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ABSTRACT: The Turkish dialects in Bulgaria early attracted the attention of scholars. The best-known researchers in this area are: D. Gadžanov, St. Mladenov, G. Németh, St. Çilingirov, T. Kowalski, N. K. Dmitriev, S. Kakuk, G. Hazai, V. Guzev, H. Memova-Süleymanova, M. Mollova. Their research are presented in this article.
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The Balkan Turkish dialects have attracted the attention of scholars for a long time. Their studies started already in the beginning of the twentieth century. The investigations of Hungarian scholar Ig. Kúnó who was mainly engaged in Turkish folklore studies are accepted as a starting point of the research on the Rumelian Turkish dialects (Kúnó 1906a, 1906b, 1907).

The Turkish dialects in Bulgaria early attracted the attention of scholars. First steps in the field were undertaken by the lecturer of the Sofia University D. Gadžanov. In 1910 and 1911 following a request from the Vienna Academy of Sciences, D. Gadžanov performed two field trips to North-Eastern Bulgaria to study the Turkish dialects. Here, he made dialectological and ethnographic observations, included in two reports (Gadžanov 1911, 1912). Restricting himself almost exclusively to two characteristic features of the studied dialects: the existence or deletion of p and the forms of present tense, he made an attempt to classify the North-Eastern Turkish dialects. The relative lack of factual material and limited objective during fieldwork did not permit him to propose a scientifically based classification. Later, scholars like T. Kowalski and others, considered D. Gadžanov's trials premature (Kowalski 1933: 14-15).

The pursuits of V. A. Moškov, a Russian ethnographer and dialectologist, also have relevance to the study of the North-Eastern Turkish dialects in Bulgaria. Studying the Gagauz dialects, he determined a close link with the Turkish dialects in the Deliorman region. V. Moškov travelled to the Balkans in 1903, visited North-Eastern Bulgaria, where he undertook observations on the dialect of the Pamukçu village near Novi Pazar. The author pointed out that the dialect of this village was identical with the Gagauz dialect of the Beshalma village in Bessarabia (Мошков 1904).
The first one to record texts for scholarly purposes is the Bulgarian scholar St. Mladenov (1914). He published a collection of articles, in which he included Turkish proverbs, the majority of which are used in Bulgarian as well. Later, the Hungarian turkologist G. Németh (1956) analysed this book and emphasized as a drawback the fact that the records were made by Bulgarians who knew Turkish. Characteristic dialect features are not expressed in them. Moreover, it is not always clear of which dialect the informant is a speaker. Despite the fact that the material is localized, some speakers had in their language characteristics without relevance to the local dialect.

Another collection of articles was published later, the author of which was St. Čilingirov (Чилингиро 1922-1936). The main drawback of this book, as pointed out by G. Németh, is the lack of localization of the material. In addition, the proverbs, sayings and the synthesized characteristic phrases are not always a reliable source for the study of the local dialect. Such idiomatic phrases usually keep their phonetic, grammatical and lexical characteristics when used by people from different regions who speak different dialects.

Systematic research on the Balkan Turkish dialects began with the works of the Polish scholar T. Kowalski. He is one of the most authoritative researchers of Asia Minor, as well as the Balkan Turkish dialects. The main outcomes of his studies, reflected in the Islamic Encyclopedia, form the basis for further research in the field of Turkish dialectology. T. Kowalski explored the relationship of Turkish with Eastern and certain European languages. He analysed and summed up the investigations in the field of Turkology of scholars from different countries (Kowalski 1919, 1926, 1929-1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1940). He devoted a special publication to the Turkish dialects in North-Eastern Bulgaria, in which he described the features of the Deliorman dialects and compared them with Gagauz from North-Eastern Bulgaria. The author reached the conclusion, that the Turkish dialects from Deliorman and the neighbouring regions and the Gagauz dialects form a unitary group. He presented them under the general title the Danube Turkish language (Kowalski 1933).

