...] iftinaje da nijfam ú ovom slidio ní parvij ni drugij’ (‘[...] it is true that I followed neither the first nor the second [system]’) (2).

In his preface of *Nediglnik Dvostruk*, Lastrić mentions that his choice of orthography is the result of the printer’s limited number of stamps of the letter <i>:

- (5) Slovo Garçko y. ipfilon sluxij za ì. produxxeno: ovie nitie moja byla voglja ni odluka stavgljati, nego il dvostruko ij. il accentato ì. Ali Shtampatur nie ovie zadofa imao, á faliti-jí troshakbi bio velik; zato vagljademi zagarlit ipfilom za ì. produxeno: na priliku *verborum*: rijçij, ili riçì, illi ryçy sveje ifti razum (III).  
‘The Greek letter y. ipilon is for long ì: it was neither my wish nor decision to use it but [I preferred] the digraph ij. or accented ì. But the printer did not have enough and to leave out jí would be at a great waste; that is why I decided to accept ipilon for long ì in examples *verborum*: rijçij, or riçì, or ryçy, all mean the same (III).’

Where the majority of his graphemes are similar to those of his contemporaries, his use of <y> for long [i] stands out. Lastrić is also exceptionally inconsistent in his employment of <y>, which can represent /ije/ (*lypo*), /je/ (*mysto*), long /i/ (*pysano*), as well as short /i/ (*byti*). Since he writes in ikavic, he does not distinguish between /ije/ and /je/, but he also sporadically fails to distinguish between short and long /i/.

Dobretić states that there are not enough Latin letters for *našc jezik* ‘our language’ and that a standard orthography for the language in which he writes does not exist (Dobretić, 1782: vi). He continues by saying that books written in *našc jezik* published in *latinica* are nevertheless understandable, despite having an insufficient orthographical system. The orthography that he proposes, which includes accents and doubled letters to indicate length, aims to help the reader, even if it is more complicated to print (Dobretić, 1782: 222). He ends by saying that speakers of *slavinski* ‘Slavonic’ or *illirički* ‘Illyrian’ speak differently in different regions; therefore, no reader should mock the language that is printed, but should accept that Dobretić writes in a different variety of language from that of the reader.

**Overview of all the Bosnian/Croatian *latinica* writers' orthography**<sup>31</sup>

Mod. CR.	BA 1613	BK 1638	RP/RR 1683	BR 1730	LT 1755	LN 1765	MA 1779	DO 1782	IL 1798–1799
c	ç	cz	ç	cz	cz	c, cz	cz	cz	cz
č	ç, c	c, ç	ç	cs,	ç	ç, cs	ç	ç, fcz	ç
ć	ch	ch	ch	ch, cs	chj, chi/e	ch	ch	ch	ch
dž	--	--	--	cx	--	--	ç	--	--
đ	di/e, dj	gi/e	gi/e	gi	gi/e	gj, gi/e, dj	gi/e	gi/e	gi/e
g	g, gh	g, gh	g, gh	g, gh	g, j, dj	g, gh	g, gh	g, gh	g, gh
h	h	h	h, ch	h	h	h	h	h	h
long i	ij, yi	i	ij, ije	ij, ii	i	i, y	i	i	ii, ij
i	i	i, y	i	i	i, y	i	i	i	i
(i)je	i	ie, i, e		i, ii	i, y	i	i	i	i
j	y	y, j	y	j, i	j	j	j	j	j
k	k, ch	k	k	k	k	k	k	k	k, c
lj	ly, gli/e	gli	gli/e	gli/e	glj, gli, gly, gle	gl, lj, li	gli/e	gli/e	gli/e
nj	gn, ny	gn, ny	gn	gn	nj, gn	gn, nj	gn	gn	gn
voc. r	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar	ar
s	s, f	s, f	s, f	s, f	s, f	s, f	s, f	s, f	s
š	sc, fc	sc, fc	sc, fc	fc	sh, ff	sh, fc	f	sc, fc	sh
ž	x, z	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

The chronological analysis of orthography shows several trends: there was a tendency among Bosnian Franciscans to write in ikavica. Even in texts where there are examples of jekavica and ekavica, ikavica is the predominant dialect. The graphemes for /g/, /h/, /k/ /s/, /š/, /ž/ and vocalic /r/ show the least variation over time. All writers use <ch> to represent /ć/, though Bračuljević has one example with <cs>: *mogucse*. This example is most likely a mistake given its infrequency. The phoneme /g/ is consistently <g> or <gh>. The grapheme <g> usually precedes back vowels: e.g. *drugoga*, *nemogu*, *dogoniti*, while <gh> precedes front vowels: e.g. *kgnighi*, *drughe*. Only in Lastrić's

<sup>31</sup> Benić and Lašvanin are excluded because their texts have been transliterated into modern Croatian spelling from *bosančica*.

*Testimonium bilabium* does <gh> occasionally precede back vowels: *drugha*. When /g/ precedes a consonant, most writers use <g>; only Bračuljević and Margitić use <gh> before consonants: e.g. *dighni, naghlu*, though <g> occurs before consonants in their texts as well. Apart from Radnić, who uses both <h> and <ch> for /h/ (e.g. *such, hotille*), all writers employ <h> exclusively for /h/. Ilijić, who lived at the end of the eighteenth century when orthographical traditions were more established, shows the most variation among the writers regarding /k/: he uses <k> for common nouns and <C> for proper nouns: e.g. *Creshevo, Capellan, Catholik, konshiliku, kada, svetkovinu, dobitka, kuchi*. All of the writers, apart from Ilijić, who uses <s> exclusively, use <s> and <ʃ> interchangeably for /s/. Four of the writers (Bandulavić, Bakšić, Radnić, Lastrić (1765), and Dobretić) use <sc> or <ʃc> for /š/: e.g. *dufca, skruscegnia, odviʃce*. Lastrić (1755) and Ilijić use <sh> for /š/: e.g. *izvarshiti, strashno, nashom*. Only Margitić uses <ʃ> for /š/: e.g. *lupeʃtina, ʃtograd*. Bandulavić is the only writer who does not employ <x> exclusively for /ž/: e.g. *zadarxij, krixax, zegliu*.

There are too few texts analysed in this dissertation to conclude when and to what extent certain graphemes became the norm, but the examples here suggest that <cz> became the dominant digraph for /c/, <ç>, for /č/, <ch> for /ć/, <gi/e> for /đ/, <h> for /h/, <gl> for /lj/, <gn> for /nj/ by the mid-eighteenth century in Bosna Srebrena. The use of <ç> for /c/ is limited to the seventeenth century, employed only by Bandulavić and Radnić. The grapheme representing /č/ varies between <ç>, <c> and <cs> until the latter part of the eighteenth century, when <ç> seems to become the dominant form. Bandulavić is the only writer to use <d> + <i> or <j> for /đ/; the other writers use <g> + <i> or <j> or <e>. By the mid-eighteenth century, <j> becomes the dominant form for /j/. Earlier writers use <y> exclusively (Bandulavić and Radnić);

both <y> and <j> (Bakšić); or both <j> and <i> (Bračuljević). Soft /l/ and /n/ tend to be represented in Italian orthography (e.g. *gliubav*, *gnegov*), though Bandulavić also uses Hungarian spelling for both phonemes and Bakšić uses Hungarian spelling only for <ny>. Lastrić is unusual in that he employs <nj> for soft /n/. There are very few examples of /dž/ in the texts studied. Bračuljević uses <cx>, while Margitić employs <ç>. Margitić's choice speaks of his knowledge of *bosančica* in which *đerv* represents /č/, /đ/, and /dž/.

If one compares the mid-to-late eighteenth-century Bosnian *latinica* texts to the Bulgarian ones (1.5.3.2), Bosnians are more consistent in representing /j/, /k/, /l'/, /nj/ and /č/. However, all the Bosnian texts studied are printed books while the Bulgarian *latinica* texts are manuscripts. It is possible that the orthography of the Bosnian Franciscans in manuscripts from the second half of the eighteenth century was also not as consistent as it appears to be on the basis of the published works analysed for this dissertation.

#### 1.6.3.1.2 Length

The writers sometimes indicate length, but never pitch. Bandulavić uses accents to show length, but the meaning of each accent is unclear: *kràgl* and *kríx* both have long vowels but they have different accent markers. On the basis of this example, one might think that the type of accent indicates pitch, but *súd* has descending pitch, as does *kràgl*, and the two words have different markers of accent. It seems that both acute and grave accents represent long vowels, without providing any information about pitch: e.g. 'king' can be spelled with either accent: *kràgl*, *krágl*. Like Bandulavić, Lastrić uses the acute and grave accents interchangeably 'zlo ú febi, i ù fvomu byftvo' ('evil in himself and in his being') (Lastrić, 1765: 213).

Doubled consonants are used by all writers other than Bandulavić to show short vowels: e.g. *opchennij*; *evvo*; *pottiçuchite*, *privvare*. Likewise, doubled vowels are occasionally employed to represent long vowels, though they are less common: e.g. *opeet*, *puuk*, *onii*. The word *Boog* is the most frequent word whose spelling indicates it has a long vowel; it can also be written as *Bog*. Margitić does not indicate long vowels but shows short vowels with doubled consonants: e.g. *kogga*, *illi otteo*, *dillu*.

Regarding length and stress, Lastrić admits to using his own system, which was more fluent and faster to write: ‘imam meni *sluxæchæ* lashtemie bijlo upijfati, nego ovak, *sluxeechee*’ (‘There were instances that were easier for me to write *sluxæchæ* than *sluxeechee*’) (Lastrić, 1755: 2). He claims that when possible he avoids accents and doubled letters, for which he would have to pick up his pen. Nevertheless, he acknowledges that accents are practical and therefore he employs them, as well as doubled letters, at times. Lastrić ends his section on orthography by saying that he has tried to incorporate the practices of all his teachers into his orthography and if the reader begs to differ or has a different system(s) to propose, he is open to discussion.

The Bosnian writers for the most part were native to areas of Bosnia where ikavic<sup>32</sup> was spoken. Their writing has a mix of ikavic and jekavic. Their dialect is apparent through hypercorrections: e.g. *manastijer* for *manastir*.

### **1.6.3.2 Bulgarian *latinica***

All three eighteenth-century Bulgarian manuscripts are written in *latinica* in a variety of Croatian orthography. MS778 and MS779 are both written with predominantly Italian orthography with limited Hungarian influence while MS780 shows greater

---

<sup>32</sup> For more on ikavic and Bosnian dialects, see Vince (2002: 46), Mønnesland (2005: 10–77).

Hungarian influence. The table below gives the modern Bulgarian Cyrillic equivalents for the most frequent representations of Bulgarian phonemes in *latinica*, as seen in the three manuscripts. There is variation in orthography from manuscript to manuscript, which is discussed in the subsections that follow the table.

### Bulgarian Latinica transcribed into Cyrillic

Latinica	Cyrillic
a	а
b	б
v	в
gh	г
d	д
e	е
x	ж
g	дж
z	з
i	и
i (internally); j (initially)	й
k or c (before back vowels); ch (before front vowels)	к
l	л
gl	лъ
m	м
n	н
o	о
p	п
r	р
s	с
t	т
ʃ (only in 779)	ст
u	у
f	ф
h	х
z	ц
ci/ce	ч
sc (+ front vowel)	ш
sct	щ
a	ъ
ju, u, iu	ю
ja, ia	я

The only sound in Bulgarian for which writers could not borrow the *latinica* equivalent from Croatian/Bosnian *latinica* orthography is /ǎ/. The grapheme <a> consistently represents it, as it does in Cyrillic. Thus, in both alphabets <a> represents two phonemes: /a/ and /ǎ/.

#### 1.6.3.2.1 MS778

MS778 shows possible German influence on the Italian orthography: umlauts are used for Turkish /ö/ and /ü/: e.g. *düzen*, *örnek*, *hökium*.<sup>33</sup> Other than in Turkish loanwords, umlauts are not present. Where umlauts occur, an alternate spelling often exists: *diuzen*, *jurnek*, *hiokium*. Turkish /ü/ can be <iu> or <ü>, while /ö/ can be <jo>, <io>, <ju>, <yu> and <ö>.

Kovačev is inconsistent with his spelling regarding /k/ before vowels: e.g. *kak*, *caco*, *kalcat colai*, *coga*, both MS778 and MS779. The graphemes <ci> = /ki/ when meaning ‘who’ but otherwise usually represents Turkish <çi>: *haracia*. Before a consonant <c> is /č/: *borclia*.

Though Kovačev varies his representation of /ö/ and /ü/, as well as /k/ : /č/, compared to the writer of MS780, he is consistent in his spelling: <a> represents /ǎ/; <sc> for /š/ is always followed by a back vowel. Of the manuscripts, MS778 has the least orthographical variation for turkisms. Where dialectal influence is visible, Kovačev uses only his dialect for the word, not a mix, as he does in MS779 and as the writer of MS780 does: *mighdan* is consistently used for *meghdan* and *bonar* is consistently used as for *bunar*.

#### 1.6.3.2.2 MS779

Though Kovačev composed both MS778 and MS779, these manuscripts differ slightly regarding dialect and orthography, especially in turkisms. Kovačev in MS779

---

<sup>33</sup> There is one example of *hökium* in MS779 but no other use of umlauts in this text.

writes in Bulgarian with Italian orthography, though he lacks consistency regarding soft /l/ and /k/: /l'/ can be both <gl>: *voglia*; and <li>: *liutto*. He is equally inconsistent regarding /k/ before /a/, /o/ or /u/: *konak* and *conak*, *kail* and *cail*, *curtulisam* and *kurtulisam*. However, the numerous examples of *kurban* are always written with initial <k>. There is one unusual example, where he uses <c> for /ts/: *konca* occurs five times on page 214b in this spelling.

For sounds not existing in Italian, Kovačev is for the most part consistent in his orthography: /ǎ/ is almost always <a>: *pat* (*păt*) *raka* (*răka*). There are a few examples of turkisms with /ɨ/ where <i> is employed instead of <a> for /ǎ/ in modern Bulgarian: e.g. *karscilik* (779) : *karşılık* (Turkish) : *кариџлџкџ* (NG); *pascialik* (779) : *paşalık* (Turkish) : *паџялџкџ* (NG). Though one might argue these examples exist because Kovačev heard /ɨ/ more as /i/, there are far more examples of /ɨ/ represented by <a>: e.g. *katlak* (779) for *ᵿkitlik*; *murtatlak* (779) for *ᵿmurtadlık*; *ortalak* (779) for *ᵿortalık*; *piscmanlak* (779) : *pişmanlık* (Turkish) : *пишманлџкџ* (NG). Most likely, Bulgarians tended to hear /ɨ/ more as /ǎ/ but due to inadequate means for representing /ǎ/ in Italian orthography, examples with <i> rather than <a> for /ɨ/ exist (1.5.2).

Palatal consonants are represented by the closest Italian equivalent: /č/ is <c> before a front vowel and <ci> before a back vowel: *cilek*, *cianta*. This representation of /č/ + back vowel does not occur in the Croatian texts analysed. For /dž/, the writer uses <g> plus front vowel: e.g. *gigher*; *genk*, *giovab*, *giumur*, which is observed in the Croatian printed books.

The sound /š/ is represented by <sc>: e.g. *sctat*, *umresc*, *sciube*, *scasckan*, *scehad*, which is characteristic of southern Croatian orthography. There are numerous examples where Kovačev uses <sci> before back vowels: e.g. *sciasckanlak*, *duscia*.

When /j/ occurs in initial position, the writer in one example uses <i> rather than the <j>: e.g. *juzbascia* and *iuzbascia* are both attested.

### 1.6.3.2.3 MS780

The orthography in MS780 differs from the other two texts in that it has greater Hungarian influence; namely, the writer uses <y>: /l'/ can be spelled as <gl>, and more frequently as <ly>. Soft [n] is usually spelled as <ny>, though also as <ni>. The grapheme <y> is also common in turkisms containing Turkish /ö/ or /ü/: *tyurli*.

Another difference, though not affected by Hungarian orthography, is that <j> doubles as /i/: both *jspoved* and *ispoved* exist; *jzin* and *izin*. The use of <j> and <i> is unsystematic: both letters can occur before consonants and vowels.

Postalveolar /č/ and /š/ are represented by two letters: <cs> is /č/: e.g. *csiarscia*; or single letters: <c>: e.g. *covvek*. As in MS778 and MS779, in MS780 <sc> represents /š/. These digraphs do not have to be followed by a front vowel: e.g. *scube*, which makes their pronunciation ambiguous: /skube/ or /šube/. The representation of /č/ as <cs> is Hungarian rather than Italian orthography.

The grapheme <z> is used in place of <x> for /ž/. Once again, one letter ambiguously represents more than one sound: *zor* could be /zor/ or /žor/.

Letters are sometimes doubled, but this doubling is random rather than systematic as it is in Croatian to indicate length: e.g. *skacce*, *nossa*, *messo*, *occi*, *Boog*. In all of these examples listed, the orthography marks the length as it would be in Croatian. The writer was apparently educated in Croatian and borrowed its orthography, in which length is represented, as Bulgarian does not distinguish between long and short vowels.

#### 1.6.4 Cyrillic

In contrast to the myriad *latinica* representations of phonemes in South Slavonic languages, Cyrillic representations show little variation. Even when comparing these two Cyrillic alphabets, they only differ in shape regarding a few characters, namely: <б>, <в>, <д>, <ч>, <ж>. In *bosančica*, the equivalent graphemes of <б>, <в>, <д>, <ж>, <ч> changed form over time as chancellery hand became less formal. The one letter specific to Bosnia is *đerv*, which was used in *bosančica* to represent both /ć/ and /đ/, sounds native only to Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, not to Bulgarian. It also preceded <л> and <н> to indicate when they were soft. Though the orthography of the Cyrillic texts differs slightly from work to work, within each work, it is consistent.

Some phonemes can be represented by more than one grapheme in Cyrillic. Stanislavov employs one grapheme per phoneme, even where multiple forms exist in Cyrillic: /o/ is always <о>, /u/ is always <у>, /z/ is always <з>. The grapheme <и> is /n/ and <н> is /i/. He also uses <н> to indicate /j/: *накω*. In contrast, the Bosnian texts are less consistent: /o/ can be <о> or <ω>, though /u/ is always <у> and /z/ always <з>.

#### 1.7 Conclusion

Various difficulties regarding turkisms arise because of the deficient *latinica* orthographical practices that were common among Catholics in Bosnia and Bulgaria in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Though the *latinica* orthographical systems employed offer a general indication of the pronunciation of the word, because of the ambiguities existing in these orthographies, there are sometimes multiple possible pronunciations of a word. In the case of more obscure turkisms, the various possible pronunciations render it difficult to determine exactly what the word is. For example, according to the Italian orthography used in MS779, *cinhadar(in)* should be

pronounced: /çinhadar(in)/, but there is no Turkish word resembling this pronunciation; however, *kinhah/kindar* exists, whose meaning, ‘vindictive, malevolent’ fits the context.<sup>34</sup> Since the writer sometimes misuses <c> before a front vowel to represent <k>, the word should most likely be spelled *kinhadar(in)*. Nevertheless, this issue is not limited to turkisms but applies to all words in texts where writers are either inconsistent in the particular orthography that they use, or in texts in which the orthographical system has ambiguities within itself.

---

<sup>34</sup> For more on the suffix of the word, see 3.2.4.

## 2.0 Chapter Two: Existing Studies and the Problem of Dating

### 2.1 Bosnian chronology

There have been several studies conducted on Turkish loanwords in Bosnian. Apart from Stachowski's monographs on the chronology and phonology of turkisms in Serbo-Croatian, all major works relating to Bosnian turkisms are dictionaries. Hazai, Bajraktarević and Stachowski have written articles on Turkish suffixal productivity, loanword origin and morphology, but the field lacks major works addressing these issues. In addition to RHSJ,<sup>35</sup> I looked at seven major dictionaries specific to turkisms:

#### 2.1.1.1 Knezević

Knezević's *Die Turzismen* (1962) gives the original Turkish term and a limited definition or translation of the turkism into German. The main part of his work divides words into categories, e.g. animals, plants, cooking appliances, smoking, etc. Each entry lists the attested derivatives of the root. Knežević does not indicate how he compiled his list of turkisms. At the beginning, he offers a bibliography, which includes many dictionaries: e.g. *Hrvatskosrpsko-francuski rječnik* ('Croatian-French Dictionary') *Hrvatsko-poljski rječnik* ('Croatian-Polish Dictionary'). He also includes articles on turkisms as well as one novel, Andrić's *Na Drini ćuprija* ('The Bridge on the Drina'). Though his dictionary is thorough regarding turkisms in twentieth-century Bosnian, he offers no information about when these turkisms came into the language, nor does he identify the region where a specific turkism exists.

---

<sup>35</sup> *Rječnik hrvatskog-sprskog jezika*, whose compilation began in the second half of the nineteenth century, is the BCS equivalent of the *Oxford English Dictionary*. It is discussed in greater detail later in the chapter.

### **2.1.1.2 Miklošić**

Miklošić's *Die türkischen Elemente in den Südosten und Osteuropäischen Sprachen* (1889) offers a comparative record of Turkish and Turkic words in Slavonic and Balkan languages. It is useful in distinguishing Turkish from other Turkic loanwords and in determining how local a word is. He offers no information about first attestations since the focus of his work is not when these words came into a particular language, but rather how widespread these turkisms are. His work gives no information regarding the semantic variation of these terms from language to language.

### **2.1.1.3 Peco**

Peco's *Turcizmi u Vukovim rječnicima* ('Turkisms in Vuk's Dictionaries') (1987) is a comparative table of the turkisms listed in Vuk's first 1818 dictionary, his 1852 edition, Škaljić's 1957 dictionary of turkisms and Popović's 1884 dictionary. Of all the dictionaries, Vuk's 1852 edition offers the most information regarding the morphological developments of turkisms in Bosnian. Peco gives no information relating to first attestations.

### **2.1.1.4 Skok**

Skok's 'Prilozi proučavanju turcizama u srp.-hrv. jeziku' ('Contributions to Researching Turkisms in Serbo-Croat'), published in three parts in *Slavia* in 1937–1938, offers detailed definitions of turkisms. The dictionary is specific in giving the location of existing turkisms. Skok discusses the disparity of turkisms in speech between Muslims and non-Muslims. He purposely avoided gathering turkisms from Muslims, who used a greater number of them, because he believed that their speech was not an accurate portrayal of the language as a whole (Skok, 1937–38: 167). However, by omitting them, he also does not give an accurate record of turkisms in

former Yugoslavia. Skok recorded his turkisms from the spoken language when he lived in Banja Luka for thirteen years and in Sarajevo for two years. Therefore, his work is limited in its number of entries and offers no information regarding first attestations.

#### **2.1.1.5 Stachowski**

Stachowski, in his 1967 monograph *Studia nad chronologią turcizmów w języku serbsko-chorwackim* ('Study on the Chronology of Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian'), divides Turkish loanwords into three categories: 1) those that are not in RHSJ; 2) those for which only a century is given in RHSJ and for which Stachowski provides a precise, though later date; 3) those that are in RHSJ, but for which Stachowski has found an earlier attestation than the earliest example listed. Stachowski translates the words into Polish. This is the only work that deals with the chronology of turkisms in Bosnian. Stachowski (1967: 5) points out that RHSJ is not exhaustive in its earliest attestations, especially for the last third of the alphabet. He has looked at numerous pre-eighteenth-century sources (e.g. *Zakon o rudnicima despota Stefana Lazarevića* ('Despot Stefan Lazarević's Mining Laws') (1412)), as well as at a variety of dictionaries of Balkan and Western European languages (e.g. *An Historical Albanian-English Dictionary*). His study does not include the works of the Bosnian Franciscans. He also excludes all derivatives from his study.

#### **2.1.1.6 Škaljić**

Škaljić's *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku* ('Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian'), first published in 1957, is crucial regarding Turkish attestations, various Turkish dialectal pronunciations and detailed definitions, including regional differences in Bosnian. He offers no information about first attestations and occasionally attributes the origin of a word to pure Turkish when it is not: he sometimes fails to mention that a word that

came into Bosnian via Turkish is originally Italian or Greek. In other instances when an Italian word exists in both Turkish and Bosnian, he might claim that the word came into Bosnian via Turkish, although there is no phonological evidence supporting his theory.

Škaljić provides a bibliography of all his sources, and in his introduction he also discusses the works which he most relied on to compile his dictionary: e.g. Vuk's 1818 dictionary; Blau's 1868 *Bosnische-türkische Sprachdenkmäler*; RHSJ; Ćorović's article on Pamučina's collection of turkisms; Skok's PPTSJ. He also consulted Bajraktarević and Sikirić, who contributed turkisms to his compilation.

#### **2.1.1.7 Supplementary materials**

Though Lejla Nakaš does not primarily focus on turkisms in her work, she addresses them in her chapter on loanwords in *Jezič i grafija krajišničkih pisama* ('Language and Script in Borderland Letters') (2010). This work looks at letters from Bosnian borderlands from the sixteenth century to the mid-eighteenth century. The chapter on loanwords is pertinent to this dissertation because Nakaš gives the precise dates of turkisms found in materials not included in any of the dictionaries and other studies on turkisms.

One of the weaknesses in this field is that these more comprehensive studies of Turkish loanwords in Bosnian and other Balkan languages are compiled by Slavists who have limited knowledge of Turkish, Arabic and Persian. According to Bajraktarević (1960: 65), because many of these Slavists do not have in-depth knowledge of these languages, mistakes in origin and in the accuracy and specificity of definition are not infrequent. Published in 2002, *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian*, compiled by Alf Grannes, Kjetil Rå Hauge, and Hayriye Süleymanoğlu, is helpful regarding accurate Turkish origin. Though it offers a comparison of turkisms

found in both Bulgarian and Bosnian, the work's primary focus is the Bulgarian language.<sup>36</sup> As a result, there are examples where the authors do not give a Bosnian Turkish counterpart, though one exists. This work does not deal with the chronology of turkisms.

### 2.1.2 Reliability of RHSJ

One questions the reliability of the earliest attestations given for turkisms in RHSJ for several reasons: as Stachowski mentions, there are fewer attestation sources listed in RHSJ for entries under T–Ž and the sources given from A–T are not exhaustive. Another issue is that many of the turkisms are only attested in *narodne pjesme* 'folk poems and songs', for which there are no dates other than that of the nineteenth-century anthologies in which they were published. And lastly, some turkisms are attested only by an entry in a pre-existing dictionary, which raises other issues: whether the turkism occurred in the written or the spoken language is unknown, as are the context and dialect; it is possible that the word existed long before it was recorded in the compiler's dictionary, or that it was a more recent loanword.

Of the 622 turkisms in the Bosnian texts analysed, 168 are attested neither in RHSJ nor in Stachowski; 572 are listed in RHSJ; 50 are listed in Stachowski, all of which have earlier attestation dates than the ones given in RHSJ. RHSJ has earliest attestations for 14 turkisms. Of the turkisms in RHSJ, 47 have only Vuk as their earliest attestation. When Vuk Karadžić is a listed source, RHSJ usually does not specify which dictionary edition the word occurs in. Thirty-three turkisms are only attested in *narodne pjesme* anthologies compiled in the nineteenth century. Stachowski proposes earlier dates or more specific dates for 50 entries and gives the

---

<sup>36</sup> See 2.2.1.2 for the importance of this work in Bulgarian.

first attestation date for five.<sup>37</sup> For 360 turkisms, the earliest attestations are the texts analysed for this dissertation. These words are: 1) not in RHSJ (166); 2) in RHSJ but have no earliest attestation date (eight); 3) are in RHSJ but are given an earliest attestation date later than my findings (448). Of the 168 turkisms not found in RHSJ or Stachowski, 14 are derivatives whose root word is reported in RHSJ. These roots have first attestations, but I do not include those dates for their derivatives, since the derivatives were possibly a later development (2.1.9). There are also two words – *kapija* and *ćuprija* – which I suspect were borrowed earlier than the eighteenth century, though the dictionary attestations and my findings are both of the eighteenth century and thus do not confirm my hypothesis.

There are several explanations as to why certain turkisms are not in RHSJ. One is that the compilers, especially if they lived in Croatia, might not have come into contact with these words at the time of the compilation since the majority of source texts are from Croatian or Serbian writers. Many of the turkisms not found in the dictionary denote something highly specific: e.g. *aklama*, *hamrija* (types of taxes); *đonlija* ‘a special dangerous mission unit in the Ottoman Turkish army made up of volunteers’; *funduklija* ‘a coin with a hazelnut depicted on it’; *dramaluk* ‘a powerful type of bullet’; *šejh-ul-Islam* ‘most senior Muslim dignitary in the Ottoman Empire’.

Nevertheless, considering the frequency with which the Franciscans used some turkisms, it seems remarkable that some of these words are not in the dictionary: BeniĆ employs *bile* frequently (over ten times):

---

<sup>37</sup> These turkisms are not in RHSJ.

- (6) Koji ne hti uzeti od fratara ništa više izvan što su prija dali gvardijani kajmekamu, premda prividi svako misto po svijuh manastirije i po cela, **bile** iđe  
‘[He] did not want to take anything more from the friars other than what the guardians had already given the *kajmekam*, though he could search every place in all the monasteries; he even went into the cells’ (Benić: 165)

The word is not found in the other Franciscan texts nor is it found in any of the existing dictionaries of turkisms. Likewise, both Benić and Lašvanin use *taksil* and *muvela*, yet neither of these words is in RHSJ.

Many of the words not found in RHSJ are compounds: e.g. *adžamoglan*, *bašaga*, *bašeskija*, *kapićehaja*, *topčaga*. In these examples, at least one element, if not both parts of the compound, is found in the dictionary: e.g. *baša* + *aga*; *top* + *aga*. Many of these compounds are titles of Ottoman Turkish officials, where one part of the compound has the same meaning regardless of what word it is in construction with or whether it is the first or second element in the compound: *aga* is an honorary title and is added to any name or position. Its suffix-like behaviour might explain why some compounds with *aga* are omitted from the dictionary. However, because other compounds with *aga* do exist in the dictionary (e.g. *čauslaraga*), it cannot be concluded that these words were omitted because the authors assumed one or both elements of the compound were self-evident from other entries.

Some turkisms appear only under an alternative spelling in RHSJ: there are entries for *hapst* and *ćefs*, but not for *avst* and *ćešif*. Under the alternative entry, the spelling from the Franciscan texts is not listed as a variant in RHSJ. It is possible that the Franciscan rendition is a regional pronunciation limited to central Bosnia, but because of different orthographic traditions, I am reluctant to attribute orthographic variation to dialectal differences.

The limited number of attestation sources makes one question how comprehensive the RHSJ compilers were, especially since certain letters have far

more early attestations than others do: of the thirty-four turkisms under T, sixteen are only attested in Vuk. In contrast, of the thirty-four turkisms under Č and Ć, six are attested in Vuk alone while all others have more specific earlier attestations. Such inconsistency also occurs regarding whether a turkism is in the dictionary at all: of the sixteen turkisms beginning with <i>, nine are not found in RHSJ; but of the twenty turkisms beginning with <d>, only one is not in RHSJ.<sup>38</sup>

Although Lastrić's *Testimonium bilabium* and the works of Divković, Posilović, Margitić and Dobretić were included as sources for certain entries in RHSJ, the other works that I analyse were not. Within the sources included in RHSJ, the editors overlooked some turkisms: e.g. *taman* and *udžerica* are both in Divković (1611), but this work is not listed under the entries for these words.

### 2.1.3 Stachowski and earliest attestations

Stachowski does not include any of the sources analysed for this dissertation as part of his corpora of Bosnian turkisms. Although his work is invaluable regarding earliest attestations of Turkish loanwords in Bosnian, it should be mentioned that he considers each spelling of a turkism a separate word: e.g. he offers earliest attestations for *kadiljuk* and *kadiluk*. Though this might be critical when looking at phonology and dialects, I group different spellings of one turkism under one encompassing entry for several reasons: even within the work of one writer, a word is sometimes recorded in two, if not three or four different spellings: e.g. *tefterdar*, *defterdar*, *teftedar*, because there was not an established orthography in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnia. Another reason for grouping multiple spellings under one entry is that the editions of the two chronicles that I analyse have been transliterated into modern Croatian spelling; therefore, I cannot take original orthography into account. This

---

<sup>38</sup> See 2.1.10.1 for more on the compilation of RHSJ.

study also does not focus on phonology or dialects but on the common turkisms which dialects share; the existence of the word and its derivatives are the primary focus. And lastly, as previously mentioned, because various orthographic systems existed and mixed until the mid-nineteenth century, one cannot be certain how reliable different orthographies are for phonological and dialectal studies.

For fifty of the Turkish loanwords in the texts that I studied, Stachowski finds an earlier attestation than the one given in RHSJ. Examples follow.<sup>39</sup>

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>RHSJ</b>	<b>Stachowski</b>
amanet	1612	1506
arnaut	1649–1651	1612
arslanija	1678	1644
mubašir	1678	1674
murasele	1774	1674
odobaša	1650	1619
top	1680	1612

In a handful of other cases Stachowski offers a specific attestation when RHSJ gives only the century when the loanword came into the language:

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>RHSJ</b>	<b>Stachowski</b>
aga	17th c.	1582
alajbeg	17th c.	1652
bezistan	17th c.	1658
kadiluk	17th c.	1587
silivatar	17th c.	1489
teskera	19th c.	1612
zaim	17th c.	1606

For four of these seven examples, Stachowski provides not only a more specific attestation, but also an attestation that is a century earlier.

Stachowski also offers earliest attestations for five words not listed in RHSJ:

*ilaka*: 1682; *iktir/iftira*: 1688; *ordija*: 1756; *ramadan*: 1491; *sejmen*: 1689.

---

<sup>39</sup> For the complete list, see Appendix III: Earliest Attestations of Turkisms in Bosnian: RHSJ: Stachowski: Dissertation Sources.

There are two examples where Stachowski gives dates for words that are listed in RHSJ without dates: *šahit* (end of 18th century), *udžet* (1470).

Despite Stachowski's significant contribution to the chronology of turkisms in Bosnian, in one example when Stachowski offers an earlier attestation than the one given in RHSJ, the earliest attestation I found in RHSJ coincides with Stachowski's 'correction'. For the word *bezistan*, RHSJ gives the seventeenth century for its earliest attestation; Stachowski states that RHSJ lists the eighteenth century as the earliest attestation of *bezistan*, for which he finds an earlier attestation: 1658. Though not a matter of accuracy, there are also two words – *delibaša*, and *zarar* – for which Stachowski's earliest attestations are later than the dates of the texts which I analysed.

#### **2.1.4 Nakaš and earliest attestations**

Nakaš provides attestations for three of the turkisms in the Franciscan texts which are found neither in RHSJ nor in Stachowski: *devletum* (18th c.); *malićan* (18th c.); *top* (18th c.); and gives one earlier attestation for a word found in RHSJ: *ferman*: 1759 (RHSJ) : 1690s (Nakaš). The term *devletum* consists of the root *devlet* + the first person possessive suffix in Turkish: *İm*,<sup>40</sup> meaning 'my country'. Its possessive form might explain why it is not in RHSJ. However, *efendum*, which is also in the first person possessive, is attested. Because *efendum* is frequently used in Turkish to mean 'please' or 'pardon', this secondary meaning is most likely why it was recorded. RHSJ does not offer *top*'s secondary meaning: 'a large roll of linen or other kind of fabric', but Nakaš cites an example from the 1690s.

#### **2.1.5 Reliability of written material for attestations**

There are two words – *kapija* and *ćuprija* – whose earliest attestations are the eighteenth century in RHSJ. Though this dating does not conflict with my findings, I

---

<sup>40</sup> A capital letter is used to indicate that an Turkish suffix has more than one possible vowel due to vowel harmony.

still question it: both of these words are simple concrete nouns, are used frequently and are never translated or glossed by a native Bosnian term in the texts that I analysed; thus, they are used with the understanding that the reader is familiar with them:

- (7) a. *ćuprija*
- i. I od istoga kamenja, od iste crvke, ograđena je **ćuprija** niže vрила Bosne’ (Lašvanin: 201)  
‘The bridge lower down on the Bosna Springs is built from the same stone, from the same church’ (Lašvanin: 216)
  - ii. I rekoše da će od njih činiti **ćupriju** priko Save  
‘And they said that they would build a bridge across the Sava’ (Lašvanin: 216)
  - iii. ‘[...] mahom me povedoše i metnuše u zindan pašin kod **ćuprije** i u sindžir’ (Benić: 153)  
‘[...] all at once, they led me to the pasha’s prison by the bridge and put me in chains’ (Benić: 153)
  - iv. [...] onu noć pobiše se među se doli pod Loparića kućom blizu one **ćuprije**  
‘[...] that night they battled each other down by Loparić’s house close to that bridge’ (Benić: 184)
- b. *kapija*
- i. [...] koliko na **kapiji**  
‘[...] however many are at the door’ (Benić: 146)
  - ii. [...] sidosmo po dućanije prid **kapijom**  
‘[...] we sat in the doorways of shops’ (Benić: 158)
  - iii. [...] svi bi nam rekli na **kapiji**  
‘[...] everyone would tell us at the door’ (Benić: 160)

In these examples, the writers chose to employ a turkism over a native synonym. If these turkisms had not already become part of the active language, they would have been glossed with their native synonyms (7.1.7.1).

### 2.1.6 Pre-seventeenth-century attestations

According to Stachowski, the earliest turkisms are from the fifteenth century. If one looks at the earliest attestations of the turkisms in this dissertation, only two words are attested before the fifteenth century: *sultan* (13th c.) and *kadija* (1396). The most common words attested earlier than the seventeenth century are those that are culturally necessary<sup>41</sup> and refer to individuals among the Ottoman elite, politicians or Islamic clergy: *aga*, *baša*, *beg*, *bula*, *čauš*, *čehaja*, *delija*, *derviš*, *emin*, *hadžija*, *harambaša*, *nahija*, *paša*, *silivatar*, *spahija*, *subaša*, *vezir*. Other cultural loans are also attested: *arza*, *čoha*, *dolama*, *đumruk*, *harač*, *haračan*, *ramadan* and *talambas*.

Other terms were borrowed into the language most likely out of frequent exposure. These words, which replace or are synonymous with native words or earlier loanwords, are often referred to as ‘core borrowings’ (Haspelmath, 2009: 48). The earliest core borrowings follow: *amanet*, *bari*, *budala*, *bunar*, *hazna*, *hesap*, *kanat*, *kula*, *mahrma*, *ortak*, *sindžir*, *sofra/sopra*, *šimlje*, *teftiš*, *teftivar*, *tepsija*, *večil*, *zaim*. These words are all nouns that refer to concrete objects. Though most of these words have Slavonic equivalents, these words became synonymous with the existing Slavonic term: e.g. in the texts analysed *sindžir* is more common than *lanac*.<sup>42</sup>

Abstract nouns are less common before the seventeenth century, or even in the seventeenth century compared to the eighteenth century. There are only four abstract nouns attested earlier than the seventeenth century: *kailj*, *teftiš*, *zanat*, and *zulum*.

Two of the pre-seventeenth-century words stand out: *bari* and *bubreg*. While RHSJ attributes these loanwords to Turkish, I am not convinced that they initially came into Bosnian via Turkish, though the terms exist in Turkish. Both *bari* and *bubreg* occur in other Turkic languages as well: e.g. *büyreğ* (Kazakh), *böyrök*

---

<sup>41</sup> A native word did not exist for Turkish loanword. For more on cultural borrowings, see Haspelmath, 2009: 46–48.

<sup>42</sup> For the use and distribution of synonymous pairs, see 7.1.7.3.

(Kyrgyz), *buyrak* (Uzbek). *Bari* might have developed from Turkish, but given its multiple spellings and pronunciations (*bar*, *bari*, *barem*), and its existence in Croatian, it might be a much earlier loan from a Turkic language other than Turkish. Though *bubreg* has only one variant in Bosnian, like *bari*, it exists in Croatian. In contrast to a word like *saat*, which is also attested in areas that were not under Ottoman rule, it seems unlikely that *bubreg*, because of its meaning, would have developed out of frequent exposure. In Bulgarian, *bubreg* is *băbreg*. Given the word is *böbrek* in Turkish, it is unusual that /ö/ becomes /ǎ/ and not /o/, /u/ or /ü/ in Bulgarian.<sup>43</sup> It is nevertheless possible that *băbreg* is the result of Ottoman Turkish dialect. However, BER attributes the word to Old Bulgar origin: *bubreg* > *băbreg*. The word is also attested in fifteenth-century Russian:

- (8) [...] *sutĭ bubrězi*  
 ‘[...] are kidneys’ (Sreznevskij, 1893, I: 188)

It seems unlikely that a non-culturally necessary turkism would appear as early as the fifteenth century in Russian.

### 2.1.7 Seventeenth-century attestations

As with the turkisms first attested before the seventeenth century, turkisms first attested in the seventeenth century developed because of frequent exposure: e.g. *kesa*, *komšija*, *komšiluk*; and out of cultural necessity: e.g. *mubašir*, *mula*, *nahija*, *odobaša*.

The most noticeable difference in turkisms attested before the seventeenth century and those attested in the seventeenth century is seen in parts of speech. Among the pre-seventeenth-century turkisms, only *bari* is not a noun. In the seventeenth century, other parts of speech became more common: eight verbs, stemming from both nouns and verbs, are attested: *ašikovati*, *esabiti*, *jagmiti*,

---

<sup>43</sup> For more on the phonological adaptation of turkisms, see Mollova (1967), Grannes (1970).

*murleisati, pobudaliti, uharačiti, usidžiliti, uzapstiti/uzavstiti*; there are four adjectives, all with Slavonic derived suffixes: *budalast, čifutski, derviški* and *haračan*; one adverb: *telalle*; and one conjunction: *ama*. There is a slight increase in the number of abstract nouns (*budalaština, hak, juriš, haber, and kavga*), though in no way approaching the increase in concrete nouns. Though *budalaština* has an Turkish root, its abstract status is due to its Slavonic suffix.

Of the words that are attested before the eighteenth century, six of the earliest attestations are from texts analysed in this dissertation: *čakmak* (Radnić: 1683), *jedžek* (Radnić: 1683), *tamam* (Diviković: 1611), *udžera* (Radnić: 1683), *udžerica* (Divković: 1611), *zanatli* (Radnić: 1683). Although the works in which these words occur were used in compiling attestation sources for RHSJ, they nevertheless are not listed as examples. This supports the hypothesis that the compilers of RHSJ were not equally careful (2.1.2).

### **2.1.8 Differences in words borrowed before the seventeenth century, in the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century**

Forty-two turkisms have their earliest attestation before the seventeenth century. One hundred forty-eight turkisms have their earliest attestation date in the seventeenth century; of these, my data have six earliest attestations. In the eighteenth century the number of earliest attestation dates for turkisms dramatically increases, by almost 200: there are 431 turkisms whose first attestation is in the eighteenth century; of these 354 are from the texts analysed.<sup>44</sup> Although these numbers show a significant increase of turkisms over the centuries, one wonders about the number of earliest attestations that occur in sources not included in studies on the chronology of turkisms. Given that over half of the earliest attestation sources in the eighteenth

---

<sup>44</sup> Turkisms from the sources that I analyse that have been included as attestation sources in RHSJ are not counted as dissertation earliest attestations.

century are the materials analysed for this dissertation, one is forced to conclude that the compilers of RHSJ either did not have access to eighteenth-century texts which have since become available, or that they simply were not adequately thorough.

Despite the insufficient number of eighteenth-century sources used in RHSJ, various trends regarding turkisms in the eighteenth century can still be surmised: as in the seventeenth century, there are numerous attestations of words that have become culturally necessary: e.g. *ćehaja, delibaša, musafir, hatišerif*. There is an increase of words relating to Islam and its religious practices: e.g. *abdest, bajram, ćitab, derviš, džamija, džemat, džematlija, efendija, hodža, icindija, imšallah, jacija, kalif, muftija, muhamedanac, mula, munara, ramazan, sabah, šehit, šejh-ul-Islam, ulem*. While these words might have been prevalent in Muslim communities, their presence in texts written by Catholics shows that they were not limited to a self-contained Muslim community.

As in the seventeenth century, in the eighteenth century there are numerous earliest attestations of core loans: e.g. *bakar, barut, bašta, kesedžija, perde, pender, peškir*. While concrete nouns are the most common, abstract nouns as well as other parts of speech are also attested: e.g. *adalet, adet, hrsuzluk, odbašiti, bile, barabar, kadar, aman*.

### **2.1.9 Dating Slavonic derivatives against roots**

Numerous Slavonic derivatives from turkisms are attested, but because some dictionaries, including RHSJ, do not always list a derivative as a separate entry from its root, first attestations of derivatives are less common. In order to have a clearer picture of the chronology of turkisms and their derivatives, I have grouped them by

the number of years between the first attestation<sup>45</sup> of the root and the first attestation of the derivative, and in a few examples, vice versa:

### 1. The derivative is attested no more than ten years after the root:

Root	Root Date	Derivative(s)	Derivative Date
adžamoglan	1785	adžamoglanski	1785
čifut	1611	čifutin; čifutski	1611; 1611
ćefil	1785	ćefiliti se; išćefiliti	1785; 1785
ćešf	1750	ćešifiti	1750
ilam	1750	ilamiti; odilamiti	1750; 1750
mehćema	1755	mehćemski	1755
muamedanac	1750	muamedanski	1750
sakat	1707	osakatiti	1707
teftišlema	1785	tevtišlemiti	1785
vakuf	1785	vakupski	1785

Nine of these ten pairs of roots and derivatives have the exact same earliest attestation date; of these, nine are first attested in the texts analysed for this dissertation. One reason for this high percentage is because half of these roots (e.g. *adžamoglan*, *ćefil*, *ćešf*, *teftišlema*) and their derivatives occur only in an Turkish context in secular texts, material often excluded from RHSJ and Stachowski. These texts are limited and tend to be of a later date.

### 2. Derivatives that are attested twenty to forty years after the root:

Root	Root Date	Derivative(s)	Derivative Date
ašik	1609	ašikovati	1631
avlija	1762	avljiski	1785
budala	1597	budalast	1611
harač	1442	haračan	1483
hazur	1750	hazuriti	1782

In contrast to group one, in which this dissertation's sources are the earliest attestation sources for over half of the examples, only one root and derived pair has its earliest attestation in dissertation sources. All of these words occur in religious texts, which were common seventeenth-century sources in the compilation of RHSJ.

<sup>45</sup> These earliest attestation sources are taken from RHSJ, Stachowski and dissertation sources combined. In order to see which source the word occurs in, please consult Appendix III.

### 3. Derivatives that are attested fifty to ninety years after the root:

Root	Root Date	Derivative(s)	Derivative Date
baška	1683	nabaška	1732
budala	1597	budalastvo; budalaština	1683; 1678
kusur	1702	iskusuriti	1785
torba	1596	torbica	1649

Few roots have derivatives between fifty to ninety years later than their first attestation date. Apart from *budalastvo* and *budalaština*, which were common in religious texts, these derivatives most likely were common in the spoken language but were infrequent among the formal writing of earlier religious texts.

### 4. Derivatives that are attested approximately 100 years after the root, +/- ten years:

Root	Root date	Derivative	Derivative date
derviš	16th c.	derviški	1631
dušman	1631	dušmanski; dušmanstvo	1730; 1730
juriš	1631	jurititi	1730
sanduk	1695	sandučić	1785
somun	1649	somunčić	1750
taban	1683	tabaniti	1785
vilajet	1649	vilajetski	1750

Apart from *taban*, all of these roots are first attested in texts not included in the dissertation. In contrast, of the eight derivatives, six are first attested in the eighteenth-century texts analysed for this dissertation. While this might suggest that derivatives tend to be a later development, if one compares these derivatives to those attested closer in time to their root, there are neither semantic nor morphological differences: nominal, adjectival, adverbial and verbal derivatives are attested in the same year as the root, several decades after, as well as a century afterwards; derivatives of frequent exposure and cultural necessity occur in all time spans.

### 5. Derivatives attested more than 110 but less than 200 years after the root:

Root	Root date	Derivative	Derivative date
(h)apst	1612	hapstiti; uapstiti	1750; 1782
ašik	1609	zaašikovati	1785
budala	1597	budalaštinica	1765
mahrama	1558	mahramica	1732
misir	17th c.	misirski	1782
ramazan	1606	ramazanski	1750
zulum	1574	zulumćar; zulumiti	1750; 1750

When the root has its first attestation 110 to 200 years earlier than that of the derivative, it is always first attested in earlier sources than those analysed in the dissertation; however, seven of the nine derivatives are first attested in the dissertation's eighteenth-century sources.

Because the word *misir* is common in religious texts, it seems unusual that its derivative is not attested until 1782. One might attribute the later attestation to the existence of the Turkish derivative *misirli*, which was also borrowed into Bosnian, but *misirli*, like *misirski*, is first attested in the eighteenth century.

### 6. Derivatives attested two hundred years or more after the root:

Root	Root date	Derivative	Derivative date
baša	1493	bašinski; odbašiti se	1750; 1782
harač	1442	haračiti; podharačiti; poharačiti; uharačiti	1730; 1750; 1704; 1649
emin	1468	eminski	1750
(h)esap	15th c.	esabiti; proesabiti	1649; first decade of 18th c.
paša	beginning of 16th c.	pašinski	1750
pazar	16th c.	pazarište	1730
teftiš/tevtiš	1456	teftišiti; zateševski	1631; 1785

The roots of derivatives that are attested two hundred or more years later than their roots are some of the most common turkisms. As with *misirski*, it seems odd that their derivatives are not attested earlier. Nevertheless, these roots would be unusual in religious texts – the most common earliest attestation sources – which might explain why these derivatives are not exemplified earlier. One would most likely have to look

at early letters, chronicles and other unpublished material in order to establish earlier attestation dates for these derivatives.

#### **7. Derivatives with earlier attestation dates than their root:**

<b>Root</b>	<b>Root date</b>	<b>Derivative</b>	<b>Derivative date</b>
hrsuz	1765	hrsuzki	1730
sidžil	1750	usidžiliti	1649
teslim	1785	preteslimiti	1782
učetuglija	1782	učetuglinski	1750
udžera	1730	udžerica	1611

Five roots have derived attestations earlier than their own. The difference in years ranges from more than one hundred years before the root to only three years before the root. Group seven represents the problem of dating derivatives against their roots better than any other group: the roots obviously had to exist at the time when the derivatives were first attested, even though there is no (known) written record of them. The limited collection of earliest attestation sources once again manifests its weaknesses.

## 8. Dating prefixed verbs against their roots and non-prefixed forms

Nom. root	Nom. root date	Non-prefixed verb <sup>46</sup>	Date of non-prefixed verb	Prefixed verb	Date of prefixed verb
ašik	1609	ašikovati	1631	zaašikovati	1785
baša	1493	bašititi se	1757	odbašiti se	1785
batal	18th c.	bataliti	19th c.	obataliti	1782
budala	1597	budaliti	1747	pobudaliti	1609
ćefil	1782	ćefiliti se	1785	iščefiliti	1785
esap	15th c.	esabiti	1649	proesabiti	first decade of 18th c.
harač	1442	haračiti	1730	poharačiti podharačiti uharačiti	1704 1750 1649
kusur	1702	kusurati	1894	iskusuriti	1782
sakat	1707	sakatiti	1729	osakatiti	1707
sidžil	1750	sidžiliti	NA	usidžiliti	1649
teslim	1785	teslimiti	19th c.	priteslimiti	1785
zapt	1759	zaptiti	1868	uzavpstiti	1785

Because all these prefixed verbs have Turkish nominal roots, it seems most likely that the root was first borrowed into Bosnian and from it, the verb developed. While this is true for most examples, there is one pair of attestation dates that does not support this argument: *sidžil* (1750) : *usidžiliti* (1649). As previously mentioned, one might suggest that this is due to an inadequate number of sources rather than a derivative developing before its root was borrowed into Bosnian.

One might also expect the non-prefixed forms of verbs to be attested earlier than their prefixed counterparts. The examples above do not support this hypothesis: of the thirteen non-prefixed verbs, only four are attested before one or both of their prefixed counterparts: *ašikovati*, *bašititi se*, *ćefiliti se* and *haračiti*. This information suggests that prefixed verbs might have existed before or at the same time as their non-prefixed counterparts; or that these verbs were more common in the perfective than in the imperfective aspect.

<sup>46</sup> Apart from *ašikovati*, these forms are not attested in the texts analysed.

### 2.1.9.1 Verbal roots and nominal roots in verbs

If one compares the earliest attestation dates of verbs stemming from nouns:

*ašikovati* (1631), *haračiti* (1730), *iskusuriti* (1782), *(iš)ćefiliti* (1785), *obataliti* (1782), *odbašiti se* (1785), *osakatiti* (1707), *pobudaliti* (1609), *poharačiti* (1704), *podharačiti* (1750), *priteslimiti* (1785), *proesabiti* (first decade of 18th c.), *uharačiti* (1649), *usidžiliti* (1649), *uzavpstiti* (1785), *zaašikovati* (1785), *zahećiti* (1782) to those stemming from verbs: *beglaisati* (1785), *bujurisati* (1785), *čurudisati* (1785), *dajanisati* (1785), *eglendisati* (1785), *imzeleisati* (1785), *išleisati* (1785), *kurisati* (1785), *murleisati* (1672), *paralaisati* (1785), *sebvdisati* (1785), *surisati* (1750), *ujdurisati* (1785), only one of the thirteen verbs with a verbal root is attested before the mid-eighteenth century, while eight of the 18 verbs stemming from Turkish nouns are; four of these (*ašikovati*, *pobudaliti*, *uharačiti* and *usidžiliti*) are first attested in the seventeenth century. The data suggest that verbs with verbal roots were a later development than those with nominal roots.<sup>47</sup>

### 2.1.10 General conclusion on dating derivatives against roots

Unfortunately, there are not enough examples of derivatives and roots in the material analysed to determine the average period of time a turkism had existed in Bosnian before a native derivative developed. One might posit that the length of time between the borrowing of a turkism into Bosnian and the development of its derivative(s) depends on the frequency of the word, but my results do not support this hypothesis: there are words that are less common, e.g. *udžer*, *adžamoglan*, which have derivatives (*udžerica*, *adžamoglanski*) with the same date of earliest attestation. On the other hand, words that are very common: *baša* (1473): *bašinski* (1750, 1785); *emin* (1480): *eminski* (1750); *harač* (1492): *haračiti* (1772), have derivatives that are first attested

---

<sup>47</sup> For more on verbal borrowing and its limitations, see chapter four.

several centuries later. Although this evidence would suggest that these derivatives were a later development, it alone is not sufficient to draw any conclusions.

### 2.1.10.1 Derivatives in RHSJ

Many of the derivatives for which RHSJ lists the nineteenth century<sup>48</sup> as their earliest attestation date have an earlier attestation in the eighteenth century, often in the same year as their roots, on the basis of this dissertation's sources: e.g. *hapstiti* (RHSJ = 19th c. : Dis. = 1750), *bašinski* RHSJ = 1868. : Dis. = 1750), *eminski* (RHSJ = 19th c. : Dis. = 1750). Such examples support the conclusion that the attestations given in RHSJ are far from comprehensive. Of the derivatives not attested in RHSJ, two of the roots (*adžamoglan* and *ilam*) are also not attested and there is one example where the derivative but not the root is attested in RHSJ (*sidžil* is not attested but *usidžiliti* is). The letter <i> in RHSJ significantly lacks turkisms and attestations, which explains why a common word such as *ilam* is not included. Though *usidžiliti* is included in RHSJ, other turkisms towards the end of the alphabet are almost entirely attested by nineteenth-century anthologies of *narodne pjesme* alone. The lack of earlier attestations occurs not because turkisms beginning with R–Ž were borrowed into Bosnian at a later date, but because certain compilers did not provide comprehensive attestations. Daničić, who edited volumes one and two (A–D)<sup>49</sup> of RHSJ, provides thorough attestations; on the basis of this study, Budman, who edited volumes three through the first part of six (Đ – Ma), has fewer attestations for turkisms, though not for Slavonic or other loan words,<sup>50</sup> like Daničić, Maretić, who edited volumes six

---

<sup>48</sup> See Appendix III.

<sup>49</sup> Matija Valjavec finished letter Č and Ć after Daničić died in 1882 (Jonke: 1976: 108).

<sup>50</sup> 'Budman ne samo nije za Daničićem zaostajao, nego ga je dosta često i nadmašio. Daničić mislim da nigdje nema (u istom odijeljku) preko 100 primijera, a Budman ima za riječ *hud* pod e, a, aa 122 primjera, za *jezik* pod d ima ih 120, za *ljubav* pod 2, a, a 122, za *mariti* pod 1, a, a, 108' ('Not only did Budman take over from Daničić, he often even surpassed him. I do not think Daničić ever has more than 100 examples (for one entry), while Budman has 122 examples for the word *hud* under e, a, aa,

(from where Budman left off) through eleven (Me–R), provides thorough attestations for the turkisms in this study. Musulin was in charge of the group of compilers who worked on volumes 12 through 22 (R– Ž) of the dictionary, the least comprehensive volumes. There are several reasons why these volumes might be weaker than the rest: the compilers had limited means when they resumed work on the dictionary after the Second World War (in 1948) (NRR: RHSJ: 23: 13–14); although engaging multiple individuals to work on the dictionary might allow for more attestations and greater precision, it would have been easy for responsibilities to be redistributed and for certain sources to be overlooked if assignments were not sufficiently coordinated. Also, by this time, the academy was eager to finish the project and possibly sacrificed precision to expedition.

From these limited data regarding derivatives, one cannot draw conclusions about the correlation of dates between a turkism loan root and its derivative(s). However, because of the frequency of the derivatives in the texts analysed, especially stemming from official titles and professions, it seems that most derivatives developed soon after their roots were borrowed into Bosnian. It does not seem that context and the type of word (cultural borrowing: core borrowing) influenced the chronology of derivatives.

## **2.2 Bulgarian chronology**

In contrast to the first half of this chapter on the chronology of Bosnian turkisms, which attempts to establish earliest attestation dates in addition to determining where the turkisms in the texts analysed fall chronologically in relation to each other, this section is less exhaustive because of the limited sources, namely the absence of a Bulgarian equivalent to RHSJ. To make up for this imbalance, the supplementary

---

for *jezik* under d he has 120, for *ljubav* under 2, a, *a* he has 122, for *mariti* under 1, a, *a*, he has 108<sup>7</sup>.) (T. Maretić, *Crtice*: 77 in Jonke: 1976: 109).

materials mentioned in 1.4.3.1 are included in the chronological analysis. While the chapter discusses the chronology of Bulgarian turkisms, the earliest attestation dates for these words are only general points of reference. Nevertheless, given that the scribal notes, along with the Wallachian texts and Cserged prayers,<sup>51</sup> are some of the earliest extant sources for written vernacular Bulgarian, it is reasonable to posit that words attested in these notes before the seventeenth century are early attestations, if not the earliest. The earliest turkism attested in the scribal notes is *amir* (1544).

### 2.2.1 Existing studies

As with Bosnian, there are several works that discuss turkisms in Bulgarian. Some of these works can be used for both Bulgarian and Bosnian: e.g. Miklošić (1889) (2.1.1.2). *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian* (2002) (2.1.1.7) is discussed in detail in this section as it mainly deals with Bulgarian. Two pre-modern dictionaries have also been included in this study: Naiden Gerov's *Rečnik na bālgarski jazyk* ('Dictionary of the Bulgarian Language') and Alpija Vlajkov's *Rečnik na upotrebljavanite v Pirdopskija govor turski dumi do 1885 godina* ('Dictionary of Turkish Words Used in Pirdop Speech until 1885'). Stachowski's work on the chronology of turkisms in Bulgarian is the only source that discusses the chronology of Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian.

#### 2.2.1.1 Gerov

Gerov's *Rečnik na bālgarski jazyk* was published from 1895–1904 in five volumes; its appendix was published in 1908 by Pančev. This work has approximately 100,000 entries and is helpful primarily for analysing the language of nineteenth-century Bulgaria. It lists numerous turkisms and also offers a few examples of phrases in

---

<sup>51</sup> Since there is very limited to no Turkish influence in the Wallachian texts and Cserged prayers, these are excluded from this study.

which turkisms are frequently used. Gerov (and Pančev) fail to give the Turkish term of origin.

### **2.2.1.2 Grannes, Hauge and Süleymanoğlu**

Although *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian* (2002) does not have information regarding the chronology of turkisms other than listing whether a word is obsolete, it is by far the most thorough work relating to Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian, and comparatively speaking, in Bosnian. It includes the Turkish term of origin with possible dialectal variants for each entry. It is especially helpful regarding semantic change since the compilers provide the meaning of the term in Bulgarian as well as the original Turkish meaning. When there is a question regarding the word of origin, more than one source word is sometimes listed and the entry is always marked with a question mark. If the source word is a loanword within Turkish, the language of origin is also given. The dictionary offers limited grammatical information: e.g. it always indicates whether adjectives are declinable or not. It also gives register labels: e.g. *ironical, obsolete, pejorative, vulgar*. The compilers consulted a large body of reference material (approx. 250 works) for this dictionary's compilation; however, rather than focusing on historical primary sources, they focus on the most current and accurate sources that record and discuss turkisms in the modern and pre-modern language. This dictionary also provides a reverse alphabetical list of all its terms – which is helpful for analysing morphological developments – as well as a comparative list of Bulgarian and Bosnian turkisms, as mentioned in 2.1.1.7

### **2.2.1.3 Pavlev and Živkov**

Pavlev compiled Turkish and Greek words from mid-nineteenth century; Živkov edited his compilation and had it published in 1855. In contrast to other scholars who have recorded turkisms as part of the Bulgarian language, these two scholars created

their work in order to cleanse the language of these foreign terms. They offer the common man a Slavonic replacement for a colloquial Greek or Turkish loanword (Pavlev: introduction: 10). Regardless of the compilers' purpose, the work offers a list of turkisms that were commonly used in the mid-nineteenth century.

### **2.2.1.3 Stachowski**

As in his monograph on the chronology of Bosnian turkisms (2.1.1.5), in his *Studia nad chronologią turcyzmów w języku bułgarskim* 'Study on the Chronology of Turkisms in Bulgarian' (1971), Stachowski gives a compiled record of turkisms found in various collections of Bulgarian manuscripts and dictionaries. This work is not as detailed as his Bosnian study, mainly because of the limited Bulgarian material.<sup>52</sup> Stachowski analyses MS779 and the *Trojanski damaskin*, both included in this dissertation. While he lists 98 of the turkisms from MS779, he has overlooked 281; similarly, of the 24 turkisms in the *Trojanski damaskin*, he has overlooked 13. Therefore, I am also somewhat sceptical of his recording of turkisms from the other Bulgarian texts included in his bibliography. He also omits both Turkish and Slavonic derivatives.

### **2.2.1.4 Stamenov**

Stamenov's work (2013) is a detailed analysis of the use of turkisms in modern Bulgarian and is the most recently published work; however, apart from its bibliography, it is not particularly pertinent to this dissertation since it focuses on the use and perception of turkisms in the modern Bulgarian language.

---

<sup>52</sup> As mentioned earlier, there is no Bulgarian equivalent of RHSJ. Therefore, the work that Stachowski does for Bosnian turkisms – provide earlier attestation dates, alternate forms and additional attestations – is not possible.

### 2.2.1.5 Vlajkov

Vlajkov's dictionary consists of 1,567 turkisms from the area of Pirdop at the end of the nineteenth century (Penčeva, 2013: 8). He lists each turkism and its meaning, occasionally including an example of how the word was used: e.g. 'teste: edinica ot deset ednakvi nešta. 'Teste knigi', znači deset knigi' ('*teste*: unit of ten of the same thing. '*Teste* books, means ten books') (Vlajkov, 2013: 152). At the initial stage of Vlajkov's compilation, Pirdop was 85% Bulgarian with a large Turkish minority. Shortly thereafter, most of the Turks left Pirdop. While the dictionary offers a detailed list of turkisms used in Pirdop in 1895, it does not state when these words were borrowed.

### 2.2.2 Dating

Only the scribal notes and Stachowski offer precise earliest attestations that are before the seventeenth century. Bakšić's *Meditationes S. Bonaeventuræ*, Stanislavov's *Abagar*, the *Tixonravovski* and *Trojanski damaskini* are from the seventeenth century; of these works only Bakšić's and Stanislavov's texts have specific dates, though they have no turkisms. It is thought that the *Trojanski damaskin* is from the middle of the seventeenth century (Ivanova, 1967: 5) and the *Tixonravovski* from the seventeenth century.<sup>53</sup> All the Franciscan manuscripts, Sofronij's text and the *Švištovski damaskin* are from the second half of the eighteenth century: Švištovski: 1753; MS778: 1773; MS779: 1779; MS780: end of eighteenth century; Sofronij: 1798. When Stachowski and the scribal notes have specific eighteenth-century earliest attestation dates, all attestations are from the second half of the eighteenth century, apart from one (*sapudžia*: 1743). Since MS780 does not have a precise date and Stachowski often lacks precise dates for both eighteenth- and seventeenth-century loans as well, there is

---

<sup>53</sup> Watermarks and handwriting suggest a date around the middle of the seventeenth century. See: Demina, II: 36–39.

insufficient information for a discussion on the chronology of Turkish loans in Bulgarian with the same specificity that is possible for Bosnian; it is possible that Stachowski's 'seventeenth century' represents earlier or later dates than seventeenth-century sources with an attestation date of a specific year.

The majority of turkisms discussed in this dissertation have their earliest attestation dates in the eighteenth century: of the 628 turkisms, 508 are first attested in the eighteenth century. Of these, Stachowski only offers one example of an exact date which is earlier than those of the texts that I analysed: *delia*: 1765 (Stachowski) : 1798 (Sofronij). Therefore, my data offers 537 earliest attestations,<sup>54</sup> though it should be noted that a word attested by a general century can be earlier or later than ones attested in a specific year. Because of the uncertainty of dates, I have divided the turkisms into two general chronological categories: 1) pre-eighteenth-century words; 2) eighteenth-century words.

### **2.2.2.1 Pre-eighteenth-century borrowings**

There are 120 turkisms with attestation dates before the eighteenth century. Of these, only twenty-seven have exact dates. Sixty-three are first attested in the two seventeenth-century *damaskini* included in this study. Because Stachowski depended heavily on manuscripts without specific dates, as mentioned above, many of his earliest attestations (both seventeenth- and eighteenth-century) consist of a general century rather than a specific date: e.g. *pazar* : 17th c. Of the seventy-one turkisms for which Stachowski gives attestation dates earlier than the eighteenth century, only five have specific dates:

---

<sup>54</sup> This number excludes *delia* and the 95 attestations from MSS779 and *Trojanski damaskin* which Stachowski also includes.

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>Stachowski date</b>
ciorape	1508
harac	1629
konak	1647
mahala	1508
subaša	1496–1507

Of Stachowski's pre-eighteenth-century specific earliest attestations, three are attested in the sixteenth century and two are attested in the seventeenth century.

#### **2.2.2.1.1 Scribal notes: earliest attestations**

Of the pre-eighteenth-century earliest attestations occurring in the scribal notes, almost all have specific dates. Only two are attested by a century rather than by a specific date:

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>Scribal note date</b>
amir	1544
aspri	1540
beg/bej	1479
čardak	1623
čauš	1634
čerabaša	1634
hadži	1643
janičar	16th c.
kadiluk	1634
kazalābaša	1638
lelja	1636
mahala	1639
musromanski	1488
muzuvir	16th c.
pascia	1636
sultan	1564
urumelieju	1573
vezirin/vizir/vezir	1643

Of these eighteen words, two are in the fifteenth century, six in the sixteenth century and ten in the seventeenth century. Though there are too few examples to be certain, the increase in the number of turkisms over the three centuries as seen in the scribal notes points to the overall increase of turkisms in Bulgarian as Turkish penetrated the

language more deeply: the almost doubling in the number of turkisms from the fifteenth to sixteenth century corresponds with the beginning of the Ottoman rule.

The scribal notes are more accurate than Stachowski regarding earliest attestation dates before the eighteenth century. In seven instances, the scribal notes offer a more specific or earlier date of pre-eighteenth-century turkisms than Stachowski:

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>Scribal notes</b>	<b>Stachowski</b>
beg/bej	1479	17th c.
čardak	1623	1662
čauš	1634	17th c.
kadiluk	1634	18th c.
pascia	1636	17th c.
sultan	1564	18th c.
vezirin/vizir/vezir	1643	17th c.

There are only two examples where Stachowski has an earlier attestation date than the scribal notes:

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>Scribal notes</b>	<b>Stachowski</b>
konak <sup>7</sup>	1789	1647
para	1770	1768

The example of *sultan* stands out because there is an approximate 200-year difference in the date of the scribal notes and the one that Stachowski cites. This disparity is most likely due to the material Stachowski analysed.<sup>55</sup>

### **2.2.2.2 Attestations in the seventeenth-century *damaskini***

The earliest attestations listed above all have dates earlier than those of the two seventeenth-century *damaskini*, which were written in the second half of the seventeenth century. Stachowski includes *Trojanski damaskin* in his chronological analysis of turkisms but not *Tixonravovski*. Nevertheless, he fails to note *bikrija* and *dušmani*; however, he offers a more specific date than *Trojanski* and *Tixonravovski*

---

<sup>55</sup> Given that the anthology of scribal notes had not yet been published in Stachowski's time, it is understandable that he does not include these notes in the body of literature that he assesses.

for *čardak*: 1662. Together the two *damaskini* contain 67 turkisms of which 64 are earliest attestations: this number includes the 11 turkisms whose earliest attestations Stachowski also attributes to the *Trojanski damaskin*.

### 2.2.2.3 Comparing Stachowski and scribal notes for pre-eighteenth and eighteenth-century turkisms

There are eighteen examples when Stachowski and the scribal notes overlap in their listings:

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>Scribal Notes</b>	<b>Stachowski</b>
ada	1789	17th c.
beg/bej	1479	17th c.
čardak	1623	1662
čauš	1634	17th c.
han	1789	1836
hanbar	1789	18th c.
kadiluk	1634	18th c.
kesia	1753	1794
konak'	1789	1647
odaja	1770	1779
pascia	1636	17th c.
pazar	1752	17th c.
pengere	1770	1779
rakia	1797	17th c.
ramazan	1789	1793
sultan	1564	18th c.
vezirin/vizir/vezir	1643	17th c.
zarar	1789	17th c.

Of these eighteen examples, Stachowski offers an earlier date for only five. For the other thirteen, the scribal notes provide either a more specific date or an earlier one. Once again, this information supports the importance of including scribal notes in an analysis of turkisms (2.2.1). While these notes certainly do not have enough examples on their own to draw reliable conclusions, they nevertheless can be a general chronological indicator for turkisms.

The turkisms that Stachowski and the scribal notes have in common are the most frequent turkisms in both Bulgarian and Bosnian. These words have relatively

late earliest attestations given how common they are: e.g. *han*: 1789. On the other hand, given the disparity between the earliest attestations in the scribal notes and Stachowski's work (e.g. *ada, kadiluk, konak, sultan*), it seems certain turkisms might have been present in the spoken language long before their earliest attestation date would suggest, especially given the dearth of literature written in the Bulgarian vernacular before the Early Modern period.

### 2.2.3 Types of pre-eighteenth-century borrowings

The pre-eighteenth-century borrowings are for the most part cultural loans:<sup>56</sup> e.g. *beg/bej, čauš, kazulbaša, pascia, sultan, vezir*. These words occur in the scribal notes and in at least one of the seventeenth-century *damaskini*. Nevertheless, there are also words that developed out of frequent exposure:<sup>57</sup> *akal, bikrija, bunar, kazandisa, singer, zarar*. These words all have Bulgarian counterparts: *umen, pijan, kladenec, zaslužavam, lanec, zlo*. Words that developed from frequent exposure might have been borrowed earlier than they are attested in the texts. If one extends this argument to the eighteenth-century vocabulary, it might be that many of those words were already present in spoken Bulgarian in the seventeenth century, even if not in the written language, especially given the limited early sources.

### 2.2.4 Parts of speech of pre-eighteenth century borrowings

Pre-eighteenth-century turkisms are predominantly nouns, though not exclusively: of the 120 words, five are verbs (*artissa, kazandissa, kondisa, kortolisa, uidurdissa*), six are adjectives (derived and non-derived): *akal, amir, arnautski, bascka, musromanski, sakat*, and five are adverbs: *angiak, barabar, bare, belkim, hemen* and the rest are nouns. Most of the nouns refer to Turkish officials (e.g. *beg, čauš, pascia, vezir*) and concrete everyday items (e.g. *bunar, rakia, singer, siunger*); there are a limited

---

<sup>56</sup> See footnote 6 in 2.1.6.

<sup>57</sup> See paragraph 3 in 2.1.6.

number of abstract nouns (e.g. *zarar*, *zevk*). While there are certainly more non-nouns borrowed from Turkish into Bulgarian in the eighteenth century than in the seventeenth century, the number of nouns is disproportionately greater. Therefore, there seems to be a general ratio regarding parts of speech in the increase of turkisms: more nouns : fewer non-nouns.

#### 2.2.4.1 Turkish suffixes in seventeenth-century borrowings

There is one seventeenth-century example of a productive Turkish suffix: *-lĭk*: *kurvalĭk* ‘whoring’ occurs in both the *Tixonravovski* and *Trojanski damaskini*. The example of *kurvalĭk* is the only example of a productive non-pleonastic<sup>58</sup> Turkish suffix in any of the Bulgarian texts included in this dissertation. According to Grannes (1996: 230) and Szymański (1968:146), the suffix *-lĭk* became a productive suffix in Bulgarian in the seventeenth century. To support his theory, Grannes states, ‘Les dictionnaires modernes les [productive suffixes]<sup>59</sup> caractérisent comme archaïques, dialectales ou comme appartenant à la langue populaire (prostonarodni dumi), ou à la rigueur à la langue parlée (razgovorni dumi)’ (Grannes, 1996: 232). He continues by listing hybrids found in various dictionaries; *kurvalĭk* is listed as dialectal. The term *kurvalĭk* is used several times interchangeably with *kurvovstvo* in the *Tixonravovski damaskin*:

- (9) Deveta e bžia zapovĕdĭ. štoto da ne skurvišĭ. | ni sĕs žensko, ni | sĕsĭ mĕžko ni sĕsĭ dobit||kĭ. zašto **kurvalĭkĭ** štoto e na mĕžko i na dobit||kĭ...tova bl(s)venii hr(s)tiane da | se | čjuvame o(t) | sĕky || grĕxĭ o(t) **kurvovstvo** ‘God’s ninth commandment is do not commit adultery. Not with a woman, not with a man and not with livestock. Because it is also adultery with a man and with livestock...let us blessed Christians stay clear of all sins related to adultery’ (*Tixonravovski damaskin*, 1971: 51)

<sup>58</sup> Pleonasm occurs ‘to make certain semantic classes of words more transparent by adding well known, productive suffixes with a well defined meaning’ (Kjetil Rå Hauge, personal communication), though the meaning of the suffix is already present in the word’s root.

