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Based on Najden Gerov’s dictionary, data from the Dialect Lexical Database of the Institute for Bulgarian Language in Sofia and published dialect materials, the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary introduces and interprets a series of related particles: легома, лагома, лаума, логома, логом, легоми, лёгоми, лагоми 'as if, as though'; лагома, лагоми, лаумà, логома, логома, лема interrogative particle 'мигар, нима'; and лаума 'so to say' (БЕР 3: 271, 325, 343, 357, 452–453). These particles are localized in the Western Bulgarian dialects in the regions of Belogradchik (Skomlja), Berkovica (Prevala), Bjala Slatina (Gabare), Botevgrad (Botevgrad; Tipchenica), Kula (Rakovica), Pleven (Pelovo), Sofia (Makocevo) and Vidin (Панчев 1908: 189), in the adjacent West Rupa dialect of Razlog (Bansko) and Balkan dialect of Teteven (Brusen) and further east in the Balkan dialect of Kotel. The earliest attestations mentioned in БЕР are легома in the seventeenth-century Копривщица damaskin and лема in the Plovdiv-based journal „Летоградъ“ (1869). Najden Gerov (Геров 3: 1, 6, 8, 9, 19) cites the interrogative particles лагома 'нели', лаумà 'лема, нима, ма', лёгома 'лема, нима, ма, лаумà' and лема 'нела, лаумà, ма, легома, истина ли, белки, санки, зер, чуники', логома 'лема, нима, мигар' and illustrates their use in context with the following sentences:

Легома си я е царя заетно, та знаеш толкова.

'As if you have eaten with the emperor and that is why you know so much.'

Лема го не знаеш? 'Don’t you know him?'
Та лема го зная? 'Do I really know him?'
Та лема е дошъл? 'Did he really come?'

Four opinions have been expressed regarding the etymology of this series of particles. They each assume a different starting point and cover a varied range of
the particles listed above. Two suggest a borrowing from Greek and the other two a Slavic origin. According to Berneker (1: 728) логом is the instrumental of лог, known in Bulgarian to have the meanings 'meadow, clearing' and 'bait'; but the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary rates this hypothesis as implausible (БЕП 3: 452). It accepts M. Filipova-Bajrova’s opinion that легома comes from the Greek noun λέγωμα 'saying' derived from the verb λέγω 'to say' (БЕП 3: 343). Christos Tzitzilis argues that there is no word λέγωμα in Greek and considers легома a loan from Greek λέγω μή 'I say not to' (Джидзилис 1990: 127). Ljubomir Miletic also considers легома in the Svišto damaskin a Greek loanword, but does not point to a specific Greek source for it (Милетич 1923: 72). Finally, лема is supplied with two alternative etymologies: either from легома or from лема, which is of Slavic origin (БЕП 3: 357, 4: 608, 650). Apparently, БЕП assumes that if the latter etymology of лема were adopted, it would mean that легома and лема have different origins.

The overview of our current knowledge about this series of particles clearly demonstrates that information about their use is, at best, sketchy. This gap constrains our ability to assess the proposed etymological explanations. Like any particles, these can only be properly understood in context. We cannot acquire dialect contexts without additional fieldwork, but the Modern Bulgarian damaskin provide dozens of tokens of легома and легоми in context that offer opportunity for comparison with both the Greek original and the archaic versions of the damaskin text. This article analyses the use of легома and легоми in the Тихонров damaskin and reassesses their etymology, thus contributing to the elucidation of the semantics, history and origin of a series of words of potential interest to the esteemed Bulgarian Balkanologist Petja Asenova, whose anniversary we celebrate in this issue of „Linguistique balkanique“. In her work, Professor Asenova has paid special attention not only to the classical phonological and morpho-syntactic features of the Balkan Sprachbund, but also to the lexical and semantic interchanges among its members (Асенова 2002; 2003).

