

OSVRTI

Татяна СЛАВОВА, *Владетел и администрация в ранносредновековна България. Филологически аспекти*, ПАМ Пъблишинг Къмпани ООД, София 2010, 342 p.

The book written by the Bulgarian Slavicist, Tatjana Slavova, on the terminology of rulers and high officials in early medieval Bulgaria contains the following five major chapters: *I. Titles and offices in early medieval Bulgaria* (p. 10–175); *II. Systematization of offices and ranks in early medieval Bulgaria* (p. 176–209); *III. The title of the Bulgarian rulers* (p. 210–265); *IV. The title of the successor to the throne ΚΑΝΑΡΤΙΚΕΙΝΟΣ, ΚΑΝΑΗΡΤΧΘΗΝΟΣ* (p. 266–271); *V. The title from the point of view of its origin* (p. 272–298). There follow a list of sources (p. 299–308), a list of abbreviations (p. 309–313), a bibliography (p. 314–339), and an English summary (p. 340–342).

The first major chapter is divided into 24 sub-chapters, in which the following words are discussed: *kauchan, boila, uk*

boila, ičergu boila, boljare/vel'čože/mogote, drugove, bagainos, bagatur, kolobros, tarkan, župan, kopanos, omēros, ēmnēkos, kronos, magotinos, tzigatos/čigotъ, sampsēs/samъčii, (il) tabare, θρεπτὸς ἄνθρωπος, ičrbyja, čъvanьčii, and κόμης. All epigraphic and literary attestations of each term, either in Greek characters or in Cyrillic characters and in the Old Bulgarian or Church Slavonic language (henceforth: ChSl.), are listed and presented with comment. At the end of each sub-chapter there is a survey of all existing etymologies. In some cases, the author proposes a new etymology of a given term.

One of the clear advantages of the book is the detailed registration of examples of the discussed lexemes. This is especially true of examples from Slavic original and translated texts. The author utilizes not only published texts (editions as well as attestations in dictionaries), but also unpublished texts from MSS. As an example, I mention the martyrdom of Pope Clement (BHG 349; p. 46) or the Vita of Hilarion the Great (BHG 753; p. 142sq.).

Nevertheless, not every piece of information about Slavic texts and manuscripts is complete or correct. For example, *КОРМАЦЕ И ХРАНАЦЕ МЕДВЕЂИ*, which is from the ChSl. dictionary of MIKLOSICH (p. 138, fn. 154), does not come from the copy of Ilolica (1262) of the Serbian Nomocanon, but rather from the Russian so-called 4. redaction of the Nomocanon, namely, from the Synodal MS GIM, Sinod. Nr. 132 (from the year 1285–1291; cf. JANIN 2004). This is clear from the chrestomathy of BUSLAEV (1861: 382.2–3), from where Miklosich took the example. In addition, the name Menaion of Mihanović is now obsolete, as is the dating to the 16th century (thus in Miklosich), the MS is the same as the Prologue Menaion of Lipljan (HAZU IIIc24) from the 14th century cited in some other places in the book. Moreover, the example *ПИТАВЬЦЬ* (p. 138) was taken from the text, *Muka blaženoga Grozdija*, which was published by Daničić in 1869 (cf. TRIFUNOVIĆ 1975: 311–312).

The author is a well-known specialist of Old Church Slavonic (Old Bulgarian) textology and philology. However, in the fields of Turkic, Mongolian and Iranian studies, she exhibits very limited knowledge. This in itself would not be too restrictive if the author would have confined herself to simply listing existing opinions. Unfortunately, she is unable to assess the dubious hypotheses of some of her compatriots (I mention here only two, Antoaneta Granberg [née Deleva] and Boris Simeonov). In addition,

she attempts to propose etymologies in these languages, which inevitably leads to unacceptable or impossible results. I will confine myself to some selected examples of etymologies.