<sup>59</sup> In this passage Grannes discusses other productive suffixes in addition to *-lĭk*.

Though this one example is insufficient to draw conclusions, it might suggest that seventeenth-century writers used *-lāk* and *-stvo* (5.4.3) interchangeably.

### **2.2.5 Difference in numbers between seventeenth- and eighteenth-century borrowings**

There is a dramatic increase in the number of turkisms from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century. Of the 628 turkisms, 508 have their earliest attestations in the eighteenth century. Without a doubt, turkisms became more common in the eighteenth century, though one might suggest that there was less of an increase in turkisms over the two centuries than the data suggests. As previously mentioned, I have included only two seventeenth-century *damaskini* in this study. These *damaskini*, especially sections dealing with hagiography, almost entirely lack turkisms but show evidence of Greek influence. However, certain homilies, especially those on sin, indicate greater Turkish influence.<sup>60</sup> One explanation for this difference, as I suggest in the introduction, is that the Orthodox education and the type of material written influenced a writer's choice of words: the more formal a text, the less Turkish influence. Fifteen turkisms are attested in these two *damaskini* only. While fifteen is not many, the number is significant given that these words do not appear again in the eighteenth-century texts nor are they in Stachowski or the scribal notes. One might suggest that if there were more examples of seventeenth-century informal writing by Bulgarians not schooled in the Orthodox Church, the number of turkisms attested in the seventeenth century would be greater.

### **2.2.6 Phonology and dating**

Because of the limited information about the manuscripts and the origin of the Turkish population in their area, I am hesitant to use phonological changes as a basis for dating. As mentioned in 1.6.3.2, the variation in orthography makes it difficult to

---

<sup>60</sup> For more on the semantic characteristics of turkisms, see 7.1.5.1 and 7.2.1.

determine the exact pronunciation of a word. There is, however, one phonological change characteristic of Bulgarian that might be used to date certain words: that is the metathesis of /r/ in diphthongs in liquid sonants. The change: *or/l* > *r/la*, *er/l* > *r/lě* is a change significantly older than the language of the texts analysed, characteristic of South Slavonic, as well as of Czech: e.g. *\*korva* > *krava*; *\*zolto* > *zlato*; *\*olni* > *lani*. There is one example where an Turkish loanword seems to have undergone a similar change by analogy: *arslan* > *raslan*, though at a later date. The term *raslan* is limited to Bulgarian, which also suggests that it is a later change. In the texts analysed, *raslan* is first attested in the seventeenth century as is *arslan* (Stachowski); however, one might suggest *raslan* was much earlier because there are many other Turkish loanwords – e.g. *artissa*, *artak* – that do not undergo this sound change. Similarly, there are other later non-Turkish loanwords (e.g. *armada*, *armija*) which also do not change. If one looks at a Bulgarian dictionary, all words beginning with <ar> are later loanwords (see Čakalov, et al., 1961).

### **2.2.7 Derivatives**

Because of the limited sources and the lack of an attestational dictionary, this section on the chronology of Bulgarian derivatives is far less extensive than that of the Bosnian derivatives. Thus, dating derivatives against their roots is only possible if the root is attested in the texts studied. Therefore, I only discuss derivatives whose roots are also attested.

### 2.2.7.1 Dating derivatives against their root

Eight roots have derivatives attested in the same year that they are first attested:

#### 1. Derivatives with the same attestation date as their root, +/- 10 years

Root	Date	Deriv.	Date
baht	1773	bahtal, bahtina	end of 18th c. 1779
bikrija	2nd 1/2 of 17th c.	bikrijski	2nd 1/2 of 17th c.
ferman	2nd 1/2 of 17th c.	fermanski	2nd 1/2 of 17th c.
hizmetkiarin	1773	hizmetkiarka	1773
kasap	1798	kasapbaša	1798
kat	1779	katlatski	1779
kaul	1779	kauliski	1779

These derivatives range in parts of speech. The roots developed out of both cultural necessity (e.g. *ferman*) and frequent exposure (e.g. *bikrija*). These examples suggest that once a noun was borrowed into Bulgarian, a derivative could be formed immediately from it.

#### 2. Derivatives attested less than half a century later than their root

Root	Year	Deriv.	Year
bairak	1753	bairaktarin	1779
dost	1773	dostasa	1779
hain	end of 18th c.	hainan	1773
harc	1753	harcia/harce	1779
piscman	1773	piscmanitse	1779
zenghin/ zinghin	1773	zenghinsto	1779
zor	1773	zorova	end of 18th c.

There are relatively few words whose roots are attested less than half a century earlier. Apart from *harc*, all of these words developed out of frequent exposure.

### 3. Derivatives attested more than a century later than their root

Root	Date	Deriv.	Year
akal	17th c.	akalen	end of 18th c.
beg/bej	1479	beghliscki, beiski	end of 18th c. 1798
ciorbagia	17th c.	ciorbagiaka	end of 18th c.
duscman	17th c.	duscmanka, duscmanski	1779 1773
haivan	17th c.	haivanski	1773
harač/harač	1629	haračiiski, poharči	1798, 1798
hozur/huzur	17th c.	huzurava	1779
kahar	17th c.	kaharuvase	1773
konak	17th c.	konakat/conakat	1773

These examples speak of the dearth of material analysed regarding turkisms: e.g. *haračiiski* and *poharči* are attested more than 150 years after their root, though the root is common. The same holds true for the derivatives of *beg*. If *zorova* is attested in the same year as *zor*, why would *huzurava* be first attested a century after its root? Given the few restrictions on loan nouns developing derivatives, one might suggest that *huzurava* could have developed as soon as *huzur* was borrowed into Bulgarian.

### 4. Derivatives attested earlier than their roots

Root	Year	Deriv.	Year
arnaut	1798	arnautski	17th c.
hizmet	1779	hizmetuva	1773
kasap	1798	kasapmiza	1773
mundar	1779	mundardissano	1773

Four derivatives are attested earlier than their roots. In some instances, the earliest attestation of the root is only a few years younger: e.g. *hizmet* (1779) : *hizmetuva* (1773). In others, there is a difference of a century or more: e.g. *arnaut* (1798): *arnautski* (17th c.). These examples suggest that the earliest attestation dates of roots are inaccurate: the roots must be present in the language before a derivative can develop. The examples also support the theory that once Turkish nouns were

borrowed into Bulgarian, there were limited if no restrictions regarding their development of derivatives: e.g. *hizmet* and *hizmetuva*.

### 2.3 Comparing earliest attestations of turkisms that occur in both Bosnian and Bulgarian

#### Bosnian and Bulgarian attestations less than a century apart

Turkish	Bosnian	Bos. Date	Bulgarian	Bulg. Date
ada	ada	1683	ada	17th c.
adet	adet	1730	adet/adit	1773
ama	ama	1674	ama	17th c.
aman	aman	1754	aman	1773
âyan	ajan(in)	1750	aenin'/ajanin	1773
baş	baš	1747	baš	1753
başka	baška	1683	bascka	17th c.
bayrak	bajrak/barjak	1689	bairak	1753
bayraktar	bajraktar/ barjaktar	1708	bairaktar(in)	1773
bayram	bajram	1759	bajram	end of 18th c.
bezirgân	bazardž/bazardan	1750	bazirghian	end of 18th c.
bile	bile	1785	bile	1779
bölük	buljuk	1755	bjuluk	1798
cevap	dževab/dževap	1750	gevap/gievab/gioap/ giovap	1773
çadır	čador	1755	ciadar	1779
çardak	čardak	1649	čardak	1623
çarşı	çaršija	1616	csiarscia/çaršija	17th c.
Çıft	čifut(in)	1611	cifut	17th c.
çuhadar	čohadar	1755	ciohodar	1779
çürümek	čurudisati	1785	ciurudissa	1773
direk	direk	1759	direk	1773
divan	divan	1613	divan	17th c.
dükkân	dućan	1683	diukkian/dükian	1779
düşman	dušman(in)	1631	doscman/duscman(in)	17th c.
duvar	duhar/duvar	1649	duvar	17th c.
elçi	elčija	1678	elcia	1773
fayda	fajda	1688	faida	17th c.
ferman	ferman	1688	ferman	17th c.
gaur	đaur/kaur	1728	giavur'(in)	1798
hak	hak	1655	hak	17th c.
halk	alk/halk	1785	halk	1773
han	han	1750	han	1753
haraç + verbal suffix	haraçiti	1730	harače	1779

hatır	hatir/hatur	1782	hatar	1773
hekim	hećim	1785	heki(e)m	1773
hırsız	hrsuz	1765	ursuz	1779
hizmet	izmet/hizmet	1755	hizmet	1779
hudut	hudut	1750	hudut	1773
ikindi	ićindija	1785	ikindia	1773
inat	inat	1785	inat	1779
izlal	izlal	1785	izlal	1773
kail	kailj	1597	kail	17th c.
kamış	kamiš	1759	kamisc	1779
kapı	kapija	1759	kapia	1779
kefil	ćefil	1785	kefil	1754
kitap	ćitab	1755	kitab	1793
komşuluk	komšiluk	1611	komsuluk	17th c.
lale	lala	1785	lale	end of 18th c.
mahalle	mahala	1475	mahala	1508
menzil	menzil	1785	manzil	1798
mısırlı	misirlija	1750	misirlia	1779
ocak	odžak	1750	ociak	1779
oda	oda(ja)	1798	odaja	1770
ordu	ordija	1756	ordia	1779
orta	orta	1785	ourta	1779
paralamak	paralaisati	1785	paraladissova	1779
parı	para	1779	pari	1768
paşalı	pašalija	1785	pasciala	1779
perde	perde	1730	perde	1773
peşkir	peškir	1704	pesckir	1779
(po)haraç + verbal forms	poharaćiti	1704	poharća	1798
pusat	pusat	1785	pusat	1779
sabah	sabah	1785	sabuh	1779
sahib	sa(h)ib	1785	saib	1773
senet	senet	1785	sened	1779
sakat	sakat	1707	sakat	17th c.
sicil	sidžil	1750	sidžil	1753
sokak	sokak	1704	sokak/socak	1785
subaşı	subaša	1415	subaša	1496– 1597
sünger	sunder	1704	siungher	1773
sürgün	surgun	1750	siurghium	1779
şaşkın	šaškin	1785	sciasckan	1779
şehit	šehit	1750	scedhad/scehat(in)	1773
taş	taš	1785	tasc	1779
tava	tava	1755	tava	end of 18th c.
teslim	teslim	1785	teslim	1773
top	top	1680	top	1779

u + haps + verbal ending	uavstiti/uapstiti	1785	uhape/uhapi	end of 18th c.
ulûfe	ulefa	1750	ulefe	1779
vilayet	vilajet	1611	vegliat/vilaet/viljat	17th c.
yabancı	jabandžija	1785	iabangia/jabangia/jabangie	1779
yalın	jalan	1785	jalan	1785
yapı	japia	1750	japia	1773
yenici	janičar	1567	janičar	16th c.
zahire	za(h)ira	1750	zahire	1779
zor	zor	1785	zor	1773

Of the 146 turkisms that Bosnian and Bulgarian have in common, 86 have their earliest attestations within a century of each other. Therefore, over half of the words in common have the same century for their earliest attestation date.<sup>61</sup>

#### **Bosnian turkisms attested a century or more earlier than the Bulgarian counterparts**

<b>Turkish</b>	<b>Bosnian</b>	<b>Bos. date</b>	<b>Bulgarian</b>	<b>Bulg. date</b>
ambar	(h)ambar	1611	ambar	1779
aga	aga	1582	aga	17th c.
arnavut	arnaut	1649– 1651	arnaut	end of 18th c.
barem	barem	1649	barem	1753
bari	bari	first half of 16th c.	bara	17th c.
başa	baša	1493	baša	17th c.
bunar	bunar	1577	bonar/bunar	1753
çavuş	čauš	1484	čauš	1634
çifit +ski	čifutski	1611	cifutski	1773
çoban	čoban	17th c.	cioban/ciuban	1779
defter	tefter/tefter	1631	tefter	1757
deli	delija	16th c.	delia	1765
efendi	efendija	1606	efendia	end of 18th c.
emir	emir	16th c.	emir	17th c.
gurus	groš	1608	groš	1798
hazna	hazna	1512	hazna	17th c.
kadi	kadija	1396	kadi	17th c.
kâhya	čehaja	1557	kehaja	1751
kapıcı	kapidžija	17th c.	kapugia	1779
komşu	komšija	1611	komšia/comscia/komscia	1753
kule	kula	16th c.	kula/cula	17th c.

<sup>61</sup> For more on the difference of turkisms from language to language, see 6.7.8.

meşdan	megdan/mejdan/majdan	1643	meghdan/mighdan	1779
mısır	misir	17th c.	misir	1779
odabaşı	odobaša	1619	odobaša	1779
otak	ortak	1511	ortak	1798
paşalık	paşaluk	1649	pascialik/pascialak	1773
pazar	pazar	16th c.	pazar	17th c.
rakı	rakija	15th–16th c.	rakia	17th c.
ramazan	ramazan/Ramadan	1491	ramazan	1789
sahan	sa(h)an	1637	sahan	end of 18th c.
saat	sahat	1609	sahat	1773
seymen	sejmen	1689	seimen	1773
silâhtar	silivatar/siladar/silihtar	1489	silihtar	17th c.
sipahi	spahija	16th c.	spahija	17th c.
sümbül	zumbul	1683	zimbul	end of 18th c.
tamam	taman	1611	tamam	1779
tepsi	tepsija	1441	tepsija	17th c.
tor	torba	1649	torba	1798
ulak	ulak	1637	ulak	1753
vekil	veçil	1488	vekil	1779
yürüyüş	juriš	1631	juruusc	1779
zanat	zanat	16th c.	zanajat	17th c.
zincer	sindžir	1489	singer/zingir	17th c.

**Bulgarian attestation is earlier by a century or more than the Bosnian**

Turkish	Bosnian	Bos. date	Bulgarian	Bulg. date
bahçe	bašta	1755	bahcia	17th c.
beraber	barabar/parabar	1755	barabar/borabar	17th c.
belki(m)	belćim	1785	belki(m)	17th c.
bey	beg	1584	beg/bej	1479
bütün	butum	1730	bjutjun	17th c.
duşman + ski	duşmanski	1750	duscanski	17th c.
haber	haber	1759	habar/haber	17th c.
hem...hem	(h)em...((h)em)	1766	hem...(hem)	17th c.
ibrik	ibrik	1750	ibrik	17th c.
kadir	kadar/kader/kadar	1781	kadar	17th c.
keseci	kesedžija	1785	kesigia	17th c.
konak	konak	1730	konak	17th c.
mısır+ski	misirski	1785	misirski	17th c.
râya	raja	1759	raja	17th c.
rakı	rakija	15th–16th c.	rakia	17th c.
uydurmak	ujdurisati	1785	ujdurdisa	17th c.

Fifty-nine turkisms have earliest attestation dates with a difference greater than a century. Of those 59 turkisms 43 are earlier in Bosnian and 16 are earlier in

Bulgarian. This difference is expected given how much more material is available in Bosnian: in Bosnian, *čifutski* is first attested in 1611 (Divković) while in Bulgarian *čifutski* is not attested until 1773. It is unlikely the Bulgarian derivative developed more than one hundred years after the root (17th c.) was borrowed into Bulgarian, especially given that this root and derivative are attested the same year in Bosnian (as are many others; see 2.1.9). Similarly, it seems unlikely that *ramazan* did not come into Bulgarian until 1789, when it is first attested in Bosnian in 1491;<sup>62</sup> it is more likely that this word was not present in earlier writings, which tended to be Christian, or that texts containing this word have yet to be analysed.

In some cases when the Bulgarian term is attested earlier, it seems that the results might be due to lack of material in Bosnian as well: e.g. *haber* is first attested in seventeenth century in Bulgarian and in 1759 in Bosnian. Given how common this word is in both Bosnian and Bulgarian texts, it is surprising that it would be approximately 100 years older in Bulgarian than in Bosnian. On the other hand, despite many of the words having relatively close attestation dates, given the number of the words limited to one language, one must allow for and expect different attestation dates from language to language. It is possible that the difference in dates speaks of how restrictive each language was regarding word integration. For example, Bulgarian has 54 verbs with Turkish verbal roots while Bosnian has only 14. Of the verbs in common, *uydurmak* is attested a century earlier in Bulgarian and *çürümek*, a decade earlier. While I can only speculate on the basis of so few examples, because it seems eighteenth-century Bulgarian was less restrictive regarding the borrowing of verbs than Bosnian, it is possible that these dates are relatively accurate. Similarly, it

---

<sup>62</sup> While the larger Muslim population in Bosnian might explain this difference in dates, it seems odd that Bulgarians were neither aware of nor discussed the religious practices of their rulers until the eighteenth century.

seems eighteenth-century Bosnian was more likely to integrate verbs with nominal roots into its aspectual patterns through verbal prefixes. The two prefixed verbs that occur in both Bosnian and Bulgarian are:

<b>Turkish</b>	<b>Bosnian</b>	<b>Bos. Dat.</b>	<b>Bulgarian</b>	<b>Bulg. Date</b>
(po)haraç + verbal forms	poharačiti	1704	poharča	1798
u+haps + verbal ending	uapstiti/uavstiti	1785	uhape/uhapi	end of 18th c.

As with the respective verbs stemming from *çürümek* and *uydurmak*, one pair has relatively similar attestation dates while the other has dates almost a century apart. One needs to compare other prefixed verbs from the eighteenth century in Bulgarian and Bosnian to see if Bosnian, which has more examples, also adapted their Turkish roots at an earlier date. Given that these nominal roots do not occur in Bulgarian – suggesting the verbs might have been borrowed via Bosnian (4.2.1.4) – this analysis cannot be done for the two examples.

## 2.4 Conclusion

One is only able to posit a general time frame for when turkisms came into Bosnian and Bulgarian on the basis of the texts analysed. Since there is a relatively small body of literature analysed for both Bosnian and Bulgarian, it is certainly possible that the turkisms in this dissertation were used at an earlier date than their first attestations presented here; similarly, other common turkisms (e.g. *jorgan* < *yorgan* ‘duvet’) are not at all attested because the authors of the texts do not address topics in which they would occur. Because there is more Bosnian material, namely RHSJ, one can be more certain when turkisms were first used. No matter how much written work is assessed, the exact amount of historical Turkish penetration into the spoken language is unknown.

Both languages show dramatic increase in the number of turkisms from the seventeenth century to the eighteenth century. While Turkish certainly had become

more present in these two South Slavonic languages, this increase is in part due to the type of material written. If seventeenth-century chronicles could be included in this study, the results might be less striking. The variation in the use of turkisms is best seen in the *Tixonravovski damaskin*. If one looks at the text on the birth of the Virgin Mary (Demina, II: 59–63) and the last three pieces in this *damaskin*, together making up 40 pages, there are no turkisms; therefore, it would seem that turkisms had not penetrated into seventeenth-century Bulgarian. On the other hand, if one looks at the life of Saint George (Demina, II: 307–325), and the homily on drunkenness (Demina, II: 227–228) – only twenty pages – there are 23 turkisms, words that are both culturally necessary and developed out of frequent exposure. Both of these writings are more colloquial and less formal than the piece on the Virgin Mary or other saints. While one might expect few turkisms in the life of Saint George because it is hagiography, it was more a local legend than a religious text, in contrast to the other lives of the saints, which explains the turkisms.

The disparity in turkisms holds true as well when comparing the eighteenth-century Bosnian religious sources to the chronicles. While the religious sources have some turkisms, they are very limited in number; the chronicles, on the other hand, have passages that have heavy Turkish influence:

- (10) Mi, videći, sadašnja vrimena, gdi niti služe **seneti**, ni **šaiti**, niti ima pravde nikakve, ni u Sarajevu, ni u Travniku, već **aman** trošak *bez* mjere (a da ima sud, ne bi se to činilo, ni **museveda išleisala**), rekoh videći se mi tako stisnuti, i da ne ide lemozina priko vrata, nađosmo svikolici kojih se tiče **makul** da se **davudžija**, rečeni Ivan, smijeri, a da mu dademo još **jaspri**.  
 ‘[Despite] seeing our present times, where documents and witnesses have no purpose, where there are no rights in Sarajevo or in Travnik; where there are instead crazy limitless expenditures (if there were a court, this would not happen, nor would the document be implemented), I said, [despite] seeing how pressed we are and that alms do not cross our threshold, all we who are involved consider it fair that the plaintiff, the mentioned Ivan, shall be placated, and we will give him more *jaspri*.’  
 (Benić: 286)

Nevertheless, the increase in the number of turkisms from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century was significant regardless of the type of material. For Bulgarian, all the sources included in this study are religious, apart from Sofronij's text. Only three turkisms occur in his text alone. If one omits these words, there is still a 508-turkism increase from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century in Bulgarian.

### 3.0 Chapter Three: Morphology of Nouns

#### 3.1 Bosnian Turkish loan nouns

Turkish nouns do not have gender. When they became loanwords in Bosnian, they had to be fitted into native declensional paradigms and therefore acquired the associated genders. What declension and gender an Turkish loan noun was given depended both on the phonological structure of its final syllable and to a limited extent on whether there was already an extant synonym for it in Bosnian.

##### 3.1.1 Loan nouns ending in a vowel

Many Turkish loan nouns end in *-ija* in Bosnian. In Turkish, most of these nouns end in /ɪ/, /i/, /u/, /ü/. Because none of these final vowels existed in the nominative singular in a native declension in Bosnian, the words underwent morphological changes in Bosnian in order for these words originally ending in /ɪ/, /i/, /u/ or /ü/ to decline. The already existing suffix *-ija* (e.g. *sudija* ‘judge’) was added to these words, making them feminine if they did not denote masculine individuals. These nouns are in the a-declensional paradigm: e.g. *çarşı* > *çaršija*; *çivi* > *čivija*; *cami* > *džamija*; *cemaatli* > *džematlija*; *hacı* > *hadžija*; *kadı* > *kadija*. Regardless of which of the four vowels was in final position in the Turkish word, the suffix *-ija* occurs in Bosnian: compare the nouns above with: *avlu* > *avlija*; *köprü* > *čuprija*. When these sounds occurred in word-final position – often in synharmonic suffixes (e.g. *-CI*) – in Turkish, they were usually realised as /ija/ in Bosnian.

##### 3.1.1.1 Turkish cases and *-ija*

Though the existing *-ija* suffix in Bosnian provided a productive model, it should be noted that the different realisations of the Turkish accusative pattern *-(y)İ* and dative case *-(y)E* are phonetically more or less similar to *-ija*. In Turkish, when a noun ends

in a vowel, the suffix takes the buffer *-y-*, which phonetically is equivalent to Slavonic /j/: *oda*<sub>NOM</sub> ‘room’; *oda* + *ı* = *odayı*<sub>ACC</sub>; *oda* + *a* = *odaya*<sub>DAT</sub>. Both the accusative and dative cases in Turkish words ending in an unrounded back vowel might have been heard as [a] by non-native Turkish speakers. Also, the raising of /a/ to /ı/ or even /i/ is common Turkish dialects; the dative form *odiya* even occurs in Turkish dialects. Therefore, one might argue that these endings influenced the productivity of *-ija*. Words that developed the *-ija* suffix where final /İ/ did not originally exist might support this hypothesis: e.g. *odaja* < *oda*. While *odaja* is not attested in the texts studied, it is listed in RHSJ. Nevertheless, it seems if Turkish cases had played a role in the development of *-ija* as a productive suffix in Turkish loan nouns, there would be more examples of /a/ or /e/ final nouns taking *-ija*: *\*perdija* < *perde*, *\*agaja* < *aga*.

### 3.1.1.2 /i/ does not become *-ija*

Two nouns ending in *-i* do not take the suffix *-ija* in Bosnian: e.g. *ARġāzī* > *Tgazi* > *BOgazi*. One might argue that the reason this noun did not develop the *-ija* suffix in Bosnian is because it had not become integrated into Turkish vowel harmony. If *ARġāzī* > *Tgazi* > *BOgazi* is compared to other nouns originating from Arabic such as *ARqādī* > *Tkadı* > *BOkadija*, these other originally Arabic words changed phonetically, allowing for vowel harmony of /İ/ ([ı], [i], [u], [ü]), while *gazi* did not: /ı/ normally follows /a/ while in the case of *gazi*, /i/ follows /a/. There are, however, other nouns that do take the *-ija* suffix in Bosnian and did not undergo changes to follow synharmonic rules when they became integrated from Arabic into Turkish: *ARġāmi* > *Tcami* > *BOdžamija*, which disproves this argument. Unfortunately, *gazi* appears only once and only in Benić’s chronicle, which makes it difficult to determine whether semantics influenced its development:

- (11) [...] veliki **gazi** Ali-paša, koji smide udarit na svu cesarovu vojsku  
‘[...] the great gazi Ali-pasha, who dared to attack the entire imperial  
army’ (Benić: 176)

In this sentence, *gazi* is a title, which means it did not decline in Turkish. This still does not explain why *gazi* does not take *-ija*, as *kadija* or *hadžija* (which are also titles) do in Bosnian. It is possible that in the eighteenth century, *gazi* was used only as a title while both *kadija* and *hadžija* were used as nouns. RHSJ lists Vuk as the first attestation for *gazija*, which suggests it might have been a later development. However, as explained in 2.1, by no means can RHSJ act as a reliable source of earliest attestations.

The second example of a noun ending in *-Ī* that does not take the *-ija* suffix in Bosnian is *yeniçeri* > *janjiçar*. The suffix *-ar* exists in Turkish but a similar suffix – *-arjĭ*, borrowed via Germanic (e.g. *bukariĭ* (OCS) < *bōkareis* (Gothic)) taken from Latin *-ārius* (Vaillant, 1958: 219–220) – was also productive in Slavonic languages. The word *yeniçeri* most likely lost its final *-i* by analogy to nouns with the *-ar* ending in Bosnian: e.g. *stražar* ‘guard’. It should be noted that, at least in the texts analysed, *\*janjičerija* is not attested.

### 3.1.1.3 Nominal suffix *čija/džija* < *-CĪ*

Within the category of nouns taking the *-ija* suffix, there is a group with the suffix *-čija/džija* stemming from the Turkish suffix *-CĪ*, which is an agentive suffix. This suffix had already become productive in South Slavonic languages through Turkic loanwords (e.g. *ocs künigŭčiji*<sup>63</sup> < *Old Turkic \*kūinigçi* ‘book-keeper’) (Vasmer, 1964: II: 263). These nouns are masculine but follow the a-stem declension, which is dominated by feminine nouns. The Bosnian *-čija/džija* suffix created a significant

---

<sup>63</sup> This word is attested in *Codex Suprasliensis*.

category of terms for officers and tradesmen declining as feminine nouns but masculine in gender: *yasakçı* > *jasakčija*; *hacı* > *hadžija*; *pabucu* > *papudžija*.

#### 3.1.1.4 Turkish nouns ending in /a/

Most Turkish nouns ending in /a/ did not undergo changes in their final syllable. These nouns were for the most part feminine and followed the a-stem declension as expected: e.g. *orta* > *orta*; *râya* > *raja*; *sofra* > *sofra/sopra*. If a noun ended in /a/ and referred to a male human being, this noun declined in the a-paradigm, but was masculine, like nouns that took the *-čija/džija* suffix: e.g. *ağa* > *aga*; *paša* > *paša*.

Turkish masculine loan nouns ending in /a/ mainly occur in the chronicles; only the words *haračija*, *paša* and *muštulukčija* are present in Lastrić's *Testimonium bilabium*, and *keseđžija* and *komšija* in his *Dvostruk Nediglnik*; the term *harambaša* occurs once in Radnić's *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye*; and *komšija* occurs once in Divković's *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski*; no such nouns are attested in the other religious texts. The noun *paša* is used in the accusative singular and declines in the a-stem declension; the nouns *komšija* and *keseđžija* both occur in the nominative singular. The term *muštulukčija* is not common: it is glossed in the first example in which it appears, referring to the Angel Gabriel when he appears to the Virgin Mary:

- (12) [...] ottishao radoftan glasnik k'B.DM iliti **mushtulukčia**  
'[...] the joyful messenger or the *muštulukčija* went off to the Blessed Virgin Mary' (Lastrić, 1755: 185)

This noun also occurs in the genitive feminine singular and feminine nominative plural to describe soldiers and angels:

- (13) Vojnici pak od gnegove vojske... ottishli prid njim, kako **mushtulukčie**  
'Even the soldiers of his army went before him as bearers of good news'  
(Lastrić, 1755: 223)

### 3.1.1.5 Gender distinction in *-a* nouns

There is a significant enough number of these *-a* nouns paired with adjectives in the chronicles to exemplify what gender agreement Turkish masculine loan nouns ending in /a/ take. Below are examples from both Lašvanin's and Benić's chronicles, as well as the one example from Radnić, that show nouns ending in /a/ that denote male individuals. In these examples gender distinction is unambiguous because the noun is in a construction with a declining adjective or participle. When these nouns are in the singular, the associated adjectives or past participles are masculine, while when the nouns are in the plural, their adjectives are feminine (14a. i. and ii.), as expected.

(14) a. **Lašvanin:**

i. [...] *dvi*<sub>F,PL</sub> **age**

'[...] two noblemen' (226)

ii. [...] *bosanske*<sub>F,PL</sub> **bešlije**

'[...] Bosnian paid cavalry men' (208)

iii. [...] *ufati* **delibaša** Skrobu, *žestokog*<sub>M,SG</sub> **bašu** (228)

'[...] the guard caught Skroba, the cruel nobleman' (228)

iv. [...] *svoga*<sub>M,SG</sub> *čaušlar-***čehaju** (209)

'[...] his assistant messenger' (209)

v. [...] *od...dviiju*<sub>F,PL</sub> **kadija** i *jednog*<sub>M,SG</sub> *ajana* (227)

'[...] two judges and one nobleman' (227)

vi. [...] *tri* *arnautske*<sub>F,PL</sub> **paše** (213)

'[...] three Armenian pashas' (213)

vii. [...] *novoga*<sub>M,SG</sub> **paše** (232)

'[...] of the new pasha' (232)

b. **Benić:**

i. [...] *htijahu* Omer-**bašu** *našega*<sub>M,SG</sub>

'[...] they wanted our Omer-basha' (260)

ii. [...] *kajmankan* *novog*<sub>M,SG</sub> **paše**

'[...] the new pasha's guard' (230)

iii. [...] *uzimav* **kadije** *travanjskoga*<sub>M,SG</sub> (262)

'[...] having taken the Travnik judge' (262)

iv. ‘muselimluk novoga<sub>M.SG</sub> paše (200)  
‘[...] *muselimluk* of the new pasha’ (200)

c. **Radnić:**

**Harambašca** Sixara, bivšci popio<sub>M.SG</sub> mliko slatko  
‘The *harambaša* Sižara, the former one, drank sweet milk’ (1683a: 330)

Benić is consistent, declining masculine nouns in the a-declensional paradigm. Lašvanin has one unusual example: *dviju kadija*. The numeral *dviju* is genitive dual<sup>64</sup> and it is unclear what case *kadija* is. When a noun is governed by the numeral ‘two’ in Bosnian, it is in the genitive singular. In accordance with the rules governing a-stem masculine nouns, the genitive singular would be *\*kadije*. If the noun were in the genitive dual, it would be *\*kadiju*. While this example might attest the relatively recent adoption of this word into Bosnian, it is equally likely that it attests the writer’s confusion regarding the dual. Given that *kadija* is first attested in 1396, one might suggest the latter is more likely.

### 3.1.1.6 Turkish nouns ending in /e/

Many Turkish nouns ending in /e/ became feminine, their final vowel changing to /a/ when they came into Bosnian, though final /e/ is a possible final vowel native to Bosnian. There are twenty-two such examples in the Franciscan texts analysed: *baḥçe* > *bašta*; *çifithane* > *čifutana*; *daulhane* > *dabulhana*; *cebhane* > *džebana*; *geçirme* > *dečerma*; *hazne* > *hazna*; *kahve* > *kava*; *kese* > *kesa*; *lüle* > *lula*; *malikâne* > *malićana*; *meyhane* > *mejhana*; *mehkeme* > *meščema*; *minare* > *munara*; *müsevedde* > *museveda*; *iskele* > *skela*; *tezkere* > *teskera*; *teftişleme* > *teftište*; *hücre* > *udžera*; *ulûfe* > *ulefa*; *zahire* > *zaira*; *zaptiye* > *zapčija*. Schmaus (1961–1962: 306) reasons that a significant number of Turkish nouns ending in /e/ went to /a/ because Bosnian does not have many soft-stem neuter nouns. However, Bosnian has a class of

---

<sup>64</sup> The dual as a form had been lost in BCS by the sixteenth century (Brozović, 1988; Popović, 1960). Therefore, Lašvanin is most likely making an attempt to be conservative in his use of numerals.

neuter nouns denoting the young of animals (e.g. *tele* ‘calf’), which would allow the final Turkish /e/ to be maintained as a neuter suffix. Nevertheless, -e still did not develop as a productive ending for most turkisms.<sup>65</sup>

### 3.1.1.6.1 Turkish /e/ > -e

There are five examples of Turkish loan nouns ending in /e/ in the texts studied: *đubre*, *hinle*, *perde*, *turbe* and *šiše*. These nouns, along with others (e.g. *ćebe* ‘blanket’, *dugme* ‘button’),<sup>66</sup> did not become feminine. Such words weaken Schmaus’s theory of infrequency for the many Turkish nouns whose final /e/ changes to /a/: Bosnian nouns ending in /e/ exist, as do Turkish loanwords, some of which are frequently used in everyday language (e.g. *ćebe*, *dugme*, *đubre*, *šiše*, *turbe*).

Apart from *inle/hinle* < *hile*, the four other nouns ending in -e did not undergo morphophonological changes when borrowed into Bosnian. The /n/ in *inle/hinle* might have developed because it is a homorganic consonant to /l/.

### 3.1.1.7 Final Turkish vowel > consonant

Though far less common, there are Turkish loan nouns that originally ended in a vowel, lost it in Bosnian and joined the masculine nominal declension (final consonant, Slavonic o-stem). There are three such nouns in the texts: *buruntu* > *burnut*; *halife* > *kalif*; *pencere* > *pendžer*. The term *pendžer* can be explained by semantic parallelism: *pendžer* : *prozor* ‘window’.

With the loss of its final /u/ and the metathesis of its penultimate /n/ and /u/, *burnut* fits into a Bosnian declensional pattern. Nevertheless, it is unusual that this noun joined the masculine declensional pattern rather than simply having the final /u/ change to -ija as is exemplified in other turkisms: e.g. *avlu* > *avlija*; *pusu* > *busija*;

---

<sup>65</sup> See 3.1.1.6.1 for loanwords that maintained final /e/ and took the declension denoting the young of animals.

<sup>66</sup> These nouns are common in Bosnian but are not attested in the texts analysed.

*köprü* > *ćuprija*; *komşu* > *komšija*. It is possible that the masculine gender of *duhan* influenced *buruntu* > *burnut*, though this seems unlikely given that *duhan* is also an Turkish loanword and semantically different from *burnut*. Or, it may be due to avoidance of a homonym collision with *buruntija*, meaning ‘a written order given by a pasha’ from *buyrultu*.

Although Turkish e-final nouns usually have their final /e/ change to /a/, *ᵀhalife* loses its /e/ and becomes masculine in Bosnian: *kalif*,<sup>67</sup> most likely, by analogy to other nouns (native and loan) denoting persons of male gender, e.g. *ajan*, *hekim*, *trgovac* ‘merchant’.

### 3.1.2 Turkish nouns ending in consonants

Turkish nouns that ended in a consonant did not have to undergo alterations since the masculine o-declensional paradigm in Bosnian consists of nouns ending in consonants. These loan nouns could fall under the masculine nominal declension: *çardak* > *čardak*; *düşman* > *dušman*; *emin* > *emin*; *emir* > *emir*; *peşkeş* > *peškeš*. However, if a noun ended in a consonant and denoted a female, an *-a* ending was added to its original consonantal Turkish ending so it would decline in the mainly feminine a-declensional paradigm: e.g. *hanım* > *hanuma* (Schmaus, 1961–1962: 302). No such words occur in the Franciscan texts that I analyse.

#### 3.1.2.1 Turkish final consonant + *-a*

A few words not denoting women that end in a consonant in Turkish developed an *-a* ending and became feminine in Bosnian. There are three such examples in these seventeenth- and eighteenth-century texts: *čelenka* < *çelenk*; *kaşika* < *kaşık*; *mamuza* < *mahmuz*. In some cases, these words take the *-a* ending and are rendered feminine because their Bosnian counterpart was feminine (Schmaus, 1961–1962: 302): *kaşika*:

---

<sup>67</sup> Both *kalif* and *kalifa* are listed in dictionaries of turkisms, but only *kalif* occurs in the texts analysed.

*žlica* ‘spoon’; *mamuza: ostruga* ‘spur’.<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, *čelenka* does not have Bosnian synonyms. Words that might overlap in meaning with *čelenka* are all masculine or neuter in Bosnian: e.g. *pero* ‘feather’, *nakit* ‘ornament’, *ukras* ‘decoration’. The term *čelenka* obviously did not become feminine by analogy to these words. In Bosnian the consonant cluster /nk/ is unacceptable in final position but it is phonologically acceptable internally; therefore, to resolve this cluster, a final /a/ was added to the word, which rendered the word feminine. A fleeting /a/ could also have been a solution, as it was for some Turkish loanwords (*čošak* < *köşk(e)*).

A similar example of Turkish noun ending in a consonant that develops a final /a/ in Bosnian is *levend* > *leventa*:

- (15) Al’ i toga **leventu**...isikoše pašalije  
 ‘But the pasha’s men cut up that brave lad as well’ (Benić: 237)

This development most likely occurred to avoid the final consonantal cluster /nt/.

The nouns *čakšire*, *kalčine*, *papuče*, *mestve* do not occur in their singular forms in the texts analysed; their singular forms end in /a/ and are feminine, but they originate from Turkish nouns ending in consonants: *çakşır*, *kalçın*, *mest*, *pabuç*. Schmaus suggests that words that denote objects that come in pairs (*čakšire*, *kalčine*, *mestve*, *papuče*) become feminine, since their native Slavonic synonyms or earlier loans occur only in the feminine plural (e.g. *čakšire* : *hlače* ‘trousers’). His theory holds true for these four examples, as well as for other Turkish loanwords which are not found in the Franciscan texts, e.g.  ${}_{\text{T}}\text{makas}_{\text{SG}} > {}_{\text{BO}}\text{makaze}_{\text{PL}}$  :  $\text{nožice}_{\text{PL}}$ ,  $\text{škare}_{\text{PL}}$  ‘scissors’;  ${}_{\text{T}}\text{çorab}_{\text{SG}} > {}_{\text{BO}}\text{čarape}_{\text{PL}}$  ( $\text{čarapa}_{\text{SG}}$ ):  $\text{cipele}_{\text{PL}}$  ‘shoes’ (Schmaus, 1961–1962:

---

<sup>68</sup> Given that spurs usually come in pairs, it is equally likely that *mahmuz* became *mahmuza* because of its tendency to occur in pairs (See following paragraph).

304). These words became feminine through semantic parallelism when borrowed into Bosnian.

The word *burija* < *buhur* is the only example where the *-ija* suffix is productive in an Turkish word ending in a consonant:

- (16) [...] evo ti ga udari ona žestokoga dropa **burija** u glavu  
‘[...] and the smells of that strong pomace went straight to his head’ (239)

In this context *burija* is in its genitive plural form. The word *\*buhur* would have been a phonologically and grammatically acceptable form in Bosnian. It seems most likely that by this time, *-ija* had become a productive suffix for nouns borrowed from Turkish: *buhur* is reduced to *bur-* and given the productive suffix *-ija* in Bosnian.

### 3.1.3 Indeterminate gender

In Benić’s chronicle there is one example of a noun that ends in a consonant in Turkish but can occur as either a feminine or a masculine noun in Bosnian: *manjgura/mangar* < *mangır* :

- (17) [...] počēše kovat **manjgure**, jerbo se k Carigradu proč ne mogaše...a za **manjugure** – po dvanaest hiljada.  
‘[...] they began to coin *manjgure* because they could not get as far as Constantinople...And the *manjugure* [were worth] 12000 [*jaspri*].’ (Benić: 53)

Because *manjgure* is in the accusative plural the only two times it is attested in the text, it is not possible from these examples alone to infer the gender of the word. However, according to reference sources consulted for this dissertation, the form *manjgura* is always feminine, while *mangar* is masculine. Monetary terms occur both in the feminine and the masculine, on a ratio of three to one in the Franciscan texts: *jaspra*, *arslanija*, *finduklija*, *groš*. It might be that these two forms are the result of semantic parallelism to different monetary terms.

The texts also have one example of an Turkish noun ending in a consonant that can be either masculine or neuter in Bosnian: the word *čengel/čengele* < *çengel* declines as a masculine noun when ending in /l/ and as a neuter noun when ending in /e/. The word occurs in Lašvanin's chronicle:

- (18) Ufatiše Nimci dva izdajnika, koji idahu užeći aršenal aliti oružnicu. I baciše ih na **čengele**; jedan umri do dva dni a drugi osmi dan  
 'The Germans caught two traitors who were going to set fire to the arsenal or weapon-store. They [the Germans] threw them [the traitors] onto gaffs; one died within two days and the other, on the eighth day' (Lašvanin: 180)

In this example, *čengele* could either be masculine plural accusative or neuter singular accusative. Because more than one person is being tortured on a gaff, and a gaff usually hangs only one animal, I suspect that this example is in the masculine plural accusative. Phonetically, one would expect *čengel* from *çengel*.

### 3.1.4 Additional vowels

In Benić's and Lašvanin's chronicles sometimes a vowel and/or consonant is added to a turkism: e.g. *kürk* > *ćurak/ćurah*; *pirinç* > *pirinač*. In the examples of *ćurak/ćurah* and *pirinač* the final /a/ was probably added in order for the words to break up word-final consonant clusters. These words fall into the Slavonic declensional paradigm that has final fleeting /a/ + /k/ (or /c/): e.g. *golubak*<sub>NOM.SG.</sub>; *golupka*<sub>GEN.SG.</sub>, *golubaka*<sub>GEN.SG.</sub> 'pigeon'. While both *\*kürk* and *\*pirinč* would fit into the Slavonic o-stem declension, they most likely developed the endings *-ak* and *-ač* respectively by analogy to words ending in *-ak* and *-ač*: *mačak* 'tomcat', *kovač* 'blacksmith'.

In other examples, missing or added vowels or consonants are most likely the result of learning Turkish by ear. Škaljić lists *šindara*, *šindra*, *šindara*, *šimla*, and *šimlja* as possible spellings for Benić's *šimlje*. According to Škaljić (1989), Blau suggests that the original word in Turkish, *şendere*, is German – *Schindel* – and was

borrowed into Turkish and then into Bosnian (Škaljić, 1989: 589). These multiple versions are most likely the result of Turkish and Bosnian dialectal treatments.

### 3.1.5 Turkish suffixes in nouns

Turkish suffixes borrowed into Bosnian include: *čija/-džija* < *-Cİ*, *-um* < *-İm*, *-li* < *-lİ*, *-ler* < *-lEr*, *-luk* < *-lİk*. Apart from *-lİ*, all of these suffixes are nominal. The suffix *-lİ* is both nominal and adjectival.

#### 3.1.5.1 Non-productive suffixes

The Turkish plural suffix *-lEr* is attested in several words in the texts analysed. Most of these words are compounds. In these compounds, the first term is often in the plural: e.g. *čauslar-ćehaja*. When such a compound occurs in the plural in Bosnian (e.g. *kapidžiler<sup>69</sup>-buljukbaše*), the compound takes the Slavonic plural ending only on its final component, as expected: it is understood as a compound noun, not two separate nouns.

There are two nouns in Benić's chronicle with the Turkish first person possessive suffix: *devletum*; *efendum*. These suffixes only occur in passages marked as dialogue in an Turkish context:

- (19) a. [...] reče mu ćehaja: '**Effendum**, nije nama puta k Carigradu.'  
'[...] the assistant said to him: 'My lord, this is not the road that takes us towards Constantinople.'" (Benić: 175)
- b. [...] rekla gospoda potle: '**Devletum**, umrijet će momak od degeneka'  
'The lords then said, 'Oh, my people! The boy will die from [a blow of] a heavy club.'" (Benić: 171)

In both examples the Turkish possessive suffix is used where the Slavonic vocative would normally be used.

---

<sup>69</sup> The front vowel in the plural suffix might suggest that the suffix was added after the word *kapıcı* was borrowed into Bosnian as the word has is formed with a front vowel auslaut. However, because there is no standard orthography in Bosnian at this time, such a conclusion cannot be made.

### 3.1.5.2 Productive suffixes

#### 3.1.5.2.1 Loan nouns from Turkish *-lî* nouns and adjectives

The Turkish suffix *-lî* means ‘relating to’. In Turkish it can be used both nominally and adjectivally, though it is more common among adjectives. According to Schmaus (1961–1962: 305) and Skok (1937–38: 171), the *-lî* suffix only becomes *-lija* in Bosnian when it occurs nominally; if it is adjectival, it remains *-li* and does not decline. When used nominally, the new noun that takes the *-lija* suffix is often a derivative related to the meaning of the root:

- (20) a. *har(a)člija*  
harç + *lî* > harç-lı > har(a)člija  
expenditure + *lî* > expenditure-ADJ > gun using large amount of  
gunpowder
- b. *sindžirlije*  
sincir + *lî* > sincir-li > sindžirlije  
chain + *lî* > chain-ADJ > two or more cannon balls attached to each  
other by a chain
- c. *dućanlije*  
dükkan + *lî* > dükkan-lı > dućanlije  
shop + *lî* > shop-ADJ > shopping area
- d. *pašalija*  
paşa + *lî* > paşalı > pašalija  
pasha + *lî* > pasha-ADJ > person in the service of a pasha
- e. *zanatlija*  
zanaat + *lî* > zanaatlı > zamatlija  
trade + *lî* > trade-ADJ > tradesman

Of the texts analysed, the earliest attestations of this suffix are in Radnić:

- (21) [...] daiuchi driueeniem tefaočem, i **zanatliami**  
‘[...] giving to the wood cutters and tradesmen’ (Radnić: 1683a: 162)

The *-lî* suffix is also frequently used in Turkish to denote nationality or place of origin, both nominally and adjectivally (5.1.6; 5.1.7). This usage of *-lî* became

productive in Bosnian through words like *misirli*: *misirlije* (Benić: 94). Radnić addresses *sarajli* in his introduction to *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* (1683a):

- (22) [...] brathi rogenoy, **sarailiami**, plemicaam bosanskiem vitezovom slavnoga grobba Issukarstova od Ieruzolima  
'[...] to my brethren by birth, Sarajevans, noble Bosnian knights of the glorious tomb of Jesus Christ in Jerusalem' (1)

While *sarajli* originated from Turkish, Radić (1999) cites numerous examples that are not based on Turkish roots (e.g. *Bečlija* 'Viennese', *Magljalija* 'people of Maglaj', *Mostarlija* 'people of Mostar', *Nišlija* 'people of Niš') (Radić, 1999: 47–51) and speak of the suffix's productivity in Bosnian. There is one such example in Benić's chronicle: *marošlije* ('people from Maroš') (Benić: 231).

In the chronicles, there are two examples of Turkish derived adjectives that have become nouns in Bosnian:

- (23) a. *arсланlija*  
[...] dao mu sto **arсланlija**  
'[...] he gave him 100 arslani' (Lašvanin: 256)  
arслан-li < arслан + -li  
lion-ADJ < lion + -li
- b. *bašlije*  
**Bashlie** illi ighle glavate  
'The principal or main points' (Benić: 324)  
baš-li < baš + -li  
main-ADJ < head + -li

The word *arсланli* ('relating to a lion') signifies the money piece that has a lion depicted on its face. It is most likely that the term for this money piece originally consisted of two words: *arсланli* and the name of the coin. It is possible that in speech Bosnians reduced this term to *arсланli*. Because *-li* was acting nominally rather than adjectivally,<sup>70</sup> *arсланli* developed the productive and declinable suffix *-ja*. Similarly,

---

<sup>70</sup> For more on this distinction see 5.1.7.

*bašlie* denotes ‘the main/principal players/actors in a situation’. Its plural ending occurs because it is a noun in this particular passage.

### 3.1.5.2.2 *-lĭk*

The suffix *-lĭk* has various meanings in Turkish: one of the most frequent and concrete ones is the ‘area where someone resides or that one oversees’: *kadiluk* < *kadılık* is ‘the area that a *kadija* oversees’; *pašiluk* < *paşalık* is ‘the area that a pasha oversees’; *komšiluk* < *komşuluk* ‘neighbourhood’ has the same root as *komšija* < *komšu* ‘neighbour’. This suffix occurs with non-Turkish roots: e.g. *krstjanluk*, *Latinluk*. Both these words signify the area of a town where Christians live.

This suffix can also have a more abstract meaning in Turkish: ‘the concept of something’: e.g. *hrsuzluk* < *hırsızlık* ‘thievery’, ‘robbery’ from *hrsuz* < *hırsız* ‘thief’; *muštuluk* < *muştuluk* ‘reward’ from *muštu*<sup>71</sup> ‘good news’; *šenluk* < *şenluk* ‘merry-making’ from *šen*<sup>72</sup> ‘merry’; *šaitluk* < *şahidlik* ‘witnessing, testimony’ from *šahid* ‘witness’.

This broader more abstract meaning of the suffix also became productive with non-Turkic roots in Bosnian:

- (24) a. *čudaluk*  
Al oni koi razghleda farce izifkivache f’kojomsiga odlukom ućinio: i nachiche, more biti, dafi vishe zaradi **čudaluka** nikog  
‘But those who consider the heart will discern the decision you made: and it must be that they will find that you did [it] more for the sake of some miracles’ (Lastrić, 1765: 27)
- b. *izdajluk*  
[...] fratrovi...hodali i Vlahe odvraćali i **izdajluk** činili  
‘[...] the friars went, turned the Vlachs back and they [the Vlachs] committed betrayal’ (Benić: 265)

---

<sup>71</sup> The Bosnian equivalent is not given as it is not attested in the texts studied. The root of the word with *-lĭk* was not always borrowed independently. In some cases, the root may not be attested independently as a loanword.

<sup>72</sup> See previous footnote.

c. *majstorluk*

Gradje ovii s'csudnovatim **maiforlukom**

'These [people] built with amazing skill' (Braćuljević: 436)

The term *čudaluk* denotes 'the concept and production of miracles'. In the example of *izdajluk*, the suffix *-luk* has the same meaning as the Slavonic suffix *-stvo*. While there are relatively few examples of the suffix *-luk* with Slavonic nouns, these examples occur in the works of four writers (Benić, Braćuljević, Lašvanin and Lastrić) and in both religious and secular texts.

### 3.1.5.2.3 -*ČI*

Though *-ČI* is productive in Bosnian, there are no examples of this suffix with Slavonic roots in the texts analysed. There are, however, three examples for which it may be argued that the suffix is productive with loanwords. Two of these examples most likely developed this suffix because of their phonological structure: *haraç* > *haračija*; *zaptiye* > *zapčija*. There are two nouns to denote 'tax collector': *haračnik*, occurring in Benić, Lašvanin and Lastrić's *Dvostruk Nediglnik* and *haračija*, which is attested only in Benić's chronicle. The noun *haračnik* consists of an Turkish root and a Slavonic nominal suffix.<sup>73</sup> On the surface, *haračija* seems to stem from *\*haraççı*; however, this word is not attested in Turkish. In Turkish the word for tax collector is *haraçlı*. Since *haračija* only occurs once in Benić's chronicle, it is difficult to determine the cause behind this Bosnian version of *haraçlı*. On the one hand, *haračija* might be a simple spelling mistake: Benić omitted <ı>. Given the meaning of these two suffixes,<sup>74</sup> it might be that in eighteenth-century Bosnian *haraçlı* meant 'relating to tax' and *\*haraç + -ČI* meant 'tax collector'. Therefore, this might be an example where *-čija /džija* is productive in Bosnian. A similar example is *zaptiye* > *zapčija*.

---

<sup>73</sup> For more on Slavonic nominal suffixes, see 3.1.6.

<sup>74</sup> In Turkish, the suffix *-ČI* is agentive; *-lİ* is adjectival, meaning 'relating to', and sometimes agentive.

The agentive *-Cĭ* suffix replaces the Turkish ending, whose phonological structure is similar.

Another example, for which it is clear that phonological structure played no role, is: *kanbeledžija* < *kanbele* + *-Cĭ*. The term *kanbele* means ‘a member of a group of men or horses’ and therefore contains agentiveness in its root. Most likely because *kanbele* is an Arabic loanword in Turkish, it developed the pleonastic agentive suffix *-Cĭ*; however, it cannot be determined whether this development occurred in Turkish and the word was borrowed as such into Bosnian, or whether this was a Bosnian development.

### **3.1.6 Slavonic suffixes**

#### **3.1.6.1 *-in* and suffixes denoting persons of male gender**

Slavonic nominal suffixes were sometimes added to Turkish loan nouns. One common Slavonic suffix added to Turkish loan nouns is *-in*, which denotes a person of male gender by profession or nationality. There are only three Turkish loanwords with this suffix in the texts analysed: *čifutin*, *čobanin*, *dušmanin*. These turkisms are some of the most common Turkish loanwords in both religious and secular texts in both Bosnian and Bulgarian. One reason this suffix might not be more frequent in nouns denoting male individuals borrowed from Turkish is because many of these nouns take the *-(č/dž)ija* suffix, whose phonological structure would inhibit the adding of *-in*.

Four other Slavonic suffixes appear with nouns denoting male individuals: *-aš*, *-dar*, *-nik* and *-ac*: e.g. *kapijaš*, *haznadar*, *haračnik* (3.1.5.2.3) and *muhamedanac*. *Haračnik* is a straightforward development: the root *harač*, denoting an inanimate object/institution, takes the suffix *-nik*, which can be agentive, to signify the individual having a role in connection with the object/institution: ‘tax collector’.

The term *muhamedanac* stems from the name of the Prophet Muhammad and means ‘Muslim’. The suffix *-ac* is a common suffix to denote male individuals in Slavonic languages (e.g. *BOblizanac* ‘twin<sub>M</sub>’) and its penultimate suffix, *-an*, is typical of ethnonyms in Slavonic languages (e.g. *Norvežan* ‘Norwegian<sub>M</sub>’).

The suffix *-aš* is added to nouns, often place names, to show that an individual is a member or supporter of that place (e.g. *Zagrebaš* ‘a member of the Zagreb football team’) (Anić, 2000: 32). In BeniĆ’s chronicle, *kapijaš* occurs once:

- (25) [...] otiĊe na kapiji Ńtokomu /meĊu/ **kapijašom**  
 ‘[...] they went off to the gate to someone among the gatekeepers’ (Benić: 284)

The suffix here is agentive. This word differs from *kapidžija* in that *kapidžija* means ‘porter, valet’:

- (26) [...] ovo je paŃi sada iktiza, jerboa mu valja opremati **kapidžiju**, koji mu je donio potvrdu  
 ‘[...] this is now the pasha’s need for he must equip the porter who brought him the confirmation’ (Benić: 172)

### 3.1.6.2 Diminutive suffixes

The Slavonic diminutive suffixes occur in both their masculine and feminine forms – *-ćić* and *-ica* – respectively, in the texts analysed for this dissertation. Lastrić describes David as a *ćobanćić* (from *ćobanj* < *ćoban*):

- (27) [...] izajde **ćobanćich** David  
 ‘[...] the little shepherd David went out’ (Lastrić: 1755: 20)

Mary takes refuge in her *užderica* (from *udžera* < *ucera*):

- (28) B.D.Maria Majka njegova u iftoj kuchi, ali ne kod nji nego u drugoj sobi, illiti **uđerici**  
 ‘The Blessed Virgin Mary, his mother, was in the same house, but not with them, rather in a different room or *uđerica*’ (Lastrić, 1755: 103)

In Lašvanin, a *somunćić* (from *somun* < *somun*) is given to the Franciscans:

- (29) [...] uze za njega **somunčić** kruha i poče misliti što će učiniti.  
 ‘[...] he took a little loaf of bread for him and began to think what he would do.’ (Lašvanin, 199–200)

Although there is a diminutive suffix in Turkish, it was not borrowed with Turkish loan nouns.

Another example with this suffix which is slightly different is *amidžić* (from *amidža* < *amca*):

- (30) [...] ali mu **amidžić**, donese /ga/ opet malo natrag  
 ‘[...] but his cousin again brought him back a little’ (Benić: 308)

The noun *amidža* means ‘uncle’ and with the diminutive suffix, the word signifies the ‘uncle’s son.’ The suffix here does not imply smaller in size but rather younger in age.

The word *džigerica* <  $\tau$ *ciđer* +  $\varsigma$ *ica* usually occurs with the diminutive suffix in Bosnian. According to RHSJ, *džiger* is attested only once in the work of an unknown sixteenth-century writer from Dubrovnik. The example occurs in dialogue with a Turk. It is unclear why and when the suffix *-ica* became an integral part of the word.

### 3.1.6.3 Suffixes denoting location

The suffix *-ište* is commonly used in BCS to denote a place: e.g. *tržište* ‘market’, *širotište* ‘orphanage’, *pozorište* ‘theatre’. Bračuljević is the only writer to use this suffix with a turkism: *pazarište*. Benić, Lastrić and Ilijić use the term *pazar* synonymously. Bračuljević implies a slight difference in meaning between the two terms:

- (31) *Targovifcteje, iliti **Pazarifcte** misto gliudczkogh pribivagnia, nixe od varofca, ali plemenitie od fela, jer u felii ne bivajuh Pazari. Koje nikii zovuh ſceer, ali to boimse nie prava nascegh jezika riicf* [sic]  
 ‘The trading centre, or *pazarište*, is a place for people to exchange goods, less prestigious than a town but more noble than a village, because there are no bazaars in a village, which some people call *šeer*, but I am afraid that it is not a real word in our language’ (Bračuljević: 344)

Neither a *pazar* nor a *pazarište* exists in villages. Although the word *pazarište* is only attested in Bračuljević's *Uzao scerafinske (nascki goruchiee) gliubavi* (1730), it seems it was a common term in the eighteenth century as it is used to gloss the Slavonic word *trgovište*. While Bračuljević questions the origin of *šeer*, he does not question that of *pazarište*, perhaps because of its Slavonic suffix.

### 3.1.6.4 Plural suffixes

The Slavonic nominal plural suffix *-ovi/-evi* was also productive with Turkish loan nouns: e.g. *topovi*, *begovi*. In the modern language, this suffix is limited to monosyllabic nouns: *čvorovi* ‘knots’, *sinovi* ‘sons’; and a few disyllabic nouns: e.g. *galebovi* ‘sea gulls’, *lišajevi* ‘lichen’. The suffix *-evi* occurs when the stem-final consonant is palatal:<sup>75</sup> *plačevi* ‘cries’; or when it is a soft consonant in origin: e.g. *putevi* ‘paths’, *carevi* ‘paths’. Otherwise, the suffix is *-ovi*: e.g. *trgovi* ‘squares’ *gradovi* ‘cities’, *zglobovi* ‘joints’ (Silić and Pranjković, 2005: 102–104). In the texts analysed, *topovi* is the only plural form of *top* that is attested, while both *begovi* and *bezi* are attested. The plural form *bezi* is more common than *begovi* and it is the only form used in Benić's chronicle. There are also several examples of the *-ovi/-evi* suffix in disyllabic words: *kusur*<sub>NOM.SG</sub> > *kusureva*<sub>GEN.PL</sub> (Benić); *čardak*<sub>NOM.SG</sub> > *čardakova*<sub>GEN.PL</sub> (Latrić, 1766); *bunar*<sub>NOM.SG</sub> > *bunarovi*<sub>NOM.PL</sub>; *bunarove*<sub>ACC.PL</sub> (Benić). While the final-stem consonant *-r* in *kusur* is not palatal, the suffix *-evi* must be understood to have been added to *kusur* by analogy to other nouns ending in /r/ that take this suffix: e.g. *carevi* ‘emperors’.

<sup>75</sup> In modern Serbian and Bosnian, there are a few nouns ending in *-s* that do not stem from Slavonic soft nouns that can take either *-ovi* or *-evi*: *nosovi/nosevi* ‘noses’, *kursevi/kursovi* ‘courses’.

### 3.1.6.5 Deverbal endings

There are two examples of nouns with Turkish roots that take the deverbal ending *-anje*, both occurring in Lastrić's *Nedignik Dvostruk: ašikovanje* and *mahmuranje*. Lastrić uses *ašikovanje* multiple times to describe the action of flirting:

- (32) Vi velite, da **ašikovagne** jest milovagne iznutargne, i gljubav farčena...  
**Ašikovagne** jest niki mio i drag razgovor nashe mladexi  
'You say that *ašikovanje* is heartfelt affection, and love of the heart...*ašikovanje* is pleasant and precious conversation among our youth'  
(Lastrić, 1766: 306)

This word formation is Slavonic: *ašikovanje* is the nominal derivative of the verb *ašikovati*. Similarly, *mahmuranje* is the deverbal noun of *mahmurati*:

- (33) [...] u pjanftvi, i pfovka: u **marmuragnju**  
'[...] in drunkenness, in curses, in hangover' (Lastrić, 1766)

Lastrić uses *mahmuranje* rather than *mahmur* to emphasise the state of hangover rather than the symptom: one is experiencing hangover (*mahmuranje*) but a hangover (*mahmur*) is unpleasant. This distinction is common in BCS: *djeca uživaju u igranju* ('the children enjoy playing') but *igra im se sviđa* ('they like the game').

### 3.1.6.6 Abstract nominal suffixes

There is one unusual example of a turkism with *-stvo*: *haramzastvo*:

- (34) Ne nahodise u sadanje vrime, nego **haramzastva**, i imbeh, govorenje naše, sasviem puno jest licumirstva, i sakrivenjenja  
'Nothing but sinning is found in our time, and the fruit, our words, are full of hypocrisy and concealment' (Posilović, 1682: 46b)

The word  $\tau$ *haramzadelik* means 'being or begetting an illegitimate child'. The Turkish suffix *-lik* was replaced by its Slavonic counterpart, *-stvo*. It is possible that *-de* might have been considered an Turkish case ending and therefore omitted, though this seems unlikely given that it is penultimate. It is also possible that Benić

left *-de* out by mistake.<sup>76</sup> Škaljić (1987) and Grannes et al. (2002) list *haramzade* (though not *haramzastvo*) in their respective dictionaries.

The Slavonic suffix *-ba* (e.g. *narudžba* ‘order’, *tužba* ‘complaint’) occurs once with an Turkish root: *kaharba* from *kahır*:

- (35) [...] nego u **kaharba** [sic],<sup>77</sup> i gorkofma, gnegouie xalloftie  
‘[...] but in sorrow, in bitterness, in his regrets’ (Radnić, 1683a: 139)

Radnić uses *kahar* synonymously with *gorkost* and *žalost*. The suffix *-ba* occurs rather than *-ost* in *kaharba* because of phonological structure: *-ost* cannot follow /r/ (*Gramatika*, 1991: 176).

### 3.1.7 Prefixed Turkish loan nouns

The word *pod-paša*, meaning ‘vice-pasha’, is in both Benić’s and Lašvanin’s chronicles. The prefix *pod-* is often added to Bosnian nouns to indicate subordination: e.g. *podložnik* ‘bootlicker’, *podanik* ‘subject’, *podvodač* ‘procurer’. While the word *pašalija* ‘second-in-command to a pasha’ exists, it does not have the same semantic specificity that *pod-paša* has.

### 3.1.8 Turkish *izafet* constructions<sup>78</sup>

The *izafet* construction is a special kind of compound noun in Turkish. The modifying noun occurs in initial position and is followed by the noun that it modifies, which takes the third person singular possessive suffix: ‘history book’: *tarih* + *kitap* = *tarih kitabı*; ‘school building’: *okul* + *bina* = *okul binası*. When these *izafet* constructions were borrowed into Bosnian, they often lost their final possessive suffix. There are only a handful of attested examples, which are listed by Grannes (1980) and Kostov (1968), that have maintained the Turkish possessive ending: e.g. *akşam pazari* <

---

<sup>76</sup> For more on Turkish case endings see 5.2.6.1.

<sup>77</sup> The lack of case declension is most likely a misprint.

<sup>78</sup> For more on the *izafet* construction, see Grannes (1980).

*akşam pazarı* ‘night market’; *kadun-đubegi* < *kadın göbeği* ‘doughnut in syrup’; *inti-jagi* < *hintyağı* ‘castor oil’. This last example is listed in Skok’s etymological dictionary, in which he lists the word as a masculine noun and an indeclinable adjective (Grannes, 1980: 12).

In the texts studied, *izafet* constructions whose second element is *baš* end in *-a*, which might suggest that these compounds maintained their third-person possessive suffix: e.g. *delibaša* < *delibaşı*. However, given *paša* is phonologically similar to *baš*, and the numerous Turkish nouns denoting persons of masculine gender that end in *-a* or *-ija* in Bosnian, it might be that *baš* > *baša*. Benić’s use of *baša* independently supports this hypothesis:

- (36) Iste godine digoše se **baše** neretavske...i otiđoše u Livno.  
 ‘The same year the noblemen around the Neretva rose up...and left for Livno.’ (Benić: 185)

Apart from *sidžilile-udžetile*,<sup>79</sup> other *izafet* constructions have lost the third-person possessive suffix: e.g. *selamaga* < *selam agası*; *bešlaga* < *bešli ađası*. Given the few examples of words with possessive compound markers<sup>80</sup> and the higher number of words without, it seems that *-sĀ* and *-Ā* were not transparent as compound markers in Bosnian.

Perhaps a more significant reason behind the loss of the possessive marker is that ‘the *izafet* construction has a phonemic shape that does not correspond to the canonical shape of the Serbo-Croatian nouns’ (Grannes, 1980: 12). However, when the possessive suffix is removed, the compound noun ends in a consonant, therefore becoming a masculine noun in Bosnian. Nevertheless, it should be mentioned that most Turkish lexical borrowing came from the spoken not written language. While

<sup>79</sup> While this compound has maintained its possessive marker (*sidžilile + udžetile* < [[[sicili] [hüccet]][[i]]]), it most likely has done so because the possessive marker is followed by another suffix. For more on *sidžilile-udžetile* and morphological attraction 3.1.9.

<sup>80</sup> These words are listed in the first paragraph of this section (3.1.8).

the possessive suffix in compound nouns is always present in literary Ottoman Turkish, it is very rarely omitted in sub-standard varieties of Ottoman Turkish (Grannes, 1980: 11). Therefore, one must take into consideration that the omission of the third person possessive suffix in most compound Ottoman Turkish nouns might, in some isolated cases, not be the result of Slavonic adaptation.

### 3.1.9 Morphological attraction

Attraction is when two words show mismatched agreement (Bock and Miller, 1991: 52; Vigliocco, Butterworth and Semenza, 1995: 186; Feizmohammadpour, 2013: 62–63). An example of such attraction occurring with subject verb agreement in English is: ‘the history of the various regions are interesting’.<sup>81</sup> The subject’s head noun is *history* yet the verb shows agreement with the head noun’s modifying prepositional phrase ‘of the various regions’ rather than with ‘history’. In Benić, there is one example of morphological attraction:<sup>82</sup> *sidžilile-udžetile* < *sicili* + *hüccetile* means ‘court registry with additional official corrections’. In Bosnian, the suffix *-IE*<sup>83</sup> is added to the first element in the compound by analogy to the second element in the compound, though semantically, *-IE* cannot belong with the first element of the compound.

### 3.2 Bulgarian nominal morphology

As with Turkish nouns borrowed into Bosnian, Turkish nouns borrowed into Bulgarian had to be fitted into a nominal declensional pattern. Though Bulgarian had lost the case system for the most part by the end of the seventeenth century,<sup>84</sup> the endings of newly borrowed nouns were still determined by the remnants of Slavonic

---

<sup>81</sup> For more such examples see Feizmohammadpour (2013), Bock and Miller (1991), Vigliocco, Butterworth and Semenza (1995).

<sup>82</sup> For more on morphological attraction, see Vigliocco, Butterworth and Semenza (1995).

<sup>83</sup> For more on *-IE*, see: Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 58, 63).

<sup>84</sup> Cases remain in certain dialects. For more on the loss of cases in Bulgarian see: Mirčev (1963: 144–158), Mladenov (1979: 246–264).

nominal declensional patterns, since gender agreement was not lost with the decline of declensions.<sup>85</sup> In Bulgarian, nouns ending in consonants are masculine, apart from a group which originally took the soft ending: e.g. *radost* ‘joy’, *pesen* ‘song’. Otherwise, feminine nouns usually end in /a/. As in Bosnian, there is a limited number of native nouns denoting masculine individuals that end in /a/. If these nouns declined, they took the feminine nominal a-declension and the masculine adjectival declension; however, in the late eighteenth-century manuscripts analysed, examples of these nouns that are declined are rare. Neuter nouns end in /e/ or /o/ and take plural endings that are remnants of the *-es*, and *-ent* declensions.<sup>86</sup>

### 3.2.1 Turkish loan nouns ending in /ĭ/

As in Bosnian (3.1.1.1), many Turkish loan nouns end in *-ija*. Many of these words end in [ɪ], [i], [u], [ü] in the Turkish original. In order for these words to be given a gender, and possibly decline if they were borrowed into Bulgarian early enough, they had to end in a consonant or /a/, /e/ or /o/. As in Bosnian, the already existing Slavonic suffix *-ija* was added to the roots of these words so that they joined the a-declensional paradigm: e.g. [ɪ] > *-ija*: *çarşı* > *csiarscia*; *hacı* > *hagia*; *yapı* > *japia*; *kadı* > *kadia*; *odabaşı* > *odabascia*; [i] > *-ija*: *asi* > *assia*; *gemi* > *ghemia*; *ikindi* > *ikindia*; [u] > *-ija*: *ordu* > *ordija*. In one example above, vowel harmony is not exemplified in Turkish: e.g. *assi*. This word was borrowed into Turkish from Arabic, in which it ends in long /i:/. Sometimes words ending in long /i:/ in Arabic do not obey Turkish rules of vowel harmony when borrowed into Turkish (see 3.1.1.2 for Bosnian examples). Nevertheless, unless these words are titles (e.g. *saabi* and *hadži*)<sup>87</sup>

<sup>85</sup> Nevertheless, some nouns changed from one declension pattern to another because of phonological and analytical changes. For more see: Mirčev (1963: 144–158).

<sup>86</sup> For more on Bulgarian nominal morphology: see Mirčev (1963); Mladenov (1979).

<sup>87</sup> Though *hadži* does not occur as a title in the manuscripts studied, it is attested numerous times as early as 1643 in the scribal notes. See Xristova et al. 2003 (2: 55).

in Bulgarian and *gazi* in Bosnian (3.1.1.2)), these words take the *-ija* ending in these two Slavonic languages.

The four vowels /ɪ/, /i/, /u/, /ü/ occur in the Turkish agentive suffixal allomorph {CI} (see 3.1.1.3). This suffix is frequent among Turkish loan nouns and became *-čija* or *-džija*: e.g. *haberçi* > *abergia/habarcia*; *alışverişçi* > *alaasveriscia*; *balıkçı* > *balakcia*; *kalkancı* > *kalcangia*; *çorbacı* > *ciorbagia*; *komşu* > *comscia*; *elçi* > *elcia*; *vekilharç* > *fekilarcia*; *fornacı* > *fornogia*; *cenkçi* > *genkcie*; *yabancı* > *iabangia*; *yardımcı* > *jardamgia*; *kapıcı* > *kapugia*; *keseci* > *kesigia*; *munafıkçı* > *munafakcia*; *okumuşçu* > *okumuscia*; *sürücü* > *surungia*; *yalancı* > *jalangia*; *zurnacı* > *zurnagia*. As in Bosnian, the suffix *-ija* became productive in Bulgarian. Though there are no examples of *-CĪ* with Bulgarian roots in the texts studied, there is one Turkish word that has this suffix only in Bulgarian:  $\tau$ *bahçivan* >  $\text{BU}$ *bahcivangia*. In Turkish the suffix *-an*,<sup>88</sup> like *-CĪ*, is used to describe a person by profession:  $\tau$ *bahçe* ‘garden’ :  $\tau$ *bahçivan* ‘gardener’. In Bulgarian, the *-an* suffix has been doubled by the *-CĪ* suffix, *bahcivangia*, making the *-CĪ* a pleonastic suffix.<sup>89</sup> The word *bahçeci* also means ‘gardener’ in Turkish. Most likely, the word *bahcivangia* is the result of contamination with *bahçeci* or other *-CĪ* nouns, since the vast majority of Turkish agentive nouns took the *-CĪ* suffix. Nevertheless, words like *bazargân* > *bazirghian* and *hekim* > *hekim* are agentive and do not take the *-CĪ* suffix in the Bulgarian texts.<sup>90</sup> The *-CĪ* suffix is, however, attested as a pleonastic agentive suffix with *hekim* in both Stachowski (1996) and Gerov (1895–1904) (Hauge, 2002: 131).

---

<sup>88</sup> This suffix is originally Persian: *-vān*.

<sup>89</sup> For more on pleonastic suffixes in Bulgarian, see 3.2.5.1; in Bosnian: 3.1.6.1.

<sup>90</sup> In MS780 *hekim* occurs with the Slavonic suffix *-in* (*hekimin*), which denotes individuals of male gender (3.2.6.1).

