SÄRTRYCK • ОТТИСК
• TIRAGE A PART • OFF
PRINT•SONDERDRUCK
• NADBITKA • SEPARAT

Per Ambrosiani (ed.)

Swedish Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists

(Ohrid, 10–16 September 2008)

Umeå Studies in Language and Literature 6
Department of Language Studies
Umeå University 2009

Antoaneta Granberg

Classification of the Hunno-Bulgarian Loan-Words in Slavonic

1 Introduction

While discussing linguistic contacts of Slavic and Altaic peoples, the term 'Altaic' covers the Huns, Avars and Bulgars[1]. From the linguistic perspective, the term 'Altaic' covers the common background both of the Hunno–Bulgarian language and, most probably, that of the Avars. These languages have in common such features which united them with the Chuvash and Mongolian languages and distinguished them from Turkic. From the historical perspective, it is incorrect to call them 'Turkic', since the first Turks appear in Europe long after the advent of Huns and Bulgars.

The early contacts between Slavic and Altaic peoples (Huns, Avars and Bulgars) have been the subject of both historical and philological studies (Curta 2006, Dobrodomov 1969, Gołąb 1992, 392–414, Granberg 2000, Kiparsky 1975, 61–64, Pritsak 1983, Szádeczky-Kardoss 1990, 207–225, Tăpkova-Zaimova 1966, Tăpkova-Zaimova and Pavlov 1993, 21–29). They have established both the geographic and chronological borders of these contacts, and they enable us to draw three main conclusions: (1) traces of such contacts are evident over a vast territory, from Pannonia in the West and the lower Danube in the South to the middle Dnepr in the East; (2) the data are insufficient to clearly distinguish Huns, Avars and Bulgars one from another; (3) the relationship of the 'local' Slavs and the Altaic 'intruders' from the Eastern steppes was a matter of evolution.

2 Chronology of the Slavic-Altaic contacts

The upper limit of Slavic-Altaic contacts is set without much dispute in the second half of the 4th c., when the Huns cross the Eastern frontier of Europe. But the concrete limits of Slavic-Altaic interaction vary either before or after the beginning of the 7th c., depending on the question whether it was the migration of Slavic peoples that led them to the definitive split into Eastern, Western and Southern Slavs. That may though be the lower limit of borrowing from Altaic into Slavic.

The contact between Bulgars and the Southern Slavs must, however, be set foreword two more centuries, from the end of the 7th century up to the second half

[1] For the history of these peoples before leaving Asia, as well as for details of their migration to Europe, cf. Yü (1990, 118–150) and Szádeczky-Kardoss (1990, 206–228).

of the 9th century. After the beginning of the state formation process in Bulgaria in the 680s, the Bulgars and the part of the Southern Slavs, which was involved in the Bulgarian society, converted to Christianity in 864.

The questions that are important for the classification and the future study of the Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words in Slavonic are:

1) What is the chronology of the borrowings and in which way they were borrowed?

2) How the borrowings were adapted – phonologically, morphologically and semantically – to become Slavonic?

3 Sources for the study

Only loan-words with well established etymology have been included in this study. Loan-words which have an uncertain origin have been excluded from the classification in order to avoid conclusions build on doubtful material. The earliest Altaic loan-words in Slavic[2] were also excluded from the classification because of the great difficulty of analyzing their proper origin.

Only written sources in Slavonic have been used when excerpting loan-words for the study. The so called Protobulgarian inscriptions in Greek and Hunno-Bulgarian[3] are not included because they do not contain texts in Slavonic.

4 Classification of the Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words in Slavonic

The classification presented below is not complete because of new Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words being discovered all the time as a result of new text studies or because of the new etymological research.

4.1 Classification according to the chronology of the borrowing

4.1.1 Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words borrowed by the Slavs prior to the formation of the distinguished groups of Eastern, Western and Southern Slavs

Igor Dobrodomov (1969, 67–69) discussed the possibility of studying early Hunno-Bulgarian borrowings in Slavonic as a distinct group. The latest borrowings belonging to this group were, according to I. Dobrodomov, dated before the dif-

[2] See for example the word **бъıкъ**) 'bull' (Korš 1909, Baskakov 1979, 205, Setarov 1990), **коза** 'goat' (Setarov 1990, 33), **батогъ**) 'branch' (Dobrodomov 1969), **печать** 'model, testimony, mark' (L'vov 1962, 93, Vaillant 1957, 138) which Altaic origin has been discussed several times.

