

Olga Mladenova (Sofia)

HONOUR AND SHAME IN REVEREND MINČO KÄNČEV'S „ВИДРИЦА“.  
AN ETHNO-LINGUISTIC STUDY

Anthropological research carried out in the Mediterranean region during the last forty years has produced interesting results. Among the most spectacular is the analysis of the code of honour and shame which governs social life around the Mediterranean. Egalitarianism (sometimes only ideologically declared) is seen as one of the significant features of Mediterranean societies which form the foundation of the competition for honour between presumably equal members of society. The function of shame is to reinforce honourable behaviour.

It would take too much space to review the abundant literature on specific Mediterranean codes of shame and honour. In order to give some idea of the anthropological perspective on honour and shame it would suffice to state briefly the findings regarding one tradition, for instance the Sarakatsans in Epirus studied by Campbell (1964). According to Campbell all Sarakatsans are considered to have been born with honour, but it is constantly threatened. In order to conserve it they must struggle all the time. Family honour can be affected by physical assault or verbal insult against its male members and by sexual assault against its female members. The honour of a family is an integral part of its social worth and a direct result of its solidarity. The maintenance of family honour requires different qualities from men and women: men's courage protects the sexual honour of the women from external insult, but women must take care of their honour from the inside by modest behaviour (shame). The proper reaction to an outsider's attack is vengeance. It is a duty owed to the honour of the family and not to the memory of a particular murdered individual. Until some kind of balance is reestablished, the victim's family is inferior in the eyes of the community to the group of the violator.

Since a social code is a coherent system with dynamic character, it is appropriate to focus its study in time and space. As a period marked by radical shifts in ideology the Bulgarian National Revival is a suitable object of study from this perspective. I intend to describe the views and discourse of Reverend Minčo Känčev (1836–1904) from the village of Arabadžievo (nowadays Kolarovo), region Stara Zagora on honour and shame in a manner that would allow comparison with the Mediterranean corpus of data. This corresponds to the general concern of anthropologists to report terminological usage in its own ethnographic context (Helfeld 1980). As a source I use the second edition of Reverend Minčo Känčev's chronicle of his times, which contains also his exile correspondence with friends and records of stories told to him by elders (Känčev 1985).

The ideal of male personality, the man of honour, for Minčo Känčev, denoted by the term *юнак* 'hero', is the courageous and physically strong man who is capable of defending

his legitimate interests by violence.<sup>1</sup> This ideal is probably not very different from that of previous generations Bulgarians, but Reverend Minčo's generation was the first which in mass widened the range of validity of this ideal mode of behaviour. As established by Mediterraneanists, the code of honour and shame regulates social relations among equals. It simultaneously prevents one from hurting other people's honour and makes one avenge any offence of his own honour. The code of honour and shame comes up in conflict situations between equals. Many such conflicts are described in the book. They start with verbal abuse or some iniquity which are perceived as damaging to the *юнак*'s honour and end with violence sometimes accompanied by various intrigues aiming at its justification. In some cases the conflicts come in long, theoretically endless series of episodes. It was, on the other hand, not honour but fear that stopped a Bulgarian of the 19th century from killing a Turk in a conflict or stealing his property. Acknowledging their social inequality with the Turks, most Bulgarians of the previous generations passively accepted conflict outcomes that offended their honour. Reverend Minčo's generation was the first to systematically apply the code of honour across ethnic and religious boundaries. The new claim was met with dissatisfaction not only by Turks, but also by Greeks who were the chief targets of the new ideal personality. Bulgarians wanted equal civil rights with the Turks and religious independence from the Greek Orthodox Church. At the same time Orthodoxy was fiercely reinforced against Protestantism.<sup>2</sup>