### 3.2.2 Turkish final consonantal nouns + *-ija*

In section 3.1.1, I mention that one might suggest Turkish cases, namely the accusative and dative, might have contributed to the development of the *-ija* ending in Turkish loan nouns in Bosnian. There are a few examples of turkisms ending in either a consonant or /a/ which could be used to support this argument for Bulgarian: *avn* > *avana*; *bazar* > *bazarija*; *rical* > *rigialia* and *oda* > *odaja*. There is no grammatical reason for final /n/, /l/, /r/ and /a/ to be unacceptable for gender and number marking in Bulgarian. The word *avn* would have had to undergo phonological changes because of the consonantal cluster /vn/, which cannot exist in final position in Slavonic languages. Nevertheless, the fleeting /ə/ alone would have been a sufficient alteration, allowing the word to fit into Bulgarian gender and number.

The noun *bazaria* is synonymous to *bazar* and is used synonymously in the same text. As with the Bosnian example of *buhur* > *burija*, the *-ija* suffix is added because it is productive in Turkish loan nouns.

Regarding *rical* > *rigialia*, it is possible that Bulgarians with a limited knowledge of Turkish misheard the ending as *-li*, especially if the word was declined in Turkish: *rical*<sub>NOM</sub> : *ricali*<sub>ACC</sub> : *ricale*<sub>DAT</sub>. The same holds true for *oda* > *odaja*, given the similarity of /l/ to /a/: e.g. *oda*<sub>NOM</sub> : *odayı*<sub>ACC</sub> : *odaya*<sub>DAT</sub>. Nevertheless, *oda* is a common word that consists of /o, d, a/, phonemes that differ only slightly from Turkish to Slavonic languages. It might be argued that the /ja/ in *odaja* developed because Slavonic nominal stems have to end in a consonant. Since the word is *odaja*, not *\*odija*, it seems Bulgarians at some point perceived the stem as *odaj-*. Though plausible, there are too many nouns that end in /a/ borrowed from Turkish that do not develop an additional suffix (e.g. *paša*) for this hypothesis to be supported. Similarly, *oda* is also attested in the MSS analysed. While case endings might have contributed to the productivity of the *-ija* suffix among Turkish loan nouns, this suffix would most

likely have become productive even without the influence of Turkish cases. If the *-ija* suffix was mainly the result of Turkish nominal declensions, the *-ija* suffix would be more common among nouns that did not undergo morphophonological changes when borrowed into Bulgarian. Whether because of the frequency of *-ija* or the influence of Turkish cases, it is not unheard of for Turkish loan nouns to be reduced to their stem and the *-ija* suffix to become their productive ending.

### 3.2.3 Turkish nouns + final /e/

In contrast to Bosnian, in which turkisms that denote pairs usually become feminine, in Bulgarian, these words do not develop a final /a/ after their consonant and are therefore masculine (Schmaus, 1961: 394). In the texts studied, there is only one example of a pair:  ${}_{\text{BU}}\text{ciorape}_{\text{PL}}{}^{91} < {}_{\text{TÇ}}\text{orap}_{\text{SG}}$  :

- (37) [...] **ciorape** ni nossi  
 ‘[...] he does not wear socks’ (780: 47b: 8)

Because the example of *ciorape* occurs only in the plural, one cannot conclude on the basis of this example alone whether the word is masculine or feminine in gender. Nevertheless, all dictionaries that were used in this dissertation list the word as masculine.

There is one example of a turkism that has /e/ added to its final consonant:

*balgam* > *balgame*:

- (38) [...] upliuhamu prisvetoto lize, i berbati i storiha sas **balgame**  
 ‘[...] they spat in his holy face and the filthy ones made [wine] with gall’  
 (778: 204)

The word *balgame* in this context means ‘gall’. On the basis of context, this word is in the singular. One might argue that the final /e/ represents the instrumental, but

---

<sup>91</sup> In modern Bulgarian, the plural ending would be *-i*. There are numerous examples in the manuscripts analysed where the plural ending is *-e* rather than *-i*. This is because Bulgarian plural endings had still not become set as they are in the modern language.

since this text is in modern Bulgarian (thus, apart from masculine singular animate nouns and pronouns in the accusative and genitive, the cases are not present in the texts analysed), this is far from likely.

### 3.2.4 Turkish nouns ending in /e/

In contrast to Bosnian, in which the majority of Turkish loan nouns that end in /e/ undergo morphophonological changes and end in /a/ (3.1.2.1.), in Bulgarian, there is greater variation. According to Schmaus (1961: 301), Cordignano and Camaj cite doublets, ending in /e/ and /a/: both *mejhane* and *mejhana*, *mide* and *mida* are attested. In the manuscripts analysed, turkisms that originally ended in /e/ in Turkish are consistently either feminine or neuter, never both, and are divided evenly between the two genders on a ratio of 9: 9. Ten words undergo the change /e/ > /a/: *bahçe* > *bahcia*;<sup>92</sup> *çesme* > *cesma*; *kese* > *cescia*; *hane* > *hana*; *hazne* > *hazna*; *kule* > *kula*; *leke* > *lekia*; *medrese* > *medresa*; *taife* > *tajfa*; while nine words undergo no morphophonological changes: *eşkere* > *esckere*; *lale* > *lale*; *mertebe* > *mertebe*; *pencere* > *pengere*; *perde* > *perde*; *şüphe* > *sciube*; *ulufe* > *ulefe*; *zahire* > *zahire*.<sup>93</sup> It is not clear why some words maintained their final /e/ and why others underwent the change /e/ > /a/. It should be mentioned that in different varieties of Ottoman, these endings can be both /e/ and /a/. Therefore, the words might not have undergone morphophonological changes but reflect different varieties of Ottoman (Bernt Brendemoen, personal communication).

One might also argue that semantic parallelism played a role, but this seems unlikely given that some words can have both a feminine and a neuter form but never a masculine form. It is more likely Turkish /e/, which has three allophones – [e], [ɛ]

---

<sup>92</sup> Orthographical norms require <i> after <c> to indicate that <c> is /č/. Therefore, the assimilation is /e/ > /a/, not /ija/.

<sup>93</sup> For more examples, see Schmaus (1961: 305).

and [æ] – was realised as /a/ or /e/ in Bulgarian, depending on its allophones.<sup>94</sup> In addition, in varieties of Ottoman Turkish might have played a role: e.g. in dialectal Ottoman Turkish, *fayda* would have been pronounced /fajda/ while in Middle Ottoman Turkish it would have been pronounced /fajde/ (Schmaus, 1961: 306).<sup>95</sup>

### 3.2.5 Turkish nominal suffixes

In addition to the Turkish nominal suffixes *-CI* and *-li*, other nominal suffixes are attested in the manuscripts studied. These are the same suffixes that occur in the Bosnian texts: *-lEr* (3.1.5.1) and *-lik* (3.1.5.2.2). Also as in Bosnian, the suffix *-lEr* is uncommon and unproductive, while *-lik* is common – more so than in the Bosnian texts – and productive.

#### 3.2.5.1 *-lEr*

There is only one example of *-lEr*, which is in MS779: *develer*, meaning ‘camels’:

- (39) [...] scteha da dodat zare sas mlogo camile i Egini **develeri** dase poklonat  
na Issussa i dagozafalat  
‘[...] the emperors will come with many camels and Aegean dromedars to  
bow down to Jesus and to praise him’ (779: 227)

Since it is doubled by the Bulgarian plural suffix *-i*, it seems the suffix *-lEr* was not transparent in Bulgarian. The *-ler* suffix does not occur because a Bulgarian plural suffix would have been phonologically problematic. As mentioned, in 3.2.4, nouns ending in /e/ are native to Bulgarian and have several possibilities for native plural endings.

---

<sup>94</sup> For more, see Grannes, 1970: 51– 52.

<sup>95</sup> Though this might explain the feminine/neuter doublets in Bulgarian, it cannot be used as an explanation for the tendency of turkisms ending in /e/ to become feminine in Bosnian: given that dialectal Ottoman Turkish was more common in Bulgaria than in Bosnia (Schmaus, 1961: 306), it seems odd that the ‘raw’ Ottoman Turkish pronunciation would have had a significant enough influence in Bosnian to create the pattern: /e/ > /a/ (3.1.1.6).

### 3.2.5.2 -*lĭk*

As in Bosnian, the suffix *-lĭk* has several meanings: one meaning is ‘an area where one resides or which one oversees’: *pascialak* < *pařalik*. While this meaning is the most frequent in the Bosnian texts, it is less frequent in the Bulgarian manuscripts, namely because the Bulgarian manuscripts are retellings of the Bible, naturally limiting the mention of Ottoman Turkish officials and the areas that they oversaw. This suffix is most frequently used to describe the concept of something: e.g. *birlik* < *birlik* ‘unity’ < *bir* ‘one’ + *lĭk*; *dosluk* < *dostluk* ‘friendship’ < *dost* ‘friend’ + *lĭk*; *dusmanlik* < *düşmanlık* ‘enmity’ < *düşman* ‘enemy’ + *lĭk*. Other examples of nouns with the *-lĭk* suffix include: *baadarlak* < *bahadırılık*; *bolluk* < *bölük*; *eksiklik* < *eksiklik*; *ghiucuk* < *güçlük*; *hainlik* < *hainlik*; *hamaratlik* < *hamaratlık*; *karsciaklak* < *karışıklık*; *karscilik* < *karşılık*; *killik* < *küllük*; *kulluk* < *kolluk*; *munafaklak* < *münafıklık*; *murtatlak* < *murtadlık*; *nekezlik* < *nekeslik*; *okumuscluk* < *okumuşluk*; *ortalak* < *ortalık*; *piscmanlak* < *pişmanlık*; *rezilik* < *rezillik*; *saighilik* < *sağırılık*; *sakatlak* < *sakatlık*; *schehadlak* < *şehidlik*; *schiascanlak* < *şaşkınlık*; *scenlik* < *şenlik*; *siurgiunluk* < *sürgünlük*; *zolumluk* < *zulümlük*. There are also two words with this suffix in which it means ‘relating to’: *jamurluk* < *yağmurluk*; *odalak* < *odalık*. The term *yağmurluk* consists of *yağmur* ‘rain’ + *lĭk* and means ‘awning’; *odalık* consists of *oda* ‘room’ + *lĭk* and means ‘concubine’: a woman who remains in a room. This meaning of ‘relating to’ does not seem to have become productive in Bulgarian on the basis of the texts studied.

There are three examples of words that take the *-lĭk* suffix in Bulgarian that are not attested in Turkish: *kurvalăk* < *kurva*;<sup>96</sup> *soltatlak* < *soltat*; *tafralik* < *tafra*; *zolumluk* < *zulüm*. The term *tafra* is attested in Turkish; therefore, *tafra* with *-lĭk* would be understood by Turks, even though this word is not attested in Turkish. On

---

<sup>96</sup> This word is attested only in supplementary texts.

the other hand, *kurvalāk* and *soltatlık*,<sup>97</sup> which do not have Turkish roots, would only be understood in Bulgarian and exemplify the productivity of this suffix in Bulgarian.

The terms *tafralık* and *zolumluk* are all examples of pleonastic Turkish suffixes in Bulgarian. A pleonastic suffix is common among words of Arabic and Persian origin which ‘would have seemed opaque to Turkish speakers with no knowledge of these two languages’ (Kjetil Rå Hauge, personal communication). Because Bulgarians were unfamiliar with these roots stemming from Arabic or Turkish, a tendency developed ‘to make certain semantic classes of words more transparent by adding well known, productive suffixes with a well defined meaning’ (Kjetil Rå Hauge, personal communication). The roots of these words are abstract and the *-lĭk* suffix is therefore redundant. This tendency to add *-lĭk* to abstract nouns of foreign origin might not be limited to Bulgarian, as it occurs in Albanian as well; likewise, it might have existed in spoken Turkish, as it is present in Turkish dialects (Kjetil Rå Hauge, personal communication).

### **3.2.6 Slavonic nominal suffixes**

Slavonic nominal suffixes are more common in Bulgarian than they are in Bosnian, though for the most part the same suffixes tend to be added to words of Turkish origin in the two languages: e.g. *-in*, for male individuals, *-ost* and *-stvo* for abstract nouns. The suffix *-ka* is used to denote persons of female gender in Bulgarian. There is one example of the feminine *-nica* suffix, and one example of feminine *-ina*.

#### **3.2.6.1 -in**

As in Bosnian, the most frequent Slavonic suffix among Turkish loan nouns is *-in*: *bairaktarin* < *bayrakdar/bayraktar*; *duscmanin* < *duşman*; *hahamin* < *haham*; *haidutin* < *haidut*; *hekimin* < *hekim*; *hizmetkiarin* < *hizmetkar*; *scehatin* < *şehad*;

---

<sup>97</sup> This word is most likely Italian in origin: *soldato*.

*vezirin* < *vezir*. Apart from one example, *okumuscin* < *okumuş*, this suffix is limited to nouns that end in consonants. There are nouns denoting persons of male gender that end in consonants that do not take this suffix: e.g. *bazirghian* < *bazargân*. Because *okumuscia* is also attested, it might be that *okumuscin* is a derivative of the noun *okumuş*. Given the frequency and the productivity of the *-Cĭ* suffix in both Turkish and Bulgarian nouns, it seems unlikely that the *-Cĭ* suffix would be dropped and replaced with a Slavonic one, though there is one such example attested in *Žitie i stradanija grešnogo Sofronija : manzilin*. Therefore, it cannot be concluded whether *okumuscin* stems from *okumuş* or *okumuşçu*.

### 3.2.6.2 *-ka*

In contrast to the Bosnian texts, which have no examples of Turkish loan nouns with the suffix for denoting individuals of feminine gender, there are several such examples in the Bulgarian texts with the suffix, *-ka*: *ciorbagiaka* < *çorbaci* + *ka*; *hizmetkiarka* < *hizmetkar* + *ka*; *ursuka* < *hırsız* + *ka*; *vezirka* < *vezir* + *ka*. This development speaks of the extent to which Turkish words had been adapted in Bulgarian by the late eighteenth century. In part, these words are attested because, women sometimes play significant roles in biblical stories. Contemporary Bosnian texts, on the other hand, discuss theology or political events, spheres from which women were usually excluded in the eighteenth century.

### 3.2.6.3 Suffixes denoting location

The Slavonic suffix *-nica*, which denotes location or place, occurs in one example: *kasapmiza*<sup>98</sup> < *kasap* + *nica*. This word usually means ‘slaughter house’ (Kjetil Rå Hauge, personal communication), but in the example in which it occurs it is used to describe the killing of the innocents in MS778:

---

<sup>98</sup> The /m/ occurs because of regressive assimilation.

- (40) [...] i odredi dase ubiat sickite deza' od dve' godine na dolo, tei zapoveda...po' sickiet negov topak, dese izvarsci tazi **kasapmiza**  
'[...] and he ordered all the children ages two and younger to be killed...he ordered this bloodbath to be carried throughout all his land' (778: 76)

On the basis of this example, it seem that *kasapmiza* underwent semantic extenstion:

'slaughter-house' > 'slaughtering' or 'mass killing'.

#### 3.2.6.4 Abstract suffixes

The feminine nominal suffix *-ina* is attested in one example:

- (41) *bahtina* < *baht*:  
[...] namisliha **bahtina** da idat na duscmanscata ordia  
'[...] they devised the luck to come upon the enemy army' (779: 107a)

The term *baht* also occurs in MS779:

- (42) [...] imaha **baht** da pobeghnat  
'[...] they had the good fortune to flee' (779: 192)

On the basis of context, one might suggest that the *-ina* suffix is used to show augmentation: in the first example, they had incredible luck to come upon the enemy army; in the second example, they were also lucky, but not to the same extent.

As in Bosnian, the suffix *-stvo* is productive with Turkish roots. In Bulgarian, there is one example of this suffix: *zenghinsto* < *zengin*. In both instances these suffixes create nominal derivatives from Turkish adjectives. Such derivatives might suggest that the adjectival roots were relatively common in Bulgarian in eighteenth-century Bulgarian.

#### 3.2.7 Compound nouns with *basc*

Turkish loan compound nouns (*izafet* constructions) are more common in Bulgarian than they are in Bosnian (3.1.8). In part, this is because Bulgarian had minimal case inflection by the eighteenth century, which allowed for the Turkish third person possessive suffix to be maintained even though its phonemic shape is different from

that of the canonical Bulgarian noun (Grannes, 1980: 13). Nevertheless, *izafet* constructions in Bulgarian occur more frequently without the possessive suffix than with it. In the manuscripts studied, there are a handful of examples of possible *izafet* constructions (blended and unblended),<sup>99</sup> all lacking the possessive suffix. While the lack of the third-person possessive suffix might be part of the assimilation process, as mentioned in 3.1.8, there are Ottoman Turkish dialects that also omit this suffix.

Because the first element of all of these compound nouns is *basc*, whether they are true *izafet* constructions is questionable. As mentioned in 3.1.8, *baş* in Turkish is both nominal and adjectival, meaning ‘head’ or ‘main’, ‘initial’, respectively. It occurs frequently in compound nouns as either the first or second element: e.g. *baş agası*, *deli başı*. However, it can also modify a noun as an adjective: *baş hekim* ‘head doctor’. Compound nouns are sometimes borrowed into Bosnian (3.1.8) and Bulgarian. In the Bulgarian texts, *baş* + native noun is common:

- (43) a. [...] na **basc mesta**<sup>100</sup>  
 ‘[...] at the place of honour’ (778: 167)
- b. Od sickite knighi, detosesa pissali na tozi Sveta **basc knigai** Sveto Pismo  
 ‘Of all the books that have been written in this world, the most important book is the Bible’ (779: 2)

Such examples with *basc* suggest it is used as a noun. It seems that Turkish *izafet* constructions<sup>101</sup> (3.1.8) have penetrated Bulgarian:

- (44) [...] beli **basc** Cifutte ciakaha daide Issukras na Jeusalem.  
 ‘[...] the Jewish high priests waited for Jesus to go to Jerusalem.’ (778: 167)

<sup>99</sup> Blended, meaning a construction made up of Turkish and Bulgarian elements; unblended, meaning a construction made up of only Turkish elements.

<sup>100</sup> This is possibly a demi-calque on the Turkish: *baş köşe*, which has the same meaning.

<sup>101</sup> For more on the *izafet* construction in Bulgarian, see Grannes (1980).

The word *basc* never takes the definite article (5.2.5) as it would if it were acting as a Bulgarian adjective. Whereas Turkish loan adjectives agree in number (5.2.4), *basc* never agrees in number with the noun that it modifies (see ex. 45). Given how common the *izafet* construction is in Turkish, especially among military and administrative positions, and the Bulgarian population's basic knowledge of Turkish,<sup>102</sup> these examples with *basc* might be modeled on the Turkish *izafet* construction.

### 3.2.8 Turkish adjectives used nominally in Bulgarian

There are several examples of Turkish adjectives/adverbs that are used nominally in Bulgarian:<sup>103</sup>

- (45) [...] izvadihago od **ghiran**  
 '[...] they took him out of the difficulty'

Turkish adjectives functioning as nouns in Bulgarian might occur because the categories of noun and adjective are not always distinct in Turkish. Therefore, if these words frequently occurred as first elements in compound nouns in Turkish, Bulgarians might have understood them as adjectives rather than nouns. Schröpfer (1968: 185) points out that Balkan Slavs had difficulty understanding the subtle difference between Turkish nouns and adjectives, i.e. determining the part of speech of a word with dual functions. Therefore, non-native Turkish speakers were often incapable of distinguishing when a word modified a noun adjectivally and when it modified a noun as the first unit of a compound noun. These examples also support

---

<sup>102</sup> 'It is certainly no exaggeration when K. Kostov affirms that 'Die Balkanslaven haben wichtige eigentümlichkeiten der türkischen Grammatik erkennt' (Grannes, 1980: 24). Grannes supports his statement by pointing out that 'there seem to be few, if any, examples of 'fausse coupure' in this type of loanwords in Bulgarian' (Grannes, 1980: 24).

<sup>103</sup> In contrast to words like *ailak*, *inat*, *sakat* and *topal* (5.2.3) which can be used nominally and adjectivally/adverbially in Turkish, the adjectives discussed here are only adjectives/ adverbs in Turkish. Therefore, their nominal usage is only in Bulgarian.

the argument that the meaning and purpose of the possessive suffix in compound nouns was opaque in Bosnian and Bulgarian (3.1.8 and 3.2.7).

While there are adjectives that can act nominally in Turkish, ‘this overlap is between an adjective that characterizes a person or thing as having some quality and a noun that stands for such items pronominally (*küçükler* ‘the little ones’)’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011: 61). Since *ghiran* cannot behave as a noun in Turkish, its nominal development is purely Bulgarian.

Another example is *barasciak* < *barışık*, which means ‘reconciled, appeased, at peace, reconciled’ in Turkish, but changes grammatical category when borrowed into Bulgarian from Turkish. In Turkish, this word is an adjective and adverb, but not a noun. Its nominal form is *barış*, which means ‘peace’. Oddly, *barış* and *barışıklık* do not occur in any of the Bulgarian manuscripts. The word *barasciak*, which becomes a noun in Bulgarian, occurs instead:

- (46) a. [...] **barasciak** stori sas nego  
          ‘[...] he made peace with him’ (779:100b)
- b. Eureite storiha pak tezi dvama zaré **barasciak**  
          ‘The Jews made peace with those two kings’ (779: 129a)
- c. [...] i da stori **barasciak** sas teh  
          ‘[...] to make peace with them’ (778: 90)

In all examples, *barasciak* occurs in the set phrase with ‘stori **barasciak**’.<sup>104</sup>

### 3.3 Conclusion

A significant number of Turkish nouns were borrowed into both Bosnian and Bulgarian. In both languages these words underwent morphophonological changes in order to develop gender and decline if necessary: Turkish nouns decline in Bosnian while in Bulgarian they take the definite article and masculine animate nouns decline

---

<sup>104</sup> I would suggest this choice of *barasciak* is semantically motivated. See: 7.2.6.

in the oblique case(s). This suggests that there were few to no restrictions regarding the integration of loan nouns, which is typical of even the least intense language contact (Thomason and Kaufman, 1991: 74–78).

The borrowing of Turkish nominal suffixes into Bosnian and Bulgarian is more complex. Productive nominal suffixes *-Cĭ* and *-lĭk* are in Bosnian and Bulgarian: in Bulgarian: *kurvalāk* and *soltatlak*; in Bosnian: *soltatluk*, *krstjanluk*, *Latinluk*, *izdajluk*, *čudaluk*, *majstorluk*. The two meanings of *-lĭk* – 1) the location where someone resides; 2) an abstract concept – are productive in both languages: <sub>BO</sub>*krstjanluk*, <sub>BO</sub>*izdajluk*; <sub>BU</sub>*soltatlak* and <sub>BU</sub>*kurvalāk*. This suffix was transparent in eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian and indicates knowledge of Turkish that extends beyond lexical borrowings.

While there are no examples of Turkish pleonastic suffixes in Bosnian, there are a handful in Bulgarian: *bahcivancija*, *ghiucluk*, *tafralik* and *zolumluk*. In Bosnian, however, there are examples of Slavonic pleonastic suffixes: e.g. *-in*: *dušmanin*. The examples of Turkish pleonastic suffixes indicate that these suffixes were transparent in Bulgarian.

## 4.0 Chapter Four: Verbs

### 4.1 Bosnian verbs

There are fifty-two verbs with Turkish stems in the Bosnian texts studied. Thirty-eight of these verbs have Turkish nominal roots and fourteen have Turkish verbal roots. These numbers suggest that nouns were more likely to be borrowed and changed into verbs through additional suffixes than Turkish verbs to be borrowed into Bosnian. It is often asserted that verbs are less borrowable than nouns because ‘verbs constitute complex and rigid systems that inhibit borrowing’ (Haspelmath, 2009: 61). Matras and Sakel (2007: 48) elaborate on this point: the verb is a lexical item, like a noun or adjective, but it also initiates predication. The verb as a lexical item, however, is often insufficient to act as a ‘predication-initiator’, which is why verbs are explicitly marked out for this function in many languages. According to the cross-linguistic database that Haspelmath cites, more than 31% of the nouns in the database are loanwords, while only 14% of all verbs are loanwords (Haspelmath, 2009: 61). Although verbs require more morphological adaptation than nouns, which can often be borrowed without any morphological adaptation, the lower percentage of verbs is also because things and concepts, and thus the words for them, are more easily transmitted from one culture to another than ‘predication initiators’ (Haspelmath, 2009: 61).

#### 4.1.1 Verbs stemming from Turkish nouns

Verbs with Turkish roots are formed in four different ways, depending on the type of Turkish word from which they originate (Škaljić, 1957: 41–44). If a verb originates from an Turkish noun, it takes the infinitival suffix *-iti*, *-ati* or *-ovati*: e.g. *apstiti*, *uavstiti*, *uzavstiti* (*apst* < *haps*), *ašikovati* (*ašik* < *aşık*), *esabiti* (*esap* < *hesap*), *har(a)čiti* (*harač* < *haraç*), *hazuriti* (*hazur* < *hazır*), *(od)ilamiti* (*ilam* < *ilân*),

*iskusuriti* (*kusur* < *kusur*); *jagmiti* (*jagma* < *yağma*), *teftišiti* (*teftiš* < *teftiş*), *pobudaliti* (*budala* < *budala*), *priteslimiti* (*teslim* < *teslim*), *tobati* (*taban* < *taban*), *usidžiliti* (*sidžil* < *sicil*), *utaboriti* (*tabur* < *tabur*), *ujoguniti* (*\*jogun* < *uygun*). Such a form does not signify that Turkish did not have a verb with the same meaning; rather, an Turkish noun was borrowed into Bosnian and from it, a verb developed.

In the texts analysed, verbs with Turkish nominal roots most frequently have *-iti* as their suffix. There is only one example of an *-ovati* verb (*zaašikovati*) and only one of an *-ati* verb (*tobati*). The verb *zaašikovati* most likely takes *-ovati* because it ends in a velar consonant; were it to take *-iti*, it would fall into a pattern with k/c alternation. The verb *tobati* is unusual as the more common verb is *tabaniti*; the editors of Benić's chronicle suggest that *tobati* might be an orthographical error (Benić: 170). As far as determining what governed the productivity of each of these infinitival suffixes with Turkish nouns, there are not enough examples in the texts analysed to draw any conclusions, other than that *-iti* is the usual denominal infinitival suffix.

#### 4.1.2 Verbs stemming from Turkish verbs

If the root of a verb is from an Turkish verbal stem, the Turkish infinitival suffix *-mEk* is replaced by the infinitival suffix *{-d, -t}-isati*, which had developed from the Greek aorist (Škaljić, 1957: 41): *eğlenmek* > *eglenisati*, *dayanmak* > *dajanisati*. There are fourteen verbs that stem from Turkish verbs: eleven with the *-isati* suffix: *beleisati* < *beğenmek*, *bujurisati* < *buyurmak*, *dajanisati* < *dayanmak*, *eglenisati* < *eğenmek*, *imzeleisati* < *imzalamak*, *išleisati* < *işlemek*, *kurisati* < *kurmak*, *murleisati* < *mühürlemek*; *ograjisati* < *uğramak*, *paralaisati* < *paralamak*, and *ujdurisati* < *uydurmak*; and two have a dental preceding this suffix: *čurudisati* < *çürümek*, *sebdisati* < *sevmek*. While the examples above from the texts analysed occur either

with or without the dental, there are numerous examples of Turkish loan verbs that have both variants: e.g. *eglenisati* and *eglendisati*. Verbs with the *-isati* suffix can be both imperfective and perfective;<sup>105</sup> however, in some examples it is difficult to determine the aspect of a verb.<sup>106</sup> On the basis of context, *eglenisati*, *išleisati* and *sebdisati* are imperfective:

(47) a. *eglenisati*

A malo bi ga tko i viditi mogao, jer bi bo, sve unutra legav na minderu, **eglenisao**<sup>107</sup> s nekijem Čifutinom, svojijem hećim-bašom.  
 ‘And few could see him, since he was entirely inside, lying on a cushion, speaking to a Jew, his doctor.’ (Benić: 199)

b. *išleisati*

Mi, videći sadašnja vrimena, gdi niti služe seneti, ni šaiti, niti ima pravde nikakve, ni u Sarajevu, ni u Travniku, već aman trošak bez mjere, a da ima sud, ne be se to činilo, ni museveda **išleisala** rekoh videći se mi tako stisnuti, i da ne ide lemozina priko vrata, nađosmo svikolici kojih se tiče makul da se davudžija, rečeni Ivan, smijeri, a da mu dademo još jaspri.  
 ‘[Despite] seeing our present times, where documents and witnesses have no purpose, where there are no rights in Sarajevo or in Travnik; where there are instead crazy limitless expenditures (if there were a court, this would not happen, nor would the document be implemented), I said, [despite] seeing how pressed we are and that alms do not cross our threshold, all we who are involved consider it fair that the plaintiff, the mentioned Ivan, shall be placated, and we will give him more *jaspri*.’  
 (Benić: 286)

c. *sebdisati*

‘Reci im, nehoću im dati, neka svatko znade da ih Turci veliki **sebdišu**.’  
 ‘‘Tell them, I won’t give [it] to them, let each know that the great Turks love them.’’ (Benić: 202)

<sup>105</sup> In contrast, Bulgarian verbs in *{-d, -t}-isati* are not dual aspect; the suffix *{-d, -t}isova* is common (4.2.1.1). According to Dickey (2012: 90), ‘Croatian [Bosnian] has a high tolerance for biaspectual verbs, especially where loan verbs are concerned.’ For more on verbal aspect, see following footnote.

<sup>106</sup> In Slavonic languages, most verbs occur in aspectual pairs: imperfective and perfective. This opposition is between boundedness and unboundedness, often implying completeness or incompleteness, respectively. While there are exceptions, most simple unprefixated verbs are imperfective. Perfective verbs are frequently formed with the addition of a prefix to their unprefixated imperfective counterpart. Prefixation, however, often alters the meaning of the verb: e.g. *BOpisati*<sub>IPF</sub> ‘to write’ : *BOopisati*<sub>IPF</sub> ‘to describe’. To form the imperfective counterpart of ‘to describe’, a suffix is added: *BOopisivati*<sub>IPF</sub>. For more on Slavonic verbal aspect, see: Comrie (1998), Comrie and Corbett (2002: 10–12; 212–13; 331–332), Flier and Timberlake (1985), Galton (1976).

<sup>107</sup> This verb in Turkish (*eğnemek*) does not mean ‘to talk’ as it does in Bosnian but ‘to have a good time.’

Also on the basis of context, *beglaisati*, *bujurisati*, *čurudisati*, *imzeleisiti*, *kurisati*, *paralaisati* and *ujdurisati* are perfective:

(48) a. *beglaisati*

Sutješćani, izvadih fetve dvije i muraselu kadije visočkoga da ograde groblje ovo ispod svetoga Grgura – i počеше ograđivat. Ama Mustafići oliti Heganovići iz Sutiske a osobito Ahmet koji su odavna ovdje: još Ahmetov otac Mustafa Hegavi, koji je potle bečke godine iz Nijemaca, iz priko Save, došao u Sutisku i vatan **beglaisao**, počеше davu činit.

‘The people of Sutjeska, having taken out two fatwas and a decree from the judge in Visoko to enclose this graveyard under Saint Grgur, began its enclosure. But the Mustafići or the Heganovići from Sutjeska, and especially Ahmet, who had been here for a long time (Ahmet’s father, Mustafa Hegavi, who came from Germany from across the Sava to Sutjeska after the Vienna year, and liked the country) began to make complaints.’ (Benić: 326)

b. *bujurisati*

I tako opet poslaše nas u avst a oni načiniše ilam dobar po nas da dobar. I Pašić odnese ga k paši i paša lijepo nam ga **bujurisa**. I mi dadosmo ondi blaga tri kese i po.

‘And so again they sent us to prison but gave a verdict in our favour. And Pašić took the verdict off to the pasha and the pasha kindly approved it for us. And we then gave three and a half purses of riches.’ (Benić: 143)

c. *čurudisati*

I sve se dade, ama povlastice se ne potvdiše nikakve, već – sklopiv ruke – hajde doma! Izvan što nješto fermana bi izvađeno, da se more tamir činiti po manastirije što je **čurudiše** od drevnoga, al’ ne ima da se more tamir činit crkva.

‘And everything was given but the licenses were not at all approved, instead he crossed his arms – go home! Apart from something of the ferman which had been taken out, so that repairs could be made in the monastery, which is rotting from age, there was nothing [given] for repairs to be made to the church.’ (Benić: 284)

d. *imzeleisati*

Indi, ne mogoše nam učiniti Neimarovići rečeni ništa, jerbo imamo mi senete plemenite svrhu toga; ama za **imzeleisat** stari udžet, otiđe nam groša deset.

‘In other words, the mentioned Neimarovići could not do anything to us since we had the noble documents on top of that, but ten of our groša went to verifying the old court ruling.’ (Benić: 264)

e. *kurisati*

I tako rečeni Babić, ne budući zadovoljan što je prošasti paša nama prisudio jest šićajet učinio novomu kajmekamu Kulaniji i iznova davu **kurisao**.

‘And so the mentioned Babić, who was not satisfied that the former pasha had sentenced us, issued a complaint to the vizier’s new representative Kulanija and he made another complaint.’ (Benić: 309)

f. *paralaisati*

i. [...] i jednu večer kasno, dade nam izun da idemo i da se pazimo da nas baše ne **paralaišu**.

‘[...] and one night, late, he gave us a permit to go and take care so the leaders would not tear us to pieces.’ (Benić: 144)

ii. Ama Muharemija...s velikijem mnoštvom baša otiđe na Zvornik i učini juriš i osvojiše zvornički grad i okrenuše topove i **paralaisaše** kapetana i još nekolicu njih, – gdi bi krvi dosti.’

‘But Muharemija...with a great mob of noblemen went to Zvornik, attacked it and they gained the city of Zvornik. They aimed cannons and slaughtered the captain and several others – there was quite a lot of blood.’ (Benić: 188)

g. *ujdurisati*

I iza toga, kadija, **ujdurisav** nječesova mubašira na Varešane dođe ovde u Sutisku.

‘And after that, the judge, who had sent off Nječes’s messenger to the area of Vareš, came here to Sutjeska.’ (Benić: 294)

There are also two verbs whose aspect cannot be determined on the basis of context alone:

(49) a. *dajanisati*

Treba zabilježiti kao peto: da se na koncu konca nikako ni bi mogao **dajanisat** manastijer inače zulumu od vojske, već otiđoh i paši i dovedoh jednoga českin-jasakčiju.

‘As a fifth point it needs to be noted: that the monastery could finally not endure in any way the terror of the army, so I went to the pasha and brought one armed guard [to the monastery].’ (Benić: 146)

b. *ograjisati*

Odgovori čoban: ‘Kazah, al’ govore siromasi Vrančani da nijesu kadur dočekat i da su blizu kasabe i Turaka, pa da će **ograjisat** siromasi.

‘The shepherd responded: ‘I said, but the poor Vrančans say that they are not capable of receiving [him] and they are in the backwaters and close to the Turks, and the poor people will therefore experience misfortune.’ (Benić: 293)

The aspectual ambiguity in this last group of verbs is due to insufficient context: the aspect of the verb can be determined neither by affix nor by semantics. The chronicles often consist of short diary entries, which convey the main event of a day (or month

or year) but offer little background information. This aspectual ambiguity might also indicate that these verbs were relatively recent borrowings at the end of the eighteenth century in Bosnia: perhaps if these verbs had been more common, there would be more examples (e.g. *paralaisati*) that could offer aspectual evidence.

#### 4.1.2.1 Turkish verbs and *{-d, -t}isati*

The *{-d, -t}* that occurs before *-isa* is influenced by the Turkish simple past. The Slavonic suffix, originating from the Greek aorist, is *-is-* and can be preceded by a *{-d, -t}*; *{-d, -t}* is the initial consonant of the past-tense suffixes in Turkish: *BOsebdisati/sevdisati*: *Tsevmek*<sub>INF</sub>, *sevdi*<sub>3rd per.SG.SP</sub>; *BOčurudisati* : *Tçürümek*<sub>INF</sub>, *çürüdü*<sub>3rdper.SG.SP</sub>. The Bosnian form that is built on the Turkish simple past is not semantically different from any of the other forms: it can occur in all tenses and all persons.

In Turkish, *-dİ/-tİ* exists in the simple past tense, in which it attaches immediately to the stem.

Person	Simple past suffixes
1 <sup>st</sup> pers. sg.	dİm
2 <sup>nd</sup> pers. sg.	dİn
3 <sup>rd</sup> pers. sg.	dİ
1 <sup>st</sup> pers. pl.	dİk
2 <sup>nd</sup> pers. pl.	dİnİz
3 <sup>rd</sup> pers. pl.	dİ(1Er)

Most likely because of the frequency with which these past tense suffixes occur, *{-d, -t}* became common in Turkish loan verbs. Since there are only two examples of a *{-d, -t}* infinitive among the verbs in the Franciscan texts, one cannot determine if the *{-d, -t}* infinitive is more common with verbs frequently used to describe the past.

#### 4.1.2.1.1 Turkish past-tense third-person finite form in Bosnian

There is one example of a verb that has no infinitival form in the texts studied and is attested only in its past-tense third-person finite form: *basti* < *basti* from *basmak* (Škaljić, 1957: 122):

- (50) ‘**basti** đaur’, što hoće reć ‘navali nevirnik’  
‘‘*basti đaur*’, which means ‘the infidel hit [attacked].’ (Lašvanin: 209)

Since *basti* is glossed, and because it is listed in Škaljić only under this example, it most likely was employed only in this set phrase, not independently. The infinitive *bastisati* exists, but its past participle would be *\*bastisao*.

#### 4.1.2.1.2 Turkish verbal suffixes

Four of the verbs with Turkish verbal roots have the Turkish *-IE* suffix: *imzeleisati* < *imzalamak*, *išleisati* < *išlemek*, *paralaisati* < *paralamak*. This is one of the numerous Turkish suffixes which change nouns or adjectives into verbs: e.g. *iş* ‘work + *IE* + *mEk* > *išlemek* ‘to work’. In contrast to the Bulgarian manuscripts (4.2.2), this is the only Turkish verbal suffix attested in the Bosnian texts.

#### 4.1.3 Noun-verb compounds

The last type of verbal construction built on an Turkish word is ‘noun’ + *učiniti*. This construction is a demi-calque on Turkish noun-verb compounds<sup>108</sup> in which the infinitive *etmek*, meaning ‘to do/make’, is paired with a noun, often not native to Turkish: e.g. *devam etmek* ‘to continue’. Though this construction already existed in Bosnian, e.g. *učiniti prijekor* ‘to reprove’, the frequency with which Turkish nouns occur with *učiniti* suggests that the Turkish noun-verb compound might have influenced its development with Turkish nouns.

---

<sup>108</sup> For more on noun-verb compounds, see Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 157–160).

Nakaš (2005: 122) comments on the frequency of this construction in the oral tradition. She points out that ‘turkism’ + *učiniti* facilitates rhyme and rhythm in poetry. Though certainly true, the majority of the examples that she cites also exist as ‘noun’ + *etmek* in Turkish, which would suggest that these forms developed in Bosnian as demi-calques rather than to maintain poetic parallelism. She does have a few examples where in Turkish a verb other than *etmek* would be used: e.g. *BO**dževab učiniti* but *1**cevap vermek* (*BO**dževab dati*) ‘to answer’. Although many of these noun-verb compounds with *učiniti* might have been demi-calques, ‘turkism’ + *učiniti* became productive where ‘noun’ + *etmek* is not attested.

In the texts studied, there are several such demi-calques: e.g. *izlal učiniti*, *surgun učiniti*. The phrasal verb *surgun učiniti* is synonymous with the Turkish loan verb stemming from an infinitive *sursatiti*<sup>109</sup>/*surisati* < *sürmek*:

- (51) [...] **učini** ih **surgun** šest’  
 ‘[...] he banished six of them’ (Lašvanin: 179)

Both the infinitival form (*1**sürmek*) and the ‘noun’ + *etmek* (*1**sürgün etmek*) were borrowed into Bosnian. Therefore, it seems the Turkish verbal root and nominal element from Turkish noun-verb compounds are distinct in Bosnian, though one needs more examples. As seen in the example, the word order of these compounds is not set, in contrast to standard Turkish, where the nominal element always immediately precedes the verb, which is always in final position.

#### 4.1.4 Verbal prefixes

It is not uncommon for verbs stemming from Turkish to have developed Slavonic prefixes. In Slavonic languages, verbal prefixation frequently either modifies the

---

<sup>109</sup> According to the editors of Lašvanin’s chronicle, this form of the verb is only attested in Lašvanin and is most likely a mistake.

meaning of the verb or derives verbs with new meanings,<sup>110</sup> normally with perfective aspect as a concomitant effect (Comrie and Corbett, 2008: 11). In the texts analysed, there are fourteen prefixed verbs that stem from Turkish: one in Dobretić, three in Lašvanin and ten in Benić. Both chronicles contain *uapstiti*, but there are otherwise no overlaps.

Slavonic verbal prefixes<sup>111</sup> that occur in the texts analysed are: *iz-* (completion, where all components of the object are encompassed:<sup>112</sup> *izjesti* ‘to eat up’); *o/ob-* (the adjectival stem becomes an active process: *objačati* ‘to strengthen’); *od-* (away, contra: *oteti* ‘to take away’; to carry out an action to its final degree: *odmoliti se* ‘to pray one’s heart out’); *po-*<sup>113</sup> (change of state: *poturčiti* ‘to convert to Islam’; for a series of actions that are completed:

- (52) [...] neki su od njih **poginuli**...drugi **pobjegli**...braća su ponovno **podigla**...samostan  
 ‘[...] some of them perished...others fled...brothers rebuilt the monastery’  
 (106)

It can also indicate a limited or specific time: *popočekati*<sup>114</sup> ‘to wait a short period’); *pod-* (to bring under: *podsjediti* ‘to possess’); *pre-* (transformation or transferral: *predati* ‘to hand over’); *pro-* (to carry through an action: *promisliti* ‘to think over’); *u-* (into: *ući*; the subject takes possession of the object: *uhvatiti* ‘to capture’); completion: *upoznati* ‘to get acquainted with’); *za-* (the beginning of an action: *zaplakati* ‘to burst out crying’). In the examples of verbs with Turkish nominal roots

<sup>110</sup> There is debate about whether prefixes that do not modify the meaning of verbs, e.g. *na-* in the pair: BO*pisati*<sub>IPF</sub> : BO*napisati*<sub>PF</sub> ‘to write’ are indeed ‘empty prefixes’. For more, see Šarić (2011), Dickey (2012), Endresen et al. (2012).

<sup>111</sup> Slavonic prefixes have multiple meanings. Only the meanings that exist in the texts studied are given here. In some examples, the meaning given is not the most frequent. For a complete explanation of Bosnian prefixes, see: Anić (2000); Bujas (2005); Šarić (2011; 2012; 2013), Dickey (2012).

<sup>112</sup> All examples are taken from Benić’s chronicle.

<sup>113</sup> For detailed analysis of the meaning of *po-* in BCS, see Dickey (2012: 90–94).

<sup>114</sup> The verb *popočekati* does is not attested in the standard language. Most likely the doubled prefix indicates waiting for a very short and limited time.

from the texts analysed, *iz-*, *o/ob-*, *od-*, *po-*, *pod-*, *pre-*, *pro-*, *u-* and *za-* create new verbs belonging to a different lexical aspect or *Aktionsart*<sup>115</sup> of the root verb: they alter the meaning of the root verb and sometimes create verbs with new meanings. For example, the prefixed counterparts of *plakati* ‘to cry’ indicate how one cries: *poplakati* ‘to weep a little’; *zaplakati* ‘to burst out crying’; *naplakati* ‘to cry one’s fill’; *otplakati* ‘to cry a little’; *isplakati* ‘to cry one’s eyes out’. The prefixed counterparts of *govoriti* ‘to speak’ are more distinct in meaning. Although all prefixed forms relate to the type of speech one utters, these verbs are not limited to contexts relating to speech: *odgovoriti* ‘to respond’; *izgovoriti* ‘to pronounce’; *nagovoriti* ‘to persuade’; *zagovoriti* ‘to advocate’; *podgovoriti* ‘to incite’. The prefixes *od-* and *za-* in the texts analysed also create verbs with meanings different from that of their root verb.

#### **4.1.4.1 Prefixes and *Aktionsarten***

Apart from two verbs (*haračiti* and *apstiti*), each prefixed verb stemming from Turkish occurs with only one prefix. Verbs whose prefixes denote *Aktionsart* of the root verb are the most frequent. Although most verbs with prefixes denoting *Aktionsart* occur with only one prefix in the texts, because the prefix is used for delimitation, these verbs could take other prefixes as well, depending on context, as the verbs *haračiti* and *apstiti* do (4.1.4.1.2).

##### **4.1.4.1.1 *Aktionsarten* with one prefix**

The verb *kusuriti* occurs with the prefix *iz/s-*:

---

<sup>115</sup> For the purpose of this dissertation *Aktionsart* is defined as the ‘lexical class to which a verb belongs by virtue of the type of process, state, etc. that it is used to refer to’ (Mathews, 2014). In Slavonic languages the type of process to which a verb refers often lies in the meaning of the verbal prefix: e.g. inceptive verbs tend to have the prefix *za-*, *po-* is often telic.

- (53) I premda bija/s/mo počeli pridavat džuluš, ništa ne manje svega ondi ne mogosmo **iskusurit**.  
 ‘Though we had begun paying the tax, we were entirely unable to pay it in entirety.’ (Benić: 232)

The prefix *iz-* can have two meanings: ‘out of’:

- (54) [...] gvardijan, kako **izađe** iz avsta  
 ‘[...] the guardian, as he went out of the prison’ (49)

It can also mean ‘completion’:

- (55) a. [...] te take mrtve ljude sve bi **izjeli** živi.  
 ‘[...] the living would eat up all such dead people.’ (53)
- b. Budim vas **izgori** u Turaka.  
 ‘All of Budim burned in the hands of the Turks.’ (47)

In the example of *iskusuriti*, completion is implied: the Franciscans were not able to pay the amount demanded in entirety. The verb *iskusuriti*, which might have developed through semantic parallelism to *isplatiti* ‘to pay off’, is an Turkish loanword which exemplifies how a prefix makes a verb perfective, in addition to altering its meaning: \**kusuriti* ‘to pay’ > *iskusuriti* ‘to pay in entirety’.

The example with *išćefiliti se* is similar to that of *iskusuriti*:

- (56) Međuto, [od onih] koji su jur [u]avšt[en]i [bili], reče jedan...da su ih knezovi poslali na tu kavgu...Ter i njija u avst. Ele nekako **išćefile se** knezovi, ter skočivši se u Travnik k Babiću, koji je inače poglaviti emin, i od njega donesoše knjigu. I davši (oni koji su se bili i u avstu se našli tada) nekoliko jaspri, pustili su se.  
 ‘However, one of those who had already been captured said that the princes had sent them to that fight...They were [sent] to prison, too. Well, the princes were somehow excused for they hurried over to Travnik to Babić, who was otherwise the most trustworthy person, they brought the document from him. And those (who had fought and were in prison) gave some *jaspri* and were freed.’ (Benić: 295).

The prisoners bribed in full their way out of the prison.

#### 4.1.4.1.1.1 *u-*

Benić uses *u-* in several verbs that contain Turkish roots to make the meaning of verbs more precise. The verb *uavstiti* means ‘to imprison’:

- (57) I ništa ne manje odvedoše sobom jednoga fratra do mule, koga mula **uavsti** i uze groša 41 a muselim groša pet.  
‘And all the same they took a friar with them to the *mula*, who imprisoned him [the friar] and took 41 *groš* and the *muselim* took five *groš*.’ (Benić: 255)

On its own, however, *apstiti* means ‘to catch’ or ‘to take captive’. The prefix *u-* adds the meaning of confinement to the verb: the friar was not only taken captive, he was held captive in a prison.

Benić uses the prefix *u-* with the same meaning in verbs with native roots in his chronicle:

- (58) Na 27. jula 1780. metnusmo u zid, oliti **uzidasmo** u crkvene zidove, križa kamenitijeh [na broj] deset.  
‘On 27 July 1780 we put ten stone crosses within walls, or we enclosed them in the church walls.’ (Benić: 315)

Given that *metnuti u zid* is glossed with *uzidati*, it seems that *uzidati* is a common verb. The adverbial phrase *u crkvene zidove* ‘in church walls’ is a cognate of the verb *uzidati*. This phrase modifies the verb: the crosses were enclosed by church walls, rather than by another type of wall. In both of these examples, the prefix, in addition to making the verb perfective, enables the verb to take a cognate object that further refines the meaning of the verb.

The verb *usidžiliti* is a similar example with *u-*:

- (59) Otiđe isti o.p. fra Antun zajedno s o.p. gvardijanom kreševskijem...u Sarajevo za **usidžiliti** u mule ferman i uzeti po njemu muraselu.  
‘The same o.p. fra Antun went together with the o.p. Kreševski guardian... to Sarajevo to the *mula* to have the *ferman* sealed and to take the decree from him.’ (Benić: 218)

As with *uapstiti* and *uzidati*, complete containment is implied: the nominal root *sidžil* is maintained within, or rather on the object. In contrast to the example of *uzidati*, *usidžiliti* is neither glossed nor described. In part, the lack of circumlocution might be the result of semantic parallelism: *usidžiliti: upečatiti* ‘to seal’.

Another example with the prefix *u-* as a perfective specifying marker is:  
*uzavstiti*:

- (60) Dakle, iza toga mahom stiže na Bosnu kajmekamom zet Ćuprilić, za **uzavstit** Bosnu, misto punčevo.  
‘So, after that, all of sudden the son-in-law Ćuprilić arrived as the *kajmekam* in Bosnia to conquer Bosnia, his father-in-law’s place.’ (Benić: 237)

The prefix *u-* in this instance has a different meaning: it suggests finality. Benić uses the prefix *u-* to suggest finality in native verbs e.g. *uhvatiti*: ‘to capture and keep’; *ukopati*: ‘to bury’.

#### 4.1.4.1.1.2 *po-*

In the one prefixed verb used by Dobretić, *pobudaliti*, the prefix *po-* most likely occurs to indicate an abrupt and definite change, a change in state:

- (61) a. Ticzio imaduchi 10 godin **pobudali**, i izajde izvan jebe jašvim, nictanamagne švakoga mišecza poedan put povratife uše, i dojde u poznagne, i pametno govorii, i gludski dilluje, ovih imaduchi jurve 30 godina.  
‘Ticzio who was ten, went crazy, and completely left himself, all the same every month he would return to himself, become conscious and speak intelligently and act human, this has been happening already 30 years.’ (Dobretić: 517)
- b. Takoger da jedan danas pià Karsctegne, a futra **pobudallii**, i izgubii švišt, i utomu štagnu daše karštii, dobrobi bio karscten  
‘Also if someone today requests baptism, but goes crazy tomorrow and loses consciousness, he would be a legitimate Christian if he were baptised in this state’ (38)

Ticzio suddenly became insane and remained so for a significant period of time; likewise, one is a baptised Christian if one has asked for baptism, even if on the day

of the baptism one has already lost one's mind entirely. The prefix *po-* emphasises the action of going from the state of being sane to being insane, as it does in the modern language: e.g. *Čovjek je poludio* 'The man went crazy'. Though Dobretić does not use the prefix *po-* frequently in this text, there are examples of the prefix having the same connotation with native verbs:

- (62) I Karsctegne **poftalo**, i za dobro vazda darxano, i od czarkve dopuscteno  
 'And baptism came into effect, regarded as good everywhere and permitted by the church.' (28)

Baptism became a sacrament of the Catholic church, not gradually, but suddenly and firmly. In an anecdote relating to confession, Dobretić describes a man who has confessed mortal sins (e.g. stealing, murder) and yet feels no remorse. Dobretić states that his confession is nevertheless worthy and that, '...bi imao odluku temeglitu, dafe vechie nechie **povratiti** na grihe' ('...he would make the fundamental decision that he will sin no more') (92): from this day forward the man must never again commit such sins.

The prefix *za-* might also be the perfective prefix with *budaliti*. Although *za-* would emphasise the beginning of the action, e.g. the loss of sanity, or a sudden but brief change, e.g. *zaplakati*, it would not stress the change of state, as *po-* does: Ticzio did not just begin to go mad, but went completely mad rather suddenly for a significant period. The choice of *po-* in *budaliti* is surely also influenced by semantic parallelism: *poluditi* 'to go crazy' : *pobudaliti*. It seems that *po-* is used to denote an immediate change from one state to another. Parallel examples can be seen with *poturčiti* 'to convert to Islam' and *pobašiti* 'to become a nobleman':

- (63) a. [...] reć baliije: 'valah se **poturčio!**  
 '[...] the *baliije* said, 'My God, he became Muslim!'' (Benić: 321)

- b. [...] ama, kako se balije oprostiše zuluma pašina oliti takijeh nameta, evo se sve **pobaši**.  
 [...] ‘but, since the *balije* forgave the pasha’s injustice (or excises), now he has completely become a *baša*.’ (Benić: 187)

One does not gradually convert to another faith; one participates in a ritual that immediately allows one to become and remain a member of that specific religion. As soon as the Muslims forgave the pasha his excises, he became a nobleman. The example of *paharčiti* is similar:

- (64) I tu bi dosti muke krstjanom i fratrom; i doklem ga se izbaviše, **poharčiše** krstjani sedam tovara blaga.  
 ‘And here the Christians and friars had a great deal of suffering; and upon being delivered [from the one making them suffer], the Christians lost [had to pay] seven shipments of riches.’ (Benić: 46)

The Christians and friars lost their riches, which were never again regained; thus their state changes from having riches to no longer having them.

#### 4.1.4.1.2 Verbal roots that are found with more than one prefix

There are also examples where the same verbal root has different prefixes in each chronicle: *podharačiti* (six times) and *uharačiti* (twice) are attested in Lašvanin.

Though these verbs have different prefixes, how they differ in meaning is debatable:

- (65) a. *podharačiti*:
- i. Umri Amintaš, kralj makedonski, koji bijaše **podharačio** Slovincem.  
 ‘Amyntas, the Macedonian King, who had subjected the Slavs to taxation, died.’ (Lašvanin: 47)
  - ii. Aron, turski poglavica...carigradskoga cesara, obside i kruto **podharači** nepravednim načinom.  
 ‘Aron, the Turkish head...of the Constantinople emperor, conquered and cruelly taxed unjustly.’ (Lašvanin: 86)
  - iii. Ugri Grke **podharačiše**  
 ‘The Hungarians taxed the Greeks’ (Lašvanin: 91)
  - iv. Senjani veliku silu čine na moru...more posvojiše i **podharačiše**.  
 ‘The people of Senj were violent at sea...they gained the sea and instigated tax.’ (Lašvanin: 108)

v. Iste se godine Lazar Turčinu **podharači** po nagovoru svoga zeta.  
'The same year under the persuasion of his son-in-law, Lazar taxed the Turk.' (Lašvanin: 121)

vi. Senjani vojuju protiva Turkom i Mlečanom...Po turskoj zemlji više od četrdeset gradova i sela **podharačiše**.  
'The people of Senj wage war against the Turks and Venetians...they taxed more than forty cities and villages throughout the Turkish land.' (Lašvanin: 157)

b. *uharačiti*:

i. Alekšandro sva kraljestva **uharači**; posli toga, na godini umri, otrovan  
'Alexander taxed all kingdoms, a year later he died, poisoned' (49)

ii. **Uharači** bugarskoga poglavicu.'  
'He taxed the Bulgarian leader.' (111)

The verb *uharačiti* is possibly used when taxation is comprehensive: *sva kraljestva* 'all kingdoms'. It is plausible that *podharačiti* emphasises the authority instigating the tax rather than the one who is taxed or the amount. The prefix *pod-* with *haračiti* is also explained by the numerous examples of the phrase *podložiti pod harač* 'to subject to paying tax' throughout the chronicle:

(66) Mir s Goti učini i **pod harač položi se**, što bi velika pogrda Rimljanom.  
'He made peace with the Goths and submitted to taxation, which was a great reproach to the Romans.' (Lašvanin: 66)

The verb *podharačiti* has the same meaning as this three-word expression but is more succinct. It might be concluded that *uharačiti* stresses the taxation of an entire region or group of people while *pod-* emphasises the one instigating the tax.

#### 4.1.4.1.3 Prefixes that create new verbs

There are several examples of verbs stemming from Turkish where the native Bosnian prefix changes the meaning of the verb. These prefixed forms that result in meanings different from that of the root verb occur because of the semantic weight that a prefix carries or because of semantic parallelism. The pair: *ašikovati* : *zaašikovati* is such an example. Each of the verbs is attested in a different chronicle:

- (67) a. *ašikovati*  
 Na 28. oktobra 1760. iziđe museveda na fratre ovoga manastijera da je nječesova bula, udovica Sarajka, ulazila s nekijem Sarajkama krst[j]ankam zajedno u crkvu i da su fratri za njom **ašikovali**.  
 ‘On 28 October 1760 a hand-written document went to the friars of this monastery [saying] that some *bula*, a Sarajevo widow, came with some Sarajevan Christian women to church and the friars fell for her.’ (Benić: 217)
- b. *zaašikovati*  
 [...] se poturči gvardijan u Srebrenici, bivši se **zaašikovao** za bulom.  
 ‘[...] having fallen in love with a *bula*, the guardian in Srebrenica became Muslim.’ (Lašvanin: 254)

Because of the limited context, *ašikovati* could mean ‘to fall in love with’ as *zaašikovati* does, but in this example, *ašikovati* most likely means ‘to fancy’, ‘to flirt with’: the monks fancied this *bula*, but were not in love with her. On the other hand, when Lašvanin uses *zaašikovati*, the guardian has fallen in love, broken his vows and converted to Islam for a *bula*.

The verb *zaašikovati* most likely developed through semantic parallelism to the pair: *ljubiti*: *zaljubiti se*: *ašikovati* : *zaašikovati se*. Because the prefix *za-* is inceptive, *zaašikovati* could hypothetically mean ‘to begin to flirt with’ or ‘to fall in love’. On the basis of context, it seems that *zaašikovati* means to ‘fall in love’.

#### 4.1.4.1.4 Prefixal reinforcement

A slightly different example is *esabiti* : *proesabiti*:

- (68) a. [...] **esabi**, brate, zuluma!  
 ‘[...] imagine, brothers, the injustice!’ (Benić: 163)
- b. [...] ljudi **esabljahu** da će im biti adalet  
 ‘[...] people understood that they would have justice’ (Benić: 169)
- c. [...] onda mi se svi dogovorismo i **proesabismo** da je to naopako.  
 ‘[...] then we all agreed and concluded that it was topsy-turvy.’ (Benić: 157)

Benić employs the prefix *pro-* in several examples with native Slavonic verbs in which the prefix has a similar if not the same meaning as it does in *proesabiti*:

- (69) a. *prosuduti* ‘to judge’  
Sada tebi ostavljam da **prosudiš** i ocijeniš, dragi čitatelju  
‘I now leave it to you, dear reader, to judge and assess’ (83)
- b. *promisliti* ‘to consider’  
[...] vidjeli su i razmotrili ono što jest i što je bilo i **promislili** o  
budućnosti.  
‘[...] they saw and considered things as they are and as they were and  
considered the future.’ (83)
- c. *proglasiti* ‘to declare’  
Bosanci se ne mogu **proglasiti** buntovnicima niti neposlušnima ili  
smutljivcima, jer su naveli sasvim dovoljne razloge svoje odsutnosti s  
kapitula  
‘Bosnians cannot be declared rebels or disobedient or trouble-makers  
because they have given entirely sufficient reasons for their absence from  
the Chapter’ (87)
- d. *prouzročiti* ‘to instigate’  
2. 1686 izgorio je skupa sa samim gradom, u požaru koji su **prouzročili**  
carski vojnici, samostan sv. Marije u Srebrenici.  
‘In February 1686 the Monastery of St. Mary in Srebrenica burned, along  
with the city itself, in a fire that had been instigated by the imperial  
soldiers.’ (110)

Most likely *proesabiti* developed through semantic parallelism to several verbs having the prefix *pro-*: *promisliti* ‘to consider’, *pronaći* ‘to invent’, *proučiti* ‘to learn’. In all of these verbs, the prefix implies carrying through an action (Bujas: 2005).

The verb *proesabiti* occurs only once in Benić’s chronicle, while *esabiti* occurs ten times, three of which are in the imperative. This distribution is noticeable in that it is more common to have a perfective than an imperfective verb in the imperative in Bosnian. There certainly are examples of imperfective verbs used in the imperative in Bosnian (e.g. *Piši!* ‘Write!’; *Čitaj!* ‘Read!’), but Benić employs *esabi/esabite* where *zamisli/zmislite*<sub>PF</sub> ‘Imagine!’, would be used as the native counterpart:

- (70) [...] izvadismo ih mrtve... otac rečenoga pokojnog momka Jozipa, da vidi nesretni slučaj i da razmisli. Koji kad ugleda, **esabite** koji ovo uzštijete, kakav plač, kakva li tuga bi!  
 ‘[...] we took them out dead... [so that] the father of the mentioned deceased boy Jozip saw the unhappy case and reflected. Imagine, you who read this, how it hurt him when he [the father] looked at him [Jozip], what crying, what unbearable sadness!’ (Benić: 239)

It is possible that *esabiti* originally lacked a prefix and like *pisati* ‘to write’ and *čitati* ‘to read’, occurred in the imperative without a prefix. Whether this original prefixless form was dual-aspectual is impossible to determine given that there are no examples of *esabiti* or *proesabiti* in the earlier seventeenth-century text.

The verb *priteslimiti* is similar. *Teslim*, meaning ‘to hand over’ or ‘to surrender’, occurs frequently but only once as the root of a prefixed verb:

- (71) Pak mi njima **priteslimismo** a oni na amanet Omer-baši Imamoviću u Sutisci i da se ima poslat odonle u Visoki za prodati na telalu.  
 ‘So we handed [it] over to them and they, under the trust of Omer-baša Imamović in Sutjeska, should send it on to Visoko to be sold to the messenger.’ (Benić: 255)

The prefix *pre*<sup>116</sup> means ‘to change or transfer from one position or state to another’:

- (72) a. *predati* ‘to hand over’  
 [...] **pridadoše** Kandiju.  
 ‘[...]he] relinquished Kandija.’ (Benić: 47)
- b. *presuditi* ‘to arbitrate’  
 [...] pa je konačno **presudio** da se provincija podijeli’  
 ‘[...] so he finally arbitrated to divide the province.’ (Benić: 57)

The verb *priteslimiti* might have developed through semantic parallelism to *predati* ‘to hand over’ (*pridati* in this text), though it is also possible that the prefixed form of the verb developed independently of semantic parallelism; the prefix was productive in the same way that it is among native verbs.

---

<sup>116</sup> The author writes in *ikavski*, which is why the prefix is spelled *pri* rather than *pre*.

#### 4.1.4.1.5 Verbs attested only with prefixes

Several verbs are attested only with a prefix. These prefixes are *o/ob-* (*obataliti*, *osakatiti*) and *od-* (*odilamiti*, *odbašiti se*). There are two examples with *o/ob-*; these verbs are the only verbs with an Turkish adjective as their root:

- (73) a. [...]kao da smo mi...u meščemu varešku konje i goveda ugonili i **obatalili**.  
‘[...]it was as if we drove out horses and cattle to the Vareš court and let them rot.’ (Benić: 290)
- b. *Parvo*: ako ubiesh, il **offakatish** gnegovo xivinçe  
‘*First*, if you kill or maim his head of cattle’ (Lastrić, 1766: 158)

The prefix *o(b)-* in 74a is used to denote that something is subjected to the effects of a process, which is one of the prefix’s common usages (4.1.4). The prefix has the same meaning in 74b. Benić uses the prefix *ob-* with the same meaning in several other examples of native verbs:

- (74) a. *objačati* ‘to strengthen’  
[...] i turski car dojde u Mecedoniju za **objačati** vojsku na Kandiji  
‘[...] and the Turkish emperor came to Macedonia to strengthen the army in Kandija’ (47)
- b. *omaliti* ‘to be content with little’  
Da izgubi viru i da to učini aman bi uzrok mati joj Stažija; jerbo joj milo bijaše da rečeni pašo imade prijateljstvo s njezinom kćerju; a Turčin **omalit** ne zna.  
‘Her mother Stažija was the cause of her losing faith, because she was glad that the mentioned pasha had a friendship with her daughter. But the Turk did not know to be happy with little.’ (207)
- c. *osloboditi* ‘to liberate’  
Stoga su se, u vrijeme kapitula, kad su se birali službenici, rađale razne razmirice i svađe među ocima a najviše onda, kada su se Božjom pomoću, Dalmacija i oni prekosavski krajevi **oslobodili** od turskog ropstva.  
‘Then, during the Chapter, when they were choosing their members, various differences arose and there were arguments among the fathers, but the biggest was then when, with God’s help, Dalmatia and the regions on the other side of the Sava were liberated from Turkish slavery.’ (60)

d. *ozloglašivati* ‘to defame’

No budući da onaj koji je na zlu glasu ne može **ozloglašivati**, zato... Sve te stvari radili su oni od brace koji su uvijek bili nemirni, ambiciozni, tvrdoglavi i svojeglavi.

‘But because the one who has been defamed cannot defame, therefore...all those things were done by those among the brothers who had always been restless, ambitious, stubborn and capricious.’ (93)

These verbs that have adjectives as their roots exist only with prefixes in both their perfective and imperfective forms.

The prefix *od-* has several meanings<sup>117</sup> in modern BCS: ‘away’: *odletjeti* ‘to fly off or away’; ‘un-, de-:’ *odlediti* ‘to defrost’, *odvezati* ‘to untie’; to finish or complete an action: *odslušati* ‘to listen to the end’, *otplakati* ‘to cry for some time and then stop’ (Anić, 2000; Bujas, 2005).

In their glossary the editors of Benić’s chronicle define *odilamiti* as ‘to issue a court decision’. In three of the four examples of this word, the editors’ definition fits:

- (75) a. Međuto, **odilami** kadija fojnički manastijer da su nješto načinjali iznova unutra.  
‘However, the judge issued the verdict that they had once again done something inside.’ (218)
- b. Zato rečeni kadija iznese musevedu i **odilami** da je leš pao kod mise.’  
‘Therefore the judge issued a document and made the verdict that the corpse fell during mass.’ (236);
- c. [...] jerbo kadija...bio je **odilamio** nas ružno.  
‘[...] for the judge had given us a cruel verdict.’ (301)

In these examples, *od-* suggests completion and makes the verb *ilamiti* perfective.

However, there is one example where the prefix changes the meaning of the verb:

---

<sup>117</sup> While *od-* has several meanings, these meanings are related. Šarić and Tchizmarova (2013:7) argue that the spatial meaning ‘from’ of *od-* is extended to ‘metaphorical or figurative movement’. When *od-* emphasises the completion of an action from the beginning to end, this meaning exemplifies ‘metonymy: the source stands for the entire path’ (22).

- (76) [...] *kadija* visočki suprotiva samomu sebi **odilami**, negoli je prija ilamio. Turčina ne vidjoh, brate, po naravi boljega ni pravijega negoli bi ovi *mubašir*.  
 ‘[...] the Visoko judge contradicted himself and revoked the verdict that he had made earlier. I haven’t seen a Turk, brothers, better and more just in nature than this *mubašir*.’ (Benić: 165)

It seems more likely here that *odilamiti* means ‘to revoke a court decision’ on the basis of context and the meanings of the prefix *od-*. Because the *mubašir* encouraged the *kadija* to revoke his decision, the monasteries were freed from paying additional taxes and the monks felt esteem for the *mubašir*. If the *mubašir* had encouraged the *kadija* to finalise the decision whether to search and tax the monastery, Benić would not declare, ‘Turčina ne vidjoh, brate, po naravi boljega ni pravijega negoli bi ovi *mubašir*’ (‘I haven’t seen a Turk, brothers, better and more just in nature than this *mubašir*.’) (165).

In the case of *odbašiti*, the verb has an entirely different meaning without the prefix,<sup>118</sup> which is critical to the word’s meaning. This verb most likely developed by analogy to the native word, *odbaštiniti (se)* ‘to be deprived of one’s inheritance’. In both of these verbs, the prefix *od-/ot-* signifies cancellation.<sup>119</sup> In these texts, there is only one example of *odbašiti se*, which makes it impossible to determine whether it can also occur without the reflexive pronoun as *odbaštiniti* can. In both words, the *od-* signifies ‘to deprive someone of something (one’s status as a *baša* or one’s inheritance)’:

- (77) Indi, vratiše se na Duvno i uzeše od baše dvanaest kesa i od raje dvije kese jaspri i **odbašiče se**.  
 ‘Otherwise, he returned to Duvno and took twelve bags of *jaspra* from the *baša* and two from the people and lost his status as *baša*.’ (Benić: 175)

<sup>118</sup> *bašititi se*: ‘to behave like a *baša*’.

<sup>119</sup> For more, see Šarić and Tchizmarova (2013: 16–20).

Most likely, *odbašiti* developed because of the productive meaning of *od/ot* and its similar phonological structure to *odbaštiniti*.

#### 4.1.4.1.6 Conclusion

Although it is difficult to draw conclusions on the basis of these limited examples, one can observe common trends in prefixed verbs: the writers had a clear understanding of the multiple meanings of each prefix. In some cases, verbs with Turkish roots are synonymous with native verbs that have the same prefix: e.g. *pobudaliti* : *poluditi* ‘to go crazy’; *priteslimiti*: *predati* ‘to hand over’. These synonyms might suggest that semantic parallelism plays a role in the prefixal development of verbs with Turkish roots. Though native synonyms might have influenced the frequency of verbs with Turkish roots that take prefixes, these prefixed verbs did not develop from semantic parallelism alone. These prefixes often caused the verbs to develop a meaning foreign to the Turkish nominal or verbal root: e.g. *baša*: *odbašiti se*.

All prefixed verbs in the texts analysed have Turkish nominal roots. In part, this might be due to the respective infinitival suffixes for verbs stemming from Turkish nouns and from Turkish verbs: *-iti, -ati, -ovati* (nouns); *{-d, -t}-isati* (verbs). The *{-d, -t}-isati* suffix is predominantly though not exclusively perfective, while the suffixes *-iti, -ati* and *-ovati* verbs (when not prefixed) are almost always imperfective. With *-iti, -ati, and -ovati* verbs, prefixation commonly establishes *Aktionsart* with perfectivization as a concomitant effect (e.g. *spavati* ‘to sleep’ > *pospavati* ‘to sleep for a bit’), as exemplified by verbs stemming from Turkish nouns. *Aktionsarten* are most likely limited to verbs with Turkish nominal roots because it would be unusual for *Aktionsarten* to be formed on perfective verbs. Thus, it might be that *{-d, -t}-isati* verbs did not develop prefixes because they were perfective (as well as imperfective).

The examples that are imperfective and ambiguous might be recent borrowings in Benić's time, which would explain why their aspect was still not fully distinct. Therefore, it seems the development of *Aktionsarten* and perfectivization in prefixed verbs were most likely simultaneous.

#### 4.2 Bulgarian verbs

Forming verbs from Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian is less clearly related to grammatical categories than it is in Bosnian. In Bosnian, verbs stemming from Turkish verbs always take the *{-d, -t}-isati* infinitival ending, while verbs formed from Turkish nominal roots or adjectives take the *-ati, -iti* or *-ovati* endings (4.1.1). Though the infinitive had been lost in Bulgarian by the eighteenth century,<sup>120</sup> conjugations with Turkish stems follow similar trends to those of Bosnian, albeit to a lesser extent.

Lakova (1970) categorises verbs stemming from Turkish by their morphological developments: verbs from Turkish verbs that take the *{-d, -t}-isa* suffix; verbs built on Turkish nouns or adjectives; demi-calques of Turkish noun-verb compounds. These patterns occur in the texts analysed. Lakova also mentions examples of verbal roots on to which conjugational endings are added without any buffer: e.g. *biçmek* > *biča* 'to cut'.<sup>121</sup> Conjugational endings can also be added directly to Turkish nouns and adjectives to make *i*-stem verbs: *meze* > *meze + i* >

---

<sup>120</sup> There is not one example of any verb – native or loan – in its infinitive form in the texts analysed for this dissertation.

<sup>121</sup> Lakova (1970) cites eight verbs as such, which she says have the same structure in Bulgarian as they do in the original Turkish. Apart from the *biçmek/biča* pair, all of the Turkish verbs that she cites have the suffix *-IE*, which is used to make a verb from a noun in Turkish (see section 4.2.2). In the examples which Lakova cites, this suffix is not borrowed into Bulgarian: e.g. *bokluča* 'to litter' = *boklamak* (In this example, the <l> is from *bokluk*, not *-la-*); *darača* 'to comb, to rake' = *taraklamak*; *kalafatja* 'caulk' = *kalafatlamak*. The pattern of conjugational endings added directly to the verbal root in Bulgarian does not match the Turkish verb form, which always has the penultimate *-IE-* suffix preceding the final endings. Since some Turkish verbs were incorporated into Bulgarian complete with the *-IE-* suffix, it is unlikely that the structure Turkish noun + conjugational endings originated from Turkish verbs containing a noun + *IE* + endings. It is more likely that the Turkish nouns independent of the verbal form were the source of the pattern of Turkish noun + conjugational endings, as is the case in Bosnian (see 4.1.1).

*mezja* ‘to snack, to have an appetizer’. These *i*-stem verbs usually have Turkish nouns as roots. The suffix *-uva-m* is common for deriving verbs from nouns: *çirak* > *čirak* > *čirakuvam* ‘to be an apprentice’. This conjugational pattern also occurs among secondary derivatives: e.g. *čorbažijstvo* > *čorbadžijstvuvam* ‘to put on airs’ (Lakova, 1970: 435). Four other less common conjugational patterns also exist for verbs with roots of Turkish origin: *-eja*: *šiškaveja* ‘to grow fat’; *-kam*: *budalkam*; *-am* ‘to be a fool’; *n+a*: *čalna* ‘to steal’ (Lakova, 1970: 435).

#### 4.2.1 Verb formation

There are sixty-six verbs and five conjugational patterns for verbs of Turkish origin in the three Bulgarian manuscripts analysed. The five verbal suffixes are as follows, in order of frequency: *{-d, -t}-isa*, *i*-stems, and *-ova-*, *-uva-*, and *-stvuv-*.