[3] These ca 90 inscriptions, published by Veselin Beševliev (1979) are dated to the time of the First Bulgarian empire (7th–11th c.). Most of the inscriptions are in Greek, some are in Hunno-Bulgarian with Greek letters and the majority of them were made before the advent of Slavonic writing at the end of the 9th century.

ferentiation of the Slavic groups to Eastern, Western and Southern Slavs. What is still uncertain is the chronology of the latest borrowings from Hunno-Bulgarian, common for all Slavs.

There are, however, some historical arguments, essential for the chronology of these borrowings. The Goths and the Huns came into contact with the Slavs during the 3rd–4th centuries. Slavic tribes lived north of the Goths and Huns who, who in this way played the role of a 'wall' between the world of the Slavs and that of the Roman Empire (Curta 2006, 39–69, Gjuzelev and Dražev 1966, 12). The Goths and Huns blocked the historical migration of the Slavs up until the late 5th or early 6th century (Angelov 1981, 92). The period of borrowings from Hunno-Bulgarian, common for all Slavic languages, must therefore be updated up to the early 6th century.

The Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words were used in the earliest texts and books written in Slavonic, i.e. these words appeared in the scripts at the end of the 9th century. An important argument for defining them as *early* is that the borrowings exist in all Slavic languages. Both their phonology and their semantics can be traced back to the early common Slavic period, which continued up until the early 6th century. The following loan-words belong to this group:

(1) **блъванъ** 'column, (funeral) statue, idol, στήλη' (Clauson 1972, 333, Granberg 1997a, 55, Menges 1951a, 21–22). The Huns and the Bulgars raised such *bulvans* on graves or in memorial places. Some of these *bulvans* can today be seen in Bulgaria, Italy and Ukraine (Daniľčenko 1981, 17–26).

(2) **блъгаринъ** 'Bulgar, Βούλγαρ(ος)' (Granberg 1997a, 55–57, Pritsak 1954, 219).

(3) **клобоукъ** 'Fur cap, tiara, κίδαρις' (Granberg 1997a, 79–80, Vasmer 1986 II, 252). *Klobuk* was a specific kind of conical fur cap used by Huns and Bulgars. An example of *klobuk* can be seen in the miniature from the *Menology* of the Byzantine emperor Basil II (975–1025 AD) (Migne PG 117, 276–556).

(4) **колимогъ, колимага** 'Tent, camp, σκηνή' (Granberg 1997a, 82–83, Miltenov 2006, 188, Vasmer 1986 II, 291). *Kolimog* was a kind of round tent which could be transported on wheels.

(5) **крагоуиъ** 'Sparrow-hawk, *Accipiter nisus*, ἱεράξ' (Granberg 1997a, 85, Setarov 1990, 56–57).

(6) **кръчагъ** 'Mug, κεραμεύς, κεράμιον, ξεστός, τρύβλιον, urceus' (Granberg 1997a, 86, Miltenov 2006, 189, Vasmer 1986 II, 341).

(7) **къниги** has many meanings in Slavonic: 'Writing, book, ἀποστάσιον, βιβλίον, βίβλος, γράμματα, γραμματεῖον, γραφεῖον, γραφή, γραφική, δέλτιον, δέλτος, διαγράμματα, ἐπιγραφή, θεσπίσματα, ἱστορία, πραγματεία, συγγραφή, χαράγμα, libri' (Granberg 1997a, 94–97, Vasmer 1986 II, 262–263). This loan-word meant also 'the third stomach of ruminants', by analogy to the form and the shape of the codex,

and this meaning, besides the main meaning 'book', is still in use in many Slavic languages and dialects.
(8) **сабл҃ꙗ** 'Sword, ἐγχειρίδιον' (Clauson 1972, 782, Granberg 1997a, 105, Vasmer 1986 III, 541).
(9) **слонъ** (Granberg 1997a, 109, Ivanov 1977, 153–157, Sevortjan 1974, 177–179, Vasmer 1986 III, 674–675).
(10) **хорѫгъı** '1. Flag, standard, τάγμα, 2. Scepter, σκῆπτρον, 3. Tribe, race, clan, σκῆπτρον' (Dobrev 1987, 96, Granberg 1997a, 116). *Chorong*(*y*) was the flag of the cavalry used by Huns and Bulgars.
(11) **чеканъ** 'Hammer, battle axe' (Granberg 1997a, 119, Setarov 1990, 75, Vasmer 1986 IV, 324–325).
(12) **ъьванъ** 'Mug, ξέστης, sextarius' (Granberg 1997a, 121).
It is highly plausible that the title joupa¢) 'župan' belongs to this group of early Slavic borrowings from Hunno-Bulgarian (Menges 1959, 178).