***

The particle легома is used in both the earlier тогази and the later тогива sections of the Тихонрав damaskin in the homilies St. Еустаце, St. Деметрий, St. Николай, Veneration of the Holy Cross, St. Mary of Egypt, Birth of Jesus Christ, Burial of Jesus Christ, Palm Sunday, Apostle Philippe, Apostle Matthew and Ascension, on the one hand, and St. Paul’s Vision and St. George, on the other. The Свиштов damaskin opts for легоми in the homilies Birth of Jesus Christ, Epiphany, Candlemas, St. Theodore Tyron, Pentecost, Virgin Mary’s Miracles,
Annunciation, Assumption, The Forty Martyrs of Sebaste, St. Nicholas, St. Mary of Egypt, John Chrysostomos on Good Thursday, Elijah the Prophet and Akathistos to Virgin Mary's Miracle in Constantinople. There are three times as many (or 153 vs. 46) instances of лего̀м in the Свиштов than of лего̀м in the Тихонрakov damaskin. The Тихонрakov damaskin represents a seventeenth-century Northwestern Bulgarian speech variety, whereas the Свиштов damaskin reflects a proto-collection dated somewhat later and localized in the Moesian area of Northeastern Bulgaria. This quantitative predominance of the available data in the Свиштов homilies questions the validity of the geographic distribution presented in БЕР, which situated contemporary usage mostly in the Western dialects with a limited spillover into the West Rupa and the Balkan dialects, or at the very least makes it look like the outcome of a recent areal reduction of лего̀м.

Some of the homilies included in the Тихонрakov and the Свиштов damaskins go back to the same source, or display parallel wordings that could not have appeared independently, as conclusively proven by Evgenija Demina (Демина 1968). Two of the homilies that use лего̀м (от лего̀м) – Birth of Jesus Christ and St. Nicholas – belong to this category. They include eight instances of the overlapping use of лего̀м and лего̀м. I shall cite here a single example to illustrate this category:

1. Написа̀ се и въ въ Августово повеленѝе, ради дѣ б о работи, идно [ … ] въ второ пакь, защо лего̀м като бѣ̀хъмь поробени въ диа̀волски рѣ̀шь, и всичко се затова сложи, да извѣ̀днѣ на въ послѣ̀дването диа̀волъ (Демина 1971: 263) – Написа̀ се Христос въ повеленѝето Августово за дѣ̀ ри работи, една [ … ] А втората е оти лего̀м като бѣ̀хъмь поробени у диа̀волски рѣ̀шь, подклони се Христосъ, замь̀ да извѣ̀днѣ насъ (Милетич 1923: 82)

The testimony of the Свиштов damaskin shows that the compiler of the Moesian proto-collection systematically rendered лего̀м as лего̀м. This is a sign that he must have been aware that his source used the alien лего̀м where his own speech variety had лего̀м. My further analysis will prove that the functional ranges of these variants do not coincide completely. Since both the first and the second Modern Bulgarian damaskin groups3 use лего̀м, the contrast of лего̀м and лего̀м appears to be a valid diagnostic, on par with the adverbial of time тогистъ (Демина 1968: 220), of the fourth Modern Bulgarian damaskin group, which descends from the Moesian proto-collection4.

What we know about the meaning of лего̀м and лего̀м allows us to classify them as modal particles, whose general function is to fit the content of a sentence to the context of speech (Hartmann 1994: 2956). Students of modal particles agree that, together with illocutionary force (declarative, interrogative, imperative or exclamative) and polarity (positive or negative), intonation is an
important co-occurrence restriction. However, the damaskin texts provide even less information on intonation than regular written texts because their punctuation does not reflect it properly. Based on his reading of the text, Ljubomir Miletic introduced his own punctuation and capitalization into his edition of the Svišto damaskin. This punctuation proposes illocutionary force and indirectly reflects the intonation, as he imagined it. It follows modern standards and is in striking contrast with the original, as one can see by comparing his version with the eleven pages of the manuscript provided in facsimile at the end of the edition. Some contexts allow for alternative readings; a fact that has an impact on the interpretation of the modal particles. I shall give here one example preserving, as always in this article, Miletic’s punctuation:

2. И тамъ дод пророкъ Иліа и срешна Авдію, а Авдію като го видъ него, падна на лицето си и рече: легоми тъ си господинъ мой Иліа. Каже му пророкъ Иліа: азъ есъмъ, току ели и речи господину своєму Ахаву какъ шеъ го видъ да хуртуван сасъ него. (Милетич 1923: 298)

This episode refers to events described in the Old Testament, where the underlined utterance of Obadiah to Elijah is rendered as a question rather than a qualified statement. Both readings are possible, but the choice has repercussions for the alleged meaning of легоми. Miletic opted for a statement.

