

Olga M. MLADENOVA (Calgary)

BETWEEN SPEECH AND WRITING: THE CASE OF CIOPLEA

Bulgarian-speaking Catholics form a small minority that has attracted a lot of attention in the linguistic literature not least because of their migrations, apparently related to their denominational choice (Милетич 1903, Стойков 1967, Стойков 1968, Младенов 1993, 42–43, 46, 317–363, Трумер 1981, Трумер 2000а, Трумер 2000б, Селимски 1974, Селимски 1991, Селимски 1999, Selimski 2002, Неделчев 1994).¹ The same reason, compounded in some cases by the geographic isolation of Bulgarian-speaking Catholics from other Bulgarians, contributed to the rise of a separate written tradition² whose relationship to mainstream Bulgarian literary usage has not been fully elucidated. Its significance for the historical dialectology of Bulgarian however cannot be overestimated.

My focus here will be on the Bulgarian Paulitian (павликянски) dialect as spoken in the Catholic village Cioplea near Bucharest and writings produced in it at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. In my work on *Maxim Mladenov's Electronic Corpus of the Bulgarian Dialects in Romania* (ММЕС-BDR) I came across Mladenov's records from Stojan Romanski's archive preserved at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.³ Besides Mladenov's handwritten copies of Romanski's field notes from 1906 and 1908 when the latter visited Cioplea, there was a xerographic copy of a brochure entitled *Bratstvoto ili congregația za pomost i otervanie na siromašite duše ot purgatoro u Cioplea* (referred to further as ВСП).⁴ All Bulgarian texts and songs collected by Romanski in Romania will be included in ММЕС-BDR. The dialect texts require no further comment here, but the brochure is of special interest as an explicitly localized token of the Bulgarian Catholic written tradition. This article aims to describe the language of the brochure in relation to mainstream Bulgarian, the dialect spoken in Cioplea and the Catholic written tradition.⁵

At the end of the nineteenth century Cioplea with a population of 399 „had a Catholic church served by Catholic priests and a private school (seminary), which employed three teachers and was funded by the Catholic Church“ (MDG 2: 427). Romanski notes on August 31, 1906 that the church had a pipe organ and was

devoted to Virgin Mary and that the school was built in 1890 by villagers under the leadership of the priest Constantin Bibielle (or Bibiella) who was Polish, originally from Silesia. The school had three classrooms in which children were taught to read and write Bulgarian. In 1898 the priest was banned from the village for supporting Bulgarian-language education. When after six months he returned, he did not find his papers, which had presumably been burnt in his absence. By 1906 the church school had been disbanded and the village administration was using its premises. A new Romanian school had taken over. But even after the demise of Constantin Bibielle, Cioplea continued to have a vibrant community life centred around the church.

A glimpse into it is provided in the introduction to the brochure (BCP: 3–5), signed by the priest August Kuczka. It mentions Constantin Bibiella by name as the initiator of the Brotherhood, which was founded (*zatemelino*) in 1892 and had as its goal the promotion of the Christian way of life. Members of the Brotherhood had the duty to participate in charity, fast, pray, regularly go to church and to confession and the right to particularly solemn funerals involving the use of the two black Brotherhood banners and a High and a Low Mass officiated specifically for them besides all regular Masses. The monthly membership dues (10 *bani* for married persons and 5 *pari* for single persons) were set so low that anybody could afford to be a member. The brochure (called in the introduction *knighice*) contains prayers arranged by their order in the Mass (BCP: 7–16), prayers, hymns and psalms in juxtaposition with their Latin originals (BCP: 17–20), prayers for the dead (BCP: 21–24), a rhymed Bulgarian version of the twenty-stanza Roman missal *Dies Irae* (BCP: 24–26), a litany for the dead (BCP: 26–28) and, finally, five prayers to Jesus Christ for the souls in purgatory (BCP: 29–31). On page 6 the brochure explains the Roman Catholic dogma of the purgatory as a place of temporary punishment of penitent souls. This punishment can be shortened if members of the extended family pray for the dead person, but prayer is also beneficial for those who pray, because when their turn comes to stand in front of God to be judged, they will have the support of the dead for whom they have prayed (BCP: 9).

This overview of the content of the brochure clearly indicates that its text can roughly be divided into two segments, whose balance between the spontaneity of everyday dialect speech and the orderly structures of written tradition is achieved on different terms. On pp. 3–6 and in the introductory lines to prayers throughout (to be referred further as segment **A**) the compiler is less constrained by tradition than in the texts of prayers, hymns and psalms themselves, which may well have been transmitted from previous generations in the form recorded in the brochure (segment **B**).

Both oral and written transmission of the tradition must have shaped the text as we find it in the brochure. Ljudvig Selimski, who was born in Žitnica, region Plovdiv (locality number 3035 in the Bulgarian Dialect Atlas network,

representative of the South Paulitian dialect), recalls the adjective *нибиџки* 'heavenly' (a borrowing of West Slavic/Croatian origin) from prayers that his mother taught him when he was a little boy (Селимски 2004: 61), a good example of oral transmission of the tradition. As to the mechanism by which the tradition was consolidated through the circulation of written texts, Romanski reports on September 1, 1906 of his encounter in Cioplea with the seventy-eight-year old local resident Ivan Kežan who showed him a book he owned: *Nauka kristianska. Za kristianete ot filibenskata darxava* (...) published in 1844,⁶ bound together with *Alphabetum bulgaricum sive cyrillianum nunc primum editum catholicis Thraciae Bulgaris* (Romae, MDCCCXLIV) and containing, besides the alphabet, prayers like *Отче наш* and *Радџи сѧ Марїѧ* in Cyrillic and Latin transcriptions. We can thus take it for granted that the residents of Cioplea were familiar with written texts produced outside Cioplea and based on other Bulgarian speech varieties.