The Russian turkologist N. K. Dmitriev devoted a lot of attention to the Turkish dialects in the Balkan Peninsula. Besides his studies on the Gagauz dialects, he also analysed St. Čilingirov's materials (Дмитриев 1927).

In 1927, the Hungarian scholar G. Németh started studying the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria. He devoted publications to the dialects in North-Western Bulgaria (Németh 1951-1952, 1965). During the 1950s G. Németh again visited Bulgaria. He gave lectures on the history of the Turkish language and Turkish dialectology. He especially emphasized the characteristics of the Turkish Vidin dialect and the dialect of the Turks from Ada Kale. He was accompanied by his graduate student, the future turkologist G. Hazai. He also visited different regions of the country. As a result of his trips during 1953, 1954 and 1955, he wrote his book Zur Einteilung der Türkischen Mundarten Bulgariens, which was released in 1956 in Sofia. In it G. Németh divides the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria into two main groups: Western and Eastern. The line separating these two groups goes through the city of Lom, to the east of Vraza, Sofia, Samokov and afterwards, turning to west, passes to the south of Kjustendil. The author points out, that this isogloss runs in parallel with that dividing the Bulgarian dialects into Eastern and Western. This coincidence, according to T. Kowalski and G. Németh, is not accidental. The development and formation of the dialects of the two languages took place in the same historical and geographical conditions.
The Western Turkish dialect area goes beyond the borders of Bulgaria and reaches the island of Ada Kale on the Danube, Bosnia, Southern Macedonia and probably, according to the author, also Albania. The Western Turkish dialects are considered in much more detail in the book.

The Eastern dialects form separate islands and reach the coasts of the Black Sea. They are situated in the Rhodopes (in Peštëra, Asenovgrad, Haskovo, Kârdžali, etc. and in Pirin up to Goce Delčev). The author also mentions the existence of intermediary dialects.

The Turkish dialects in the cities of Varna and Razgrad were Eckmann’s object of study (1941). During the summer months of 1938 and 1939, he visited the cities of Târgovište and Varna, where he collected dialect materials. In 1941 he published only the materials concerning the Turkish dialect of Varna. In 1949 in Ankara he contacted settlers from Razgrad. He analysed the materials collected from these informants and published his analysis together with four short fairy tales (Eckmann 1950).

Another Hungarian scholar who studied the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria was S. Kakuk. In 1956 and 1957 she visited Bulgaria and published the results of her observations on the Turkish dialects in the cities of Kazanlǎk, Kjustendil and Mihailovgrad (nowadays Montana) as separate papers (Kakuk 1958a, 1958b, 1961a, 1961b). As illustrative material she provided texts, which are of major importance for study of the lexical features of these dialects.

Elaborate studies on the Balkan Turkish dialects were undertaken by G. Hazai, who focused on their classification. In his numerous papers he analysed the features of the dialects, kept track of the work done and prepared a blueprint for future research on these dialects. G. Hazai visited Bulgaria several times. In 1957-1959 he taught an introductory course on Turkology and the history of Turkic languages for majors in Turkish philology at the Sofia University. He also visited the Eastern Rhodopes where he collected dialect materials. He reported his findings at the Eighth Congress of Turkology in Turkey (Hazai 1957). Later on, he published in Hungary an extended version of his report together with texts from the Rhodope Turkish dialects (Hazai 1959).

It should be mentioned that the first scholar to visit the Rhodopes and study the Rhodope Turkish dialect was the Azerbaijani dialectologist M. Širaliev. As a guest professor during the 1953-1954 academic year, he gave lectures on Turkish dialectology in the speciality of Turkish philology at the Sofia University. He did fieldwork in the village of Komuniga, Kârdžali Region. He also visited the village of Opaka in Târgovište Region. He illustrated his lectures with examples from these dialects by emphasizing their characteristic features and making a comparison between them.

