

Florence Lydia GRAHAM, 2020:
Turkisms in South Slavonic Literature: Turkish Loanwords in Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscan Sources. Oxford: OUP.
409 pp.

Florence Lydia Graham tackles the complex topic of Ottoman Turkish borrowings in Bosnian and Bulgarian writing traditions in her work *Turkisms in South Slavonic Literature: Turkish Loanwords in 17th and 18th century Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscan Sources* (hereafter TSSL). Along with analyzing Turkisms, she discusses the earliest written attestations of Turkisms in these traditions, adding many earlier dates to those noted in previous studies.. Graham's analysis shows the increase in Turkisms used in Franciscan writing from the 17th to the 18th century. Because the analysis deals with pre-standardized texts, there is a section on orthography to aid the interpretation of the examples in TSSL.

All but three writers whose texts are analyzed wrote in Latin script (27). The Latinica used by the Franciscans had influences from either Italian or Hungarian, and Graham describes the differences between the two and provides comparisons with modern standards, noting that primary sources in Bosančica are transcribed into "modern BCS spelling," while works written in Latinica are kept in their original spelling (9). Bulgarian Cyrillic appears to have been transcribed like Bosančica, judging by her example on page 18 and how the Bulgarian glossary entries include graphemes such as č and š for Cyrillic ч and ш.

Graham limits her study to the Bosnian Franciscans of the 17th and 18th

century noting that "until the 19th century, the majority of the books published in Bosnian were written by the Bosnian Franciscans", and "Bosnian Muslims tended to write in Arabic" and "Serbs had Church Slavonic influence" (2). The primary Bulgarian texts used in this study were also written by Franciscans, though some non-Franciscan writing is used for comparison of earliest attestation dates. Graham states that originally, Bulgarian was "included as a point of comparison," but the "significance of Turkish in the Bulgarian texts" causes the Bulgarian texts to have "equal weight to the Bosnian texts" (3). However, Bosnian receives more focus throughout TSSL.

The Bosnian texts are the works of seven 18th century and five 17th century Bosnian Franciscans. Graham describes how the Franciscans from Italy first founded *Bosna Srebrena*, the Franciscan order of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in 1291. In 1463, Sultan Mehmed II issued a capitulation, or contract, allowing the Franciscans to remain, although many Catholics left Bosnia or converted to Islam during Ottoman rule (4). Graham describes the circumstances of the Franciscans in the Ottoman Empire, noting that "despite the harsh treatment /.../ experienced at the hands of the Turks, they still incorporated Turkish words into their writing" (6). Graham also provides detailed descriptions of each of the 11 writers analysed, all monastic brothers, and the texts analyzed, which include eleven religious works "written for the use of clergymen in Bosnia and the greater South Slav area" as well as two chronicles describing events that affected the friars lives, such as power vicissitudes of the Ottoman Empire and the Kingdom of Hungary, as well as biblical events (9–13).

The Bulgarian Catholics were mainly Saxon miners and tradesmen from Western Europe, until the Council of Trent (1545–1563), after which Bosnian Franciscans were given responsibility for the welfare of the Catholics in Bulgaria and also converted Bulgarian non-Catholics, “especially the Paulicians around Plovdiv and the Danube.” Graham explains that the Bulgarian Catholics were more rebellious than the Bosnian Catholics, though she does mention that reports on Bulgarian Catholic-Ottoman Turkish relations are largely limited to the Čiprovci uprising of 1688. This informational gap is a point of possible future study, as Graham mentions that the “amount of Turkish influence on the language and the continuous existence of the Paulician Catholic communities” illustrates the complex relationship between Bulgarian Catholics and the Ottomans (13–15).

Graham analyzes two Bulgarian published works. The first is Petar Bogdan Bakšič’s *mediationes S. Vonauenturæ, To yefn Bogoglivbna razmiscglianya od Otayftva Odkuplienya Covičanskoga ‘Saint Bonaventura’s Mediations, That is God-loving Reflections on the Mystery of the Redemption of Mankind’* (1638) which, as Graham states, is a translation into Croatian with little Bulgarian influence since Croatian was the language of the seminary in Bulgaria at the time (16). The other published work is Filip Stanislavov’s *Abagar ‘Abgar’* (1651), “regarded as the first printed book in Early Modern Bulgarian” (16). Graham also analyzes three unpublished Bulgarian Catholic manuscripts, the site of the majority of Turkisms. Notably, the two published works were written for a learned audience and only have one Turkism, “*harami* ‘bandits’” between them. The three manuscripts, all in