The first part of the book devoted to the received local history reveals Reverend Minčo's biases towards this new ideal: he chose to recount mainly tales that reflect his ideal of proper behaviour and deviations from it. In this way he supplies the reader with a time perspective. Seen in depth, the new ideal appears as a result of multiple rearrangements of the rules of contextualization of the code of honour. „Видрица“ postulates the existence of at least three codes of honour with various prevalence in time. Reverend Minčo places his own code in the middle of the scale. On one extreme is the no-code of those who are not *юнаци* and let their honour down<sup>3</sup>, on the other extreme the code of dishonour of outlaws and bandits who in the pursuit of illegitimate goals offend other people's honour. These three codes are not discrete entities, but more a matter of degree and negotiation. To them correspond three prototypical personalities, which (from Reverend Minčo's perspective) can be dubbed: helpless weakling – *юнак* – bandit. Naturally, from the perspective of the no-code which excludes violence as means to defend one's interests, there is no big difference between *юнаци* and bandits. They were even referred to in Bulgarian by the same ambiguous term *хайдути* 'haidouks'<sup>4</sup>. Different circumstances of social and political life may force people to switch their code of honour and transform from weaklings into *юнаци*, or from *юнаци* into bandits<sup>5</sup>, or from weaklings into bandits. Reversals from *юнак* to weakling are also possible. Examples of such changes abound in „Видрица“.

The term used to denote honour in „Видрица“ is the standard Bulgarian *чест*. As in Mediterranean societies, Bulgarian *чест* is gender oriented: regarding females it refers to the virginity of maidens and the chastity of married women.<sup>6</sup> A chaste woman is called by Reverend Minčo *честна* f. lit. 'honest' (p. 591). Losing their virginity or chastity, women are dishonoured and the verbs *безчестя*, *обезчестявам* 'to dishonour' are used throughout the book to denote rape. Since sexual behaviour is an integral part of honour, it should not come as a surprise that the terms for the two prototypical dishonourable acts (cheating and stealing) are extended to denote irregularities of sexual behaviour.<sup>7</sup> But *чест* may refer to the sexual honour of a man as well: homosexuality is damaging to the honour of a man (p. 70).<sup>8</sup> As in the Sarakatsan community, everything that has a connection to sex and procreation is considered to be shameful.<sup>9</sup>

Outside gender context *чест* splits in three: *h o n o u r – v i r t u e*<sup>11</sup>, *h o n o u r – r e p u t a t i o n*<sup>11</sup> and *h o n o u r – d e f e r e n c e*<sup>12</sup>. Reputation<sup>13</sup> and deference are two

sides of the same coin: one expects people to treat him with the amount of deference which his reputation deserves. Reputation, on the other hand, is at least partially virtue-based. This is a point which was obviously reinterpreted in the ideology of Reverend Minčo's generation. From being essential to the reputation of a man for the previous generation of Bulgarians, wealth transforms into a negligible entity for the new generation if not accompanied by the virtues of a *юнак*. This point comes through clearly especially in Reverend Minčo's correspondence with some of his much less radical relatives. In spite of the dubious significance of wealth for honour-ranking, economic self-sufficiency is important: it is a shame to ask for money (p. 575).

Status and the reputation based on it compel a person to live up to the expectations connected with that status. It is considered a shame to do things which are incompatible with one's social status.<sup>14</sup> It is a disgrace and a grave social blunder, on the other hand, not to show deference to a person who deserves it in the eyes of the community (p. 592).

In contrast to the situation in some Mediterranean societies I did not find connections between descent and honour. Assuming that an individual was not an illegitimate child, he like everybody else achieved honour on his own by his deeds, it was not ascribed to him by birth. But a person's honour had repercussions on that of his or her family members.

The assertive personality of the *юнак* not only supports his claims with violence, but may also for the sake of his high goals cheat, steal and even kill outside the ethnic and religious boundaries of the community with only negotiable damage to his honour. „Видрица“ gives examples of such behaviour which can be quite shocking for the contemporary reader. Ethnic solidarity and unity, on the other hand, are considered a component of a *юнак's* honour and the lack thereof is regarded as a disgrace.<sup>15</sup> It is also a means of achieving equal rights with Turks and Greeks and therefore better conditions for protecting honour.