4.1.1.1 History of the early Altaic-Slavic language contact

Hunno-Bulgarian language belongs to the Altaic family and it is commonly considered as language from the Western branch of the Turkic languages (Menges 1951b, 88–89). Omeljan Pritsak (1982) and Boris Simeonov (1982) argue that Hunno-Bulgarian should be classified as an East Altaic language of the Hunnic branch.

The Huns dominated Central Europe during the second half of the 4th century, after their victory over the Alans and the Goths (Tăpkova-Zaimova 1966, 11–15). In the early 5th century the Bulgars established certain political power in Pannonia and in the Western Carpathian valley. The Slavs were at that time living in an area stretching from Pannonia to the middle stream zone of the river Dnepr. Some groups among the Slavs were at the end of the 4th century in war with the Goths. The Huns entered the war as allies of the Slavs and the Goths suffered defeat (Jordanes, 88–89).

The early contacts between the Slavs and different political formations, where Altaic languages might have been spoken, should however not be overstated. The Huns and the Bulgars were nomads and stock-breeders and their natural milieu was the steppe. The Slavs were settled as farmers and took a different 'ecological niche' in Central and Eastern Europe.

The loan-words listed above are not that many – most are names for objects which the Slavs were unfamiliar with prior to their contact with Huns and Bulgars. The source language of these loan-words is an Altaic language of the Hun-

nic group, but it is quite difficult to make a distinction between Hunnic and Bulgarian at the time[4].

4.1.2 Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words borrowed by the Eastern and Southern Slavs, but not by the Western Slavs

The distribution of loan-words from this group shows that they were borrowed later than those from the first group (4.1.1), but not later than the second half of the 7th century when the process of Bulgarian-Slavic state formation began on the Balkans.

This group is not homogeneous when it comes to the way of borrowing and it could be divided in three sections.

4.1.2.1 Loan-words borrowed into all South Slavic and East Slavic languages

The following loan-words belong to this section:

(13) **бисьръ** 'Pearl, μαργαρίτης' is an Arabic loan-word in Hunno-Bulgarian, which was borrowed by the Slavs from Hunno-Bulgarian (Granberg 1997a, 54, Vasmer 1986 I, 168).

(14) **болиаринъ, бъилıа** 'Boyar, ἄρχων, μεγιστᾶνες, συγκλητικός, σύγκλητος, φίλος, οἱ τὰ πρῶτα φέροντες'. *Boyla* was among the Bulgars a common title for magnates close to the ruler (Clauson 1972, 385, Granberg 1997a, 58).

(15) **бѣлъчюгъ** 'Ring' (Clauson 1972, 380, Granberg 1997a, 63).

(16) **бѣлѣгъ** 'Gift, sign, symbol, σημεῖον, σύμβολον' (Clauson 1972, 338–339, Granberg 1997a, 63–64).

(17) **капь** 'Mould, model, likeness, prototype, box, ἄγαλμα, αὐλός, δοχεῖον, εἰκών, θεός, θήκη, κολεός, περίβολος, σῶμα, τάλαντον' (Clauson 1972, 584, Granberg 1997a, 75–78).

(18) **ковъчегъ** 'Blister, pustule; box, coffin; grave, tomb; stone hillock, ἀποθήκη, γλωσσόκομον, θήκη, κιβωτός, λάρναξ, σηκός, σωρός' (Clauson 1972, 586–587, Granberg 1997a, 80–81, Vasmer 1986 II, 272–273).

(19) **коштуна** 'Fable, μῦθος, μυθολογήμα' was borrowed into Hunno-Bulgarian from an Iranian language and then borrowed from Hunno-Bulgarian into Slavonic (Granberg 1997a, 85, Vasmer 1986 II, 362).

(20) **кумиръ** 'Form, statue, pagan god, altar, ἄγαλμα, ἀνδριάς, βωμός, γλυπτόν, δαίμων, εἴδωλον, εἰδωλολάτρης/-ία, ἴνδαλμα, κίβδηλος, ξόανον, σέβασμα, στήλη, χαλκούργημα' (Granberg 1997a, 88–91, Vasmer 1986 II, 416).