##### 4.2.1.1 Verbs with *{-d, -t}-isa*

In contrast to the Bosnian texts, where the *-isa-* suffix without the Turkish *{-d, -t}* is more common than with the preceding dental, in the Bulgarian texts, there are only two examples of verbs with *-isa-* and fifty-four with *{-d, -t}-isa*. In the reverse alphabetical index of Grannes et al. (2002), there are approximately 120 verbs without *{-d, -t}* while there are 380 with *{-d, -t}*. Also distinct from Bosnian, the sigmatic suffix can occur as *-osa-* and *-jasa-*, in addition to *-isa-*. Although *-osa-* and *-jasa-* only occur with verbs whose stems are Turkish verbal roots in the Bulgarian texts analysed, both suffixes are attested in verbs stemming from Turkish nouns: *trampa yapmak*<sup>122</sup> > *tramposam* ‘to exchange’ (Lakova, 1970: 436).

By far the most common Bulgarian verbal suffix for turkisms is *{-d, -t}-isa*. As in Bosnian, *{-d, -t}-isa* developed from combining the Turkish past tense and the sigmatic suffix (4.1.2). Contrary to Lakova’s statement that *{-d, -t}-isa* is only

<sup>122</sup> Though Lakova lists *trampa yapmak*, according to Redhouse, it is *trampa etmek*.

productive with Turkish loan verbal roots, in the manuscripts analysed there is one {-d, -t}-isa verb that has an adjectival root (*mundardissa* from *mundar*: ‘unclean, filthy’). This might suggest productivity of the {-d, -t}-isa suffix among verbs with Turkish roots. However, this example alone is not enough to consider the {-d, -t} productive with non-verbal roots, and given that there are not other examples attested in later dictionaries (e.g. Gerov; Grannes et al.), it seems unlikely.

Other than *mundardisa*, all {-d, -t}-isa verbs stem from Turkish verbs in the texts analysed; there are fifty-four in total: *actisa* < *açmak*; *agiadissa* < *acımak*; *allasctissa* < *alışmak*; *aliverdissa* < *alivermek*; *baialdissa* < *bağırmaq*; *barasctissa* < *barışmaq*; *basciardissa* < *başarmak*; *bejendisa* < *beğenmek*; *bojurdissa* < *buyurmak*; *bozusctiissa* < *bozuşmaq*; *bulusctissa* < *buluşmaq*; *bulandardissa* < *bulandırmak*; *caskandissa* < *kıskanmak*; *cialasctissa* < *çalışmaq*; *ciurudissa* < *çürümek*; *condissa* < *konmak*; *cordissa* < *kurmak*; *cosctissa* < *koşmaq*; *cuvetlendissa* < *kuvvetlenmek*; *davrandissa* < *davranmak*; *eksildissa* < *eksilmek*; *esckereledissa* < *eşkerelemek*; *ghetirttissa* < *getirmek*; *ghioscterdissa* < *göstermek*; *ghiulendissa se* < *gülünmek*; *halalascctissa* < *helalaşmaq*; *ilendissa* < *eğlenmek*; *isckelendissa* < *işkillenmek*; *jajaldissa* < *yıyılmak*; *kabardissa* < *kabarmak*; *kaciardissa* < *kaçırmak*; *karascctissa* < *karışmaq*; *kazandissa* < *kazanmak*; *kestissa* < *kesmek*; *kolandissa* < *kullanmak*; *kondurdissa* < *kondurmak*; *kundisa* < *konmak*; *miuhurledissa* < *mühürlemek*; *munafakladissa* < *münafıklamak*; *oidisa* < *uyamak*; *oturdissa* < *oturmak*; *oturtdissa* < *oturmak*; *paraladissa* < *paralamak*; *razgheldissa se* < *rastgelmek*; *razgheterdissa* < *rastgetirmek*; *saidissa* < *saymak*; *sakaldissa* < *sıkılmak*; *sciubelendissa* < *şüphelenmek*; *tutturdissa* < *tutturmak*; *uidurdissa* < *uydurmak*; *vazghectissa* < *vazgeçmek*; *zorladissa* < *zorlamak*.

These verbs can occur in both perfective and imperfective aspects. In Bulgarian the suffix *-ov-* is added to *-isa* (*-isova*) to form the imperfective from *{-d, -t}-isa* verbs. The formation of the imperfective is therefore more straightforward than it is in Bosnian. In contrast to the Bosnian texts, where limited context can make it difficult to determine the aspect of *{-d, -t}-isa* verbs (4.1.2), aspectual distinction is always overtly marked in verbs with Turkish verbal roots in the Bulgarian texts. These aspectual pairs developed by analogy to native Bulgarian. Hauge (2006) uses dialectal developments to support this argument:

In this connection it is also worth noting that the perfective Bulgarian borrowings have a dialectal present tense form *bojadiša* (instead of literary B *bojadisam*) that is obviously formed by analogy to the pattern of verbs like B *piša* ‘to write’ with the past (aorist) tense *pisax*—in other words, the Bulgarian present tense form in these cases is not directly borrowed, but derived by a pattern of analogy (171).

#### **4.2.1.2 Verbs with nominal roots**

Turkish loan verbs that take the *-ova-*, *-uva-*, and *-stvuv-* suffixes seem to be limited to verbs with nominal roots. Though Lakova (1970: 435) lists some of her examples as stemming from verbs (e.g. *salmak* > *salmuvam* ‘to release’), her examples have the same verbal stem as they do verbal noun (e.g. *salma*). Since the *-ova-* suffix is also productive in forming secondary derivatives from nouns with Slavonic suffixes (*čorbadžijstvuvam* < *čorbadžijstvo*), one might suggest that these suffixes are limited to verbs with nominal roots. There are four such verbs in the texts studied: *hizmetuva*, *huzurva*, *kiaruva* and *kaharuva*. Their roots are also attested independently as nouns in the manuscripts: *hizmet*, *huzur*, *kiar* and *kahar*. Most likely the frequency of these nouns contributed to their developing verbal derivatives in Bulgarian.

Lakova (1970) points out that *i*-stem verbs stemming from Turkish nouns often correspond to noun-verb compounds in Turkish: e.g. *inatja se* ‘to be stubborn’ = *inat etmek*; *kabulja* ‘to agree’ = *kabul etmek*; *kirlivja* ‘to dirty’ = *kirletmek*;  *pazarja*

‘to shop’ = *pazarlık etmek*; *rezilja* = *rezil etmek* ‘to shame’ (Lakova, 1970: 433). Two of the five *i*-stem nouns in the texts analysed correspond to Turkish noun-verb compounds: <sub>BU</sub>*uhapsi* : <sub>T</sub>*hapsetmek*; <sub>BU</sub>*popiscmani se* : <sub>T</sub>*pişman etmek*. The verb *popiscmani se* is different from the other examples in that it stems from an adjective.

#### 4.2.1.4 Prefixed verbs

There are only two prefixed verbs in the Bulgarian Catholic texts: *uhapsi* and *popiscmani*. The verb *poharči*, which occurs in *Žitie i stradanija grešnogo Sofronija*, is the only prefixed verb in the supplementary texts. According to Lakova (1970: 438), there are other examples of prefixed verbs with Turkish roots in Bulgarian: e.g. *inatja se* > *zainatja se*, *zainatjavam se*, though she does not list *uhapsi* or *popiscmani*. Given the strong Bosnian Franciscan presence among Bulgarian Catholics, one cannot rule out the possibility that *uhapsi* and *popiscmani* were borrowed from Bosnian since prefixed verbs stemming from Turkish words in Bosnian are not uncommon. Although they are attested in Bulgarian, on the basis of the texts analysed, it seems that prefixes were not as frequent in eighteenth-century Bulgarian as they were in Bosnian: there are sixty-six verbs in the Bulgarian texts, only two of which are prefixed; there are fifty-two verbs in the Bosnian texts, with fourteen prefixed. Both *uhapsiti*, *popišmaniti* are attested in Bosnian, though *popišmaniti se* does not occur in the texts studied. Despite these Bosnian attestations, both words might have been a Bulgarian development.

There is only one example of *popiscmani*:

- (78) Kak Sveti Ivan Evanghelista izlezi is Conacat od Vladicata Caifa: kak Blaxena Deviza Maria utide da vidi Sinasi, kak Judase **popiscmani** zascto besce izdal Issukrasta  
 ‘How John the Baptist left the residence of the ruler Caiaphas; how Blessed Virgin Mary went to see her son; how Judas regretted having betrayed Jesus’ (778: 207)

The prefix *po-* is used in the same way it is in the Bosnian examples (4.1.4.1.1.2): to describe a change from one state to another: at first, Judas felt no remorse for betraying Jesus; then, he did.

#### 4.2.2 Turkish verbal suffixes

In contrast to Turkish nominal suffixes, verbal suffixes did not become productive; they are limited to a handful of verbs, all stemming from Turkish verbs. The most common Turkish verbal suffixes in these texts are those which change nouns or adjectives into verbs, as well as voice (diathetical) suffixes – the causative, passive, reflexive and reciprocal.

There are numerous suffixes in Turkish that change nouns or adjectives into verbs. The most frequent, as previously mentioned in 4.1.2.1.2 and the only ones occurring in the texts studied, are: *-IE-* and *-IEn-*.<sup>123</sup> Both of these suffixes are added directly to nouns and followed by the infinitival ending or personal endings: e.g. *hazır* ‘ready’ > *hazırlan* > *hazırlanmak* ‘to get ready’; *bıçak* ‘knife’ > *bıçakla* > *bıçaklamak* ‘to stab’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011: 195). Without these verbalising suffixes, nouns cannot become verbs.

In the texts studied there are eight verbs that have either the *-IE-* or *-IEn-* suffix: *-IE-*: *zorladissa* < *zorlamak* from *zor*; *esckereledissa* < *\*eşkerelemek* from *eşkere*; *miuhurledissa* < *mühürlemek* from *mühür*; *munafakladissa* < *\*munafıklamak* from *munafık*; *paraladissa* < *paralamak* from *para*; *-IEn-*: *cuvvetlendissa* < *kuvvetlenmek* from *kuvvet*; *isckelendissa* < *işkillenmek* from: *işkil*; *sciubelendissa* < *şübhelenmek* from *şübhe*. The nominal roots of these verbs also exist as nouns in the texts studied, suggesting that these verbs may have been borrowed independently. Of these verbs, neither *\*eşkerelemek* nor *\*münafıklamak* is attested in

---

<sup>123</sup> For more on suffixes that make nouns and adjectives verbs in Turkish, see: Göksel and Kerslake (2005: 145).

Turkish. Given that there is no record of eighteenth-century spoken Turkish, it is certainly possible that these verbs existed in Turkish but are not attested in writing. However, one might argue that *-ledisa/-ladisa* became productive in Bulgarian. I would suggest otherwise for two reasons: the two examples here would indicate that Turkish vowel harmony was maintained in a productive Bulgarian suffix; there are no examples of this suffix attested with Slavonic roots (ORSBE, 1975).

#### 4.2.2.1 Verbal voice (diathetical) suffixes

There are four voice suffixes in Turkish loan verbs in Bulgarian: causative, passive, reflexive and reciprocal. These suffixes change the transitivity of the verb (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 145).

##### 4.2.2.1.1 Causative

In the texts analysed, the most common voice suffix is the causative, which makes intransitive verbs transitive: e.g. *korkmak*<sub>INF</sub> > *korkuyor*: ‘he is frightened’; *korkutmak*<sub>INF</sub> > *kızı korkutuyor*: ‘he frightens the girl’. The causative can also indicate that someone is requiring someone else to carry out an action (Göksel and Kerslake, 2005: 172): *yemek*: ‘to eat’; *yedirmek*: ‘to make or let someone eat’.

There are multiple causative suffixes in Turkish; the four most frequent ones are: *-DİR-*, *-t-*, *-Er-* and *-Ir-*. Two of these four suffixes are exemplified in the manuscripts; the suffix *-DİR-*, which occurs three times, is the most common one: *bulandardissa*: *bulandırma* ‘to blur, cloud, trouble’ < *bulanmak* ‘to cloud over, to become muddy’; *kondurdissa* < *kondurma* ‘to make/allow one to stay’ < *konmak* ‘to settle oneself, to sit, to stay’; *tutturdissa*: *tuturma* ‘to seize, to set on’ < *tutmak* ‘to hold, keep’. There is one example with *-t-*: *oturtdissa*: *oturta* ‘to make sit’ < *oturma* ‘to sit’.

Apart from *oturtdissa*, the causative meaning is clearly evidenced in all examples in the manuscripts studied:

- (79) [...] deto Judita besce namislila i zatovaja zafaliha, pakja **condurdissa** oloferne sas halaikat pod jedin ciadar  
'[...] that Judith had made up her mind and they praised her and again Holofernes made her stay with her servant in a tent' (779: 120)

Holofernes made Judith stay in his tent.

The causative in *oturttisa* is ambiguous:

- (80) a. [...] zapoveda Issukras sicki da sednat, i Apostolete sickighi **oturttissaha** na zelenata treva.  
'[...] Jesus ordered everyone to sit and the apostles made them all sit down on the green grass.' (778: 145)
- b. [...] kazaim kaktrebovasce [sic] dase ponesat, koga beha vikani na nekoi ziafet, sanki dane sednat na parvite, i basc mesta: makar daimse stoji, em da sednat na alciak mesto, da dodi pak koitoghi vikal tada ghi **oturtdissa** na po'visoko mesto sas po'golema tehna falba' i saighilik  
'[...] he told them how they should behave when they are invited to a feast, that they should not sit in the first place, the head place, rather they should stand or sit in the lowliest place, so that if the person who invited them should come again then he makes them sit at a higher place with greater honour' (778: 167)

Example 81a is the only example of a *-tisa-* verb where the <t> is doubled. Because of context, as well as the doubled <t>, one might suggest that *oturttisa* stems from *oturmak*: 'to seat someone'. However, in example 81b the form *oturtdissa* is used causatively although it does not include the Turkish causative suffix. There are several explanations for the two forms of this verb. Because there is no standard orthography, it is possible that neither spelling is the causative, or that both verbs are the causative, or that one is and the other is not. Even in Turkish, *oturmak* and *oturttmak* differ by one phoneme only. When the causative *-t-* precedes the *-tisa-* suffix, it becomes redundant in Bulgarian since Bulgarian does not distinguish between long and short vowels.

An example in which the causative suffix is audible is *tutturdissa*:

- (81) [...] kak utide Judas sa mlogo seimene da **tutturdissa** Issukrasta; ama toise ne smilova da prosit malko nescto na jedin negov drugar, deto imasce damu dava, emigo **tutturdissa**, i zapre' u tamniza.  
'[...] how Judas went with many officers to seize Jesus; but he [Judas] was not merciful to ask something of his friend, which he [Jesus] had to give, but seized him [Jesus] and shut him in prison.' (778: 158–159)

Jesus was seized and taken to prison. In contrast to the example with *condurdissa*, where the causative is used to show that someone commands the action, in this example (as well as in the example of *oturttisa*), the causative emphasises the actual action. The causative form of *tutmak* has an additional syllable, *tut-tur-mak*, which made the causative suffix less likely to be lost.

The verb *bulandardisa* is different from the other causative verbs in that it is used metaphorically:

- (82) Kato svarsco Issukarssicko, i zadade sveto pricistenie, duma Sveti Ivan Evanghelista, cimuse **bulandardissa** kefat i rece ci jedin od onezi deto beha sas nego sctesce dago izbade na raze od negovite duscmane  
'When Jesus finished everything, and gave Holy Communion, St. John the Evangelist says that, his pleasant mood clouded over and he said that one of them who was with him would thrust him into the hands of his enemies' (778: 191)

The pleasant atmosphere was clouded over or disturbed by one of Jesus's disciples. Given there are only four examples of verbs incorporating an Turkish causative suffix, it cannot be determined whether Bulgarians were conscious of the semantic change that the causative suffixes bring about in verbs. Hauge (2006) gives several examples of Turkish loan verbs where the causative form was borrowed into Bulgarian but with the meaning of the Turkish root verb:

B<sup>124</sup> (obsolete) *verderisvam* 'to hand over, transfer' (RDTG) with plain

---

<sup>124</sup> Hauge uses B as an abbreviation for Bulgarian and T for Turkish. For his source abbreviations, see Hauge (2006).

transitive meaning corresponds to T causative *ver-dir* ‘to have someone give something’. B dial. *vāsgešterdisvam se* (Slavejkov) is borrowed from T *vazgeç-ir-*, the causative ‘to make someone renounce something’ of T *vazgeç-* ‘to renounce’, but has the plain transitive meaning ‘to renounce, balk at something’ (174).

Especially given the variation in causative suffixes, it is unlikely that these suffixes were transparent, though examples such as *kondurdisa*, which have no Bulgarian equivalents, suggest that causative and non-causative Turkish verb forms were borrowed into Bulgarian as distinct verbs, though their morphology remained opaque.

#### 4.2.2.1.2 Passive

Several verbs have been borrowed into Bulgarian from Turkish in their passive form. The passive voice is common in Turkish since both transitive and intransitive verbs can be made passive (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011: 175). When an intransitive verb is made passive, the sentence becomes impersonal. The formation of the passive in Turkish is regular: *-n-* is added to verbal roots ending in vowels; *-İn-* is added to verbal roots ending in *l* and *-İl-* is added to verbal roots ending in any other consonant: e.g. *istemek* ‘to want’ > *istenmek* ‘to be wanted’; *almak* ‘to take’ > *alınmak* ‘to be taken’; *görmek* ‘to see’ > *görölmek* ‘to be seen’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011:175).

In the texts studied there is only one example of a verb with a passive suffix:

*jajaldissa* < *yayılmak* ‘to be spread’<sup>125</sup> from *yaymak* ‘to spread’:

- (83)      *Gospodin Boogh stori daim lipsa zvazdata, detoim kazovasce pattet... da ulezat u tova gradiscte, deto besce Metropoli, i kade’ imasce mlogo hora knixovni, i Mudri na Sveta Kniga, da pitat teh, kadese rodil IssuKras, i tei dase **jajaldissa** negovoto porodene.*  
‘The Lord made the star that was showing them the way fail them so that they would come to the large town that was [called] Metropoli and where there were many educated people, and scholars of the Holy Book, so that

---

<sup>125</sup> This meaning is antiquated in Turkish.

they would ask where Jesus Christ was born and thus that [the word of] his birth would be spread.’ (778: 76–77)

In this phrase the Turkish passive is doubled by the Slavonic reflexive pronoun, *se*, which is frequently used in Slavonic languages for impersonal constructions. Menskaja (1975) points out that Turkish verbs with the passive or reciprocal suffixes (4.2.2.1.3) are always paired with *se* in Bulgarian (Menskaja, 1975: 152–160; Hauge, 2006: 172). While the Turkish passive meaning of this verb might have been transparent in Bulgarian, the passive morpheme was not.

Hauge cites several examples of Turkish loan verbs with the passive suffix, though the meaning of the verb is that of the verb without the suffix:

B *säkälđisvam/säkälđisam* ‘to trouble, inconvenience’ (RRODD) corresponds in formal respects to T *sık-ıl-* ‘to become squeezed, become embarrassed’ with a passive suffix, while its meaning is closer to T *sık-* ‘to squeeze, to put pressure on someone’. However, the verb B *säkälđisvam se/ säkälđisam se*, with the reflexive particle *se* added (RRODD, BTR 1963), has the passive meaning of ‘to become embarrassed’ (172).

If the meaning of the Turkish passive suffix had been borrowed into Bulgarian, there would most likely be more examples of passive suffixes from Turkish and these suffixes would not be doubled by the reflexive pronoun *se*.

There is a second example, which might have an Turkish passive suffix:  
*ghiulendissa se < gülünmek*:

(84) [...] trebe nicoi dase ne **ghiulendissa**. (778: 211)  
‘[...] no one should be mocked.’ (778:211)

It is possible that Bulgarians misunderstood an impersonal passive utterance such as *gülündü*: ‘everyone laughed’ (Celia Kerslake, personal communication).

#### 4.2.2.1.3 Reciprocal *-(İ)ş*

One way in which reciprocity can be expressed in Turkish is with the suffix *-(İ)ş-*.

However, the suffix is limited to a small group of verbs (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011: 178). One such verb is exemplified in MS779: *bulusctissa* from *buluşmak* ‘to meet’:

- (85) [...] utidi na Antiokia, dase **bulusctissa** sas...Rimski Pascia.  
‘[...] he went to Antioch to meet with the Roman pasha.’ (779: 184a: 10)

As in Turkish, in Bulgarian *bulusctissa* takes the preposition ‘with’. However, this preposition might also be due to semantic parallelism to *sreštam s/s(ās)* ‘to meet’. From the example, it seems that the meaning suffix (-*İ*)ş was opaque in Bulgarian and has the same reciprocal meaning as the Bulgarian term *s/s(ās)* and the reflexive pronoun *se*.

#### 4.2.2.1.4 Suffix indicating quickness: *-(y)Iver*

There is one example of a verb with *-(y)Iver*: *aliverdissa* < *alivermek* < *almak*. This suffix implies that an action is carried out quickly. It is not clear whether the connotation of quickness is in the three examples of the one verb with this suffix:

- (86) a. [...] damu **aliverdissa** lozito na zaret  
‘[...] that he buy the emperor’s vineyard’ (779: 109)
- b. [...] zatova molise na basctasi i na maikasi damuja **aliverdissat**.  
‘[...] because he asked his father and mother to buy it for him.’ (779: 66a)
- c. [...] i iskascce damui **aliverdissa** za stopaniza  
‘[...] and he wanted to buy it for him for farmland’ (779: 114b)

### 4.3 Conclusion: Bosnian and Bulgarian verb formation

In both Bosnian and Bulgarian verbs can be formed from Turkish nouns, adjectives and verbs. While I have come across no examples of verbal suffixes for diathetical relations (voice suffixes) in Bosnian loan verbs, they are attested in Bulgarian. In some instances, the meaning of these suffixes in Turkish corresponds to the meaning

of the sentence in Bulgarian; however, the functions of the passive and causative suffixes remained opaque.

## 5.0 Chapter Five: Adjectives and Adverbs

### 5.1 Bosnian adjectives

There are three types of adjectives stemming from Turkish in Bosnian – 1) those that adopted Slavonic adjectival suffixes, such as *-ast*, *-ski*, *-an*; 2) those most likely derived from verbs as they have the past participial suffix *-an/en*; 3) and those that remain in their original Turkish forms and do not decline. All of the adjectives taking the *-ski* suffix have Turkish loan roots: e.g. *bašinski* < *baša*; *eminski* < *emin*; *kadijski* < *kadija*; *sejmenski* < *sejmen*; *uđugljiski* < *uđuglija*.<sup>126</sup> Those taking *-an/en* are formed from verbs: e.g. *poavšteni* < *poapstiti/poavstiti*; *arzeno* < *arziti*; *pošišećen* < *\*pošišećiti*; *mahmuran* < *mahmurati*. Two of these past participles are also formed with the Slavonic perfectivizing prefix *po-*.<sup>127</sup>

#### 5.1.2 Adjectives with the Slavonic suffix *-ski*

The Slavonic *-ski* suffix is the most productive in turning nouns – usually denoting titles and positions – into adjectives. Adjectives ending in *-ski* always agree in gender, number and case with the noun that they modify, as would be expected: with the derived ending *-ski*, these words have become morphologically integrated into Bosnian and therefore behave as Bosnian adjectives. Some examples follow:

---

<sup>126</sup> This word is not attested in the texts studied but is listed in Škaljić (1989).

<sup>127</sup> For more on verbal prefixes, see 4.1.4.

- (87) a. **Benić**  
 i. [...] **adžamoglanski**<sub>M.SG.NOM</sub> aga  
 ‘the one in charge of the *adžamoglan*’ (47)  
 ii. [...] **arnautskoga**<sub>M.SG.GEN</sub> barjaktara  
 ‘Armenian flag-bearer’ (199)  
 iii. [...] velike opačine **jenjičarske**<sub>F.PL.NOM</sub>  
 ‘great janissary wickedness’ (45)  
 iv. [...] novi **sejmenski**<sub>M.PL.NOM</sub> groši  
 ‘the new *groš* of the guard’ (203)  
 v. [...] na **turbićkomu**<sub>M.SING.LOC</sub> hududu  
 ‘at the edge of the mausoleum’ (308)
- b. **Bračuljević**  
 [...] upaŕti u **duŕcmansku**<sub>F.SG.ACC</sub> Tursku fillu  
 ‘[...] for whose love he bore’ (28)
- c. **Lastrić**  
 [...] iz lučarice **čobanske**<sub>F.SG.GEN</sub>  
 ‘[...] from the shepherd’s torch’ (1766: 327)
- d. **Lašvanin**  
 [...] ufatiše agu **jenjičarskoga**<sub>M.SG.ACC</sub>  
 ‘[...] he caught the guard’s nobleman’ (164)

Six of the twelve texts analysed contain adjectives built on Turkish stems with the suffix *-ski*. Of these twenty-six adjectives, only five occur in more than one text:

Adjective	Text
bašinski	LA, BE
čifutski	BR, LA, LT, LN, DO, BE
jenjičarski	LA, BE
pašinski	LA, LT, BE
vezirski	LA, BE

Only four adjectives refer to something other than a human being: *avlijski*, *meščemski*, *turbićki* and *zateševski*. These words occur in Benić’s chronicle alone. Apart from *dušmanski*, *harszki* and *čifutski*, all the adjectives are cultural loans (see 2.1.6).

Lastrić and Bračuljević are the only two writers to employ *čifut* with an adjectival suffix, and Lastrić prefers *žudinski*: *čifutski* occurs twice while *žudinski* is attested nine times in his chronicle. In part, this is because he does not treat *židov/jevrej/žudii* and *čifut* as synonyms (7.1.8.1). Bračuljević, on the other hand, prefers *čifut* and rarely uses *žudii* or any of its derivatives. In Benić's chronicle, however, where these words are treated as synonyms, only the adjectival form of *jevrej* is attested.

### 5.1.3 Slavonic past participial suffix

The Slavonic past participial suffix is productive in words of Turkish origin: *-an/-en*: *arzen*, *bojadisan*, *džerašen*, *mahmuran*, *poavšten*, *poharačen*, *pošišećen*. Of these examples of past passive participles, only two have their root verbs attested in the texts analysed: *poavšten* : *poapstiti*; *poharačen* : *poharačiti*. Though *aržiti* and *bojadisati* are not in the texts analysed, they are attested in RHSJ. It seems that *\*šišećiti* and *\*pošišećiti* developed from *şişe* 'molded or planed lath', though this is an unsupported supposition. The verb *\*džerašiti* probably developed from *cerh* 'wounding'. It is most likely that once these nouns were borrowed into Bosnian, they began to be used derivatively as well: e.g. *ašik* > *ašikovati*, *zaašikovati*; *harač* > *poharačiti*, *poharačen*. Similar examples also occur in Bulgarian (5.2.1.4).

### 5.1.4 Adjectives with *-ast*

There is also one example of the Slavonic suffix *-ast*, which indicates likeness or similarity, e.g. *plavičast* 'blue-like' (Barić et al., 1995: 359), as a productive suffix with an Turkish root: *budalast* (Dobretić: 272; 275; 278; 279; 280). The suffix *-ast* is attested as an adjectival suffix only in *budalast* in the texts studied but in other turkisms in Bosnian: e.g. *pamučast* 'cotton-like'.

### 5.1.5 Pleonastic *-ski*?

There are several instances where Turkish nouns have both the Slavonic possessive suffix (*-ov/-ev* or *-in*)<sup>128</sup> and *-ski*: e.g. *pašinski* and *bašinski* are attested throughout both chronicles. This phenomenon is not limited to Turkish loanwords: e.g. *banovski* ‘like a governor’, *kraljevski* ‘like a king’ also occur throughout both chronicles. This form is used when the individual to which it refers is indefinite:

- (88) 1750. Na 30. aprila dojde muselim novoga paše u Travnik; čovik dobar i pravedan, koji niti uze od manastira džulusa, niti kud posla tevtiša. I lipo primi od gvardijana cast govoreći: ‘Ako ste drugim muselimum davali džulus **pašinski**, ja neću ništa.  
‘On the 30th of April 1740 a *muselim* of the new pasha came to Travnik; a good and just man, who neither taxed the monastery nor sent an inspector. And he kindly received the honour of the guardian, by saying, ‘if you gave other *muselims* pashas’ taxes, I do not want anything.’ (Lašvanin: 232–233)

When the writer discusses a specific reference, the possessive form (without the additional *-ski*) is used:

- (89) a. Na 27. novembra dovede delibaša **pašin** Kulenovića Mahmut-paše sina, koji je hodio s hajduci i mlogo po Krajini zla činio i robio.  
‘On the 27th of November the pasha’s *delibaša* brought Kulenović Mahmut-pasha’s son, who hung out with thieves and did much harm and plunder in Krajina.’ (Lašvanin: 230)
- b. [...] u kuća **kazančevijeh**  
‘[...] to some of the houses of the coppersmiths’ (Benić: 142)

Two examples – *osmanliski* and *učuglinski* – have Turkish derived adjectives as their stems. Though there are many adjectives without the suffix *-li* in Turkish, it is frequent as it derives adjectives from nouns; therefore, the suffix *-li* has the same purpose as Slavonic *-ski*. The suffix *-li* is especially common in the texts for denoting nationality or origin, as is the case with *osmanli* (see 3.1.3.2.1). In Turkish, *-li* can be both adjectival and nominal regarding nationality (3.1.3.2.1): *osmanli* is both

---

<sup>128</sup> The suffix *-ov/-ev* occurs with nouns ending in consonants and in some instances *-o*; the suffix *-in* occurs with nouns ending in *-a* and in some instances *-o*.

‘Ottoman<sub>ADJ</sub>’ as well as ‘Ottoman<sub>NOUN</sub>’. In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Bosnian the suffix *-lĭ* was used nominally to denote nationality or origin (3.1.3.2.1). Thus, in these examples of nominal nationality the suffix *-ski* would not be pleonastic to *-lĭ*. However, there are also numerous instances in Turkish where *-lĭ* denotes nationality but is only adjectival: e.g. *bosnali* = ‘Bosnian’; *boşnak* = ‘Bosnian<sub>NOM</sub>’. Such is the case with *Arnavut* = ‘Albanian<sub>NOUN</sub>’ and *Arnavutlu*<sub>ADJ</sub> = ‘Albanian’. The term *Arnautski* (Benić: 145; 199) might suggest that the adjectival meaning of the *-lĭ* suffix was transparent to Bosnians: the Turkish suffix is replaced by *-ski* because the *-lĭ* suffix is only adjectival in this particular instance. However, it is just as likely, if not more so, that *arnautski* derives from *Arnautski* < *Arnaut* + *-ski* < *Arnaut* < *Arnavut*.

The example of *uĉtuglinski*, which does not relate to nationality, is most likely derived from *uĉtuglija* in Bosnian: *uĉtuglija* > *uĉtuglinski*.

- (90) [...] bubnjevi **uĉtuglinski**  
 ‘[...] the *uĉtulija*’s drums’ (Benić: 188)

### 5.1.6 Turkish derived adjectives

As mentioned in 5.1.5, the addition of the Turkish suffix *-lĭ* often changes a noun into an adjective, though this is not its exclusive purpose. In the Bosnian texts analysed, there are only three derived adjectives ending in *-lĭ*:

- (91) a. *jedekli*  
       *jedekli*                    < *jedek* + *lĭ*  
       having a spare horse < *bridle* + *lĭ*
- b. *kanli*  
       *kanli*     < *kan* + *lĭ*  
       bloody    < *blood* + *lĭ*
- c. *vergili*  
       *vergili*                < *vergi* + *lĭ*  
       taxed, tribute < *tribute* + *lĭ*

The other occurrences of *-li* are all nominal, though in some cases the word might be both nominal and adjectival (3.1.3.2.1): e.g. *misirli*: ‘Egyptian<sub>ADJ</sub>’ and ‘Egyptian<sub>NOUN</sub>’. As mentioned in 3.1.3.2.1, Schmaus and Skok state that the *-li* suffix only becomes *-lija* in Bosnian when it occurs nominally; if it occurs adjectivally, it remains *-li* and does not decline:

- (92) a. [...] miseca novembra dolazi ovdi, u Sutisku, **jedekli** mubašir.  
 ‘[...] in the month of November, a *mubašir* who had a spare horse came here to Sutjeska.’ (Benić: 264)
- b. [...] imadu bo njihovi čifluci po selije **vergili**  
 ‘[...] for they had their properties in villages taxed’ (Benić: 187)
- c. I zovu je Turci **Kanli**-Bunar, to jest Krvava voda, zašto govore, kad su posikli onoga mučenika, da je u oni čas krvju provriol; i sad, vele da u ono vrime provrije krvju.  
 ‘And the Turks call it ‘Kanli Bunar, that is ‘Bloody Water’ because they say that when they slew that martyr, at that moment, his blood boiled up; and now it is said that at that time [on the anniversary] blood boils up.’  
 (Lašvanin: 200)

The adjective *kanli* is part of an Turkish name, which makes it difficult to determine whether it is behaving according to Turkish or Bosnian rules. Since the translation of this name is given, it seems that *kanli bunar* might not be part of the Bosnian language. The term *vergili* also does not decline. Like *jedekli*, this example carries greater weight than *kanli* because Benić employs the term himself, rather than noting an Turkish name. Although there are few examples of adjectival *-li*, the examples that occur both nominally (3.1.3.2.1) and adjectivally (5.1.7) support the argument made by Schmaus and Skok (3.1.3.2.1). Unfortunately, there are too few examples to determine how transparent the adjectival usage of *-li* in Turkish was in eighteenth-century Bosnian. While the adjectival and nominal functions of *-li* words are differentiated in Bosnian through the development of *-lija*, the extent to which the meaning of the suffix *-li* is borrowed is unclear.

### 5.1.7 Turkish root adjectives

In addition to the *-li* adjectives, there are several Turkish root adjectives/adverbs<sup>129</sup> that do not have Slavonic suffixes and often do not decline or agree in gender and number in Bosnian: e.g. *butum* < *bütün*; *jalan* < *yalın*; *kailj* < *kail*; *muka(j)et* < *mukayyet*; *nahoš* < *nahoş*; *sakat* < *sakat*. Though all these words function as adjectives in both languages, some of them function as nouns as well in both Turkish and Bosnian: e.g. *topal*, *sakat*, *šaškin*. Traditional language theorists support ‘a model of language that classifies all words into simple parts of speech’ (Sinclair, 1999: 174). Sinclair (1999: 173) investigates whether grammatical distinction ‘reflects the nature and structure of language, or reflects merely assumptions about [it].’ Turkish loanwords that can act as both adjectives and nouns in Bosnian suggest that grammatical classification is not a precise reflection of the complexities of language structure. This is especially true for recent loanwords, which are borrowed as lexemes and acquire function through contextuality. As mentioned in 3.1.5.2.1, when these words function as nouns in Bosnian, they decline.

In the chronicles, Benić employs five Turkish root adjectives and Lašvanin three. There are no examples of Turkish root adjectives in the religious texts. In the following examples it is clear the words function adjectivally because:

(93) They **modify nouns**:

a. *butum/bütün*

[...] koji tada **butum** Bosnom s pašom upravljaše  
‘[...] who at that time oversaw all of Bosnia with the pasha’ (Benić: 147)

b. *hazur*

Maravić...ih odtira i posla **hazur** dževapa, koji došav u Kreševo  
‘Maravić...drove them and sent a ready messenger who had come to Kreševo’ (Lašvanin: 255)

---

<sup>129</sup> When these Turkish adjectives/adverbs are used only adverbially in Bosnian, they are discussed under Turkish adverbs (5.1.11).

c. *jalan*

I otiđu davudžije Foničani i **jalan**-šaiti suprot ljudima siromasima.  
'And the accusers from Fojnica and false witnesses went out against the poor people.' (Benić: 320)

d. *kavi*

[...] za potvrditi seneta i uzeti **kavi**, oliti plemenitu, muraselu  
'[...] to verify the document and to take the noble [glossed] epistle'<sup>130</sup>  
(Benić: 291)

(94) They are **conjoined with Slavonic adjectives**:

*zendil*

[...bili su to] ljudi dobri, **zendil**.  
[...] those people were good and wealthy.' (Benić: 231)

(95) They are **modified by an adverb**:

*nahoš*

Međuto, o.p. sekretar provincijalov donio mi je žig Provincije a provincijal bio nešto **nahoš**.  
'However, the o.p. provincial secretary brought me the provincial stamp, and the provincial had something wrong with him.' (Benić: 313)

There are three examples where it is ambiguous whether the Turkish root adjective functions adjectivally or nominally in Bosnian:

(96) a. *kailj*

Što Sarajlije čuvši, ne biše **kailj** pašinoj besidi  
'Having heard this, the Sarajevans were not understanding of the pasha's speech' (Benić: 172)

b. *makul*

[...] našosmo svikolici [kojih se tiče] **makul**  
'[...] all of us concerned found [that] reasonable' (Benić: 286)

c. *mukaet*

Vidiš li, gospodine, gdi sutješki gvardijan nije ti ni **mukaet** a ti pao prid njegovijem vratima; to će reći da te malo poštuje.  
'Don't you see, sir, the Sutjeska guardian is not interested in you yet you fell before his door; that would suggest that he has little respect for you.'  
(Benić: 189)

As mentioned in 3.1.5.2.1, when an Turkish adjective functions as a noun in Bosnian, it is declined to avoid functional ambiguity in the sentence. Because an

---

<sup>130</sup> This example can also be listed under category two.

adjective usually immediately precedes or follows the noun which it modifies, there is less ambiguity about its role in the sentence when not declined than if a noun were not declined. This is true of all of the examples listed above. However, some of the above examples – *jalan*, *nahoš* – are in the nominative. The word *jalan* might even be part of a set phrase borrowed from Turkish as this same phrase also occurs in Bulgarian: ‘**jalan** schehatin’ (‘false witness’) (779: 166a).

### 5.1.8 Morphophonological changes of *zengin* > *zendil*

Benić uses *zendil* once: ‘ljudi dobri i **zendil**’ (‘Good and rich people.’) (Benić: 231). The word *zendil* has its origin in *zengin*. According to Škaljić, this root is also attested in Bosnian. The term *zendiliji* occurs once as well: ‘[ja]hu što bolje i **zendilije**’ (‘[They] ride all the better and with more riches’) (Benić: 257). This comparative form, *zendiliji* has a separate entry in Škaljić’s dictionary. It seems that the word *zendil* developed from *zendili* < *zengin* + *li*. Pleonastic *-li* developed perhaps since this suffix was associated with Turkish adjectives; the phoneme /n/ might have been lost through assimilation to the homorganic consonant, followed by simplification of the double consonant: \**zendinliji* > \**zendilliji* > *zendiliji*.

### 5.1.9 Adjectival *-IE*

The suffix *-IE* in Turkish means ‘with’ or ‘by’ and is used predominantly adverbially in Ottoman, though not exclusively: e.g. *kitabıla erkek*: ‘the boy with his book’; *nöbetle*: ‘in rounds, in shifts’. While *-IE* is usually adverbial in Bosnian (see 5.1.12.1), Benić has one example of *-IE* that is adjectival:

- (97) a. [...] kupismo zemlju u Ratnju od Jozepovića **milćile**.  
 ‘[...] we bought the land in Ratanj from Jozepović [who had] property.’  
 (285)
- b. [...] pak i kao dućan, da mu je **milćile**, ostao od oca.  
 ‘[...] as is the shop, it is part of his property, left from his father.’ (326)

It seems that BeniĆ might have confused the *-lĭ* and *-lE* suffixes in this example, as *-lĭ* tends to be used adjectivally in Turkish and *-lE* tends to be adverbial.

### 5.1.10 Word order with adjectives

In standard Turkish, adjectives precede the noun that they modify; their free position in the sentence is characteristic of Bosnian:

- (98) a. [...] ljudi dobri, **zendil**.  
'[...] good and rich people.' (BeniĆ: 235)
- b. [...] paramentu **butun**  
'[...] entire chasuble' (BeniĆ: 148)

In example 99a, the postpositional adjective is stressed: BeniĆ emphasises that the people are good and wealthy. The case and number of undefined adjectives in both 99a and 99b can be inferred from the preceding noun.

### 5.1.11 Adverbs

There are only a handful of Turkish root adverbs in the texts analysed: e.g. *belćim* < *belkim*; *bile* < *bile*. In the Bosnian texts Turkish nouns also sometimes occur with the suffix *-lE* to form adverbs: *nobetile* < *nöbeteli* + *lE*; *tevdĭčile* < *tebdil* + *lE*. Sometimes Turkish nouns occur with Slavonic adverbial suffixes: *budalasto* < *budalast* < *budala*. In Turkish, an adjective and an adverb have the same structure (no secondary suffix is added to an adjective to make it an adverb).

#### 5.1.11.1 Native Turkish adverbs

While not frequent, a handful of Turkish root adverbs are attested in the texts studied: *barabar/parabar* < *beraber*; *bari* < *bari*; *bile* < *bile*; *birbi, birda* < *birden*; *butum/n* < *bütün*;<sup>131</sup> *ġene* < *gene* (dialectal); *meaf* < *muaf*; *mute/muta/mufte/mukte* < *müft*;

---

<sup>131</sup> *Butun* is adverbial in one example: 'čovik vrstan **butun** i pošten' ('a very skilled and honest person' (BeniĆ: 147).

*mutlak* < *mutlak*; *safi* < *safi*.<sup>132</sup> In contrast to adjectival roots borrowed into Bosnian, which undergo few phonological changes, seven of the ten adverbial roots borrowed from Turkish into Bosnian exemplify changes in phonological structure. All of these adverbs are attested in BeniĆ's chronicle alone except for *parabar* and *bari*. It is possible that *muaf* > *meaf* by analogy to Turkish loans with the sequence /ea/ and /eha/: *meana/mejana/mejhana*; *će(h)aja*. BeniĆ might have confused Turkish cases, especially since Bosnian does not have the ablative case: *birda* < *birden*; *birde*<sub>LOC</sub> means 'in one' while *birden*<sub>ABL</sub> means 'from one'. The word *birbi* most likely has lost the ablative suffix and final /r/, thus stemming from *birbirden*.

BeniĆ employs *bile* frequently in his own writing:

- (99) a. [...] težak zulum činjahu i **bile** na Avdulah-pašine čadore udariše.  
 '[...] they were committing serious violence and even struck Avdulah-pasha's tents.' (129)
- b. [...] niti, **bile**, htjede smicati ubojica  
 '[...] he did not even want to kill the murderers' (230)
- c. [...] vizitaše manastijer, cele, crkvu, **bile** oko oltara.  
 '[...] he visited the monastery, the cells, the church and even the area around the altar.' (255)

BeniĆ is the only writer to use the adverb *bile*. He uses other adverbs less frequently: e.g. he employs *belćim* twice.

Two of the Turkish adverbs end in the suffix *-le*, which means 'with' or 'by means of' (5.1.9):

- (100) a. [...] po redu oliti **nobetelile**  
 '[...] in order or in rounds' (BeniĆ: 170)

---

<sup>132</sup>Like *butun*, *safi* can be used both adjectivally and adverbially. Because it only occurs in one example in which it is adverbial, it is discussed under adverbs: '[...] bila je **safi** gola ova sakrištija' ('[...] the sacristy was entirely bare')(BeniĆ: 151).

- b. I bi taki zulum, da poslasmu između sebe ovoga istoga o.p. gvardijana, da vidi što li je, kako li je, i to kao **tevdīčile**.  
 ‘And there was such violence that we sent among us that same o.p. guardian to see what was happening, how things were, and he did that incognito.’ (Benić: 198)

In the first example, the native term is glossed by the Turkish form; the second example is not glossed. Especially given that there are no examples of this suffix with Bosnian nouns, it seems most likely that the suffix *-IE* was borrowed into Bosnian in set phrases, not as an independent suffix.

The term *japče*, which occurs in a passage marked as dialogue and is glossed, most likely has the Turkish adverbial suffix *-CE*. The suffix *-CE* can be added to adjectives to form verbs that denote the type of manner in which an action is carried out.<sup>133</sup> On the basis of context, it seems that *japče* stems from *yavaşça*:

- (101) ‘**japče, japče**’ to jest polagano, polagano.  
 ‘‘japče, japče’, which means slowly, slowly.’ (Benić: 156)

### 5.1.11.2 Slavonic adverbial suffixes

In the texts analysed there is only one example of an Turkish noun which has developed the Slavonic adjectival suffix *-ast*, from which the adverbial derivative was formed with the additional *-o* ending: *budalasto*:

- (102) [...] buduchi gni **budalafto**, ili pijano  
 ‘[...] being neither crazy nor drunk’ (Dobretić: 537)

This secondary derivative *budalasto* occurs in the text with the third fewest number of turkisms. The noun *budala*, however, is one of the most common turkisms and one of the earliest attested; it also replaced the native (or loan) word that had existed before it came into the language. The abstract meaning of *budala* facilitates its adverbial form

---

<sup>133</sup> For more on the suffix *-CE*, see Göksel and Kerslake (2011: 83–84).

in contrast to many turkisms – especially those related to positions and everyday locations and objects, which were not prone to become adverbs because of semantics.

#### 5.1.11.5 Word order and adverbs

Like Turkish adjectives borrowed into Bosnian, Turkish adverbs no longer follow Turkish word order rules. For example, *bile* is enclitic in Turkish and follows the word it emphasises. In Bosnian, it can follow or precede the word it emphasises:

(103) a. [...] i tako pomljivo vizitaše manastijer, cele, crkvu, **bile** oko oltara.  
'[...] he scrupulously visited the monastery, the cells, the church and even the area around the altar.' (Benić: 255)

b. [...] niti, **bile**, htjede smicati ubojica  
'[...] he did not even want to kill the murderers' (Benić: 228)

#### 5.2 Bulgarian adjectives and adverbs

The Bulgarian texts differ from the Bosnian ones in that they have more adjectives and adverbs. As in Bosnian, there are three types of adjectives that stem from Turkish in Bulgarian: 1) adjectives with Turkish roots that take Slavonic adjectival suffixes: e.g. *-ski*, *-av*, *-en*; 2) those that are Turkish derived adjectives; 3) and those that are Turkish root adjectives. Although there are exceptions, in general, adjectives that take *-ski* and *-av* have Turkish nominal roots while those that take *-en* tend to stem from adjectives. On the whole, Turkish root adjectives did not undergo morphophonological changes when borrowed into Bulgarian in order to agree in gender with the nouns that they modify. These adjectives did not develop productive Slavonic suffixes and are in their original Turkish forms. They do, like Turkish derived adjectives, however, usually agree in number with the nouns that they modify. While the Slavonic possessive suffixes *-ov-* and *-in-* are not uncommon, they are less frequent in the Bulgarian texts than they are in the Bosnian ones.

## 5.2.1 Slavonic suffixes

### 5.2.1.1 *-ski*

Compared to the Bosnian materials, the Bulgarian texts have relatively few examples of the *-ski* suffix; the suffix *-ski* is attested with only a handful of Turkish roots: *cifu(t)ski*, *duscmanski*, *hailaski*, *haivanski*, *katlaktski*, *kauliski*, *misirski*. In Bosnian, this suffix is most frequently used to change concrete nouns (usually denoting persons of masculine gender, often Turkish officials) into adjectives. In Bulgarian, only *ciftuski* and *duscmanski*, both of which are also attested in Bosnian, fall into this category; the adjective *haivanski* stems from a concrete noun. On the other hand, *hailaski*, stems from the abstract noun *hail* ‘fear’:

- (104) *hailaski*  
[...] **hailaski** dumi  
‘[...] fearful words’ (778: 74)

Adjectives with abstract nouns as roots often have the *-li* suffix in Turkish, which was borrowed into Bulgarian as well:

- (105) a. *berektlia* < *berekteli*  
[...] i napalnighi sas zito sas snepi u **bereketliete** godini za katlatskite, i  
tolkova Bogh badi bereket  
‘[...] and he filled them with grain and sheaves in the fruitful years for the  
lacking, and let God give in abundance’ (780: 41a)
- b. *hairlia* < *hayırlı*  
[...] reci Jozo, bis mene Bogh...odgoave [sic] **hairlia** na Faraona.  
‘[...] Joseph said without me, God...will answer favourably to Pharaoh.’  
(780: 40b)

The adjective *hailaski* also stands out because of its word formation. The suffix *-ski* is usually added to nouns ending in consonants, not vowels. Preceding velar consonants undergo phonemic alternations, as seen in the example of *katlatskite* < *katlak*: k/c. If the final consonant in the root is voiced, it becomes unvoiced by assimilation. The word *\*hailski* would have been acceptable in Bulgarian. Given that this word is

attested only once and only in MS778, it is difficult to determine whether the <a> between the <l> and <s> might be an orthographical error.

The two seventeenth-century *damaskini* have three *-ski* adjectives with Turkish stems: *bykriski* (Tix.), *duscmanski* (Tix. and Troj.), *misirski* (Tix.). In these three examples *-ski* changes concrete nouns denoting individuals of masculine gender into adjectives.

Sofronij's work, which is a text contemporary to the MSS analysed, offers numerous examples of *-ski* adjectives: *arnautski*, *beiski*, *bostančiiski*, *vezirski*, *hanski*, *čelepki*, *turecki*, *turski*. These examples show that the *-ski* suffix was indeed common among adjectival derivatives with Turkish nominal roots in late eighteenth-century Bulgarian. One reason *-ski* adjectives are more common in Sofronij's text is because it is not a religious work but a description of events in his life. Therefore, it is similar to the Bosnian chronicles, which also have more *-ski* adjectives than the Bosnian religious texts do. Adjectival derivatives with *-ski* are less frequent in religious texts because these adjectives tended to develop from concrete nouns, specifically those denoting persons of male gender.

### 5.2.1.3 *-en*

Similarly, there is only one adjective with the *-en* suffix; the word *ghiucen*, which means 'difficult', comes from the Turkish word *güç*. The *-en* suffix most likely became productive with Turkish roots by analogy to Slavonic adjectives, e.g. *gladen* < *glad* 'hunger' + *-en* 'hungry'. The word *güç* can be both a noun and an adjective in Turkish. In the Bulgarian text, *ghiucklanduk*, with its pleonastic *-luk*, is nominal while *ghiucen* is adjectival:

- (106) a. *ghiucklanduk*  
[...] tolcova **ghiucklanduk**mu pravisc  
'[...] you make so much trouble for him' (779: 219a)

- b. *ghiucen*  
[...] mu stana **ghiucna** tazi rabota  
‘[...] this task became difficult for him’ (779: 156a)

While there are numerous words in Turkish that can be both adjectives and nouns, when these words were borrowed into Bulgarian, they split into two distinct parts of speech.

#### 5.2.1.4 *-an*

The ending *-an* is limited to past participles. In the manuscripts analysed, there is one example in MS778 of a past participle: *kabardissan*, which means ‘swollen’, comes from the verb *karbarmak*.<sup>134</sup>

There is, however, another adjective that stems from a verbal derivative: *rahatlen*, which means ‘calm, comfortable, peaceful.’ In Turkish the root of this word is the noun and adjective *rahat*. Though there is limited evidence, it is possible that *rahatlen* might be Turkish dialect with *-len* being the dialectal form of the post-position *-ile* (Bernt Brendemone, personal communication).

### 5.2.2 Turkish adjectives

#### 5.2.2.1 Turkish derived adjectives

There are more examples of derived adjectives in the Bulgarian texts than in the Bosnian ones. In contrast to Bosnian, in which *-lĭ* does not always undergo morphophonological changes if it occurs as part of an adjective, in Bulgarian, *-lĭ* consistently becomes *-lija*,<sup>135</sup> regardless of its part of speech. Since *-lĭ* can be a nominal as well as an adjectival suffix in Turkish, and *-ija* is a nominal suffix in

---

<sup>134</sup> Since the Bulgarian verb is not attested, this verb is given in Turkish.

<sup>135</sup> There is one exception: *bahtl* > *bahtal*. See. 5.2.2.1.

Bulgarian, the function of the loanword is not always distinct.<sup>136</sup> One can often determine that *-lija* is adjectival in Bulgarian through several tests:

(107) It is **conjoined with a Slavonic adjective**:

a. *akallia*

[...] jedin momak, detogo vikaha Jeroboam, i zasctogo zaret vide hitar i **akallia**

‘[...] one boy, who was called Jeroboam, and because the emperor considered him sly and clever’ (779: 98)

b. *ikramlia*

Dadiim pak jedni nauke tvrarde...i **ikramlie** i i kazaim kak trebovasce dase ponesat koga beha vikani na nekoi ziafet, sanki dane sendat na parvite i basc mesta

‘He gave them hard and honourable parables and he told them how they should behave when they were invited to a feast, that they should not sit in the first places, the head places’ (778: 167)

c. *lekelia*

[...] negovata dusca stani ciarna, grozna, **lekelia**, mondar

‘[...] his soul became black, terrible, stained and dirty’ (780: 7a)

d. *lezetlia*

Cat okussiha Eureite od тази Manna, videha, ci besce jaco slatka i **lezetlia**.

‘When the Jews tasted this manna, they saw that it was very sweet and delicious.’ (779: 39b)

e. *zararlia*

[...] hora losci i **zararlie**

‘[...] bad and harmful people’ (779:127a)

(108) It **modifies a noun**:

a. *bereketlia*

[...] i napalnighi sas zito sas snepi u **bereketliete** godini za katlaktskite, i tolkova Bogh badi bereket.

‘[...] and he filled them with grain and sheaves in the fruitful years for the lacking, and let God give in abundance.’ (780 41a)

b. *diuzenlia*

[...] tolcos hubava i **diuzenlia** japia’

‘[...] such a beautiful and orderly building’ (779 216b)

---

<sup>136</sup> The adjectival suffix *-lija* exists in modern Bulgarian and is productive with loanwords: e.g. *fasonlija*, *kuražlija*. For more on function ambiguity, see 5.1.7.

- c. *jureklia*  
 [...] jedin **jureklia** momak  
 ‘[...] one brave lad’ (779 183a)
- d. *kaharlia*  
 [...] basctai **kaharlia**  
 ‘[...] sorrowful garden’ (779 16a)
- e. *kanlia*  
 [...] zascto beha **canlie** pari  
 ‘[...] because it was blood money’ (778 209)
- f. *kemerlia*  
 [...] izguraha hubavite **kemerlie** saivante, deto beha ocolo cerquata  
 [...] they pushed out the beautiful arched lean-tos that had surrounded the church.’ (779: 199a)<sup>137</sup>
- g. *pusatlia*  
 [...] sas mlogo hora **pusatlie**  
 ‘[...] with many armed people’ (779 16a)

In these examples the *-lia* adjective is always in number agreement with the noun that it modifies.

(109) It takes a **Bulgarian comparative form**:

- a. *kabihatlia*  
 [...] zascto se ni pokaje sas sve sarze togava stane po **kabihatlia** pred Boga  
 ‘[...] why he does not repent with all his heart, then [he] becomes even guiltier before God’ (780: 17b)

(110) It is **modified by an adverb**:

- a. *ikramlia*  
 Blaxena Deviza Maria zaciudisse, i sciasctissase ne zascto vide Angel Boxij...emi zascto ciu’ tezi dumi tolkos **ikramlie**  
 ‘The Blessed Virgin Mary was amazed and happy not because she saw God’s angel but because she heard these words which were so honourable’ (778: 59)
- b. *sciubelia*  
 [...] zaret na tazi rabot tolcos **sciubelia**  
 ‘[...] the ruler was terribly suspicious about this matter’ (779:97a)

---

<sup>137</sup> This example could also be listed under category one.

Since *-lia* can also be nominal, there is an instance, especially since the *-lia* word is used as a predicate, when it could be either nominal or adjectival in Bulgarian:

- (111) *jaralia*  
[...] cato vide Saul askeratsi razvalen, i sinovetesi ubiti, i sebesi **jaralia**, ta nimoxesce veke dase bii.  
‘[...] when Saul saw his soldier destroyed, his sons killed and himself hurt, he could no longer fight.’ (779: 108b)

### 5.2.2.1 Anomaly

There is one example in which *-li* does not change to *-lia* but to *-al* when borrowed into Bulgarian: *bahtal* < *bahtli*:

- (112) [...] to scte damu bude **bahtal** ne stoj na cello, neto na vexde  
‘[...]that, which is neither on on his forehead, nor on his eyelids, will be his fate’ (780: 63a)

While *bahtli* is the Turkish counterpart to the Bulgarian adjective *bahtal*, it is possible that the word *bahtal* was not borrowed from the adjective *bahtli*. The root *baht*, as well as another Slavonic nominal derivative – *bahtina* – is also attested in the texts. It is possible that the noun *baht* was the initial borrowing and from it, the adjective *bahtal* (and *bahtina*) developed in Bulgarian.

### 5.2.2.2 Turkish derived adjective with pleonastic *-ski*

There is one adjective in the main corpus of texts – *kauliski* < *kavilli* – which has its Turkish suffix *-li* doubled by the Slavonic suffix *-ski*. This adjective different from the Bosnian ones with *-li* + *-ski* (5.1.5) because they are without a doubt pleonastic. The adjective *kauliski*, which is broken down into the units of ‘noun’ (*kavil*) + *-li* + *-ski*, seems to have been understood as a whole rather than unit by unit.

### 5.2.3 Turkish root adjectives

There are numerous adjectives in the manuscripts studied that are Turkish roots borrowed into Bulgarian. These words sometimes belong to more than one part of

speech in Turkish. In the Bulgarian texts, these words are used adjectivally, as well as sometimes adverbially (5.2.6) and nominally (3.2.8).<sup>138</sup> Therefore, as with derived adjectives, certain tests must be done to determine their part of speech in Bulgarian. For the most part, these occur adjectivally in Bulgarian,<sup>139</sup> as the following grammatical analysis supports:

(113) These words are **conjoined with Slavonic adjectives**:

a. *kefsiz*

[...] ama toi, zascto besce sardit, i **kefsiz**, ni saidissa nito teh, nito kurbanetim.

‘[...] but because he was angry and in bad humour he paid attention neither to them nor to their sacrifice.’ (779: 135a)

b. *diuzghiun*

Cato videha assiete golemiet asker Rimski, i colco beha hubeve **diuzghiun**.

‘When the soldiers saw the great Roman army, how beautiful and orderly they were.’ (779: 194a)

c. *sakat*

[...] caco scetesce da pravisc da bescese rodil nem, ja gluh, ja slep, illi **sakat**, ja na krak, ja na raka?

‘[...] what would you do had you been born mute, or deaf, or blind, or crippled, either in leg or arm?’ (779: 216a)

(114) They **modify a noun**:

a. *acik*

i. Besce Iona na Jedno’ mesto **acik**

‘Jonas was in an open place’ (779: 112a)

ii. [...] sas tolkos slatko i **acik** dumi

‘[...] with such sweet and clear words’ (779: 112a)

---

<sup>138</sup> Since these nouns all end in consonants and have not undergone morphophonological changes, contextual examples are not given in chapter three. Therefore, examples of these words used nominally are given in footnotes after each entry.

<sup>139</sup> For examples when these words act nominally, see 3.2.8 and for when they act adverbially, see 5.2.6.

- b. *ghiran*  
 [...] pusnetgo toia **ghiran** pustini; pusnago u ghiranat vetei.  
 ‘[...] they send him into the inhospitable desert; he puts him into the terrible cistern.’ (780:39a)
- c. *jalan*  
 [...] **jalan** schehatin  
 ‘[...] false witness’ (779: 166a)
- d. *uigun*  
 Celotomue’ **uigun**, i tvardo hubavo, bes lekie, i od jedin renk xiv.  
 ‘His forehead is attractive, very beautiful, without blemish and of one bright colour.’ (778: 99)
- e. *zenghin*  
 Auramse varna pak sas onunukasi Lot na Canaan, i sedeha tam, i jaco **zenghine** beha.  
 ‘Abram then returned with his grandson Lot to Canaan and they stayed there and were very rich.’ (779: 8a)

(115) They are **modified by an adverb**:

*acik*  
 [...] kosatamue’jako hubava i dlaga do ramata, ciarvena, ama malko **acik**  
 ‘[...] his hair is very beautiful and long, down to his shoulders, red, but a little light’ (778: 99:)

There are also multiple instances where the part of speech of the word in Bulgarian cannot be determined by context or grammar:

- (116) a. *jasak*<sup>140</sup>  
 [...] togava ni besce **jasak** (779:15a)  
 ‘[...] it was prohibited to us’ (779:15)
- b. *eksik*  
 [...] de im ni besce **eksik** ni lebat ni mesoto  
 ‘[...] they lacked neither bread nor meat.’ (779: 39a)
- c. *sakat*<sup>141</sup>  
 i. [...] i u negovo Ime izdravili beha one **sakat**  
 ‘[...] and they had healed that cripple’ (779: 175)

<sup>140</sup> Nominal examples of *jasak* are: ‘beha storili **jasak** po’ sickite gradiseta’ (‘It was prohibited throughout all cities.’) (779: 76b); ‘**jasak** stori’ (‘He prohibited it.’) (779: 130a)

<sup>141</sup> Nominal examples of *sakat* include: ‘prid occitesi **sakatiet** izdravil’ (‘The crippled became healthy before his eyes.’) (779: 175); ‘I makar da besce prostil i na **sakatiet** grehovete’ (‘And if he had only forgiven the cripple his sins.’) (778: 121).

- ii. [...] one **sakat** besce izdravil  
‘[...] he had healed those cripples’ (779: 175)
- iii. Colzina sesa rodili zdravi...colzinasa stanali **sakati**  
‘So many were born healthy...So many became crippled’ (779: 217b)
- d. *sciasckan*<sup>142</sup>
  - i. Zatova Erode saidissago **sciasckan** i za kascmer obleciga  
‘Therefore Herod considered him foolish and dressed him as a buffoon.’
  - ii. [...]darximo cato **sciasckane**  
‘[...] we consider [them] ridiculous’

Examples 118a signify both the concept (abstract noun) and the quality (adjective) while examples 118c and 118d signify the quality (adjective) and the person who has the quality (concrete noun).<sup>143</sup>

#### 5.2.4 Turkish adjectives and gender and number agreement

Because *-lia* adjectives end in /a/, gender is not marked; however, number is:

- (117) a. [...] hora **pusatlie**  
‘[...] armed people’ (779: 16a)
- b. [...] hora losci i **zararlie**  
‘[...] bad and harmful people’ (779:127a)

Similarly, in Bulgarian when Turkish root adjectives end in a consonant, gender is also not marked but number is:

- (118) a. Celom<sub>N</sub>tomue **uigun**  
‘His forehead was attractive’ (778: 99)
- b. [...] jaco **zenghin** besce  
‘[...] he was very rich’ (779: 10a)
- c. [...] jaco **zenghine** beha  
‘[...] they were very rich’ (779: 8b)

There are nevertheless a few examples where there is no number agreement:

<sup>142</sup>A nominal example is: ‘Reciim Issus: ah**sciasckane**, i slabi na vera, zascto ni verovati?’ (‘Jesus said: Oh, foolish and weak in faith, why don’t you believe?’) (779: 172a)

<sup>143</sup>Though *topal* occurs only once and it is nominal in the example in which it occurs, one might suggest that it could also be used adjectivally, as *sakat* is, since both denote human characteristics: ‘jedin **topal**’ (‘one lame man’) (779: 181).

- (119) a. Cato videha assiete golemiet asker Rimski, i colco beha hubeve **diuzghiun**.  
 ‘When the soldiers saw the great Roman army, how beautiful and orderly they were.’ (779: 194a)
- b. [...] izdravili beha one **sakat**  
 ‘[...] those crippled had been healed’ (779: 175)

In these two examples the adjective probably lacks number agreement because it is immediately preceded by an adjective or pronoun that has number agreement; this agreement is implicit in the following adjective.

### 5.2.5 Placement of definite article

The word *jasc* < *yaş* does not take the definite article as native Bulgarian adjectives would:

- (120) [...] **jasc jemisciat**  
 ‘[...] the fresh fruit’ (779: 3b)

In this way *jasc* differs from other Turkish loan root adjectives, which do take the definite article:

- (121) [...] u **bereketliete** godini za katlatskite  
 ‘[...] in the fruitful years for the lacking’ (780: 41a)

It might be that ‘*jasc jemisciat*’ was borrowed into Bulgarian as a set phrase since both the adjective and the noun are Turkish borrowings, which would explain the position of the definite article. In Bulgarian noun phrases, the definite article attaches to the noun unless it is preceded by an adjective, in which case it attaches to the root of the adjective. Given that there are other root adjectives with the definite article, it is probable that *jasc jemisc* < *yaş yemiş* is a phrasal borrowing:

- (122) [...] a ne po’**alciakat**  
 ‘[...] and not the more lowly’ (779: 47b)

### 5.2.6 Adverbs

In Turkish, adjectives and adverbs do not differ in formation: e.g. *mutlu* is both ‘happy’ and ‘happily’. While most of these adjectives/adverbs are used only adjectivally in Bulgarian, there are a few that are used only adverbially:

- (123) a. *ialanisc*  
Tuka moxe cilek da razbere’ **jalanisc** tezi dumi  
‘Here a person can understand these words incorrectly’ (779: 97)
- b. *ailak*  
i. [...] sedi **ailak**  
‘[...] he sat idly’ (778: 98)  
ii. [...] sedeha **ailak**  
‘[...] they sat idly’ (779: 32a)
- c. *acik*  
i. [...] kaza po’**acik**  
‘[...] he spoke more openly’ (778: 125:5)  
ii. [...] vide ci ni besce cadar, damu upre’ na **acik**, zatvorise u Jeruzalem  
‘[...] he saw that he was not capable of resisting him in the open, he shut himself up in Jerusalem’ (779: 141a)

There are also two *-lia* words used adverbially:

- (124) a. *hairlia*  
[...] reci Jozo, bis mene Bogh...odgoave [sic] **hairlia** na Faraona.  
‘[...] Joseph said without me, God...will answer favourably to Pharaoh.’  
(780: 40b)
- b. *kiimetlia*  
Ti tolkos stori zarad nas, tolkos zahmet isteghli a nia pakse tolkos **kiimetlia** darximo  
‘You did so much for us, endured such difficulty and we do not behave properly’ (778: 68)

The words occur adverbially in Bulgarian without undergoing the morphological changes that make native Bulgarian adverbs formally distinct from adjectives.

There are, however, adverbial words or phrases that cannot be adjectives in Turkish: e.g. *artak* < *artık*, *bara*, *barem* < *bare*, *barem*; *barabar* < *beraber*; *belki*,

*belkim* < *belki, belkim*; *bile* < *bile*; *ghittikces* < *gittikçes*; *ghiugiune* < *gücün*; *tekrar* < *tekrar*. Of these words the example *ghiugiune* < *gücün* developed an additional final phoneme when borrowed into Bulgarian. Most likely this development is modelled on Bulgarian adverbs ending in /e/: e.g. *zime*, *lete*.

### 5.2.6.1 Adverbial phrases with Turkish oblique cases

There are also examples of Turkish declined nouns that are used adverbially in Bulgarian. Four Turkish nouns in oblique cases are attested in the Bulgarian texts. In three instances, this suffix is the ablative *-DEn*, which indicates ‘from’, ‘out of’ or ‘through’ (Göksel and Kerslake, 2011: 52): e.g. *aciktan* = ‘from a distance’; *izbirden* = ‘all of a sudden’; *kendilinden* < *kendiliğinden* = ‘by one’s self’; and in one instance, the locative suffix *-DE*, which indicates location, is used:<sup>144</sup> *ghercekta* = ‘truly, really’, ‘literally’, ‘in truth’. *Kendilinden*, *aciktan* and *ghercekta* are original to Turkish and have undergone no changes in Bulgarian: *aciktan* < *açık + tan*; *ghercekta* < *gerçek + ta*; *kendiliğinden* < *kendiliğin + den*. The word *izbirden*, on the other hand, is a combined Turkish-Bulgarian form: <sub>BU</sub>*iz* ‘out of’ + <sub>T</sub>*bir* ‘one’ + <sub>T</sub>*dEn*<sub>ABL</sub> and is modelled on <sub>BU</sub>*izvednāž* ‘all at once’. While it is unclear in the other three examples whether the case endings and their meanings were transparent, this example suggests that the meaning, though not the form of the ablative case, was transparent: the Slavonic prefix, which means ‘out of’ (the meaning implied by the ablative case in Turkish) is another example of pleonasm.

There is also one Turkish adverbial loan that was borrowed as a set phrase: *gherejehibi* < *gereği gibi*, which means ‘as is necessary’. The word *gibi* is the postposition ‘as’ or ‘like’ in Turkish.

<sup>144</sup> For more on cases in Turkish, see Göksel and Kerslake (2011: 47–55).

### 5.2.6.3 Turkish noun used as adjectives or adverbs

One word that is only a noun in Turkish but can be used both adjectivally and nominally in Bulgarian is attested in MS780:

*iabangia* < *yabancı*:

- (125) [...] da kazovat na edin cilek **iabangia** sickoto deto imat skrito na sarze  
‘[...] that they should tell a foreign man everything that they have hidden  
in their hearts’ (780:18)

This examples contains a productive suffix that is limited to nominal usage in Bulgarian as well as in Turkish.

There is one Turkish noun that is used adverbially in Bulgarian: *durmamacalık* > *duramagilik* ‘incessantly, without stopping’. In Turkish *duramacılık* consists of the verbal root *dur* (*durmak* = ‘to stop’ + the suffix *EmE*, which denotes negative potential + *-Cİ*, which denotes agentiveness + *-lık* ‘the concept of’); thus, *duramacılık* means ‘the concept of a person not being able to stop’. However, in the Bulgarian text, this word is used adverbially:

- (126) Sveti Josef rabotesce **duramagilik**  
‘Saint Joseph was working ceaselessly’ (778: 91)

This example supports Sinclair’s argument (5.1.7) concerning the functional ambiguity of words, especially loanwords, whose function developed through contextuality.

### 5.2.6.4 Adverbs related to time

There are two adverbs relating to time: *osahat* < *o sahat*; and *satno* < the adverbial form of *sahat*. Both of these words are deictic. According to the grammatical hierarchy for borrowing proposed by Matras and Sakel (2007: 58), deixis are subordinate to indefinites, but in the manuscripts studied, there are no indefinite time loans. The term *osahat* is a direct borrowing of *o* (‘that’) and *sahat* (‘hour’): ‘at that

hour’, ‘exactly then’. It is by far the most common adverb in the manuscripts studied. Because this expression is used so frequently, I would suggest that it was borrowed as a set phrase rather than as two separate words.

The second adverb that deals with time is a Slavonic formation: *satno* < *satan* < *sahat*, and means hourly. In contrast to *osahat*, which occurs frequently and in all three manuscripts, *satno* occurs only once, in MS778.

### 5.3 Conclusion

While the Bosnian texts have more examples of adjectives that derive from Turkish nominal roots, the Bulgarian ones have more Turkish root adjectives and adverbs. Although Turkish loan adjectives do not agree in gender in Bulgarian, they frequently agree in number:

- (127) a. [...] jaco **zenghin** besce  
‘[...] he was very rich’ (779: 10b)
- b. [...] jaco **zenghine** beha  
‘[...] they were very rich.’ (779: 8b)

The few root adjectives in Bosnian do not agree in number and gender, nor do they decline:

- (128) [... bili su to] ljudi dobri, **zendil**.  
‘[...] those were] good and rich people.’ (Benić: 231)

The adaptation of Turkish *-lî* derived adjectives into Bulgarian also supports this statement. Like the root adjectives, these adjectives do not show gender agreement but do show number agreement:

- (129) a. [...] sas mlogo hora **pusatlie**  
‘[...] with many armed people’ (779: 16a)
- b. [...] zaret na тази работ tolcos **sciubelia**.  
‘[...] the emperor was very suspicious of this matter.’ (779:97a)

However, these derived adjectives differ from the root adjectives because they have undergone the morphological change *-lĭ* > *-lija* in Bulgarian. The *-lija* suffix produces syncretism with a feminine adjectival ending (e.g. *ničija*). Therefore, Turkish root adjectives behave exactly as *-lija* derived adjectives. It is possible that *-lija* adjectives influenced Turkish root adjectives' remaining undeclined for gender in Bulgarian. However, it is equally possible that number agreement carried greater weight than gender agreement when these adjectives were initially borrowed into Bulgarian.

It is unclear how transparent the meanings of *-lĭ* were in eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian. In Bulgarian, this suffix was frequently maintained (e.g. *sciubelia*), sometimes doubled by *-ski* (e.g. *begliscki*), or lost (e.g. *bellibasc*). While the second two examples differ semantically from the first (they derive from concrete nouns), the *-lĭ* suffix has the same meaning regardless of what it modifies: it still means 'relating to.' On the basis of *beghliscki*, one might argue that *-ski* is added to *-lĭ* adjectives to have an unambiguous relative adjectival suffix, though there are not enough examples to draw conclusion. Since *-lĭ* can be both adjectival and nominal, it is possible that its dual function in Turkish hindered its semantic infiltration into Bulgarian and Bosnian.<sup>145</sup>

There are several types of adverbs with Turkish roots in both Bulgarian and Bosnian: secondary derivatives (e.g. <sub>BO</sub>*budalasto*), Turkish root adverbs (e.g. <sub>BO</sub>*mukajet*) and Turkish adverbial phrases (e.g. <sub>BU</sub>*gherejehibi*). While all types of adverbs are present in both languages, the first category is more common in Bosnian while the latter two are more common in Bulgarian.

---

<sup>145</sup> Weinreich 1955 points out that 'morphemes with complex grammatical functions seem to be less likely to be transferred' (34).

## Chapter Six: Conjunctions

According to Matras and Sakal (2008: 54), conjunctions are ‘the most susceptible [part of speech] to borrowing’. The three most commonly borrowed connectors are ‘but’, ‘or’ and ‘and’. Subordinating conjunctions are less though still frequent in most instances of language borrowing.

