It has been ninety years since Turkey in Europe was reduced to eastern Thrace, but the Turkish language continues to exert both lexical and symbolic power in the Balkans. Aside from the fact that Turkish-speaking minorities continue to live throughout the Southern Balkans and Turkey remains a prestige language for old urban families in many towns, the resurgence of Turkisms in the press of ex-communist Southeastern Europe as well as the importance of Turkisms in the standardization of Bosnian attest to the significance of Turkish for the Balkan languages both in the past and in the present. Since Miklosh’s (1884-1890) path-breaking work laid the foundations for the study of Turkish lexical elements in the languages of Eastern and Southeastern Europe, numerous studies of Turkish elements in individual Balkan languages have appeared, of which Škaljić’s 1966 dictionary of Turkisms in Serbo-Croatian has been the standard reference work of its kind against which all others could be measured. (We can also mention the important studies by Boretzyński 1975–1976 and Jasar-Nasteva 2001, which are the most valuable contributions to the study of Turkisms in Albanian and Macedonian, respectively.) A dictionary of Turkisms in Bulgarian (henceforth DTB) is a worthy companion to Škaljić in its thoroughness and careful scholarship, and it surpasses the older work in many respects. At the same time, DTB demonstrates that despite the commonplace assertion that the Balkan languages share a significant component of Turkish lexical material, there are important differences between Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian in the selection of Turkish vocabulary.

DTB begins with a concise introduction that explains the principles used in compiling the dictionary (vii-xii) followed by a bibliography of 216 items (xiii-xvi). This dictionary relies primarily on other dictionaries for its material, although specialized studies were also consulted. For each main entry, the compilers give a source, and when a word occurs in more than one source, they select the most recent. The reader can thus tell immediately the extent to which a given Turkism is considered current and standard.

Turkism is defined as a word that entered through the Turkish of Ottoman or post-Ottoman Turkey, and thus words of non-Turkish origin that entered Bulgarian via Turkish are included but words from other Turkic languages are not. Also excluded are Turkish words with Bulgarian derivational affixes when there is a non-derived Turkish item, e.g. _kutan_ ‘tar’ is given but _kutamen_ ‘relating to tar’. This principle extends to Turkish words with Turkish affixes when the Turkish word underwent semantic shift in Bulgarian so that the affixed form is a Bulgarian development, e.g. Turkish _tarıkat_ ‘sect’ gives the Bulgarian Turkish _tarıkat_ ‘wise guy’ but _tarıkatlık_ ‘slyness’ is a Bulgarian formation. DTB gives more than twice as many variants as Škaljić, but DTB is more modest in the etymologies of non-Turkish words that entered via Turkish. Whereas Škaljić attempted to etymologize every entry, DTB only goes beyond the standard or dialectal Turkish source if the ultimate origin is a language other than Arabic or Persian. Another difference between DTB and Škaljić is that the latter gives literary citations whereas the former does not (although Grammes 1996 does this for many words). On the other hand, DTB supplies definitions in English as well as Bulgarian, which is a boon both for the translator and the reader who knows English better than Bulgarian. The English translations themselves are accurate and idiomatic.

The authors also discuss their use of certain register labels. They define as neutral (unmarked) those words that do not have exact synonyms from non-Turkish sources, whereas stylistically marked Turkisms have neutral synonyms of non-Turkish origin. The chief categories of non-neutral items are colloquial, dialectal, and obsolete. DTB attempts to describe actual usage rather than reproducing the normative judgments of Bulgarian dictionaries. Thus, for example, it treats _kavarma_ ‘a kind of meat stew’ as neutral, rather than reproducing the label dialectal used in the most recent Academy dictionary, since “the word is found on the menus of fine restaurants in the capital and all over Bulgaria” (ix). Also, their classification colloquial includes words labeled “substandard” in the most recent Academy dictionary, since the Academy usage seems to be normative rather than descriptive. Within the category neutral they distinguish historical and Ottoman historical, the former being for words that are stylistically neutral but that denote items “no longer a part of Bulgarian daily life” and the latter being used for “[c]oncepts and institutions relating to the Ottoman empire and its administration” (ix). DTB uses more than a dozen other register labels, including folklore, ironic, pejorative, vituperative, vulgar, slang, professional jargon, technical, etc.

The main body of the dictionary (1-304) contains 7,427 headwords and 3,917 variants. These numbers surpass Škaljić, which contains 6,878 headwords and 1,864 variants. Following the main body of the dictionary is an index (305-528) organized by Turkish source words which gives not only the headwords and variants of DTB but also those of Škaljić. This is a truly marvelous feature, enabling the scholar to compare the Turkisms of Serbo-Croatian with those of Bulgarian. Particularly interesting is the fact that out of the list of almost 10,000 Turkish words, the two languages share only somewhere between a half and two thirds of the total number of Turkish lexical items. The remainder occur only in one dictionary or the other. Thus while in the raw number of head words DTB surpasses Škaljić by only 549 entries, in fact the number of Turkish words in DTB not attested in Škaljić numbers in the thousands. This fact greatly enhances the value and importance of DTB and moreover suggests the need for a detailed comparative study. The work concludes with a
reverse alphabetical word list (529-583), which will also prove extremely useful to future investigators interested in word-formation and other questions of morphology.

DTB is a reference work that belongs on the shelf of every Turkologist, Slavist, and Balkanist. Its impeccable scholarship, thorough coverage, and useful indices set a new standard for such reference works. Alf Grannes’ untimely death during the final phases of the preparation of the manuscript is noted and mourned by his two co-editors at the end of the acknowledgments. The author of these lines, too, mourns his passing. Alf devoted much of his scholarly career to the study of Turkisms in Bulgarian, and this dictionary is both a fitting monument to his scholarship and a truly significant achievement on the part of all three of the editors.
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