Keeping in mind the limitations of the analysis imposed by this feature of my sources, I can now proceed to an overview of the usages of легома and легоми represented in my corpus of data. I shall start by adding to the co-occurrence restrictions certain basic assumptions that I share with other scholars of modal particles (see Николаева 1985 and Hartmann 1994 for more details). First, since the demarcation of modal particles from other word classes is not clear-cut, I do not expect легома and легоми to be limited to their function as modal particles. Second, as their scope is the clause, they may either refer to the entire sentence in the case of simple sentences, as in example (2), or contribute to the cohesion of clauses into periods and beyond into larger discursive chunks, as in example (1), which was too long to cite in full (note the omitted text marked as [...]). Third, without contributing to the propositional meaning of a sentence, modal particles bring to the fore the speaking subject and the communicative situation as a whole. They give hearers insight into the speakers’ evaluative and epistemic attitudes towards the propositional content of utterances and their perspectives on the relation of these utterances to previously available information.

All my examples with легома, and the vast majority of those with легоми, place them in declarative sentences, which are much more often positive than negative. At least part of the differences between легома and легоми is due to the легоми’s use in contexts for which there are no examples with легома. This may
be so because either our data is incomplete or легома indeed had a narrower range of functions in comparison with легоми. All usages of легома and легоми can be divided into four broad categories, some of them with subdivisions.

A. Declarative illocutionary force, positive or negative: [Both speaker and hearer know that p], where p stands for the propositional content of the sentence.

The reason why both interlocutors have this information may be that it is common knowledge in their society. Standard Bulgarian uses нали in this function (Илиев 1986: 33, Цьбатов 1988: 31) and Najden Gerov’s dictionary, as indicated above, identified it for легоми. It is noteworthy that this important function of легома and легоми, of which I have 27 instances in the Тихонрavoв and 25 in the Свиштов damaskin, was ignored by all later sources at my disposal. The following examples illustrate this function in a positive (3) and a negative (4) declarative complex sentences:

3. И малко дни би и време вищо корабникъ и жената идта чиста и необкръвна в оногони барбаре. Защо легома това бе искушено бъде (Демина 1971: 74) — кой езепидь дола като докимън Теодъ егъното, мибъ тозе епархировван о Теодъ на манахъ ап тов барбаров екейнов монъс мета олъных иерарши спящане о навилърус екейос, кой и гунайка на Агию апбомеин еис айеин (Δαμασκηνός 1971: 277)⁶

4. Заради туй поиска бога самсмь да дойди и да се въплъти и да се яви на свята. Ала не какво бе, оти легоми очи чловечески не е можно да видят святостта божества, облече са въ плътъ, замъ да надвъ пресидъ бъка въ плътъ, да облъстъ диавола (Милетич 1923: 169) — Горь ради власотъ съмъ егъръроднъмъ Синъ Ехно о биа рожденими престил всич вълъкъ Хъ Сиос нд а пръдлъ, дававанитъ ща да епитъсъ се въ миътъ. Щапъ не какъко вът. Имъ оцимъ уди не логъ да пиаи святостта Ехно. Улени се още въ тъкло и пълъ, да понадвъ песяннъмъ въка, въплътъ се да пръдветътъ диавола (Bucharest damaskin, BA Nr. 146: 1⁰—2⁰) — дия товто о Теодъ еблънсе монъс ту а елъна а сарковъ, ндъ фоин еис товъ косямъ плънъ ци кадъсъ атъ, оти зефаломъ товъ анфъгътъ дивъ дъвнаитъ на идълъсъ сърътъ теодъ, ефросъсъ десъ съра, дия н икъпъ товъ аносъко дъвна асаркъ въди въ диаволон (Δαμασκηνός 1971: 18)

It should be noted that легома in (3) and легоми in (4) have no counterparts in the archaic damaskin text or the Greek original, because естепида at most stands for защо легома, whereas нео and оти stand for оти легоми. On a number of other occasions легома and легоми in this function also correspond in the archaic damaskins and the Greek original to zero. Elsewhere, there is a motley
selection of equivalents ποιηκε ευ, ικε ευ (Krnino damaskin), νεο ποιηκε, ζανικε (Bucharest damaskin), ηλια (Adzar damaskin) and έπειθε γουν, γουν, ουν, λοιπων, μεν, ομως and οπος. Textological comparison seems to be least edifying regarding this function, which is, in my opinion, a clear sign that the compilers of the Modern Bulgarian damaskins were here relatively independent of their sources and relied mostly on their language intuition as native speakers of Bulgarian.