### 6.1 Bosnian conjunctions

There are three Turkish loan conjunctions in the Bosnian texts: 1) *ama* means ‘but’; 2) *(h)em... (h)em* means ‘both...and’; 3) and **medžer** means ‘but’. The conjunction *ama* is attested in all of the texts studied while the conjunctions *em...em* and *medžer* are found only in Benić:

- (130) a. [...] **em** zaradi teškijeh vitrova, **em** zaradi corsara  
‘[...] both because of strong winds and because of pirates’ (Benić: 247)
- b. Al’ **meder** onu noć doletio iz Visokoga  
‘But nevertheless that night he flew there from Visoko’ (153)

Margitić uses *ama*<sup>146</sup> once in a religious song:

- (131) [...] kakvoje **amo** stagne?  
‘[...] but what is the state?’ (Margitić: 252)

Benić makes use of it frequently, on thirty-two pages:

- (132) a. [...] **ama** bijaše sve srezano oliti skrojeno.  
‘[...] everything was completely razed or cut.’ (Benić: 151)
- b. [...] nije broj falio, **ama** sam se ja privario  
‘[...] there was not a number missing; rather I had made a mistake’ (Benić: 45)

The conjunction *ama* follows the hierarchical scale proposed by Matras and Sakal (2008).

---

<sup>146</sup> In several instances in Margitić (1779), the grapheme <a> is used in place of <o>: e.g. ‘olli’ for *ali*. These are most likely misprints. Similarly, the grapheme <m> is used for <n>: e.g. ‘latimskim’ (Margitić: 1779: 9) and italics occur in non-italicized words: e.g. ‘slovim’ (Margitić: 1779: 9).

The earliest attestation of *meder* is the eighteenth century, while for *em...em*, the earliest attestation is the seventeenth century. Conjunctions are not limited by topic: ‘and’, ‘but’ are used in everyday and more formal language.

## 6.2 Bulgarian conjunctions

The Bulgarian manuscripts have far more examples of Turkish conjunctions than the Bosnian texts do. In total, there are five conjunctions: *ama*, *ciunki*, *hem...hem*, *ja...ja*, and *sanki*.

### 6.2.1 *Ama*

In the Bulgarian manuscripts, *ama* is by far the most common conjunction:

- (133) a. Beha Adam i Eva goli, **amase** ni poznavaha  
‘Adam and Eve were naked but they did not realise it.’ (779: 3a)
- b. Pokloni jenasc Cain kurban Bogu od jemisciat od zemeta...**ama** od nai  
alciak jemisc  
‘Cain also made a sacrifice of the fruit of the ground, but of the vilest fruit,  
to God’ (779: 4a)

While *alla* is also attested, *ama* is far more common:

- (134) [...] **alla** iskat da se najadat da se napjat kolko moxiat  
‘[...] but they want to eat and drink their fill as much as they can’

### 6.2.2 *Ja...ja*

In Turkish, *ya...ya* is disjunctive. The conjunction *ja...ja* is attested three times in the three manuscripts:

- (135) [...] nie dal dase rodisc od bascti pogane, **ja** turzi...**ja** zigane, illi od drughi  
necoi hora zagubeni  
‘[...] he did not grant for you to be born of pagan fathers, or Turks...or  
Gypsies, or of any other forsaken people’ (779: 217a)

As in several other instances with conjunctions, *ja...ja* is followed by the Bulgarian equivalent: *illi*. Under the negation in this example *ja...ja* is (interpreted as) conjunctive: not (A or B) = (not A) and (not B).

The other two examples of *ja...ja* do not involve negation:

- (136) a. Horturva oscti Staro Sveto Pismo od Prorozite, detosa prorokuvali **ja** odIssuKраста, ja od drughe rabote, detosesa do' siga' **ja** dokareli, **ja** setat dase dokarovat dorse svarsci tozi Svet  
'The Old Testament also speaks of the prophets, who prophesied either about Jesus Christ, or about other things that have been done up to now, or which will be done until this World ends' (779:2)
- b. [...] caco scetesce da pravisc da bescese rodil nem, **ja** gluh, **ja** slep, illi sakat, **ja** na krak, **ja** na raka?  
'[...] what would you do had you been born mute, or deaf, or blind, or crippled, either in leg or arm?' (779: 216a)

It should also be noted that the use of *ja...ja* does not support the hierarchy of conjunctions proposed by Matras and Sakal (6.1). The conjunction *ili...ili* is the preferred choice for 'either...or' and *i...i* for 'both...and'.

### 6.2.3 *Hem (...hem)*

The conjunction **hem** means 'and what's more', 'moreover' in Turkish. It occurs in numerous examples with this meaning in the three manuscripts:

- (137) Issukras zarad nas slagalse i sluscial dori da umre. **Hem** da umre na kraj sas goleme bolevei.  
'Jesus Christ lay down his life for us and was obedient even to dying. What's more [is] at the end he died in agony.' (778: 15)

In Turkish it can also occur in a double construction: **hem...hem**, meaning 'both...and'. It is attested once in MS779 and once in MS778 in this construction:

- (138) a. Zasceto tvaratse **hem** ses tolkova svoj greove **hem** sas ciuxdi greove  
'Because they give themselves airs both with so many of their own sins and those of others' (780: 14a)
- b. Kak scta da bada as **hem** maika, **hem** devoika?  
'How will I be both mother and virgin?' (778: 60)

### 6.3 Subordinating conjunctions

#### 6.3.1 *Sanki*

The subordinating conjunction *sanki*, meaning ‘thus’ or ‘so’, ‘in other words’, as well as ‘as if’, is the second most common conjunction in the three manuscripts:

- (139) a. Osahat seto prigresciha Adam i Eva, reci Gospod na zamjata, **sanki** na ghiuaulat’  
‘At that hour when Adam and Eve sinned, God said to the snake, as if to the devil’ (779: 221)
- b. [...] ako iska danameri spassenie na onzi svet. 8 rabote trebe da znaj: **sanki** 1. Da znaj ci ima jedin sam Boogh u tri kipa  
‘[...] if a person wants to find salvation in that world, he must know eight facts: thus, 1. he must know that there is one God in three forms’ (778: 1)

#### 6.3.2 *Ciunki*

The term *ciunki*, meaning ‘because’ is also common:

- (140) a. Cato vide’ Gospod, ci tezi sciascanese niostaveha od tazirabota... i napravili beha jedna’ geloma i ciudna rabota **ciunki** do togava besce jedin...jezik na svetata.  
‘When God saw that those fools did not give up this task, and they had made one huge and amazing thing, because until then there had only been one language in the world.’ (779: 7a)
- b. I **ciunki** Blaxena Deviza Maria besce od korenat od zar David  
‘And because the Blessed Virgin Mary was of the origin of King David’ (778: 58)

### 6.4 Conclusion

Turkish conjunctions were more prevalent in eighteenth-century Bulgarian than in Bosnian. Since Slavonic counterparts exist, these conjunctions developed out of frequent exposure, not necessity. According to the borrowing scale that Thomason and Kauffman outline, the borrowing of conjunctions is one of the determinants that distinguishes Level Two: Slightly More Intense Contact: Slight Structural Borrowing from Level One: Casual Contact (1991: 74).

Apart from *ama*, conjunctions are attested only in the manuscripts and in the chronicle, not in the published works or supplementary texts. It might be suggested that Bosnians and Bulgarians tended to exclude Turkish conjunctions from more formal writing. This would support the hypothesis that though the texts have significant Turkish influence, they do not fully exemplify the extent of Turkish borrowing in spoken Bulgarian and Bosnian.

## 7.0 Chapter Seven: Motivation, Semantics and Integration of Turkisms

### 7.1 The Bosnian writers and turkisms

Divković, Posilović, Radnić, Margitić, Bračuljević, Lastrić, Dobretić, Lašvanin, Benić, and Ilijić incorporated turkisms into their writing because: 1) these words had replaced or become synonymous with a native or loan term by their time (core loans,<sup>147</sup> e.g. *vilajet*, *pender*); 2) they were culturally necessary since there was no Slavonic equivalent (cultural loans, e.g. *aga*, *beg*).<sup>148</sup> While some core loans are synonymous with Slavonic terms, it might be argued that their usage is determined by the context in which they occur. Similarly, some core loans have developed an additional connotation possibly influenced by context or origin (7.1.8). At other times, core loans occur in analogies that explain esoteric religious or philosophical ideas. While core loans are present in both the chronicles and religious texts, cultural loans are for the most part limited to the chronicles.

In addition to each writer's knowledge of Turkish, his personal views of Turkish influenced the number of turkisms that he employed: e.g. Lastrić employed turkisms and other loanwords to embellish his writing. For Lastrić, loanwords were not a threat to his native language, but an enrichment (Cattaneo, 2000: 63–64). On the other hand, Bračuljević, who was not fond of the Turks (Bračuljević, 1730: 29; 343), most likely unconsciously employed numerous turkisms that had replaced native terms.

While true that an individual's knowledge and views of the source language influence the extent to which he employs the source language's words in the recipient language, linguistic and sociolinguistic factors have influence as well. As mentioned throughout this dissertation (3.3; 4.1; 6.1), grammatical borrowing hierarchy is

---

<sup>147</sup> For more on core loans, see Haspelmath and Tadmor (2007: 48–49).

<sup>148</sup> For more on cultural loans, see Thomason and Kaufman (1991: 77), Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 46–48).

significant: e.g. in most inflected languages, nouns are more easily borrowed than verbs.<sup>149</sup> Thomason and Kaufman (1991: 77), however, point out that social factors (e.g. prestige, political pressure, social mobility) play a greater role than grammatical hierarchy in borrowing.

### **7.1.2 Four types of context**

In order to determine to what extent the Turkish loanwords in the Franciscan texts had become incorporated into the local language and the possible social factors behind them, I have divided the words – regardless of their part of speech or whether they are derivatives – into several contextual categories: 1) words marked as employed in dialogue by Turks; 2) cultural loans, often consisting of nouns denoting human beings, that establish an Turkish context; 3) Turkish words, especially verbs, adjectives and conjunctions, used by the Franciscans in writing about the Turks; 4) words in an entirely non-Turkish context. Each of these categories has a different degree of Turkish infiltration. Because religious texts (Divković, Posilović, Bračuljević, Dobretić, Lastrić, Margitić and Ilijić) focus on Catholic sacraments, biblical texts and the saints, the first three categories do not apply to them. Apart from one exception in Bračuljević's work, a turkism is in an entirely non-Turkish setting if it is in a religious text.

#### **7.1.2.1 Turkish dialogue**

There are relatively few passages marked as dialogue between Turks or Turks addressing Bosnians. All parts of speech are found in dialogue and the majority of interjections occur only in dialogue. There are only two verbs that are present in dialogue: *hazuriti* in the imperative and *sebdisati* in the present tense:

---

<sup>149</sup> For more on borrowing hierarchies, see Haspelmath and Tadmor (2009: 55–63); Matras and Sakel (2007: 40–59); Thomason and Kaufman (1991: 74–95).

- (141) a. Mubašir: ‘hajde, **hazuri** konak u Sutisci meni.’  
 ‘Messenger: ‘Come on, prepare the residence in Sutjeska for me.’’ (Benić: 170)
- b. Paša: ‘neka svatko znade da ih Turci veliki **sebdišu**’  
 ‘Pasha: ‘Let everyone know that the great Turks really loved them’’ (202)

In both these examples, Turks are addressing Turks. Although these verbs occur in the most Turkish context – dialogue marked as spoken by Turks – the verbs have adopted Bosnian verbal suffixes, conjugate correctly in Bosnian, and the word order is not native to Turkish, suggesting an active understanding and use of these verbs in Bosnian.

### 7.1.2.2 Turkish context

The presence of Turks presupposes an Turkish setting:

- (142) **Ali-paša** došo izpod Biograda, dojde naredba **muselimu** sarajevskomu.  
 ‘The Ali-pasha came from the vicinity of Belgrade, the order came to the Sarajevan officer.’ (Lašvanin: 217)

In this example, *ali-paša* and *muselim* are categorised under Turkish setting, since it is their very presence that renders the setting Turkish. In an Turkish context, turkisms denoting persons of masculine gender are the most common loanwords: e.g. *kadija*, *paša*, *muselim*, *mubašir*, *kajmakan*, *ćehaja*. In short, turkisms referring to religious or political officials always fall into the Turkish-setting category in Bosnian.

It is also possible to have an Turkish setting without the presence of Turks. In both chronicles, Benić and Lašvanin describe the taxes (*harači*) that the monasteries had to pay and the influence *fermani* had on their monastic life or on their Catholic community. In both cases these settings are Turkish since the situation only exists because of Turkish governance.

There is a limited group of verbs that implies Turkish setting. Many of the verbs that came into Bosnian from Turkish describe practices that are closely

associated with the Ottoman conquest and are therefore politically and socially motivated: e.g. *džilitati se*, *(pod)(u)haračiti*, *(od)ilamiti*, *odbašiti (se)*, *teftišiti*, *tobati/tabaniiti*. As is the case with cultural loan nouns, these verbs were borrowed into Bosnian because no native term existed with the exact meaning that these Turkish terms had: an Turkish context was necessary for these verbs to exist. However, these verbs were grammatically fully integrated into Bosnian: they occur in present, past and future tenses, as well as in the infinitive. The verb *odbašiti se* has the root word *baša*, but its affixes are Slavonic and its form is native to Bosnian.

In contrast to the other religious texts, which show no elements of an Turkish cultural context, Bračuljević's work has one example that does:

- (143) [...] razlučuju jedan duševni zakon od drugoga; ilišu od poglavara odregiene, za ralučegnie švoga duševnogh zakona od drugoga. I hodichia, kojaje odregiena, i noššije za zlamengnie takogh zakona: kako na priliku kod **Turaka**, **abdest**, **Ramazan**, i **zelena čalma** kod **Alilovaczah**, a biila kod Homerovaca (Alia i Homer, dva **Muhamedova Alkorana** tomasšteglia, kadšu Lutor, i Kalvin uznemirili czarkvu Iffukarštovu, razdarvšci gniegovu nefcievenu haglinu, razdvoivšci toješft gniegovo štado, i odmamivšci za šobom mloghe ovcze u puštigniu tešcke bludnošfti, za ranu vukovom: ondašu i oni uzbunili **Turke**, i razdilili zakon **Muhamedov**) kako kod **čifututa** obrizovagnie  
 [...] they distinguish one spiritual law from another; or they are regulated by leaders to distinguish their spiritual law from another. And the dress which is prescribed and worn as a sign of such a law: for example among the Turks, ablution, Ramadan and the green strip of cloth wrapped around the fez of the Alilovaci, and among the Homerians (Alia and Homer, two Muslim interpreters of the Holy Qur'an, when Luther and Calvin disrupted the church of Jesus Christ, tearing his unsewn garment to pieces, that is dividing his flock and luring many sheep after them into the desert of grave debauchery to be food for wolves: then, they also disturbed the Turks and they divided the law of Muhammed), like circumcision with the Jews (147)

This passage shows a mix of motivation behind turkisms: *abdest*, *čalma* and *Ramazan* are culturally motivated. The noun *čifut*, however, is most likely a core loan.

### 7.1.2.3 Non-Turkish context

A non-Turkish setting is characterised by no Turkish presence or influence: e.g.

Lašvanin describes notable friars of the past:

- (144) 1608. O.m.p.f. Ilija Čakalović, od Fojnice. Ovi je bio čudan: koliko **jedžek**, toliko vino triba mu je bila.  
'1608. O.m.p.f. Ilija Čakalović, from Fojnica. This one was strange: however much he ate, he needed that much wine.' (Lašvanin: 254)

The Turks are not present in this description and Turkish actions and policies have no influence over this situation.

### 7.1.3 Core loan nouns and context

The use of many Turkish core loan nouns and their Slavonic counterparts does not seem to be determined by context. For example, *most* and *ćuprija*, *penđer*, *novac* and *para* and *pendžer* occur in Turkish and non-Turkish settings:

- (145) a. *most* : *ćuprija*  
i. [...] stoji pod ćemerom od **mosta**  
'[...] he stood under the arch of the bridge' (Lašvanin: 201)  
ii. Turci...učiniše **most** od uža...i pobigoše priko **ćuprije**  
'The Turks made a bridge out of rope...and fled across the bridge'  
(Lašvanin: 210)
- b. *novac* : *para*  
i. [...] nije mogao naći **novac**  
'[...] he could not find the money' (Benić: 115)  
ii. [...] ali je stajao dosta **para**  
'[...] but there was enough money' (Benić: 168)
- c. *prozor* : *penđer*  
[...] prid jednom krstjanskom kućom...me poznaše kroz **penđer**.  
'[...] in front of one Christian house...they recognised me through the window.' (Lašvanin: 195)

These Turkish core loans have become part of the local language: they occur in both Turkish and in non-Turkish settings, they are not glossed, and they decline according to the grammatical rules of Bosnian. While both Turkish and Slavonic forms are

attested for ‘money’ and ‘bridge’, only *pend̄er* is attested for ‘window’. Since there is only one example of *pend̄er*, it cannot be assumed that *pend̄er* had replaced *prozor* in Lašvanin’s community, though it is significant that *pend̄er* is present in a non-Turkish setting.

The term *sindžir* is used exclusively over *lanac* in six of the twelve Franciscan texts, both in Turkish and non-Turkish contexts and in both religious and non-religious texts:

<i>sindžir</i>		<i>lanac</i>
T context	non-T context	DI, PO, MA, DO
BE, LA	BE, BR, LT, LN, LAS, IL, RP, RR	

The texts in which *sindžir* is not used are religious. The word *sindžir* was attested as early as the fourteenth century, which means it was present in Bosnian in Divković’s time. It is possible that Divković, Posilović, Margitić and Dobretić had a wider audience in mind, one that would not understand this turkism, though their broader audience did not inhibit them from using *bula*, *muzevir*, *hazna*, *taman* and other turkisms that are limited to a Bosnian audience. Their choice of *lanac* over *sindžir* might simply be a personal preference. The attestations of core loans over native terms might suggest that they were more integrated into Bosnian than turkisms limited to passages marked as dialogue or nouns denoting professions and titles, which became part of Bosnian out of cultural necessity.

#### 7.1.4 Context and core verbs

In several cases core loan verbs most likely came into Bosnian because they were actions that the Turks frequently carried out: e.g. *surgun učiniti*, *usidžiliti*, *apstiti*. In the texts analysed, these three verbs are always used in an Turkish context. However, because the Franciscans employ them, they are one step removed from an Turkish

context. While nouns denoting human beings are essential in establishing Turkish context, verbs are not.

On the other hand, the majority of the core loan verbs convey actions not limited to the Turkish authorities: e.g. *čurudisati*, *dajanisati*, *eglenisati*, *esabiti*, *išleisati*, *jagmiti*, *ograisati*, *zaašikovati se*. In the texts studied, most of these verbs occur only in an Turkish context and never more than twice in one chronicle:

(146) a. *eglenisati*

[...] sve unutra legav na minderu, **eglenisao** s njeziem Čifutinom, svojim hećim-bašom.

‘[...] since he was entirely inside, lying on a cushion, speaking to a Jew, his doctor.’ (Benić: 199)

b. *išleisati*

Mi, videći sadašnja vrimena, gdi niti služe seneti, ni šaiti, niti ima pravde nikakve, ni u Sarajevu, ni u Travniku, već aman trošak bez mjere (a da ima sud, ne bi se to činilo, ni museveda **išleisala**, rekoh videći se mi tako stisnuti, i da ne ide lemozina priko vrata, našosmo svikolici kojih se tiče makul da se davudžija, rečeni Ivan, smijeri, a da mu dademo još jaspri.

‘[Despite] seeing our present times, where documents and witnesses have no purpose, where there are no rights in Sarajevo or in Travnik; where there are instead crazy limitless expenditures (if there were a court, this would not happen, nor would the document be implemented), I said, [despite] seeing how pressed we are and that alms do not cross our threshold, all we who are involved consider it fair that the plaintiff, the mentioned Ivan, shall be placated, and we will give him more *jaspra*.’ (Benić: 286)

c. *ograjisti*

Odgovori čoban: ‘Kazah, al’ govore siromasi Vrančani da nijesu kadur dočekat i da su blizu kasabe i Turaka, pa da će **ograjisat** siromasi’

‘The shepherd responded: ‘I said, but the poor Vrančans say that they are not capable of receiving [him] and they are in the backwaters and close to the Turks, and the poor people will therefore experience misfortune.’ (Benić: 293)

d. *zaašikovati*

[...] se poturči gvardijan u Srebrenici, bivši se **zaašikovao** za bulom.

‘[...] having fallen in love with a *bula*, the guardian in Srebrenica became Muslim.’ (Lašvanin: 254)

It might be suggested that the Franciscans’ use of these core loan verbs was determined by context. For example, in 150d it is because of *bula*, not *zaašikovati*,

that this context is Turkish. It might be argued that *zaašikovati se* embellishes the context but is not necessary to it. However, it is also possible that in Lašvanin's time *zaašikovati se za* was as frequent or more than *zaljubiti se u*. Unfortunately, there is not a counter example of either *zaljubiti se* or *zašikovati se* in a non-Turkish setting (7.1.2.3). Lastrić's use of *ašikovanje* (3.1.6.5; 7.1.7.2) supports the argument that *ašikovati* and its derivatives were common and not limited to an Turkish context in the eighteenth century.

Another example which supports this hypothesis is Benić's use of *čurudisati* and *tamir učiniti* for which there are several Bosnian synonyms (*čurudisati*: e.g. *trunuti, raspadati se*; *tamir učiniti*: e.g. *popraviti*):

- (147) I sve se dade, ama povlastice se ne potvdiše nikakve, već – sklopiv ruke – hajde doma! Izvan što nješto fermana bi izvađeno, da se more **tamir činiti** po manastirije što je **čurudiše** od drevnoga, al' ne ima da se more **tamir činit** crkva  
 'And everything was given but the licenses were not at all approved, instead he crossed his arms – go home! Apart from something of the *ferman* which had been taken out, so that repairs could be made in the monastery which is rotting from age, there was nothing [given] for repairs to be made to the church' (Benić: 284)

Benić does not gloss<sup>150</sup> these turkisms and employs them to describe the state of the monastery. One might suggest that the choice of words was influenced by the *ferman* described, though there is not sufficient evidence to support this hypothesis. It seems more likely that these terms were commonly used as synonyms or even replacements (there are no examples of the Slavonic synonyms attested in the material analysed) for their Slavonic counterparts.

Other verbs occur in both settings or only in a non-Turkish setting:

---

<sup>150</sup> For more on glossing, see 7.1.7.2.

- (148) a. Emilio, rimske vojske zapovidnik, zapovidi...da **jagme** što tko more  
 ‘Emilio, the commander of the Roman army, ordered to plunder whatever one could.’ (Lašvanin: 52)
- b. Alekšandro sva kraljestva **uharači**.  
 ‘Alexander taxed all the kingdoms.’ (Lašvanin: 49)
- c. **Esabite**, bratjo, što su činili siromaši!  
 ‘Imagine, brothers, what the poor people did!’ (Benić: 129)

The verb *jagmiti*, a synonym for *pljačkati*, is used in Turkish and non-Turkish settings, in both present and past tenses. Both *uharačiti* and *podharačiti* occur in non-Turkish settings. These verbs came into the language because the practices that they represented were instigated by the Turkish authorities. Though these verbs denote a specific type of taxation in the eighteenth century, they are also used in the more general sense ‘to tax’. It is when these verbs are used in their secondary meaning ‘to tax’ that they are used in a non-Turkish context.

### 7.1.5 Semantic categories

#### 7.1.5.1 Types of categories

a) **taxes, sentences, orders, documents, assessments:** *aklama, arzohal, buruntija, ćešif, dava, džulus, ferman, fetva hamrija, harač, (poharačiti, podharačiti uharačiti), đumruk, hatišerif, ilam, izun, mahzar, murasela, senet, sidžil, taksil, tefter, tembi, temesuć, teskera, teftiš, teftišlema, teftišiti, udžet, ušur, vergili;*

b) **weaponry and violent conflict:** *barut, basti, bukagija, čengel, degenek, dramaluk, džebana, džilitati se, dušman, handžar, hasum, jarak, juriš, kanadžija, katil, kavga, kesedžija, kulušci, lagum, prangija, pusat, sindžir, šenluk, tabaniti, toljaga, top, topuz, zor, zorba;*

c) **pejorative or negative terms:** *aždaja, balija, budala, čifut, đaus, harambaša hrsuz, inle, izal učiniti, muzevir, papaz, telbiz, tufekdžija, zarar, zulum, zulumiti;*

d) **government and army officials:** *alajbeg, bajraktar, bašeskija, begler-beg, bešlaga, bešlija, buljuk-baša, čauš, čausler-aga, čauslerćehaja, davudžija, delibaša, delija, elčija, jasakčija, kadija, kajmekan, kalif, muslim, mubašir, muvela, naip, nefer, odoabaša, paša, sejman, serašćer, serdar, spahija, subaša, sultan, teftedar, tefterćehaja, topčaga, ućtuglija, ulak, vezir, zapčija;*

e) **religious terminology:** *adet, bajram, ćitab, derviš, džamija, džemat, džematlija, efendija, hodža, ićindija, imšallah, jacija, kalif, mećit, muftija, muhamedanac, mula, munara, ramazan, sabah, šehit, šejh-ul-Islam, ulem;*

f) **trade and monetary terms:** *arslanija, bezistan, čaršija, ćumurdžija, dućan, espap, funduklija, groš, hajakterija, iskusuriti, kesa, komora, kujundžija, manjgura, malćina, meaf, papučija, pazarište, poarćiti, zanat*

g) **daily life:** *ahar, alat, badem, bardak, bašta, beden, bešik, boja, bunar, burnut, ćador, ćakmak, ćerga, ćorba, ćilim, ćumur, duńđer, đećerma, fajda, ibrik, jaka, jardum, kafaz, kalćina, kašika, makaze, minten, muselez, odžak, oluk, peškir, sać, sanduk, sirće, somun, suńđer, taš, tava, tel, torba, zahira, zanat*

As mentioned, turkisms developed in areas where terminology was lacking in Bosnian or where the exact meaning of an Turkish term made it easier to accept an Turkish loanword than to give a native word an additional meaning. Such is the case regarding cultural loans: titles of government and military officials, religious vocabulary, monetary terminology and words related to taxes and protocol, as well as weaponry. These terms are never glossed with Bosnian vocabularly.

Some words which were borrowed from Turkish have negative connotations, or had become pejorative in Bosnian by the eighteenth century:<sup>151</sup> e.g. *ćifut, balija,*

---

<sup>151</sup> Research has been done pejorative turkisms in nineteenth-century and modern Bulgarian Stamenov (2011: 156–172); Stajnova (1963: 183–186) but to my knowledge, not for Bosnian or eighteenth-century Bulgarian.

*đaus*, *budala*, *papaz*, *popodžija*. The words *çifit*, *gavur* and *budala* have negative connotations in Turkish, while *balija* is a Bosnian development (7.1.8.2.3). A Bosnian counterpart to the word *budala* and its derivatives is not attested. While *papaz* and *pappuçu* are neutral in Turkish, *papaz* and *papadžija* have a disrespectful connotation in Bosnian. Titles showing respect, though always exclusive to Turkish officials, also came into Bosnian (e.g. *aga*, *baša*), as did many neutral terms. Nevertheless, apart from official titles, in these texts the only loanword denoting a person with a positive connotation is *muštulukčija*. In contrast to many nouns borrowed from Turkish denoting people, these pejorative nouns are not culturally necessary: Bosnian had extant words for these nouns, but the native nouns did not offer the pejorative or local connotation: e.g. *čifut* : *jevrej* ‘Jew’; *balija* : *musliman* ‘Muslim’; *đaur* : *nevjernik* ‘infidel’, *poganin* ‘pagan’; *papaz* : *svećenik*, *duhovnik* ‘priest’. While these terms all stem from Turkish, they are not limited to describing one religious group.

#### **7.1.5.2 Semantics in religious texts**

Religious works have fewer loanwords than chronicles and travelogues because their subject matter is theological (Pranjković, 2005b: 246). The most frequent turkisms in religious texts are: *čifut*, *budala*, *budalaština*, *mejdan*, *sindžir*, *zanat*. Frequency in this context is defined as multiple occurrences in one religious text, as well as occurrence in more than one religious text.

### 7.1.5.2.1 Divković

Divković, whose work is notably the earliest (1611), uses thirteen turkisms. Some examples follow:

- (149) a. *čifut*  
[...] i turčin i vlax i **čiputin**; i ciganin i svaki duh čovječanski  
‘[...] and the Turk and the Vlach and the Jew; and the Gypsy and every human being’
- b. *hazna*  
[...] staljeno **uhaznu** [sic] duhovnu  
‘[...] put in the spiritual treasury’ (285)
- c. *hambar*  
[...] ni u **hambar** sipanu  
‘[...] nor is it poured into the granary’ (46)
- d. *mahala*  
[...] akoje ono dobro zasvu **mahalu**  
‘[...] if it is good for the whole neighbourhood’ (211)
- e. *muzevir*  
[...] također ovi muke ne procjenuju pianci, lažci, oholice... **muzoveri**  
‘[...] drunks, liars, the arrogant and trouble-makers also do not assess these pains’ (303)
- f. *rakija*  
[...] vino, **rakia**, mlieko sve vode koiese čine Otravaa  
‘[...] wine, brandy and milk [are] all liquids which count as poison’ (144)
- g. *taman*  
Parvie kadano čoviekī svoje tielo razbie, i prospe svoje sieme; grex dele **taman**, i pogardai.  
‘The first is when man breaks his body, spills his seed and certainly shares sin and abuses.’ (122)
- h. *udžerica*  
‘[...] to jest kakonose svakolika vrata varte **udžerici**.  
‘[...] it is just as every door opens to the cell.’ (287)
- i. *zanat*  
[...] i svaki zanatčĭa štogodi dobude nasvomu **zanatu**  
‘[...] and every kind of tradesman whatever he gains by his trade’ (135)
- j. *zanatčĭja*  
[...] i svaki **zanatčĭa** štogodi dobude nasvomu zanatu  
‘[...] and every kind of tradesman whatever he gains by his trade’ (135)

Apart from *taman*, all of the turkisms that Divković employs are nouns, none of which are cultural loans. Divković does not gloss any of these terms, which indicates that the words were adopted into Bosnian by 1611.

#### 7.1.5.2.2 Radnić

Some of the turkisms in the religious texts occur only once, but these turkisms, which have early attestations,<sup>152</sup> were most likely common in the spoken language and are often attested in the chronicles; they often denote concrete nouns present in everyday life: e.g. *čalma*, *čelik*, *dimija*, *hambar*, *jasprica*, *jedžek*, *kašika*, *pamuk*, *papuča*, *perde*, *rakija*, *sirčet*. Radnić uses these turkisms as explanatory words in analogies to explain religious ideas, usually relating to Christ:

(150) a. *sirče*

O pridraghi bišseru, i priuišsoki draghi kamenu, koife raztapa u **firchetu** illi oçttu od prigliute tuoye mukke; biošfi zadouoglan ne famo biti našc, nego yofcter našca pichia, hrana, i xiuot.

‘O most precious pearl and greatest precious stone which dissolves in the vinegar of your bitterest suffering; you were content not just to be ours but even more to be our drink, food and life.’ (Radnić, 1683a: 202)

b. *čelik*

Zafctoye neimafc millošt Boxyu, zato nenauidiſc nepriateglia. Zafctoye noxu magnak **čellik**, vzima barzo hargiu i niche da ſtoy çift,...zafcto neima **čellika** od millošti.

‘Because you do not have God’s mercy therefore you hate your enemies. Because a knife lacks steel, [it] rusts more quickly and never remains clean because it has no steel of mercy.’ (Radnić, 1683a: 389)

c. *papuča*

Bog yeſt ſvarhu ſuakye ſtuarij. Nemoyſe çuditi ako yedan dobar pridobie mnoghae zllae, zascto yofc nebba billa velika ſtuar, da yedan çoek xije, pobiye, i izrannij mnoga tiellaſſa gliudii martuie. Podplat çreugle, alli **Papuče**, akoche naydebgli, i naytuargi biti iztançaſe i ſmagnkaa nofechiſe, doklega neſtannae, a koxahna ruçi, buduchi tanka, i plemenita, ne samo ne skoncauasa, i razdiere, s’poſlouagnem negose jofc çinni tuargia, i yaççaa trudechi, kako vidimo na ruku texaçkye i maystroskye, koyse gnima trudae.

‘God is above every thing. Don’t be surprised if a good person experiences much evil, because it would not be a serious matter that a person lives, kills

---

<sup>152</sup> See Appendix II.

and lacerates many human bodies dead. The soles of slippers, even if they are the thickest and hardest, they will grow thin and less when being worn until they disappear, but the skin on one's hands which is thin and refined, does not only not disappear and tear, but with labour it becomes harder and stronger through, as we see on the hands of labourers and tradesmen who work with them.' (Radnić, 1683a: 238)

d. *zumbul*

Tuoye ruke yeŕfu okrughe, i od zlata, i punne **ŕumbula**  
'Your hands are plump in gold and full of hyacinths' (Radnić, 1683a: 92)

e. *jeđek/jeđžek*

Alli oudi yeŕft vzŕuprotiuno: yere ya neimam kuŕcati **yeččka**, nego izkuŕcati mene iŕtoga.  
'But here it is the opposite; for I don't have any other food for you to eat but myself.' (Radnić, 1683b: 115)

With these turkisms it seems the writer puts more learned philosophical ideas into a local context so his text, which he addresses to his 'brathi rogenoy, sarayliami' ('brothers by birth, Sarajevans') (Radnić, 1683a: 1), becomes applicable to their daily life.

### 7.1.5.2.3 Margitić

Margitić employs a number of turkisms because he writes less for scholarly friars and more for the common folk: '[...]navlastito siromasi, koji soviim kgnixiczam najvisce sluxichiese' ('[...especially the poor, who will use this book the most') (Margitić: 1779: 9). He acknowledges that the local language has many turkisms: 'Ima mnogo stvari u našem jeziku da im ni mi imena ne znamo, aliti ne služimo se, kako rečemo: **kail sam, čakšire, dečerma, dolama, kalpak, kalčine, marama, peškir, sopra, kašika**, i to je sve turski' ('There are many things in our language for which even we do not know the name and don't use [the name] such as: *kail sam, čakšire*... which are all Turkish') (Karamatić, 2006: 118). The turkisms which he lists are all core loans. He uses these words in his religious writing, though to a lesser degree than Lastrić (7.1.5.2.5).

#### 7.1.5.2.4 Dobretić

Given his later date (1783), there is a very limited number of Turkish loanwords attested in Dobretić's work: *badem, barem, bašta, budala, budalaština, budalasto, pobudaliti, burnut, čerga, ćilim, duhan, đečerma, đuvegija, hatur, jaspra, jasprica, kadar, kalpak, krstjanluk, mejdan, mahramica, nabaška, obataliti, pita, saht, tepsija, vilajet, vilajetski, zanat*. These words are core loans and are not glossed. In contrast, when he uses technical terminology, he sometimes translates the term into Latin:

- (151) [...] iſtomačegne ovogh zapiſagna, oliti **definitiona**  
'[...] the interpretation of the definition' (Dobretić, 1783: 412)

His limited use of turkisms is related to the audience that he is addressing: learned men, fluent in Latin and educated in the church. He uses Latin to translate his coinage of terms in Bosnian.<sup>153</sup> At the same time, it is a given that his Bosnian Franciscan audience is familiar with turkisms:

- (152) a. [...] u tugi dalek **vilaet**  
'[...] in a foreign far away district' (Dobretić, 1783: 525)
- b. [...] a nie pian, ni **budala**, ni drugom boleſtju  
'[...] he is not drunk, or a fool or ill with another sickness' (552)
- c. [...] jerbi toh [sic] velika **budalasctina** bila  
'[...] because that would be absolute nonsense' (141)
- d. [...] izachi na **mejdan** protiva svitu  
'[...] to go out publicly against the people' (142)

#### 7.1.5.2.5 Lastrić

Lastrić's *Testimonium bilabium* has the highest number of turkisms of the religious texts. Lastrić was highly educated and imaginative in his use of language (Gavran, 2003c: 37–39). His homilies are vivid:

---

<sup>153</sup> Dobretić is not alone among the Franciscans who gloss religious terminology with everyday words: Gabrić-Bagarić points out glossing religious terminology is common in Franciscan writing: e.g. *priſtaſtje aliti advenat Gospodnji* ('Communion') (Pranjković, 2005b: 248).

- (153) Strave dakle biahu dva razbojnika, a megiu gnima Ifus, ali sve biashe jednako zeleno, zashtoje...ova **axdaja**, smart to jest...Ifuša proxdrie  
 ‘Horrors, there were two robbers and between them Jesus, but everything was the same green because...this monster, that is death, devoured Jesus’  
 (Lastrić, 1755: 184)

At times they are also colloquial:

- (154) **Hajde** u ime Ifuša nashega: **hajde** za Ifušovu slavu i poshtenja  
 ‘Come on in the name of our Jesus; come on for the glory and honour of Jesus’ (Lastrić, 1755: 18)

Lastrić uses turkisms to embellish his language (Cattaneo: 2000: 63–64):

- (155) a. [...] koibi naprid ottishao radoftan glasnik k’ B.D.M. iliti **mushtulukcia**  
 ‘[...] the joyful herald or bearer of good news who would first go off to the Blessed Virgin Mary’ (Lastrić, 1755: 185)
- b. [...] oftrixeni **perçina** i kosa  
 ‘[...] cut hair’ (Lastrić, 1755: 223)
- c. [...] u prilici **harsuza**, i raazbojnika  
 ‘[...] in the case of a thief’ (Lastrić, 1755: 19)

In all of these instances, the native word is coupled with the Turkish loan (but not necessarily glossed<sup>154</sup> since the conjunction is usually *i*, not *oliti*), where in the Latin text, only one word exists: ‘u prilici **harsuza, i raazbojnika**’ (‘in the case of a thief’) (Lastrić, 1755: 19) : ‘*aliam in forma latronum*’ (Lastrić: 1755: 64) (Cattaneo, 2000: 63–64).

#### 7.1.5.2.6 Hapax legomena in religious texts

Posilović, Radnić and Bračuljević each use one turkism that is unique to his writing and is not attested in reference sources.

Apart from Bandulavić, Posilović uses the fewest turkisms of all the writers. Five turkisms – *kula*, *vilajet*, *jaspra*, *haramzastvo*, *amo* – three of which are the most common turkisms in the texts analysed, are attested in his text. The word

---

<sup>154</sup> For more on glossing, see 7.1.7.

*haramzastvo*, however, is not attested in the other Franciscan works or in the reference sources consulted for this dissertation:

- (156) Ne nahodise u sadanje vrime, nego **haramzastva**, i imbeh, govorenje naše, sasviem puno jest licumirstva, i sakrivenjenja  
'Nothing but sinning is found in our time, and the fruit, our words are full of hypocrisy and concealment' (46b)

Radnić employs *kaharba*, which, like *haramzastvo*, occurs only in the author's text and is in no other work or reference source:

- (157) V vechooj poghibili ſtoy tuoye ſpajffengne, xiuuchi u ęeftitochiami ouoga hudnoga ſuieta, nego u **kaharba** [sic] i gorkoſtma, gnegouie xalloſtie  
'Your salvation lies in greater danger when you live in the felicitations of this weak world than in regret, bitterness and its misery' (Radnić, 1683A: 139)

Since *kaharba* is synonymous with both *gorkost* and *žalost*, one might argue that Radnić uses it as an embellishing term.

Bračuljević is the only Bosnian writer to use *parabar*:

- (158) Zatoje odredila tolike blaghdane Boga i svetogliubstva, kao duhovne pazare svetignie. Uredila razlike nacfine devocziona, kao zanate blaxenogh rukodilstva, da niko ne ostane brez dobiitka, moguchi svak, ako za jedan nie pristao, mutnutse na drughi, da **parabar** s'ostalima, vocatione, qua vocatus est, za Boxje posctegnie, i svoje vicsgnie uxivagnie trudi, i primi plachiu kao i ostali.  
'That is why [the church] ordered so many holidays of God and holy love, like spiritual markets for holiness. It ordered various forms of worship, like the trades of blessed handicraft, so that everyone receives something, if one [devotion] does not fit, he can switch to another and together with the others, vocatione, qua vocatus est, he may strive for the honour of God and for his eternal enjoyment, receive reward just like the rest.' (Bračuljević, 1730: 200)

While this term is common in the Bulgarian texts (7.2.3.5), the Slavonic counterpart (*zajedno* 'together') is always used in the Bosnian texts. Given the mix of Bosnian, Turkish and Latin in the above passage, it seems Bračuljević was writing in his vernacular, a mix of Turkish, Latin and Bosnian.

### **7.1.6 The motivation behind verbs with Turkish roots**

The use of verbs is influenced not only by the type of text and when the text was written, but also by the extent of each writer's familiarity with Turkish. Benić's use of thirty-seven verbs might be a result of his knowing Turkish; Lašvanin employs only eight.

7.1.6.1 Distribution of verbs in an Turkish setting – in dialogue, in writing, as participles, tenses

Verb	Author's text						Dialogue		
	Inf.	Fut.-Con.	Pre.	Past	Imp.	Part.	Imp.	Pres.	Past.
apstiti		BE							
ašikovati				BE					
beglaisati				BE					
bujurisati			BE						
čurudisati				BE					
dajanisati	BE								
džilitati				BE					
eglenisati				BE					
esabiti			BE	3BE		BE			
haračiti	BE	BE		BE					
hazuriti							BE		
ilamiti				2BE					
imzeleisati	BE								
iskusuriti	BE								
ispatiti			BE						
išleisati									BE
izal učiniti <sup>155</sup>				BE					
jagmiti			LA	LA					
jake oparati						LA			
kurisati				BE					
murlešiti			BE						
odbašiti				2BE					
odilamiti				BE					
ograjisati		BE							
paralaisati				2BE					
poharačiti				BE					
proesabiti			BE		BE				
sebdisati								BE	
surgun učiniti				BE LA					
sursatiti				LA					
priteslimiti				BE					
teftišiti	BE LA			BE LA					
tobati	BE								
uavstiti				BE					
ujdurisati						BE			
usidžiliti	BE								
uzavstiti	BE								
zaašikovati				LA					

<sup>155</sup> Because this table focuses on the context in which verbs are used, not their morphology, verbal phrases as well as simple verbs are included.

### 7.1.6.2 Distribution of verbs in a non-Turkish setting – in dialogue, in writing, as participles, tenses

Verb	Author's text						Dialogue	
	Inf.	Fut-Con.	Pre.	Past.	Imp.	Part.	Imp.	Pres.
<b>esabiti</b>					2BE	BE		
<b>proesabiti</b>			BE		BE			
<b>podharačiti se</b>			LA					
<b>uharačiti</b>				LA				
<b>pobudaliti</b>				DO				

Whereas Benić employs verbs in all tenses – both in Turkish and in non-Turkish settings – as well as in participles, Lašvanin's usage of verbs is restricted to the present and past tenses and the infinitive. Nevertheless, Lašvanin does not limit verbs stemming from Turkish to an Turkish setting.

There is little overlap in the use of verbs among the four writers, making it difficult to determine how integrated these verbs were in Bosnian during the Franciscans' time. The verb *pobudaliti* occurs only in Dobretić, while six of Lašvanin's eight verbs are not among Benić's thirty-seven. The one verb that occurs in both chronicles is the cultural loan verb *teftišiti*. Similarly, the only verbal phrase that is in both chronicles is *surgun učiniti*.

Though *esabiti/proesabiti* is attested only in Benić's chronicle, its tokens outnumber that of verbs occurring in both texts. It is in a three-to-five ratio of non-Turkish context to Turkish context, occurs in present and past tenses, in the imperative as well as in participial constructions, and in perfective and imperfective forms.

### 7.1.7 Glossing

Whether turkisms are glossed can indicate how integrated these words had become in eighteenth-century Bosnian, though not always. The purpose of glossing turkisms might be determined by the audience addressed in a particular text. It seems if the

writer is addressing a foreign audience, the gloss is sometimes used to explain a locally limited term. These glosses usually exist in the construction ‘x or y’, where ‘x = y’.

- (159) **Bashlie** illi ighle glavate  
 ‘head or main points’ (Lastrić, 1766: 324)  
 bash-li-e      illi    ighl-e      glavat-e  
 head-ADJ-PL    or    point-PL    main-PL

If the writer is addressing a local audience, it is often the foreign word or less colloquial term that is glossed:

- (160) Od **gljubavi neçifte**, iliti **Ashikovagnja**  
 ‘About impure love’ (Lastrić, 1766: 304)  
 od    gljubav-i    neçift-e      iliti    ashikovagnj-a  
 about    love-GEN    impure-GEN    or    impure love-GEN

In some cases the writer might be addressing both a local and foreign audience and therefore uses both terms:

- (161) [...] u svoju **polaçu**, illiti **ugericu**  
 ‘[...] To the cell’ (Lastrić, 1755: 184)  
 u    svoj-u      polaç-u      illiti    ugeric-u  
 to    her-ACC    cell-ACC    or    room[DIM]-ACC

It is not uncommon for more than one word to be attested for a term; in such instances a writer might employ both words:

- (162) [...] ponofefe, niki u lipoti obraza, niki **kofah**, **i perçina**  
 ‘[...] some are proud of their beautiful faces, others of their hair’ (Lastrić, 1766: 328)  
 kof-ah      i      perçin-a  
 hair-GEN    and    hair-GEN

While one tends to use one word in speech to save time, writing encourages a more expansive language: e.g. Bračuljević consistently pairs *studenac* with *bunar*:

- (163) [...] studenacz iliti **bunar**  
 ‘[...] water well’ (Bračuljević, 1730: 419)  
 studenacz            iliti    bunar  
 well[NOM.SG]    or    well[NOM.SG]

It would be unlikely for one to use such lengthy pleonasm in everyday language.

### 7.1.7.1 Glossing in chronicles

Glossed terms are often cultural loans in the chronicles: e.g. specific terminology regarding the governing forces or Islam:

- (164) a. [...] dadosmo **arzohale** oliti memoriale  
 ‘[...] we gave the request’ (Benić: 158)  
 arzohal-e    oliti    memorial-e  
 request-PL    or    request-PL
- b. [...] **šehit**, naški – sveto tilo  
 ‘[...] martyr, in our language – holy body’ (Lašvanin: 200)  
 šehit    naški    –    sveto    tilo  
 martyr    our    –    holy    body
- c. [...] **kavi**, oliti plemenitu muraselu  
 ‘[...] the noble epistle’ (Benić: 291)  
 kavi    oliti    plemenit-u    murasel-u  
 strong    or    noble-ACC    epistle-ACC
- d. [...] proštac oliti **parmak**  
 ‘[...] pole’ (Benić: 325)  
 proštac            oliti    parmak  
 pole[NOM.SG]    or    pole[NOM.SG]

In some cases, as in the first example, a word is glossed for an Turkish term that has no native equivalent. Examples b, c and d are turkisms that are glossed by Bosnian terms. The last example, however, is a common Slavonic word glossed by a turkism. Because relatively few words were glossed in Benić’s and Lašvanin’s chronicles, one can only posit that the turkisms not glossed were current among the audience for which these works were written.

### 7.1.7.2 Glossing in religious texts

Glossing is less common in the religious texts than in the chronicles. One reason for this is because there are fewer turkisms. While Divković, Posilović, Markovac and Dobretić do not gloss the turkisms that they use, Radnić, Bračuljević, Lastrić and Ilijčić do to differing extents. Radnić glosses three everyday turkisms:

- (165) a. [...] **pençxer** illti oblok  
'[...] window' (Radnić, 1683b: 433)  
pençxer                      illti oblok  
window[NOM.SG] or window[NOM.SG]
- b. [...] **çakmak** illi oghnilo  
'[...] light, flame' (Radnić, 1683b: 189)  
çakmak                      illi oghnilo  
light[NOM.SG] or light[NOM.SG]
- c. [...] **fırçetu** illi oçttu  
'[...] vinegar' (Radnić, 1683b: 202)  
fırçet-u                      illi oçtt-u  
vinegar-DAT or vinegar-DAT

Although these terms became common in Bosnian, given that Radnić is their earliest attestation and the terms are glossed, it may be they were contemporary borrowings. Because his work was published, it might also be that he glossed these words when he had a larger audience in mind: his brethren in Croatia, to whom turkisms would be foreign. Radnić, however, also glosses one Slavonic term with a turkism:

- (166) [...] blagouati koiu yezbinu, illi **yeçek**  
'[...] to bless food' (Radnić, 1683b: 115)  
yezbin-u                      illi yeçek  
food-ACC or food[ACC]

Because the turkism is the explanatory word in this pair, one might suggest that this example weakens the argument that *pendžer*, *sirčet* and *çakmak* were borrowings contemporary to Radnić: *jedžek* also has its earliest attestation in Radnić, though it is the explanatory term in this pair of words.

Bračuljević has two glosses that include turkisms; in one, the turkism is glossed while in the other, the turkism offers the explanation:

- (167) a. [...] studenacz iliti **bunar**  
 ‘[...] water well’ (Bračuljević, 1730: 419)  
 studenacz            iliti    bunar  
 source[NOM.SG]    or    source[NOM.SG]
- b. [...] **huçere**, illi komore  
 ‘[...] rooms’ (Bračuljević, 1730: 202)  
 huçer-e    illi    komor-e  
 room-PL    or    room-PL

In the second example, *udžera*, whose diminutive form is first attested in Divković over a century earlier, is glossed with a Romance term. It might be the writer had Croatian brethren in mind and is offering an explanatory term. The same might hold true for Radnić’s synonymic pairs.

Like Radnić and Bračuljević, Lastrić often offers a synonym for a particular word:

- (168) a. [...] polaçu illiti ugericu  
 ‘[...] cell’ (Lastrić, 1755: 184)  
 polaç-u    illiti    ugeric-u  
 cell-ACC    or    room[DIM]-ACC
- b. [...] radostan glasnik...iliti mushtulukçia  
 ‘[...] the joyful herald’ (Lastrić, 1755: 185)  
 radostan    glasnik    iliti    mushtuluk-çia  
 joyful    herald    or    good news-bearer

Such glosses seem to be more a poetic tool than an explanatory one, as seen in the following example:

- (169) [...] ne znaju spuštiti oçiju na zemglju...ni zaftiditi; nego ponofefe, niki u lipoti obraza, niki **kofah, i perçina**, kakono i Abfolon, komu ghizdavi perçin sluxi za liçinu, kojomfe obifi o raafstu  
 ‘[...] they do not know to lower their eyes to the ground or to be embarrassed; rather they are proud, some of their beautiful face, some of

their hair, just like Absalom, whose showy hair served as his rope, and in which he got hanged on a bush' (Lastrić, 1766: 328)

However, in the example with *ašikovanje*, he seems to be defining or refining the meaning of the term. His seventy-fourth homily in *Dvostruk Nediglnik* is entitled:

- (170) Od gljubavi nečifte, iliti **Ashikovagnja**  
'About impure love' (Lastrić, 1766: 304)  
od gljubav-i nečift-e iliti ashikovagnj-a  
of love-GN impure-GEN or impure love-GEN

The homily describes exactly what *ašikovanje* is:

- (171) Danaschemo od ove nečifte i nedoštoine, tojest, od gljubavi, i milovagnja, shto vi zovete **ashikovagne**... Breznačinno, nevrimenito, i neuredno milovagne, i gljubav nedoštojna, pace otrovna, tojest, zli običaj ashikovagnja u šadashgnem narashtaju  
'Today we are going to discuss impure and unworthy love, that is caressing, which you call *ašikovanje*. Meaningless, inappropriate and disorderly affection and unworthy love, truly poisonous, that is the evil habit of *ašikovanje* in the present generation' (Lastrić, 1766: 304)

The meaning of *ašikovanje* was already established in the spoken language during Lastrić's time since he glosses 'gljubavi nečifte' with '**ashikovagne**'. Nevertheless, given his detailed explanation of *ašikovanje*, he might be refining the meaning of the term: *ašikovanje* is specifically impure flirting and affection; however, it seems that Lastrić considered all flirting and affection impure. It should also be noted that in contrast to *ašikovati* and *zaašikovati*, *ašikovanje* is used in a non-Turkish setting, though its negative connotation (7.1.5.1) might be behind the author's decision to use the term over a native one.

The glossing in Ilijić's works seems more poetic than explanatory:

- (172) a. [...] **jarak** illti oruxje  
'[...] weapon' (43)  
jarak illti oruxje  
weapon[NOM.SG] or weapon[NOM.SG]

- b. [...] **arçom**: illti troshkom  
 ‘[...] with cost’ (32)  
 arç-om                      illti    troshk-om  
 expenditure-INS    or    expenditure-INS

The term *jarak* is first attested in 1683, making it unlikely that these two turkisms needed to be glossed. The verb *poharčiti*, a derivative of *arč* is common in both chronicles and never glossed. It seems the writer chose either to show that a Slavonic term also existed for these turkisms or to embellish his writing. Given Ilijić’s animosity towards Turks and Muslims, it seems the former is more likely.

### 7.1.7.3 Turkish Bosnian synonymic compounds

The Franciscan texts also contain Turkish-Bosnian synonymic compounds: e.g. *beg-gospodar*, *car sultanija*, *konja-ata*. These compounds act as glosses, with the form ‘foreign word *illti* translation’ or ‘translation *illti* foreign word’. Though *beg-gospodar* and *konja-ata* are not frequent compounds, *car sultanija*, or *car sultan* are. The term *sultan* is frequently used as a title, either preceding the ruler’s name or as a suffix attaching to it. When this occurs, preceding or following this term is *car*:

- (173) [...] jerbo evo ne imade poroda ni **sultan Mahmut**, ni **sultan Osman**, pak evo **sultan** sadašnji Mustafa III... da je ovi **car**.  
 ‘[...] because these, neither Sultan Mahmut, nor Sultan Osman, had descendants, so now we have the present Sultan Mustafa III...who is this emperor.’ (Benić: 206)

On the basis of the letters that Nakaš analyses in her *Jezik i grafija krajišničkih pisama* (2010), *car sultan* was the usual formula. While *beg* was most likely used frequently enough in Bosnia for it to lose its native component *gospodar*, *sultan* was not a local official, which might explain why the compound *car sultan* is attested more frequently and remained common. The words *beg* and *sultan* are the only titles that occur in Turkish-Bosnian compounds.

### 7.1.7.3.1 Explanatory pairs

The texts yield a handful of examples where titles are explained in Bosnian with *turski* + ‘native term’: e.g. *kadija : turski sudac* ‘Turkish judge’; *sultan: turski car* ‘Turkish emperor’; *bula: turska divojka* ‘Turkish girl’. Though these are less immediate translations than glosses or compound synonyms, these *turski* translations serve as a means for incorporating turkisms into Bosnian. The construction *turski* + ‘native word’ is also attested without the Turkish counterpart to this construction. The texts suggest that settings do not influence whether a *turski* + ‘native word’ or the original turkism is used.

## 7.1.8 Core loans and connotations

### 7.1.8.1 Čifut : Žudij

Lastrić uses Turkish synonyms of Slavonic words to give a negative connotation to a person described. This is especially true, in part due to their frequency, of *čifut* and *žudij* and their derivatives:

- (174) a. [...] kooga **Xudie** zovu Meffiom  
‘[...] who the Jews call the Messiah’ (Lastrić, 1755: 21)
- b. [...] kragl **xudinski**  
‘[...] Jewish king’ (Lastrić: 1755: 61)
- c. ‘[...] **xudij** proge dobročinechi i ozdravljujuchi sve’  
‘[...] the Jew passed, doing good and curing all’ (Lastrić, 1755: 160)

compared with:

- (175) a. [...] kad Iŕukarst pokkara **Cjifute**, sthoga nepriimajuh, i nevirruju’  
‘[...] when Jesus rebuked the Jews because they did not accept or believe in him’ (Lastrić, 1755: 39)
- b. [...] kako **čiffuti** odbacijvahu riçma Iŕuŕa  
‘[...] how the Jews denied Jesus’ (Lastrić, 1755: 70)

- c. [...] **čifut** proodechi iz prid krixa rugahufe njemu, pšujuchiga’  
 ‘[...] Jews, passing before the cross, mocked him and cursed him’ (Lastrić, 1755: 117)

It seems Lastrić has made a conscious choice regarding when to use the Turkish versus the older loan for ‘Jew’.

Both Divković and Bračuljević employ *čifut* as well:

(176) a. **Divković**

I ne samo da može svaki karstianin karstiti; nego jošte kadaje potreba može svaki čovek’ karstiti, i turčin i vlax i **čiputin**; i ciganin i svaki duh čovječanski.

‘And not only can every Christian baptise, but what’s more is, when necessary, any person – Turk, Vlach and Jew; and Gypsy and human being – can baptise.’ (143)

b. **Bračuljević**

[...] razlucfuju jedan dušcevní zakon od drugoga; ilišu od poglavara odregiene, za ralucfegnie švoga dušcevnogh zakona od drugoga. I hodichia, kojaje odregiena, i noššije za zlamengnie takogh zakona: kako na priliku kod Turaka, abdešt, Ramazan, i zelena cšalma kod Alilovaczah, a biila kod Homerovaca (Alia i Homer, dva Muhamedova Alkorana tomasšiteglia, kadšu Lutor, i Kalvin uznemirili czarkvu Iffukarštovu, razdarvšci gniegovu nešcievenu haglinu, razdvoivšci toješšt gniegovo štado, i odmamivšci za šobom mloghe ovcze u puštigniu tešcke bludnošti, za ranu vukovom: ondašu i oni uzbunili Turke, i razdilili zakon Muhamedov) kako kod **čifututa** obrizovagnie

[...] they distinguish one spiritual law from another; or they are regulated by leaders to distinguish their spiritual law from another. And the dress which is prescribed and worn as a sign of such a law: for example among the Turks, ablution, Ramadan and the green strip of cloth wrapped around the fez of the Alilovaci, and among the Homerians (Alia and Homer, two Muslim interpreters of the Holy Qur’an, when Luther and Calvin disrupted the church of Jesus Christ, tearing his unsewn garment to pieces, that is dividing his flock and luring many sheep after them into the desert of grave debauchery to be food for wolves: then, they also disturbed the Turks and they divided the law of Muhammed) like circumcision with the Jews (147)

In the first example, Divković does not use *čifutin* pejoratively. While *evrej* is used to describe the Jews in the Bible, *čifutin* is used to describe the local Jews: a *čifutin* is among the members of society who are allowed to baptise. Likewise, Bračuljević describes the Jewish (*kod čifutata*) tradition of circumcision in language similar to which he describes Muslim traditions. In contrast to Divković, Bračuljević shows

disdain for religious traditions and practices that are not Catholic. Nevertheless, it does not seem that *čifut* is meant to be an insulting term; rather, it refers to the local Jewish community. There are too few examples of *čifut* and its synonyms to determine the exact connotation that this word bears in Bračuljević's writing.

The word *čifut* is also present in the chronicles and does not have a pejorative connotation. Instead, it seems to have replaced the older term, as have other Turkish synonyms:

- (177) a. [...] ono jutro izgori **čifutana** sarajevskih **Čifuta**  
[...] that morning the synagogue of the Sarajevo Jews burned' (Benić: 173)
- b. A malo bi ga tko i viditi mogao, jer bi bo, sve unutra legav na minderu, eglenisao s njekeimn **Čifutinom**, svojim hećim-bašom.  
'And few could see him, since he was entirely inside, lying on a cushion, speaking to a Jew, his doctor.' (Benić: 199)

In both contexts, Benić respects the Jews whom he mentions and employs *čifut* in the same way that he does *hećim-baša* or *eglenisati*. Nevertheless, not just in modern Bosnian, but also in modern Turkish, *çifut/čifut* is pejorative and other non-pejorative terms for 'Jew' in Bosnian exist: *jevrej*, *židov*, *žudii*. On the basis of Lastrić's writing, the word might have already begun developing its derogatory meaning in the eighteenth century. However, Lastrić's forte was writing in his native language, and his distribution of *čifut* and *žudi/židov* might reflect his personal use of the terminology.

#### 7.1.8.2.2 *Udžera*

The term *udžera* or its diminutive *udžerica* occurs in three of the religious texts and is glossed twice:

- (178) a. [...] to jest kakonose svakolika vrata varte **udžerici**  
[...] that is how every door opens to the cell' (Divković, 1611: 287)

- b. [...] darxi kgliuč od gnegoue **huçere**, illi komore naiskromvitié  
‘[...] he held the key to his cell, or his most modest room’ (Radnić, 1683b: 156)
- c. [...] i cġinechi od ſvoih kuchia puſtigniu, a od **ucxera** ſcpigliu  
‘[...] and making a desert out of their homes and caves out of their rooms’  
(Bračuljević, 1730: 7)
- d. [...] u ſvoju **ucxeru**, iliti czelu  
‘[...] in his cell’ (Bračuljević, 1730: 202)

The diminutive of the word is attested in Divković and is not glossed, which suggests that *udžera* and *udžerica* were common turkisms in the early seventeenth century. The word without the diminutive suffix is glossed in both Radnić’s and Bračuljević’s texts. In every example, the gloss of *udžera* implies a small and modest room: in the first, the diminutive is used, in the second, *udžera* is glossed by the phrase, ‘most modest/humble room’ and in the last, it is glossed by ‘cell’. While the older loan word *sobica* would convey the smallness of a room, it would not convey the modesty that *udžera* does.

#### 7.1.8.2.3 *Balija*

In modern Bosnian the word *balija* is a pejorative term for a Muslim. Škaljić suggests that *balija* stems from the Muslim name, *Bali* + *ja*. Because *balija* has only one meaning – an insulting name for a Muslim – it seems odd that if it originated from the proper name *Bali*, it was and still is used as a name: *Balibeg*, *Gazi Balibeg*, *Balibegović* (Bajraktarević, 1960: 68). Bajraktarević suggests that *balija* comes from the originally Arabic turkism *abali*, meaning ‘poor, despised, cowardly’. His conclusion is plausible and speaks to the familiarity that Bosnians had with the Turkish language. Benić uses the term *balija* twice, both times to refer to Muslims with whom he is displeased:

- (179) a. [...] ama, kako se **balije** oprostiše zuluma pašina oliti takijeh nameta, evo se sve pobaši.  
 ‘[...] but as soon as the *balije* rid themselves of the terrors of the pasha, in other words to those taxes, they themselves all began acting like noblemen.’ (Benić: 187)
- b. [...] reć **balije**: ‘valah se poturčio!’  
 ‘[...] the *balije* said, ‘My God, he became Muslim!’ (Benić: 321)

The term *balija* is an example of a word originating from Turkish but attested only in Bosnian.

#### 7.1.8.2.4 *Sahat : čas*

There are other examples where the Turkish and native words were originally synonymous but one or the other has developed different connotations. *Čas* had, and still has in certain regions, the meaning of ‘a particular time’. However, in every one of these five texts it signifies ‘moment’ while *sat* has replaced it to mean ‘hour’:

- (180) a. [...] jer neznamo **časa**, ni ure, ni Miecz, ni godine nafe smarti  
 ‘[...] because we do not know the moment, or hour, or month or year of our death’ (Margitić: 51)
- b. [...] neznaduchi ni **čaffa**, ni **fahata** od fvoje smarti.  
 ‘[...] knowing neither the moment nor the hour of death.’ (Dobretić: 177)

Another example is the pair *pastir* and *čoban*: *pastir* can signify both ‘shepherd of sheep’ and ‘spiritual shepherd’, while *čoban* never denotes ‘spiritual shepherd’:

- (181) a. **Benić**  
 [...] davši nama jednoga **pastira** s kojim mu drago imenom iz skupštine ovijeh našijeh redovnika...bdeći svrhu stada svojega.  
 ‘[...they] gave us one shepherd, whose name was carefully [selected] from the group of our friars, to watch over his flock of sheep.’ (132)
- b. **Lastrić**  
 [...] biashe josh **paftir od ovacah**...izajde **čobančich** David  
 ‘[...] he was still a shepherd...the little shepherd David’ (20)
- c. **Lašvanin**  
 [...] i tako ga vodeći izpod Liskovica, gdi se zgodise **čobani**

‘[...] and taking him down to Liskovic, where the shepherds were’ (196)

In the cases of *sat* vs. *čas* and *čoban* vs. *pastir*, their different connotations exist in the modern language.

#### 7.1.8.2.5 Semantic change

There are fewer semantic changes from the Turkish original to Bosnian in the Bosnian texts than in the Bulgarian (7.2.5).<sup>156</sup> The example that stands out is Benić’s use of *burija*:

- (182) *Spomenutog dana po ručku, budući potreba da momci i laici pritrepļu u konobi badnjeve u kojizijem nahođaše se drop od gro/z/dja, indi, unišav u jednoga neki Jozip, sin Filipa Trgovčevića iz Sutiske, inače momak vrstan i na vas mah jaki, da ga streplje s nogama. Evo ti ga udari ona žestokoga drop **burija** u glavu, ter ga smete i počme zvati pomoć – da ga izvade.*  
‘On the mentioned day after lunch, the boys and lay-brothers had to trample the vats in the shed in which the grape must was located, a certain Josip, the son of Filip Trgovčević from Sutjeska, who was skilled and the strongest, [went] into one to tread it with his feet. And the smells of that strong pomace went straight to his head, for it disturbed him and he began to call for help for the others to take him out.’ (Benić: 239)

In Turkish, *buhur* means ‘frankincense or incense’, but in this context it seems to mean ‘smell/odour’.

## 7.2 Bulgarian Semantics

### 7.2.1 Writers and turkisms

There is far less known about the writers of the Bulgarian manuscripts and their relationship with the Turks than there is about the Bosnian writers. One can only infer the extent to which these Bulgarian writers were familiar with Turkish as there is no, or very limited, secondary material discussing these writers. Nevertheless, given the extent to which Turkish infiltrated into these religious manuscripts, the writers and/or their predecessors had obviously been exposed to a significant amount of Turkish. If

---

<sup>156</sup> Some of these semantic changes are touched upon in 3.1.6.6.

one compares the amount and level of Turkish used in the Bulgarian Catholic texts to the Bulgarian secular text, the Catholic texts have just as many turkisms as Sofronij's text does, if not more; if one does the same comparison between the Catholic texts and the Orthodox *damaskin* from the 1750s, the Catholic texts have significantly more turkisms. One might argue that this is because the Catholic texts (and Sofronij's) are at least two decades younger. Though this is true, it seems implausible that there was such a dramatic increase in turkisms in a period of twenty years. It is more likely that the Orthodox writer's knowledge of and training in Church Slavonic inhibited his use of the vernacular. When turkisms slip in, they are in sections that show vernacular influence:

(183) [...] sili dade gi bog' Adamu, da misli za dušev'nata si fajda.  
'[...] God gave strength to Adam, so that he might think about spiritual needs.' (*Sviš*: 77)

While 'bog Adamu' is Church Slavonic or older Bulgarian, the use of the *da*-clause and the definite article are characteristic of the modern Bulgarian vernacular. The use of turkisms in this vernacular resembles that of the Catholic texts: the words are not glossed and are juxtaposed to religious terminology.

Because all the Bulgarian core texts are religious, namely prayers and the retelling of biblical stories, the contextual classification used for the Bosnian texts cannot be applied to these texts: the Turkish loanwords always occur in a non-Turkish context and are never glossed. One might say that the Bulgarian texts exemplify a greater degree of integration of Turkish than the Bosnian texts do. For the most part, these turkisms behave as words native to Bulgarian do.

Although a contextual classification is not possible for the Bulgarian texts, the numerous Turkish loan words that occur in these religious texts can be broken down

into more semantic groups than the turkisms attested in the Bosnian religious texts can.

### 7.2.2 Semantic categories

- a) **taxes, sentences, orders, documents, assessments:** *akibet, bojurdissova, denet, ghiumrük, harac, hiuget, hiokium, ispatlak, izin, jasad, kabaat, kail, kal, kaul, kauliski, miuhur, nekal, nekezlike, rehim, scehad, scehadlak, siurgium, siurghiunluk, uhape;*
- b) **weaponry and violent conflict:** *ghiugiune, gillar, hangiar, hapus, hapusbascia, juruusc, kakangia, kanlia, kaspaliza, mazdrak, mertebe, merteblija, pusat, pusatlija;*
- c) **pejorative or negative terms:** *agiadissa, ailak, alciak, angaria, cinhadarin, bozuscitissa, bulandardissa, cirudissa, duscman, duscmanka, duscmanlak, duscmanski, eksildissova, eskik, enkiar, ghiran, ghiucluk, ghiucan, haidutin, hailaski, hain, hainlik, hasna, hatar, ialanisc, inat, ingittisa, isckelendissova, izlal, jalan, jalangia, kabahatlija, kahar; kaharlija, kaharuvas se, karez, karsciaklak, kascmer, kascmeri, kascmerlik, kaskandissa, kaskangialuk, kefsiz, kefsizlik, mahana, munafakladissa, mundar, mundardissano, munafakcia, munafaklak, paraladissa, piscman, piscmanit se, piscmanlak, rezil, rezilik, sakaldissova, sakat, sakatlak, sakit, tafralik, ursuz, zahmet, zarar, zararlija, zeher, zolumluk, zor, zorladissa, zorlen;*
- d) **positive terms:** *ahenk, akal, akallia, akalan, baht, bahtina, barasciak, barascitissa, basciardissa, bejendisova, dosluk, dost, dostasa, fudul, hair, hairlija, hak, hubost, huzur, huzuruva, ikram, izanlija, jureklija, kef, kiimetlija, kuvet, pascialak, rahat, rahatlen, razgheterdissa, schenlik, seir, sevda, zevk, ziafet;*

- e) **government and titles:** *aga, alai, basc, beg, beghliscki, fakilarcia, halaik, hizmet, hizmetkiarin, kapugia, odabascia, pascia, rigialia, vekil, vezir;*
- f) **military:** *asker, assia, atlia, avania, bairak, bairaktarin, bimbascia, furka, genk, genkcia, iuzbascia, kolluk, kordissa, kuvetlendissa, leventlik, mahmuz, ordija, sefe, seimen, seimenbascia;*
- g) **religious:** *abergia, (belli basc) çifut, çifutski, elcia, giumma, hagia, hahamin, ikinidia, korban, murtatlak, siunet;*
- h) **relating to time or quantity:** *artak, artissa, bara, barem, hemen, hic, kadar, osahat, sabuh, sahat, satno;*
- i) **commerce and monetary:** *alascverisc, alascveriscia, aliverdissa, altan, bakscisc, bazaria, bazirghian, bereket, berektlia, birlik, borc, borclia, cescia, cianta, ciorbagia, ciorbagiaka, csiarscia, diukkian, harcia, hazna, hesap, ikramlia, karar, kiar, miras, mirazcia, musctera, pari, pazar, pazari, tefter, teslim, torba, ulefe;*
- j) **peasantry:** *ambar, berket, berketlia, burgiak, bunar, farlia, haivan, haivanski, hamarat, hamaratlik, harman, jasc, jermisc, kairek, kalem, kalai, kamisc, kat, katlak, kefaf, killik, kiukiurt, kiurek, öfke, paner, sundurma, somun.*

At first glance at this range of categories, it might seem that eighteenth-century Bulgarian religious texts have far greater Turkish influence than even secular Bosnian texts. Though perhaps true on one level, the Bosnian religious texts differ significantly from the Bulgarian religious texts in their content: while the Bulgarian religious texts are often embellished retellings of biblical stories, Bosnian religious texts are almost exclusively homilies or theological writings. Similarly, the Bosnian texts are published books while the Bulgarian ones are manuscripts. In order to determine how the Bosnian and Bulgarian texts differ in their adoption of Turkish

loanwords, one would have to compare religious texts of the same type. This is only possible for the late-seventeenth century texts. If one compares Bakšić<sup>157</sup> to Radnić or even to Posilović and Divković, it is the Bosnian texts that show greater influence: e.g. Bakšić uses no turkisms while Posilović, the Bosnian writer with the fewest number of turkisms, uses five turkisms multiple times. Since I have neither eighteenth-century Bosnian manuscripts that retell the stories of the Bible, nor late-eighteenth-century Bulgarian Catholic homilies and theological published writings,<sup>158</sup> it is not possible to go into detail as to how the late eighteenth-century Bulgarian and Bosnian religious texts differ. Nevertheless, within the context of Bulgarian, one can posit why the terms above developed and often replaced extant terms.

#### **7.2.2.1 Core loans and cultural loans**

One might suggest that cultural loans motivated by political pressure include those relating to the implementation of taxes and orders (Category A), government (Category E), Ottoman military presence (Category F), punishment (Category B and to a certain extent Category C). Most of the words in categories A, E, F and to a certain extent B<sup>159</sup> denote positions, objects or practices that are not attested in Bulgaria before the Ottoman conquest. Bosnian also has numerous words which fall into these categories.

Many Turkish loanwords borrowed into Bulgarian were core loans and often socially motivated, e.g. terms relating to the harvest: e.g. *ambar*, *bereket*, *bereketlia*, *jasc*, *jemisc*, *haivan*, *kat*, *katlak*. This terminology is more common in the Bulgarian

---

<sup>157</sup> Although Bakšić wrote in Croatian and is therefore usually discussed with the Bosnian texts, his vernacular was Bulgarian. Thus, it was the Bulgarian use of turkisms, not the Bosnian, that influenced his language.

<sup>158</sup> One must exclude Orthodox homilies from this analysis even as points of reference in Bulgarian given that Bosnian (i.e. Bosnian-Serbian) Orthodox homilies are excluded. I occasionally comment on the use of Turkish in the three *damaskini* and Sofronij's work.

<sup>159</sup> Forms of torture carried out by Ottomans: e.g. beating the bottom of a victim's feet.

texts than in the Bosnian ones. One might suggest that this difference occurs because of the different types of literature: fruit, crops and the possible dangers that might plague them, are all prominent aspects in biblical stories. Such everyday words suggest that there was significant Turkish lexical penetration in Bulgarian in all areas and levels of society.

It is difficult to say whether Turkish culinary words e.g. *paner*, *somun*, *öfka* are cultural or core loans. On the basis of the examples in the texts analysed, one might argue that they are core loans as they are used in biblical texts, which implies that they have lost their Turkish connotation.