The inner circle of 'us' is double bounded ethnically and religiously. The outer circles contain people who have the same ethnicity, but different religion (e. g. Protestants whose choice of religion is seen as a repairable mistake); people who have the same religion, but different ethnicity (e. g. Greeks); people who have both different religion and ethnicity (Turks, Moslem Gypsies, Jews). Although both criteria of affiliation are important, there appears to be a bias towards ethnicity in the sense that for Reverend Minčo's generation it appears not to be negotiable, while religion is. „Видрица“ offers examples of attempts to change one's religion for political reasons and they are viewed with humour by the author. Distrust marks relations across religious and ethnic lines even when they are peaceful.<sup>16</sup> This attitude is in sharp contrast to the indifference to ethnic matters which had been the norm for previous generations.<sup>17</sup>

From contemporary point of view the everyday behaviour of a *юнак* has a childish quality about it. He is fascinated by arms and horses. He is always armed and prepared to shoo in threat or joy<sup>18</sup>. This pointless noisiness attracts to him the attention of his enemies, which does not seem very wise for a conspirator. But to assert his new ideal publicly was obviously as important to him as to succeed in winning the independence of Bulgaria.

Etymologically Bulgarian *чест* is an old Slavic word with cognates in all the Slavic languages, connected to the family of \**čisti* 'to reckon; to pay attention; to think' (SP 2: 206–208). That is, honour for the creators of the term was primarily and mainly deference. Other terms for deference, besides the related *почит*, *почет*, are motivated in a similar way, e. g. Rus. *уважение*, *уважать* < Pol. *uwagać* 'to observe' (Фасмер IV:144), Lat. *respectus* < *respicio* 'to look back', Engl. *consideration* < Lat. *consideratio* 'mental examination, contemplation' < *considero* 'to view attentively'. The consideration shown to a person was the distinctive feature of the complex notion of honour which caught the eye of the name-givers during the Common Slavic period. This choice of motivation should not come as a surprise in view of the conclusions reached by anthropologists, cf. Michael Herzfeld's statement: „Moral taxonomies have to do with the public evaluation of

behaviour, with degrees of conformity to a social code, rather than with hypothetical inner states" (H e r z f e l d 1980:341). The show of regard by gift-exchange and treating a person to a good dinner and wine, i. e. the concrete signs of respect, the honours, civilities, courtesies are central to the meaning of some derivatives of 'honour' in the Slavic languages (SP 2:316), because not only preserving of honour requires generosity but one also shows deference by generous gestures<sup>19</sup>, cf. *честя* 'to honour; to congratulate; to treat to; to make a gift; to repay' (Г е р о в V: 548–549). Romanian also supports the tradition, cf. *a face cinste* lit. 'to make honour' means 'to treat (particularly to a drink)' (DA 1/2: 426), *a cinsti* has the same meaning (DA 1/2: 428–429). There is evidence of the same semantic evolution in Turkish: *birine ikram etmek* 'to show honour to, to give a present, to offer (a cigarette etc.), to make a reduction in price'.<sup>20</sup> A further lexical connection between the code of honour and shame and hospitality is made in Reverend Minčo's usage of a derivative of *срам* 'shame', *отсрамам се* 'to acquit oneself well in front of one's guests' (p. 206), lit. 'to stop being ashamed'.

Another sign of deference throughout the book is the lack of challenge to the views of a respected person.<sup>21</sup> Deference is therefore a mechanism through which the leaders of public opinion are able to express freely their thoughts and thus form this opinion. The new ideal of Reverend Minčo's generation was a challenge to the old one and this is made clear by the author: the rich elders who were loyal to the Ottoman empire were very bitter because they were not held by the younger generation in due respect. Against such background the connection between Bulg. *мача* 'to hold in respect' and Rus. *макать* 'to agree', *мачить* 'to indulge, to humour', both to the family of CS \**takъ* 'so, thus' (Ф а с м е р IV:29) appears as obvious.

In contrast to the other Slavic languages, Bulgarian exhibits one more important meaning of *чест* which is 'fate, lot, happiness'. Reverend Minčo makes frequent use of the term in this meaning. It sounds very logical to the Bulgarian mind: reputation is a resource allocation mechanism; therefore one's fate depends on one's reputation, or in other words it is all *чест*. It is ironically a linguistic haphazard that caused this curiously Mediterranean semantic connection<sup>22</sup> because of phonetical reasons the descendants of two different Common Slavic words \**čьstь* 'honour' and \**čьstь* 'part, lot' coincided in Bulgarian (SP 2:194). Romanian offers phonetical evidence of the blending of the two words in Dacian Slavic: the Slavic loanword *cinste* while keeping the meaning 'honour' of \**čьstь* has the vowel of \**čęstь* (C i o r a n e s c u: No. 1937).

