

Максим Сл. Младенов. *Говорът на Ново село, Видинско. Принос към проблема за смесените говори*. София: Издателство на БАН, 1969 [Трудове по българска диалектология, кн. 6].

---

## **The Dialect of Novo Selo, Vidin Region: A Contribution to the Study of Mixed Dialects**

*English summary by Olga M. Mladenova*

Maxim Sl. Mladenov, the author of the 1969 monograph reprinted in this volume,<sup>1</sup> was a native speaker of the Novo-Selo dialect who preserved his fluency in the dialect all his life. The material for the monograph was collected over a period of about fourteen or fifteen years in the 1950s and the 1960s. His monograph is not the first description of this dialect. It follows Stefan Mladenov's study of the language and the national identity of Novo Selo (Vidin Region) published in *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina*, vol. 18, 1901, 471-506. Having conducted his research at a later date, M. Sl. Mladenov had the opportunity to record any modifications that had taken place in the dialect in the conditions of rapid cultural change, thus adding an extra dimension to this later study of the Novo-Selo dialect. His is a considerably more detailed survey of this unique dialect, which is the outcome of the lengthy coexistence of speakers of different Bulgarian dialect backgrounds in a Romanian environment. The author's concern with the identification and localization of the components that comprise the language system of the Novo-Selo dialect makes the monograph relevant to the study of mixed dialects as well as language contact.

The monograph consists of eight chapters, a differential glossary (pp. 207-300), speech samples (pp. 301-306) and bibliography (pp. 307-309). The introduction (pp. 7-12) presents the demographic and ethnographic features of the village, previous research that has touched upon the Novo-Selo dialect and folklore and the author's own research method. Readers are provided with a map that shows the location of Novo Selo in the far northwest corner of Bulgaria on the bank of the Danube River (p. 8).

Novo-Selo residents have traditionally earned a living with viticulture, agriculture and, to a lesser extent, fishing. Both local oral history going back to the first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century and the name of the village (*Novo selo* means 'New village') imply that it is a relatively recent settlement. Among the settlers who founded Novo Selo there were, according to tradition, Romanians as well as people from the Tetovo Region in Macedonia, the Sofia and the Dupnica<sup>2</sup> Regions in Southwest Bulgaria, the Čiprovci Region in Northwest Bulgaria and perhaps the Gabrovo Region in Eastern Bulgaria. According to L. Miletič's hypothesis based on oral tradition and analysis of language data, it should be assumed that the demographic history of Novo Selo had the following outline: a group from the Tetovo, Kumanovo and Kratovo Regions in Macedonia moved to Čiprovci in Northwest Bulgaria, which they left in 1688 in the aftermath of the Čiprovci uprising to go to the Banat Region in Romania. It is from Banat that they came finally to Novo Selo, where they have remained since. At some point, the group must have been Catholic.

---

<sup>1</sup> This summary was prepared for a second edition of Mladenov's monograph, which so far (2007) has not appeared because of problems with its funding.

<sup>2</sup> In the text of the book referred to under its old name Stanke Dimitrov.

Some customs, elements of the male folk costume and the term *latinîsi* ‘Latins’ used in the past by outsiders to refer to Novo-Selo residents connect Novo Selo with the Belogradčik-Berkovica area in Northwest Bulgaria, where this term and others of the same root denote local groups, especially those presumed to have been Catholic. Elements of the female folk costume and hairstyling link it with the Razgrad Region in Eastern Bulgaria and areas as far removed as Ukraine and Transylvania. As is the case with other Bulgarians (such as those in Banat) who have resided for a long time in isolation surrounded by other ethnic groups, the Novo-Selo residents have no folk songs of their own. A large and flourishing village, Novo Selo has traditionally been an economic and cultural centre of the area. At the time of research there were no speakers of Romanian in Novo Selo. Residents only recalled that certain families were of Romanian origin. Despite contact with Romanian for more than two centuries, bilingualism has not been common among speakers of the Novo-Selo dialect. Only Romanian swearwords are in mass use, though speakers are aware only of their general negative connotations and not of their literal meanings.