* * *

Let us now turn to the linguistic analysis of the text. On the level of **orthography** I can distinguish three sources of influence. Most important is the impact of the Romanian language, whose spelling conventions define the appearance of the text to the greatest extent. The following equivalences between the brochure's orthographic system and Cyrillic match Romanian conventions:

| | |
|---|--|
| <i>ă</i> for ъ | <i>măkite</i> (BCP: 3 – A, 11 – B), <i>u păkala</i> (BCP: 6 – A), <i>ogăna</i> (BCP: 6 – A), <i>nai păren</i> (BCP: 7 – A), <i>da isvărșa</i> (BCP: 9 – B); |
| <i>c</i> followed by <i>e</i> or <i>i</i> for ч | <i>cestitia</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>cerkva</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>vsicikite</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>vsicikite</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>ci</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>vecimoto</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>pocesto</i> (BCP: 3 – A), <i>da specielat</i> (BCP: 7 – A), <i>pedepsata vecina</i> (BCP: 9 – B); |
| <i>c</i> followed by other vowels or consonants for κ | <i>bașca</i> (BCP: 4 – A); |
| <i>ch</i> for κ in front of <i>e</i> or <i>i</i> | <i>chip</i> (BCP: 7 – B); |
| <i>g</i> followed by <i>e</i> or <i>i</i> for дж | <i>singire</i> (BCP: 29 – B); |
| <i>g</i> followed by other vowels or | <i>u godinata</i> (BCP: 4 – A), <i>Gospode</i> (BCP: 17 – B); |

consonants for *z*

- gh* for *z* in front of *e* or *i* *ghi* (BCP: 3 – A), *draghi* (BCP: 5 – A, 11 – B), *evanghelia* (BCP: 9 – B), *Angheli* (BCP: 11 – A), *slughi* (BCP: 21 – B, 23 – B);
- j* for *ж* *kajimi* (BCP: 3 – A), *blajenstvo* (BCP: 3 – A; 9 – B), *mojat* (BCP: 3 – A), *grijat* (BCP: 3 – A), *ojinati* (BCP: 4 – A), *otvajdat* (BCP: 6 – A), *jivot* (BCP: 7 – A), *ni moje* (BCP: 9 – B), *slujba* (BCP: 12 – A), *dlläjen* (BCP: 15 – A);
- ş* for *ш* *pomoşt* (BCP: 3 – A), *duşe* (BCP: 3 – A), *naşte başti* (BCP: 3 – A), *iştat* (BCP: 3 – A), *sluşanieto* (BCP: 6 – A), *oproştene* (BCP: 24 – B);
- ţ* for *ц* *congregaţia* (BCP: 3 – A), *ţena* (BCP: 4 – A), *ţaruvaş* (BCP: 24 – B);
- z* for *з* *da zemat* (BCP: 3 – A), *znaia* (BCP: 9 – B), *nazad* (BCP: 12 – A), *slezovaia* (BCP: 12 – A), *onezi* (BCP: 12 – A), *zaştoto* (BCP: 16 – B).

Second in importance is the Italian influence, which can be discerned in spellings like the following:

- z* for *ц* *broinize* (BCP: 3 – A), *mesez* (BCP: 4 – A), *bariazi* (BCP: 4 – A), *Sarze* (BCP: 5 – A; 23 – B), *Otez* (BCP: 5 – A), *u frantzuskata zeme* (BCP: 5 – A), *Sfezi* (BCP: 14 – A), *lizeto* (BCP: 18 – B), *plamazite* (BCP: 21 – B), *plesniza* (BCP: 25 – B), *duşiza* (BCP: 25 – B), *desniza* (BCP: 25 – B), *veniz* (BCP: 30 – B);
- zz* for *ц* *dezza* (BCP: 14 – B), *rezzete* (BCP: 18 – B), *Devizza* (BCP: 23 – A);
- s* for *з* *saştoto* (BCP: 10 – A), *slatne* (BCP: 12 – A);
- tt* for *м* *etto* (BCP: 4 – A), *etto me* (BCP: 11 – B)⁷;
- cc* for *мч* *Occe* (BCP: 14 – B, 20 – B, 27 – B).

Some spellings identified above as Romanian would have been the same according to Italian orthography (for instance, *gh* for *z*, *ch* for *к* and *c* for *ч*) and some of them are present also in *Nauka kristianska* (1844), cf. *drughi pesni* (Селимски 1991: 120) and in the older handwritten literature (Walczak-

Mikołajczakowa 2004: 66, 70–71). As one would expect, Romanian and Italian spellings are encountered in both segments A and B of the text but against a general predominance of the Romanian forms; the Italian ones are more frequent in segment B, which is more dependent on the written tradition.

And finally, the Cyrillic tradition – and more specifically the so-called Resava orthography, characterized by the indiscriminate use of *к* (*ī*) for etymological *к* and *ч* – can only be responsible for spellings *behī* 'I was' (BCP: 15 – B), *tehi* 'them' (BCP: 7 – B, 13 – B, 14 – A, 28 – B) or alternatively *tehi* (BCP: 7 – B). Similarly, to correspond to pronunciation, *az padam* (BCP: 11 – B), *zarad tui* (BCP: 10 – B), *prez sfeti ispoved* followed by a full stop (BCP: 9 – B) should have been written with devoiced final consonants as the dialect recordings indicate⁸ and the preservation of the voiced consonant in writing in positions from which it is banned in the spoken language can only be a proof of awareness of the Cyrillic tradition, the only one with roots reaching far enough in time to account for this. Devoicing is abundantly attested in BCP but there also are words whose orthography follows the etymological principle favoured in the Cyrillic tradition.