In the denominal adjectives derived from *чест* can be traced the whole bunch of meanings discussed above:

*Честен* refers to people as well as things. While in the contemporary language it is mostly understood in its connection to honour-virtue<sup>28</sup> and sexual honour, Reverend Minčo also uses it actively as a synonym to *почтен*, *почитаем*, i. e. in connection to honour-deference: *честното събрание* (p. 265), *честното правителство* (p. 409 and passim), *честната черк. община* (p. 507); *честний кръст* (pp. 268, 352, 404), *честното ви писъмце* (p. 409 and passim). In contexts like *по-добре смърт честна, нежели живот безчестен* (p. 372) *честен* appears to refer to the whole complex of meanings of *чест*.

*Честит* is almost exclusively connected to 'fate, luck', e. g. *дали ще бъдем честити назад да се живи повърнем* (p. 59), *байрака... да ти е честит* (p. 42), *царьо честити* (p. 641). Congratulations is the field in which meanings 'luck' and 'honour' get blended: Геров gives *честитявам*, a derivative of *честит*, as equivalent to *честя* 'ходя някому на честито, ходя за много годин на госте' (Г е р о в V: 548–549).

Without actually being an antonym to *чест*, Bulgarian *срам* 'shame' which is an old Slavic term with cognates in the Indo-European languages (P o k o r n y:615) and its derivatives may denote:

1) Any event which causes shame: a mistake or failure of the actor, sex related behaviour and negative social sanctions. Adjective *срамен* refers mainly to this facet of *срам*. A partial synonym of *срам* in this sense is *позор* 'disgrace' < CS \**pozorъ*: \**zbrěti* (Ф а с м е р III: 303) which in other Slavic languages also means 'attention, observation'. *Срам* is a wider notion than *позор*: sex is shameful but may be far from a disgrace. The same (polarized) motivation therefore stays both for honour-deference and shame-disgrace when they refer to social sanctions. Social sanctions are equaled to approving or disapproving scrutiny of the individual by the community. This is the interpretation which enables us to make sense of the proverb: *Седи сам, да не те е срам* (Г е р о в V:239).

2) The anxiety with which loss of honour (*безчестие*) is publicly recognized.<sup>24</sup> A variety of verbs derived from *срам* are based on this meaning: *срамувам се, засрамя (се), посрамя (се), острамя (се), отсрамя се*.<sup>25</sup>

3) The reticent, modest behaviour by which one avoids loss of honour and negative social sanctions (mockery, rebukes etc.).<sup>26</sup> Here belong the derivatives *срамежлив* 'shy' and *пресрамя се* 'to overcome one's shyness'. Some of the verbs mentioned above can be used to denote shyness, e. g. *срамувам се, засрамя се*. A synonym to *срам* in this meaning is *сван* (not used by Reverend Minčo) a derivative of which had been borrowed in Romanian: *a se sfiî* 'to be shy, modest' (DEx). The motivation of this term throws abundant light on the way the notion designated by it was perceived: it belongs to the family of CS \**svojъ*. Reticence, reservation is therefore seen as 'keeping to oneself'. Reticence is the behaviour complementary to that of the mentioned above respected person, who expresses his opinions unchecked, or as the Bulgarian proverb has it: *Срамът е чужда чест* (Г е р о в V:548). By keeping silent, the bride whose permanent epithets are *свенлива* and *срамежлива*, honours her affines, cf. *чиня чест на някого* as a synonym to *говее* 'to keep ritual silence' (Г е р о в V:548).