The second chapter (pp. 14-46) deals with the Novo-Selo sound system from two perspectives and provides a synchronic phonological description and an overview of phonetic change. The vowel system consists of seven phonemes /i/, /e/, /a/, /ə/, /o/, /o̘/ and /u/, divisible into two groups according to the conditions that govern their distribution: /i/, /ə/, /o/ and /u/ are independent of stress and position in the word whereas the distribution of /e/, /a/ and /o̘/ is determined by stress and position. Exotic against the background of the Bulgarian diasystem is the diphthong /o̘a/, which appears under stress mostly in words of Romanian origin containing the same diphthong. The diphthong’s phonemic status in the Novo-Selo dialect is not supported by minimal pairs but it appears in variation with /o/ in the aspectual pairs of some verbs (*sə pərzo̘âl’em* imperfective vs. *sə pərzo̘lim* perfective ‘I-slip, I-slide’) and in other related words (*nepo̘ata* ‘granddaughter’ vs. *nepo̘tul* ‘grandson’). Two features of the vowel system (the dependence of some open vowels on stress and the position of /ə/ around liquids) connect typologically and perhaps genetically the Novo-Selo dialect with the Eastern Bulgarian dialects.

The consonant system consists of 34 phonemes: /b/, /b’/, /p/, /p’/, /m/, /m’/, /v/, /f/, /f’/, /d/, /d’/, /t/, /t’/, /n/, /n’/, /l/, /l’/, /r/, /r’/, /z/, /s/, /dz/, /ts/, /z/, /ʃ/, /ʃ’/, /dʒ/, /dʒ’/, /tʃ/, /j/, /g/, /g’/, /k/ and /k’/, which can be classified into 21 voiced and 13 voiceless consonants or, alternatively, into 20 non-palatalized and 14 palatalized consonants. The system differs from that of the standard language in several respects: (a) Missing are the non-palatalized velar fricative /x/ and the palatalized labio-dental /v’/, voiced and voiceless dental fricatives /z’/ and /s’/ and the dental affricate /tʃ’/; (b) The opposition voiced/voiceless is preserved at the absolute end of the word; (c) Affricates /dʒ/ and /dʒ’/ are employed, the latter especially in Turkish and Romanian loan-words but also in words of Slavic origin as the substitute for Proto-Slavic \*dj and as the counterpart of Standard Bulgarian /z/, /tʃ/ and /g’/; (d) Only /n’/, /l’/, /k’/ and /g’/ of all palatalized consonants occur both before front and back vowels. Almost nonexistent are the palatalization-based minimal pairs.

The vowel alternations  $e \sim ə$ ,  $a \sim ə$ ,  $e \sim \emptyset$  and  $ə \sim \emptyset$  and the consonant alternations  $g \sim g'$ ,  $g \sim dʒ$ ,  $g \sim dʒ'$ ,  $k \sim k'$ ,  $k \sim ts$ ,  $k \sim tʃ$ ,  $t \sim tʃ$ ,  $\emptyset \sim ʃ$ ,  $\emptyset \sim s$  and  $\emptyset \sim j$  are represented; these are mostly of morphological importance and were brought about by phonetic processes that took place in the past.

The discussion of the evolution of the Novo-Selo sound system starts with a comparison of the Novo-Selo vowels with their Old Bulgarian and Standard Bulgarian counterparts. As opposed to the standard language, which keeps these vowels apart, the Novo-Selo descendants of the Old Bulgarian reduced vowels *ǔ* and *ǐ* merge as *ə*. Further, both the Old Bulgarian *u* and the Old Bulgarian back nasal vowel *ϕ* are rendered as *u* under stress. Novo-Selo *e* is the descendant of three other Old Bulgarian vowels (*e*, *ě* and *ę*) under stress. In unstressed position, Novo-Selo *ə* stands for six Old Bulgarian vowels: *ǔ*, *ǐ*, *a*, *e*, *ě* and *ę*. This vowel is indubitably the most frequent in the dialect. Only in certain positions and usually for good morphological or phonological reasons are these unstressed vowels represented by *a* and *e*. The reduction of unstressed *a* and *e* to *ə* as one of the most specific features of the Novo-Selo vowel system has been explained in various ways. The author assumes that tendencies that have been recorded in speech varieties with which the Novo-Selo dialect is supposed to have been in contact, such as the Belogradčik-Čiprovci dialect or Romanian, were generalized in a novel way to produce the Novo-Selo state of affairs.