Thus we can attribute the following chronological order to the three orthographic systems whose traces can be found in the brochure, starting with the earliest one: (1) Medieval Cyrillic Resava orthography; (2) Italian orthography; (3) Romanian orthography. It is noteworthy that some Italian spellings that characterize *Nauka kristianska* are encountered extremely rarely or not at all in BCP, eg. *sc* for *u*, cf. *izvárscimi*, *tescka*, *iskasc* (Селимски 1991: 118) but see the single instance of *loscini* (BCP: 8 – B) side by side with *lošine* (BCP: 15 – B); *x(i)* for *ж*, cf. *káxi* (Селимски 1991: 118), *darxiava* (Селимски 1991: 120). Standard Italian has neither the voiced palato-alveolar fricative *ж* nor an accepted way to write it down. However, the Ligurian dialect had this fricative and used to render it as *xi*, cf. the name of Garibaldi's Genovese friend and supporter Nino Bixio (1821–1873), pronounced [b'ixɔ] in Ligurian as opposed to [b'ixsɔ] in Standard Italian.⁹ I am grateful to my colleague Dr. Stefano Giannini at the University of Calgary for pointing this Genovese trait out to me. It opens interesting perspectives on the potential Genovese contributions to the Bulgarian Catholic written tradition.¹⁰

Even the examples cited so far show that there is a great deal of variation in orthography, as one can expect from a language that is at the very beginning of its codification. Thus Cyrillic *ж* can be rendered not only by *j* as shown above but also by *z* – *strah bozi* (BCP: 5 – A), *pravdinata boza* (BCP: 6 – A), *o Boze* (BCP: 7 – B: 8 – B); Cyrillic *ъ* – not only by *ǎ* but also by *a* – *martvi duše* (BCP: 4 – A), *llajen* (BCP: 4 – A: 9 – B), *tvarde* (BCP: 5 – A), *mlogo pati* (BCP: 5 – A), *nai skapa kraf* (BCP: 7 – B), *da badat* (BCP: 7 – B), *na pakala* (BCP: 9 – B), *sled smarta* (BCP: 9 – B), *kahar* (BCP: 19 – B) and *e* as in *drej* (BCP: 12 – A), *tei* (BCP: 5 – A: 9 – B), *u sena* (BCP: 11 – A), *na gredi* (BCP: 12 – A), *otervanie* (BCP: 3 – A), *otervi me* (BCP: 19 – B), *treni* (BCP: 30 – B). Cyrillic *к* can be

represented by *k*, *c* or *ch*, Cyrillic *з* by *z* or *s*, Cyrillic *ц* by *č*, *z*, *zz* or even *c* – *iagance* (BCP: 28 – B), Cyrillic *μ* (*оже*) not only by *g* but also by *dz* as in *po bārdzi* (BCP: 3 – A), *po bardzi* (BCP: 6 – B)¹¹ etc.

Comparison with Walczak-Mikołajczakowa's observations on the orthography of the Bulgarian Catholic manuscripts from the second half of the eighteenth century shows recurrence of the Italian spelling patterns (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 63–72). Not surprisingly, there are in her corpus no traces of Romanian influence as, first, Romanian itself was at the time still using the Cyrillic alphabet and, second, the eighteenth-century texts were written in the interior of Bulgaria far from any contact with Romanian. It is more intriguing that Walczak-Mikołajczakowa found no orthographic signs of awareness of the old Cyrillic tradition.

* * *

The next important question concerns the relationship of the language of BCP: to the Cioplea dialect and other Bulgarian varieties, including Standard Bulgarian. This question is best answered on the basis of BCP's phonological and morphological traits.

There is only one fact pertaining to **phonology** that I would like to mention here: the absence of the close central unrounded vowel [ɨ] – [i] in IPA transcription – characteristic of both the Paulitian dialects in Bulgaria (Стойков 1993: 138) and the Cioplea dialect (Младенов 1993: 319–320). This absence prepares us for a relative independence of the language of BCP: from the speech patterns of its compilers and readers and at the same time it is a sign of continuity with the Catholic written tradition, which also ignores the phoneme [ɨ] (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 66).

The brochure shares characteristic **morphological** features with the Cioplea dialect, but it also contains competing forms of different origin. The formation of the future tense supports this claim. The future tense particle in Cioplea is *зъ* (Гуцу 1968: 329, Младенов 1993: 343–344) and it is used frequently in the brochure in both sections of the text: *za ima grija* (BCP: 5 – A), *za zemat del* (BCP: 5 – A), *za me vikaš* (BCP: 8 – B), *za se ciudim* (BCP: 24 – B), *za utuori* (BCP: 25 – B). Mainstream Bulgarian *уѐ* however is also frequent, sometimes followed by *da*: *šte zagubi pravo* (BCP: 4 – A), *šte se molat* (BCP: 5 – A), *šte stigma* (BCP: 8 – B), *šte dedi* (BCP: 8 – B), *šte da isgare* (BCP: 24 – B), *šte mi pomost dava* (BCP: 25 – B) etc. Its use in both sections A and B is an indication that textological reasons alone cannot account for its presence. The future tense particle *уѐ* was not just copied from texts available to the compiler; it had been internalized and appears in competition with *зъ* in sentences he composed. Since *уѐ* (*da*) is also the future-tense marker in the earlier handwritten literature (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 121–122), this literature should be considered the probable source for *šte* (*da*) in BCP.