The disregard of the code of honour is considered to be *безсрамие* 'shamelessness'<sup>27</sup> or *дебели очи* lit. 'thick eyes' (p. 140), cf. contemporary compound *дебелоочие*. Here *очи* 'eyes' appears to be used metonymically for *лице* 'face', as in *мия си очите* lit. 'to wash one's eyes' meaning actually 'to wash one's face'. And the face is equaled in the Balkans to one's honour-virtue (including sexual honour), cf. Bulgarian *невестино лице* 'virginity', lit. 'bride's face' (БЕР III:439), Romanian *obraz* 'face; honour', cf. *a fi gros de obraz* and *a fi fără (de) obraz* 'to be shameless', *obraznic* 'shameless' (DEx). Another example of metonymy in this sphere is Greek *ξετοίλωτος* 'shameless, barefaced', lit. 'skinless'.<sup>28</sup>

A slightly different understanding, connected with the eye as organ of sight, is offered by Bulgarian *безочие* 'shamelessness', *безочлив* 'shameless' < *без* 'without' and *очи* 'eyes'.<sup>29</sup> A person too guilty and therefore ashamed to show in front of someone can say: *нямам очи да го видя* 'I have no eyes to see him', *нямам очи да изляза пред него* 'I have no eyes to come in front of him', cf. also *с кои очи ще ме гледа* 'with what eyes is he going to look at me' (Г е р о в III:349–350). If sight is perceived as one's organ „of shame“, shameless is the person who lacks the organ and therefore sensitivity in this matter.

As shown by proverbs, *срам* in the sphere of social interaction correlates with *грях* in the religious sphere: *Що е грехота, то е и срамота; От Бога е грехота, от хората срамота* (Г е р о в V:238); *Когато не е срам, него не е и грях* (Г е р о в V:239).

When compared with Mediterranean codes of honour and shame Reverend Minčo Kăncëv's code is found to differ mainly in one but important point: in the way it draws the line between 'us' and 'them'. While for the Mediterraneans the family is 'us', for Reverend Minčo 'us' is ethnically and religiously bounded. The vantage point of honour

and shame is definitely useful in analyzing the period of formation of Bulgarian national self-awareness.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This ideal type comes close to the Sarakatsan *παλικάρι*, described by Campbell.

<sup>2</sup> Reverend Minčo was the initiator of an attack against Protestant Bulgarians in the region of Ćirpan. Destroying their school he held the following speech: Вий, българи, които днес сте се излъгали, та се казвате протестанти, да вървите в бащината си черква, че който не слуша, вечер през коминя на къщата ще го извадим и жив одерем (p.341).

<sup>3</sup> Защо ни е такъв живот, когато и скотовете не търпят това, щото търпим ние? Къщите ни, дюкениите ни, имането ни и добитъкът ни се палат и отнемат, жените ни и дъщерите ни се безчестят, децата ни се турчат, бесят и набиват на кол, майките и бащите ни се живи горят в къщите им. Какво искаме от това по-лошо? Аз мисля, че и смъртта е по-сладка от такъв гнуснав и унизителен живот, и затова трябва или да се живее по-добре, или да се умре с пушка в ръка, другоаче не може (p. 511).

<sup>4</sup> Тези богаташи българи, които носеха името „хаджи“ или „ефенди“, „чорбаджи“ и „светогорски поклонник“, считаха за грях да мислят даже, че България може един ден да се освободи и да се нарича свободна. Даже тях ги гневеше думата „бунтовник“ и „таен комитет“ и им се струваше от чума по-лошо. И всеки младеж, който си позволяваше пред тях да загатне такава нещo и изгърве такава дума към общото народно дело, те го наричаха: чапкънин, едипсизин, нехранимайка, царски душманин (p. 264).

<sup>5</sup> Щом хванем да обираме, да крадем — работата ни не е свята, не е народна, ами само един вид хайдутлук (p. 323).

<sup>6</sup> Recounting the story of Todor, his grandfather's brother, Reverend Minčo tells about his conflict with the Turks, and especially with Arab Merdžan over a woman. Todor and his haidouk friends made an ambush on the road for Merdžan. When his enemy together with armed guards and his harem fell into the trap and the women started crying Todor said: „Стойте, не плачете, аз съм Тодор войвода, с жени юнаштво нямам, вашата чест никой не може да докачи“ (p. 35). After that the haidouks disarmed the guards and let them leave together with the women, but kept Merdžan and subsequently killed him.