The representation of Old Bulgarian *ě* by stressed *e* and unstressed *ə* is most enigmatic. The author argues that the current situation should be regarded as the outcome of a two-step process: at an earlier date any *ě* regardless of stress was replaced by *e* (as in the West Bulgarian dialects in general) and later, perhaps under the impact of the speech patterns of settlers from Eastern Bulgaria and under circumstances that are not entirely clear, unstressed *e* of any origin was replaced by *ə*.

Of great interest for the tracing of the contributions of various areas to the Novo-Selo dialect is the almost unanimous rendering of the Old Bulgarian initial sequences *črĭ-* and *črě-* as *tʃər-*. The author appraises as more probable the second of the two hypotheses that have been put forward to explain this Novo-Selo counterpart. One assumes that the settlers of Novo Selo must have left North Macedonia and the Čiprovci Region prior to the change of *črĭ-* and *črě-* to *tsr-*, which characterizes the dialects of both regions today and thus preserved the archaic pronunciation. The other assumes that the current state was brought about by settlers from Eastern Bulgaria, a claim that finds support in the existence of other East Bulgarian features in the Novo-Selo dialect.

A variety of other historical processes is also considered in this chapter, among them changes pertaining to specific vowels and consonants or to larger sequences, such as metatheses, epentheses, syllable deletion and phenomena that characterize isolated words.

The largest chapter, devoted to morphology (pp. 47-144), is organized by part of speech. The grammatical categories of the noun are gender, number, case, address form and animacy. Typically, masculine nouns have zero ending and a small group of animates *-a*, feminines end in *-a* and neuters in *-o* or *-e* (*-ə*). Masculine and feminine nouns denoting persons and animals are animate. Masculine animates and all feminines have case, a category limited in Novo Selo to nominative, accusative and dative. Only masculine and feminine nouns that denote persons (including personal names) have forms for the dative. Case functions as a category only in the singular. The formation of the plural depends on the gender of the noun and on its phonetic and morphological structure. Masculines with zero ending have two plural forms: a general one and a form that occurs after numbers. Some nouns are singularia or pluralia tantum; there also are collective nouns. All morphological markers of the grammatical categories of the noun are summarized in Table 8. It shows that in

comparison with the standard language the Novo-Selo dialect is characterized by specific grammatical categories (case), exotic morphological markers for categories in common use (e.g. plural endings *-ə* for feminines and *-itʃi* for some neuters) and, occasionally, specific distribution of formants.

Against the background of the other Bulgarian dialects and the standard language, conspicuous is the absence of the category of definiteness in Novo Selo. Feminines with consonant endings have, as a rule, changed their gender in Novo Selo and become masculine, e.g. *sitən səl* ‘fine-ground salt’. Several feminines ending in consonants have kept their gender, but appear today extended with the formant *-ta*: *rəʒtə* ‘rye’, *tsəftə* ‘tube, reed.’ This formant is identical with the definite article for feminine nouns but in Novo Selo it lacks definite semantics. The existence of such feminine nouns in Novo Selo indicates that its dialect, too, must have known the definite article at some point in its history. Similar forms have been recorded in the Trŭn dialect, which has the category of definiteness, and were convincingly explained there as reinterpretation of the definite form as indefinite. This phenomenon links the dialects of Novo Selo and the Trŭn Region.

The adjective is one of the fascinating parts of speech of the Novo-Selo dialect. An overview of the morphological markers of the Novo-Selo adjectives is provided in Table 11. All adjectives have the categories gender, number and case. Most Bulgarian dialects either restrict gender distinctions to the singular (as in the majority) or keep them in both numbers. As opposed to this, the Novo-Selo dialect contrasts the tripartite gender opposition in the singular with a distinction in the plural between feminines on one hand, and masculines and neuters on the other. The Novo-Selo dialect appears to have carried the tendency towards simplification of the gender distinctions in the plural only halfway through. This feature groups it with two dialects in the Southwest: that of the Kraište area in the Kjustendil Region and that of the Kumanovo Region in Macedonia.