More puzzling are the forms of the demonstrative pronouns for proximity. Students of the Cioplea dialect give them as *моѹъ*, *moc*, *mo* m. – *маѹъ*, *mac* f. – *мыѹа*, *myŭ* n. – *мѹѹъ*, *mec* pl. (Гуцу 1968: 323), and alternatively as *moc*, *myc* m. – *мъс* f. – *myŭ* n. – *mec*, *m'ac*, *mŭa*, *mue* pl. (Младенов 1993: 339). BCP: features *toz* (*tozŭ*) m. – *taz* f. – *toz* n. – *tezi* (*tezŭ*) pl., cf. *na toz svet* (BCP: 10 – B), *na tozŭ sfet* (BCP: 31 – B), *taz jalost* (BCP: 10 – B), *bratstvoto toz* (BCP: 3 – A; 5 – A), *ve toz silo* (BCP: 3 – A), *toz vsicŭkoto* (BCP: 10 – A), *na tezi siromaŭsite duŭe* (BCP: 3 – A), *za tezi siromaŭsite duŭe* (BCP: 13 – B), *idin ot tezi pisani* (BCP: 4 – A). However, alone-standing neuter *tui* is also used, exclusively in prepositional phrases, cf. *zarad tui* (BCP: 4 – A, 5 – A, 16 – B), *ot tui* (BCP: 4 – A). As research done by Borjana Velčeva shows, omonimity of the masculine and neuter demonstrative pronouns *moc* is currently not a characteristic of any Bulgarian dialects but it appears in older texts from Northeastern Bulgaria. Most recently, evidence of it has been reported from the Kotel dialect in 1911. Later fieldwork in Kotel did not confirm the existence of the neuter form *moc* (Велчева 1964: 183–190). Stoian Romanski's records contain no information about the neuter demonstrative in the Cioplea dialect. Sixty years later, Maxim Mladenov did not encounter neuter *moc* in any of the Bulgarian dialects in Romania. So it is only the testimony of BCP: that opens the possibility that the Cioplea pronominal system may have been of Northeastern Bulgarian type in the past. Unless it can be proven that the BCP pronominal system has another origin, it should be concluded that until the end of the nineteenth century the Cioplea dialect featured a demonstrative pronoun *moc*, which agreed with masculine and neuter nouns. If so, it is remarkable that a dialect developing in isolation should have followed the language trends of the metropolis.

The phenomena surveyed in this section show that the relation between the language of BCP and the Cioplea dialect is not straightforward: (1) not everything that characterizes the dialect has found a reflection in the language of the brochure; (2) phenomena that are definitely extraneous to the dialect have penetrated the language of the brochure from other Bulgarian varieties directly or through the mediation of the written tradition; and (3) BCP allows a glimpse into the history of the dialect because it may have preserved forms that have subsequently become obsolete.

*

BCP attempts to remain understandable to its readers while at the same time addressing issues that are rarely tackled by the majority of dialect speakers. It demonstrates the predicament of all language codifiers at all times: they must, however grudgingly, expand the inventory of syntactic constructions and vocabulary (by borrowing and word-formation) beyond the everyday usage of the community at large.

Expansion in the area of **syntax** is not easy to track on the basis of the available data. At this stage we can just recognize phenomena that reflect the

Cioplea dialect and those that categorically deviate from it, rather than inventory the traits that go beyond normal dialect oral practice. Thus, conjunction *dorkato* (BCP: 5 – A, 14 – B), which corresponds to Standard Bulgarian *докато*, is well documented in the dialect (Младенов 1993: 352–353), whereas the equivalent to Standard Bulgarian conjunction *както* *kaketo* (BCP: 14 – B), *keketo* (BCP: 24 – B) is not present in the available recordings of dialect speech or the descriptions of the dialect, which however does not entitle us to conclude that it is not used by speakers.

Foreign models apparently account for some syntactic features of BCP. The preposition *ot* seems to be used as an equivalent of the Genitive case elsewhere in Slavia in contexts which would require *na* in Standard Bulgarian: *da ia preimiš u vecinata slava ot rai nebeski* (BCP: 22 – B), *da ghi preimiš u mestoto ot mir, ot šfetlost i ot vecinata slava* (BCP: 23 – B), *Sfeta Devizza ot Devizzete* (BCP: 27 – B), *dušite ot vsicikite verni Kristiani* (BCP: 29 – B), *zavedi ia na mestoto ot Tvojata slava* (BCP: 29 – B). Such a function of *ot*, which, by the way, is not the only one attested in the brochure, does not characterize the Cioplea dialect (Младенов 1993: 351). Given the contexts in which it appears (all of them within section B of the text), I believe that it calques Latin or Slavic genitival constructions and reflects translation practices of the contributors to the Bulgarian Catholic written tradition. It should be kept in mind that the mainstream Bulgarian preference for *na* in such constructions is also reflected, cf. *dena na iat, na kahar i nevole* 'dies irae, calamitatis et miseriae' (BCP: 19 – B). This use of *ot* is present in Walczak-Mikołajczakowa's corpus as well, cf. *pomognete mi na cias od mojata smart* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 181), *i na sredata darvoto od xivot i darvoto od znanie od dobroto i od zloto* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 183), *sas pot od tvojetto celo da se hranisc* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 185), *i nime odsadi Gospod na maki vecni od pacal* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 227).

A peculiarity of word order in BCP, for which I could find no parallels elsewhere, is also worth noting. Most conjunctions have a fixed place at the beginning of the clause they introduce. So do the adversative conjunctions *no*, *ava* and certainly the Turkish loan *ama* 'but, however', well known to spoken Bulgarian and present in the eighteenth-century Catholic manuscripts (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 99) and BCP. BCP however often opts for a word order in which *ama* unexpectedly takes a second position in the clause, eg. *Dušite ot purgatoro vikat nai păren do Boga, milostovia; vikat ama i na teinite brati i rodnini* (BCP: 7–8 – A); *Măkite ot purgatoro să strašne i goleme, taman tei, kato onezi ot păkala; sal sas taz reslika, ci ve păkala să do veka i bez sfăršenje; ot purgatoro ama ima otleknovanie i otervanie* (BCP: 16 – B). This is an option that only its synonym *obaque* has in Standard Bulgarian. The phenomenon deserves further attention in a broader context.