The Russian turkologist V. Guzev was another researcher of the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria. His article devoted to the Turkish dialect of Krepča, Târgovište Region, provided an insightful analysis of its characteristics (Гузеv 1962). Based on his fieldwork, his research takes as a starting point the established classification of the Balkan Turkish dialects. V. Guzev pays attention to the phonetic and morphological characteristics of the dialect, but concentrates on its syntactic features and emphasizes the influence of Bulgarian on different syntactic constructions. He also separately highlights its lexical characteristics and finally publishes as illustrative material a text, with translation, recorded from a speaker of the local Turkish dialect.
M. Mollova also showed interest in the Eastern Rhodope Turkish dialects. During the second half of 1950 she visited several villages and collected dialect materials. She analysed them in several articles (Mollova 1968, 1970, 1971). She also compiled a dictionary of the Rhodope dialects, which as mentioned in its short preface, was ready for publication in 1975. The dictionary was released in 2003 in Ankara (Mollova 2003). The data presented in this dictionary is taken into account in this article.

FOLKLORE materials were published in the 1950s and 1960s (Mollov 1958, Süleymanova, Boev 1962, 1965, Boev – Memova 1963, Boev – Süleymanova 1964). Because they targeted a broader audience, the texts included in them were normalized, i.e. they were not presented in the relevant transcription, and from a lexical viewpoint they were subjected to simplification.

HÜSEYİN Dallı who in 1971 defended a PhD dissertation at the Sofia University on the Turkish dialect in Milino village published it under the title Studies on the North-Eastern Turkish Dialects in Bulgaria after his emigration to Turkey (Dallı 1991).

DURING the second half of the 1960s the influence of Bulgarian on Turkish including also the language of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria attracted strong interest. Hayriye Memova-Süleymanova (Memoğlu-Süleymanoğlu) early on directed her attention to this area. She considered the influence exerted on the vernacular as well as on the more formal varieties of Turkish. During subsequent years research continued on a broader basis, as onnamastic material was also included. Her attention also focused on Bulgarian geographic and personal names in Ottoman-Turkish documents with an emphasis on their phonetic and, in certain cases, also morphologic features (Memova – Süleymanova 1977). In another publication she looked into issues of Bulgarian and, more generally, Slavic influence on the Turkish spoken and written language in Turkey as well as in the regional dialects (Memova – Süleymanova 1981, 1983). Her monograph entitled Slavic-Turkic Language Interactions from a Historical Perspective provides an overview of the progress reached in this field and pays special attention to the Slavic influence on the Balkan Turkish dialects and more specifically to the impact of Bulgarian on vocabulary (Süleymanoğlu Yenisoğlu 1998). The lexicons of Bulgarian and Turkish are compared and plenty of interesting observations are provided. It is not surprising that, co-existing in similar conditions, speakers of these languages exchanged vocabulary to designate the same or similar objects and concepts. For example:

**Bulgarian Loans in Turkish**

- bara 'puddle; marsh' < Bulg. бара
- buratva 'meat chopper' < Bulg. брадва
- bulatalik 'swamp' < Bulg. блато
- kasha 'polenta' < Bulg. каша
- korta 'sink; must vat' < Bulg. корито
- mez 'ancient weapon' < Bulg. меч

**Turkish Loans in Bulgarian**

- гьол 'puddle, pond' < Tur. göl
- сатър 'meat chopper' < Tur. satır
- батак 'morass' < Tur. batak, bataklik
- буламач 'gruel, tasteless meal' < Tur. bulamaç
- тежне 'trough; trunk for slaked lime' < Tur. tekne
- казъч 'curved sabre' < Tur. Kılıç

THE book includes maps of the geographic distribution of older Bulgarian loanwords in the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria, such as grah 'peas', encountered in an Ottoman document from the sixteenth century regarding the Bulgarian lands, kosa 'scythe', which nowadays continues to be widespread, vedre 'pail', which is found in an Ottoman document from the
fifteenth century, etc. I have reproduced here several maps of the geographic distribution of Bulgarian loanwords.