Two other grammatical categories – analytical degrees of comparison and definiteness – characterize only qualitative adjectives in all genders and numbers. Such adjectives, however, opt for non-nominative case forms in nominal groups in the non-subject position only if the head noun is masculine animate or feminine. Definiteness is also marked on ordinal numerals and possessive pronominal adjectives. Definite adjectives are used exclusively in nominal groups that refer to specific referents, mostly deictically. The definite article is enclitic as in Bulgarian in general but, as opposed to other dialects, it is the descendant of the Old Bulgarian demonstrative pronoun *onŭ*. Here are the Novo-Selo nominative forms of the adjective meaning ‘big’: indefinite singular *goləm* masc., *goləmà* fem., *goləmò* neut.; indefinite plural *goləmì* masc. and neut., *goləmè* fem.; definite *goləmən*, *goləmàna*, *goləmàno*, *goləmàni* and *goləmànə*, respectively. This Novo-Selo feature finds parallel only in the Svinica dialect in Romanian Banat. The author argues that it is most probably the outcome of the convergent development of dialects embracing diverse strategies regarding the expression of definiteness that came into contact at a time when definiteness was only starting to become grammaticalized in Bulgarian. Indeed, out of the dialects that have contributed to the Novo-Selo mixed dialect, the Eastern Bulgarian and the Čiprovci dialects have one definite article *-ət*, whereas the Trŭn and Kumanovo dialects possess a triple system: *-əv*, *-ət*, *-ən*.

A small group of possessive adjectives formed from kinship terms displays the grammatical category of person, as the following set of nominative masculine forms demonstrates: *tèjk'in* ‘referring to speaker’s aunt’ *tèjk'intin* ‘referring to hearer’s aunt’ *tèjk'insin* ‘referring to third party’s aunt’. The second and the third person forms are

obtained from the first person by inserting the unstressed short dative pronouns *ti* ‘your’ or *si* ‘one’s’ with possessive meaning in front of the grammatical endings. This is a unique type in the Bulgarian diasystem.

The Novo-Selo dialect has cardinal and ordinal numerals as well as “collective” numerals *dvòja* ‘two’, *tròja* ‘three’ used of pluralia tantum such as *kola* ‘cart’ and “personal” numerals *dvoìtsa* ‘two’, *troìtsa* ‘three’ and *tšətvòritsa* ‘four’ used of male persons. A specific feature that links Novo Selo with the dialects in Macedonia is the numeral *òbajtsa* (*obèjtsa*) masc. and neut., *òbədva* fem. ‘both’ from Old Bulgarian *oba* masc. and neut., *obě* fem. ‘both’. A separate article dealing in detail with this numeral was published by M. Sl. Mladenov in *Izvestija na Instituta za búlgarski ezik* (vol. 8, 1962, 293-297).

The pronominal system consists of: personal (Table 13) and reflexive pronouns; possessive adjectives (Table 14); emphatic (Table 22), indefinite (Table 23), negative (Table 24) and inclusive (Tables 25 and 26) pronouns and adjectives; demonstrative (Tables 15, 16 and 17) and interrogative (Tables 18, 19, 20 and 21) pronouns, adjectives and adverbs. The demonstrative pronouns feature a systematic triple opposition of forms, cf. in the nominative masculine singular: *təj* general deictic ‘that’, *ovəj* ‘this here’, *onəj* ‘that there’; *tòlk’i* ‘so big’, *ovòlk’i* ‘of the size of this here’, *onòlk’i* ‘of the size of that there’; *təkəf* ‘such’, *ovəkəf* ‘of the kind of this here’, *onəkəf* ‘of the kind of that there’. In regard to demonstrative pronouns, the Novo-Selo dialect sides with the dialects in the Kumanovo, Kratovo and Tetovo Regions in Macedonia. The system’s extreme regularity, and especially the generalization of the Old Bulgarian anaphoric pronoun *i* as a formant, allows the author to showcase it as a typical instance of the outcome of the convergent processes taking place in mixed dialects. What is heterogeneous in such dialects is the origin of the micro-systems that comprise them, but as soon as the language system has consolidated, paradigms are rigorously followed and exceptions are reduced to a minimum.

The Novo-Selo verbal system is presented in the interaction and interdependence of its three most important categories: aspect, tense and mood. It features both peculiar forms and peculiar usages of forms common for the Bulgarian diasystem. Its most important formal characteristic is the existence of five verbal stems (for some categories of verbs, only four) from which the five synthetic paradigms (indicative present, imperfect and aorist, hypothetical present and imperative) are formed with exceptionally regularized and unified endings, as shown in Table 47. Of interest here is the balancing between a large number of stems (for comparison, the standard language and most other dialects have just two) and a small number of endings. Besides synthetic (or simple) forms, verbs also have:

- analytical (or compound) paradigms:
  - indicative future, future anterior, future in the past, past anterior and past indefinite;
  - conditional;
  - hypothetical past and future;
- non-finite forms: two participles (past active and past passive), a deverbative noun and, strangely enough, a vital gerund.