In the realm of **vocabulary**, I will deal with a handful of lexical items that present a general interest for Bulgarian lexicology and lexicography. There are in BCP: a number of borrowings that were clearly inherited from the dialect and some were even attested in the samples of dialect speech at our disposal. In this category are Turkish borrowings such as: *barem* (BCP: 4 – A, 8 – B), *baška, başca* (BCP: 4 – A, 14 – A, БЕР 1: 37), *faida* (BCP: 4, 5, 6 – A), *hismekiare i hismekiarki* (BCP: 23 – B, БЕР 2: 39), *iurnizi* (BCP: 15 – B, БЕР 2: 108, ПРОДДЛ: 584), *kabate si* (BCP: 6 – A, БЕР 2: 116), *kaharove* (BCP: 27 – B, БЕР 2: 285), *kail* (BCP: 25 – B, БЕР 2: 142–143), *da kasandisova* (BCP: 7 – A, БЕР 2: 137), *kašmer* (BCP: 25 – B, БЕР 2: 301), *ot kurban* (BCP: 11 – B, БЕР 3: 144), *mazdrak* (BCP: 31 – B, БЕР 3: 612), *ot misirskite zeme* (BCP: 11 – A, БЕР 4: 123), *sanki* (BCP: 8 – B, 9 – B, БЕР 6: 482–483), *sede* (BCP: 3 – A, 9 – B, БЕР 6: 406), *zaman* (BCP: 5 – A, БЕР 1: 596), or Greek borrowings like *hurte* (BCP: 3 – A, 9 – B), *kata den* (BCP: 3 – A, БЕР 2: 266), *kondikata* (BCP: 4 – A, БЕР 2: 585), *pedepsite* (BCP: 6 – A, 8 – B, БЕР 5: 124–125), *zatemelino* (BCP: 3 – A). The majority of this lexical layer, of course, consists of non-borrowed Bulgarian words of a broader or narrower distribution. Examples of the latter kind would be: *nai pāren* (BCP: 7 – A, 9 – B, 13 – B), *po paren* (BCP: 10 – A), *стайъ раны| се умъйие пърѣи ну ръѣете| ну учите* (ММЕС–BDR, Cioplea: 1076), cf. *първѣи* (БЕР 6: 71), preposition *въз* (Младенов 1993: 348, БЕР 1: 203), *ila vas toz Altar* (BCP: 12 – A). This is the layer that brings the language of BCP: together with Bulgarian spoken in Cioplea and elsewhere. It should however be kept in mind that many of the lexical items of this category were also part of the written tradition by virtue of their presence in the Paulitian dialects in Bulgaria. So Walczak-Mikołajczakowa notes in the texts studied by her the presence of *fajda, jornek (jurnek), kabahat, kahar, kascmerlik, kurban (curban), Misir (Missirsko, zeme missirska), muzdrak, temel, barem (parem), zaman, sanki, bascka, cail, kazandissasc, hurta, pedepsvam/pedepsam, kata* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 91–108).

Side by side with the majority of words in BCP, stemming from the spoken language, there is another lexical layer, which clearly distinguishes its language from other Bulgarian varieties (be it spoken or written) and marks it out as a part of the Catholic written tradition. It consists of occidentalisms, as L. Selimski calls them, or, in other words, borrowings from Croatian and/or Slovenian, and semantic evolutions and word formations that involve native Bulgarian words but have been inspired by foreign models. Learned borrowings and calques are:

Bozanstvoto mu 'his divine nature' (BCP: 13 – A) < Cr. *božanstvo* 'divinity' (Bogadek 1999);

kališ 'communion cup from which a communicant drinks', cf. *ve kališ slatne* (BCP: 12 – A), *drej tvoia kališ vas kališa na domena* (BCP: 12 – B), *u kališa* (BCP: 13 – B) < Cr. *kalež* (Bogadek 1999) < Lat. *calix* 'chalice' (Skok 2: 20);¹²

Gospod nai mojin 'the mightiest Lord' (BCP: 14 – B) < Cr. *možan* 'powerful, mighty' (Bogadek 1999), cf. also БЕР (4: 205), where meaning 'mighty' is cited only for Ukrainian and Polish;

nebeski 'heavenly', cf. *bašta nebeski* (BCP: 7 – B, 11 – A), *Zar nebeski* (BCP: 25 – B), *rai nebeski* (BCP: 9 – B, 12 – A, 14 – B, 15 – B, 21 – B, 23 – B, 28 – B), *nebeskoto țarstvo* (BCP: 22 – B), *nebeski duhove* (BCP: 27 – B) < Cr. *nebeski* (Селимски 2004: 59–63, Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 114–115), but *blajenstvoto nebesno* (BCP: 21 – B);

prepisani u matkata 'copied in the register' (BCP: 5 – A), calqued after Cr. *matica* 'matriculation, book, register, record' (Bogadek 1999), itself formed after the model of Lat. *matrix*, cf. БЕР (3: 686) for the better known meanings of *матка*;

opacine 'iniquitates' (BCP: 17 – B) < Cr. *opačina* 'vice, wickedness, corruption, depravity' (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004, 116). Mainstream Bulgarian sources give only meanings 'reverse side of something', 'cantankerous character' and 'cantankerous person' for the rare Bulgarian *опачина* (БЕР 4: 894).

opcina na Sfezite 'community of the Saints' (BCP: 14 – B) < Cr. *općina* 'municipality, community, district, parish, township, congregation' (Bogadek 1999). The mainstream Bulgarian counterpart *община* displays the expected reflection of *tj (БЕР 4: 761);

redovnik 'priest' (BCP: 3 – A, 5 – A) < Cr. *redovnik* 'clergyman' (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 115);

