

Alf Grannes. *Loan Compounds in Bulgarian Reflecting the Turkish Indefinite Izafet-Construction*. (II Hist.-Filos. Klasse Skrifter Ny Serie No. 15). Oslo: The Norwegian Academy of Sciences and Letters, 1980. 56 pp.

Grannes' most recent work, while concentrating on a very limited class of Turkish loanwords in Bulgarian, constitutes a valuable and important contribution to the study of Balkan Turkisms and at the same time raises a number of questions which are themselves worthy of separate studies. The Turkish indefinite Izafet-construction (hereafter IzC) is a nominal compound in which the qualifying noun is unsuffixed while the qualified noun takes the third singular possessive suffix, e.g., *köçek hava-si* 'belly-dance tune', *kadin göbeg-i* 'lady's navel' (a type of pastry). Grannes' study concentrates on Bulgarian borrowings of these compounds in which the possessive suffix is preserved, e.g., *kiuchek-khavas'*, as opposed to the more common phenomenon, where the suffix is dropped, e.g., *kad'n-giubék*. After a survey of the indefinite IzC with preserved suffix in Romanian, Albanian, Greek, and Serbo-Croatian, none of which preserve more than a mere handful of such forms, and a brief overview of Bulgarian borrowings reflecting loss of the suffix and other types of IzC, Grannes gives a list of 153 loanwords of the type under consideration with sources, translations and Turkish etymologies. The list is followed by a discussion of orthographical, phonological, morphological, and other grammatical phenomena in the analysis of the origins and adaptations of these words in Bulgarian. Grannes briefly mentions the problem of hybrid compounds and compares the IzC to Slavic appositional compounds, e.g., Russian *vagón-restorán* 'dining-car', pointing out that Turkish influence was probably a significant factor in reinforcing the native Slavic forms in Bulgarian just as Greek was earlier and German was later. The work concludes with a semantic classification of the 153 words on the basis of which Grannes states that "the compound loanwords are distributed in roughly the same categories as other Turkish loanwords in Balkan Slavic," as opposed to their being obviously bookish in their semantic content despite suggestions that the phenomenon of a preserved suffix in indef IzC borrowings is a bookish phenomenon.

This work is thorough and stimulating, and it is also worthy of some discussion. First of all, as Grannes himself points out in his semantic analysis, 42 of his 153 words are plant names. While it may indeed be the case that botanical terminology constitutes an important class of Turkisms in Bulgarian, it is clear that they do not constitute more than 25 percent of Bulgarian Turkisms in general, and so the semantic distribution of these IzCs is considerably different from that of other types of Bulgarian Turkisms with respect to proportions rather than just the number of categories represented. It is also interesting to note that when the second, i.e., the suffixed, element is examined, four words account for 61 of the compounds: *ot* 'grass' (29), e.g., *kurt-otú* 'white horehound' (literally 'wolf grass'), *papa* 'money' (18), e.g., *kan-paras'* 'blood money', *ogul* 'son' (8), e.g., *kakhpúolu* 'whoreson', and *aga* 'lord' (6), e.g., *enichar-aras'* 'Commander-in-chief of the Janissaries'. Add to these the six words occurring 3 times and the five words occurring twice, and we find a total of 15 words accounting for 89 of the examples. In view of the fact that almost 60 percent of the suffix preserving indefinite IzCs in Bulgarian are based on less than 20 percent of the suffix preserving words, it could be argued that the preservation of the suffix in indefinite IzCs may be tied to some extent to the specific lexical item involved.

suffix cited in the *Obraten rechnik na makedonskiet iazik* (Skopje: Institute for the Macedonia Language, 1967), nor in the *Pravopis na makedonskiot literaturne iazik* (Skopje: Institute for the Macedonia Language, 1970), nor in the three-volume *Rechnik na makedonskiot iazik* (Skopje: Institute for the Macedonia Language, 1961-66). This leads to two considerations. 1) It could well be the case that Macedonian has preserved far fewer suffixes in indefinite IzC borrowings or that there exist isoglosses on Bulgarian and Macedonian linguistic territory for preservation vs. loss in general or for specific classes of lexical items. This question is worthy of further investigation. 2) The existence of these forms in older Bulgarian and Macedonian literature and their general exclusion from modern dictionaries (in addition to our comment on Macedonian we should note that of the 21 indefinite IzC borrowings beginning with the first two letters of the alphabet in Grannes' list [excluding compounds with *bas*], only one, *babá-khak* 'paternal right, patrimony', is cited in the first volume of the new *Rechnik na bulgarskiia ezik*) brings up the issue of the actual place and function of suffix-preserving IzC borrowings in these languages. Consider in this light the following fact. One of Grannes' 153 items is *shkembe-chorbas* (Turkish *iskembe corbasi*) 'tripe soup' as used by Aleko Konstantinov in Bai Ganiu, although the only form given in the orthoepic dictionary of Bulgarian is *shkembé-chorbá*. In Macedonian, the only form encountered in written sources and dictionaries as well as in conversation is *shkembe* horba, and yet in the Macedonian translation of Konstantinov's work the form used is *shkembe-chorbasi*. These could all be taken as indications that despite the fact that vocabulary reflected by suffix-preserving IzC borrowings is not itself bookish or abstract, the use of such items is nevertheless primarily a bookish phenomenon, i.e., a nineteenth-century literary device, which could perhaps be compared to a certain extent to the use of Greek and Latin plurals in English. Thus one question not addressed by Grannes but raised by his material is the actual use and comprehension of such forms in modern literary and colloquial Bulgarian.