All Novo-Selo verbs (with very few exceptions listed separately: *səm* ‘I-am’, *òtšəm* ‘I-want’ and *nètšəm* ‘I-do-not-want’) are divided in three conjugations according to the first stem and in seven classes according to the second stem. The three conjugations are the familiar ones: first conjugation with theme vowel *-e-* divisible in two accentual subtypes (with stress on the root or stress on the theme vowel); second conjugation

with theme vowel *-i-* with the same accentual subtypes and third conjugation with theme vowel *-ə-*, always stressed on the root. The relationship between the three conjugations and the seven classes is shown in Table 28. The first three classes (those with theme vowels *-o/-ə-*, *-o/-e-* and *-a-*) consist of verbs of all three conjugations, whereas the class with zero theme vowel consists only of first-conjugation verbs, that with *-i-* only of second-conjugation verbs, that with *-u-* only of third-conjugation verbs and, finally, that with *-i/-e-* of verbs of the first and the second conjugations. The Novo-Selo dialect is extremely consistent in the application of the general Bulgarian tendency towards the formation of secondary imperfectives (mostly in *-ûvəm*). In general, the dialect's specifics in the realm of aspect, the imperative and the future anterior tense are limited to the formal side. Conversely, the contrast between the two past tenses (imperfect and aorist) that in most Western dialects is reducing, presumably under the influence of the neighbouring Serbian dialects, is kept up and even strengthened by the introduction of salient formal differences between them. Both tenses are used in competition with the past indefinite tense. The hypothetical mood with its three tenses finds no precise parallel in the Bulgarian diasystem or the standard language. It is formed from the fourth verbal stem, which extends the old infinitival stem with the Novo-Selo counterpart *-iǝ-* of the 1<sup>st</sup> person singular of the present tense of *šta* 'I-want'. Similar forms are used in the dialects of the Gallipoli and the Timok Serbs to express the future tense. The old short form of the infinitive followed by the conjugated verb *šta* is a stylistically marked expression of the future in Standard Bulgarian and many Eastern dialects. The Rhodope equivalent has even been found to render a more indefinite and less sure future than the regular one, which makes it the closest semantic parallel to the Novo-Selo hypothetical mood. The hypothetical mood was discussed by M. Sl. Mladenov in more detail in a separate article published in *Bŭlgarski ezik* (18/6, 1968, 526-531). Significant is the absence of the renarrated mood in the Novo-Selo dialect.

The third chapter also has sections on adverbs, conjunctions, particles and interjections as well as a detailed overview of the inventory and use of prepositions, provided with abundant examples. As the Novo-Selo dialect has preserved more of the case system than other Bulgarian dialects, it was important to see what repercussions this situation had on the use of prepositions. The author concludes that prepositions are used as broadly in Novo Selo as elsewhere in the Bulgarian diasystem. The specifics of the dialect manifest in the existence of some less well-known prepositions and in the usage of some common prepositions. Some instances of the latter category are due to Romanian influence.

The fourth chapter (pp. 145-153) deals with accentuation. Stress can fall on any syllable of the word in the Novo-Selo dialect. Most words keep the stress constant throughout their paradigms. Information about the position of stress in such words can be found in the glossary. This chapter focuses on the words with shifting stress. Among nouns there are thirteen models of stress shift: three among monosyllabic masculines, six among bi-syllabic masculines, three among tri-syllabic masculines and one each among bi-syllabic feminines and neuters. Adjectives have three models of stress shift. In the verbal paradigm, stress shift characterizes only the aorist of the prefixed verbs (excluding the secondary imperfectives in *-ûvəm*). Tables 31-37 provide an overview of the stress patterns in the aorist. There is stress shift between the forms derived from the same numeral, although each type of numeral has its own constant stress pattern. Adverbs formed from prepositional groups shift the stress on the preposition. Occasionally, stress can serve as a distinctive marker between minimal pairs.