[4] Even the language of the Avars, which also belonged to the Hunnic group, could be discussed as a possible source for the borrowings (Dobrodomov 1969).

(21) **санъ** 'Rank, status, dignity, ἀξία, ἀξίωμα, ἀρχή, βαθμός, εὐπραγία, προκοπή, τάξις, τιμή, τόπος, φύσις' (Clauson 1972, 830–831, 833, Granberg 1997a, 105–107).
(22) **ъпагъ** 'Bag, pocket, outer garment' (Granberg 1997a, 121–122, Vasmer 1986 IV, 146–147, 373–374).

4.1.2.2 Loan-words with limited diffusion in the South Slavic and the East Slavic languages

These loan-words were mostly used in medieval texts and books of Bulgarian and Russian origin.
(23) **багръ** 'Purple regalia, πορφύρα' was borrowed into Hunno-Bulgarian from Arabic (Clauson 1972, 317, Granberg 1997a, 48–49).
(24) **бльхъчии** 'Craftsman, τέκτον, *faber*' (Granberg 1997a, 57, Vasmer 1986 I, 174).
(25) **бохмитъ** 'Mohammed', refers only to the prophet of Allah (Granberg 1997a, 60, Moravcsik 1958 II, 200–203), only in texts of Russian origin.
(26) **брачина** 'Silk brocade, σηρικόν' (Clauson 1972, 357–358, Granberg 1997a, 60).
(27) **доχъторъ** 'Pillow, προσκεφάλαιον' (Clauson 1972, 899, Granberg 1997a, 67–68).
(28) **кръчии** 'Smith, goldsmith, χαλκεύς' (Clauson 1972, 647, Granberg 1997a, 87).
(29) **коүрѣлъкъ, коүрилъ** 'Prototype, mould, τύπος' (Clauson 1972, 736, Granberg 1997a, 92).
(30) **кълъıгъ** 'Parasite, leech, παράσιτος' (Clauson 1972, 620–621, Granberg 1997a, 94).
(31) **онминъ** 'Soldier, στρατιώτης, στρατός' (Granberg 1997a, 102, Vasmer III, 126–127).
(32) **самъчии** 'Steward, counsellor, μειζότερος, ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας, οἰκονόμος' (Clauson 1972, 830–831, 833, Granberg 1997a, 105). The official who was *samči* participated in the most important of the khan's embassies. He may have been a specialized counsellor, e.g. one conversant in foreign languages and scripts.
(33) **сапогъ** 'Leather shoe, sandal, boot, πέδιλον, ὑπόδημα' was borrowed into Hunno-Bulgarian from Mongolian (Clauson 1972, 786, Granberg 1997a, 107–108). Chlebnikova (1988, 244–253) has studied the footwear found at the excavations in and around the city of Bolgar and the techniques employed in its production.
(34) **сокачии** 'Cook, μάγειρος, ὀψοποιός' (Granberg 1997a, 110), **сокалъкъ, сокало** 'Kitchen, μαγειρεῖον' (Granberg 1997a, 109–110, Vasmer 1986 III, 708).
(35) **съıнъ** 'Turret, tower, πύργος' (Clauson 1972, 834, Granberg 1997a, 111–112).
(36) **чиготъ** 'Bearer of arms, aide, σπαθάριος, **меченоша**' (Granberg 1997a, 119–120). *Čigat* was the title of the courtier following the ruler and bearing his sword.

(37) **ѹрьтогъ** 'Bedchamber, house, palace, θάλαμος, νυμφών, παστάς' was borrowed in Hunno-Bulgarian from Persian (Granberg 1997a, 120–121, Rusek and Račeva 1982, 27–34).

(38) Hunno-Bulgarian suffix **-ѵии** was borrowed in Slavonic and used for building new *nomina agentis* words like: **зьдъѵии** 'builder, οἰκοδόμος', **ѩконожьгъѵии** 'baker of (ceramic) icons, εἰκονοκαύτος', **клепъѵии** 'smith', **корабьѵии** 'shipbuilder, sailor, ναυπηγός, ναύτης', **кораблѩпловьѵии** 'navigator', **кръмьѵии** '(spiritual) helmsman, κυβερνήτης', **потикъѵии** 'double dealing' and ca 20 other words.