B. Interrogative illocutionary force, positive or negative: [Speaker demands hearer’s confirmation that NEG (p)], where p stands for the propositional content of the sentence and NEG indicates speaker’s negative epistemic attitude.

Even though there are only seven examples of this type, all of them in two consecutive homilies of the Svištov damaskin (Epiphany and Candlemas), this category, whose Standard Bulgarian equivalent is имена, is one of the most frequently recorded in the literature, as pointed out at the beginning of this article. It is also among the usages that have clear-cut equivalents that can be traced through the archaic damaskins back to the Greek original, as my illustration in (5) shows:

5. Ταμ ταπία πρεδέα: δα νε βελέπες τι περοκατ? Α τοι κάκε, χι ηεσεε
αζ. Χι ηεγομει νε βελέπες περοκατ? Β τεικεν περοκα τοιε (Μιλετική 1923: 94) έ τοιο αε τον ιενα ορασα με κεν ακτοι. ίελλα χε νε εμεν ορασα. ίελλα με ηε στη νοιρκα. ιο ορασα ιο (Adzar damaskin, ΒΑΝ 24.4.32: 26) ~ "Εκεν γουν έρογοχον τον Προδρομον Μη να ειηες ειου Προφητης και αυτος ειπεν "Οτι δεν ειμει εινω και μη γαρ δεν ητον Προφητης ναι, Προφητης ητον (Δαμασκ Εκκλησιαστική 1971: 50)

Elsewhere, the Greek equivalent of ηεγομει in this function is μητως, μη or zero. It is noteworthy from the perspective of the following discussion that Greek μη γαρ has been borrowed in Bulgarian as мигар (БЕП 3: 783), which has the very same function as its Greek source. The full functional overlap between the Greek μη γαρ and the Bulgarian мигар makes the etymological connection between them very convincing.

Combining functions A and B, Bulgarian ηεγομει forms a remarkable contrast to Standard Bulgarian нами, whose use in sentences with interrogative illocutionary force, positive or negative, could be expressed schematically so: [Speaker demands hearer’s confirmation that POS (p)], where p stands for the propositional content of the sentence and POS indicates speaker’s positive epistemic attitude. In function A, as mentioned above, ηεγομει is equivalent to нами.
C. Declarative illocutionary force, positive or negative: epistemically qualified statement [surely p] / [as though p], where p stands for the propositional content of the sentence.

If the previous uses of легома or легоми assumed the speaker's categorical knowledge of a particular state of affairs and differed in regard to the speaker's treatment of the hearer's knowledge of it, a small number of examples illustrate an expansion of легома and легоми into the area of the speaker's qualified commitment to the truth value of the utterance. The modal particle points to the speaker's estimate of the chances that a certain state of affairs has occurred or can occur; or, in other words, it qualifies the truth of the proposition expressed in the utterance by assigning to it an intermediate status between true and false. My corpus includes eight examples of this function of the modal particle, whose counterpart in Standard Bulgarian would be сигурно 'surely'. Example (2) with the punctuation proposed by Miletić is an instance of it, and so is the following utterance that Theopista addresses to her husband, St. Eustace, after he tells her that he has seen Jesus Christ between a stag's horns while hunting:

6. той ще да сици и тебе и мене и чеда нашни. защо и азь ньго вижда в тзви нощь. и даваше ми, оутре да доидете при мене, и тъ, и мъжа тво, и дкаката ваша и щете да ми познайте какъ съмъ азь истинния бъ. амь ногома и тебе загова се яввил (Демина 1971: 71) - тъ да сиците тве и мии и дакати наш. торо въ видькъ ни азь въ пръвъ пръвъ носъ. нъ въ ли звъухъ па пръвъ накъ инъ тъ нъ мъжъ тво и дакъ нашъ. и познайте дько азь съмъ дкъ истинния, ядомъжъ ли въ и нъ тъдъ дръжко съмъ (Адзар damaskin, БАН 24.4.32: 328–328') - аутос въ съда и есена, и и мьена, и тъ пандима иакъ автов едъ и ену въ тъдъ алесмахъ нокъ и о улекенъ Абпинъ въ елъбеде пръдъ мьена, ену, и о нъ днъръ съ, и тъ пандима съ, и нъ днъръете йти ену емозъ. теос апънъ едъ ерънъ и дакати бъ ерънъ да ерънъ и есъ съма елъфоу (Дмькъ съкънъ 1971: 273–274)

Interestingly, the function of these modal particles most often recorded in the literature, as indicated at the beginning of this article, is of lower-level probability. Only two of the examples in my corpus are open to such an interpretation. In them, replacement of легома (лагоми) with сигурно 'surely' and, alternatively, като че ли, сказаи 'as if, as though' is equally plausible:

7. А беотъ съ дакъ и зади имъ: гледати ми са, о вошами, нкъ ци номати ума да са поклони на великите богоци, амь ногома мяцати да ви момъ азъ, та че тогисъ да го сторите (Милетич 1923: 230)
Greek equivalents elsewhere include ἐπειδὴ and ἐπείπερ. The word choice in the Adžar damaskin for this category — گم — is known from other sources with the meaning 'as if' and is included in the dictionary of the Russian language between the eleventh and the seventeenth centuries on the basis of a sixteenth-century text (СРЯ XI–XVII 5: 48–49).

D. Expansion beyond modality, into the factual content of utterances as an indicator of the logico-semantic relations between clauses.

The kind of shared knowledge discussed under A. may be considered a sufficient basis for an ensuing action as in the following utterance that Zosima addresses to St. Mary of Egypt:

8. Речи ми за любовь божія, недей да скрьщв нежо от мене, оти легоми заради туй благоволибь богъ и видѣх та, замъ да чюбъ и азъ от твоите речи нѣчтоже и да придобиа (М и л е т и ч 1923: 261)

When spelled out, shared knowledge may prompt agreement on the action it entails as a matter of common sense, and thus it is a potent rhetorical device in a naturalized world order. Moreover, this is the stepping-stone that shows how the modal particle could have expanded its use and started to function as a causal conjunction. In (8) omu is the causal conjunction. I have a significant body of examples in which the link of cause and effect is expressed by легома or легоми itself (12 and 90 examples, respectively) and the Standard Bulgarian equivalent in such sentences can be the same нами, replaceable with понеже (for the use of нами as a conjunction see Илиев 1986: 35–36). Since more than half of all examples belong to this category, it is by far the most important one. It also is the one that allows for the most convincing tracing of textological continuity between the Modern Bulgarian texts and their archaic sources as well as the Greek original, as the following examples show:

9. иди легома и той бѣше чѣлѣ, и тѣло имаше землино, като и сѣчкѣ чѣли. и дойде мѣ нѣ дать се прѣстабви (Демина 1971: 178) – 'Αλλ' ἐπειδὴ ἄνθρωπος ὅτον καὶ αὐτός καὶ τὸ κορμὶ εἶχεν ἀπὸ τὴν γῆν ὡσπερ δολοὶ ἄνθρωποι, ἢμελλε τὸν ἀποδάνη (Δ α μ α κ η ν δ ια 1971: 301)
10. легоми чѣще богъ да просвѣти сѣчкѣ свѣтъ на сѣчкѣтѣ езидѣ да далѣ богопознаніе. Заради туй и философите на сѣчкѣтѣ езидѣ дарби му пренесоха (М и л е т и ч 1923: 78) – а понеже вѣрнѣ бъ всѣ им просвѣти. и вѣр вѣръ езирѣ покажетѣ богопознаніе, сие рѣди въ велики дари пренесоши (Bucharest damaskin, BA Nr. 146: 19°) – ελασα πλευριτεκѣ вѣр вѣръ миръ
представиха. О, във въздишка извършиха показати ниво зеровка български. тога равен ог
настика да привие. (Adžar damaskin, БАН 24.4.32: 15) — Естествено, този 
экспонентъв, о, о, този кръвят, така една нег това въпросът, какви да се 
утовият ви. (Архов дамаскин, Илиевски 1971, 2: 25) — като тоа една 
изказът на този една що, о, о, този въпросът, така това и въпросът на 
ероготерон от това друга като това едно и въпросът, като една 
друга на същия. (Архов дамаскин, Илиевски 1971: 47)