#### **7.2.2.2 Abstract core loans**

The abstract, pejorative, negative and positive terms further indicate that there was more than administrative contact between the Ottoman rulers and the people whom they ruled.<sup>160</sup> Terms reaching beyond governance, commerce or trade, speak of a greater knowledge of Turkish than those terms do. Some of these terms pertain to war and peace: *barasciak*, *barascitissa*, *agiadissa*, *angaria*, *baadarlak*, *bozuscitissa*, *bulandardissa*, *cirudissa*, *dosluk*, *dost*, *dostasa*, *duscman*, *duscmanka*, *ducsmanlak*, *duscmanski*, *eksildissova*, *eskik*, *enkiar*, *ghiran*, *ghiucluk*, *ghiuacan*, *haidutin*, *hailaski*, *hain*, *hainlik*, *hak*, *hasna*, *hatar*, *huzur*, *huzuruva*, *ialanisc*, *ingittisa*, *izlal*, *jalan*, *jalangia*, *kabahatlia*, *karsciaklak*, *karsciaklak*, *kuvet*, *paraladissova*, *razgheterdissa*, *rezil*, *rezilik*, *ursuz*, *zahmet*, *zarar*, *zararlia*, *zeher*, *zolumluk*, *zor*, *zorladissa*, *zorlen*. Such terms were most likely both politically and socially motivated.

#### **7.2.2.3 Intimate loans**

Other terms in negative and positive categories pertain to emotion and/or human qualities: e.g. *ailak*, *alciak*, *ahenk*, *akal*, *akallia*, *akalan*, *baht*, *bahtina*, *basciardissa*,

---

<sup>160</sup> For more, see Nikolova, 2006.

*bejendisova, fudul, hair, hairlia, ikram, izanlia, jureklia, kef, kiimetlia, pascialak, rahat, rahatlen, schenlik, seir, sevda, zevk, ziafet, inat, cinhadarin, isckelendissova, kahar, kaharlia, kaskandissa, kaskangialuk, kaharuva se, karez, kefsiz, kefsizlik, munafakladissa, munafaklak, munafakcia, tafralik.* Some of these words suggest an advanced knowledge of Turkish vocabulary: e.g. *kahar, kaharlia, kaskandissa, kaskangialuk, munafaklak, munafakcia, munafakladissa, kefsizlik, karez, piscman, piscmanlik, scasckan* and *sciasckanlak*. Bloomfield (1957: 461) labels such loans as ‘intimate’ loans as they occur ‘when two languages are spoken in what is topographically and politically a single community...and extend to speech forms that are not related to cultural novelties’. Joseph (2010: 626) expands on ‘intimate loans’ by saying that such words are ‘tightly tied to discourse.’ These words were not necessary to daily life or describing an event; they speak of a more intimate level of discussion and the desire to convey emotions.

### 7.2.3 Cultural loans become integral

#### 7.2.3.1 Military terms and titles

Turkisms that became an integral part of Bulgarian, as exhibited in these religious texts, are extensive:

- (184) a. Kak bediha Issukrasta sas **jalangie sechate** pred vladicata Caifa i pred sickiete **divan** i kakmmuse prismehe, i **cascmeriha**  
 ‘How Jesus was accused before the ruler Caiaphas and all the council with false witnesses and how they laughed and made fun of him’ (778:202)
- b. [...] kak Judase **popiscmani** zascto besce izdal Issukrasta  
 ‘[...] how Judas regrets having betrayed Jesus’ (778: 207)
- c. [...] zapovedova Gospod na Aurahama, damu zacoli **kurban** sinasi Isaka  
 ‘[...] God orders Abraham to slaughter his son Issac as a sacrifice’ (779: 10b)
- d. Kak Issukras izdravi **Hizmekiarinat** na jedin **Juzbascia**  
 ‘How Jesus heals the servant of an army captain’ (778: 135)

Another example is *ciohodar* < *çuhadar*. The term *çuhadar* means ‘a courtier of the sultan’ (Redhouse, 2000). In Bulgarian, however, *ciohodar* means ‘one of the ruler’s courtiers’:

- (185) [...] prid coja’ sedeha zarskite **ciohadare**  
‘[...] before whom the emperor’s courtiers sat’ (779: 61)

These terms have lost their Turkish cultural connotation. In turn, the retelling of the Bible is put into a familiar cultural context. There are nevertheless other terms which remain distinctly culturally Ottoman Turkish: while *odalak*, *juzbascia*, *sejmen* are used in biblical stories and therefore are no longer cultural loans, the term *sultan* is not attested: e.g. King Herod is always *kral* ‘king’ never *sultan*.

### 7.2.3.2 Islamic terms

There is a handful of Islamic terms attested in the three Catholic manuscripts. In some instances these terms are not exclusively limited to religious contexts in Turkish:

- (186) a. *elcia*  
i. Juda prascte **Elcie** na Rim i storova sas Rimzite dosluk  
‘Judas sent a messenger to Rome and became friends with the Romans’ (779:135b)  
  
ii. I sled tozi genk dode na Soria sas askerat i tuca dodoha **Elcie** od sickite zare, deto beha na okolo i Aristobolo Kral od Eureisco prati **Elcia** i prati na Pompea bakscisc jedna loza od zlato, napravina jaco hubeva i vrednovasce 120 kesie, i Hircano prati **Elcia**.  
‘And then the army with soldiers came to Soria and the messengers of all the rulers of the area came there and Aristobulus king of the Jews sent a messenger and sent a gift of a vine of gold, very beautifully made and worth 120 purses to Pompey and Hircan sent the messenger.’ (779:143b)
- b. *kurban*  
Pokloni jednasc Cain **kurban** Bogu od jemisciat od zemema  
‘Cain gave a sacrifice of the fruit of the ground to God’ (779:4a)
- c. *siunet*  
[...] nisa dlaxni Cristianete, da darxiat starate zacon nito dase starat siunet, zere na mesto **siunetat** Issus besce zadal Sveto Krasctene.

‘[...] Christians are not obliged to follow the Old Testament, or to be circumcised because Jesus had given holy baptism in place of circumcision.’ (779a: 181b)

Since *elcia* can be ‘messenger’ as well as ‘herald’, its usage in this passage is not significant. The term *kurban* is used consistently to describe the sacrifices and offerings that take place in the Old Testament. Similarly, *siunet* is always the term used to describe Jewish circumcision.

The term *cuma* in Turkish means ‘Friday’ as well as ‘the sermon given on Fridays in mosques’. This second meaning is also present in Bosnian and Bulgarian. However, in the manuscripts studied, *giumma* means ‘religious council’:

- (187) a. [...] recei...sickiet **giummaat** storil besce basc pop bratasi Aarona, cato dai Gospod tei zapovedal  
‘[...]he] told them that all the council had made his brother Aaron high priest, as the Lord had commanded it’ (779: 47a)
- b. Tova vreme tamam...umre Joakim basc Pop, i sickiet **giummaat** na negovo mesto stori basc pop Juda  
‘At exactly that time...the High Priest Joachim died and the entire council made Judah high priest in his place’ (779: 135b)

The word has been extended in meaning in Bulgarian: like a sermon, a religious council gives religious advice and wisdom.

Of all the religious terms, only the abstract noun *murtatlak*, meaning ‘apostasy’ suggests that there might have been religious discussion among the Bulgarians and Turks:

- (188) David sas svojetesi 600. soltate, i catogo videha Filsteite, dodeim sciube, dani stori necoi **murtatlak** na ordiataim  
‘When the Philistines saw David with his 600 soldiers, they [the Philistines] suspected that some apostasy might strike their army’ (779: 85b)

Using an Islamic turkism to replace a native term or earlier borrowings from Western languages in a Christian text speaks of the heavy Turkish lexical influence on

Bulgarian at the time. Stamenov (2013: 138) and Grannes (1996: 9) point out that Islamic terminology is still present in Bulgarian Christian usage (e.g. *xadžija* ‘pilgrim’). Stamenov continues by saying that this phenomenon has parallels in nineteenth-century Macedonian, in which there are examples of *kurban* for ‘Eucharist’ and *kurtulija* for ‘saviour’ in nineteenth-century texts. While Stamenov does not address eighteenth-century Bulgarian, the Turkish influence of that time was deep and wide-spread enough to remain in the language even after the end of the Turkish rule.

### 7.2.3.3 Wise men and elders

Both MS779 and MS778 use the terms *okumuscluk* and *okumuscin*:

#### (189) a. MS779

i. Catose varna Nabucodonosor na Baghdat, izbra’ od Eureite jedni mladi i hubavi momceta od golem soj... daghi nauci...**okumuscluk**...Odrediha tezi cetvoriza, macar dasa robje, dase ni ostavat od Boga, im dadi dase nauciat lesno sickiet **okumuscluk**.

‘When Nabuchadnezzar returned to Baghdad, he selected from the Jews several young and handsome boys of good pedigree to teach them letters. He ordered these four, though they were slaves, never to abandon God and arranged for them to learn all the texts easily’ (779: 122a)

ii. Cilek colco dae **okumuscin**, amu iskaxi, deto besce toi sanuval i zatova, citoisctesce damu iskaxi sanat ne sas cuvet od svojatsi **okumuscluk**, emi sas cuvet’ Boxi

‘However well a man is read, he [Nebuchadnezzar] tells him [the man/Daniel] what he [Nebuchadnezzar] dreamt because he [Nebuchadnezzar] wanted him [Daniel] to tell him [Nebuchadnezzar] the dream not with the power of his knowledge but with power from God’ (779: 122b)

#### b. MS778

i. [...] namerigo, cisedesce srede **okumusce**, i knixiovni i uccesceghi koga vide Blaxi Devi Maria bajaldissa artak od rados

‘[...] they found him sitting among the wise men and learned, he was teaching them when the Blessed Virgin Mary saw him she at once cried out in joy’ (778: 96)

ii. Simeone besce Redovnik Boxij, i mlogo **okumuscia** na Evreiskata zakon, i besce Mastor na jedno Medresse, i ucesce mlogo Momzina Sveta Kniga

‘Simeon was a priest of God and knew the Jewish law very well, and was in charge of a school, and taught many boys the Holy Book’ (778:83)

These words indicate that the Turkish terms for ‘reader’ and ‘reading’ had replaced, or in the first example 189b, doubled the Slavonic terms for ‘learned/wise’ and ‘learning/reading’ in eighteenth-century Bulgarian. Such examples suggest that there might have been scholastic exchange between the Ottoman Turks and Bulgarians. Turkish loans was not considered inferior to those of Slavonic or Western (or Greek) origin. As (2006: 33) points out, Christian communities were tolerated under Islamic law during the Ottoman rule and these communities had contact with Turkish communities and Ottoman officials living in Bulgaria. Given the amount of Turkish influence on the language and the continuous existence of the Paulician Catholic communities, the relationship between Ottomans and Catholics in the eighteenth century seems more complex than some historical accounts, especially anti-Ottoman accounts, might suggest, as Nikolova mentions.

In his introduction, the writer of MS779 employs only the Slavonic counterparts:

- (190) Od sickite knighi, detosesa pissali na tozi Sveta basc knigai Sveto Pismo, zerci izlezlo iz usta Box ii zatova temelet od sickite drughi knighii u Sveto Pismo i tei dumat sicki **Mudri** i **knixiovni hora**. Zatova coi znai scetogod od Sveto Pismo moxe dase rece scetogod dai **Mudari** zere u Sveto Pismo namerova kristiansca **Mudros**, i zatova assamse macil sedem meseza dai ubarna od Talianski jezik na Balgarski, da moxisc ti Sinco da vidis, i da poznaisc cacoi storil Gospod za horata.  
‘Of all the books which have been written in this world, the principal book is the Holy Book because it came from the lips of God and therefore the basis of all other books is the Holy Book, thus say all the wise and learned people. Therefore, whoever knows something from the Holy Book, can be said by all means to be wise because Christian wisdom is found in the Holy Book and that is why I laboured seven months translating it from Italian into Bulgarian so that you, little son, can see and learn what God did for people.’ (779: 2)

In his opening Kovačev uses *mudra* and *knixiovni*, derivatives of the Slavonic words that have if not exact, very similar meanings to the Turkish *okumuş* and its

derivatives, which he prefers throughout the main body of his work. In part, he might have been more conscious of his language in his introduction and thus tried to avoid turkisms compared with his translation of the paraphrase of the Bible. MS779 does not exhibit significant Italian influence. Kovačev creates a work in the Bulgarian vernacular, whose lexicon is heavily Turkish, including terminology regarding learning.

#### 7.2.3.4 Terms for ‘Jew’ and its derivatives

As mentioned in 7.1.8.1, *çifit* is pejorative in Turkish, though its use in these Bulgarian manuscripts seems to be a matter of preference of the writer. Kovačev in MS779 uses *cifut* and *cifutski* each one time:

- (191) a. Juda prokleti izdadi /i na dusmana pridadi/ i na **cifutte** prodadi Issusa  
 ‘Damned Judas betrayed Jesus and handed [him] over to enemies and sold [him] to the Jews’ (779: 205)
- b. Utidoha tezi hora /bes strah od **cifutski** zbora  
 ‘These people left, fearless of the Jewish council’ (779: 207)

These examples are in a song or poem. In all other examples, the writer uses *eurei* and its derivatives, regardless of the type of context in which the Jews are described:

- (192) Sveto Pismose razdelena dve: jenotose vika Stara Sveto Pismo i tova darxiat i **Eureite**, drugotose vika Novo Sveto Pismo. Staro Sveto Pismo hortuva, cak Gospod zadadi tozi svet i cak zadadi cileka, i sicko, detoi na Svetat: cak izbra’ Deda Aurahama, i sickiet negov coren, sanki **Eureite**, za svoje hora cak padaha **Eureite** u Robsto Misirsco... Novo Sveto Pismo hortuva cak Sin Boxi IssuKrasse porodi na tozi Svet...i cak dadi Cristianasca zacon; taci cakgo maciha **Eureite** i rasprehago na Kras.  
 ‘The Bible is divided in two: the first is called the Old Testament and Jews follow this one as well, and the second is called the New Testament. The Old Testament tells how God created the world, created man and everything that is in the world: how he chose grandfather Abraham and all his descendants, namely the Jews, for his people, how the Jews fell into Egyptian slavery...the New Testament tells how the Son of God Jesus Christ was born into the world...and how he gave Christian law; and how the Jews tortured him and crucified him on the cross.’ (779: 1–2)

Given that the writer uses *Eureite* when describing those who tortured Christ in this passage, as well as in many others, it is fair to say that *cifut* and *cifutski* in the recorded song are not his word choice as the song is not his composition. Another version of this song appears in MS780. In the first verse, the MS780 version also has *cifut*:

- (193) Juda prokleti izdadi/ i na duscmani predadi i na **cifute** predadi za triiset grosca  
 ‘Damned Judas betrayed [Jesus] and surrendered him to the enemy and handed him over to the Jews for thirty grosha’ (780:80)

However, the second example has *Evreiska* instead:

- (194) [...] otidoha tezi hora biis strah od **Evreiska** zbora  
 ‘[...] the people left fearless from the Jewish council’ (780:82)

One cannot argue that the writer’s feelings regarding Jews played a role in word choice here any more than one could argue that the difference in case declensions (compare: ‘bes strah od **cifutski**<sub>NOM</sub> zbora’ (779): ‘biis strah od **Evreiska**<sub>GEN</sub> zbora’ (780) was a conscious choice.

In contrast to MS779 and MS780, *cifut* is common in MS778. This term is not used interchangeably with *evrei*. The priests who want to kill Jesus throughout the retelling of the New Testament are called *belibasc cifute*:

- (195) [...] **belibasc ciufutte** storiha sabor da dadat Issukrasta na smart  
 ‘[...] the high Jews [the High Jewish Priests] took counsel to sentence Jesus to death’ (778:171)

However, Jesus is also a *cifut*:

- (196) U tazi koliba ulezoha tezi zaret, i ako napretse beha ciudili koga ja videha **cifutat** besce zaret deto tia tarsseha  
 ‘The kings entered that stable and if at first they had been surprised when they saw it [the stable], the Jew was the king whom they had been looking for’ (778:80)

Of all the Bosnian and Bulgarian writers, only Lastrić (7.1.5.2.5) made a conscious differentiation between *evrei* and *cifut*. While it seems that *cifut* was becoming pejorative in Bosnian, this same development cannot be inferred from the examples in the Bulgarian texts analysed.

### 7.2.3.5 Turkish Holy Trinity

In all three Bulgarian manuscripts the Turkish adverb *beraber* is used in phrases to describe the Trinity:

- (197) a. As verovam da ima jedin sam Boogh u tri kipa boxij, detose zovat Otazi, Sin, Duh Sveti **barabar**  
'I believe that there is only one God in three godly forms, which are called Father, Son, Holy Spirit together' (778:10)
- b. Boogh **barabar** sas Oza, i sas Duha Svetoga stana cilek od Maria zaradnas grehovite  
'God together with the Father and Holy Spirit became man from Mary for us sinners' (778:61)

The Slavonic counterpart (e.g. *zaedno* 'together') is never used to describe the Trinity. Given that *barabar* is not limited to describing the Trinity but is used throughout the texts to signify 'together', it seems that in eighteenth-century Bulgarian, it was the preferred term for 'together':

- (198) [...] i sas teh **barabar** jedni hora od kral Eroda  
'[...] and with them together [they were] one people of King Herod' (778:181)

In contrast, the Bosnian equivalent, *paraber*, is attested only in Bračuljević's work (7.1.5.2.6) in an entirely non-Christian context.

Also in contrast to the Bosnian texts, the Bulgarian texts lack glossing. While it cannot be said that glossing is only explanatory in Bosnian, the glossing suggests that more than one term was common. The lack of glossing in the Bulgarian texts

speaks of the assimilation of Turkish loanwords: the Turkish term had, if not replaced the Slavonic term, become a word used frequently.

#### 7.2.4 Frequency

To a certain extent, the frequency with which turkisms are used might suggest how common these words were in Bulgarian: e.g. in MS779 *genk* occurs 89 times, *pusat* occurs 54 times, *zenghin* occurs 19 times, *munafaklak* occurs only once and *scasckanlak* only twice. While ‘hypocrisy’, ‘confusion’, ‘sorrow’ and ‘jealousy’ are less common than ‘battle’, ‘gun’, ‘rich’, this more ‘intimate’ vocabulary (7.2.2.3) is never glossed, which suggests that it was equally part of Bulgarian. Context rather than knowledge of Turkish seems to be the motivation behind the use of turkisms.

For the most part, turkisms are used in the texts with semantic subtlety. For example, *huzur* specifically means ‘inner personal peace and quiet’. While it is difficult to determine the exact meaning of this word on the basis of context, it does imply ‘rest’ and ‘long-standing peace’ rather than ‘momentary cease-fire’:

- (199) a. **Huzur** nebeski dovek  
‘Heavenly peace forever’ (778:46)
- b. Cato svarsco David sickite genkove, sedna...da **huzuruva**  
‘David finished with his troops and sat down to rest’ (779: 88)

The word *barış*, which means ‘general peace’ (e.g. after a time of war), is not used in the texts, but its derivatives are:

- (200) a. [...] sanki scetesce da **baractissa** Bog sas horata  
‘[...] thus God made peace with the people’ (778: 196)
- b. [...] cogago vidi sardit na horata, i iska da ghi pedepsa; i tei dago **baractissa** sas teh  
‘[...] when he saw him angry at the people, he wanted to teach them and wanted him to make peace with them’ (778:246)

The term *barascitissa* means ‘to establish peace after battle or a dispute’ while *huzuruva* means ‘to find inner peace and quiet; to rest’.

### 7.2.5 Semantic extension

A handful of words in the Bulgarian manuscripts seem to differ semantically from their Turkish original. Because a term rarely occurs more than once, the Bulgarian meaning of the word is not always apparent. To analyse some of these examples, I relied on Grannes, Hauge and Süleymanoğlu (2002), who offer semantic comparisons of turkisms and their roots in Bulgarian and Turkish, and take into account obsolete meanings of Turkish loanwords, albeit usually only as early as the nineteenth century.

Although there are some examples where *zeitin* means ‘olive’ or ‘olive branch’ (this is the word used for the branch brought back to Noah when the flood begins to recede), in Bulgarian the word can also mean ‘oil’:

- (201) a. *Ilia ta’mu reci ci nemasce lep, emi tuco malco brascno i malco **zeitin***  
‘She told Elijah that she did not have bread but only had a little flour and oil’ (779:102)
- b. [...] *nagotviha **zeitin** za candilata...imame **zeitina** od milost boxia’ i od dobro’ praveno u nascite kandila.*  
‘[...] they prepared oil for the lamp...and we have the oil of God’s mercy and of the right-doing in our lamp.’ (778: 182)

The turkism *zeitin* is also employed to describe the perfumed oil with which the sinful woman anointed Jesus. Semantic extension occurs from ‘olive’ to ‘olive oil’ to ‘oil’.

A similar example is *miuhurledissa se* from *mühürlemek*. *Mühürlemek* has the root ‘seal’ and means ‘to stamp with a seal’. This word is used five times to discuss the sealing of Jesus’s tomb:

- (202) *Cato zacopaha Issukrasta utidoha belibasc popovete na Pilata i molihamuse da **muhurledissa** grobat*  
‘When they had buried Jesus the high priests went to Pilate and asked him to seal the grave’ (778: 231)

Most likely, since ‘stamping a seal’ at the time usually sealed a letter or document shut, *miuhurledissa* also developed the meaning ‘to seal shut’.

The root *munafak* < *mūnafik* has three derivatives which occur in the manuscripts analysed:

- (203) a. *munafaklak*  
[...] storiha mu **munafaklak** prid zar Daria, i nacarehago, dagofarli na aslanete dago izedat  
‘[...] they slandered him [Daniel] before King Darius and made him [King Darius] throw him [Daniel] to the lions to eat’ (779:125b)
- b. *munafakladissa*  
Amase uplasci dago **munfakladissat** nescto prid Rimskiet zar.  
‘But he fears that they slander him before the Roman emperor.’ (778: 213)
- c. *munafakcia*  
[...] posluscia **munafakcie**  
‘[...]he] listens to slanderers’ (779: 147)

In Turkish, *mūnafik* means ‘hypocrite (especially in religion)’ while in Bulgarian, it means ‘gossip, slander, intrigue’. The meanings of ‘hypocrite’ and ‘hypocrisy’ were extended to specific types of hypocrites (gossipers and slanders) and hypocrisy (gossip and slander).

Another example of semantic extension is *culluk* < *kuluk*. In Turkish, *kuluk* means ‘guardhouse’ while in Bulgarian it means ‘guard’:

- (204) Pilato zapoveda...da dase ostavi jedin **culluk**, da pazi grobat  
‘Pilate ordered one guard to remain to watch over the grave’ (778: 230)

This example is the only example in which the writer uses semantic extension rather than the agentive suffix *-cia* to denote a human being.

### 7.2.6 A different part of speech becomes a noun

As mentioned in 3.2.8, *barasciak* < *barışık*, which means ‘appeased, at peace, reconciled’ in Turkish, changes its part of speech when borrowed into Bulgarian from

Turkish. The term *barasciak*, which becomes nominal in Bulgarian, is used instead of its nominal counterpart, *barış*:

- (205) a. [...] **barasciak** stori sas nego.  
‘[...] he made peace with him.’ (779:100b)
- b. [...] i da stori **barasciak** sas teh  
‘[...] and he made peace with them’ (778: 90)

It is possible that *barasciak* is used over *barış* for semantic purposes. The word *barış* means ‘all-encompassing peace’: there is no connotation that there was violence before this peace became present. The term *barasciak*, on the other hand, suggests that peace was recently established and that there was violence before and that there might be violence to follow.

### 7.2.7 Turkish vs. Bulgarian suffixes

In the manuscripts studied, there is relatively little combining of Turkish roots with Bulgarian suffixes or vice versa. When this happens, it most commonly occurs with Turkish roots and Bulgarian suffixes denoting individuals: e.g. *dusmanin* <  $\tau$ *düşman* + *-in*; *ciorbagiaka* <  $\tau$ *çorbacı* + *-ka*. Since Turkish does not distinguish gender, the suffix *-ka* is a frequent Bulgarian addition when Turkish nouns denote women. While the suffix *-in* is not essential for denoting a person of masculine gender, it is common in Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian and Bosnian and most likely developed out of analogy, not semantic necessity.

Abstract nouns with Turkish roots and Slavonic suffixes are very limited in number in the texts studied. There is only one example of an Turkish root with a Slavonic suffix: *zenghinstvo*:

- (206) [...] i vide ci negovoto **zenghinsto** bilo po golemo od detose dumalo  
‘[...] they saw that his wealth was greater than was thought’ (779: 98a)

Though not in the main corpus of texts included in this dissertation, there is one example of productive *-lāk* with a Slavonic root – *kurvalāk* – in the *Tixonravovski damaskin*.<sup>161</sup> There are far from enough examples in the texts analysed to form conclusions regarding the semantic difference of these two suffixes. In this example the word *kurvalāk* is used interchangeably with *kurvastvo*, which would suggest that at least in this example, there was no semantic difference between the suffixes in the seventeenth century. Grannes’s analysis of the semantics of the two suffixes in the modern language can add insight to the historical development of *-lāk* vs. *-stvo*. These suffixes can only be used interchangeably with regard to abstract nouns: *kurvalāk* = *kurvastvo*. In other instances, these two suffixes are not synonymous and therefore *-stvo* cannot replace *-lāk*. For example, *-līk* can be used to form concrete nouns in Turkish: e.g. *yorgan* ‘duvet’ > *yorganlık* ‘duvet cover’. While *iorganlāk* is attested in Bulgarian, *\*iorganstvo* is not, since *-stvo* does not have the same function as *-līk* in this example (Grannes, 1996: 248). Similarly, in these same instances, *-lāk* is not productive with Bulgarian roots. The suffix *-līk* was productive in Bulgarian during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but only in its capacity to denote abstract meaning.

### 7.3 Conclusion

The Bosnian and Bulgarian texts have only 162 words in common. These words are for the most part common (occurring multiple times in more than one text) and can be both cultural (e.g. *bey*, *Bayram*) and core loans (e.g. *perde*, *peşkir*).

Islamic religious terms that are used in a Christian context are limited to the Bulgarian texts: *elcia*, *giumma*, *kurban muratlak*, *siunet*. Such words suggest more intimate social contact between Turks and the Balkan Slavs.

---

<sup>161</sup> For the chronology of *-lāk* vs. *-stvo*, see 2.2.4.1.

The Bulgarian and Bosnian texts in part have relatively few words in common because they are different types of texts. The Bosnian texts are all published works and therefore the writers would have been more prone to editing and formality.

One social factor distinguishing the recipient languages is that all of Bulgaria was under Turkish influence. While Bosnia was part of the Ottoman Empire, Croatia was not and the Franciscans had close contact with their brethren there, and maintained contact with a part of their language which was not subject to Turkish influence. Since the Bosnian Franciscans were writing not just for the local population, but also for their brothers in Croatia, they were more likely to omit or gloss turkisms so their texts would be understood beyond their Bosnian communities.

## **8.0 Conclusion**

Because the body of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century material used to analyse turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian for this dissertation is limited, one can only point out common trends which might be of use in further studies relating to Turkish loanwords in Slavonic languages, as well as other languages that had contact with Turkish.

Of the 622 Bosnian turkisms presented in this dissertation, 360 have their earliest attestations in sources analysed for this dissertation and 168 are attested neither in RHSJ nor Stachowski. Of the 628 Bulgarian turkisms, 537 have their earliest attestations in the sources analysed for this dissertation. Of the 162 turkisms which occur in both languages, 86 of them have respective attestation dates within a century or less of each other. When words do not have similar attestation dates, this might be due to the different types of source material. In both languages there is a dramatic increase in the number of turkisms from the seventeenth to the eighteenth century.

In this study, nouns are by far the most common loanwords. The high number of nouns among loanwords is common in language interference for semantic reasons (Weinreich, 1955: 37) as well as because of grammatical hierarchy. There are more morphophonological changes in Bosnian nouns than in Bulgarian nouns. Of the 622 turkisms in the Bosnian texts, 527 are nouns, while of the 628 turkisms in the Bulgarian texts, 443 are nouns. These numbers might suggest that nouns were easily borrowed into both languages but that other parts of speech were more prone to be borrowed into Bulgarian than into Bosnian.

On the basis of the texts analysed, Bosnian and Bulgarian differ on several points regarding the development of verbs with Turkish roots. In both languages, verbs can develop from Turkish nominal, adjectival or verbal roots; the verbal suffix

is determined by the Turkish part of speech that acts as the verbal stem. In both Bosnian and Bulgarian  $\{-d, -t\}$ -*isa(ti)* is the suffix for verbs with Turkish verbal roots; the dental is more common in Bulgarian verbs than in Bosnian ones.

On the other hand, verbal prefixes are more common in Bosnian: the Bulgarian texts have two examples of prefixed verbs while the Bosnian ones have fourteen. This difference in numbers might be in part because prefixes are more common in Bosnian for distinguishing aspect than in Bulgarian, which can express the imperfective aspect with the productive suffix *-ova* in verbs with Turkish verbal roots as their stems. Apart from *-IE*, Turkish verbal suffixes are attested only with Bulgarian verbs in the texts analysed.

As with verbs, there are more Turkish adjectives and adverbs in Bulgarian (94) than in Bosnian (34). Neither language shows attempts toward gender agreement between Turkish adjectives and the nouns that they modify. Bulgarian, however, has number agreement between Turkish loan adjectives and the nouns that they modify. In part, this might be because Bulgarian does not formally differentiate adjectival *-li* words from nominal *-li* words. Since *-lija* nouns are formally distinct from *-li* adjectives in Bosnian, number agreement could be implied from the noun that the *-li* adjective modified.

Although there are more Turkish conjunctions in the Bulgarian texts than in the Bosnian texts, in both languages they are used interchangeably with native conjunctions.

While one cannot make a conclusive semantic comparison regarding Turkish loanwords in Bosnian and Bulgarian since Bosnian and Bulgarian works analysed represent two different types of literature, there is more varied lexical borrowing in Bulgarian than in Bosnian. Turkisms are not glossed in the Bulgarian texts, while

glossing occurs to a limited extent in the Bosnian texts, perhaps because they were intended for a wider audience. The lack of glossing in the Bulgarian manuscripts suggests that Turkish loans were more common terms.

In Bosnian, for the most part, cultural loans are restricted to Ottoman contexts. In Bulgarian, originally culturally specific words are used in non-Turkish contexts: Ottoman military titles occur in biblical texts: e.g. *assia*, *atlia*, *bairaktarin*, *bimbascia*, *iuzbascia*, *seimen*, *seimenbascia*. Similarly, Islamic terminology has lost its Islamic cultural aspect and is used in the retellings of the Bible: e.g. *kurban*, *murtatlak*, *siunet*.

This study suggests that there might have been more variation in the parts of speech borrowed in eighteenth-century Bulgarian than in Bosnian. While Turkish loanwords were prevalent in both eighteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian, there was limited structural borrowing: e.g. Turkish affixes became productive, demi-calques on noun-verb compounds, conjunctions and numerals were borrowed. Though Bosnian and Bulgarian differ regarding semantics, e.g. semantic extension, pleonasm and shift in grammatical function, they have more or less incorporated the same structural borrowings, e.g. productive *-Cĭ* and *-lĭk*, distinct verbal suffixes depending on the part of speech of the stem. The languages do differ regarding their adaption of some loanwords: e.g. final /e/ tends to become /a/ in Bosnian while it becomes /a/ or /e/ in Bulgarian; prefixed verbs are more common in Bosnian and adjectives only exhibit number agreement in Bulgarian.

This research brings several questions to the fore: how do Turkish borrowings differ from borrowings from other languages in Bosnian and Bulgarian? What developments occur with Turkish loanwords in nineteenth-century Bosnian and Bulgarian? To what extent have Bosnian and Bulgarian changed with regard to Turkish loanwords from the eighteenth century to the present day?

## Appendices

## Appendix I: Glossary of Bosnian Turkish Loanwords

Turkish loanwords are listed in their modern Bosnian spelling and in the pre-modern spelling(s) in which they occur in the texts analysed. All attested spelling variants of a loanword are listed. Definitions of the word are listed only under the entry with modern Bosnian spelling. Under entries with pre-modern spellings, the reader is directed to the modern spelling. All attested pre-modern spellings of a word are listed at the end of each modern Bosnian entry. Following the English translation of the word, or the cross-reference to the modern spelling, the work in which the word occurs is given. If the word is not a derivative of a turkism already listed, the original Turkish word is given in modern Turkish spelling in italics immediately following the definition of the term and references; otherwise, the root turkism is given in bold. Because some words occur only in pre-modern spelling, some entries with modern Bosnian spelling contain no reference initials. Each derivative has its own entry. When an entry contains a word listed in the glossary, this word is in bold. I primarily depended on Škaljić (1989) and the editors of the chronicles, *Redhouse* (2000) to make this glossary.

### A

**abdest** *n* ablution; ritual of washing before prayer (BR); *abdest*.

**ada** *n* island (RR, BR, LT, LN, BE); *ada*.

**adalet** *n* justice (BE); *adalet*.

**adet** *n* tradition, ritual (BR); *adet*.

**adžam** *n* 1) Persian; 2) anyone who is not Arab (BE); *Acem*.

**adžamoglan** *n* boy, often Christian, brought from a conquered land to be schooled for the Ottoman military or other services (BE); *acemi ođlan*: foreign child.

**adžamoglanski** *adj* adjectival form of **adžamoglan** (BE).

**aga** *n* lord, well-respected citizen, leader (LA, BE); *ađa*.

**ahar** *n* stall, usually for a horse (BE); *ahir*.

**ajan** *n* leader, esteemed lord/noble; a well-respected citizen (LA, BE); *âyan*.

**ajanski** *adj* adjectival form of **ajan** (LA, BE).

**ajde** *inter* see **hajde** (LN).

**aklama** *n* assessment tax (BE); *joklama*.

**alajbeg** *n* cavalry commander in any regiment (LA, BE); *alaybeyi*.

**alat** *n* tool (LT, LN); *alit*; **halat**, **hallat**.

**alk** *n* people, mankind (BE); *halk*.

**alkoran** *n* Holy Koran (BR); *Al-Koran*.

**ama** *conj* but, only (RR, BE, IL); *amma*.

**aman** *inter* 1) God, help; have mercy; 2) surely; probably (LN, BE); *aman*.

**amanet** *n* 1) trust, protection; 2) item to be kept and protected (BE); *emanet*.

**ambar** *n* granary (LN); *ambar*; **hambar**.

**amidža** *n* paternal uncle (BE); *amuca/amca*.

**apstiti/avstiti** *v* to capture (LA, BE); **haps**.

**araç** see **haraç** (DO, LT, LN).

**aracs** see **haraç** (BR).

**araç** see **haraç** (BE).

**arapçe** see **arapçe** (LN).

**arapçe** *n* 1) Arab; 2) Arabic; *arapçe*: Arabic; **arapçe**.

**arç** see **haraç** (IL).

**Arnaut** *n* Albanian (LA, BE); *Arnaut*.

**Arnautluk** *n* Albania (BR, BE); *Arnavutluk*.

**arfcin** see **aršin** (RP).

**arslanlija** *n* Turkish money piece with the face of a lion (*arслан* (Tur.)). Its value is 100 *jaspra* (LA); *arslanli*.  
**aršin** *n* old measure for length (LT, LA, BE); *aršin*; **arfcin**.  
**arzen** *adj* petitioned; requested (BE); **arzohal**.  
**arzohal** *n* request, petition; **arz(a)** is an abbreviated form (LA, BE); *arzuhal*.  
**ashikovagnje** see **ašikovanje** (LN).  
**ashikovati** see **ašikovati** (IL).  
**ašikovanje** *n* flirtation; wooing; **ašikovati**; **ashikovagnje**.  
**ašikovati** *v* to fancy, to flirt with (BE); *aşik*: lover, in love; **ashikovati**.  
**avlija** *n* court-yard (BE); *avlu*.  
**avlijski** *adj* the adjectival form of **avlija** (BE).  
**avst/(h)aps** *n* prison (LA, BE); *haps*.  
**axdaja** see **aždaja** (LT).  
**azna** see **hazna** (BR).  
**aždaja** *n* water monster with legs, wings and one or more heads that attacks people (LT, LN); *ejderha*; **axdaja**.

## B

**badem** *n* almond; *badem*; **bajam**.  
**bajam** see **badem**; this is a dialectal pronunciation (DO).  
**bajrak** *n* 1) flag; 2) regiment in the army whose soldiers carry their flag while marching (LA, BE); *bayrak*; **bariak**; **baryak**.  
**bajraktar** *n* soldier who carries his flag while marching (LA, BE); **bajrak**; **baryaktar**.  
**bajram** *n* Eid (BE); *bayram*.  
**bakar** *n* copper (IL); *bakır*.  
**balija** *n* 1) simple, lower-class or primitive Muslim; 2) derogatory term for Muslims in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BE); *abali*.  
**barabar** *adv* together; *beraber*; **parabar**.  
**bardak** *n* glass or cup (BE); **bardak**.

**barem** *adv* at least (PO, RP, RR, MA, BR, LA, LT, LN, DO, BE, IL); *bari*.  
**bari** *adv* at least (MA, LT, LN); *bari*.  
**bariak** see **bajrak** (RR).  
**barut** *n* gunpowder (BE); *barut*.  
**baryak** see **bajrak** (RP, BR, LT, LN, IL).  
**baryaktar** see **bajraktar** (BR).  
**basc** see **baš** (BR, LN).  
**bascka** see **baška** (BR, RP, RR).  
**basclia** see **bašli** (LN).  
**bash** see **baš** (IL, LN).  
**bashka** see **baška** (IL).  
**basti** *v* hit, pounced, attacked (LA); *basti* < *basmak*.  
**baš** *adj* 1) main, head; *adv* 2) very (LA, BE); *baş*; **basc**, **bash**.  
**baša** *n* 1) senior, head, leader; 2) title given to especially respected or well-endowed citizens; 3) title given to an ordinary janissary (LA, LN, BE); *başa*.  
**bašaga** *n* head or most senior **aga** (LA, BE); *başa-aga*.  
**bašeskija** *n* veteran janissary (BE); *başeski*.  
**bašinski** *adj* adjectival form of **baša** (LA, BE).  
**baška** *adj* 1) separate; 2) special; 3) other (BE); *baška*; **bascka**, **bashka**.  
**bašlia** *adj* main, principal, head; *başlı*; **bascli**.  
**bašta** *n* 1) garden; 2) fruit orchard (BE, LA, LT); *bahçe*.  
**bazardžan** *n* merchant (BE); *bezirgân*.  
**beden** *n* body, person (BR); *beden*.  
**bedevija** *n* mare of good breed (LA); *bedevi*.  
**beg** *n* 1) bey, a nobleman; 2) title added to a Muslim's name to show respect; 3) lord; 4) commander of a military unit (LA, BE); *bey*.  
**beghluk** see **begluk** (LN).

**begleisati** *v* to like<sup>1</sup>(BE); *beğenmek*.  
**begler-beg** *n* high military or civil commander of an area or field (LA); *beylerbeyi*.  
**begluk** *n* area which a bey oversees; *beglik*; **beghluk**.  
**belaj** *n* misfortune, trouble (BE); *belâ*.  
**belćim** *adv* maybe, probably, likely (BE); *belki*.  
**beshik** see **beşik** (LN).  
**beşik** *n* cradle; *beşik*.  
**bešlaga** *n* commander of the **bešlija** (LA); *bešli ağası*.  
**bešlija** *n* member of the paid cavalry (LA, BE); *bešli*.  
**bezistan** *n* covered square or market which houses shops (LA, BE); *bezistan*.  
**bihuzur** *adj* upset, troubled (BE); *bihuzur*.  
**bile** *adv* even, all the more (BE); *bile*.  
**binjiš** *n* long-sleeved robe of thick home-spun cloth (BE); *biniş*.  
**birbi** *adv* immediately, suddenly (BE); *birden*.  
**birda** *adv* more, no longer (BE); *birden*.  
**boja** *n* 1) colour; 2) paint (LT, LN, BE); *boya*; **boya**.  
**bojadisan** *adj* painted; **boja**; **bojadissan**.  
**bojadissan** see **bojadisan** (BR).  
**boya** see **boja** (RP).  
**bubreg** *n* kidney (RR); *böbrek*.  
**budala** *n* fool, idiot, nut (RP, BR, DO, LA, LT, LN, BE,); *budala*; **budalla**.  
**budalafctina** see **budalaština** (RP, RR, BR, LN).  
**budalasctina** see **budalaština** (BR).  
**budalashtina** see **budalaština** (LN).  
**budalast** *adj* silly, foolish (LT, LN, DO, IL); **budala**; **budalaft**.  
**budalaft** see **budalast** (BR, RP, RR).

**budalafto** see **budalastvo** (RP, RR, BR, LN).  
**budalastvo** *n* concept of being a fool (DO); **budalafto**.  
**budalaština** *n* nonsense, idiocy (LT, DO, BE); **budala**; **budalafctina** **budalasctina**, **budalashtina**.  
**budalaštinica** *adj* diminutive form of **budalaština** (LN).  
**budaliti** *v* to go crazy; to be extremely silly (LN); **budala**.  
**budalla** see **budala** (RP).  
**bugaghia** see **bukagija** (BR).  
**bugluk** *n* division of the army (LT, LN); *bölük*.  
**bujurisati** *v* 1) to command, speak; 2) to confirm or approve (BE); *buyurmak*.  
**bukagija** *n* chain worn around one's leg in prison (BE); *bukaği*; **bugaghia**.  
**bula** *n* 1) Muslim woman; 2) married Muslim woman; 3) well-respected Muslim woman schooled in Islamic prayer (LN, BE); *bula*.  
**buljuk-baša** *n* 1) commander having the rank of captain in a janissary unit consisting of 100 members; 2) leader of any group, order or unit (LA); *bölübaşı*.  
**bnar** *n* 1) water well; 2) source (RP, RR, MA, BR, LT, LN, DO); *bunar*.  
**burija** *n* 1) fume; 2) fumigatory (BE); *buhur*: incense.  
**burnut** *n* snuff (DO); *buruntu* (*buruntu*).  
**buruntija** *n* order or written command given by a pasha (LA, BE); *buyrultu*.  
**busija** meeting (LA); *pusu*; **buffia**.  
**buffia** see **busija** (BR).  
**butum** *adj* whole, complete, entire (LA); *bütün*.

## C

**cfalma** see **čalma** (BR).  
**cfifut** see **čifut** (BR).  
**cfifutczki** see **čifutski** (BR).

<sup>1</sup> The editors of Benić's *Ijetopis* suggest that his spelling of this word is incorrect for *begenisati*.

**cfoban** see **čobanj** (BR).  
**cxep** see **džep** (BR).

## Č

**čador** *n* tent (BE, LA, LT); *çadır*.

**čakmak** *n* flame, lighter (RR); *çakmak*;  
**čakmak**.

**čakšire** *n* type of men's loose trousers which are narrow at the feet and button on the side (MA); *çakşır*.

**čalma** *n* strip of cloth wrapped around a fez or another type of hat (LA, BE); *çalma*; **čfalma**.

**čardak** *n* 1) grand two-storied house with gardens, grounds and summer house (LA, BE); *çardak*.

**čaršija** *n* trade centre of a city (LT, LN, BE); *çarşı*; **čarshhia**, **čarshia**.

**čauš** *n* 1) messenger in the service of the king, pasha, vizier, or other high commanders (LA); *çavuş*; **čaush**.

**čaušlaraga** *n* see **čauš** and **aga**; head janissary (LA, BE).

**čaušlarčehaja** *n* see **čaus** and **čehaja**; assistant messenger (LA).

**čekmedže** *n* chest with drawer where valuables or money are kept (LA); *çekmece*.

**čelenka** *n* decorative ornament in the shape of a feather made from gold and sometimes containing precious stones (LT, LN); *çelenk*.

**čelik** *n* steel; *çelik*; **čelik**, **čellik**.

**čengel/čengele** *n* iron gaff used to hang and clean slaughtered animals or for human torture (RP, LA); *çengel*.

**čerga** *n* modest tent, common among Roma (BE); *çerge*.

**čifluk** *n* type of feudal possession which the lord deals with alone (BE); *çiflik*.

**čifuče** *n* collective noun for Jews (LT, BE); **čifut**.

**čifut** *n* Jew (LA, LT, DO, BE); *Çift*<sup>2</sup>;  
**čifut**, **čifut**.

**čifutana** *n* synagogue (LA, BE); *çifithane*.

**čifutin** *n* Jew (LT, BE); *Ṭçift* + *-in*;  
**čifutin**.

**čifutski** *adj* adjectival form of **čifut** (LT, DO); **čifutczki**, **čifuski**.

**čirak** *n* candlestick holder (BE); *çırak*.

**čivija** *n* 1) wooden or iron wedge, peg or bolt (LA); *çivi*.

**čizmedžija** *n* cobbler (BE); *çizmeci*.

**čobanin** see **čobanj** (RR, LN); **čobanin**.

**čobanski** *adj* adjectival form of **čoban**;  
**čobanski**.

**čobanj** *n* shepherd (LA, LT); *çoban*;  
**cfoban**, **čoban**.

**čoha** *n* high-quality, often soft, fabric (LT); *çuha*.

**čohodar** *n* courtier of the sultan, a pasha or regional bey in charge of looking after his master's clothing (LA, BE); *çuhadar*.

**čorba** *n* stew or soup; *çorba*; **čorba**.

**čurudisati** *v* to ruin; to rot (BE); *çürümek*.

## Ć

**ćatibija** *n* copying (BE); **ćatip**.

**ćatip** *n* scribe (LA); *kâtib*.

**ćefil** *n* guarantee (BE); *kefil*.

**ćefilema** *n* guaranteeing (BE); *kefilma*.

**ćefiliti (se)** *v* 1) to guarantee; 2) (se); to be obligated to (BE) **ćefil**.

**ćehaja** *n* 1) assistant to a vizier, pasha or any other dignitary; 2) village noble, prince (LA, BE); *kâhya*.

**ćeif** *n* good mood, enjoyment (BE); *keyif*.

**ćemer** *n* vault (door, window, bridge) (MA, LA); *kemer*.

<sup>2</sup> This is a pejorative term in Turkish.

**ćeskin-jasakčija** *n* **ćeskin** means sharp or strong and **jasakčija** means guard (BE); *keskin + yasakçi*.  
**ćešif /ćešf** *n* 1) inspection; 2) an assessment of one's expenses (LA, BE); *keşif*.  
**ćešifiti** *v* to inspect (LA, BE); **ćešif**.  
**ćilim/kilim** *n* woollen carpet or blanket (DO); *kilim*; **chilim**.  
**ćispet** *n* suit (BE); *kispet*.  
**ćitab** *n* book that contains religious texts and rules, e.g. the Kur'an or Bible (LA, BE); *kitab*.  
**ćoso** *n* simpleton; otherwise, a man with little or no beard (BE); *köse*.  
**ćošak** *n* 1) corner (LA, BE); *köşk*.  
**ćumur** *n* coal (wood or stone) (LA, BE); *kömür*.  
**ćumurdžija** coalman (BE); *kömürcü*.  
**ćuprija** *n* bridge (LA, BE); *köprü*.  
**ćurak/ćurah** *n* man's fur coat or a coat lined with fur (LA, BE); *kürk*.

## Ç

**ćakmak** see **ćakmak** (RR).  
**ćarshhia** see **ćaršija** (IL).  
**ćarshia** see **ćaršija** (LN).  
**ćaush** see **ćauš** (IL).  
**ćelik** see **ćelik** (IL).  
**ćellik** see **ćelik** (RP).  
**ćepp** see **džep** (LN).  
**chilim** see **ćilim** (DO).  
**ćiffut(in)** see **ćifut** (LT, LN, DO).  
**ćifuski** see **ćifutski** (LN, DO).  
**ćobanin** see **ćobanj** (RR, LN).  
**ćobanski** see **ćobanski** (LN).  
**ćorba** see **ćorba** (DO).

## D

**dabul(h)ana** military music (BE); *daulhane/davlhane*.  
**dajanisati** *se* endure (BE); *dayanmak*.  
**dalkarluč** *n* voluntary soldier (BE); *dalkilič*.

**dava** *n* complaint, accusation, charge (LT); *dâva*.  
**davudžija** *n* accuser, plaintiff, prosecutor (BE); *dâvacı*.  
**degenek** *n* club or heavy stick (BE); *değnek*.  
**delibaša** *n* 1) head guard of the vizier or pasha (LA, BE); *delibaşı*.  
**delija** *n* 1) type of cavalry officer; 2) vizier's guard (BE); *deli*.  
**dernek** *n* association (IL); *dernek*.  
**derviš** *n* 1) dervish (LA); *derviş*.  
**derviški** *adj* adjectival form of **derviš** (LA).  
**devletum** *inter* 1) my country!; 2) my people!; (BE); *devlet + İm*.  
**dilendžija** *n* beggar (BE); *dilenci*.  
**dimia** see **dimija** (BR).  
**dimija** *n* loose fitting Turkish trousers (MA); *dimi*.  
**direk** *n* post or beam (BE); *direk*.  
**divan** *n* 1) council, assembly; 2) palace, house, home of a sultan, vizier or pasha; 3) discussion, speech, sermon; 4) type of couch, usually long with a low back (LA, BE); *divan*.  
**divitar** *n* secretary (BE); *divit*: inkwell.  
**dizija** *n* belt made of pearls, jewels or gold coins (LT); *dizi*.  
**dolama** *n* type of covering worn by men or women made of purple, green or red cloth, with or without sleeves and coming down to the knee (MA); *dolama*.  
**dramaluk** *n* powerful bullet (BE); *dihermlik*.<sup>3</sup>  
**duchian** see **dućan** (RR, BR, DO).  
**dućan** *n* shop (LA, BE); *dükkân*; **duchian**.  
**dućanlije** *n* shops or shopping area (BE); *dükkân+ İİ*.  
**duhan** *n* tobacco (BR, DO); *duhan*.  
**duhar/duvar** *n* wall (LA); *duvar*.

<sup>3</sup> This turkism has possible Greek influence.

**dunder** *n* wood (BE); *dülger*.  
**ducmanica** see **dušmanica** (BR).  
**dufcmanin** see **dušman(in)** (BR).  
**ducmanski** see **dušmanski** (BR).  
**dufcmanstvo** see **dušmanstvo** (BR).  
**dufcmanski** see **dušmanski** (BR).  
**dušman(in)** *n* enemy or opponent (BE);  
*düşman*.  
**dušmanica** *n* feminine diminutive form  
of **dušman**; **ducmanica**.  
**dušmanski** *adj* adjectival form of  
**dušman**; **ducmanski**, **dufcmanski**.  
**dušmanstvo** *n* enmity; **dušman**;  
**dufcmanstvo**.

## Dž

**džabija** *n* endowment collector (BE);  
*cabi*.  
**džamija** *n* mosque (LA, BE); *cami*.  
**džebana** *n* 1) ammunition; 2) arsenal  
(LA, BE); *cebhan*.  
**džemat** 1) society or community; 2)  
prayer group; 3) Muslim  
congregation (LA, BE); *cemaat*.  
**džematlija** *n* member of a Muslim  
congregation (LA, BE); *cemaatli*.  
**džerašen** *adj* cut, wounded (BE); *cerh*:  
wounding.  
**džerim** *n* fine, penalty (BE); *cerime*:  
penalty.  
**dževab** *n* response (LA, BE); *cevab*.  
**džigerica** *n* liver; <sub>T</sub>*ciğer* + *sica*;  
**xighericza**.  
**džilitati se** *v* 1) to throw a spear, to  
lance; to attack with a spear; 2) to  
throw one's body forward, to jump  
(BE); *cilit*: a game in which horsemen  
throw spiked clubs.  
**džulus** *n* 1) tax; 2) tribute that the  
Franciscans paid annually or when a  
new vizier came. (The Franciscans  
were first made to pay tributes by the  
Vizier Kara- Mehmed in 1673.) (LA,  
BE); *cülus*.

## Đ

**đaur/kaur** *n* non-Muslim, infidel,  
Christian (LA, BE); *gavur*.  
**đečerma** *n* vest (DO); *geçirme*.  
**đene** *adv* again, still, probably (BE);  
*gene* (dialect).  
**donlija** *n* special unit in the Turkish  
army for dangerous missions made up  
of volunteers (BE); *güğüllü*.  
**đubre** *n* manure (LN); *gübre*.  
**đumruk** *n* customs, tax paid on  
imported goods (BE); *gümrük*.  
**đuvegija** *n* groom of a bridal couple; a  
fiancé (DO); *güveyi*; **giuveghia**.

## E

**efendija** *n* effendi (BE); *efendi*.  
**efendum** *inter* 1) my lord; 2) please; 3)  
pardon (BE); *efendi* + *İm*.  
**eglenisati /eglendisati** *v* to talk, discuss  
(BE); *eğlenmek*: 1) to have a good  
time; 2) to joke.  
**elčija** *n* envoy (BE); *elçi*; **elčia**.  
**elčia** see **elčija** (LT, LN).  
**ele/hele/helem** *inter* so it is; finally; and  
so; well; what should I say (BE);  
*hele*.  
**em...em.../hem...hem** *conj* and, apart  
from that (BE); *hem...hem*.  
**emin** *n* 1) trustworthy reliable person;  
*adj* 2) sure, confident (LA, BE); *emin*.  
**eminski** *adj* adjectival form of **emin**;  
(BE, LA).  
**emir** *n* leader; (BE); *emir*.  
**Ergeglia** *n* region of Ereğli in Turkey  
(BR); *Ereğli*.  
**esabiti** *v* to think, consider, regard (BE);  
**hesab**.  
**espap** *n* material or clothes to be sold  
(BR, LT); *espap*;  
**ešap** see **hesap** (BR).  
**evlad** *n* child (BE); *evlat*.

## F

**fajda** *n* use, gain (BE); *fayda*.  
**ferman** *n* sultan's decree (LA, BE); *ferman*.  
**fetva** *n* fatwa: legal decision or instructions responding to questions regarding Sharia law (BE); *fetva*.  
**fetvadžija** *n* one who issues a fatwa (BE); *fetvacı*.  
**filj** *n* elephant (LT, LN); *fil*.  
**fukara** *adj* poor (BE); *fukara*.  
**funduklija** *n* type of Turkish coin with a hazelnut (*funduk*) on it (BE); *findıklı*.

## G

**gazi** *n* hero, conqueror (BE); *gazi*.  
**giueveghia** see **đuvegija** (DO).  
**groš** *n* small Turkish money piece with the value of 40 *akče* (LA, BE, IL); *guruş*.

## H

**haber** *n* news, report (BE); *haber*.  
**hadet** see **adet** (BR).  
**hadžija** *n* one who has been on Hajj (BE); *hacı*.  
**hajde** *inter* let's go, go, time to move on; I'm saying good-bye now (LA, LT, LN, BE); *hayede*.  
**hak** *n* winnings of a feud (BE); *hak*.  
**halat** see **alat** (BR).  
**halk** *n* people (BE); *halk*; **alk**.  
**hallat** see **alat** (RP, RR).  
**hambar** see **ambar** (DI, BR, LN, RP).  
**hamrija** *n* tax on wine (BE); *hamrî*: related to wine.  
**han** *n* inn (LA, BE); *han*.  
**handžar** *n* long (70-80 cm) sharp double-bladed knife (LA); *hancer*.  
**haraaç** see **harač** (RP, RR).  
**harač** *n* type of personal tax paid by non-Muslim men to the Turkish rulers (BE, LA, LT); *haraç*; **arač**, **araç**, **arcs**, **arç**, **haraaç**.  
**haračan** *adj* 1) taxed; 2) paid; **harač**.

**harač(l)ija** *n* individual who collected *harač* (LT, BE); *haraçlı*.  
**haračiti** *v* 1) to tax; 2) to spend money; **harač** (BE).  
**haračlija** *n* gun which uses a lot of gunpowder (BE); *harçalı*.  
**haračnik** *n* tax collector (BE, LA, LT); **harač**.  
**haračan** see **haračan** (RP).  
**harambaša** *n* chief of a group of bandits (RR, LA); *harami başı*.  
**haramzastvo** *n* sinning (PO); *haramzadelik*.  
**harfuf** see **hrsuz** (LN).  
**harsuzki** see **hrsuzki** (BR).  
**has** *n* feudal estate (BE); *has*.  
**hasesećija** *n* 1) soldier belonging to a military unit serving the court (LA, BE); *haseki*.  
**hasum** *n* opponent, enemy (LA, BE); *hasim*.  
**hatar** *n* memory; *hatır*; **hator**, **hatur**.  
**hatišerif** *n* special deed granted by the Turkish sultan (LA, BE); *hattıšerif*.  
**hator** see **hatar** (BR).  
**hatur** see **hatar** (DO).  
**hazna** *n* 1) treasury; 2) treasure (DI, BR, LA, DO, BE); *hazne*.  
**haznadar** *n* treasurer; (LA, BE); *ḥazna* + *dar*.  
**hazur** *adj* ready, present (BE LA); *hazır*.  
**hazuriti** *v* to get ready, to prepare; (BE); **hazur**.  
**hećim** *n* doctor (BE); *hekim*.  
**heli-rza** *n* educated people (BE); *ehli-rz*.  
**hersuz** see **hrsuz** (LN).  
**hesap** *n* reckoning (LN, BE); *hesap*; **efsap**.  
**hićisar** *n* fortress (BE); *iç* + *hisar*.  
**hindat/indat** *n* military aid (food, money, men) (LT, BE); *imad*.  
**hodža** *n* Muslim clergyman (BE); *hoca*.  
**hrsuz** *n* thief (LT, BE); *hırsız*; **harfuf**; **hersuz**.  
**hrsuzan** *adj* stolen (BE); **hrsuz**.

**hrsuzki** *adj* stolen (BE); **hrsuz**.  
**hrsuzluk** *n* robbery, thievery (MA, BE);  
*hırsızlık*.  
**hršum** *n* loud angry cry (BE); *hışım*.  
**hudut** *n* 1) border (between regions); 2)  
 region (LA, BE); *hudut*.  
**hušum** *adj* long (LA); *uzun*.

## I

**ibrik** *n* copper, gold or silver jug with a  
 narrow neck, dome-shaped lid and  
 long handle (LA); *ibrik*.  
**ićindija** *n* third of five daily Muslim  
 prayers (BE); *ikindi*.  
**ićituglie-paša** *n* pasha who has prestige  
 indicated by his wearing two horses'  
 tails. He is of a lower rank than a  
 pasha wearing three horses' tails  
 (BE); *iki tuđlu*.  
**iktira/iftira** *n* curse (BE); *iftira*.  
**iktiza** *n* need (BE); *iktiza*.  
**ilaka** *n* area of a town that is owned by  
 the town (BE); *alâka*.  
**ilam** *n* final court decision or verdict  
 made by a judge (LA, BE); *ilân*.  
**ilamiti** *v* to make a final court decision  
 (LA, BE); **ilam**.  
**imam** *n* 1) imam; 2) any individual with  
 sufficient religious education to lead  
 prayer; 3) the title given to notable  
 Muslim scholars (LA, BE); *imam*.  
**imšallah/inšallah** *inter* God willing  
 (BE); *inšallah*.  
**imzeleisati** *v* to confirm (BE);  
*imzalamak*.  
**inat** *adj* stubborn, obstinate (LN); *inat*.  
**indže** *adj* thin, light, easy (LT); *ince*.  
**inle/hinle** *n* deceit; trickery, speculation  
 (BE); *hile*.  
**iskusuriti** *v* to pay back a loan  
 completely (BE); **kusur**.  
**isnat** *n* deceit, allegation (BE); *isnat*.  
**ispatiti** *v* to attest, to testify (BE); *ispat*.

**išćefiliti se** *v* to be a guarantee for  
 someone; to bail someone out (BE);  
**ćefil**.  
**išleisati** *v* to do, to perform a task (BE);  
*işlemek*.  
**izlal** *n* deception (BE); *izlâl*.  
**izmet/hizmet** *n* service or favour (LT);  
*hizmet*.  
**izun** *n* permit; permission (BE); *izin*.

## J

**jabandžija** *n* foreigner (BE); *yabancı*.  
**jacija** *n* 1) two hours after sundown; 2)  
 the fifth of the five daily Muslim  
 prayers (BE); *yatsı*.  
**jagmiti** *v* 1) to grab; 2) to steal (LA);  
*yağma*: loot.  
**jaka** *n* collar; **jake oparati**: to remove  
 one's collar to show he is a soldier;  
 (LA, BE); *yaka*.  
**jalan** *adj* false, incorrect (BE); *yalın*.  
**jalija** *n* empty area on the periphery of a  
 town (BE); *yalı*.  
**jamak** *n* 1) **bajraktar** substitute; 2)  
 recruit for the janissary army; 3)  
 assistant to a tradesman (LA, BE);  
*yamak*.  
**janjičar** *n* janissary (LA, BE); *yeniçi*;  
**jenjičar**.  
**janjičarski** *adj* adjectival form of  
**janjičar** (LA, BE).  
**japče** *adv* slowly, gently (BE); *yavaaş*.  
**japija** *n* wood building material (LT,  
 BE); *yapı*.  
**jarak** *n* weapon (RP, LT, LN, BE, IL);  
*yarak*.  
**jardum** *n* help (BE); *yardım*.  
**jasakčija** *n* guard (BE); *yasakçı*.  
**jazuk** *n* pity, damage (BE); *yazık*.  
**jedek** *n* bridle (BE); *yedek*.  
**jedekli** *adj* having a spare horse (BE);  
*yedekli*.  
**jedek/jedžek** *n* food (LA, BE); *yeyecek*;  
*yecek*.  
**jendek** *n* ditch or gutter (BR); *hendek*.

**jenjičar** see **janjičar** (BE).  
**jol** *n* road, journey (BE); *yol*.  
**junjga/junga** *n* measurement for weight, especially for lard or wool (BE); *yonga*.  
**jurifc** see **juriš** (BR).  
**juriš** *n* attack (LT); *yürüyüş*; **jurifc**.  
**juriti** *v* to attack (LA); *juriš*.

## K

**kadar/kader** *adj* capable, able; *kadir*;  
**kadur**.  
**kadija** *n* Sharia judge (LA, BE); *kadı*.  
**kadiluk** *n* area a **kadija** oversaw (LA, BE); *kadılık*.  
**kadinski** *adj* adjectival form of **kadija** (LA, BE).  
**kadur** see **kadar** (DO).  
**kafaz** *n* 1) cage; 2) wooden bars or lattice work covering windows (LA, BE); *kafes*.  
**kaftandžibaša** *n* court official responsible for kaftans (BE); *kaftancı + başı*.  
**kaharba** *n* sorrow (RP); *ᵀkahır + sba*.  
**kailj** understanding, willing (MA, BE); *kail*.  
**kajmekan** *n* vizier's representative in a government or other position (LA, BE); *kaymakam*.  
**kalčina** *n* knee socks (MA); *kalçın*.  
**kalif** *n* head of all Muslims in the world, or of one greater region (LA); *halife*.  
**kalpak** *n* 1) soldier's hat whose brim is made of fur; 2) helmet (MA, LA); *kalpak*.  
**kamiš** *n* long-stemmed pipe (BE); *kamiş*; **kamišc**.  
**kamišc** see **kamiš** (DO).  
**kanat** *n* wing of a bird, door or window (LT); *kanad*.  
**kanbeledia** *n* member of a group of men or horses (BR); *kanbele + cĀ*.  
**kandžija** *n* bat, stick (BE); *kamcı*.  
**kanli** *n* bloody (LA); *kanlı*.

**kanun** *n* governmental law (BE); *kanun*.  
**kapak** *n* door (LT); *kapak*.  
**kapetanluk** *n* area that a captain oversees (BE); *kapetan + lĀk*.  
**kapia** see **kapija** (BR).  
**kapičehaja** *n* official who represented the governor in the Ottoman empire; see **čehaja** (BE).  
**kapidžija** *n* porter, valet (LA, BE); *kapıcı*.  
**kapidžiler-buljugbaša** *n* **kapidžiler** is the plural of **kapidžija** in Turkish; **buljugbaša** is a commander: head doorman (BE).  
**kapija** *n* door or gate (LA, BE); *kapı*;  
**kapija**.  
**kapijaš** *n* gatekeeper (BE); **kapija**.  
**karščianluk** see **krstjanluk** (BR).  
**karštjanluk** see **krstjanluk** (DO).  
**kasap(a)** *n* butcher (BE); *kasap*.  
**kašika** *n* spoon (RR, MA); *kaşık*.  
**katil** *n* murderer or criminal (LA, BE); *katil*.  
**kaur** see **đaur** (BE).  
**kaurski** *adj* adjectival form of **kaur** (BE).  
**kava/kahva** *n* coffee (LA, BE); *kahve*.  
**kavga** argument or fight (LA, BE); *kavga*.  
**kavi** *adj* noble (BE); *kavi*: firm, strong.  
**kazančija**<sup>4</sup> *n* coppersmith (BE); *kazancı*.  
**kesa** *n* 1) bag or purse; 2) wallet; 3) specific amount of money (LA); *kese*;  
**kefa, keffa**.  
**kefa** see **kesa** (LN).  
**kesedžija** *n* 1) executioner (decapitator); 2) thief (BE); *kesici*.  
**keffa** see **kesa** (BR, RP).  
**komora** *n* means of transporting goods, usually by cart or horse for the benefit of the army (LA, BE); *komora*.  
**komšija** *n* neighbour (DI); *komşu*;  
**konshia**.

<sup>4</sup> In standard Bosnian, this word is *kazandžija*.

**komšilik** *n* neighbourhood; *komşuluk*;  
**konshilik, konšilik.**  
**konagdžija** *n* guest who spends the night (BE); *konakçı*.  
**konak** *n* 1) inn; 2) one-day trip or one-night stay; 3) home of an affluent person (BR, LA, BE, IL); *konak*.  
**konshia** see **komšija** (LN).  
**konshilik** see **komšilik** (IL).  
**konšilik** see **komšilik** (BE).  
**kreč** *n* whitewash (LA); *kireç*.  
**krstjanluk** *n* area of a city or town where the Christian community lives (BE); *krstjan* + *lĭk*; **karffchianluk**; **karftjanluk**.  
**kršla** *n* army barrack (BE); *kışla*.  
**kujundžija** *n* goldsmith (BE); *kuyumcu*.  
**kula** *n* 1) fort or fortress; 2) tower (DI, PO, RR, BR, LA, LT, LN, BE); *kule*; **kulla**.  
**kulčaus** lower official in the janissary army (BE); see **čajuš**.  
**kulla** see **kula** (RR).  
**kulugdžija** *n* commander of the night guards (BE); *kul ođlu* + *cĭ*.  
**kulušci** *n* type of weapon (BE); *kiliç*.  
**kurisati** *n* to make, to wind (BE); *kurmak*.  
**kurjuk** *n* animal's tail (LT, LN); *kuyruk*.  
**kuskun** *n* 1) belt fastened under a horse's tail to keep the saddle from sliding; 2) ribbon or string of wool attaching to a woman's braid to keep her hat in place (LA, BE); *kuskun*.  
**kusur** *n* flaw, mistake (BE); *kusur*.  
**kutia** see **kutija** (BR).  
**kutija** *n* box (BE); *kutu*; **kutia**.

**L**  
**lagum** *n* land mine (LA, BE); *lâğun*.  
**lagumdžija** *n* one who places land mines (BE); *lâğuncu*.  
**lakrdija** *n* gossip, silly talk (BE); *lakırdı*.  
**lala** *n* tulip (BE); *lale*.

**leš** *n* corpse (BE); *leş*.  
**leventa** *n* handsome, strong youth (BE); *levend*.  
**lula** *n* pipe (DO, LA); *lüle*.

**M**  
**mahala** *n* neighbourhood (DI); *mahalle*.  
**mahalbaša** *n* senior or respected person in a mahala (a part of a city or village, quarter) (LA); *mahalle başı*.  
**mahmaricza** see **maramica** (IL).  
**mahmuranje** *n* hangover (LT); *mahmur*: having a hangover.  
**mahzar** *n* collective request or complaint, appeal or petition from the people to the higher Turkish authorities; 2) report (BE); *mahzar*.  
**majdan** *n* mine where minerals and stones are removed (LA); *maden*.  
**makaze** *n* scissors (LT); *makas*.  
**makul** *adj* reasonable, fair (BE); *makul*.  
**makuldžija** *n* understanding, rational person (BE); **makul**.  
**malícana** *n* temporary gathering of goods for the ruler (BE); *malikâne*.  
**mamuza** *n* spur worn on one's shoe (LT, LN); *mahmuz*.  
**manjgura/mangar** *n* 1) small copper Turkish coin which was forged for the first Ottoman sultans; 2) copper coin of varied value: money, change (LA, BE); *mangır*.  
**marama** *n* towel or scarf (LN, MA); *mahrâma*.  
**maramica** *n* diminutive of **marama**; **mahmaricza, maramicza**.  
**maramicza** see **maramica** (DO, IL).  
**marifet** *n* skill (BE); *marifet*.  
**matara** *n* travel vessel for water, usually made of leather or tin (LA); *matara*.  
**mazgal** *n* window or opening in a building from which a gun can be fired (BE); *mazgal*.  
**mazul** *adj* dethroned, deposed (LA, BE); *mazul*.

- meaf** *adv* gratis (BE); *muaf*.
- meana** see **mejhana** (LN).
- mečit** *adj* small mosque which usually does not have a minaret and an ablution fountain. *Džuma* (Friday afternoon prayer) and *Bajram* prayers may not be said there (LA); *mescid*.
- medžer/meder** *conj* but, nevertheless (BE); *međer*.
- mehana** see **mejhana** (LN).
- mehćema/meščema/mehkema** *n* court, the court building (LA, BE); *mehkeme*.
- meidan** see **mejdan** (RP, RR).
- mejdan** *n* large open space in a city: a field or square (RP, RR, BR, LA, LT, LN); *meydan*; **meidan**.
- mejhana** *n* inn (LA); *meyhane*; **meana**, **mehana**.
- menzil** *n* 1) Tartar postal service in the Ottoman Empire; 2) Tartar horse which brought the mail (LA, BE); *menzil*.
- menzil-čatal** *n* postman (BE); see **menzil**; **čatal**: *čatalı*: formulary.
- mestva** *n* soft leather heel-less shoes worn at home (BE); *mest + sva*.
- meščemski** *n* adjectival form of **mehćema** (LA, BE).
- metručat** *n* abandonment (BE); *metrukiet*.
- milćile** *adj* with property (BE); *mülk + le*.
- minder** *n* seat cushion filled with straw or wool (BE); *minder*.
- minten** *n* shirt (BE); *mintan*.
- miraščija** *n* inheritor (BE); *mirasçı*.
- mirija** *n* property belonging to the state (BE); *miri*.
- miser** *n* Egyptian (BE); *mısır*; **miffir**.
- misirlija** *adj* Egyptian (LA); *mısırli*.
- misirski** *adj* adjectival form of **misir** (BE).
- miffir** see **miser** (BR).
- mubašir** *n* messenger, herald (LA, BE); *mübašir*.
- muftija** *n* most senior imam in an area (LA, BE); *müftü*.
- muhafeza** *n* protecting, defending, protection (BE); *muhafaza*.
- muhamedanac** *n* Muslim (LA); *Muhammed*
- muhamedanski** *adj* adjectival form of **muhamedanac** (LA).
- muhur** *n* seal, stamp (LA, BE); *mühür*.
- muka(j)et** *n* cautious, interested (BE); *mukayyet*.
- mukarem** *n* first month in the Muslim year (BE); *Muharrem*.
- mula** *n* 1) learned man, theologian or a **kadija** in a larger city; 2) title the sultan gave to individuals for exceptional scholarly or theological work; 3) title given to anyone who has attended religious school (LA, BE); *mülla*.
- munara** *n* minaret (LA, BE); *minare*.
- murad/murat** *n* wish, goal (BE); *murad/murat*.
- murasela** *n* epistle, official invitation or decree from the **kadija** (LA, BE); *mürasele*.
- murleisati/muhurleisati** *v* to stamp (BE); *mühürlemek*.
- musafir** *n* guest or traveler (LA, BE); *misafir*.
- muselez/musezez** *n* must (grape juice before or during fermentation) (BE); *müselles*.
- muselim** *n* synonym for **kajmekan** (LA, BE); *müsellim*.
- muselimluk** *n* area that a **muselim** oversaw (LA, BE); *muselimlik*.
- museveda** *n* 1) hand-written document (LA, BE); *müsevedde*: draft.
- mushtulukçija** see **muštulukčija** (LT).
- muštulukčija** *n* one who first bears good news and therefore deserves *muštuluk* (reward) (LT); *muštulukçu*.

**mute/muta/mufte/mukte** *adv* for free (BE); *müft*.  
**mutlak** *adv* absolutely (BE); *mutlak*.  
**muvela** *n* representative (LA, BE); *müvellâ*.  
**muzevir** *n* meddler or mischief-maker (DI, LA); *müzevir*.

## N

**nabaška** *adj* 1) separated, apart; 2) different, other (BR, DO); **baška**: *baška*.  
**nahija** *n* parish that is smaller than a **kadiluk**. Two or more **nahija** make up a **kadiluk** (LA, BE); *nahiye*.  
**nahoš** *adj* weak, ill (BE); *nahoš*.  
**naip** *n* **kadija**'s representative or substitute; a substitute or representative in an executive office (LA); *naib*.  
**nal-karan** *n* nickname for an especially strong person; (BE); *nal + kiran*: horseshoe + participle of *kırmak*: to break.  
**nefer** *n* 1) foot soldier; 2) ordinary citizen (LA, BE); *nefer*.  
**nizam** *n* law, order (BE); *nizam*.  
**nobetile** *adv* in shifts, rounds, order (BE); *nöbeteli +le*.

## O

**obataliti** *v* to ruin, soil, corrupt (BE, DO); *battal*: large and clumsy, invalid.  
**oda** *n* room (IL); *oda*.  
**odbašiti** *v* to deprive a **baša** of his title and wealth (BE); **baša**.  
**odilamiti** *v* 1) to revoke an **ilam**; 2) to carry out an **ilam** (LA, BE); **ilam**.  
**odobaša** *n* commander of the janissaries (BE); *oda başı*.  
**odžak** *n* house, home, family, relation (LA, BE); *ocak*.  
**ograjisati** *n* to experience hardship, to suffer (BE); *uğramak*.

**oka** *n* measurement having the weight of one kilo and 28 dkg (BE); *okka*.  
**oluk** *n* tin gutter (BE); *oluk*.  
**ordija** *n* army (BE); *ordu*.  
**orta** *n* battalion (BE); *orta*.  
**ortak** *n* companion or colleague (LA); *ortak*.  
**osakatiti** *n* to make lame; to hurt (LN); **sakat**; **offakatiti**.  
**osmanliski** *adj* Ottoman (BE); *osmanlı*.  
**offakatiti** see **osakatiti** (LN).