4.1.2.3 Loan-words registered only in Slavonic texts of Bulgarian origin

To this section belong loan-words which were used in texts produced in medieval Bulgaria:

(39) **комърогъ, гоморъ, гомръ** 'Vessel for water, strongbox, money belt, κεράμιον, ὑδρία' was borrowed into Hunno-Bulgarian from an Iranian language (Granberg 1997a, 83, Rusek and Račeva 1982, 27–34). The Slavonic manuscripts transmit various spellings of the loan-word: **комьрогъ, коморогъ, комѹрогъ, комрогъ** and **коморгъ**.

(40) **корьмъ** 'Abdomen, belly, stomach, κεκρύφαλος' (Clauson 1972, 661, Granberg 1997a, 84–85).

(41) **крькыга** 'Car (disambiguation), litter (vehicle) (von Arnim 1956, 45–46).

(42) **кръѵагъѵии** 'Potter, κεραμεύς' (Granberg 1997a, 86–87).

(43) **къловбрии** 'Prophet, guide, προψίκιος, ὀψίκιος' was a shaman or wizard, who made sacrifice in time of peace and war. According to Clauson (1972, 617) the title was first recorded in 923 by Ibn Fadlan, but the title *qoluwr* κολοβρος was recorded in Bulgarian inscriptions from the 8th century (Beševliev 1979, 56–58, 64–65, inscription 68).

(44) **тетегъ** 'Litter (vehicle)' (Reinhart 1995, 135–142).

(45) **хръзанъ** 'Whip, scourge, φραγέλλη' was borrowed in Hunno-Bulgarian from some Iranian language and has been registered even in Greek χαρζάνιον 'scourge' (Granberg 1997a, 117, Vasmer 1986 IV, 277).

(46) **ѵаи** 'Brew, tea' was discovered in the text of **врачьба коѹзьмина** 'The treatment of Cosma' (Dobrev 1989–90, 168–171, Granberg 1997a, 118).

(47) **ѹрьгоѹ(бъилга)**, **ѹрьгъыга** 'Črigu Boyla' was the title of the second *boyla* at the Bulgarian khan's court. He was in command of 455 coats of mail, 540 helmets of one and 854 of another type, and 427 breastplates, i.e. five regiments of heavy and light cavalry (Beševliev 1979, 63, inscription 53, Granberg 1997a, 120).

(48) **ѩтъхоѹльница** 'Hospice, ξενοδοχία' (Clauson 1972, 882, Granberg 1997a, 122).

4.1.3 Discussion

It is difficult to establish whether the loan-words from the second group – (13–22) and especially (23–38) – were borrowed directly, through oral contact with the Hunno-Bulgarian language, or if they were borrowed only by the Southern Slavs and then used in the first texts in written Slavonic. The Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words could then have been distributed to other Slavic groups by way of the books written in Slavonic. It is quite plausible that loan-words known only from written sources could have been borrowed via the script while others, registered in different Slavic dialects, could have been borrowed directly.

The end of the 4th century and the beginning of the 5th century saw the Huns move towards the lower stream zone of the Danube River, while part of the Slavs began to move to Pannonia and Dacia. The so called Pannonian Slavs became part of a political union, under Hunnic leadership, also including the Pannonian Bulgars (Angelov 1981, 92). The death of Attila and the following collapse of the Hunnic political union in the late 5th century meant that the Slavs could establish their own society on the territories south of the Carpathian Mountains, and even south of the Danube River. The Slavs, together with the Bulgars, started their attacks on the Balkans, from the first decennia of the 6th century. Several Byzantine historians mention the joint attacks of the Slavs and the Bulgars (Tăpkova-Zaimova 1966, 58 ff.) e.g. the attack of 558, when the Bulgars called Kutriguri, together with the Slavs advanced as far as the walls of Constantinople.

The wars between the Slavs and the Avars started at the middle of the 6th century. This conflict affected mostly the Pannonian Slavs, but most important is that both the Slavs and the Bulgars became a part of the khaganate of the Avars (Tăpkova-Zaimova 1966, 5–60). Byzantium tried to turn the Slavs against the Avars, but the two became instead allies against Byzantium in the last decennia of the 6th century. The joint attacks of the Avars, Slavs and Bulgars against Byzantium continued during the 7th century as well. A combined Avar, Slav and Bulgar army, under Avar leadership, attacked Thessalonica in 618 and in 626 besieged Constantinople. A Bulgar group (Khuber's people), together with some Slavs (*Dragoviti* and others), crossed the Danube river in the late 680s and settled in the territory near Bitola.