Grannes' book is thus an extremely valuable contribution to the field of Balkan linguistics and especially the study of Turkisms both for the material it presents and the questions it raises. As such it can be hoped that it will serve as the basis and inspiration for future studies.

Victor Friedman

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Ирина Семенко. *Поэтика позднего Мандельштама: От черновых редакций к окончательному тексту* (Eurasatica 1, Quaderni del Dipartimento di Studi Eurasiatici Università degli Studi di Venezia). Roma: Editore Carucci, 1986. 126 pp. no price (paper).

Irina Semenko, daughter of the distinguished Ukrainian poet Myhailo Semenko, has long been publishing fine textological analyses of Mandel'shtam's drafts of variants both in the West and in the Soviet Union. She is one of the rare scholars who has taken it upon herself to work systematically with these, unfortunately, sparse materials left by Osip Mandel'shtam and preserved by Nadezhda Iakovlevna Mandel'shtam, the poet's widow. Over the years, she has systematically studied the texts of the poet's notebooks for his prose masterpiece,

We should also mention here Grannes' treatment of compounds with the second element *bas* 'head, chief, e.g., *binbashiia* 'major' (literally 'head of a thousand'). Because these words are considered "frozen" forms in Turkish and are treated as single nouns both in Turkish and in Bulgarian, where they are treated like ordinary Turkish loanwords ending in a high vowel, viz. the suffix *-ia* is added, e.g., *kapi* 'gate' > *kapiia*, Grannes excludes them from his list of 153 IzC borrowings and only gives a partial list of 15 items in a separate section. As Grannes himself observes, however, there are other IzC borrowings which also behave in this manner and which he has nevertheless included in his list, e.g., *binek tasi* 'mounting stone, horse block' > *binektashiia* and *binek taw* as well as *binek-tash*. More important, IzC borrowings based on *bas* can also occur with the unchanged form *bashi*, e.g., *Bin bashi*, which occurs in an example on page 22 of Grannes' book but which he does not refer to in his section on these compounds. The first volume of the new *Bechnik na Bulgarskiia ezik*, A-B (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1977), which may not have been available to Grannes at the time he compiled his study, lists *bash* as a separate entry and defines it as an adjective used after Turkish titles, usually in the vocative, e.g., *akhchi bashi* 'chief cook', *arami bashi* 'bandit chieftain'. So while Bulgarian forms in *-bashiia* can be treated as frozen, it is likewise true that *baw* still represents the borrowing of what was apart of an indefinite IzC and is freely applicable to compile an exhaustive list of the possibilities.

This brings us to a comment on the exhaustiveness of the study. It is clear from the bibliography that Grannes has consulted most if not all of the available relevant dictionaries and specialized works, but more than a quarter of his examples come from literary works. Given this and the fact that these types of words are very often labeled *dialectal* in standard Bulgarian dictionaries, an exhaustive account of these constructions would probably need to examine all of the available dialect descriptions and accounts of secret languages as well as folklore collections and other literary works. While Grannes does not specifically claim that his list is exhaustive, there are at least two items in the *Rechnik na redki, ostareli i dialektin dumi v literaturata ni ot XIX i XX vek* (Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1974) consulted by him which were omitted from his list, viz. *aiak-tert* 'fee paid for work involving travel' (literally 'foot sweat') and *diunia giuzeli* 'the most beautiful girl in the world' (literally 'world beauty'). Other items which I have found in Macedonian literature could quite possibly also occur somewhere in Bulgarian literature, e.g., *devlet dushmanlavi* 'enemies of the state' (Vojdan Cernodrinski, *Izbrani dela* [Skopje: Makedonska kniga, 1975], p. 326), *ustaogliite* 'the sons of master craftsmen' (Marko Cepenkov, *Makedonsko narodno tvoreshitvo*, vol 10 [Skopje: Makedonska kniga, 1972], p. 20), *s'chandishi* 'a type of decorative hem stitching' (literally 'mouse tooth') (*ibid.*, p. 124).

This in turn raises the question of the comparison of Bulgarian and Macedonian. Grannes makes reference to Macedonian on several occasions (e.g., pp. 13, 32-35) and quotes or cites relevant works by Iashar-Nasteva, Koneski, and Vidoeski, but with the exception of some Prilip and other dialect forms cited on page 33, he does not mention any indefinite suffix-preserving IzC borrowings for Macedonian as he did for the other Balkan languages. On the contrary, he points out that all the loanwords based on the Turkish indefinite IzC cited in Vidoeski's articles on compounds (*Makedonski iazik*, 2 [1951], 131-40) occur without the suffix. While suffix preserving forms do occur in older Macedonian folklore and literature, there are, to the best of my knowledge, no such forms with the preserved