The distribution of **grah** 'peas' loanword in different regions

The distribution of **kompir** 'potato' loanword in different regions
The distribution of *koptor* 'oven,…' loanword in different regions

The distribution of *kosa* 'scythe' loanword in different regions
The distribution of *peçka* 'peas' loanword in different regions

The distribution of *piyka* 'turkey' loanword in different regions
The distribution of *vedre* 'pail' loanword in different regions

The distribution of *yarka* 'peas' loanword in different regions

**Bulgarian** lexical loans continue to be used in the language of Turks, who emigrated from Bulgaria into Turkey. They use Bulgarian loanwords both in everyday communication and when they recall their lives in Bulgaria (Cüneymanoğlu 1993). It should be remembered that the mass emigration of Turks from the Balkans into Anatolia since the second half of the nineteenth century is an important factor for the spread of Slavic lexical elements in the Anatolian Turkish dialects as well. Tietze (1957) and Eren (1960) studied the Slavic lexical component.
The list of Bulgarian lexical loans can be supplemented with the words, listed by M. Mollova (2003) in her dictionary of the Eastern Rhodope Turkish dialects. In the short preface to the dictionary, the author underlines that the Eastern Rhodope Turkish dialects form a separate regional unit of the Turkish language in the Balkans. She mentions that from Turkish dialects nowadays spoken on the territory of Greece and Bulgaria, only the latter have been included. The vocabulary was collected during her visits to Haskovo, Kărdžali, Momčilgrad, Harmanli, Ardino, Krumovgrad, as well as some villages. She also collected materials from workers and students from the Rhodopes visiting Sofia. The presence of formal vocabulary among the loans suggests that among the informants there were well-educated people fluent in Bulgarian. The outcome of twenty years of work, this dictionary, as Mollova writes, contains about 10,000 words. The dictionary reflects the state of the Eastern Rhodope Turkish dialects during the period before 1975. The majority of the Bulgarian loanwords in the dictionary are accompanied with a remark that the word is of Bulgarian origin. Most of them have previously been registered by other authors and published in their studies. However, some words were identified as Bulgarian here for the first time.

The political, economical and cultural changes in Bulgaria after the Second World War were reflected in Bulgarian vocabulary. New words entered in the language of the Turkish minority as well. Bulgarian loanwords connected with the specific conditions of life in Bulgaria during the first post-war decades prevail in the dictionary. It is also worth mentioning, that these loanwords were changed phonetically on a Turkish conversational base, but remained unaffected semantically.

The Bulgarian loanwords can be grouped in the following semantic groups:

**Household items**
- **Tur. apartment** - Bulg. **apartament**
- **Tur. kana** - Bulg. **кана**
- **Tur. kravat, girvat** - Bulg. **креват**
- **Tur. kotlan, kottan** - Bulg. **котлон**
- **Tur. märäcä** - Bulg. **мрежа**
- **Tur. purcina** - Bulg. **пружина**
- **Tur. vidala** - Bulg. **одеяло**
- **Tur. zakachalka** - Bulg. **закачалка**

**Clothes, shoes and other personal belongings**
- **Tur. batuş, botuş** - Bulg. **ботуш**
- **Tur. bluza** - Bulg. **блуза**
- **Tur. bombä** - Bulg. **бомбе**
- **Tur. brasnaçga, brasnaçka** - Bulg. **бръсначка**
- **Tur. gașta** - Bulg. **гащи**
- **Tur. ışlifär, ışdifär, ıştifär** - Bulg. **шлифер**
- **Tur. plat** - Bulg. **плат**
- **Tur. ranitsa** - Bulg. **раница**
- **Tur. virasga, vıraska** - Bulg. **вързка**

**Food**
- **Tur. kiflä** - Bulg. **кифла**
Vegetables and fruits
Tur. *kompot* 'stewed fruit' - Bulg. *компот* 'id.'
Tur. *konsərva* 'can' - Bulg. *консерва* 'id.'
Tur. *pawła* 'wafer' - Bulg. *вафла* 'id.'
Tur. *popara* 'panada, bread soup' - Bulg. *попара* 'id.'