It is obvious that the Eastern Slavs, but still more the Southern Slavs, had active contacts with Avars, Huns and Bulgars for a rather long period, stretching from the 5th century up until the 7th century. These contacts resulted in words borrowed from at least one, but most probably several languages of the Hunnic group.

4.2 Classification according to the adaptation and usage of the borrowings into Slavonic

The main criteria for the classification of the borrowings are their phonetic, morphological and different semantic changes. All these changes are due to the 'slavicisation' of the borrowings. Only the development of new semantics of borrowed words from Hunno-Bulgarian will be discussed below.

4.2.1 Loan-words with low level of adaptation and low frequency

Part of the borrowings was only occasionally used and did never become part of the active vocabulary in Slavonic. These loan-words did not build derivates or compounds. They usually only have one meaning and they are, as a rule, not preserved in modern Slavic languages and dialects. Representatives of this kind of borrowings are: **дохъторъ** (27), **коугрѣлъкъ** (29), **кълыгъ** (30), **хръзанъ** (45), **патъхоульница** (48). These words are most related to the political elite, the matter of religion, the organization of the army and the society, as well as to different armor. It is therefore quite common that these loan-words were later replaced by others when texts were copied and redacted (Tichova 1987, 307).

4.2.2 Loan-words with a high level of adaptation and relatively high frequency

The loan-words from this group were more frequent, they developed several meanings and had derivates and compounds. These borrowings became an active part of the vocabulary in Slavonic.

Кънигъı (7) for example had at least nine different meanings: 'alphabet, chapter (of a book), The Bible, board for writing, incunabula, document, text, letter' and 'inscription' (Granberg 1997a, 94–97, 1997b, 31–40). There were also several derivates from **кънигъ**: **кънижьникъ** 'copyist', **кънижьнъ** adj., **кънижик** 'books', **кънижица** 'booklet'.

Коумиръ, коумирь (20) also belongs to this group. It had at least eight derivates and six compounds, e.g.: **коумирьница** 'pagan temple', the adjectives **коумирьскъ, коумировъ** and **коумирьнъ, коумирослоужень** 'idolatry', **коумирослоужитель** 'idolater', **коумироꙗсти** 'eat the food of idolatry'.

Багръ (23) had at least 16 derivates, including the verbs **багрити - багровати** 'color'.

4.2.3 Discussion

The semantic of the borrowings changed when they became part of the Church Slavonic and the texts written or translated after the conversion to Christianity.

The Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words became in some occasions synonyms to Slavic words and in a few occasions even to Greek words in the Slavonic vocabulary. An interesting example is the loan-word **блъванъ** (1) which could mean 'column' and 'statue'. Its synonym for the meaning 'statue' was another Hunno-Bulgarian word **капь** (17) which could even mean 'sheath, quiver, scabbard, box' and '(an image of a) god'. The derivate **капиштє** could also mean 'statue' and 'pagan temple' and functioned as synonym of **блъванъ** and **капь** in the meaning 'statue'. One more Hunno-Bulgarian loan-word, **коүмиръ** (20) 'pagan god' and 'statue' was used as synonym of **блъванъ, капь** and **капиштє** in the meaning 'statue'. All these words, **блъванъ, капь, капиштє** and **коүмиръ**, functioned as synonyms of the Slavic words **ѡбразъ** and **подобьк** and to the Slavonic loan-word from Greek **идолъ**.

5 Conclusions and discussion

A more precise periodization of Slavic-Altaic contacts is important for historical studies. The study concerns the early borrowings from Altaic into Slavic, which means that their dating can be hardly more than relative in the widest possible sense. The introduction of literacy among the Slavs coincides with the lower limit of Slavic-Altaic contacts; the attestation of borrowings in texts written in Slavonic from the late 9th century onward is no more than an attestation after the fact.

According to the chronological criteria the Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words in Slavonic could be divided in two groups, early borrowed loan-words (4.1.1), common for all Slavic languages (1–12) and later borrowed loan-words (4.1.2) with more restricted distribution in the Slavic languages (13–48).