The author proposes a new etymology for the title *kavchan*. The first part of the word is explained as the reconstructed simple verb **qav-* ‘*означаващ извършване на съвместно действие*’ (p. 15), which is the derivational base of the Old Uyghuric verbs *qavir-/qavur-* ‘*zusammenbringen, bring together*’ and *qaviš-* ‘*unite*’. The title is then interpreted as ‘*coruler of the khan*’. Unfortunately, she did not note that the element *qav-* is an appropriation from Middle Chinese *γâp* (合; modern pronunciation *hé*; cf. VON GABAIN 1974: 356, s.v. *qawir*; PULLEYBLANK 1991: 123). – The Mongolian *daruga* ‘*chief, superior; chairman, commander, etc.*’ (s. LESSING 1973: 234, s.v. *DARUT-A*) she attempts to derive from Persian *dāroyā* (p. 49). Actually, the Persian word came to Persia only with the Mongolian Ilkhan rulers (cf. DOERFER 1963: 319ff., s.v. *dārūga*). – The first element of the title *σεται βασιλης* is connected with the Old Turkic title *šadapit*. The first syllable of the Old Turkic word has already been connected with Sogdian *γšyd* ‘*Herr, master*’ (cf. e.g., VON GABAIN 1974: 365, s.v. *šad*)¹. In Slavova’s book, the Sogdian word is cited as *γšyd* (p.

¹ Cf. GERSHEVITCH 1954: 42 (»*γšyd*, *γšyd* ‘*lord*’ from Av. *xšaēta-*«), LIVŠIĆ; CHROMOV 1981: 405 (»*(γ)γšyd*, *(γ)γšyd* ... **xšēd*«).

57; which, in turn, is thought to be related to Old Iranian *xšaθra-*!), and the alleged *y-* is believed to have given *š-* in the Turkic language of Bulgaria. – The connection of the title *kolobros* with Buryat Mongolian *холо* ‘distant, far’ (Khalkha *хол*) and *бэрхэ* ‘experienced, clever’ taken over from B. Simeonov without any corresponding comment (p. 68f.) fails already because of historical phonetics: in Classical Mongolian, the two words are *chola* and *berke* (cf. LESSING 1973: 956b, 99f.). – The first element of the title *πηλε ζωπαν* in a 10th century inscription from Preslav is thought to be related to Common Turkic **baš* ‘head’ and represent the Oguric form with lambdacism (p. 88f.). This explanation ignores the fact that Chuvash *nyç* (cf. EGOROV 1964: 168; RÄSÄNEN 1969: 64, s.v. *baš*; SKVORCOV 1982: 317; TENIŠEV 1984: 238) excludes a preform with **l*. – An etymological *pièce de résistance* is the explanation of the title or name *Μαγοτῖνος* attested in the continuation of the Chronicle by Theophanos (the Slavic translation of the Chronicle of Hamartolos has *Klogatinь*). It is interpreted as a Turkic compound (!) consisting of the elements *boya/moya* ‘bull’ and *tin* ‘rein’, and it allegedly designates a soldier who is responsible for the harnessing of draught animals in the army (военно лице, отговорящо за животинския впряг [обоз] във войската, p. 112). – The second part of the Danube Bulgarian title *κανα συβηγη* is, according to the author, related

to »Iranian« **subhagah* (p. 215). Unfortunately, she failed to mention that Iranian intervocalic and prevocalic **s* appears as *h* without exceptions.²

The author tries to derive as many of the discussed titles as possible from the Turkic language of Bulgaria (Proto-Bulgarian). This is certainly justified in the case of titles known from pre-Christian inscriptions in Greek characters before the second half of the 9th century, and constitutes common scientific practice. However, this is not the case with lexemes attested only in Slavic texts. The author wants, e.g., to connect the title *čьvanьčii* or rather its derivational base *čьvanь* ‘(wooden) jug’ with Turkic **čügün* ‘cast iron’ (p. 149sq.). Since the Slavic forms with initial **čьb-* are supposed to have arisen through assimilation, all modern etymological dictionaries posit a preform **čьb-anь*, from which *čьvanь* developed secondarily (cf. BERNEKER 1908–13: 105, ĚSSJa 4: 138, ESJS 2: 120). From a general phonetic perspective, an assimilation *č – b > č – v* is much more plausible than an assimilation in the opposite direction. Moreover, the existence of an ancient Turkic etymon **čügün*, posited by Gerard Clauson and Martti Räsänen and taken over by Slavova, is quite unlikely. The reason for this is that, above all, the Turkic languages not only have an old word *čodin* ‘cast iron’ (first attested in the dictionary by Mahmud of

² Cf. REICHELTL 1967: 51, § 84.2, 52, § 86.