Tur. *gra(h)* 'green peas' - Bulg. *грах* 'id.'
Tur. *gompil, gombilă, kombil, kompir*1 'potato' - Bulg. *компир* 'id.'
Tur. *morkuva* 'carrot' - Bulg. *морков* 'id.'
Tur. *malina* 'raspberry' - Bulg. *малина* 'id.'

Adimistration, politics and law
Tur. *agitasya* 'propaganda' - Bulg. *агитация* 'id.'
Tur. *agitator* 'propagandist' - Bulg. *агент* 'id.'
Tur. *çasdik, çastik* 'police station' - Bulg. *участък* 'id.'
Tur. *dălăgasya* 'delegation' - Bulg. *делегация* 'id.'
Tur. *dălgat* 'delegate' - Bulg. *делегат* 'id.'
Tur. *dărcava, dărciva* 'state' - Bulg. *държава* 'id.'
Tur. *dărjdană* 'order, command' - Bulg. *нареждане* 'id.'
Tur. *naçalnik* 'boss' - Bulg. *началник* 'id.'
Tur. *narăjdană* 'order, command' - Bulg. *нареждане* 'id.'
Tur. *ofă* - Bulg. *ОФ* - abbreviation from *Отечествен фронт* 'Front of the Fatherland'
Tur. *ordăn* 'order (decoration)' - Bulg. *орден* 'id.'
Tur. *partiyäs* 'party member, member of the communist party' - Bulg. *партиец*1 'id.'
Tur. *peçat* 'seal' - Bulg. *печат* 'id.'

Healthcare and social insurance
Tur. *abort* 'abortion' - Bulg. *аборт* 'id.'
Tur. *aptdäka, apäka* 'drug-store, pharmacy' - Bulg. *аптека* 'id.'

1 Not identified as Bulgarian in the dictionary.
Tur. milingit 'meningitis' - Bulg. менингит 'id.'
Tur. oprasya 'surgery' - Bulg. операция 'id.'
Tur. rahit 'rachitis' - Bulg. ракит 'id.'
Tur. korort 'resort' - Bulg. курорт 'id.'
Tur. otpusga, otpuska 'leave of absence, vacation' - Bulg. отпуск 'id.'
Tur. pensiya, pensiyä 'pension' - Bulg. пенсия 'id.'
Tur. pensiyonär 'retiree' - Bulg. пенсионер 'id.'
Tur. zaplata 'salary' - Bulg. заплата 'id.'

School
Tur. cimlaza, gimlazya, gimlazya, gimnazyä, gimnazyä 'high school' - Bulg. гимназия 'id.'
Tur. ışkola 'school' - Bulg. школа 'id.'
Tur. kırjok 'study circle' - Bulg. кружок 'id.'
Tur. matimatika 'mathematics' - Bulg. математика 'id.'
Tur. tehnikum 'vocational school' - Bulg. техникум 'id.'

Art, musical instruments
Tur. armonika 'concertina, mouthorgan' - Bulg. гармоника 'id.'
Tur. asambol 'folk dance group' - Bulg. ансамбъл 'id.'
Tur. dirigänt 'orchestra conductor' - Bulg. диригент 'id.'
Tur. balerina 'ballet dancer' - Bulg. балерина 'id.'
Tur. balät 'ballet' - Bulg. балет 'id.'
Tur. tans 'dance' - Bulg. танц 'id.'

Military vocabulary
Tur. aftomat 'submachine gun' - Bulg. автомат 'id.'
Tur. fetfebel 'sergeant major' - Bulg. фелдфебел 'id.'
Tur. ışmayzär 'submachine gun' - Bulg. шмайзер 'id.'
Tur. mobilizasya 'mobilization' - Bulg. мобилизация 'id.'
Tur. moryak 'sailor' - Bulg. моряк 'id.'
Tur. nabor '1. batch; 2. year of birth' - Bulg. набор 'id.'
Tur. parasut 'parachute' - Bulg. парашут 'id.'
Tur. potburuçuk, potpuruçuk 'second lieutenant' - Bulg. подпоручик 'id.'
Tur. purçuk 'lieutenant' - Bulg. поручик 'id.'
Tur. zapas 'reservist' - Bulg. запас 'id.'