There are of course significant differences in the diffusion of Altaic loan-words in the Slavic languages. The attestation of such words in all, or almost all, Slavic languages has been used in order to argue for their greater antiquity (Gołąb 1992, 400–409). But the analysis of such borrowings yields reliable chronological indications only in few cases. In most cases it remains uncertain whether these are true pre-literary borrowings, or whether their diffusion belongs to a later inter-Slavic interaction, including the diffusion of texts (Granberg 1996b, 2000).

According to the results of the adaptation of the Hunno-Bulgarian loan-words in Slavonic two distinct groups could be established. The first group (4.2.1) consists of borrowings with low level of adaptation and low frequency in the Slavonic texts. These loan-words did not build any derivates or compounds and did not develop new semantic. To the second group (4.2.2) belong loan-words with higher level of adaptation and relatively high frequency in Slavonic. The borrowings became part of the active Slavonic vocabulary and they developed new meanings and built derivatives and compounds.

It might be more productive to take a step back from the dating features of the Altaic loan-words in general in Slavic and give more consideration to their semantics. We of course find terms from the sphere of culture and religion (**блъванъ** '[ritual] column, idol, tombstone', **кънигъı** 'book', **тлъмачь** 'interpreter, translator', **хоржгъı** '[cavalry] standard'), warfare and social organization (**жоуπанъ** title, **сабліа** 'sabre', **тьмъı** 'ten thousand, countless', **үєканъ** 'mace, hammer'), architecture and transport (**колимогъ** 'tent', **шатъръ** 'tent, pavilion', **тєтєгъ** 'litter'), household objects (**үаша** 'mug', **уьванъ** 'vessel, jug'). Most of them would seem to designate phenomena unknown in Slavic culture.

References

Angelov, Dimităr. 1981. *Obrazuvane na bălgarskata narodnost.* Sofia.

von Arnim, Bernd. 1956. "Urbulgarisch kъlubrъ ~ κουλούβρος". *Festschrift für Max Vasmer zum 70. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrasowitz, pp. 45–46.

Baskakov, Nikolaj A. 1979. *Russkie familii tjurkskogo proizchoždenija.* Moscow.

Beševliev, Veselin. 1979. *Părvobălgarski nadpisi*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Chlebnikova, Tamara A. 1988. "Koževnoe delo". *Gorod Bolgar. Očerki remeslennoj dejatel'nosti*. Moscow, pp. 244–253.

Clauson, Sir Gerard. 1972. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Curta, Florin. 2006. *Southeastern Europe in the Middle Ages 500–1250.* Cambridge University Press.

Daniľčenko, K. 1981. "Bolgarskie toponimy v italii". *Balkansko ezikoznanie* XXIV, kn. 4, pp. 17–26.

Deleva, Antoaneta K. 1996b. "Prabălgarskite zaemki v starobălgarskija ezik kato material za predpismenata istorija na bălgarskija ezik". *Medievistični izsledvanija v pamet na Pejo Dimitrov.* Šumen, pp. 119–129.

Deleva, Antoaneta K. 1997a. *Prabălgarski zaemki v starobălgarskija ezik. Mechanizmi na ezikovata adaptacija*. Disertacija. Sofijski universitet 'Sveti Kliment Ohridski', Sofia.

Deleva, Antoaneta K. 1997b. "Kănigy – proizxod i značenie na dumata". *Preslavska knižovna škola* 2. Šumen, pp. 31–40.

Deleva, Antoaneta K. 2000. "Prabălgari i prabălgarski zaemki (vărchu material ot starobălgarskite pismeni pametnici". In *Acta Palæoslavica.* Vol. 1, edited by Margarita Mladenova. Sofia, pp. 109–115.

Dobrev, Ivan D. 1987. *Starinni narodni dumi.* Sofia.

Dobrev, Ivan D. 1989–1990. "A new collection of Slavonic manuscripts from the Sinai peninsula", rec. (Ioannis C. Tarnanidis, The Slavonic Manuscripts Discovered

in 1975 at St. Catherine's Monastery on Mount Sinai. Thessaloniki, 1988). *Cyrillomethodianum* 13–14, pp. 168–171.

Dobrodomov, Igor' G. 1969. "Iz bulgarskogo vklada v slavjanskich jazykach. I." *Ėtimologija* 1967. Moscow.

Gjuzelev, Vasil and P. Dražev. 1966. *Slavjani i prabălgari v našata istorija.* Sofia.

Gołąb, Zbigniew. 1992. *The Origins of the Slavs. A Linguist's View*. Columbus: Slavica.