Kashgar; according to Šervažidze 1989 derived from Middle Chinese **čü-duŋ* [PULLEYBLANK 1991: 415, 310: **tʃy* + **tʰüŋ*; Modern Chinese *zhù* ‘to cast metal’ + *tóng* ‘copper’]), but also the word *čojgun* ‘cast-iron vessel; tea-kettle’ with much later attestations. Some Turkologists have attempted to combine the two words under a common preform **čodgun*, which is highly improbable (cf. ŠERVAŠIDZE 1989: 61sq.)³. In this connection, it should be noted that Russ. *čugun* should not be taken as a proof of an old Chuvash or Volga Bulgarian (Turkic) word, since Chuv. *čugun* cannot be an inherited word because of its initial *č-* (Chuv. **č* developed into *ś*).

In two cases, the author posits two new Old Church Slavonic (or Old Bulgarian) words, the titles *drugъ* and *ičrъgyja*. *drugъ* is interpreted as a homonym of *drugъ* ‘friend’. The title *drugъ* was, until now, known only from Miklosich’s dictionary (MIKLOSICH 1862–65: 177, s.v. *дрѣгъ*), who categorized it as an incomprehensible word («vox obscura»). Miklosich specified not only the MS, the Prologue Menaion of Gračanica/Lipljan (HAZU *IIIc24*), but also the text, the Passio of

Pope Clement, and the folio in which the word appears. The text reads as follows: *ѿ сего же снѣна мнози дрѣгове и дрѣгозы нерона црѣ къ боу обрѣтшиѣ.* (HAZU *IIIc24*, 340vb24–26). Miklosich and Slavova (p. 46) cite the example in a normalized way and alter it to a certain degree. Slavova was able to find several other examples of the word (cf. p. 41–52). It is attested in the Slavic translation of the Chronicle by Georgios Synkellos, in verse 3.7 of Jonah in the Minor Prophets with the Commentaries of Theodoretos of Kyrrhos, in the already mentioned Passio of Pope Clement as well as in verses 14.5.8 of the Book of Exodus. In the Greek originals of the Slavic texts, there are several equivalents, e.g., *μεγιστᾶνες, σύγκλητος, ἄρχων, στρατιότης, περιφανής, θεράπων*. The examples of the word are adduced – even from variant copies – and clearly arranged in tabular form. The following orthographic variants exist (p. 48): *derg*, *drōg-*, *drug-*, *drbg-*, *drbg-*, and *drg-*. The oldest and only Middle Bulgarian example is attested in the Parimejnik (Prophetologion) of Grigorovič (12th c.; Exod 14.5: *дрѣговеъ*, Exod 14.8: *дрѣговеъ*). The author posits an original form *drugъ*, and surmises that the forms with a nasal vowel – or its reflexes – can be explained as secondary contaminations with Gr. *δροῦγγος* ‘part of an army’ (p. 51). As already mentioned, Slavova connects the Slavic word with Modern Persian *dārūga* (دوراد). This is impossible for chronological reasons, since the Mongolian word reached

³ Cf.: «Однако наличие в тюркском старой самостоятельной основы **čoyun* более чем сомнительна. Цитируемые Г. Дёрфером балкарские и уйгурские слова, скорее всего, представляют собой результат поздних междиалектных заимствований. Сколько-нибудь древней фиксации эта форма не имеет.»

Iran only as a result of the rule of the Mongolian Ilkhanids in the 13th century. But even an indirect borrowing from Mongolian via some Turkic language is improbable, since it is attested too late (Chagatay Turkic, Ottoman Turkish, cf. RÄSÄNEN 1969: 133; otherwise only in East Siberian Turkic languages). In addition, the loss of *-a-* in the first syllable makes this scenario highly improbable. On the other hand, a semantic development of the word *drugъ* ‘friend’, which is also preserved in the derived noun *družina* ‘vassals of a ruler’, does not seem impossible. At least, André Vaillant interpreted one passage in the *Vita Methodii* in this sense:⁴ етеръ другъ богатъ зъло и съвѣтъникъ. ѡже-ни са коупетрою своєю. рекъше ѡтръвѣю. (VM 11, Usp. sb. 107B24).