Sfetoto pismo 'the Holy Scripture' (BCP: 4 – A) < Cr. *Sveto pismo*, the Bulgarian Catholic equivalent of mainstream Bulgarian *Светото писание* (cf. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 131, 181);

molim Ti se slojno 'we pray to You together' (BCP: 21 – B), *spored našte slojne molbe* 'according to our unanimous prayers' (BCP: 24 – B) < Cr. *složan* 'conformable, unanimous, harmonious' (Bogadek 1999). The word finds a parallel in an anonymous manuscript from the end of the eighteenth or the beginning of the nineteenth century: *dase klanemi sas sloxino sarze* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 213).

koito si nakicel Tvoite slughi sas vrednosta Gospodinova ili Domenova 'who have decorated your servants with the dignity of a gentleman or a clergyman' (BCP: 21 – B) < Cr. *vrednoća* 'value, worth, rate, price, worthiness' (Bogadek 1999), cf. mainstream Bulgarian *вредност* 'dexterity, ability' (БЕР 1: 184–185);

zadosta 'enough' (BCP: 6 – A, 16 – B) < Cr. *zadosta* 'enough, sufficiently, plenty' (Skok 3: 245, Bogadek 1999);

Zdrava Maria (BCP: 3 – A; 29 – B) < Cr. *Zdrava Marija*, corresponding to the Latin *Ave Maria*, as for instance in a poem by the Croatian poet Dragutin Domjanić (1875–1933): „Vozi za vozom se voz, / Cesta polahko zavija, / Stari zazvonel je zvon: / Zdrava Marija!“ The phrase appears in two versions in the

handwritten Catholic literature of the eighteenth century: *zdrava Maria* and *zdrava Mario* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 84, 127).

From Latin directly or more probably through Croatian or Italian mediation have come words like *domen* 'Catholic priest' (BCP: 3 – A) ~ Lat. *dominus* (Селимски 1991: 117, Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 111, 113), *Missa* (BCP: 3, 4 – A) ~ Lat. *missa* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 111), *membrite* (BCP: 5 – A) ~ Lat. *membrum, congregația* (BCP: 3, 5 – A) ~ Lat. *congregatio, purgatoro* (BCP: 3, 6 – A) ~ Lat. *purgatorium, Amen* (BCP: 6 – B) ~ Lat. *amen, hostia* ~ Lat. *hostia* 'the bread of wafer consecrated in the celebration of the Eucharist' (BCP: 12 – B), *limbo* (BCP: 13 – B) ~ Lat. *limbo* 'a region on the border of hell or heaven, serving as the abode after death of unbaptized infants' (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 61), *sas indulghenzite* (BCP: 16 – B) ~ Lat. *indulgentia, Altar* (BCP: 12 – A) ~ Lat. *altare* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 111), *o Issukraste* (BCP: 13 – B), *măkite na Issukrasta* (BCP: 11 – B) ~ Lat. *Jesus Christus* (Селимски 1991: 115–116, Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 113). Most of them are frequent in the Bulgarian Catholic literature and some have been noticed before.

As we saw above, it is not always easy to distinguish between the popular and the learned layers of vocabulary. For instance, regarding the following terms I have evidence neither that they are Croatian loan-words nor that they are used in the Cioplea dialect, but they are rare enough to attract attention and many of them refer to social realities more consistent with complex rather than face-to-face peasant societies. Some, as will be indicated in the appropriate places, have parallels in the Catholic handwritten literature. Here is an incomplete list of them:

moite boleve 'my pains' (BCP: 11 – B), which must point back to a feminine singular *boleva*, if one takes into account the testimony of the Catholic written tradition (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 78);

delovit 'participating, participant' (BCP: 4 – A) formed from *del* with suffix *-ovit* like *grehovit* 'sinful' (BCP: 9 – B), the latter being attested in the Catholic literature and elsewhere (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 80, БЕР 1: 290);

listo 'sheet, page' (BCP: 7 – A), which is not unknown in this meaning elsewhere in Bulgarian (БЕР 3: 427) but is still noteworthy because in Cioplea the word for 'leaf' is shown in Romanski's field notes to be *лыс*, masculine. This makes the neuter *listo* exotic in its dialect surroundings.

nidostoini hora pceski 'unworthy irresponsible people' (BCP: 25 – B), which echoes *oshti po pcesciak i grhovit stana* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 186) and *kolko i p[...].jeska mudrostata od tozi svet* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 212), left by her without an explanation. The forms *pceski, pcesciak* and *p[...].jeska* are instances of Bulgarian dialect *пчеуцьк* 'canine; wicked; difficult to train, irresponsible' < *нсе* 'dog' (БЕР 6: 32).

moiata poklonena molitva 'my respectful prayer' (BCP: 21 – B), *sas pokloneno sarze* 'with a respectful heart' (BCP: 23 – B), which find a precise equivalent in *sas pokloneno sarze* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 188);

sedostvo 'throne' (BCP: 8 – B) < *седя* 'sit', cf. БЕР (6: 585) for other derivatives from this verb;

zas nai zalnovito sarze 'with a most mournful heart' (BCP: 31 – B), which has a counterpart in *onazi xialnovita xenà* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 232) and seems to blend together two regular Bulgarian adjectives *жален* and *жаловит* (БЕР 1: 527–528).