Latinica, contain 658 Turkism lemmas altogether. There are also five supplementary Bulgarian texts of non-Catholic origin, three *damaskini*, a *žitie*, and a collection of scribal notes (Xristova et al. 2004), analyzed to provide chronological comparison in the absence of a source listing the earliest attestations of Turkisms in Bulgarian (13–17). The total number of Bulgarian Turkisms in this study is 852 (189); however, Graham’s appendices include Turkisms that were only encountered in the supplementary materials; for example, *hiletčija* ‘cheater, imposter’ from Tr. *hiletçi* was found only in the *Trojanski damaskin* (225). Presumably therefore, 659 is the number of Turkisms used by the Bulgarian Franciscans, one more than the total of the three manuscripts since *harami* ‘bandits’ is only encountered in *Abagar* (225), while the remaining 193 Turkisms reported come solely from the supplementary materials. While the source of each Turkism is shown in the glossary (215–240), Graham does not discuss this discrepancy in detail. All told, the page count of primary sources is staggering, with many sources being hundreds of pages each, showing the amount of work that went into this study.

The book includes eight chapters, which equal about half of the book’s page count, followed by eight appendices making up the remaining half. The organization of TSSL and the appendices allow this book to be used as a reference for future studies dealing with the chronology of Turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian, as well as studies about Turkisms in general.

The first chapter is the introduction of the book and discusses terminology, the translations/glosses used, the rationale for material selection, overview of the book, historical background and

description of the sources, as well as discussions relating to language, phonology, and orthography used in the work.

The second chapter discusses the problems of earliest attestations and dating of Turkisms from the findings from this study as well as previous studies and existing referential sources. This chapter, with the related appendices, could be used as reference for any future study relating to the pre-19th century chronology of Turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian.

Chapters three through six describe in detail how the Turkisms are represented and fit into the grammatical system of Bosnian and Bulgarian, primarily in regard to part-of-speech and morphology. Namely, chapter three discusses nouns, chapter four verbs, chapter five adjectives and adverbs, and chapter six conjunctions.

The analysis in chapter three describes how Bosnian and Bulgarian assigned gender and declension type to the Turkisms, as well as how nominal suffixes both Slavic and those borrowed from Turkish were added to borrowed stems. For example, Graham finds that the suffix *-luk* < *-lĭk* was productive in Bosnian occurring with non-Turkish roots such as “*gospodarluk* ‘kingdom’ and *Latinluk* ‘area populated by Christians’” (85). A similar description of nominal suffix Turkisms is given for Bulgarian as well.

Chapter four focuses on borrowed verbs. Graham discusses wholesale borrowing of Turkish verbs versus adding Slavic verbal suffixes to nominal Turkisms, how such verbal suffixes were added, the aspect of borrowed verbs, as well as how prefixes were added to verbal Turkisms.

In chapter five, Graham describes the various ways that borrowed adjectives

are formed. She divides the adjectives borrowed into Bosnian by types — “those that adopted Slavonic adjectival suffixes */.../*, those often derived from verbs as they have the past participial suffix *-an/en*, and those that remain in their original Turkish forms and do not decline” (134). Bulgarian adjectives are found to have three types as well, though slightly different; “adjectives with Turkish roots that take Slavonic adjectival suffixes..., those that are Turkish derived adjectives; and those that are Turkish root adjectives” (143). This chapter also describes borrowed adverbs.

Chapter six describes borrowed conjunctions. It is the shortest chapter and each conjunction borrowed is briefly discussed since there are so few.

Chapter seven is devoted to “Motivation, Semantics and Integration of Turkisms.” This chapter provides insight into the choice and use of the Turkisms described throughout the work. Here Graham divides the Turkisms into categories based on similar semantic meanings such as, “weaponry and violent conflict, religious terminology, or trade and monetary terms” (163). She also discusses the “role of writers’ background and views” (164).

The conclusion, chapter eight, includes a summary of findings as well as a holistic comparison of Turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian. The last paragraph of the body text presents questions for future research, such as differences in Turkisms from other languages and what that reveals about sociolinguistic contact, “how do these developments differ due to Slavonic and Turkish dialects”, and how has the status of Turkisms changed in Bosnian and Bulgarian since the 18th century.

As noted earlier, around half of TSSL is appendices, 201 pages out

of 409, and so they are crucial to the work as a whole. Throughout the first half of TSSL around 125 Turkisms are described in detail and it is in these appendices that we see the remaining Turkisms. The appendices give the true scope of the study as they include all the individual Turkisms found in the source material. Each appendix conveys information that could be used as reference material for future studies and so are briefly described below.

Appendix I: Glossary of Turkisms in Bosnian – a Bosnian glossary of the Turkisms found in the study listed in alphabetical order with spelling variations, part of speech, English translation, the source in which they were found, and the Turkish word from which they were borrowed in the modern Turkish spelling.