The second word is *ičrbyja*, which was likewise known until now only from Miklosich’s dictionary (p. 1121, s.v. *чръга* or *чръгына*, respectively). Miklosich quoted it again from the the Prologue Menaion of Gračanica/Lipljan (HAZU IIIc24), namely, from the Vita of St. Hilarion. There it is attested twice, separated only by some lines: (1) едни же ѡ чръгы него нз’дѣт’ска нмы скврѣн’на бѣса въ себѣ. (HAZU IIIc24, 137ra13); (2) егдаже оузрѣ нчръгыю стѣи. (HAZU IIIc24, 137rb8). Both times, the Slavic word is the translation of Gr. *κανδι-δᾶτος*. Slavova convincingly interpretes

the second example from Turkic **ičrāki*, **ičrāgi* ‘inside, internal’ (from *ič* ‘inside’, cf. RÄSÄNEN 1969: 168), a word also known from Danube Bulgarian inscriptions as well as from the Old Bulgarian (Slavic) inscription of Mostič from the end of the 10th c. (*črbgubylja*). However, regarding the first example of the word, it is surprising that the author wants to connect it with another Turkic word, *čärig* ‘army’ (cf. RÄSÄNEN 1969: 105). This is both improbable and unnecessary: not only is it dubious that the same Greek word would have been translated by two different words at two passages in very close proximity, but a derivation of *črbga* from *čärig* is by no means trivial from the perspective of phonetics and morphology. The explanation of the form *чръгы* from (н) *чръгыне* (Old Bulgarian genitive singular (н)чръгына), on the other hand, is quite simple: the initial *i-* could easily have been elided. This could have already taken place during the 10th century (cf. the compound in the Mostič inscription), and the final *-je* could equally have disappeared before the *je-* of the following word.

When generally assessing the reviewed book the abundant material and the detailed documentation of the discussed titles must be assessed positively. In addition, the survey of existing etymological interpretations of the titles is both accurate and useful. However, as has already been stated, the uncritical mention of some etymologies is unacceptable. Moreover, the author’s own

⁴ »Другъ doit avoir ici le sens spécial de дружинникъ, ‘membre de la *družina*’ «(VAILLANT 1947: 41, fn. 1).

etymological proposals do not meet the standards of contemporary Iranian, Mongolian and Turkic studies.

REFERENCES

- BERNEKER, E. 1908–1913. *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Erster Band (A – L), Heidelberg: Winter.
- БЕШЕВЛИЕВ, В. 1979. *Първобългарски надписи*. София: Издателство на Българската академия на науките.
- БУСЛАЕВ, Ф. 1861. *Историческая хрестоматия церковно-славянского и древне-русского языка*. Москва: Университетская типография.
- DOERFER, G. 1963. *Türkische and mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer neupersischer Geschichtsquellen vor allem der Mongolen- and Timuridenzeit, Band I: Mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- ЕГОРОВ, В. Г. 1964. *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка*. Чебоксары: Чувашское книжное издательство.
- ĚSSJa 4 = *Этимологический словарь славянских языков, 4 (*čaběniti – děl'a)*, Москва 1977.
- ESJS 2 = *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského, 2 (blagъ – dělo)*. Praha 1990.
- VON GABAIN, A. 1974. *Alt türkische Grammatik*. 3. Auflage, Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- GERSHEVITCH, I. 1954. *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- ЯНИН, В. Л. 2004. О дате Новгородской Синодальной кормчей. *Средневековый Новгород. Очерки археологии и истории*. Москва: Наука, 232–236.
- LESSING, F. D. 1973. *Mongolian-English Dictionary*. Bloomington: The Mongolia Society, Inc.
- ЛИВШИЦ, В. А.; А. Л. ХРОМОВ. 1981. Согдийский язык. В. С. Расторгуева (отв. ред.). *Основы иранского языкознания. Среднеиранские языки*. Москва: Наука, 347–514.
- MIKLOSICH, F. 1862–1865. *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*. Vindobonae: Guilelmus Braumueller.
- PULLEYBLANK, E. G. 1991. *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- RÄSÄNEN, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen seura.
- REICHELT, H. 1967. *Awestisches Elementarbuch*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- СКВОРЦОВ, М. И. 1982. *Чувашско-русский словарь. Чăвашла-вырăсла словарь*. Москва: Русский язык.
- ШЕРВАШИДЗЕ, И. Н. 1989. Фрагмент общетюркской лексики. Заимствованный фонд. *Вопросы языкознания 2*: 54–92.
- ТЕНИШЕВ, Э. Р. 1984. *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Фонетика*. Москва: Наука.
- ТРИФУНОВИЋ, Ђ. 1975. *Ситнији списи Ђуре Даничића. III. Описи ћирилских рукописа и издања текстова*. приредно Ђорђе Трифуновић. Београд: Српска академија наука и уметности (Посебна издања, књига CDLXXXVI, Одељење језика и књижевности, књига 25).
- VAILLANT, A. 1947. Une homélie de Méthode. *Revue des Études Slaves 23*: 34–47.

JOHANNES REINHART