Agriculture
Tur. agronom 'agronomist' - Bulg. агроном 'id.'
Tur. bırgadir 'foreman' - Bulg. бригадир 'id.'
Tur. ızveno 'team of agricultural workers at a cooperative farm' - Bulg. звено 'id.'
Tur. kombay, kombayın 'combine harvester' - Bulg. комбайн 'id.'
Tur. kombaynär 'combine operator' - Bulg. комбайнер 'id.'
Tur. kopalatur 'cooperative farmer' - Bulg. кооператор 'id.'
Tur. kosa 'scythe' - Bulg. коса 'id.'
Tur. salaş 'ensilage' - Bulg. силаж 'id.'
Tur. varshaçka 'threshing machine' - Bulg. вършачка 'id.'
Tur. obar 'stable' - Bulg. обор 'id.'
Technical vocabulary
Tur. bolt 'bolt, stud' - Bulg. болт 'id.'
Tur. dok 'electric current' - Bulg. ток 'id.'
Tur. gayka 'nut' - Bulg. гайка 'id.'
Tur. incinăr 'engineer' - Bulg. инженер 'id.'
Tur. kuruşga, kuruşka 'electric bulb' - Bulg. крушка 'id.'
Tur. tehnik 'technician' - Bulg. техник 'id.'
Tur. usmur '1. string; 2. cord' - Bulg. шнур 'id.'

Transportation
Tur. ireyis, reiz 'bus' - Bulg. реиз 'id.'
Tur. karsa 'cart' - Bulg. каруса 'id.'
Tur. motır 'motorcycle' - Bulg. мотор 'id.'

Industry
Tur. doboyni: yüksek 'high achiever in agriculture or industry' - Bulg. високодобивник 'id.'
Tur. kaçesto, kaçestu 'quality' - Bulg. качество 'id.'
Tur. nina 'mine' - Bulg. мина 'id.'
Tur. minyor 'miner' - Bulg. миньор 'id.'
Tur. norma 'quota' - Bulg. норма 'id.'
Tur. ramon 'renovation' - Bulg. ремонт 'id.'
Tur. zavot 'plant' - Bulg. завод 'id.'

In terms of morphology, as seen also from the words included in the semantic classification, almost all of them are nouns with concrete meaning while only several are abstracts. From the other parts of speech, the adjective pros, puros 'silly' and the adverbs sigur 'sure', slobodno 'free' and toçno 'exactly' can be mentioned. The word süzonno 'seasonal' is used as an adjective and adverb both in the Eastern Rhodopes and in other Turkic dialects: süzonno iş 'seasonal work', süzonno çalısmak 'to work seasonally' without change of morphological form.

There are also the following collocations - plotiv kit(mek) 'to behave against', çaş çek(mek) 'to greet', ustroy ol(mak) 'to line up', in which the first component is a Bulgarian loanword and the second is a Turkish verb.

The dictionary of the Eastern Rhodope Turkish dialects compiled by M. Mollova represents an important source for researchers studying the Balkan Turkish dialects.

At this stage the following conclusions can be drawn:

The study of the Turkish dialects in Bulgaria has a long history and established traditions. The earliest objects of research were the North-Eastern and North-Western Turkish dialects. Interest in the Eastern Rhodope dialects goes back to the 1950s.

Bulgarian has exerted influence over the vocabulary of the Turkish minority in Bulgaria. Apparently, in the newest economical, social and cultural conditions in Bulgaria
since 1990 the adoption of new Bulgarian words by the language of the Turkish minority will be accelerated. An important factor in this process is the Turkish-Bulgarian bilingualism.
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