<sup>7</sup> Marriages of Turks to Bulgarian girls against the will of their families and their own wishes are referred to as theft (p. 539). Gäläb, the disappointed lover of Stanka who chose to marry another man, considered that she had deceived him and thus offended his honour. He wanted to kill her in revenge, but could not find her and killed instead her father (p. 55).

<sup>8</sup> This is the context in which one of Reverend Minčo's friends refuses to let an Armenian doctor give him an enemy, preferring to ask his friend for this service (p. 546). Reverend Minčo calls him for this reason *честолюбив* lit. 'honour-loving'. This is the meaning of *честолюбив* and *честолюбие* lit. 'love of honour' throughout the book (cf. pp. 200, 525). In Reverend Minčo's usage the terms correspond formally and semantically to Greek *φιλότιμο*, *φιλοτιμία* (Campbell 1964: 307; Duboulay 1976:406). In the standard language *честолюбие* 'ambition, touchiness' shows a shift, probably produced under the influence of Russian. The semantic shift is therefore from 'love of honour-virtue' to 'love of honour-deference'. More about honour-virtue and honour-deference will be said below.

<sup>9</sup> Not only are genitals referred to in the book as *срам* 'shame' (p. 547), but the author's brother announces in the following fashion the birth of his daughter in a letter: *То май срамота, ама ще ти кажа и похвалям, че ни се роди на 15 февруарий Денка* (p. 576). Wedding customs are referred to as *женски срамотии* 'women's shames / disgraces' (p. 139) by Reverend Minčo when he describes his wedding.

<sup>10</sup> Appears in contexts like *пазя честта на някого* (p. 31), *докачам честта на някого* (p. 35), *нарушавам честта на някого* (p. 587), *потъпквам честта на някого* (p. 621).

<sup>11</sup> Е. г. *затова имам чест между табаците* (p. 261); *като се разгласили кой да мине по на голяма чест* (p. 277).

<sup>12</sup> Called by Reverend Minčo *въздавам чест* (p. 494), *имам на някого честта* (p. 395), *правя чест* (p. 347).

<sup>13</sup> Reputation (good or bad) can be referred to in the Balkans and elsewhere as '(good or bad) name', cf. Bulg. *ползвавам се с добро име* 'to have a good reputation', *излиза ми лошо име*, Rom. *a-i ieşi cuiva nime rău* (Dex) 'to acquire bad reputation'.

<sup>14</sup> Reverend Minčo's father gives, for instance, his horse to the village teacher so that he wouldn't go on foot to the nearby town, *„че било срамотно даскала да върви“* (p. 82). Priests are also offered the special treatment due to their rank: at the hearing of a lawsuit between Reverend Minčo and Husein, a Turkish officer, the only seated people were Husein and the author, who was expressly invited to sit down „as a priest“ (p. 223).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Черква с псувни и кавга не се съгражда, но и съградената се събаря. *Срамота е* (р. 150).

<sup>16</sup> И наистина турчин, като му напълниш очите, обикнува те, но пак е все кученце (р. 135). After telling the story about how the Bishop of Târnovo who was Greek ordered to be burned many medieval Bulgarian manuscripts which were preserved in a church, Reverend Minčo concludes: От турци лошо, а от гърци още по-лошо! (р. 163).

<sup>17</sup> Reverend Minčo writes about an old man from Macedonia: Питам го: „Дядо Коста, от каква народност си?“ Той ми отговори: „Не знам. Баща ми знаеше да говори български, гръцки, влашки и арнаушки.“ Същите езици знаеше и дядо Коста (р. 611).

<sup>18</sup> Once after vespers Reverend Minčo invited a couple of friends to go for a visit to a nearby village where they made a feast in the school. At one moment the Reverend decided to show that his gun can make a nice round hole in the glass of the window without breaking it. Everybody else also took out their guns and no window remained unbroken. The event provoked longlasting discussions in the village (р. 356).

<sup>19</sup> The relevance of the code of honour for exchange in general, of which hospitality is only an aspect, manifests itself linguistically in terms like Lat. *honorarium* 'a reward for services performed' < *honor* 'honour'.

<sup>20</sup> About honour and hospitality in Greece, cf. Herzfeld 1980.