All the more salient against this background are the few traces in the brochure of mainstream Bulgarian vocabulary, strongly associated with Orthodoxy: *iaktenie* (BCP: 11 – B, 17 – B, ПРОДДЛ: 126), *Bogorodiza* (BCP: 27 – B), *kalugheri* (BCP: 27 – B), *molitve* (BCP: 3 – A, 12 – A), used side by side with *molbite* (BCP: 8 – B) in the same meaning. There also are other lexical traces of the old Cyrillic tradition. For instance, *vidi* = *въведи* in *ne vidi nas u napast* 'ne nos inducas in tentationem' (BCP: 20 – B) seems to be a learned loanword misunderstood by the compiler of BCP as the spelling clearly indicates. As spelled, the phrase could be understood to mean 'do not see us in calamity'. The Orthodox Bulgarian tradition has *и не въведи нас в изкушение* (Моли́твеник 1991: 13) in this place of the prayer „Отче наш”. It preserves the perfective aspect of a negative imperative even though this is a position normally filled by an imperfective in Standard Bulgarian. And this is what the current normalized Catholic text of the prayer has: *и не въвеждай ни в изкушение* (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 60, footnote 16). Miletič cites two versions that were employed by Paulitians in Bulgaria: one leaning heavily on Croatian (*не уведи нас у напас*) and a free translation into the local dialect (*Боже [...] изиш на гјаулат да мо ували у грех*) (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 60). In my opinion the BCP form *ne vidi* mirrors the Cyrillic *не въведи* perhaps pronounced as *не введи*.

It is noteworthy that there are very few Romanian lexical borrowings in BCP, which comes as a surprise because Romanian-Bulgarian bilingualism was already common in Cioplea at the time of the brochure's publication and Romanian influence on the dialect is well documented in the texts recorded in Cioplea. I could cite as undoubtedly Romanian *mai* 'more' and *milă* 'mercy', cf. *nemai moje da napravi* (BCP: 7 – A), *kato nimat mila i revnost za sibesi* (BCP: 3 – A, cf. also 29 – B). Regarding other words encountered in Romanian as well as in BCP, alternative sources may be suggested, cf. *pedepsite* (BCP: 6 – A) mentioned above as a Greek borrowing or *congregația* (BCP: 3 – A; 5 – A) and *membrite* (BCP: 5 – A) treated as occidentalisms. Very interesting is the case of *chip* 'image', cf. *spored Tvoia chip i upreliciovanie* (BCP: 7 – B). The Romanian spelling adopted by the compiler makes the word also visually identical with Romanian *chip*, which is identified as a Hungarian borrowing (Ciorănescu, Nr. 1816). However, the word is part of the older Bulgarian Catholic tradition as well (Walczak-

Mikołajczakowa 2004: 118) and as it is known to Slovenian and Serbo-Croatian, chances are that it was a learned Croatian borrowing, enforced in Cioplea by the ubiquity of Romanian *chip*.

This brief survey of the learned syntactic and lexical features of BCP depicts the image of a nascent literary language, oriented towards different models than the Bulgarian spoken and written by other groups. It shows a promise that was never realized, although in Cioplea it was carried out further than in the Catholic communities inside Bulgaria, which by this time had already embraced Standard Bulgarian for their devotional needs.

* * *

This article tried to answer some of the obvious initial questions posed by this unstudied and almost inaccessible piece of Bulgarian Catholic writing. When the brochure is published online as part of MMEC–BDR, scholars will be able to integrate its evidence in their analyses of various other aspects of the language and culture of the small but in many ways remarkable group of Bulgarian-speaking Catholics and their connections inside and outside the larger Balkan cultural framework.

NOTES

¹ See Стойков (1993: 137–139, 192–198) and Walczak-Mikołajczakowa (2004) for a general overview and additional bibliography.

² Regarding Banat cf. Стойков (1967), inside Bulgaria during the eighteenth century cf. Walczak-Mikołajczakowa (2004).

³ For more details on this project cf. Младенова (2005).

⁴ The original is kept at БАН, Архив Ст. Романски, ф.130К, а. е. 2. See also Младенов (1993: 317–318). The title of the brochure was reproduced above as on the front page but it is repeated on page 3 as „Bratstvoto ili congregația za pomošt i otervanie na siromašite duše ot Purgatoro“ which makes better sense and can be translated as 'The Brotherhood or Congregation for Help and Salvation of the Needy Souls from Purgatory'.

⁵ Information about the Cioplea dialect can be gleaned from Olimpia Guțu's work (Guțu 1965, Guțu 1966, Guțu 1968), Mladenov's monograph (Младенов 1993: 317–363), the dialect texts recorded in 1906 and 1908 by Romanski and those recorded in 1963 by Olimpia Guțu and Gheorghe Bolocan and transcribed by Maxim Mladenov.

⁶ See Селимски (1991) for an analysis of Croatian lexical borrowings in the Paulitian dialect, which are attested in this book, cited by him as „Nauka kristianska za kristianete od Filibeliskata darxiava. U Rim, sas slovite od S. Sküpa od Propaganda fide“, 1884. He quotes two stanzas from the missal „Dies Irac“ 'Day of Wrath' entitled in his source „Pesen za martavi dusci“ 'Song of Dead Souls' (Селимски 1991: 119). The first of them is omitted in BCP but corresponds reasonably well to the respective stanza in the Latin original, whereas the second has a counterpart in BCP (24), featuring variations that seem to point to oral transmission of the text. These parallel texts, which do not have a counterpart in the anthology published by Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, deserve to be studied specifically.

⁷ This spelling, which characterizes just the emphatic particle *emo* 'here; there', points to a double consonant, a feature that can only be pragmatic, as the neutral pronunciation does not involve doubling of the dental stop. Its presence is probably due to the tradition, being documented in this word among others already in the handwritten literature from the second half of the eighteenth century (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 70).

⁸ Cf. ас чуй чи мойта майке бѣши на Букурѣш утколѣ|| (MMEC-BDR, Cioplea: 417); зарат питѣла|| (MMEC-BDR, Cioplea: 27).