## P

**pamuk** *n* cotton (DI, BE); *pamuk*.  
**papaz** *adj* priest (BE); *papaz*.  
**papuča** see **papuča** (RP).  
**papuča** *n* slipper (BE); *pabuç*; **papuča**.  
**papučija/papudžija** *n* tradesman who makes slippers (BE); *pabuççu*.  
**para** *n* 1) money; 2) change; 3) fortieth of a **groš**; 4) hundredth of a dinar (BE, IL); *para*.  
**parabar** see **barabar** (BR).  
**paralaisati** *v* to break or tear apart into pieces (BE); *paralamak*.  
**parmak** *n* finger, bar, spoke (BE); *parmak*.  
**palca** see **paša** (BR).  
**paša** *n* pasha: the title for a high dignitary or military officer (the rank of a general), but not in religious hierarchy (LA, LT, BE); *paşa*; **palca**.  
**pašalija** *n* person in the service of a pasha (BE); *paşalı*.  
**pašaluk** *n* area that a pasha that oversees (BE); *paşalık*.  
**pašinski** *adj* adjectival form of **paša** (LA, LT, BE).  
**pazar** *n* bazaar (BE, BR, IL, LN); *pazar*.  
**pazarisšte** see **pazarište** (BR).  
**pazarište** *n* market or trade area; *ᵗpazar + šište*; **pazarisšte**.  
**pencxer** see **pendžer** (BR).  
**pendžer** *n* window (LA, BE); *pencere*; **pencxer**.

**perčin** *n* hair; *perçem*; **perçin**.  
**perçin** see **perçin** (LT, LN).  
**perde** *n* curtains (BR, LN); *perde*.  
**pesckir** see **peškir** (MA).  
**peškeš** *n* present, gift (BE); *peškeš*.  
**peškir** *n* towel (MA); *peškir*; **pesckir**.  
**pirinač** *n* brass (BE); *pirinç*.  
**poaračiti** *v* to spend (BE); *harcmak*;  
**poharcsiti**.  
**poavšten** *adj* caught (BE); from **apstiti**  
**pobudaliti** *v* to go crazy (LN, DO);  
**budala**.  
**pod-paša** *n* second-in-line-to the pasha  
(LA, BE); *spod + 1paša*.  
**podharačiti** *v* to subject to paying **harač**  
(LA); **harač**.  
**poharcsiti** see **poaračiti** (BR).  
**pogača** *n* bread; *poğaç*: pastry.  
**pogača** see **pogača** (LN).  
**pošišećen** *adj* having a ceiling (BE.); *şiş*.  
**prangija** *n* small cannon (LA); *frengi*.  
**priteslimiti** *v* to hand over (BE); **teslim**.  
**proesabiti** *v* to reckon, understand (BE);  
*hesap*.  
**pusat** *n* weapon of no specific kind  
(BE); *pusat*.

## R

**raja** *n* 1) non-Muslims as a collective; 2)  
group of friends or people united by  
something in common (BE); *râya*.  
**rakia** see **rakija** (DI, DO).  
**rakija** *n* brandy (LA); *rakı*; **rakia**.  
**ramazan/ramadan** *n* Ramadan (BR,  
LA); *ramazan*.  
**ramazanski** *adj* relating to Ramadan  
(BE).

## S

**sabah** *n* 1) dawn; 2) the first morning  
prayer in Islam (BE); *sabah*.  
**sač** *n* metal pan and covering used over  
and under coals (BE); *saç*.

**safi** *adv* 1) exactly, just, completely;  
correct, right; 2) clean, innocent (BE);  
*sâfi*.  
**sahan** *n* copper bowl or plate (BE);  
*sahan*.  
**sahat** *n* hour (LA, BE); *saat*; **saht**, **faht**,  
**fahat**.  
**saht** see **sahat** (IL).  
**saib/sahib** *n* 1) proprietor (BE); *sahib*.  
**sakat** *n* 1) cripple, invalid; *adj* 2) lame,  
crippled, injured (LA, BE); *sakat*.  
**sandučić** *n* diminutive form of **sanduk**  
(BE).  
**sanduk** *n* small wooden chest or box  
(LT, LN); *sandık*.  
**sandžija** *n* cramps (BE); *sancı*.  
**saraili** *n* person native to Sarajevo (RP);  
*saraylı*.  
**saruk** *n* piece of cloth tied around a fez  
or other type of hat (BE); *sarik*.  
**sceer** see **šehar** (BR).  
**sebdisati** *v* to love, respect (BE);  
*sevmek*.  
**seferija** *n* military campaign (BE);  
*seferi*: prepared for war.  
**sejmen** *n* member of one type of  
janissary unit; 2) guard (LA, BE);  
*seymen*.  
**seksenije** *n* eighty strikes (BE); *1seksan*  
+ *sije*.  
**selamaga** *n* master of ceremony (BE);  
*selâm ağası*.  
**senet** *n* document (BE); *senet*.  
**serasker/seraščer** *n* head high  
commander; only the Grand Vizier  
was above him (LA, BE); *serasker*.  
**serdar** *n* leader, head, commander (LA,  
BE); *serdar*.  
**serhat** *n* border, area around a border  
(BE); *serhat*.  
**sidžil** *n* 1) stamp, seal; 2) court protocol  
(LA, BE); *sicil*.  
**sidžilile-udžetile** *n* court protocol with  
court corrections (BE); *sicili* +  
*hüccetile*.

**siladar/silivtar/silihtar** *n* officer in charge of the upkeep of the vizier's or pasha's weapons (LA); *silâhtar*.  
**sindžir** *n* chain (LA, BE); *zincir*; **finçir**, **finger**, **finxir**, **finxyr**.  
**sindžirdžija** *n* prison warden (BE); *sincirci*.  
**sindžirlije** *n* two or more cannon balls attached to each other by a chain (BE); *sincirli*.  
**sirće** *n* vinegar (RR); *sirke*; **firche**.  
**skela** *n* harbor (LA); *iskele*.  
**sofra/sopra** *n* table (LA); *sofra*.  
**sokak** *n* street (BE); *sokak*.  
**somun** *n* loaf of bread; *somun*; **fomun**.  
**somunčić** *n* bread (LA); <sub>T</sub>*somun* + <sub>S</sub>*čić*.  
**spahija** *n* 1) stableman who in the case of war was obligated to go to battle in the cavalry; 2) more affluent Muslim native to Bosnia and Herzegovina (LA, BE); *sipahi*.  
**subaša** *n* overseer or inspector (LA); *subaşı*.  
**sultan** *n* sultan (BR, LA, BE); *sultan*.  
**sunder** *n* sponge; *sünđer*; **sunđer**.  
**sunđer** see **sunder** (LT, LN).  
**surgun** *n* exile, banishment (LA, BE); *sürgün*.  
**surisati/ sursatiti**<sup>5</sup> *v* to exile, banish (LA, BE); *sürmek*.

## f

**faht** see **sahat** (LN).  
**fakat** see **sakat** (LN).  
**landuk** see **sanduk** (LN).  
**finçir** see **sindžir** (LN).  
**finger** see **sindžir** (LN, RR).  
**finxir** see **sindžir** (BR, LN).  
**finxyr** see **sindžir** (LN).  
**firche** see **sirće** (RR).  
**fomun** see **somun** (LN).  
**fumbul** see **zumbul** (RP).

<sup>5</sup> According to the editors of Lašvanin, this second spelling exists only in his chronicle.

## f

**fahat** see **sahat** (DO).  
**fakat** see **sakat** (DO, LN).  
**fcerbet** see **šerbet** (BR).

## š

**šait/šahit** *n* witness (BE); *šahit*.  
**šaitluk** *n* testimony, witnessing (BE); *šahitlik*.  
**šaškin** *adj* 1) aghast, shocked, terrified; *n* 2) terrified person (BE); *šaškin*.  
**šehar/šeker** *n* large city (LA, BE); community outside of a town where merchants live and sell their goods (BR); *šehir*.  
**šehit** *n* Muslim who dies heroically in battle; martyr (LA); *šehit*.  
**šejh** *n* head or most senior man (LA); *šeyh*.  
**šejh-ul-islam** *n* most senior Muslim dignitary in the Ottoman Empire (BE); *šeyhülislâm*.  
**šenluk** *n* gaiety, celebrating by shooting rifles (BE); *šenlik*.  
**šerbet** *n* sweet non-alcoholic beverage; *šerbet*; **fcerbet**.  
**šeret** *n* brazen-faced, cunning (BE); *šeremet*.  
**šičajet** *n* complaint, grievance (BE); *šikayet*.  
**šimlje/šindra** *n* house shingles (BE); *šendere*.  
**šiše** *n* molded or planed lath (BE); *šiše*.  
**šukunded** *n* great-grandfather, forefather (LT); *Šukri* (male name) + first component of *kökün* (foundation) + <sub>BO</sub>*djed*.

## T

**taban** *n* 1) bottom part of one's foot; 2) foot as a measurement (RR, LA); *taban*.  
**tabaniti** *v* to beat the bottom of a person's feet with a stick (BE); **taban**.

**tabi biti** *v* to be under someone's authority (BE); *tabi*.

**tabor** *n* battalion (LA, LN, BE); *tabur*.

**taht** *n* throne (LA); *taht*.

**tain/tajin** *n* military meal or food supplies (BE); *tayin*.

**taksil** *n* tribute (LA, BE); *tahsil*.

**talambas/daulbaz** *n* 1) type of drum; 2) drumming (LT, LN); *daulbaz*.

**taman** *adv* 1) completely; 2) exactly, just (DI); *tamam*.

**tamir** *n* repair (BE); *tamir*.

**taš** *n* stone (BE); *taş*.

**tava** *n* baking sheet (LT); *tava*.

**tavan** *n* attic (LT); *tavan*.

**teftedar/tevtedar** *n* head of finances in a vilajet (BE); *defter + dar*.

**tefter/tevter** *n* notebook, register, protocol (BE); *defter*.

**tefterčehaja/tevterčehaja** *n* assistant to the teftedar (BE); see **tefter** and **čehaja**.

**teftiš/tevtiš** *n* 1) inspection, assessment; 2) inspector (LA, BE); *teftiş*.

**teftišiti/tevtišiti** *v* to inspect, assess (LA, BE); *teftiş/tevtiş*.

**teftişlema/tevtişlema** *n* inspection, assessment, overview (LA); *teftişleme*.

**teftişlemiti/tevtişlemiti** *v* to inspect, to assess (BE); *tevtişlema*.

**tel** *n* string (BE); *tel*.

**telal** *n* 1) messenger, herald; 2) selling by shouting out one's good (LT, BE); *tellâl*.

**telalle** *adv* by shouting or calling out (LT, LN); *tellâl + IE*.

**telbiz** *n* evil, sly, cunning person (LA); *telbis*.

**tembi** *n* command or prohibition (BE); *tembih*.

**temesuć** *n* written confirmation (BE); *temessük*.

**tepsija** *n* round copper dish used for baking; *tepsi*; **tepfija**.

**tepfija** see **tepsija** (DO).

**terza** *n* tailor (BE); *terza* is the diminutive form of *terzi*.

**teskera** *n* epistle, document, confirmation, invitation (LA, BE); *tezkere*.

**teskerdžija** *n* officer who issued a **teskera** (LA); *tezkereci*.

**teslim** *n* handing-over or surrender (BE); *teslim*.

**teslimija** *n* handing over; surrendering (BE); *teslime*.

**tevdicile** *adj* dressed in different clothes, incognito (BE); *tebdil + IE*.

**tobati**<sup>6</sup> see **tabaniti** (BE).

**toljaga/tojaga** *n* bat, big stick (LA, BE); *toyğa*.

**top** *n* 1) cannon (LA, BE) 2) large roll of linen or other kind of fabric (BE); *top*.

**topal** *n* person with a limp (LA); *topal*.

**topčaga** *n* commander in charge of cannons (LA); *topçu agaşı*.

**topuz** *n* mace, spiked club (LA, BE); *topuz*.

**torba** *n* purse or bag that can be worn on one's shoulder (BR, LA, LN); *torba*.

**torbica** *n* diminutive of **torba**; **torbicza**.

**torbicza** see **torbica** (IL).

**tuć** *n* bronze (BE); *tunç*.

**tufekdžija/tufegdžija** *n* gunsmith (LA); *tüfekçi*.

**turbe** *n* mausoleum, a covered grave (LA, BE); *türbe*.

**turbički** *adj* adjectival form of **turbe** (BE).

## U

**uapstiti** *v* to imprison (BE); **apst/avst**.

**ucxera** see **udžera** (BR).

<sup>6</sup> The editor of Benić's chronicle suggests that Benić uses *tobati* for *tabaniti*. This conclusion is based on context, not on phonology.

**uĉtuglija** *n* pasha or vizier who wears three horses tails as a sign prestige (LA, BE); *üĉtuglu*.  
**uĉtuglinski** *adj* adjectival form of **uĉtuglija** (BE).  
**uĉum** *n* head governing office (BE); *hüküm*.  
**udžera** *n* room (BE); *hücre*; **ucxera**; **ugera**.  
**udžerica** *n* diminutive of **udžera** (LT).  
**udžet** *n* court ruling, sentence or correction (LA, BE); *hüccet*.  
**ugera** see **udžera** (RR, LT, LN).  
**uharaĉiti** *v* to tax (LA); **haraĉ**.  
**ujdurisati** *v* to fob off (BE); *uydurmak*.  
**ujoguniti** *v* to suit (LN); *uygun*.  
**ulak** *n* messenger or postman (LA, BE); *ulak*.  
**ulĉek** *n* 40 **oka** (BE); *ölĉek*.  
**ulefa** *n* salary, earnings, usually in the military (LA, BE); *ulûfe*.  
**ulem** *n* student of Islam (LA, BE); *ulema*.  
**usidžiliti** *v* to register, to take protocol (LA, BE); **sidžil**.  
**ušur** *n* tax consisting of one-tenth of one's land (BE); *öş(ur)*.  
**uzapstiti** *v* to conquer (BE); *zapt*: conquest, capture.

## V

**vakuf** *n* endowment, foundation (BE); *vakıf*.  
**vakupski** *adj* adjectival form of **vakuf** (BE).  
**valah** *inter* my God! (BE); *vallahi*.  
**vatan** *n* homeland (BE); *vatan*.  
**veĉil** *n* plenipotentiary (BE); *vekil*.  
**vergili** *n* tribute, tax (BE); *vergi*.  
**vezir** *n* vizier (LA, BE); *vezir*.  
**vezirski** *adj* adjectival form of **vezir** (LA, BE).  
**vezirstvo** *n* capacity of being a **vezir** (LA, BE).  
**vilaet** see **vilajet** (LT, LN, DO).

**vilajet** *n* 1) region or province; 2) one's homeland (BE, LA); *vilayet*.  
**vilajetski** *adj* adjectival form of **vilajet** (LA, DO, BE).

## X

**xighericza** see **džigerica** (LN).

## Y

**yeĉek** see **jedžek** (RR).

## Z

**zaašikovati** to fall in love with (LA); *aşık*: in love, lover.  
**zaer** see **zahira/zaira** (LN).  
**zahira/zaira** *n* food (LA, BE); *zahire*; **zaer**.  
**zahiredžija** *n* servant who was in charge of food (LA); *zahireci*.  
**zaim** *n* person who owns significant livestock (LA, BE); *zaım*.  
**zanaĉia** see **zanaĉija** (LT, LN);  
**zanaĉija** *n* tradesman; *zanaĉı*; **zanaĉie**.  
**zanat** craft, trade, profession, job (DI, RP, RR, BR, LA, LT, LN, DO, BE); *zanat*.  
**zanatli** *n* skilled (RP); *zanatlı*.  
**zapĉija** *n* police officer (BE); *zaptıye*.  
**zarar** *n* pity, loss, damage (BE); *zarar*.  
**zateševski** *n* inspected; assessed (BE); **teftiš/tevtiš**.  
**zendil** *adj* rich, wealthy (BE); *zenginli*.  
**zendiliji** *n* rich person (BE); *zenginli*.  
**zindan** *n* prison (BE); *zindan*.  
**zohr** see **zor** (IL).  
**zor** *n* force, torture, violence (BE); *zor*; **zohr**.  
**zorba** *n* violence, terror (BE); *zorba*.  
**zulum** *n* injustice, violence, terror (BE; LA); *zulüm*.  
**zulumĉar** *n* one who carries out violence (LA, BE); *zulümĉär*.  
**zulumiti** *v* to carry out violence; to terrorise (BE; LA); **zulum**.  
**zumbul** *n* hyacinth (BR); *sümbül*.



## Appendix II: Glossary of Turkish Loanwords in Bulgarian

Turkish loanwords are listed in the pre-modern spelling(s) in which they occur in the texts analysed. The loanwords from the supplementary materials in Cyrillic are transliterated. All spelling variants of a loanword are listed. Definitions of the word are listed only under the entry which occurs first alphabetically, with the exception of words spelled with initial <c> for /k/, in which case, these words are listed under K. Following the English translation of the word, or the cross-reference to the entry where the word is listed, the work in which the word occurs is given. If the word is not a derivative of a *turkism* already listed, the original Turkish word is given in modern Turkish spelling in italics immediately following the definition of the term and references; otherwise, the root *turkism* is given in bold. Each derivative has its own entry. When an entry contains a word listed in the glossary, this word is in bold. I primarily depended on Grannes et al. (2005) to make this glossary.

### A

**abardžia** *n* herald, messenger (780);

*haberci*; **abergia**, **habercie**.

**abergia** see **abardžia** (780).

**acik** *adj* 1) open; 2) light coloured (778, 779); *açık*.

**aciktan** *adv* from a distance (779); *açıktan*.

**ada** *n* island (SN); *ada*.

**adet** *n* custom, practice (778, 779, 780); *adet*; **adit**.

**adit** see **adet** (780).

**aenin**<sup>?</sup> *adv* likewise, exactly (Sof., SN); *aynen*; **ajanin**.

**aenlak** *n* sameness (Sof., SN); *aynılık*.

**aferam**<sup>?</sup> *inter* bravo, well done (Troj.); *aferim*.

**aga** *n* lord or master (778, 779); *ağa*.

**agaba** *inter* perhaps, I wonder (779); *acaba*.

**agiadissa** *v* 1) to hurt, torture; 2) to pity (778, 779, 780); *acımak*.

**ahenk** *n* merry-making (779); *ahenk*: harmony.

**ailak** *adj* idle; unemployed (778, 779); *aylak*.

**ajanin** see **aenin**<sup>?</sup>.

**akal** *n* 1) reason, intelligence; 2) mind, comprehension, memory; 3) idea,

opinion; *adj* 1) intelligent, clever (778, 779, 780); *akıl*.

**akallia** *adj* reasonable, intelligent, wise (779); *akıllı*.

**akibet** *n* outcome, result (779); *akibet*.

**alai** *n* 1) military procession; 2) a regiment (778, 779, 780); *alay*; **alaj**.

**alaj** see **alai** (779).

**alascverisc** *n* commerce, shopping (779); **aliscverisc**; *alışveriş*.

**alascveriscie** *n* merchant (779); *alışverişçi*; **aliscverscie**.

**alciaak** *adj* vile, mean (778, 779); *alçak*.

**aliscverisc** see **alascverisc** (778).

**aliscverscia** see **alascveriscia** (778).

**aliverdissa** *v* to buy, trade (779); *alivermek*.

**allasctissa** *v* to become accustomed to; to get used to (780); *alışmak*.

**altan** *n* gold (779); *altın*.

**ama** *conj* 1) but; *inter* 2) oh! (778, 779); *ama*.

**aman** *inter* 1) oh! ah! for goodness sake! (778, 779); *aman*.

**ambar** *n* granary (780); *ambar*; **hambar**, **hanbar**.

**ami** see **ama** (Tix., Troj., Sviš., 779, 780, Sof.).

**amir** *adj* superior (Tix., SN); *amir*.

**angek** *adv* 1) only; *conj* 2) but, however (780); *ancak*; **angiak**.

**angiak** see **angek** (778, 779).  
**aneria** *n* robe (779); *entari*.  
**aralak** *n* gap, opening (779); *aralık*.  
**arkallia** *adj* supported (779); *arkalı*: 1) broad-backed; 2) who has a supportive friend or back.  
**arlak** *n* bashfulness (778); *arlık*.  
**arnaut** *n* Albanian (Sof.); *arnavut*.  
**arnautski** *adj* adjectival form of **arnaut** (Sof.).  
**artak** *adv* 1) left, remaining; 2) no longer (778, 779); *artık*.  
**artissa** *v* to remain; to be no more (778, 779); *artmak*.  
**asia** *n* rebel (778, 779); *asi*; **assia**.  
**asker** *n* army (778, 779); *asker*.  
**aslan** *n* 1) lion; *adj* 2) brave; 3) heroic (778, 779); *aslan*; **aslin**, **raslan**.  
**aslin** see **aslan** (778).  
**assia** see **asia** (779).  
**at** *n* horse or stallion (779); *at*.  
**atlia** *n* horseman (779); *atlı*.  
**avania** *n* guard (779); *avn*.  
**azgan** *adj* lustful (780); *azgın*.

## B

**baadarlak** *n* brave action (779); *bahadırılık*.  
**badem** *n* almond (779); *bajam*.  
**bahcia** *n* garden (778, 779, 780); *bahçe*.  
**bahcivangia** *n* gardener; (779); *bahçıvan*.  
**baht** *n* luck (778, 779); *baht*.  
**bahtel** *adj* lucky (780); *bahtlı*.  
**bahtina** *n* fortune, luck (779);  $\uparrow$ *baht* + *s-ina*.  
**baialdisa** *v* to shout, cry out (780); *bağırmaq*; **bajaldissa**.  
**bair** *n* wasteland or desert (778, 779); *bair*.  
**bairak** *n* flag (778, 779, 780); *bayrak*.  
**bairaktarin** *n* standard-bearer (779);  $\uparrow$ *bayrakdar/bayraktar* + *s-in*.  
**bairam** *n* Eid (Sof.); *Bayram*.  
**bajaldissa** see **baialdisa** (778, 779).

**bakscisc** *n* gift, often money (779); *bahşiş*.  
**balakcia** *n* fisherman (778, 779); *balıkçı*.  
**balgame** *n* mucus, phlegm, gall (778); *balgam*.  
**bara** *adv* at least (779); *bari*; **barem**.  
**barabar** *adv* together (778, 779, 780); *beraber*; **borabar**.  
**barasciak** *n* peace making (778, 779); *barışık*: at peace, reconciled.  
**barascitissa** *v* to make peace (778, 779); *barışmak*.  
**barem** *adv* at least (778, 779, 780); *bari*.  
**basc** *adv* head or chief official (778, 779, 780); *baş*.  
**basciardissa** *v* to achieve, to manage (778, 779); *başarmak*.  
**bascka** *adj* 1) separate; 2) different; *inter* 3) except (778, 779, 780); *başka*.  
**baša** *n* leader; *baş*.  
**bazaria** *n* market (778); *bazaar*.  
**bazirghian** *n* merchant (780); *bazargân*.  
**beg** *n* bey (778, 779); *beğ*.  
**beghlicski** *adj* belonging to a nobleman (779); *beglik* + *-ski*.  
**beiski** *adj* adjectival form of **beg**.  
**bej** see **beg**.  
**bejendisova** *v* to like (780); *beğenmek*.  
**belek** *n* mountain pass (780); *belek*.  
**belki** *inter* maybe, perhaps (778, 779, 780); *belkim*; **belkim**.  
**belkim** see **belki** (779, 780).  
**belli** *adj* obvious, known (779); *belli*.  
**bellibasc** *adj* main, chief, (778, 779); *bellibaşlı*.  
**bereket** *n* abundance, plenty (779, 780); *bereket*.  
**bereketlia** *adj* blessed, fruitful (779, 780); *bereketli*.  
**bile** *adv* even (778, 779, 780); *bile*.  
**bimbascia** *n* captain (779); *binbaşı*.  
**binisc** *n* long cloak (779); *biniş*.  
**birlik** *n* unity, oneness (779); *birlik*.

**bjuluk'** *n* military company (Sof.); *bölük*.  
**bjuljur** *n* crystal glass (Sviš); *billür*.  
**bjutjun** *adv* fully, completely (Troj.); *bütüm*.  
**boaz** *n* pass, opening (779); *boğaz*.  
**bojuk venedik** *n* Great Venice (779); *büyük vendik*.  
**bojurdissova** *v* to command (779); *buyurmak*.  
**bolluk** *n* herd (779, 780); *bölük*: part, division, section.  
**bonar** see **bunar** (778).  
**borabar** see **barabar** (780).  
**borc** *n* debt (778, 779); *borç*.  
**borclia** *n* one who collects debts (778); *borçlu*.  
**bostančia** *n* field-keeper (Troj., Sof.); *bostancı*.  
**bostančiski** *adj* adjectival form of **bostančia** (Sof.).  
**bozuscitissa** *v* to argue (779); *bozuşmak*.  
**buiruntija** *n* order or written command given by a pasha (Sof.); *buyrultu*.  
**bulandardissa** *v* to cause to be upset (778); *bulandırmak*.  
**buluscissova se** *v* to meet (778, 779); *bulaşmak*.  
**bunar** *n* well, source (779); *bunar*;  
**bonar**.  
**burgiak** *n* common vetch (780); *burçak*.  
**bykria** *n* drunkard (Tix., Troj.); *bekri*.  
**bykriski** *adj* drunk (Tix.); **bykria**.

## C

**cabahat** see **kabaat** (778).  
**cabahatlia** see **kabahatlia** (779, 780)  
**cabil** see **kabil** (779).  
**cabul** see **kabul** (779).  
**cadar** see **kadar** (779);  
**caik** see **kaik** (779).  
**cail** see **kail** (779).  
**cairek** see **kairek** (779).  
**calabalak** see **kalabalak** (779).  
**calai** see **kalai** (779).  
**calcangia** see **kalkangia** (779).

**canlia** see **kanlia** (779).  
**cascmeri** see **kascmeri** (778).  
**caskandissa** see **kaskandisa** (778, 779).  
**cauliski** see **kauliski** (779).  
**cescia** see **kesia** (779).  
**cesme** *n* fountain (778, 780); *çesme*.  
**ciadar** *n* tent (Troj., 779); *çadır*.  
**cialascitissa** *v* to try (778); *çalışmak*: to work, to try; **çalıştisa**.  
**cianta** *n* pouch, bag, purse (779); *çanta*.  
**ciarscaf** *n* sheet or covering (779); *çarşaf*.  
**ciarva** *n* beast of burden (779); *çarva/çarpa*.  
**cift** *n* pair (778, 779); *çift*.  
**cifut** *n* Jew (778, 779, 780); *çifit*.  
**cifutski** *adj* adjectival form of **cifut** (778, 779).  
**cinhadarin** *n* person who is malevolent (778);  $\tau$ *kinhah/kindar* + *şin*: vindictive; malevolent.  
**cioban** *n* shepherd (778); *çoban*; **ciuban**.  
**ciohodar** *n* one of the ruler's intimate servants (779); *çuhadar*: a courtier of the sultan.  
**ciorape** *n* socks (780); *çorap*.  
**ciorba** *n* soup (779); *çorba*.  
**ciorbagia** *n* rich man (778, 779, 780); *çorbacı*: 1) one who makes soups; 2) official receiver and entertainer of guests in a village or town;  
**çorbadžia**.  
**ciorbagiaka** feminine form of **ciorbagia** (780).  
**cioval** *n* sack (779) *çuval*; **ciuval**.  
**ciuban** see **cioban** (778).  
**ciultar** *n* horsecloth (779); *çultar*.  
**ciunki conj** because (778, 779); *çünkü/çünkü*.  
**ciurudissa** *v* to rot, decay (778, 779); *çürümek*.  
**ciuval** see **cioval** (780).  
**colai** see **kolai** (778, 779); **kolaj**.  
**comscia** see **komscia** (779).  
**conak** see **konak** (778, 779).  
**condissa** see **kondissa** (778, 779).

**cordissa** see **kordissa** (779).  
**corsan** see **korsan** (779).  
**cosctissa** see **kosctissa** (779).  
**csiarscia** *n* shopping area (778, 780);  
*çarşı*; **çarşıja**.  
**cula** see **kula** (779).  
**culluk** see **kulluk** (778).  
**cuvet** see **kuvet** (779).  
**cuvetlendissa** see **kuvetlendissa** (779).

## Č

**čaktisa** *v* to steal (Sof.); *çakmak*.  
**čalasštiva** see **cialasctissa** (Sviš).  
**čardak** *n* grand two-storied house with  
gardens, grounds and a summer house  
(Tix., SN); *çardak*.  
**çarşıja** see **csiarscia**.  
**čauš** *n* messenger in the service of the  
king, pasha, vizier, or other high  
commanders; *çavuş*.  
**čelepiski** *adj* gentlemanly (Sof., SN);  
*çelebi*.  
**čerabaša** *n* military commander (SN);  
*çeribaşı*.  
**češit** *n* sort, variety (Sviš.); *çeşit*.  
**čorbadžia** see **ciorbagia** (Sof., SN).

## D

**davrandissa** *v* to get up (778);  
*davranmak*: 1) to rise to action; 2) to  
act, behave; 3) to make or reach for.  
**delia** *n* bold, obstinate youth (Sof.); *deli*:  
crazy.  
**denet** *n* control, supervision (778, 779,  
780); *denet*.  
**develer** *n* camels (779); *develer*: *deve*  
(camel) + *ler* (plural suffix).  
**direk** *n* pillar (778, 779); *direk*.  
**diukkian** *n* shop (779); *dükkan*; **dükian**.  
**diuzdissa** *v* to set up, to put in order  
(779); *düzmek*.  
**diuzen** *n* order (778, 779); *düzen*;  
**düzen**, **dyuzzen**.  
**diuzenlia** *adv* in order, orderly (779);  
*düzenli*.  
**diuzghiun** *adj* long (779); *düzgün*.

**divan** *n* council (778, 779); *divan*.  
**dor** *particle* even, as far, long, etc. as;  
until (780); *doğru*: straight, right.  
**doscman** see **duscmán(in)** (780).  
**dosluk** *n* friendship (779); *dostluk*.  
**dost** *n* friend (778, 780); *dost*.  
**dostasa** *v* to become friends, to be  
friends (779); **dost**.  
**duramagilik** *adv* without stopping,  
incessantly (778); *duramacılık*.  
**duscmán(in)** *n* enemy; (778, 779, 780);  
*duşman*; **doscman**.  
**duscmanka** *n* feminine form of  
**duscmán(in)** (779).  
**duscmánlak** *n* enmity, hatred (779);  
*düşmanlık*; **duscmánlik**.  
**duscmánlia** *adj* enemy (780); *düşmanlı*.  
**duscmánlik** see **duscmánlak**; (778).  
**duscmanski** *adj* adjectival form of  
**duscmán** (778, 779); **duscmán**.  
**duvar** *n* wall (779); *duvar*.  
**dükian** see **diukkian** (778).  
**dülger** *n* carpenter (Tix.); *dülger*.  
**düzen** see **diuzen** (778).  
**dyuzzen** see **diuzen** (780).  
**dželet** *n* blunt javelin (Tix.); *cirit*.

## E

**efendia** *n* effendi (779); *efendi*.  
**eksik** *adj* lacking, insufficient (778,  
779); *eksik*.  
**eksiklik** *n* lack, deficiency (778);  
*eksiklik*.  
**eksildissova** *v* to disappear, to destroy  
completely, to wipe out (779);  
*eksilmek*.  
**elcia** *n* hearld, messenger (778, 779);  
*elçi*.  
**emir** *n* leader (Tix., Sviš.); *emir*.  
**emiš** *n* fruit (778, 779); *yemiş*; **jemisc**,  
**jimisc**.  
**encas** *adv* at least, just (779) *inkaz*.  
**enkiar** *n* abnegation, betrayal (779);  
*inkâr*.  
**esckere** *n* manifest, clear, open; open  
place (778, 780); *eşkera/aşıkare*.

**esckereledissa** *v* to make public; to announce; to appoint (779); *eşkerelemek*.  
**esckil** *n* physical form, figure (778, 779); *eşkâl/şekil*.

## F

**faida** *n* use, advantage (778, 779); *fayda*; **fajda**.  
**fajda** see **faida** (780).  
**falanga** *n* board used to support the feet of a victim of bastinado (Sof.); *falaka*.  
**farlia** *n* rope on a fishing net (778); *faril(li)*.  
**fekilarcia** steward (780); *vekilharç*.  
**fener** *n* lantern (779); *fener*.  
**ferman** *n* official order, decree (778, 779); *ferman*.  
**fermansko** *adv* adverbial form of **ferman** (Tix.).  
**fes** *n* fez (SN); *fez*.  
**fil** *n* elephant (779, 780); *fil*.  
**fornogia** *n* ovenman; a baker (780); *fornaci*.  
**fudul** *adj* 1) virtuous; 2) superior (780); *fadıl/fudala*.  
**furka** *n* military subdivision (779); *fırka*.

## G

**genk** *n* battle (779, 780); *cenk*.  
**genkcia** *n* soldier (779); *cenkçi*.  
**gevap** *n* response (780); *cevap*; **gioap**, **giovab**, **gievap**.  
**ghecit** *n* passageway or road (779); *geçit*.  
**ghemia** *n* boat or ship (779); *gemi*; **ghimia**.  
**ghemidžia** *n* sailor (Tix., Troj., Sviš.); *gemici*.  
**ghercek** *adj* true, real; truly, really; the truth (778, 779, 780); *gerçek*; **ghircik**.  
**ghercekta** *adj* in truth (778); *gerçek+ta*.

**gherejehibi** *adv* as is necessary (779); *gereği gibi*.

**ghetirttissa** *v* to bring (778); *getirmek*.

**ghimia** see **ghemia** (780).

**ghiöl** *n* rose (778); *gül*.

**ghioscterdissova** *v* to show, to seem, to look (778); *göstermek*: to show, indicate, to point out.

**ghiran** *n* difficult situation (780); *giran*: difficult.

**ghircik** see **ghercek** (778).

**ghirdan** *n* necklace (780); *gerdan*: neck, throat.

**ghittikces** *adv* gradually, little by little (780); *gittikçe*.

**ghiucen** *n* 1) difficult; *adj* 2) difficulty (779); *güç*.

**ghiucluk** *n* difficulty, trouble, pain (779); *güçlük*.

**ghiugiune** *adv* by force (779); *gücün*.

**ghiulendissa** *se v* to ridicule; to laugh at (778); *gülünmek*.

**ghiumrük** *n* custom, duty, tariff (778); *gümruk*.

**giavur'(in)** *n* non-Muslim, infidel, Christian (Sof.); *gaur*.

**gievab** see **gevap** (778).

**gigher** *n* liver (779); *ciger*; **giher**.

**giher** see **gigher**(780).

**gillat** *n* executioner (780); *cellat*.

**gioap** see **gevap** (780).

**giovab** see **gevap** (778, 779).

**giumma** *n* community, congregation (779); *cemaat*.

**giummurlen** *adv* all together, in a group (779); *cumhurlen*.

**giumur** *n* crowd or throng of people (778, 779, 780); *cümhür/cumhur*.

**gjumrjukčia** *n* customs (Tix.); *gümruk*.

**gumrukči** *n* customs officer (Sof); *cümrukçi*.

## H

**habar** *n* news, information, message news, message (778, 779); *haber*; **haber**.

**habarcia** see **abargia** (779); *haberçi*.  
**haber** see **habar** (780).  
**hadži** *n* one who has been on a pilgrimage (778, 780, Sof., SN); *hacı*; **hagia**.  
**hagia** see **hadži**; (778, 780);  
**hahamin** *n* rabbi (778, 779); *haham*.  
**haide(te)** *inter* 'let's go' (778, 779); *haydı*.  
**haidutin** *n* bandit (779, 780); *haydut*.  
**hailaski** *adj* frightful (778); *hail*.  
**hain** *n* traitor (780); *hain*.  
**hainan** *n* traitor (778); *hain*.  
**hainlik** *n* treachery, perfidy (778); *hainlik*.  
**hair** *n* goodness, prosperity (778, 779, 780); *hayır*.  
**hairlia** *adj* prosperous, auspicious (780); *hayırlı*.  
**haita** *n* vagabond (779); *hayta*.  
**haivan** *n* animal (778, 779); *hayvan*.  
**haivanski** *adj* adjectival derivative of **haivan** (779).  
**hak** *n* justice (778, 779, 780); *hak*.  
**hal** *n* state, condition, situation (778, 779, 780); *hal*.  
**halaik** *n* servant (779); *halaik*.  
**halal** *adj* simple, pure (780); *halal/helal*: canonically lawful.  
**halalascitissa se** *v* to ask for forgiveness; to say good-bye for good (778); *helallaşmak*.  
**halk** *n* people (778, 779, 780); *halk*.  
**hamarat** *n* hard work; effort (778); *hamarat*; **hamaret**.  
**hamaratlik** *n* state or concept of hard-work (778); *hamaratlık*.  
**hamaret** see **hamarat** (778).  
**hambar** see **ambar** (779).  
**han** *n* inn (778); *hane*: house, building.  
**hanbar** see **ambar** (SN).  
**hangiar** *n* short curved dagger (779); *hancer/hançer*.  
**hanski** *adj* adjectival form of **han**.

**hapus** *n* prisoner (779, 780); *hapis*: 1) confinement, imprisonment; 2) prison; 3) prisoner.  
**hapusbascia** *n* chief prison guard (780); *hapis* (imprisonment) + *başı* (head).  
**har(a)ci** *v* to spend (779, 780); *harcamak*; **harce**.  
**harac** *n* tax or tribute (778, 779); *haraç*; **harač**.  
**haracia** *n* tax collector (778, 779); *haraççı*.  
**harač** see **harac** (Sof.).  
**haračiiski** *adj* adjectival form of **haracia** (Sof.).  
**harc** *n* spending (Sviš.); *haraç*.  
**harce** see **haracia** (779).  
**harem** *n* women's quarters; *harem*.  
**harman** *n* harvest (779); *harman*.  
**hasna** *n* enemy (778); *hasna*.  
**hatar** *n* danger (778, 779, 780); *hatar*.  
**hatayla** *adj* mistaken (778); *hata* (mistake) + *(y)la* (with).  
**hava** *n* air, weather (778, 779); *hava/heva*.  
**havan' top** *n* mortar gun (SN); *havan topu*.  
**hazna** *n* significant wealth (778, 779); *hazine/hazne*: treasure, treasury.  
**hekiem** see **hekim** (779).  
**hekim(in)** *n* doctor (778, 779, 780); *hekim*; **hekiem**.  
**hem(...hem)** *conj* both, as well as (778, 779, 780); *hem...hem*.  
**hemen** *adv* immediately (780); *hemen*.  
**hendek** *n* ditch, trench, gutter (779); *hendek*.  
**hesap** *n* reckoning, reason (778, 779); *hesap*; **hisap**.  
**hic** *n* nothing, not at all (778, 779, 780); *hiç*.  
**hiokium** *n* sentence; (779); *hokum*; **hokium**, **hökium**.  
**hipsa** *adj* whole, entire (778); *hepsi*.  
**hisap** see **hesap** (780).  
**hiuget** *n* deed (779); *hüget*.

**hizmet** *n* service, duty, servitude (779, 780); *hizmet*.  
**hizmetkiarin** *n* servant (778, 779); *hizmetkar*.  
**hizmetkiarka** *n* feminine form of **hizmetkiarka** (778, 779).  
**hizmetuva** *v* to serve (778, 779); **hizmet**.  
**hokium** see **hiokium** (779).  
**hökium** see **hiokium** (778).  
**hozur** *n* peace, rest (780); *huzur*; **huzur**.  
**hudut** border (778); *hudut*.  
**hudula** *se v* to be haughty (780); <sub>BU</sub>*hudul* < *fodul*.  
**huzur** see **hozur** (778).  
**huzuruva** to make peace (779); **huzur**.

## I

**iabangia** *n* 1) foreigner; *adv* 2) abroad; (780); *yabancı*; **jabangia**.  
**ialanisc** *adj* wrong, incorrect (778); *yalniş*.  
**iamik** *n* food, sustenance (779); dialect for *yemek*.  
**iatak** *n* support (778); *yatak*.  
**iki kapulu** double-doored (SN); *iki kapılı*.  
**ikindia** *n* time of afternoon prayer (778); *ikindi*.  
**ikinica** *n* the second, the other (779); *ikinci/çi*.  
**ikram** *n* honour (778, 779); *ikram*.  
**ikramlija** *adj* fruitful (778); *ikramli*.  
**ilendissa** *v* to enjoy oneself (779); *eğlenmek*.  
**iliman** *n* sea port (778); (*i*)*liman*.  
**inat** *adj* obstinate, stubborn (779, 780); *inat*.  
**ingittissa** *v* to hurt, injure, upset (779); *incitmek*.  
**iornek** *n* example (780); *örnek*; **jurnek**, **örnek**.  
**isckelendissova** *v* to be suspicious, to doubt (778); *işkillenmek*.  
**iskazandisa** *v* to work (780); *iş kazanmak*.

**ispatlak** *n* 1) proof, evidence; (780); *ispat*.  
**iuzbascia** *n* military captain (778); *yüzbaşı*; **juzbascia**.  
**izanlia** *adj* thoughtful (778); *izanlı*.  
**izbirden** *adv* all of a sudden (779); *siz + <sub>T</sub>birden*.  
**izin** *n* permission (778, 779); *izin*; **jzin**.  
**izlal** *n* humiliation (778); *izlal*.

## J

**ja...ja** *conj* either...or (779); *ya...ya*.  
**jaban** *n* desert, wilderness (778, 780); *yaban*.  
**jabangia** see **iabangia** (778, 779).  
**jajaldissa** *se v* to spread (778); *yığılmak*.  
**jajan** *adv* on foot (779); *yayan*.  
**jalan** *adj* false, deceitful (779); *yalan*.  
**jalangia** *n* deceptive, deceiving person (778); *yanlancı*.  
**jamurluk** *n* roof over a doorway (779); *yağmurluk*.  
**janiçar** *n* janissary (Sof., SN); *jeniçi*.  
**japia** *n* building, edifice (778, 779); *yapı*.  
**jaralia** *adj* injured, wounded (779); *yaralı*.  
**jardamgia** *n* helper (779); *yardımcı*.  
**jasak** *n* 1) prohibition; *adj* 2) prohibited (779); *yasak*.  
**jasakçija** *n* guard (Sof.); *yasakçı*.  
**jasc** *adj* fresh (779); *yaş*.  
**jemisc** see **emisc** (779).  
**jimisc** see **emisc** (780).  
**joglia** *adj* dead (779); *ölü*; **yoglia**.  
**jureklia** *adj* brave (779); *yürekli*.  
**jurnek** see **iornek** (779).  
**juruusc** *n* military attack (779); *yürüyüş*.  
**juzbascia** see **iuzbascia** (779).  
**jzin** see **izin** (780).

## K

**kabaat** *n* offence, guilt, sin (778); *kabahat*; **cabahat**, **kabahat**.  
**kabahat** see **kabaat** (778, 779, 780).

**kabahatlia** *adj* guilty (779, 780); *kabahatlı; cabahatlia*.  
**kabaik** *n* shameful deed (778); *kabayih*.  
**kabardissan** *adj* swollen (778); *karbarmak*.  
**kabil** *adj* 1) possible; *n* 2) possibility (778, 779, 780) *kabil; cabil*.  
**kabul** *n* agreement, consent (778, 779); *kabul; cabul*.  
**kaciardissa** *v* to drive away (778, 779); *kaçırmak*.  
**kadar** *adv* 1) at that point; *conj* 2) until (778, 779, 780); *kadar*: 1) as much/many as; 2) about, approximately; 3) till, up to, until enough, when; **cadar**.  
**kadia** *n* judge, kadi (779); *kadı*.  
**kadiluk** *n* area a kadi oversees (Tix., Sviš., 779, Sof., SN); *kadılık*.  
**kahar** *n* sorrow (778, 780); *kahır; kair*.  
**kaharlia** *adj* sorrowful (780); *kahırlı*.  
**kaharuva se** *v* to be distressed, upset (778); **kahar**.  
**kaik** *n* boat (778, 779); *kayık; caik*.  
**kail** *n* agreement, consent (778, 779, 780); *kail; cail*.  
**kaimakan** *n* vizier's representative in a government or other position (Sof.); *kaymakam*.  
**kair** see **kahar** (779, 780).  
**kairek** *n* stone (778); *kayrak; cairek*.  
**kal** *n* word, talk, speech (778); *kal*.  
**kalabalak** *n* crowd (778, 779, 780); *kalabalık; calabalak*.  
**kalai** *n* tin (779); *kalay; calai*.  
**kalem** *n* cane (780); *kalem*.  
**kalkangia** *n* warrior (779, SN); *kalkancı calcangia*.  
**kamisc** *n* reed, common reed (779, 780); *kamış*.  
**kanlia** *adj* bloody (778, 780); *kanlı; canlia*.  
**kapia** *n* gate (779); *kapı*.  
**kapugia** *n* gate-keeper (779); *kapıcı*.  
**kar** *n* profit (779); *kar*.  
**karanfil** *n* carnation (780); *karanfil*.

**karar** *n* decision, resolution (778, 779, 780); *karar*.  
**kararsciak** *adj* mixed (778, 779); *karışık*.  
**kararsiz** *adj* undecided (778); *kararsız*.  
**karascitissa** *v* to mix up, confuse (778); *karışmak*.  
**karez** *n* resentment, grudge (780); *garez/garaz*.  
**karsci** *prep* opposite; contrary, against (778); *karşı*.  
**karsciaklak** *n* disorder; agitation (779); *karışıklık*.  
**karscilik** *n* response (778, 779); *karşılık*.  
**kasap** *n* slaughtering (Sof.); *kasap*.  
**kasapbaša** *n* head butcher (Sof.); *kasap başı*.  
**kasapmiza** *n* slaughtering (778); *kasap + şıca*.  
**kascandissa** see **kaskandissa** (778).  
**kascmer** *n* buffoon, fool (778, 779, 780); *kaşmer*.  
**kascmeri** *v* to mock, to humiliate (778, 779); **casceri**.  
**kascmerlik** *n* buffoonery (779); *kaşmerlik*.  
**kaskandissa** *v* to envy, to be jealous (779); *kıskanmak; caskandisa, kascandisa*.  
**kaskangialuk** *n* jealousy (778); *kıskancılık*.  
**kaskangilak** see **kaskangialuk**; (779).  
**kat** *adj* scarce, little, few (779, 780); *kat*.  
**katlak** *n* lack, scarcity, insufficiency (779); *kıtlık*.  
**katlatski** *adj* scarce, lacking (780); **katlak**.  
**kaul** *n* agreement (780); *kavıl*.  
**kauliski** *adj* agreed; *kavilli; cauliski*.  
**kazandissa** *v* to be worthy of, to earn (779, 780); *kazanmak*.  
**kazälbaša** *adj* Persian (Tix., SN); *kızılbaş*.  
**kazälbaško** *adv* adverbial form of **kazälbaša** (Tix.).

**kef** *n* pleasure, delight, joy; happiness (780); *keyif*; **kief**.  
**kefaf** *n* sufficient subsistence (778); *kefaf*.  
**kefil** *n* bail, security (779); *kefil*.  
**kefsiz** *adj* in bad humour, lacking joy (778, 779); *keyifsiz*.  
**kefsizlik** *n* state of being unwell; unhappiness (779); *keyifsizlik*.  
**kehaja** *n* chief shepherd (779); *kahya*.  
**kemerli** *adj* arched (779); *kemerli*.  
**kendilinden** *adv* by oneself; independently (779); *kendilinden*.  
**kesia** *n* purse, a small bag; (778, 779); *kese*; **cescia**.  
**kesigia** *n* robber (779); *keseci*.  
**kestissa** *v* to stop, give up (778); *kesmek*, *kestirmek*.  
**kiar** *n* profit (778, 779); *kâr*.  
**kiaruva** *v* to profit, to gain (778); **kiar**.  
**kidissa** *v* to sacrifice oneself (778); *kendi + kiymak*.  
**kief** see **kef**; (779).  
**kiimetli** *adj* valuable, precious (778); *kimetli*.  
**killik** *n* ash hole or pit (778); *küllük*.  
**kimer** *n* arch (Sof.); *kemer*.  
**kioška** *n* corner (Sof.); *köşe*.  
**kitab** *n* book (SN); *kitap*.  
**kiukiurt** *n* sulphur (779); *kükürt*.  
**kiurčia** *n* furrier (SN); *kürkçü*.  
**kiurek** *n* oar or paddle (778); *kürek*.  
**kolai** *n* 1) way or means; *adj* 2) easy (778, 779); *kolay*; **colai**, **kolaj**.  
**kolaj** see **kolai** (780).  
**kolandissa** *v* to use, make use of, treat (778, 779); *kollanmak*.  
**kolluk** *n* guard (779); *kuluk*: guardhouse; **culluk**.  
**komscia** *n* neighbour (779); *komşu*; **comscia**.  
**komsuluk** *n* neighbourhood (Tix., Sviš); *komşuluk*.  
**konak** *n* 1) place to spend the night; 2) overnight stay; 3) estate; (778, 779); *konak*; **conak**.

**konakčia** *n* guest (Sof.); *konakçı*.  
**kondissa** *v* to spend the night (778, 779, 780); *konmak*; **condissa**.  
**kondurdissa** *v* to make or let someone stay (779); *kondurmak*.  
**korban** see **kurban** (780); *kurban*.  
**kordissa** *v* to set up camp or prepare an army for battle (779); *kurmak*; **cordissa**.  
**korsan** *n* pirate (779); *korsan*; **corsan**.  
**kortolisa** see **kurtulisa** (780).  
**kosctissa** *v* to run, to hurry (779); *koşmak*; **cosctissa**.  
**kovet** see **kuvet** (780).  
**kovlačia** *n* slanderer (Sviš.); *kovlaçı*.  
**kovladisa** *v* to slander (Sof.); *kovlamak*.  
**kula** *n* tower (779, 780); *kule*; **cula**.  
**kurban** *n* sacrifice (778, 779); *kurban*; **korban**.  
**kurtalissa** see **kurtulisa** (779).  
**kurtolissa** see **kurtulisa** (779).  
**kurtulisa** *v* to be saved, to save (779); *kurtulmak*: to save oneself (778, 779); **curtulissa**, **kortolisova**, **kurtalissa**, **kurtolisa**.  
**kuvet** *n* strength, power, force (779); *kuvvet*; **cuvet**, **kovet**.  
**kuvetlendissa** *v* to gain force or territory (779); *kuvvetlenmek*: to become strong; to be strengthened; **cuvetlendissa**.

## L

**lale** *n* tulip (780); *lale*.  
**leka** see **lekia** (780).  
**lekelia** *adj* stained, spotted (779, 780); *lekeli*.  
**lekia** *n* skin blemish (778); *leke*; **leka**.  
**leventlik** *n* heroism, military or political victory (779); *levend*.  
**lezet** *n* taste, flavour (779); *lezzet*.  
**lezetlia** *adj* tasty, delicious (778, 779); *lezzetli*.

## M

**mahala** *n* neighbourhood (Sviš., Sof., SN); *mahalle*.  
**mahana** *n* fault (778, 779, 780); *mahana*.  
**mahmuz** *n* spur (779); *mahmuz*.  
**mail** *prep* inclined to (779); *mail*.  
**mais** *n* manure (Sof.); *mayıs*.  
**makat** *n* cushion (778); *mak'ad*.  
**malik** *n* possessor, owner (778); *malik*.  
**mangar** *n* small copper coin with a value of 2.5 piastres (Sviš.); *mangır*.  
**manzilia** *n* pertaining to a courier (Sof.); *menzilli*.  
**manzilin** *n* courier (Sof.); *menzilçi*.  
**mazdrak** *n* spear, lance, javelin (779, 780); *mızrak*; **mozdrak**, **muzdrak**.  
**medresa** *n* school (778); *medrese*.  
**meghdan** *n* city square (778, 779, 780); *meydan*; **mighdan**.  
**memlegia** *n* chief among publicans (779); possibly a rapid contraction of **memleket čorbadžija**.<sup>1</sup>  
**memleket** *n* region (778); *memleket*; **memlekiet**.  
**memlekiet** see **memleket** (779).  
**merdeven** *n* ladder (NG) (778); *merdiven*; **merdiven**.  
**merdiven** see **merdeven** (779).  
**mertebe** *n* rank, order (778, 779); *mertebe*.  
**merteblija** *n* superior in rank (778, 779); *mertebeli*.  
**mighdan** see **meghdan** (779, 780).  
**millet** *n* nation, people (780); *millet*.  
**miras** *n* inheritance (780); *miraz*.  
**mirazcia** *n* inheritor (779); *mirazcı*.  
**Misirlia** *adj* Egyptian (779); *Mısrili*.  
**Misirsea** *adj* Egyptian (779); *Mısri*.  
**Misirski** *adj* Egyptian (778, 779, 780); **Misir**.  
**Misirsko** *n* Egypt (778, 779); *Mısri*; **Mysirssko**.  
**miuhlet** *n* rest or break (779); *mühlet*.

<sup>1</sup> This hypothesis was proposed by Kjetil Rå Hauge and is on the basis of context.

**miuhur** *n* seal, signet (778); *mühür*.  
**miuhurledissa** *se v* to seal shut (778); *mühürlemek*: to stamp with a seal.  
**miulk** *n* possession, property (779); *mülk*.  
**mozdrak** see **mazdrak** (780).  
**mubašir** *n* messenger, herald (Sof.); *mübaşir*.  
**munafakcia** *n* slanderer (779); *munafıkçı*.  
**munafakladissa** *v* to slander, to humiliate (778); *münafıklık*.  
**munafaklak** *n* humiliation, slandering (779); *münafıklık*: hypocrisy (especially religious).  
**mundar** *adj* unclean, immoral (779); *mundar* (coll. of *murdar*).  
**mundardissan** *adj* soiled, dirty (778); **mundar**.  
**murtatlak** *n* apostasy (779); *murtadlık*.  
**musaip** *n* representative (Tix., Sviš.); *musahip*.  
**muscetera** *n* customer (780); *müşteri*; **musctera**.  
**musctera** see **muscetera** (778).  
**mutlak** *adj* happy, joyous (780); *mutluk*: happiness; good fortune.  
**mutlakja** *adv* absolutely; without fail (779); *mutlaka*.  
**muzdrak** see **mazdrak** (780); **mozdrak**.  
**muzuvir** *n* gossip, slanderer (SN); *müzevir*.  
**Mysir** *n* Egypt (780); *Mısri*.  
**Mysirssko** see **Misirsko** (780).

## N

**nekal** *n* punishment; chastisement (779); *nekal*.  
**nekezlik** *n* stinginess (778); *nekeslik*; **nikezlik**.  
**nikezlik** see **nekezlik** (780).  
**nišan** *n* sign, mark (Sviš.); *nişan*.

## O

**ociak** *n* hearth (779); *ocak*.

**odabascia** *n* janitor (779); *odabaşı*.  
**odaja** *n* room (778, 779); *oda*; **odaya**.  
**odalak** *n* concubine (779); *odalık*.  
**odaya** see **odaja** (780).  
**oidissa** *v* 1) to fit; 2) to confirm; 3) to follow; 4) to approach; (780); *uymak*;  
**uidissa**, **ujdissa**, **ujdissova**,  
**ujdossova**.  
**oilese** *adv* so, like that (778, 779); *öyle*;  
**öilese**.  
**okumuscia** *n* person who is educated and well-read (778, 779); *okumuşçu*.  
**okumuscin** *adj* well-read, literate person (778, 779); *okumuş*.  
**okumusluk** *n* reading material (779); *okumuşluk*: literacy, the fact of being well read.  
**ordija** *n* army (778); *ordu*.  
**orman** *n* forest, wood (Sviš); *orman*.  
**orta** *adj* middle, central (779); *orta*.  
**ortak** *n* partner (Sof.); *ortak*.  
**ortalak** *n* surroundings (779); *ortalık*.  
**osahat** *adv* at that hour; now; when; exactly then (778, 779, 780); *o saat*;  
**usahat**.  
**oturdisa** *v* to sit (778, 779); *oturmak*.  
**oturtdissa** *v* to place, let have a seat, appoint (779); *oturttmak*.  
**oulu** *n* son (Sof.) *oğlu*.  
**ourta** see **orta** (Sof., SN); *orta*.  
**öfka** *n* bread, manna (778); *yufka*.  
**öilese** see **oilese** (778).  
**örnek** see **jerne** (778).

## P

**paner** *n* cheese (779); *peynir*.  
**para** *n* money (778, 779, 780); *parı*.  
**paraladissova** *v* to chop up; to destroy (778, 779); *paralamak*.  
**parca** *n* small piece, fragment, bit (779, 780); *parça*.  
**pascia** *n* pasha (779); *paşa*; **paša**.  
**pasciala** *adj* relating to a pasha (779); *paşalı*.

**pascialak** *n* 1) peace, tranquillity; 2) area that a ruler oversees (779); *paşalık*; **pascialik**.  
**pascialik** see **pascialak** (778).  
**paša** see **pascia** (Sof.).  
**pašali** *n* pasha's assistant (Sof.); *paşalı*.  
**pazar** see **bazaria** (779).  
**pazardžik** *n* market visitor, customer (SN); *pazarcı*.  
**pazari** *v* to bargain (778, 779); **pazar**.  
**pengere** *n* window (779, 780); *pencere*.  
**perde** *n* sheet (Jesus's shroud) (778, 779); *perde*.  
**pesckir** *n* towel (778); *peşkir*.  
**piscman** *adj* regretful (778, 779, 780); *pişman*.  
**piscmani se** *v* to regret (779); **piscman**.  
**piscmanlak** *n* regret (778, 779); *pişmanlık*.  
**poharči** *v* to spend, to lose, to waste (Sof.); *haraç*.  
**pusat** *n* weapon (779); *pusat*.  
**pusatlia** *adj* armed (779); *pusatlı*.

## R

**rahat** *n* ease; rest; comfort, peace (778, 779, 780); *rahat*.  
**rahatlen** *adj* calm, comfortable, peaceful (779); **rahat**.  
**raja** *n* people, society (778, 779); *reaya*.  
**rakia** *n* brandy (Tix., Troj., SN); *rakı*.  
**ramazan** *n* Ramadan (SN); *ramazan*.  
**raslan** see **aslan** (Tix.).  
**razgheldissa se** *v* to come across, meet (778); *rastgelmek*.  
**razgheterdissa** *v* to succeed (778, 779); *rastgetirmek*.  
**rehim** *n* pledge, security (779); *rehin*;  
**rehin**.  
**rehin** see **rehim** (779).  
**reizbaša** *n* ship captain (Sviš.); *reisbaşı*.  
**renk** *n* colour, skin tone (778); *renk*.  
**rezil** *n* shame (778, 780); *rezil*.  
**rezilik** *n* shame (778); *rezillik*.  
**rezillic** see **rezilik** (778).

**rigialia** *n* men of importance (779);  
*rical*.

## S

**saabi** *n* male child (779); *sabi*.

**sabuhlein** *adv* early morning (778);  
*sabaleyin*.

**sadaka** *n* alms, charity (779); *sadaka*.

**sahan** *n* dish (780); *sahan*.

**sahat** *n* hour (778, 779, 780); *saat*.

**saib** *n* owner; possessor (778, 779, 780);  
*sahip*; **saip**.

**saidissova** *v* 1) to honour; 2) to regard,  
consider; 3) to suppose (778, 779,  
780); *saymak*; **sajdisova**.

**saighalak** *n* honorifics (779); *saygılık*;  
**saighilik**.

**saighilik** see **saighalak**; (779).

**saip** see **saib** (778).

**sajdisova** see **saidissova** (780).

**sakaldissova** *v* to upset, to make  
uncomfortable (779); *sıkılmak*.

**sakan** *v* beware, take care (779); *sakin*.

**sakat** *adj n* crippled (778); *sakat*.

**sakatlak** *n* being crippled (779);  
*sakatlık*.

**sakit** *adj* mute (778); *sakit*.

**sandak** *n* box or coffin (779); *sandık*.

**sanki** *conj* thus, therefore, that is to say  
(778, 779, 780); *sanki*.

**saraj** *n* palace (778, 779); *saray*.

**saštisuvan** *adj* bewildered, confused  
(Sviš.); *şaşmak*.

**satno** *adv* hourly (778); **sahat**.

**scasckan** *adj* confused, surprised (779);  
*şaşkın*.

**scedhad(in)** *n* witness (778); *şehad*;  
**scehatin**.

**scehat(in)** see **scedhad** (778, 780).

**scenlik** *n* cheerfulness (778, 779); *şenlik*.

**schehadlak** *n* witnessing (779); *şehidlik*;  
**schehadlik**.

**schehadlik** see **schehadlak** (778).

**sciasckanlak** *n* bewilderment, surprise  
(779); *şaşkınlık*.

**sciube** *n* doubt (778, 779); *şüphe*; **scube**.

**sciubelendissa se** *v* to suspect or have  
doubt (778, 779); *şüphelenmek*.

**sciubelia** *adj* 1) doubtful; 2) suspicious  
(779); *şüpheli*.

**scube** see **sciube** (780).

**sebep** *n* reason, cause (778, 779, 780);  
*sebep*.

**sefer** *n* state of war (779); *sefer*.

**seimen** *n* guard (778, 779, 780); *seyman*/  
*segban*.

**seimenbascia** *n* head guard (780); see  
**seimen** + **bascia**.

**seir** *adj* happy, gay (780); *seğir*: source  
of enjoyment.

**semer** *n* cushion (778); *semer*.

**sened** *n* title, deed (779); *sened/senet*.

**sevda** *n* love (780); *sevda*.

**sidžil** *n* kadi's record book (Sviš.); *sicil*.

**sigim** *n* cord or string (779); *sicim*.

**silihtar** *n* weapons-keeper of a notable  
person (Sof.); *silahhtar*.

**singer** *n* chain (780); *zincir*; **zinger**.

**siunet** *n* circumcision (778, 779);  
*sünnet*; **sünet**, **sünnet**.

**siungher** *n* sponge (778); *sünger*.

**siurghiun** *n* banishment, exile (779);  
*sürgün*.

**siurghiunluk** *n* place of exile (779);  
*sürgünlük*.

**socak** see **sokak** (779).

**sokak** *n* street (778, 779); *sokak*; **socak**.

**somun** *n* loaf of bread (778, 779, 780);  
*somun*.

**spahija** *n* cavalry knight (Tix., Sviš.);  
*sipahi*.

**subaša** *n* 1) police commander; 2) chief  
administrator (Tix., Sof.); *subaşı*.

**sultan** *n* sultan (Tix., Sof.); *sultan*.

**sundurma** *n* shed where animals are  
kept; stable (778); *sundurma*.

**surungia** *n* messenger (779); *sürücü*.

**sünet** see **siunet** (778).

**sünnet** see **siunet** (779).

**sürek** *n* herd (778); *sürek*.

**Š**

**šadrvan** *n* fountain (Tix.); *šadırvan*.

**T**

**tafralik** *n* pride, conceit, arrogance (778); *tafra*.

**tajfa** *n* group (779); *taife*.

**tajfalija** *adj* (of a woman) having many children (Tix., Troj.); *tayfali*.

**takam** *n* group of people (778); *takım*.

**talik** *n* support (778); *talik*.

**talim** *n* practice, exercise (779); *talim*.

**talimlia** *adj* practiced, experienced, instructed (779); *talimli*.

**tamam** *adv* exactly, just (778, 779, 780); *tamam*.

**tamiz** *n* blind man (778); *ta'miye* (blindness).

**tasc** *n* stone (779); *taş*.

**tava** *n* pan (780); *tava*.

**tebdil** *n* change, modification (778); *tebdil*.

**tedarak** *n* preparation (779); *tedarik*; **tidarek**.

**tefter** *n* account book (778); *defter*.

**teftiša** *v* to examine, investigate (Tix., 778); *teftiş*: examination, investigation.

**tekrar** *adv* again (778, 779, 780); *tekrar*.

**tepečik** *n* butt of a gun (Sof.) *tepengi*.

**tepsija** *n* baking pan (Tix.); *tepsi*: tray.

**tesker** *n* passport, travel document (Sof.); *tezkere*.

**teslim** *n* handing over or delivery (778); *teslim*.

**testir** *n* permission (Tix., Troj.); *destur*.

**tevekel** *n* 1) one who leaves things to chance; *adv* 2) by chance (778); *tevekkel*.

**tidarek** see **tedarak** (780).

**top** *n* cannon (Sof., SN); *top*.

**topal** *adj* lame, cripple (779); *topal*.

**toprak** *n* land, territory (778, 779); *toprak*.

**torba** *n* bag, purse (779); *torba*.

**trapaza** *n* handrail, banister (Sof.); *trabzan*.

**tufedžia** *n* gun repairman or dealer (SN); *tüfekçi*.

**tumruk** *n* log for making planks (Sviš.); *tumruk*.

**turli** *n* kind or sort (779, 780); *türlü*;

**türlia, türlü türlü, tyurliji**.

**tutturdissa** to set on, go after (778); *tutturmak*.

**türlia** see **turli** (778).

**türlü türlü** see **turli** (778).

**tyurliji** see **turli** (780).

**U**

**uhape** *v* to imprison (779); *hapis*; **uhapi**.

**uhapi** see **uhape** (780).

**uidissa** see **oidissa** (778; 779).

**uidurdissa** *v* to choose (779); *uydurmak*.

**uigun** *adj* 1) appropriate; 2) agreeable (778); *uygun*.

**ujdissa** see **oidissa** (780).

**ujdossova** see **oidissa** (780).

**ulak** *n* courier, messenger (Sviš.); *ulak*.

**ulefe** *n* wage, salary (779); *ulufe*.

**urman** *n* forest, thicket, wood (779); *orman*.

**ursuka** feminine form of **ursuz** (779); see **ursuz**.

**ursuz** *n* thief, criminal (779); *hırsız*.

**urumelieju** *adj* Greek (SN); *Urumlu*.

**usahat** see **osahat** (780).

**üstün** *adj* superior (779); *üstün*.

**V**

**vazghectissa** *v* to give up (779); *vazgeçmek*.

**vegliat** *n* 1) district; 2) homeland (780); *vilayet*; **vilaet**.

**vekil** *n* representative (779); *vekil*.

**vezir(in)** *n* high official (779); *vezir*; **vizir**.

**vezirka** *n* feminine form of **vezirin** (779).

**vilaet** see **vegliat** (778, 779).

**vilatlia** *n* fellow countryman (779);  
*vilayetli*.  
**vizir** see **vezirin** (Tix., Sof. SN).

## Y

**yoglia** see **joglia** (779).

## Z

**zahire** *n* provisions (778); *zahire*.  
**zahmet** *n* 1) trouble, difficulty; 2) work,  
effort (778, 779); *zahmet*.  
**zaman** *adj* presently, now (778, 779);  
*zaman*.  
**zanajat** *n* craft, trade (778, 779, 780);  
*zanaat*.  
**zapt** *adj* caught, arrested (778); *zabt*: 1)  
a firm grasp: 2) taking possession of.  
**zarar** *n* damage, harm (778, 779, 780);  
*zarar*.  
**zararlia** *adj* harmful (779); *zararlı*.  
**zefk** *n* pleasure, merriment (778); *zevk*.  
**zeher** *n* 1) grief, anxiety; 2) poison  
(780); *zehir*; **zehir**.  
**zehir** see **zeher** (778, 779).

**zeitin** *n* oil (778, 779); *zeytin*: olive.  
**zembak** *n* lily (780); *zambak/zanbak*.  
**zenghin** *adj* rich (778, 779); *zengin*;  
**zinghin**.  
**zenghinsto** *n* wealth (779); *zengin*.  
**ziafet** *n* feast, celebration (778, 779);  
*ziyafet*.  
**zift** *n* pitch; tar (779); *zift*.  
**zimbul** *n* hyacinth (780); *zümbül/*  
*sümbül*.  
**zinghin** see **zenghin** (780).  
**zingir** see **singer** (778, 779).  
**zolumluk** *n* pillage (779); *zulümlük*.  
**zor** *n* 1) distress, difficulty; 2) violence  
(778, 779); *zor*.  
**zorladissa** *v* to force (778, 779);  
*zorlamak*.  
**zorlen** *adj* violent (779); **zor**.  
**zorova** *v* to make difficult, to weigh one  
down (780); **zor**.  
**zulumčia** *n* rogue, robber (Sof.);  
*zülümcü*.  
**zurnagia** *n* military musician (779);  
*zurnacı*.

**Appendix III: Earliest attestations of turkisms and their derivatives in Bosnian:  
RHSJ: Stachowski: dissertation sources**

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
abdest						x							--	--
ada				x		x		x	x		x		1683 (Radnić)	--
adalet											x		18th c. (?)	--
adet						x							1762 (Rapić)	1759 (RUNS)
adžam											x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
adžamoglan											x		--	--
adžamoglanski											x		--	--
aga							x				x		17th c. (Gundulić)	1582 (St.)
ahar											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ajan							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ajanski							x				x		--	--
aklama											x		--	--
alajbeg							x				x		17th c.	1652 (St.)
alat			x	x		x		x	x				1609 (Divković)	--
alk/ halk											x		--	--
alkoran						x							1637 (Držić)	--
ama					x						x	x	NA	1674 (GZM)
aman									x		x		1754 (Lastrić)	--
amanet											x		1609 (Divković)	1506 (GZM)
ambar/ hambar	x		x			x			x				1611 (Divković)	--
amidžić											x		--	--
arapče									x				1765 (Lastrić)	--
arnaut							x				x		1649–1651 (Mikalja)	--
arnautluk						x					x		Vuk	1731 (SSZN)
arslanlija							x						1678 (St.)	1644 (SSZN)
aršin			x				x	x	x		x		1683 (Radnić)	--
arza							x				x		1558 (St.)	--
arzeno											x		--	--
arzohal							x				x		--	--
ašikovati									x		x	x	1631 (Mrnavić)	--

<sup>1</sup> Stachowski's sources are only listed when they have are of an earlier or more specific date; therefore, later attestations are excluded.