Granberg 1996, 1997a, 1997b, 2000 – see Deleva.

Ivanov, Vjačeslav. 1977. "Nazvanie slona v jazykach Evrazii". *Ėtimologija 1975,* Moscow, pp. 153–157.

Jordanes. 1882. *De origine actibusque Getarum*. Monumenta Germanie Historica, ser. Auctores Antiquissimi, vol. V. 1. Berlin, pp. 1–200.

Kiparsky, Valentin. 1975. *Russische Historische Grammatik*, 3. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Korš, Fedor E. 1909. "O nekotorych bytovych slovach, zaimstvovannych drevnimi slavjanami iz tak nazyvaemych uralo-altajskich jazykov". *Sbornik v čest' 70-letiju G. N. Potanina.* St. Petersburg.

L'vov, Andrej S. 1962. "Staroslavjanskoe pečat' – pečat'ljati". *Ėtimologičeskie issledovanija*, 2. Moscow, pp. 93–103.

Menges, Karl G. 1951a. *The Oriental Elements in the Igor-Song* (= Monographs/ Supplement of Word 7). New York.

Menges, Karl G. 1951b. "Altaic elements in the Protobulgarian inscriptions". *Byzantion* 21, nr 1, pp. 85–118.

Menges, Karl G. 1959. "Schwierige slawisch-orientalische Lehnbeziehungen". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 31, pp. 177–190.

Migne, Jacques-Paul. 1854–1899. *Patrologiæ græcæ et latinæ cursus completus*. Seria Latina 1854–1890, Seria Græca 1857–1899. Paris.

Miltenov, Javor. 2006. *Dialozite na Psevdo-Kesarij v slavjanskata răkopisna tradicija*. Sofia: Avalon.

Moravcsik, Gyula. 1958. *Byzantinoturcica,* I–II. Berlin.

Pritsak, Omeljan Yosypovič. 1954. "Der Name Avitoxolă". *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 26, pp. 190–220.

Pritsak, Omeljan Yosypovič. 1982. "The Hunnic Language of the Attila Clan". *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 6, no. 4, pp. 428–476.

Pritsak, Omeljan Yosypovič. 1983. "The Slavs and the Avars". *Gli Slavi occidentali e meridionali nell'alto medioevo*. Spoleto, pp. 353–435.

Reinhart, Johannes. 1995. "(Alt)kirchenslavisch *tetegъ* 'Sänfte'". *Wiener slavistisches Jahrbuch* 41, pp. 135–142.

Rusek, Jerzy and Marija Račeva. 1982. "комарогъ, комрогъ – starinnoe nazvanie v bolgarskom jazyke". *Balkansko ezikoznanie* 25/2, pp. 27–34.

Setarov, Dževat S. 1990. *Nazvanija životnych v russkom jazyke. Ėtimologija istinnych, spornych i mnimych tjurkizmov*. Vilnius.

Sevortjan, Ervand V. 1974. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' tjurkskix jazykov. Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na glasnye*. Moscow.

Simeonov, Boris. 1982. "K voprosu o proischoždenii i ėtničeskoj prinadležnosti prabolgar". *Balkansko ezikoznanie,* 25/3, pp. 52–58.

Szádeczky-Kardoss, Samuel. 1990. "The Avars". *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia.* Edited by Denis Sinor. Cambridge: University Press, pp. 206–228.

Tăpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka. 1966. *Našestvija i etničeski promeni na Balkanite prez VI–VII v.* Sofia.

Tăpkova-Zaimova, Vasilka and Plamen Pavlov. 1993. "Severnite 'varvari' i Černomorieto". *Bălgarite v Severnoto Pričernomorie,* 2. Veliko Tărnovo, pp. 21–29.

Tichova, Marija. 1987. "Zamjana na prabălgarskite dumi v Rimskija paterik". *Godišnik na Sofijskija Universitet, Naučen centăr za slavjanovizantijski proučvanija.* Sofia.

Vaillant, André. 1957. "Problèmes étymologiques". *Revue des études slaves* 34, pp. 136–143.

Vasmer, Max. 1986. *Ėtimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, 1–4. 1986–1987, Moscow.

Yü, Ying-Shih. 1999. "The Hsiung-nu". *The Cambridge History of Early Inner Asia.* Edited by Denis Sinor. Cambridge: University Press, pp. 118–150.