<sup>21</sup> This idea is expressed in „Видрица“ as follows: затова повече ме почита и обича и каквото кажа, думата две не прави (р. 46); беше толкова почтен и обичлив за турците, стана още по-славен, на когото думата се слуша и почита от прага на вратата (р. 161).

<sup>22</sup> A fascinating Greek parallel is to be found in the attraction of the Turkish loan *γρουνσουζιά* 'bad luck, misfortune' < Т. *uğursuz* 'unlucky' < *uğur* 'good luck; good omen' into the semantic field of honour and shame where it labels the anti-social and therefore shameful behaviour of an insider (Herzfeld 1980: 345–346). Very similar is the meaning of the Turkish loan in Bulgarian and Romanian, cf. respectively *урсуз(ин)*, *угурсуз* 'долен, нисък човек, смахнат, безобразник' (Геро в V:451), *ursuz* 'morocănos, posac neprietenos, nesocomunicativ, nesociabil' (DEX).

<sup>23</sup> Е. г. *честни хора* (р. 396), *най-честните трудолюбиви момци* (р. 510); *честна дума* (р. 172).

<sup>24</sup> When the Christian public opinion in Dytarbakt takes the side of the exiled Bulgarians in their conflict with a Greek, the anxiety of the party losing ground is described as follows: Кир Антониади кой не го напада да му говори за нази от диарбекирските християни, но той от срам мига като куче на полог (р. 592).

<sup>25</sup> Е. г. *моите юнаци... нийде не ме засрамят* (р. 49); *Мохамед... да го посрамят* (р. 607); *Шабан остана осрамен и всички му се смеят* (р. 111).

<sup>26</sup> An example of reticence is offered by Reverend Minčo's premarital relations with his future in-laws. He is ashamed to sing in their house and to listen to tactless hints about his love for Deška: Камбура Йорго, що му трябваше да ме похваля, каза тъй: „Бате Стоене, хубай слушай това даскалче, ще му вземем ваша Дешка и ще ни стане зет.“ Дядо Стоян се засмя, ний се засрамахме, станахме и из вратата, та навън (р. 124).

<sup>27</sup> A suitable illustration comes from a letter to Reverend Minčo in which the village headman and two of his followers are described as rascals and thieves. Ив. Степанов и Янко Станчев веднъж им направих бележка за лошите им постъпки, но тий *без да се засрамят* нападнали ги с *най-безсрамни* думи и ги заплашили с убивание (р. 444).

<sup>28</sup> About a different view of the Greek word cf. Peristiany 1965:182.

<sup>29</sup> Slavic counterparts to the motivation 'shameless' = 'without eyes' cf. in ЭССЯ II:35–36.

## REFERENCES

- Campbell, J. K. 1964. Honour, Family and Patronage. A Study of Institutions and Moral Values in a Greek Mountain Community Oxford.
- Cioranescu, A. 1966. Diccionario etimológico Rumano. Tenerife.
- Duboulay, J. 1976. Lies, Mockery and Family Integrity. – In: Mediterranean Family Structures. Ed. J. G. Peristiany. Cambridge, 389–406.
- Herzfeld, M. 1980. Honour and Shame: Problems in the Comparative Analysis of Moral Systems. – Man n. s., XV, 339–351.
- Peristiany, J. G. 1965. Honour and Shame in a Cypriot Highland Village. – In: Honour and Shame. The Values of Mediterranean Society. Ed. J. G. Peristiany. London, 171–190.
- Pokorny, J. 1949–1959. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern.
- Геро в, Н. 1975–1978. Речник на български език. I–V. София.
- Кънчев, Поп Минчо. 1985. Видрица. Спомени, записки, кореспонденция. Второ издание. София.

Ф а с м е р, М. 1986—1987. Этимологический словарь русского языка. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева. I—IV. Москва.

## ABBREVIATIONS

- DA      Dicționarul limbii române. Sub redacția lui S. Pușcariu. București, 1913—1949.  
DEX     Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române. București, 1975.  
SP      Słownik prasłowiański. I—Wrocław etc, 1974—.
- БЕР     Български етимологичен речник. I—София, 1971—.  
ЭССЯ    Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праoslavянский лексический фонд. I—Москва, 1974—.