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
avlija											x		1762 (Rapić)	--
avljiski											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
avst/ haps							x				x		1757 (Nenadić)	1612 (GZM)
aždaja								x	x				1708 (Margitić)	--
badem/ bajam										x			1796 (Reljković)	--
bajrak/ barjak							x	x			x		1689 (St.)	--
bajraktar/ barjaktar							x	x			x		1708 (Margitić)	--
bajram (barjam)											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
bakar												x	1823 (Zelić)	--
balija											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
barabar; parabar						x							19th c. (Vuk)	--
bardak											x		1649 (Mikalj)	--
barem			x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	1649 (Mikalj)	--
bari					x			x	x				first half of 16th c. (Marulić)	--
barut											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
basti							x						--	--
baš						x		x	x		x	x	1747 (Banovac)	--
baša							x		x		x		1493 (Mon. Croat)	1473 (SSZN)
bašaga							x				x		--	--
bašeskija											x		--	--
bašinski							x				x		1868 (Jovanović)	--
baška				x		x	x				x	x	1683 (Radnić)	--
bašlija/ baslija									x				1765 (Latrić)	--
bašta							x	x	x		x		1755 (Latrić)	--
bazardžan/ bazardžan											x		1858 (Jukić)	--
beden						x							--	--
bedevija							x						1696 (Vitezović)	--
beg							x				x		1584 (Krnarutić)	--
begler-beg							x						first half of 17th c. (Gundulić)	--
begluk/ beghluk									x				--	--
belaj											x		(1762)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
belćim											x		Zanićić 19th c. (Vuk)	--
beleisati											x		--	--
bešika									x				1765 (Lastrić)	
bešlaga							x						--	--
bešlija							x				x		1627 (Mrnavić)	--
bezistan							x				x		17th c. (?)	1658 (CI)
bihuzur											x		--	--
bile											x		--	--
binjiš											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
birbi											x		--	--
birda											x		--	--
boja			x					x	x		x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
bojadisan						x							1728 (della Bella)	--
bu(j)runtija							x				x		1689 (St.)	1672 (GZM)
bubreg				x									1637 (Držić)	--
budala			x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x		1597 (Zlatić)	--
budalast	x		x	x		x		x	x	x		x	1611 (Divković)	--
budalastvo			x	x		x				x			NA	--
budalaština			x	x		x		x	x	x	x		1678 (Ančić)	--
budalaštinica									x				1765 (Lastrić)	--
budaliti									x				--	--
bugluk								x	x				--	--
bujurisati											x		--	--
bukagija											x		1678 (Ančić)	--
bula									x		x		16th c. (Pelegrinovi ć)	--
buljuk-baša							x						19th c. (Vuk)	--
bunar			x	x	x	x		x	x	x			1614 (Baraković)	1577 (SSZN)
burija											x		--	--
burnut/ burmut										x			--	--
buruntija							x				x			
busija						x	x						1614 (Baraković)	--
butum/ butun							x						1853 (Vuk)	--
čador							x	x	x		x		1755 (Lastrić)	--
čakmak				x									Vuk	--
čakšire					x								1704	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
													(Glasnik. 31)	
čalma						x	x				x		1780 (Kanižlić)	--
čardak							x				x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
čaršija								x	x		x		1616 (Divković)	--
čauš							x					x	17th c. (Gundulić)	1484
čaušlaraga							x				x		--	--
čaušlarčehaja							x						--	--
čekmedže							x						19th c. (Vuk)	--
čelenka								x	x				1755 (Lastrić)	--
čelik			x					x	x			x	1683 (Radnić)	--
čengel/ čengele			x				x						1683 (Radnić)	--
čerga											x		1614 (Baraković)	--
čifluk											x		1766 (Lastrić)	--
čifuče								x			x		--	--
čifut	x					x	x	x	x		x		1611 (Divković)	--
čifutana							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
čifutin	x							x			x		1611 (Divković)	--
čifutski	x					x		x					1611 (Divković)	--
čirak											x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
čivija							x						1649 (Mikalja)	--
čizmedžija											x		1783 (Obradović)	--
čobanski									x				1759 (Banovac)	--
čobanj(nin)				x		x	x	x	x				17th c. (Gundulić)	--
čoha								x					1520 (?)	--
čohodar							x				x		1883 (Petrović)	--
čorba										x			--	--
čurudisati											x		--	--
čatibija											x		--	--
čatip							x						1874 (Bogišić)	--
čefil											x		1868 (Vrčević)	--
čefilema											x		--	--
čefiliti se											x		--	--
čehaja							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	1557 (GZM)

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
ćeif											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ćemer					x		x						1728 (della Bella)	--
ćeskin-jasakčija											x		--	--
ćešif/ ćešf/ ćeš							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ćešifiti							x				x		--	--
ćilim										x			1728 (della Bella)	--
ćispet										x			--	--
ćitab							x				x		1759 (Reljković)	--
ćoso											x		1740 (Bjelostjena c)	--
ćošak							x				x		1759 (Kanižlić)	--
ćumur							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ćumurdžija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
ćuprija							x				x		1732 (Bačić)	--
ćurak							x				x		1747 (Banovac)	--
dabul(h)ana											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
dajanisati se											x		1843 (Golubica)	--
dalkarluč											x		--	--
dava								x					1649 (Mikalja)	--
davudžija											x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
degenek											x		1868 (Vrčević)	1672 (GZM)
delibaša							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	1820 (SSZN)
delija											x		16th c. (Gučetić- Bendeviševi ć)	--
dernek												x	1771 (Palikuća)	--
derviš							x						16th c. (Gučetić- Bendeviševi ć)	--
derviški							x						1631 (Mrnavić)	--
devletum											x		1847 (Petranović)	--
dilendžija											x		--	--
dimija					x	x							1759 (Kanizlić)	--
direk											x		1755	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
													(Lastrić)	
divan							x				x		1613 (Baraković)	--
divitar											x		--	--
dizija								x					1755 (Lastrić)	--
dolama					x								16th c. (Marulić)	--
dramaluk											x		--	--
dućan				x		x	x			x	x		1683 (Radnić)	--
dućanlije											x		--	--
duhan						x				x			1708 (Margitić)	--
duhar/ duvar							x						1649 (Mikalja)	--
dunder											x		--	--
dušmanica						x							--	--
dušmanin						x					x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
dušmanski						x							1759 (Knezević)	--
dušmanstvo						x							--	--
džabija											x		--	--
džamija							x				x		1759 (Kačić)	1658 (GZM)
džebana							x				x		1759 (Kačić)	--
džemat							x				x		1880 (Statistika)	--
džematlija							x				x		1837 (Pje. Crm)	--
džerašen											x		--	--
džerim											x		--	--
dževab							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
džigerica									x				--	--
džilitati se											x		1867 (Petranović)	--
džuluš							x				x		1849 (Popović)	1658 (GZM)
đaur/ kaur							x				x		1728 (?)	--
đečerma										x			1704 (Margitić)	--
đene											x		--	--
đonlija											x		--	--
đubre									x				1769 (Pavić)	--
đumruk											x		1480 (Mon. Serb.)	1478 (GZM)
đuvegija										x			1782 (Dobretić)	--
efendija											x		1606 (St.)	--
efendum											x		--	--
eglenisati/ eglendisati											x		1867 (Petranović)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
elčija								x	x		x		1678 (St.)	--
ele/ hele/ helem											x		1747 (Banovac)	--
em...em/ hem...hem									x		x		1766 (Lastrić)	--
emin							x				x		1480 (Mon. Serb)	1468 (GZM)
eminski							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
emir											x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
Ergeglja						x							1796 (Reljković)	--
esab/piti											x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
espap						x		x					1755 (Lastrić)	--
evlad											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
fajda											x		1688 (Zanotti)	--
ferman							x				x		1759 (Kačić)	1752 Nakaš (169-)
fetva											x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
fetvadžija											x		--	--
filj								x	x				1649 (Mikalja)	--
fukara											x		1875 (Ljubiša)	--
fundaklija											x		1866 (Stojanović)	--
gazi											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
groš							x				x	x	1655 (St.)	--
haber											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
hadžija											x		1613 (Mon. serb.)	1576
hajde							x	x	x		x		1759 (Banovac)	--
hak											x		1655 (St.)	--
halk											x		--	--
hamrija											x		--	--
han							x				x		1808 (Vuk)	--
handžar							x						1616 (Divković)	--
(h)apstiti							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
harač			x	x		x	x	x	x		x	x	1442 (Mon. serb)	--
haračan			x										1483 (Mon. serb.)	--
haračija								x	x		x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
haračiti						x					x		1772 (Jablanci)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
haračlija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
haračnik							x						1456 (Mon. serb.)	--
harambaša				x			x						1582 (St.)	--
haramzastvo		x											--	--
has											x		1696–1703 (Starine)	--
hasesećija							x				x		17th c. (Palmotić)	--
hasum							x				x		--	--
hatar/ hatur/										x			1782 (Dobretić)	--
hatišerif							x				x		--	--
hazna	x					x	x			x	x		1512 (Mon. Serb.)	--
haznadar							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
hazur							x						19th c. (Vuk)	--
hazuriti											x		1867 (Petranović)	--
hećim											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
heli/rza											x		--	--
hesap									x		x		16th c. (Gučetić)	--
hićisar											x		--	--
hindat/indat								x			x		1769 (?)	--
hodža											x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
hrsuz								x	x		x		1765 (Lastrić)	--
hrsuzan											x		--	--
hrsuzki											x		--	--
hrsuzluk											x		(1762) Rapić	--
hršum											x		--	--
hudut							x				x		1889 (Hörmann)	--
hušum							x						--	--
ibrik							x						1759 (Kačić)	--
ićindija											x		18th c. (?)	--
ićuglie-paša											x		1768 (Rad.)	--
iktir/ iftira											x		--	1688 (GZM)
iktiza											x		--	--
ilaka											x		--	1682 (GZM)
ilam							x				x		--	--
ilamiti							x				x		--	--
imam							x				x		1845 (Osvetnici)	--
imšallah											x		1837 (Pjev. Crm)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
imzeleisati											x		--	--
inat									x				1791 (Rajić)	--
indže								x					--	--
inlet/ hinlet											x		--	--
iskusuriti											x		--	--
isnat											x		--	--
ispatiti											x		--	--
iščefiliti se											x		--	--
išleisati											x		--	--
izlal učiniti											x		--	--
izmet/ hizmet								x					1755 (Lastrić)	--
izun											x		1746 (?)	--
jabandžija											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
jacija											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
jagmiti							x						1631 (Mrnavić)	--
jaka							x				x		1704 (Terzić)	--
jalan											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
jalija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
jamak							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
janjičar							x				x		1637 (?)	1567 (SSZN)
janjičarski							x				x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
japče											x		--	--
japija								x			x		1750 (Filipović)	--
jarak			x					x	x		x	x	1683 (Radnić)	--
jardum											x		1768 (GZM)	1551 (Arg. I)
jasakčija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
jazuk											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
jedek											x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
jedekli											x		--	--
jedek/ jedžek			x	x			x				x		1759 (Kanižlić)	--
jendek						x							Vuk	--
jol											x		--	--
junjga (junga)											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
juriš						x		x					1631 (Mrnavić)	--
jurititi						x							Vuk	--
kadar/ kader										x			1791 (Rajić)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
kadija							x				x		1396 (Spom. Srp.)	--
kadiluk							x				x		17th c. (Glasnik)	1587 (SSZN)
kadinski							x				x			
kafaz/ kafez							x				x		1762 (Rapić)	--
kaftandžibaša											x		--	--
kaharba			x										--	--
kailj					x						x		1597	--
kajmakan							x				x		1708 (Margitić)	--
kalčina					x								1704 (Glasnik)	--
kalif							x						beginning of 18th c. (Kavanjin)	--
kalpak					x		x						17th c. (Gundulić)	--
kamiš										x			1759 (Kačić)	--
kanat								x					16th c. (Marulić)	--
kanbeledia						x							--	--
kandžija											x		1796 (Reljković)	--
kanli							x						1889 (Hörmann)	--
kanun											x		1868 (Vrčević)	--
kapak								x					1704 (Terzić)	--
kapetanluk											x		--	--
kapićehaja											x		--	--
kapidžija							x				x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
kapidžiler- buljugbaša											x		--	--
kapija						x	x				x		1759 (Pavić)	--
kapijaš											x		--	--
kasap(ba)											x		1706-7 (?)	--
kašika				x	x								1683 (Radnić)	--
katil							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
kaurski											x		--	--
kava (kahva)							x				x		1678 (St.)	--
kavga	x						x				x		1611 (Divković)	--
kavi											x		19th c. (Nar. pjes.)	--
kazančija										x			19th c. (Vuk)	--
kesa				x			x	x	x				1639 (Posilović)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
kesedžija											x		--	--
komora							x				x		1759 (Budmani)	--
komšija	x								x				1611 (Divković)	--
komšiluk	x										x	x	1611 (Divković)	--
konagdžija/ konakčija											x		1728 (Radonjić)	--
konak						x	x		x		x		1775 (Matović)	--
kreč							x						1704 (Glasnik)	--
krstjanluk						x				x	x		--	--
kršla											x		--	--
kujundžija											x		1678 (Ančić)	--
kula	x	x		x		x	x	x	x		x		16th c. (Lukarević)	--
kulčaus											x		--	--
kulugdžija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
kulušci											x		--	--
kurisati											x		--	--
kurjak/ kurjuk/ kujruk								x					1649 (Mikalja)	--
kuskun							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
kusur											x		1708 (Glasnik)	--
kutija						x					x		1772 (Jablanici)	--
lagum							x				x		1704 (Margitić)	--
lagumdžija											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
lakrdija											x		1753 (Knezević)	--
lala											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
leš											x		1765 (Zoričić)	--
leventa											x		16th c. (Vetranic)	--
lula							x			x			1782 (Dobretić)	--
mahrama/ marama					x				x				1558 (St.)	--
mahala	x												1611 (Divković)	1475 (SSZN)
mahalbaša							x						1706-7 (Glasnik)	--
mahmuranje								x					--	--
mahramica										x		x	1732 (Bačić)	--
mahzar											x		19th c. (Nar.)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
													Pjes.)	
majdan							x						1762 (Rapić)	--
makaze								x					1765 c. (Lastrić)	--
makul											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
makuldžija											x		--	--
malicana											x		--	--
mamuza								x	x				1759 (Kačić)	--
manjgura/ mangar							x				x		1759 (Budman)	--
marifet											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
matara							x						1728 (della Bella)	--
mazgal											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
mazul							x				x		--	--
meaf											x		--	--
mečit							x						end of 17th c. (Lj.pam. šaf)	--
medžer/ međer											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
mehćema/ meščema/ mehkema							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	1682 (SSZN)
mejdan/ megdan			x	x		x	x	x	x				1643 (Armolušić)	--
mejhana							x						1678 (Anić)	--
menzil							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
menzil-čatal											x		--	--
mestva											x		17th–18th c. (St.)	--
meščemski							x				x		1867 (Nenadović)	--
metručat											x		--	--
milčile											x		--	--
minder											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
minten											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
mirasčija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
mirija											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
misir						x					x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
misirlija							x						19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
misirski											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
mubašir							x				x		1678 (unknown)	1674 (GZM)

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
													author)	
muftija							x				x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
muhafeza											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
muhamedanac							x						1762 (Pavić)	--
muhamedanski							x						1840 (Tekelija)	--
muhur							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
muka(j)et											x		--	--
mukarem											x		--	--
mula							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
munara							x				x		--	--
murad/ murat											x		1861 (Nenadović)	--
murasela							x				x		1774 (MS)	1674 (GZM)
murleisati											x		1824 (Vuk)	1672 (GZM)
musafir							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
muselez/ musezez											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
muselim							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
muselimluk							x				x		--	--
museveda							x				x		1780s (Obradović)	--
muštulukčija								x					1755 (Laštrić)	--
mute/ mufta/ mukta											x		1631 (Kačić)	--
mutlak											x		1840 (Nar. Pjes.)	--
muvela							x				x		--	--
muzevir	x						x						--	--
nabaška						x				x			1732 (Bačić)	--
nahija							x				x		1759 (Budmani)	1561 (SSZN)
nahoš											x		--	--
naip							x						--	--
nal-karan											x		--	--
nefer							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
nizam											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	1839 (SSZN II)
nobetelile											x		--	--
obataliti										x	x		1782 (Dobretić)	--
oda												x	--	--
odbašiti											x		--	--
odilamiti							x				x		--	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
odobaša											x		1650 (St.)	1619 (SSZN)
odžak							x				x		--	--
ograisati											x		1759 (Pavić)	--
oka											x		1649–1651 (Mikalja)	--
oluk											x		--	--
ordija											x		--	1756 (SSZN)
orta											x		--	--
ortak							x						1675 (Daničić)	1511 (GZM)
osmanli(j)ski											x		1869 (Nar. Pjes.)	--
ossakatiti									x				1707 (Grličić)	--
pamuk	x										x		1611 (Divković)	--
papaz											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
papuča			x								x		1616 (Divković)	--
papučija/ papudžija											x		NA	--
para											x	x	19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	1779 (SSZN)
paralaisati											x		--	--
parmak											x		1733 (Glasnik 56)	--
paša						x	x	x	x		x		beginning of 16th c. (Šafarik)	--
pašalija											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
pašaluk											x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
pašinski							x	x			x		19th c.(Vuk)	--
pazar						x			x		x	x	16th c. (Vetranić)	--
pazarište						x							--	--
pendžer				x		x	x				x		1759 (Pavić)	--
perčin								x	x				1649 (Mikalja)	--
perde						x			x				19th c. (Vuk)	--
peškeš											x		18th c. (Đorđić)	1666 (SSZN)
peškir					x								1704 (Margitić)	--
pirinač											x		1733 (Glasnik, 56)	1690 (SSZN)
pita										x			1649 (Mikalja)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
po(h)arčiti						x	x				x		1704 (Margitić)	--
pobudaliti									x	x			1609 (Divković)	--
pod-paša							x				x		--	--
podhar(a)čiti							x		x		x		--	--
pogača									x				1649 (Mikalja)	--
pošišećen											x		--	--
prangija							x						19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
priteslimiti											x		--	--
proesabiti											x		first decade of 18th c. (Glasnik)	--
pusat											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
raja											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
rakija	x						x			x			15th–16th c. (St.)	--
ramadan/ ramazan						x	x						1759 (Kačić)	1491 (GZM)
ramazanski							x						--	--
sabah											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
sač											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
safi											x		1884 (Popović)	--
sahan											x		1733 (Glasnik)	1637 (SSZN)
sahat			x	x			x	x	x		x	x	1609 (Divković)	--
sahan											x		1733 (Glasnik)	1637 (SSZN)
saib/ sahib											x		NA	--
sakat							x				x		1707 (Grličić)	--
sandučić											x		1791 (Rajić)	--
sanduk								x	x				1695 (Budim. spo. in Glasnik)	--
sandžija											x		--	--
saraili			x										1683 (Radnić)	--
saruk											x		1759 (Kačić)	--
sebdisati											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
seferija											x		--	--
sejmen							x				x		--	1689 (SSZN)
seksenije											x		--	--
selamaga											x		1886	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
													(Smajlagić)	
senet											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
serašcer/ serasker							x				x		1684 (Račanski ljetopis)	--
serdar							x				x		1687 (?)	--
serhat											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
sidžil							x				x		NA	--
sidžille-udžetile											x		--	--
silivatar/ siladar/ silihtar							x						17th c. (Palmotić)	1489 (GZM)
sindžir				x		x	x	x	x		x		14th c. (Zakonik grbaljske občine)	--
sindžirdžija											x		--	--
sindžirlije											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
sirčet				x									1732 (Bačić)	--
skela							x						1759 (Kačić)	--
sofra/ sopra					x								16th c. (Sasin)	--
sokak											x		1704 (Jerotije Račanin)	--
somun									x				2 <sup>nd</sup> ½ of 16th c. (Držić)	--
somunčić							x						1759 (Pavić)	--
spahija							x				x		16th c. (Lucić)	--
subaša							x						1415 (Spom. Srp.)	--
sultan						x	x				x		13th c. (Domentijan )	--
sunder								x	x				1704 (Margitić)	--
surgun učiniti							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
surisati							x						--	--
sursatiti							x				x		--	--
ša(h)it											x		NA	end of 18th c. (WMBH)
šaitluk											x		--	--
šaškin											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
šeher/ šeher							x				x		1683 (?)	--
šehit							x						19th c. (?)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
šejh											x		19th c. (?)	--
šejh-ul-islam											x		--	--
šenluk											x		1782 (Dobretić)	--
šerbet						x							17th c. (Palmotić)	--
šeret											x		1884 (Popović)	--
šićajet											x		--	--
šimlje/ šindra											x		1595 (Vrančić)	--
šiše											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
šukundjed								x					1649 (Mikalj)	--
taban				x			x						1683 (Radnić)	--
tabaniti											x		NA	--
tabi biti											x		--	--
tabor							x		x		x		19th c. (?)	--
taht							x						19th c. (?)	--
ta(j)in											x		19th c. (?)	--
taksil							x				x		--	--
talambas/ talamdaulbuz								x	x				16th c. (Marulić)	--
taman	x												(1851) Jukić	--
tamir učiniti											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
taš											x		--	--
tava								x	x				1755 (Lastrić)	--
tavan								x					1755 (Lastrić)	--
teftedar/ tevtedar											x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
tefter/ tevter											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	1490 (GZM)
teftiš/ tevtiš							x				x		1456 (Muhammed II)	--
teftišiti/ tevtišiti							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
teftišlema/ tevtišlema											x		--	--
tefterčehaja/ tevterčehaja											x		--	--
teftišlemiti/ tevtišlemiti											x		--	--
tel											x		1851 (Jukić)	--
telal								x			x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
telalle								x	x				1649 (Mikalja)	--
telbiz							x						1884 (Popović)	--
tembi											x		19th c. (Smajlagić)	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
temesuć											x		1718 (Budim. spom. in Glasnik)	1634 (JF)
tepsija										x			1441 (Dubrovnik)	--
terza											x		--	--
teskera							x				x		19th c. (?)	1612 (SSZN)
teskerdžija							x						1887 (Kapetanovi ć)	--
teslim											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
teslimija											x		--	--
tevdčile											x		--	--
tobati											x		--	--
toljaga/ tojaga							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	--
top							x				x		1680 (Račanski rukopis)	1649–1651 (Mik.)
top (2)											x		--	--
topal							x						1740 (Letopis ravanički)	--
topčaga							x						--	--
topuz							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
torba						x	x		x				1637 (Držić)	1596 (SSZN)
torbica												x	1649 (Mikalja)	--
tuč											x		17th c. (Gundulić)	--
tufekdžija/ tufegdžija							x						19th c. (Vuk)	1734 (SSZN)
turbe							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
turbički											x		--	--
uapstiti											x		1868 (Nar. pri. Vrčević)	--
učtuglija							x				x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
učtuglinski											x		--	--
učum											x		1461 (Mon. Serb.)	--
udžera				x		x	x		x		x		1755 (Lastrić)	--
udžerica	x							x	x				1755 (Lastrić)	--
udžet							x				x		1470 (St.)	1468 (GZM)
uharačiti							x						1649–1651 (Mikalja)	--
ujdurisati											x		--	--

Turkism	DI 1611	PO 1682	RP 1683	RR 1683	MA 1701	BR 1730	LA 1750	LT 1755	LN 1765	DO 1783	BE 1785	IL 1798 – 1799	RHSJ	Stach. <sup>1</sup>
ujoguniti									x				1765 (Lastrić)	--
ulak							x				x		1637 (Držić)	--
ulček											x		19th c. (?)	--
ulefa							x				x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
ulem							x				x		--	--
usidžiliti							x				x		1649 (Mikalja)	--
ušur											x		1779 (Reljković)	--
uzavpstiti											x		--	--
vakuf											x		1851 (Jukić)	--
vakupski											x		1861 (Srp. nov.)	--
valah											x		1796 (Reljković)	--
vatan											x		1887 (Bos. vil.)	--
većil											x		1488 (Mon. serb.)	1412 (ZR)
vergili											x		--	--
vezir							x				x		1432 (Mon. serb.)	--
vezirski							x				x		16th c. (Marulić)	--
vezirstvo							x				x		16th c. (Gundulić)	--
vilajet		x					x	x		x	x		1649–1651 (Mikalja)	--
vilajetski							x	x		x	x		1759 (Pavić)	--
za(h)ira/ zaer							x				x		1728 (Della Bella)	1634 (SSZN)
zaašikovati							x						NA	--
zahiredžija							x						--	--
zaim							x				x		16th c. (Statut Poljički)	--
zanačija	x							x	x				1609 (Divković)	--
zanat	x		x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		16th c. (Statut Poljički)	--
zanatli			x										--	--
zapčija											x		19th c. (Vuk)	--
zarar											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	1852 (SSZN)
zateševski											x		--	--
zendil											x		1776 (Radić)	--
zendilija											x		--	--
zindan											x		19th c. (Nar. Pjes.)	--
zor											x	x	19th c. (?)	--

<b>Turkism</b>	<b>DI 1611</b>	<b>PO 1682</b>	<b>RP 1683</b>	<b>RR 1683</b>	<b>MA 1701</b>	<b>BR 1730</b>	<b>LA 1750</b>	<b>LT 1755</b>	<b>LN 1765</b>	<b>DO 1783</b>	<b>BE 1785</b>	<b>IL 1798 – 1799</b>	<b>RHSJ</b>	<b>Stach.<sup>1</sup></b>
zorba											x		19th c. (?)	--
zulum							x				x		1631 (Mrnavić)	1574 (SSZN)
zulumćar							x				x		1759 (Kačić)	--
zulumiti							x				x		--	--
zumbul			x										19th c. (Vuk)	--

#### Appendix IV: Earliest attestations of turkisms in Bulgarian

The table below shows the earliest attestations of turkisms in Bulgarian. When words have more than spelling, all spellings are listed in alphabetical order under the first entry, apart from words with initial /k/. Due to transliteration conventions these words classified under <k>.

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
abardžia/ abergia/ habercie						x	x	x	1776	1793 (OSR)
acik				x	x			x		--
aciktan					x				1779	1779 (PR)
ada									1789	17th c. (LjD)
adet/ adit				x	x	x		x		18th c. (PK)
aenin'/ ajanin							x		1773	1791 (OSR)
aenlak							x		1789	--
aferam'		x								17th c. (TrD)
aga				x	x		x	x	1789	1794 (IzvSSF)
agaba					x			x		1776 (OSR)
agiadissa				x	x	x				18th c. (NP)
ahenk					x			x		17th c. (PK)
ailak				x	x			x		--
akal				x	x	x		x		17th c.
akallia					x			x		--
akibet					x					--
alai/ alaj				x	x	x		x		--
alascverisc/ aliscverisc				x	x			x		--
alascveriscia/ alisveriscia				x	x			x		--
alciak				x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
aliverdissa					x					--
allasctissa						x		x		--
altan					x			x		17th c. (PK)
ama/ ami	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		17th c. (TrD)
aman				x	x			x		--
ambar/ hambar/ hanbar					x	x		x		--
amir	x								1544	--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
angiak/ anged				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
arteria					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
aralak					x			x		--
arkallia					x			x		--
arlak				x						--
arnaut							x			--
arnautski							x			--
artak	x	x		x	x			x		17th c. (PK)
artissa		x		x	x			x		17th c. (TrD)
asia/ assia				x	x			x		--
asker				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
aslan/ aslin				x	x			x		17th c. (KD)
at					x			x		--
atlia					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
avana					x					--
azgan						x				
baadarlak					x				1779	1779 (PR)
badem					x					1779 (PR)
bahcia		x	x	x	x	x				17th c. (LjD)
bahcivangia					x			?		1861 (TEv)
baht				x	x			x		--
bahtel						x				--
bahtina					x					--
baialdisa/ bajaldissa				x	x	x	x	x	1779	1779 (PR)
bair				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
bairak			x	x	x	x	x	x		1753
bairaktarin					x			x		--
bairam							x			18th c. (SvD)
bakscisc				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
balakeia				x	x					--
balgame				x				x		--
bara	x				x			x		--
barabar/ borabar				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
barasciak				x	x			x		18th c. (PCar.)
barascitissa				x	x			x		18th c. (NP)
barem			x	x	x	x		x		--
basc			x	x	x	x				17th c. (PK)
basciardissa				x	x					1779 (PR)
bascka	x		x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
baša		x							1789	--
bazaria				x				x		--
bazirghian						x				18th c. (NP)
beg/ bej		x	x	x	x		x	x	1479	17th c. (TrD)
beghliski					x			x		--
beiski							x			--
bejendisova						x		x		--
belek						x				--
belki/ belkim	x			x	x	x		x		17th c. (NP)
belli					x					--
bellibasc				x	x			x		--
bereket	x				x	x		x		17th c. (PR)
bereketlia					x	x		x		--
bile				x	x	x		x		--
bimbascia					x			x		--
binisc					x			x		--
birlik					x			x		--
bjuluk <sup>?</sup>							x			1861 (TEv.)
bjuljur			x							--
bjutjun		x							1789	--
boaz					x			x		18th c. (PCar.)
bojuk venedik					x					--
bojurdissova					x					18th c. (NP)
bolluk					x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
bonar/ bunar			x	x	x			x		--
borc				x	x		x	x		17th c. (PK)
borclia				x				x		18th c. (NP)
bostančia		x					x			17th c. (TrD)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
bostančiski							x			--
bozuscitissa					x			x		--
buiruntija							x			1861 (TEv.)
buluscitissova se				x	x			x		--
bunlandardissa				x						--
burgiak						x				--
bykria	x	x								--
bykriski	x									--
cesme	x			x		x		x		18th c. (TD II)
ciadar		x			x			x		17th c. (TrD)
cialascitissa/ čalasštiva			x	x				x		--
cianta					x			x		--
ciarscaf					x			x		--
ciarva					x					--
cift				x	x			x		18th c. (PCar.)
cifut				x	x	x		x		1779 (PR)
cifutski				x	x					--
cinhadarin				x						--
cioban/ ciuban				x				x	1779	1779 (PR)
ciohodar					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
ciorape						x		x		1508 (RSI.)
ciorba					x			x		--
ciorbagia/ čorbadžia				x	x	x		x	1791	17th c. (PK)
ciorbagiaka						x				--
cioval/ ciuval					x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
ciultar					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
ciunki				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
ciurudissa				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
csiarscia/ čaršija			x	x		x	x	x		17th c. (TrvD)
čaktisa							x			--
čauš							x		1634	17th c. (TD I)
čelepki							x			--
čerabaša									1634	--
češit			x							--
davrandissa se				x				x		--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
delia							x			1765 (KtID)
denet				x	x	x		x		--
develer			x		x					--
direk				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
diukkian/ dükian					x			x		18th c. (TD I)
diuzdissa					x					--
diuzen/ düzen/ dyuzzen				x	x	x		x		--
diuzenlia					x					--
diuzghiun					x					--
divan	x		x	x	x			x		17th c. (TD I)
dori				x	x	x				
dosluk					x			x		18th c. (NP)
dost				x		x		x		18th c. (NP)
dostasa							x			--
duramagilik				x						--
dusman(in)/ doscman(in)	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
dusmanlia						x				
dusmanka					x					--
dusmanlik/ dusmanlak	x	x		x	x	x				17th c. (TrD)
duscanski	x	x		x	x					--
dušmani		x								--
duvar	x				x					17th c. (TD I)
dülger	x									17th c. (TD I)
dželet	x									17th c. (LjD)
ebrik	x									--
efendia							x			--
eksik				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
eksiklik				x						--
eksildissova					x			x		--
elcia				x	x			x		18th c. (PCar.)
emir	x		x							17th c. (LjD)
emiš/ jemisc/ jimisc			x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (LjD)
encas					x			x		--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
enkiar					x					1779 (PR)
esckereledissa					x				1779	1779 (PR)
esckil				x	x					--
faida/ fajda	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	18th c.	17th c. (PK)
faidutin		x								--
falanga							x			--
farlia				x						--
fekilarcia						x				--
ferer					x			x		--
ferman		x		x	x		x	x		17th c. (LjD)
fermansko	x									--
fes									1770	--
fil					x	x		x		18th c. (PCar.)
forragia						x				--
fudul						x				--
furka					x					1779 (PR)
genk					x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
genkcia					x					18th c. (PCar.)
gevap/ gievab/ gioap/ giovap				x	x	x		x		2 <sup>nd</sup> ½ of 18th c. (PCar.)
ghecit					x			x		--
ghemia/ ghimia	x	x			x	x		x		17th c. (LjD)
ghemidžia	x	x	x							17th c.(LjD)
ghercek				x	x	x		x		--
ghercekta				x						--
gherejehibi					x				1779	1779 (PR)
ghetirtissa				x					1779	1779 (PR)
ghiöl				x				x		1861 (TEv)
ghiöscterdissova				x						--
ghiran						x				--
ghirdan						x		x		--
ghittikces					x					--
ghiucen					x					--
ghiucluk					x					--
ghiugiune					x					--
ghiulendissa se				x						--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
ghiumrük				x						--
giavur <sup>2</sup> / giavurin							x			18th c. (PCar.)
gigher/ giher					x	x		x		1779 (PR)
gillat						x		x		--
giumma					x			x		1779 (PR)
giummurlen					x				1779	1779 (PR)
giumur				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
gjumrjukčia	x									17th c. (TD I)
gumrukči			x							--
habar/ haber			x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
hadži/ hagia				x		x	x	x	1643	1792 (OSR)
hahamin				x	x					--
haide(te)				x	x			x		--
haiduk/ haidutin	x				x	x	x	x	1789	17th c. (KD)
hailaski				x						--
hain						x				--
Hainan				x						--
hainlik				x						--
hair				x	x	x		x		--
hairlia						x		x		--
haita					x					--
haivan				x	x					17th c. (PK)
haivanski				x						--
hak			x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
hal				x	x	x		x		--
halaik					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
halal						x		x		--
halalascitissa se				x						--
halk				x	x	x		x		--
hamarat				x						--
hamaratlik				x						--
han			x	x			x	x	1789	1836 (OSR)
hangiar					x			x		1779 (PR)
hanski							x			--
hapus					x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
hapusbascia						x				--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
haracia/ harce					x	x		x		--
harac/ harač			x	x	x		x			1629 (PR)
haracia				x	x			x		--
haračiiski							x			--
harc			x							17th c. (PK)
harem							x			--
harman					x			x		1779 (PR)
hasna				x				x		--
hatar			x	x	x	x			1779	1779 (PR)
hatayla				x				x		--
hava				x	x			x		--
havan' top									1789	1791 (OSR)
hazna				x	x					17th c. (LjD)
hekiem/ hekim				x	x	x		x		--
hem...hem				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
hemen						x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
hendek					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
hesap/ hisap				x	x	x		x		1776 (OSR)
hic				x	x	x		x		18th c. (PCar.)
hiokium/ hokium/ hökium				x	x					1779 (PR)
hipsa				x						--
hiuget					x					1503– 1508 (RSl.)
hizmet					x	x		x	18th c.	1779 (PR)
hizmetkiarin				x	x			x		18th c. (NP)
hizmetkiarka				x	x					--
hizmetuva				x	x					--
hodulin				x						
hozur/ huzur				x		x				17th c. (TrD)
hudut				x						--
hudula se						x				
huzurava					x					--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
iabangia/ jabangia/ jabangie				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
ialanisc				x				x		--
iamik					x					--
iatak				x				x		--
iki kapulu									1789	--
ikindia				x				x		--
ikinica					x					--
ikram				x	x			x		--
ikramlija				x						--
ilendissa					x					--
iliman				x				x		--
inat					x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
ingittissa					x					--
iornek/ jornek/ jurnek/ örnek				x	x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
iskelendissova				x						--
iskazandisa						x				--
ispatlak						x				--
iuzbascia/ juzbascia			x	x	x			x		1861 (TEv.)
izanlia				x						--
izbirden					x					--
izin/ jzin				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (TEv.)
izlal				x						--
ja...ja					x					--
jaban				x		x				--
jajaldissa se				x						--
jajan					x					--
jalan					x			x		--
jalangia				x				x		--
jamurluk					x			x		--
janičar							x		16th c.	--
japia				x	x			x		--
jaralia					x			x		--
jardamgia					x					1779 (PR)
jasak					x			x		1779 (PR)
jasakčija							x			--
jasc					x					--
joglia/ yoglia					x					--
jureklia					x					--
juruusc					x			x		2nd 1/2

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
										of 18th c. (PCar.)
kabaat/ cabahat/ kabahat				x	x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
kabahatlia/ cabahatlia					x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
kabaik				x						--
kabardissano				x				x		--
kabil/ cabil				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
kabul				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
kaciardissa				x	x					--
kadar		x	x	x	x	x				17th c. (TD I)
kadia	x	x			x					17th c. (TrvD)
kadiluk	x		x				x	x	1634	17th c. (TD II)
kahar				x		x		x		17th c. (PK)
kaharlia						x				--
kaharuva se				x						--
kaik										2nd 1/2 of 18th. c. (PCar.)
kail				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
kaimakan							x			--
kair				x	x	x				--
kairek					x					--
kal				x				x		--
kalabalak				x	x	x				18th c. (NP)
kalai/ calai					x			x		--
kalem						x		x		--
kalkangia					x				1779	1779 (PR)
kamisc					x	x		x		--
kanli/ canli				x	x	x		x		--
kapia					x		x	x	1779	1779 (PR)
kapugia					x					--
kar					x					--
karanfil						x		x		--
karar/ carar				x	x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
kararsciak				x	x			x		1779

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
										(PR)
kararsetissa				x				x		--
kararsiz				x						--
karčailiski							x			--
karez	x	x				x		x		17th c. (LjD)
karsci				x						17th c. (PK)
karsciaklak					x			x		--
karscilik				x	x			x		--
kasap							x			--
kasapbaša							x			--
kasapmiza				x				x		--
kascmer				x	x	x		x		--
kascmeri				x	x			x		--
kascmerlik					x					18th c. (PR)
kaskandisa/ caskandisa/ kascandisa				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
kaskangilak/ kaskangialuk				x	x					--
kat					x	x	x	x		18th c. (NP)
katlak					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
katlatski						x				--
kaul						x		x		--
kauliski					x					--
kazandissa					x	x		x		17th c. (TD I)
kazülbaša	x								1638	17th c. (LjB.)
kazulbaško	x									--
kef/ kief					x	x		x		--
kefaf				x						--
kefil			x		x			x		16th c. (TD I)
kefiz				x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
kefsizlik					x					--
kehaja			x							17th c. (PR)
kemerli					x			x		--
kendilinden					x				1779	1779 (PR)
kesia/ cescia							x		1753	1794 (IzvSSF)
kesigia	x			x	x			x		17th c. (TD I)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
kestissa				x				x		--
kiar				x	x			x		--
kiaruva				x						--
kidissa							x			
kiimetlia				x						--
killik				x						--
kimer							x			--
kioška							x			--
kitab									1793	--
kiukiurt					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
kiurčia									1797	1833
kiurek				x						--
kolai/ colai				x	x	x				--
kolandissa				x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
kolluk/ culluk/				x				x		--
komscia/ comscia/ komšia			x		x			x		17th c. (PK)
komsuluk	x		x					x		17th c. (LjD)
konak/ conak	x			x	x			x	1779	1647 (GCR)
konakčia							x	x		
kondissa/ condissa	x	x		x	x	x		x		17th c. (KD)
kondurdissa					x					--
korban/ kurban	x	x		x	x	x	x	x		17th (KD)
kordissa/ cordissa					x			x		--
korsan/ corsan					x	x				1779 (PR)
kortolisa/ kurtalisa/ kurtulisa/ curtulisa	x	x		x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
kosctissa/ cosctissa					x					--
kovlačia			x							--
kovladisa							x	x		--
kula/ cula					x	x		x		18th c. (TD II)
kuvet/ cuvet					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
kuvetlendissa					x					--
lale						x		x		--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
lekelia					x	x				--
lekia				x						17th c. (PK)
leventlik					x					--
lezet					x			x		--
lezetlia				x	x			x		--
mahala			x				x	x	1639	1508 (RSl.)
mahana				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
mahmuz					x			x		--
mail					x					--
mais							x			--
makat				x				x		--
malik				x				x		--
mangar			x							--
manzilia					x		x			1779 (PR)
manzilin							x			--
mazdrak/ mozdrak/ muzdrak					x	x		x		--
medresa				x				x		--
meghdan/ mighdan				x	x	x		x		18th c. (PCar.)
memlegia				x	x					--
memleket/ memlekiet				x	x			x		--
merdeven/ merdiven				x	x			x		--
mertebe				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
merteblia				x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
millet						x		x		--
miras						x		x		--
mirazcia					x					1779 (PR)
Misirlia					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
Misirsea					x					--
Misirski/ Misirsko/ Mysirssko	x			x	x	x				--
miuhlet					x				1779	1779 (PR)
miuhur				x				x		--
miuhurledissa se				x				x		1837 (TEv.)
miulk					x			x		17th c. (PK)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
mubašir							x			--
munafakcia					x				1779	1779 (PR)
munafakladissa				x						--
munafaklak					x					--
mundar					x			x		--
mundardissano				x						--
murtatlak					x					1779 (PR)
musaip	x		x							18th c. (LjD)
muscetera/ musctera				x		x				--
mutlak						x		x		--
mutlakja					x			x		--
muzuvir									16th	--
Mysir						x		x		17th c. (PMR)
nekal					x					--
nekezlik/ nikezlik				x		x				--
nišan			x		x					18th c. (NP)
ociak					x				1779	1779 (PR)
odabascia					x			x		--
odaja				x	x	x		x	1770	1779 (PR)
odalak					x				1779	1779 (PR)
oidisova/ uidissa/ uidisova/ ujdosova				x	x	x		x		--
oilese/ öilese				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
okumuscia				x	x					--
okumuscin				x	x					--
okumuscluk					x				1779	1779 (PR)
ordija				x	x		x	x	1779	1779 (PR)
orman			x							--
orta/ ourta					x		x		1779	1779 (PR)
ortak							x			--
ortalak			x		x					--
osahat			x	x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
osahat/				x	x	x				--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
usahat										
oturdissa				x	x					--
oturtdissa					x					--
oulu							x	x		--
öfke				x						--
paner					x			x		--
para				x	x	x	x	x	1770	1768 (IzvSSF)
paraladissova				x	x				1779	1779 (PR)
parca					x	x		x		18th c. (IBr.)
pascia/ paša	x		x		x		x	x	1636	17th c. (LjD)
pascialik/ pascialak				x	x			x		--
pašali							x			--
pazar	x	x			x			x	1752	17th c. (LjD)
pazardžik'									1778	--
pazari				x	x			x		--
pengere					x	x		x	1770	1779 (PR)
perde				x	x			x		--
pesckir				x				x		--
piscman				x	x	x		x		--
piscmani se					x					--
piscmanlak				x	x			x		--
pita						x		x		--
poharči							x			--
pusat					x			x		--
pusatlia					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
rahat				x	x	x		x		18th c. (NP)
rahatlen					x					--
raja				x	x			x		17th c. (PMR)
rakia	x	x							1797	17th c. (TrD)
ramazan									1789	1793 (OSR)
raslan	x									--
razgheldissase				x				x		--
razgheterdissa				x	x					--
rehim/ rehin					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
reizbaša			x							--
renk				x						--
rezil				x		x		x		--
rezilik/				x				x		--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
rezillic										
rigialia					x			x		18th c. (PCar.)
saabi					x					--
sabuhleim					x					1779 (PR)
sadaka					x			x		1779 (PR)
sahan						x		x		1861 (TEv.)
sahat				x	x	x		x		1788 (OSR)
saib/ saip				x	x	x				--
saidissova/ saidisova				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
saigalak/ saighilik					x					--
sakaldissova					x					--
sakan					x					--
sakat	x	x		x	x			x		17th c. (TrD)
sakatlak					x			x		--
sakit				x						--
sandak					x					--
sanki				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
saraj			x	x	x			x		18th c. (NP)
saštisuvan			x							--
satno				x						--
scasckan					x				1779	1779 (PR)
scedhad/ scehat(in)				x	x	x				--
scehadlak/ schehadlik				x	x					17th c. (PK)
scenlik				x	x		x			
sciasckanlak					x					--
sciube/ scube				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
sciubelendissa se				x	x			x		1861 (TEv.)
sciubelia					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
sebep				x	x	x		x		--
sefer					x			x		--
seimen				x	x	x		x		1861 (TEv.)
seimenbascia						x				18th c. (PCar.)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
seir						x		x		--
semer				x				x		--
sened					x			x		--
sevda						x		x		18th c. (NP)
sidžil			x							17th c. (LjD)
sigim					x			x		1779 (PR)
silihtar							x			--
singer/ zingir		x	x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (LjD)
siunet/ sünet/ sünnet				x	x			x		1861 (TEv.)
siungher				x						--
siurghiun					x			x		--
siurghiunluk					x					--
sokak/ socak					x			x	1785	--
somun				x	x	x		x		--
spahija	x		x							17th c. (LjD)
subaša	x						x			1496– 1597 (RSI.)
sultan							x		1564	18th c. (PCar.)
sundurma				x				x		--
surungia					x			x		--
sürek				x				x		--
šadrvan	x									18th c. (TD II)
tafralik				x				x		--
tajfa					x					--
tajfalija	x	x							x	17th c. (LjD)
takam				x				x		--
talik				x						--
talim					x			x		--
talimlia					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
tamam				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
tamiz				x						--
tasc					x			x		--
tava						x				--
tebdil				x						--
tedarak/ tidarek					x	x				--
tefter				x				x	1757	--

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
teftiša	x		x							--
tekrar				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
tepečik							x			--
tepsija	x									1508 (BrT)
tesker							x			--
teslim				x				x	1779	1779 (PR)
testir	x	x								17th c. (TD)
tevekel				x				x		--
top							x		1779	1779 (PR)
topal					x			x		--
toprak				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
torba					x			x		1794 (OSR)
trapaza							x			--
tufedžia									17th c.	--
tumruk								x		17th c. (LjD)
turli/ türlie/ türlü/ tyurlii				x	x	x		x		17th c. (PK)
tutturdissa				x				x		--
uhape/ uhapi					x	x		x		--
uidurdissa			x		x			x		17th c. (PK)
uigun				x						18th c. (PCar.)
ulak										
ulefe					x			x		--
urman					x			x		18th c. (NP)
ursuka					x					--
ursuz					x			x		--
urumelieju									1573	18th c. (PCar.)
üstion					x			x		--
vazghectissa					x			x		--
vegliat/ vilaet			x	x	x	x		x		17th c. (TrD)
vekil					x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
vezirin/ vizir/	x				x		x	x	1643	17th c. (LjD)

Turkism	Tix. mid- 17th c.	Troj. mid- 17th c.	Sviš. 1753	778 1773	779 1779	780 end of 18th c.	Sof. 1798	NG	SN	Stach.
vezir										
vezirka					x					--
vilatlia					x			x		--
zahire				x				x		--
zahmet				x	x			x		18th c. (NP)
zaman				x	x			x		18th c. (TD II)
zanajat				x	x			x		17th c. (TD I)
zapt				x				x	1789	1791 (TEv)
zarar		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	1789	17th c. (PK)
zararlia					x			x		--
zefk				x				x		17th c. (PK)
zeher/ zehir(e)				x	x	x		x	1779	1779 (PR)
zeitin				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
zembak						x		x		--
zenghin/ zinghin				x	x	x		x		18th c. (TD II)
zenghinsto					x					--
ziafet				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
zift					x			x		--
zimbul						x		x		--
zolumluk					x			x		--
zor				x	x			x		--
zorladissa				x	x			x	1779	1779 (PR)
zorlen					x					--
zorova						x				--
zulumčia							x			--
zurnagia					x			x		--

## Bibliography

### Primary

#### MSS

- 778 *Kniga na Paula Zarov. 1773*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite*. 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 469–470
- 779 *Petar Carski's 1780 sbornik. 1779*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite* 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 471–474
- 780 *Pavlikjanski sbornik*, at SS Cyril and Methodius National Library in Sofia; listed in B. Conev, S. Stojanov, X. Kodov (eds.) *Opis na slavjanskite rãkopisi v Bibliotekata na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite* 1969. (Sofia: BAN) 475–479
- Svištovski damaskin* 1923. L. Miletič (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite)
- Tixonravovski damaskin* 1971. A. Demina (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite)
- Trojanski damaskin* 1967. A. Ivanova (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite)

#### Books

- Bakšić, B. 1638. *Meditationes S. Bonauenturae. To yest bogoglivbna razmiscglianya od otaystva odkupglienya covicanskoga prenesena v yezik Slovinski, trudom P. O. F. Petra Bogdana Baksichia* (Rome: Typis Sacrae Congreg. de Propag. Fide)
- Bandulavić, I. 1997. *Pisctole i evangelya* (Cologne: Böhlau)
- Benić, B. 2003. *Ljetopis sutješškoga samostana* (Sarajevo: Synopsis)
- Bračuljević, L. 1730. *Uzao scerafinske (nascki) goruchiee gliubavi* (Budim: Ivan Georg Nottenstein)
- Divković, M. 1611. *Nauk krstjanski za narod slovinski* (Venice: Petro Mario Bertani)
- Dobretić, M. 1782. *Kratko skupgliegne sakramenatah* (Ancona: Petra Pavao Ferri)
- Ilijić-Varešanin, G. 1798. *Epistola pastoralis* (Dubrovnik: Andreae Trivisan)
- . 1799. *Epistola pastoralis cum aliis nonnullis litteris circularibus* (Venice: Domo Borovicesoi)

- Lastrić, F. 1755. *Testimonium bilabium* (Venice: Domenico Lovisa)
- . 1765. *Nediglnik dvostruk* (Venice: Domenico Lovisa)
- Lašvanin, N. 2003. *Ljetopis* (Sarajevo: Synopsis)
- Margitić, S. M. 1701. *Ispovid karstjanska* (Venice: Sebastian Coleti)
- Posilović, P. 1682. *Naslađenje duhovno* (Venice [unknown publisher])
- Radnić, M. 1683a. *Pogargegnie izpraznosti od svitta* (Rome [unknown publisher])
- . 1683b. *Razmiscglagna pribogomiona od gliubavi Boxye* (Rome [unknown publisher])
- Stanislavov, F. 1979 [1651]. *Abagar na Filip Stanislavov (Rim 1651)*, B. Rajkov (ed.) (Sofia: Narodna prosveta)
- Sofroni, Bishop of Vraca. 1976 [1798]. *Sofronii Vračanski: žizneopisanie* P. Dylevskij, M. Robinson, and A. Nikolaević (eds.) Leningrad: 'Nauka'
- Xristova, B., D. Karadžova, and E. Uzunova. 2004. *Beležki na bālgarskite knižovnici X–XVIII vek.* (Sofia: Narodna biblioteka 'Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij')

## Secondary

- Anić, V. 2000. *Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, 3rd ed. (Zagreb: Novi Libe)
- Babić, S. 2002. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskome književnome jeziku, treće poboljšano izdanje* (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, nakladni zavod Globus)
- Bajraktarević, F. 1960. 'Prilog proučavanju naših pozajmica orijentalnog porekla', *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 26: 334–344
- Banac, I. 1984. 'Main Trends in the Croat Language Question', in R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question* (1) (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies)
- Barbolova, Z. 2009. 'Vzaimootnošenijata na turcite i bālgarite v perioda na Osmanskata imperija, otrazeni v bālgarski precedentni tekstove', *Bālgarska reč*, 15(1–2): 114–125
- Barić, E., M. Lončarić, D. Malić, S. Pavešić, M. Peti, V. Zečević, and M. Znika. 1995. *Hrvatska gramatika* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga)
- Bloomfield, L. 1933. *Language* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston)
- Behin'ova, V. 1975. 'Barokāt i literaturata na bālgarskite katolici', *Literaturna misāl*, 19: 82–97

- Bock, K. and C. Miller 1991. 'Broken Agreement', *Cognitive Psychology*, 23(1): 45–93
- Boev, E. 1968. 'Za bālgarsko-turskite ezikovi vrāzki', *Izvestija na Instituta za bālgarski ezik*, 16: 177–183
- Brlobaš, Ž. 2007. *Glagolski vid u hrvatskim gramatikama do 20. stoljeća* (Zagreb: Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje)
- Buğday, K. 1999. *Osmanisch*. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- Bujas, Ž. 2005. *Veliki hrvatsko-engleski rječnik*, 4th ed. (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus)
- Bālgarski etimologičen rečnik*. 1971–2011. (Sofia: BAN)
- Cattaneo, R. 2000. 'Turcizmi u Lastrićevu *Testimonium Bilabium*' in *Zbornik o fra Filipu Lastriću Očevcu u povodu 300. obljetnice rođenja* (Mostar: Sveučelište u Mostaru): 55–66
- Comrie, B. 1998. *Aspect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Comrie, B. and G. Corbett. 2008. *The Slavonic Languages* (London: Routledge)
- Conev, B. 1929. *Edin pavlikjanski rākopis ot vtorata polovina na XVIII. vāk* (Sofia: Pečatnica 'Xudožnik')
- Conev, B. 1929. 'Turski dumi v bālgarski ezik', *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet. Istoriko-filolofičeski fakultet*, 25(4): 1–16
- Čakalov, G., I. Ljakov and Z. Stankov. 1961. *Bālgarsko-anglijski rečnik* (Sofia: Dāržavno izdatelstvo 'Nauka i izkustvo')
- Čaušević, E. 2004. 'A Chronicle of Bosnian Turkology: The Franciscans and the Turkish Language', in M. Koller and K. Karpat (eds.), *Ottoman Bosnia – A History in Peril*, (Madison University of Wisconsin Press, Publications of the Center of Turkish Studies): 241–253
- Daničić, Đ. 1880–1882. *Rječnik ili srpskog ili hrvatskog jezika* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska Akademija znanosti i umjetnosti)
- Dell'Agata, G. 1966. 'A proposito di alcuni prestiti grammaticali greci e turchi nelle lingue slave dell'area balcanica', *Ricerche slavistiche*, 14: 15–28
- . 1984. 'The Bulgarian Language Question from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century', in R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question* (1) (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies)
- Dickey, S. 2012. 'Osamostaljeni prefiks i gramatikalizacija vida u južnoslavenskim jezicima', *Jezikoslovlje*, 13(1): 71–105

- Dictionary of the Turkic Languages*. 1996. Öztopçu, K., Ž. Abuov, N. Kambarov, and Y. Azemoun (eds) (London: Routledge)
- Dimitrov, B. 1978. 'Istorija na Bălgarija' – sto godini predi Paisij', *Otečestvo*, 3(18): 15, 18
- . 1978a. 'Neizvesten letopis za Moravskata misija na Kiril i Metodij', *Otečestvo*, 3(18): 16–17
- . 1978b. 'Părvijat bălgarski istoričeski trud – 'Istorija na Oxrid' – ot Petăr Bogdan Bakšev, napisan v 1655 g.', *Otečestvo*, 3: 24, 34
- . 1979. 'Za istorijata na Sofija i Bălgarija ot Petăr Bogdan', *Istoričeski pregled*, 35(1): 102–108
- . 1985. *Petăr Bogdan Bakšev: bălgarski politik i istorik ot XVII vek* (Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo)
- . 1988. 'Edin bălgarin ot XVII vek meždu Italija i Bălgarija', in A. Miltenova (ed.), *Bălgarija, Italija i Balkanite* (Sofia: BAN): 172–178
- . 2009. *Petăr Bogdan Bakšev* (Sofia: Fondacija KOM)
- . 2012. *Venecijanski dokumenti za bălgarskata istorija prez XVI-XVII vek* (Sofia: UNIKART)
- Dimitrova, M. 2008. 'Knižninata na bălgarite katolici', in A. Anguševa-Tixanova and A. Miltenova (ed.), *Istorija na bălgarskata srednovekovna literatura* (Sofia: Iztok-Zapad): 744–758
- Dinekov, P. 1977. 'Bălgarskata literatura prez XVII', *Literaturna istorija*, 1: 5–15
- Dylevskij, P., M. Robinson and A. Nikolaevič. 1976. *Sofronii Vračanski: žizneopisanie*. (Leningrad: 'Nauka')
- Endresen, A., L. Janda, J. Kuznetsova, O. Yashevskaya, A. Makarova, T. Nessel, and S. Sokolova. 2012. 'Russian 'Purely Aspectual' Prefixes: Not So 'Empty' after All?', *Scando-Slavica*, 58(2): 231–291
- Feizmohammadpour, A. 2013. *Optional Subject-Verb Agreement in Persian*, unpublished doctoral dissertation (University of Florida)
- Flier, M. and A. Timberlake. 1985. *The Scope of Slavic Aspect* (Columbus: Slavic Publishers, Inc.)
- Forsyth, J. 1970. *A Grammar of Aspect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Frazer, C. 1983. *Catholics and Sultans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

- Friedman, V. 1982. 'Balkanology and Turcology: West Rumelian Turkish in Yugoslavia as Reflected in Prescriptive Grammar', *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 2 : 1–77
- Galton, H. 1976. *The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect* (Skopje: Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts)
- Gavran, I. 2003a. 'Uvod', in Bono Benić, *Ljetopis sutješkoga samostana* (Sarajevo-Zagreb: Synopsis)
- . 2003b. 'Uvod', in Nikola Lašvanin, *Ljetopis* (Sarajevo-Zagreb: Synopsis)
- . 2003c. 'Uvod', in Filip Lastrić, *Pregled starina Bosanske provincije* (Sarajevo-Zagreb: Synopsis)
- . 2007. *Suputnici bosanske povijesti* (Sarajevo-Zagreb: Knjižnica baština)
- Georgiev, L. 2010. *Bългарите католици в Трансилванија и Банат (XVIII – прввата половина на XIX в.)* (Sofia: Nacionalna biblioteka 'Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij')
- Gerov, N. 1975–1978. *Rečnik na bǎlgarskija ezik* (Sofia: Bǎlgarski pisatel)
- Göksel, A. and C. Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar* (London: Routledge)
- Göksel, A. and C. Kerslake. 2011. *Turkish: An Essential Grammar* (London: Routledge)
- Gramatika na starobǎlgarskija ezik*. 1991. (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na bǎlgarskata akademija na naukite)
- Grbić, J. 1994. 'Etnografski rad bosanskoga franjevca Ivana Franje Jukića', *Bosna Franciscana*, 2: 101–127
- Grannes, A. 1970. *Études sur les turcismes en bulgare* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget)
- Grannes, A. 1980. *Loan Compounds in Bulgarian Reflecting the Turkish Indefinite Izafet-construction* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget)
- Grannes, A. 1996. *Turco-Bulgarica: Articles in English and French concerning Turkish influence on Bulgarian* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- Grannes, A., K. R. Hauge, and H. Süleymanoğlu. 2002. *A Dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian* (Oslo: The Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture and Novus forlag)
- Grigorov, S. 2008. *Georgi Pejačević i rodāt Knežević-Parčević* (Montana: Polimona)
- Haspelmath, M. and U. Tadmor. 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)

- Hauge, K. R. 2002. 'Morfo-semantična adaptacija na njakoi turski zaemki v bälgarskija ezik', in K. Petrova, *Litora Psycholinguistica* (Sofia: SEMA RŠ): 129–134
- . 2006. 'Bulgarian words with Turkish Verbal Suffixes', in C. Townsend, E. Scatton, and R. Rothstein (eds.), *Studia Caroliensia: Papers in Linguistics and Folklore in Honor of Charles E. Gribble* (Bloomington: Slavica): 171–175
- Hazai, G. 1960. 'Beiträge zu einigen Problemen der Lehnwörterforschung in den osmanisch-türkischen Mundarten des Balkans', *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 23: 83–100
- . 1961. 'Remarques sur les rapports des langues slaves des Balkans avec le turc-osmanli', *Studia Slavica*, 7: 97–138
- . 1963. 'Käm njakoi väprosi na osmansko-turskite zaemki v južnoslavjanskite ezici', *Studia Slavica*, 9: 387–391
- . 1964. 'Prilog istorijatu morfeme -LUK', *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 7: 59–61
- Hämeen-Anttila, V. E. 1963. 'Les emprunts dans les langues slaves du sud', *Scando-Slavica*, 9: 387–39
- Iovine, M. 1984. 'The 'Illyrian Language' and the Language Question among the Southern Slavs in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', in R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question* (1) (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies)
- Isačenko, A. V. 1968. *Die Russische Sprache der Gegenwart* (1) (Halle: Veb Max Niemeyer Verlag)
- Ivanova, N. 1998. 'Kontakti sinonimi v säčinenijata na Petär Bogdan Bakšič, Filip Stanislavov i Kräst'o Pejkič', *Paleobulgarica*, 22(4): 101–110
- Jonke, Lj. 1976. 'Pero Budmani', in *RHSJ*, 23: 104–124
- Joseph, B. 2010. 'Language Contact in the Balkans', in R. Hickey (ed.), *The Handbook of Language Contact* (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell): 618–633
- Lakova, M. 1970. 'Struktura i značenie na glagolite ot turski proizhod v bälgarski ezik', *Bälgarski ezik*, 20(5): 431–441
- . 1972. 'Turcizmite v 'Rečnik na sävremennija bälgarski knižoven ezik' ot stilistična gledna točka', *Bälgarski ezik*, 22(1–2): 61–72
- Karamatić, M. 2006. *Hrvatska književnost Bosne i Hercegovine od sredine XVIII. do konca XIX. stoljeća* (Sarajevo: Matica Hrvatska u Sarajevu)

- Katičić, R. 1984. 'The Making of Standard Serbo-Croat', in R. Picchio and H. Goldblatt (eds.), *Aspects of the Slavic Language Question* (1) (New Haven: Yale Concilium on International and Area Studies)
- Kellner-Heinkele, B. and M. Stachowski. 1994. *Laut- und Wortgeschichte der Türkisprachen* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag)
- Kissling, H. J. 1964. 'Zu den Turzismen in den südslavischen Sprachen', *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, 2: 77–87
- Kjuvljeva, V. 1980. 'Morfologična adaptacija i asimilacija na turskite zaemki – sašttestvitelni i prilagatelni – v bälgarskija ezik', *Izvestija na Instituta za bälgarski ezik*, 24: 78–136
- Klaić, B. 2007. *Rječnik stranih riječi*, 2nd ed. (Zagreb: Školska knjiga)
- Knežević, A. 1962. *Die Turzismen* (Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain)
- Kočev, N. 1981. 'Gräcki i turski dumi v sofronievija prevod na ezopovite basni', *Säpostavitelno ezikoznanie*, 6(2): 63–68
- Kostov, K. 1968. 'Zur Entstehung und Anwendung einer substantivischen Fügung in den balkanslavischen Sprachen', *Die Welt der Slaven*, 13: 162–198
- Kowalski, T. 1932. 'W sprawie metodologii badañ zapożyczeñ tureckich w językach słowiańskich', *Sborník prací I. Sjezdu slovanskych filologů v Praze 1929: 2* (Prague: Orbis): 554–556
- Kuna, H. 1967. *Jezik fra Filipa Laštrića bosanskog franjevca XVIII vijeka* (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine)
- . 1972. 'Udio franjevačke književnosti XVIII vijeka u stvaranju literarnog jezika zapadnog srpskohrvatskog područja', in *International Congress of Slavists (7th: 1973, Warsaw)* (Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine)
- Makedonska, C. 1966. 'Turski frazeologični zaemki v bälgarski ezik', *Bälgarski ezik*, 16(4): 322–331
- Marinkovitch, L. 1881. 'Vocabulaire des mots persans, arabes et turcs introduits dans la langue serbe', in *Verhandlungen des 5. Internationalen Orientalisten-Congresses gehalten zu Berlin im September 1881* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung): 299–332.
- Matras, Y. and J. Sakel. 2007. *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter)
- Matijašević, J. 2000. 'Prefiksacija i dvovidnost glagola', *Južnoslavenska Filologija*, 56: 655–666

- Matthews, P. 1993. *Morphology*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- . 2014. *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Menskaja, T. 1975. 'Nabljudenija nad zalogom tureckix glagol'nyx zaimstovavanij v bolgarskom jazyke', in *Slavjanskoe i balkanskoe jazykoznanie: problem interferencii i jazykovyx kontaktov* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Nauka')
- Miklosich, F. 1882. *Die türkischen Elemente in den südost- und osteuropäischen Sprachen* (Vienna: Tempsky)
- . 1889. 'Über die Einwirkung des Türkischen auf die Grammatik der südosteuropäischen Sprachen', *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 120: 1–11
- Miletič, L. 1884. 'Iz istorijata na bälgarskata katoliška propaganda v XVII v.', *Bälgarski pregled*, 1: 62–83
- . 1900. 'Knižnina i ezikät na banatskite bälgari', *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis*, 26–27: 339–482
- . 1903. 'Našite pavlikjani' *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis*, 19: 1–324
- . 1905. 'Novi dokumenti za minaloto na našite pavlikani', *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija i narodopis*, 21: 1–155
- Mirčev, K. 1963. *Istoričeska gramatika na bälgarskija ezik* (Sofia: Däržavno izdatelstvo 'Nauka i izkustvo')
- Mladenov, S. 1979. *Istorija na na bälgarskija ezik* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na bälgarskata akademija na naukite)
- Moguš, M. 1993. *Povijest hrvatskoga književnoga jezika* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus)
- Mollova, M. 1962. 'Les ga-dialectes turcs dans les Balkans et leur rapport avec les autres langues turques', *Linguistique balkanique*, 4:107–130
- . 1967. 'Études phonétiques sur les turcismes en bulgare', *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 12: 115–192
- Moskov, M. 1960. 'Käm väprosa za persijsko-turskite dumi v bälgarskija ezik', *Bälgarski ezik*, 10: 357–359
- . 1964. 'Obšti po proizvod turski zaemki v balkanskite ezici', *Bälgarski ezik*, 14(4): 186–190

- . 1968. 'Turski i tjurkski zaemki ot zvukopodražatelen i nezvukopodražatelen karakter v balkanskite ezici', *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet, Fakultet po slavjanski filologiji*, 62: 433–532
- Muftić, T. 1960–61. 'O arabizmima u srpskohrvatskom jeziku', *Prilozi za orijentalnu filologiju – Revue de philologie orientale*, 10–11: 5–29
- Muslasmajić, N. 2011. *Bosnian-English Dictionary* (Bloomington: Authorhouse)
- Mønnesland, S. 2005. *Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Institut za istočnoevropske i orijentalne studije)
- Nakaš, L. 2005. 'Jezički izraz usmenog stvaralaštva bošnjaka', in Mønnesland 2005: 107–130
- . 2010. *Jezik i grafija krajišničkih pisama* (Sarajevo: Slavistički komitet)
- 'Nastavak rada na rječniku'. 1976. Odjel za filologiju Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (ed.), *RHSJ*, 23: 13–14
- Nikolova, N. 2006. *Bilingvizmät v bälgarskite zemi prez XV–XIX vek* (Šumen: Šumenski universitet 'Episkop Konstantin')
- Obraten rečnik na sävremenija bälgarski ezik*. 1975. L. Andrejčin (ed.) (Sofia: Izdatelstvo na bälgarski akademija na naukite)
- Papazjan, E. 1991. 'Sarafläk ili obmjana', *Bälgarski ezik*, 41: 505
- Pavlev, M. and A. Živkov. 1855. *Rečnik na dumy tursky i gričky v jazyka bälgarskyj* (Bucharest: Kopajnogov)
- Peco, A. 1967. 'Utica j turskog jezika na fonetiku štokavskih govora', *Naš jezik*, 16: 127–145
- . 1987. *Turcizmi u Vukovim rječnicima* (Belgrade: Vuk Karadžić)
- Pellegrini, G. B. 1969. 'Italijansko-balkanske podudarnosti u elementima orijentalnog porekla', *Prilozi za književnost, jezik, istoriju i folklor*, 35: 56–75
- Penčeva, R. 2013. 'Pregovor', in A. Vlajkov, *Rečnik na upotrebljavanite v Pirdopskija govor turski dumi do 1885 godina* (Sofia: Kibea)
- Petrović, S. 1995. 'Neki turcizmi u srpskohrvatskoj kulinarskoj terminologiji', *Južnoslavenska filologija*, 51: 223–232
- Popov, K. 1985. 'Sädbata na turskite dumi v bälgarskija ezik', *Iz istorijata na bälgarskija knižoven ezik*. (Sofia: BAN): 128–135

- Popović, Đ. 1884. *Turske i druge istočanske reči u našem jeziku: građa za veliki srpski rečnik* (Belgrade [unknown publisher])
- Popović, I. 1969. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)
- Pranjković, I. (ed.), 2005a. *Hrvatska književnost Bosne i Hercegovine od XIV. do sredine XVIII. stoljeća* (Sarajevo: Matica Hrvatska u Sarajevu)
- . 2005b. 'Jezik bosanskih franjevacā', in *Jezik u Bosni i Hercegovini* (Sarajevo: Institut za istočnoevropske i orijentalne studije): 227–258
- Prince, J. 1931. 'Surviving Turkish Elements in Serbo-Croatian', *American Oriental Society*, 51(3): 241–261
- Račeva, M. 1971, 1975. 'Orientaliski zaemki v bālgarski ezik', *Bālgarski ezik*, 21(5): 461–462; 25(2): 138–143; 25(4): 346–349
- . 1977. 'O morfoloģičeskoj adaptaciji osmanotureckix leksičeskix zaimstvovanij v balkanskix jazykax', *Balkansko ezikoznanie*, 20(1–2): 93–103
- Radić, P. 1999. 'Sufiks *-lija* u građenju imena stanovnika od imena mesta ili oblasti', *Jugoslavenska filologija*, 50: 47–66
- Rajkov, B. 1966. 'Kām vāprosa za mjestoto na "Abagara" v starata bālgarska literatura', *Izvestija na instituta za literatura*, 28–29: 279–286
- . 1979. *Abagar na Filip Stanislavov (Rim 1651)* (Sofia: Narodna prosveta)
- Redhouse Turkish/Ottoman-English Dictionary*. 2000. (Istanbul: Sev Matbaacilik ve Yayincilik A.Ş.)
- Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. 1880-1956. (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti)
- Rizvić, M. 1976. 'Pisma muslimanskih krajišnika pisana bosančicom od XVI do sredine XIX stoljeća kao oblik stare epistolarne književnosti', *Godišnjak Odjeljenja za književnost*, 5: 217–264
- Sandfeld, K. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et resultats* (Paris: La société de linguistique de Paris)
- Schmaus, A. 1955. 'Zur Lautgestalt der türkischen Lehnwörter in den südslavischen Sprachen', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 6: 104–123
- Schröpfer, J. 1956. 'Zur inneren Sprachform der Balkanvölker', *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 1(4): 135–160
- Schmaus, A. 1961–1962. 'Gramatički rod turskih imenica u južnoslovenskim jezicima', *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, 4–5: 300–308

- Sinclair, J. 1999. 'A Way with Words', in S. Oksefjell, *Out of Corpora: Studies in Honour of Stig Johansson* (Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B. V.)
- Skok, P. 1937–1938. 'Prilozi proučavanju turcizama u srp.-hrv. jeziku', *Slavia*, 15: 166–190; 336–366; 481–501
- . 1948. 'Turski sufiks *-li* u epitetima', *Rad JAZU*, 272: 39–48
- . 1971. *Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika* (Zagreb: Jugoslavenska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti)
- Spasova, A. 1952. 'Italianski zaemki v bālgarski ezik minali prez turski', *Izvestija na Instituta za bālgarski ezik*, 3: 226–227
- . 1966. 'Grāčki i turski elementi v bālgarskata morska ribarska terminologija', *Bālgarski ezik*, 16(4): 332–343
- Stachowski, S. 1961. *Przyrostki obcego pochodzenia w języku serbsko-chorwackim* (Krakow: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego)
- . 1963a. 'Czasowniki serbochorwackie o osnowie tureckiej', in *Studia linguistica in honorem Th. Lehr-Splawiński* (Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe): 265–268
- . 1963b. 'Studien über den osmanisch-türkischen Wortschatz', *Folia Orientalia*, 5: 75–80
- . 1964. 'Zametki o metodologii etimologičeskix issledovanij tureckix zaimstvovanij v serbsko-xorvatskom jazyke', *Etimologija*, 2: 56–71
- . 1967. *Studia nad chronologią turcyzmów w języku serbsko-chorwackim* (Krakow: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego)
- . 1968. 'Die Turzismen in dem 'Slavenoserbskij Leksikon' aus dem J. 1790', *Slavica*, 8: 231–236
- . 1969. 'Przyczynek do chronologii chronologią turcyzmów w języku serbsko-chorwackim', *Studia z filologii polskiej i sławiańskiej*, 8: 303–309
- . 1971. *Studia nad chronologią turcyzmów w języku bułgarskim* (Krakow: Nakładem Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego)
- . 1973. *Fonetyka zapożyczeń osmańsko-tureckich w języku serbsko-chorwackim* (Wrocław: Polska akademia nauk komitet słowianoznawstwa)
- . 1975. *Studien über die arabischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen* (Wrocław: Zakład narodowy imienia ossolińskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk)

- . 1998. *Studia turcologica cracoviensia 5* (Krakow: Księgarnia akademicka)
- Stajnova, M. 1964. 'Za pejorizacijata na turcizmite v bälgarskija ezik', *Bälgarski ezik*, 14(4): 183–186
- Stamenov, M. 2011. *Sädbata na turcizmite v bälgarskija ezik i v bälgarskata kultura* (Sofia: Izdatelstvo Iztok-Zapad)
- Stančev, K. 1975. 'Poezijata na bälgarskite pavlikjani', *Literaturna misäl*, 19(1): 63–71
- . 1981. 'Literaturata na bälgarite katolici prez XVII–XVIII v. i prexodät ot srednovekovie käm väzražđane', *Literaturna misäl*, 3: 3–11
- . 1982. *Opis na slavjanskite räkopisi v plovdivskata Narodna biblioteka 'Ivan Vazov'* (Sofia: Narodna biblioteka 'Kiril i Metodii')
- . 1988. 'Poezijata na bälgarite katolici prez XVIII–XIX vek i väprosät za nejnite obrazci', in A. Miltenova (ed.), *Bälgarija, Italija i Balkanite* (Sofia: BAN): 155–159
- . 1998. 'Njakoi utočnenija odnosno istoriografiskite säčinenija na Petär Bogdan Bakšič', *Palaeobulgarica*, 22(2): 128–132
- . 2006. 'Frančesko Soimirovič i načaloto na novobälgarskata istorigrafija' *Godišnik na Sofijskija universitet 'Sv. Kliment Ohridski' Centär za slavjano-vizantijski proučvanija 'Ivan Dujčev'* 95(14): 379–390
- Steuerwald, K. 1988. *Türkisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz)
- Stojanov, Lj. 1952. 'Za turcizmite i dialektizmite v bälgarskija literaturen ezik', *Izvestija na Instituta za bälgarski ezik*, 2: 218–219
- Šarić, Lj. 2011. 'Prefiksi kao sredstvo perfektivizacije: semantički prazne jedinice?', *Fluminensia*, 23(2): 7–20
- . 2012a. 'A Cognitive Semantic Account of the Prefix *uz* in Croatian', *Jezikoslovlje*, 13(1): 191–218
- . 2012b. 'The Verbal Prefix *na-* in Croatian: A Cognitive Linguistic Analysis', *Jezikoslovlje*, 13(1): 45–73
- Šarić, Lj. and I. Tchizmarova. 2013. 'Space and Metaphor in Verbs Prefixed with *od-/ot-* 'from' in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Bulgarian', *Space in South Slavic, Oslo Studies in Language*, 5(1): 7–33
- Šarić, Lj. 2014. 'Moving into, away, and Where Else? A Semantic Analysis of the Verbal Prefix *u-* in Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian', *Slavic and East European Journal*, 58(2): 255–279
- Škaljić, A. 1989. *Turcizmi u srpskohrvatskom jeziku*, 6th ed. (Sarajevo: Svjetlost)

- Telbizov, K. 1964. 'Novi istoričeski danni za dejnostta na bālgarskite franciskani prez XVII–XIX v.', *Duxovna kultura*, 45(10–11): 48–57
- . 1980. 'Kām biografijata na Krāstju Pejkič (1665-1730)', *Vekove*, 9: 126–135
- . 1981. 'Čiprovska knižovna škola', *Literaturna misāl*, 25(6): 121–138
- Thomason, S. and T. Kaufman. 1991. *Languages, Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Tāpkova-Zajmova V. 1988. 'Idejata za xristijanskija Rim i sāotvetnata terminologija v kāsna srednovjekovna bālgarska knižnina', in A. Miltenova (ed.), *Bālgarija, Italija i Balkanite* (Sofia: BAN): 45–50
- Vaillant, A. 1953. 'Les langues slaves mēridionales et la conquēte turque', *Byzantinoslavica*, 14: 123–129
- . 1958. *Grammaire comparēe des langues slaves* (2) (Lyon: IAC)
- Vasmer, M. 1964. *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka* (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo 'Progress')
- Velčeva, B. 1966. 'Norma i tradicija v bālgarskija knižoven ezik ot XVI–XVIII v.', *Bālgarski ezik*, 16(2): 110–121
- Večeva, E. 1988. 'Za katoličeskata cārka i bālgarskata narodnost prez XVII vek', in A. Miltenova (ed.), *Bālgarija, Italija i Balkanite*, Sofia: BAN: 112–118
- Vince, Z. 2002. *Putovima hrvatskoga književnog jezika* (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice Hrvatske)
- Vigliocco, G., B. Butterworth, and C. Semenza. 1995. 'Constructing Subject-Verb Agreement in Speech: the Role of Semantic and Morphological Factors', *Journal of Memory and Language*, 34(2): 186–215
- Vlajkov, A. 2013. *Rečnik na upotrebljavanite v Pirdopskija govor turski dumi do 1885 godina* (Sofia: Kibea)
- Vranska, C. 1952. 'Turskite naimenovanija na otvlečeni ponjatija v ezika na bālgarskija folklor', *Izvestija na Instituta za bālgarski ezik*, 2: 220–222
- Weinreich, U. 1974. *Languages in Contact*, 8th ed. (The Hague: Mouton)
- Zirdum, A. 1982. *Filip Lastrić Očevac*. Zagreb: Kršćanska sadašnjost
- . 2003. 'Uvod', *Godišnjak od događaja i promine vrimena u Bosni 1754–1882* (Sarajevo: Synopsis)

Zubčević, A. 'The Written Culture of Medieval Bosnia and its Continuation in the Ottoman Period: The Question of Break and Continuity in Bosnian Muslim Book Culture' (unpublished article emailed on 02.09.2014)