Appendix II: Glossary of Turkisms in Bulgarian – is a Bulgarian glossary with the same characteristics.

Appendix III: Earliest Attestations of Turkisms and their Derivatives in Bosnian: RHSJ: Stachowski: Study's Sources – a table of the earliest attestations of Turkisms in Bosnian, including information about each source the Turkisms occur in.

Appendix IV: Earliest Attestations of Turkisms in Bulgarian – a table of the earliest attestations of Turkisms in Bulgarian. I do want to note that these graphs of earliest attestations do not have page numbers in the print book, however the entries are alphabetically listed so it is still possible to use as a reference.

Appendix V: Comparative Table of Bosnian and Bulgarian Turkisms with their Respective Earliest Attestations – this appendix compares the date of each Turkism's earliest written attestation between Bosnian and Bulgarian.

Appendix VI-VIII: The final three appendices are ten facsimiles and transcriptions taken from each of the Bulgarian manuscript sources. Following the appendices is an extensive bibliography and indexes referencing grammatical terms, people, places, texts, and the around 125 Turkisms which are discussed in detail.

The material in TSSL is presented in an organized manner which allows for quick understanding and retrieval of the many findings. The organization and writing makes it so the reader is not required to be a Slavic specialist to follow the description; for example, on page 119 there is a brief explanation of Bosnian verbal prefixation. It is also notable that throughout TSSL, the Bosnian and Bulgarian discussions are kept separated so that a reader focused on only one language would be able to locate relevant data quickly. The structure is well organized and easy to navigate. The presentation of material into sections and subsections allows for the work to also be viewed as a reference, while still being readable as narrative. Besides the comparison of the total number of Turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian, there is also commentary and comparison of the differences between the specific Turkisms found in each language. This shows how the similar situation and the same source language can lead to differences in borrowing; however, as Graham notes, the genres of the writings differ as the Bosnian texts were published and the Bulgarian texts were mostly unpublished manuscripts meant to be read aloud to the common people. This means that a few of the differences in attestation dates and Turkisms found in this study could have different results if the texts were more similar. Lastly, Graham provides detailed analysis and

descriptions, presenting on a finding even if there was only one instance of it occurring.

A minor shortcoming is the location of the discussion of the alphabets used. A mapping of pre-modern Bosnian and Bulgarian Latinica to modern orthographic conventions is provided in tables 1.4, (31) and 1.5 (34). Because of the idiosyncratic layout, the reader must refer to pages 31 and 34 or memorize the pre-modern orthographic conventions used in the original texts. The inclusion of these tables at the beginning of the introduction, and the beginning of the glossary, would have been beneficial for comparing the 17–18th century Turkisms to other sources or modern orthography, especially as the Bulgarian texts were written in Latinica rather than Cyrillic. Nevertheless, readability and the main discussions are not affected due to the existence of English translations.

Another issue is that while the total number of unique Turkisms, or types, is included for both languages, namely 693 for Bosnian and 852 for Bulgarian (189), a total count of tokens is not included, though the data was referred to by Graham, showing that she had some of the frequency numbers. I believe this distinction between types and tokens would be very interesting and beneficial to see how much of the text is Turkisms, thereby showing if the Turkisms were repeatedly used or just a few times per type. It would also highlight the frequency of each Turkism, which could show how integrated it had become. However in appendices III and IV there is a table showing each Turkism and the texts that they occurred in. This gives an overview of the spread of Turkisms among the writers and texts.

In sum, TSSL examines how borrowed Turkisms were used by Bosnian and Bulgarian Franciscans, the writings by whom, according to Graham, while not direct transcriptions of spoken language, “are some of the closest documentations of the vernacular of the time.” This work is impressive in scale and scope and will help scholars both new and experienced, especially those focused on language contacts, the specific circumstances of the Ottoman Empire on the writing cultures of the Balkans, the language of Catholic religious communities in the Balkans, Balkan historiography, Bosnian or Bulgarian morphology and lexicography, among others. This work also benefits our understanding of early Turkisms in Bosnian and Bulgarian and shows the need for future studies on the topic since it was primarily focused on one religious group and literary tradition. By using Franciscan writings, Graham shows the usage of Turkish in a religious community outside of the Islamic and Orthodox traditions and therefore outside of the two majority religious communities. Future studies might compare Graham’s findings with contemporaneous writings in the other religious traditions.

REFERENCES

Boriana XRISTOVA, Darinka KARADŽOVA, and Elna UZUNOVA, 2004: *Beležki na bŕlgarskite knižovnici X-XVIII vek*. Sofia: Narodna biblioteka ‘Sv. sv. Kiril i Metodij’.

A. Jakob Johnson

*Department of Slavic and Eurasian
Languages and Literatures,
University of Kansas,
ajakobjk@ku.edu*