Chapter Five (pp. 154-163) discusses syntax, intonation and word order. Probably due to Romanian influence, yes-or-no questions are formulated in Novo-Selo without the interrogative particle *li*. Their sole marker is rising intonation of a different configuration than that characteristic of the standard language: in Novo-Selo the verb is high-pitched and not the final word of the question. A number of specific Novo-Selo constructions are described, including the expression of possession and indirect object by the dative of names of persons and masculine kinship terms, the constructions with the borrowed discourse marker *məj* ‘any more; else; again’ calquing Romanian constructions with the same component, the use of indirect rather than direct object in experiencer constructions like *mu e strà* ‘he is afraid’, lit. ‘to him [Dat.] is fear’ that finds a parallel in many dialects in Macedonia. Of particular interest is the double expression of objects, e.g. *Sèno ga dokəràmo jòstà it̃fēr* ‘We brought the hay in already yesterday’, lit. ‘Hay it we-brought already yesterday’. This much-discussed Balkan feature of Bulgarian is assumed to apply to definite referents marked with the definite article. As the article is not a feature of the Novo-Selo dialect, the regular use of doubled objects is thought provoking.

Clauses are linked in the Novo-Selo dialect with or without conjunctions. In the latter case, the action in the clauses may be simultaneous or consecutive. Significant is the absence of *ta*, a basic West Bulgarian conjunction, and the relative pronouns and adverbs as well as the substitution of *kə* for the standard Bulgarian *če* ‘that’. *Kə* together with a handful of less frequent conjunctions such as *finkə* ‘because’ and *jor... jor* (*jeri... jeri*, *or... or*) ‘either ... or’ are Romanian loans. The use of the major Novo-Selo coordinating and subordinate conjunctions is illustrated with sentences.

In terms of word order, among the most striking features of the dialect is the possibility of using attributes in the nominal group both in preposition and postposition, with preference for the latter, a peculiarity that finds parallels in the Kumanovo Region in Macedonia and in Romanian. Pronominal clitics always precede the verb if it is not in the imperative, in which case they follow it. Proclitic pronominal objects may be placed at the absolute beginning of the sentences. This word order is reminiscent of both Romanian and the dialects in Macedonia. No words may be inserted between the proclitic and the verb. In compound tenses the copula precedes both the eventual proclitic pronominal object and the participle. The order of copula and proclitic pronoun is reversed when the copula is used outside compound tenses. The short dative pronouns are always enclitic when used as possessives.

Chapter Six (pp. 164-185) surveys the impact of Romanian on the Novo-Selo dialect. An overview of Romanian influence on the Novo-Selo dialect was published by M. Sl. Mladenov in Romanian in *Romanoslavica* (vol. 14, 1967, 77-97). The deepest traces were left in vocabulary. Around 700 words, or under 10 percent of the 8000-word lexicon of the Novo-Selo dialect, are of Romanian origin. The majority among those are nouns (especially terms related to the human body and character, kinship relations and social life, food, dress, household items, natural phenomena, fishing, local flora and fauna); there are relatively few adjectives, quite a large number of verbs (around 70, mostly pertaining to household activities), some adverbs, interjections, conjunctions and many names of persons. The focus of the borrowed verbs on family life is a clear indication that language contact took place mostly in family contexts. An important semantic characteristic of the Romanian lexical loans is that they usually feature a more specialized meaning than their source; as they do in comparison with their Novo-Selo partial synonyms of Slavic origin.

Moving away from the lexicon, one can see syntax as another area of massive Romanian influence. In the realm of the sound system, the most salient Romanian feature is the diphthong  $\overline{oa}$ , which apparently penetrated the dialect as a part of numerous lexical loans. It is worth mentioning that neither the speakers of the Bulgarian dialect in Banat nor those of the Russian Lipovan dialect in the Danube delta borrowed this Romanian diphthong, despite lengthy language contact with Romanian. Other Romanian sounds were systematically substituted in the Novo-Selo dialect.

Loans were adapted morphologically to the Novo-Selo language system. Romanian feminine nouns ending in *-e* joined the class of feminines in *-a*, neuters in consonants the masculine class; some borrowed plurals were preserved as such, whereas others became singular despite the Romanian morphological marker of plurality. Some borrowed address forms were transformed in the Novo-Selo dialect into address particles. Both feminines ending in *-ă* and masculines were borrowed in their definite form. This is a clear sign that bilingualism could not have been widespread among Novo-Selo speakers, as it demonstrates that they were not able to analyze the Romanian words and borrow them in their unmarked basic form. Several suffixes, usually with expressive connotations, were also borrowed, among them the collective *-or*, the diminutive *-el* and *-ul* as a formant of personal names.