⁹ Gerhard Rohlf's notes the regular Ligurian transformation of etymological intervocalic Latin *x* into *š* (Rohlf's I: 374).

¹⁰ In the corpus of eighteenth-century manuscripts studied by Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, there are two *x*-based variations of the spelling for *xc*, the more frequent *x* (eg. *ciuxda*, *blaxena* etc.) and *xi* in Petür Kovačev's writings and some anonymous manuscripts (eg. *xialba*, *knixiovni*). Walczak-Mikołajczakowa interprets the latter as a notation that signals the palatalised character of *xc* in the Rupa dialects (Walczak-Mikołajczakowa 2004: 66, 67). It seems to me that in view of the probable Genovese origin of the spelling *xi*, its competitor *x* appears as a later simplification of an unnecessarily complex notation.

¹¹ The 1963 recordings corroborate that the Cioplea dialect has the adverb бърин (MMEC-BDR, Cioplea: 885). Cioplea is one of the dialects that feature affricatization, which however is only occasionally reflected in BCP, cf. *vardzane* (BCP:4 – B), *samzin* (BCP:4 – A). See Велчева (1999) for an analysis of the phenomenon in the Bulgarian dialects.

¹² This probably is the origin of the rare Bulgarian *кълишка* discussed in БЕР (3: 190) and given there with a different etymology.

REFERENCES

- BCP = Bratstvoto ili congregația za pomošt i otveranie na siromašite duše ot purgatoro u Cioplea. București: F. Biciovski, 1901, 31 p.
- Bogadek, F. A. 1999. Croatian-English and English-Croatian dictionary. Vol. 1–2. Laurier Books.
- Ciorănescu, Al. 2002. Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române. București.
- MDG = Marele dicționar geografic al României. Vol. 1–5. București, 1898–1902.
- MMEC-BDR: Maxim Mladenov's Electronic Corpus of the Bulgarian Dialects in Romania. Work in Progress.
- Rohlf, G. 1949. Historische Grammatik der Italienischen Sprache und ihrer Mundarten. Bd. 1–3. Bern.
- Selimski, L. 2002. O kilku terminach chrześcijańskich w gwarze Bułgarów w Banacie. – In: Rusek, J., W. Boryś, L. Bednarczuk (red.). Dzieje Słowian w świetle leksyki. Pamięci Profesora Franciszka Ślawskiego. Kraków, 451–456.
- Skok, P. 1971–1974. Etimologijski rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika. Knj. 1–4. Zagreb.

- Trummer, M. 1981. Bogomilen, Pomaken, Pavlikianer, Franziskaner... – Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich, 4/1, 110–126.
- Walczak-Mikołajczakowa, M. 2004. Piśmiennictwo katolickie w Bułgarii. Język utworów II połowy XVIII wieku. Poznań.
- БЕР = Георгиев, В., и др. Български етимологичен речник. София, 1971–.
- Велчева, Б. 1964. Показателни местоимения и наречия в новобългарските паметници от XVII и XVIII в. – Известия на Института за български език, 10, 159–233.
- 1999. Явления, свързани с [дз] и [дж] в българските говори. – В: Радева, В., и др. (съст.) Диалектология и лингвистична география. София, 39–44.
- Гуцу, О. 1965. Болгарский говор села Чопля. I. Замечания о системе гласных. – Revue roumaine de linguistique, 10/5, 527–536.
- 1966. Болгарский говор села Чопля. II. Замечания о системе согласных. – Revue roumaine de linguistique, 11/5, 491–502.
- 1968. Болгарский говор села Чопля (Бухарест). III. Краткое описание морфологической системы. – Revue roumaine de linguistique, 13/4, 313–330.
- Милетич, Л. 1903. Нашите павликяни. – Сборник за народни умотворения, 19, 1–369.
- Младенов, М. Сл. 1993. Българските говори в Румъния. София, 1993.
- Младенова, О. М. 2005. Об електронном издании корпуса болгарских диалектных текстов из Румынии. – В: Соболев, А. Н., и А. Ю. Русаков (ред.). Языки и диалекты малых этнических групп на Балканах. С.-Петербург, München, 98–109.
- Молитвеник. 1991. Шесто фототипно издание. София.
- Неделчев, Н. 1994. Диалект на българите-католици. Велико Търново.
- ПРОДДЛ = Илчев, Ст., и др. Речник на редки, остарели и диалектни думи в литературата ни от XIX и XX век. София, 1974.
- Селимски, Л. 1974. Българската диалектна фонемна промяна $\epsilon > \textit{i}$. – В: В памет на проф. д-р Ст. Стойков. Езиковедски изследвания. София, 183–187.
- 1991. Из южнославянските окцидентализми в българската католичка книжнина от XIX век. – Zeszyty naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego 908 (Prace Językoznawcze, 95), 115–121.
- 1999. Християнските имена у българските католици. Katowice.
- 2004. Прилагателното *небѣски* в банатския говор и у българите католици не е архаизъм, а нововъведение. – Български език, 51/4, 59–63.
- Стойков, С. 1967. Банатският говор. София.
- 1968. Лексиката на банатския говор. София.
- 1993. Българска диалектология. Трето издание. Под редакцията на М. Сл. Младенов. София.
- Трумер, М. 2000а. Родопските говори и някои въпроси на българската и балканската история. – Българска историческа библиотека, 1, 36–38.
- 2000б. Българи-католици (павликяни) и българи-мохамедани (помаци) или за въпроса за структурната приемственост в историята. – Българска историческа библиотека 2, 9–14.

Author's address:*Dr. OLGA M. MLADENOVA**Germanic, Slavic and East Asian Studies**2500 University Drive N. W.**Calgary, Alberta**Canada T2N 1N4*