An important question that awaits clarification concerns the chronology and location of the oral language contacts between Romanian and the Novo-Selo dialect. Some lexical regionalisms borrowed in the Novo-Selo dialect point not to the Romanian dialects that are now its neighbours across the Danube River but to dialects farther north. In order to localize the language contact with Romanian, one should also take into account the Romanian settlers to the south of the Danube River, who have been in the area since the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Their dialects had not been studied extensively by the time the monograph was written. The author's own research in the villages Florentin (to the east of Novo Selo) and Bregovo (to its west) showed that the residents of these two villages spoke different Romanian dialects, which implies that they had come from different areas in Romania. The most important linguistic clue that allows dating the contact with Romanian is the final *-l* in Romanian masculine and neuter definite nouns. The Novo-Selo dialect preserves this *-l*. Today both the standard Romanian language and the Romanian dialects surrounding the Novo-Selo dialect lack this final *-l*. One can find it preserved only to the far Northwest of Romania in the area of Crișana. The drop of the final *-l* took place around the 16<sup>th</sup> century or even before that time. This phenomenon makes it possible to postulate the existence of two layers of Romanian influences in the Novo-Selo dialect: an older and a more recent one. Further research would be necessary to make more detailed conclusions.

Chapter Seven (pp. 186-203) looks at the Novo-Selo dialect from a comparative perspective. The comparative data, on which this chapter is based, come from the published dialectological literature, the two dialectological databases in Sofia (at the Institute for Bulgarian Language of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and the St. Clement of Oxrid University) and the author's own field research. From a comparative perspective one can distinguish among three kinds of components of the Novo-Selo language system: general Bulgarian, regionally restricted and local Novo-Selo phenomena. The analysis of the second and the third of these categories can further our understanding of the formation of the Novo-Selo dialect, which comes through as a unified and stable language system of unique character. The heterogeneity of its components is visible only from a comparative perspective. It

should be emphasized that the components coming from different sources are never isolated words; rather, they are entire phenomena, larger language chunks, linguistic micro-systems.

At the time of writing, the dialect was featuring no variation in terms of groups of speakers or the language system as a whole, as one finds in the speech of groups that have recently come together. No preserved variants occur in free variation; all necessarily have in Novo Selo a *raison d'être*: they have either specialized semantically or appear in complementary distribution in speech. Not only did the heterogeneous components of the Novo-Selo dialect amalgamate to form a non-contradictory and balanced system, but this system continued to develop until it realized its potential for evolution to a maximum by generalizing the tendencies set in store at inception. Over the last century the dialect has experienced almost no evolution. It does not display rapprochement with the standard language and is not influenced by its neighbours. As opposed to speakers of other Bulgarian dialects, Novo-Selo speakers intending to use the standard language will, depending on their schooling, do one of two things: either they completely switch to the standard language with almost no interference from their native dialect or, keeping all other aspects unchanged, they slightly adjust the phonetics of their Novo-Selo speech to make themselves understood. One does not encounter here the very characteristic semi-dialect semi-standard speech employed by others. The only plausible scenario for the death of the Novo-Selo dialect is that younger generations of speakers decide en masse to replace it in active use with the standard language.

Looking at the components of the Novo-Selo dialect that possess regionally restricted parallels, one can see that the relevant regions belong to five larger areas:

Zone I: the Northwest Belogradčik-Berkovica area reaching south to the Balkan Mountains;

Zone II: the Godeč-Trŭn-Breznik area to the immediate south of Zone I;

Zone II<sup>a</sup>: the Kumanovo-Kratovo-Tetovo area in Macedonia adjacent to Zone II;

Zone III: the Kjustendil-Dupnica-Blagoevgrad area in Bulgaria and its neighbouring regions in Macedonia situated to the south of Zones II and II<sup>a</sup>;

Zone IV: Eastern Bulgaria.

The attribution of particular phenomena to certain regions can be unquestionable or only probable, as invariably specified in the appropriate place in the monograph. The author provides an overview of the Novo-Selo phonetic, accentological, morphological, syntactic and lexical features by zone, including at the end of subsections information about the important phenomena characterizing the zone that find no parallel in Novo Selo. The isoglosses of some phenomena cut across zones: there are, for instance, several that Zones I and II share. On the basis of this attribution, the author is able to make the following conclusions: in the realm of the sound system (phonetics and accentology), the Novo-Selo dialect's most vital links are with Zones I and II and especially with the Belogradčik, Trŭn and Breznik Regions. There are influences from other zones too (e.g. Zone IV) in this domain but they are not the ones that define the physiognomy of the Novo-Selo dialect. Morphology is the level of the Novo-Selo dialect on which its most characteristic traits appear. One should not be deluded by their mostly Northwest Bulgarian phonetic guise. The spirit of the Novo-Selo morphological system is completely different. The impact of Zones II<sup>a</sup> (and in particular of the dialects spoken in the Kumanovo and Kratovo Regions) and IV is especially strong here. The vocabulary has its major connections to Zone II (and more precisely to the Trŭn and Breznik

dialects) but it also underwent serious evolution under Romanian influence at Novo Selo's actual location. Least detailed are the conclusions in regard to syntax. Here the most important localizable contributions are those of Zone III and of Romanian.

Shortly before the time when this monograph was published, the Romanian Slavist Mile Tomici started his study of the dialect of Svinica in Banat. Tomici describes the dialect as Serbian, although his informants were not as categorical: some of them thought that they were of Serbian, others of Bulgarian or Macedonian origin. Based only on a short article on the qualitative adjectives in the Svinica dialect as well as on the opportunity to hear recordings of Svinica speech kindly offered by Mile Tomici, M. Sl. Mladenov concludes that these two dialects were probably genetically related and gives a list of the parallels he found (pp. 197-198). The differences between the two dialects were probably due to the divergent evolution of systems that initially must have been quite similar. Later, when M. Tomici published his monograph on the Svinica dialect, M. Sl. Mladenov wrote a review of this book (published in *Súpostavitelno ezikoznanie* 12/5, 1987, 101-103). He also returned to the relationship between these two mixed dialects in his monograph on the Bulgarian dialects in Romania (*Bŭlgarskite dialekti v Rumŭnija*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na BAN, 1993, 55-56).

The eighth and last chapter (pp. 200-205) serves as an introduction to the glossary and deals with the characteristics of Novo-Selo vocabulary. The majority of Novo-Selo words are of Slavic origin. The most important influence on vocabulary is that of Romanian but the Novo-Selo dialect also has a number of Greek and Turkish loans, as do all Bulgarian dialects. Quite striking is the list of quasi-general Bulgarian words that are absent from the Novo-Selo linguistic landscape. It includes unexpected items like *vŭrvja* 'I-walk', *slizam* 'I-get off; I-descend', *tŭrsja* 'I-search', *čupja* 'I-break', *gora* 'forest', *dŭžd* 'rain', *momiče* 'girl', *momče* 'boy', *reka* 'river' *stena* 'wall', *beden* 'poor', *bŭrzo* 'quickly', *bavno* 'slowly', *vŭn* 'out', *vŭv* 'in' etc. On the other hand, Novo-Selo vocabulary boasts a number of rare and specific lexical items, too. Some areas such as kinship relations are referred to by very precise and detailed terminology.

Vocabulary can be stratified chronologically. There are certain words that are known only to the oldest speakers whereas the younger ones have abandoned them. Such words can be defined as archaic. Other vocabulary items are obviously new, designating recently introduced social relations and referents.

The Novo-Selo dialect has both motivated and unmotivated words. The latter predominate, although there are some active word-building formants. A list of the most important suffixes that form nouns and adjectives is provided. Apparently, speakers of the Novo-Selo dialect found it handier to borrow words from Romanian to denote new realia than to form their own derivatives. The glossary consists of about 3800 entries, out of which 2300 are nouns, 860 verbs, 290 adjectives, 180 adverbs, 50 interjections, 15 numerals, 35 pronouns and 12 conjunctions. As prepositions had been treated in detail in Chapter Three, they were not included in the glossary. In order to be eligible to enter the glossary, an item had to have restricted distribution in Bulgarian linguistic territory. Phonetic and morphological peculiarities were also taken into consideration. When there is accentological and phonetic evidence that a loan penetrated through an intermediary, it is identified by the indication of the language from which Novo-Selo speakers received the word rather than the original source. Entries are accompanied by notes on grammatical and stylistic properties as well as frequency of occurrence. Each entry consists of an interpretation of the headword's meanings in Standard Bulgarian and illustrations that show its usage.