11. И лагома съставна, слънца напрежа влажка зареди туй и по-много създава 
почета го, и по-много му власть даде. (Милютич 1923: 90) — та нещо 
казано, стърка, стърка, дълга рида, и, върна казва на няколко скъсна, та 
неговия пръстът, една пълна. (Китин дамаскин, Илиевски 1971: 72, 18) 

Она на случаи, които биха потребили унизителна цитати, ако бяхме 
достигнали и една така, славата на този изследовател. Винаги това 
би трябвало на вас и неговата къща. (Милютич 1923: 268) — ако, ето 
една това въпросът, как, ако вас, въпросът, каквото и да било, 
можете да се съгласите, и те да се съгласите. Богът и 
сафата и охранитата да. (Китин дамаскин, Илиевски 1971: 72, 18) 

Besides these cases of overlap between modality on one hand and causality or 
consequence on the other, there are fourteen examples in which causality or 
consequence are expressed by лагома (and on one occasion by лагома) in contexts 
from which the Standard Bulgarian нами would have been barred. For instance, in 
(12) and (13) лагома is used in sentences with imperative illocutionary force, an 

On four occasions, all of them in the Akathistos to Virgin Mary’s Miracle in Constantinople (Militeich 1923: 183, 186 [first instance], 187, 188), legeomys seems to function as a conjunction of time, roughly corresponding to the Standard Bulgarian dokato ‘while’. Since I have neither archaic nor Greek texts with which to compare the Svištov version of the Akathistos, I will refrain from further speculations about this usage. It should only be noted that ejteidh may also function as a conjunction of both cause and time.

The meaning of a number of tokens from the Svištov damaskin remains unclear. The problem with at least some of them must lie in textual corruption, accumulated throughout damaskin textological history.

***

To summarize these observations on legeomys and legeomys, I have to point out that their usage is distributed between two categories: modal particle and conjunction. The following table presents an overview of the strength of the functions of legeomys and legeomys according to the testimony of the Tihonravov and the Svištov damaskins:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>By subcategory</th>
<th>Totals by category</th>
<th>By subcategory</th>
<th>Totals by category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modal particle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nali'</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nima'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sigurno'</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sigurno/</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'saka'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between modal particle and conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nali/ponem'</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'nali/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sledovatelno'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ponem/slidovatelno'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dokato'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only легома and легоми but also their most frequent textological counterparts (поме в the Крнино and Bucharest damasks, έμα in the Аджар damaskin and ἐπιθρο in the Greek original) seem to be cutting across categories 'modal particle' and 'conjunction'. Since the Аджар damaskin besides έμα occasionally also has поме, whereas the Крнино and the Bucharest damasks never use έμα, as well as in view of their genealogy, which is the subject of another study, the contrast between поме and έμα can be considered a reliable textological diagnostic, distinguishing between two stages in the history of the archaic damasks and the manuscripts that belong to them.

The functions of легома and легоми as conjunctions listed under D seem to be easier to identify and trace back textologically than their functions as modal particles. Viewing the modal functions of легома and легоми in the theoretical framework introduced by José Sanders and Wilbert Spooren (1997), we could argue that these functions are indicators of a subdomain within the truth-domain (or, in other words, basic reality), always involving subjectification and perspectivization in interaction. Subdomains can be of two basic types. The speaker-bound subdomain is governed by the viewpoint of the speaker (subjectification). A speaker’s utterances, however, may include subdomains governed by the viewpoint of other persons (perspectivization). The modal particles легома and легоми modify the factual statement and add to it a certain dimension, which is due to the presence of interacting speaker-bound and other person-bound subdomains.

Function A of легома and легоми depends on the overlap of the speaker-bound and the other person-bound subdomains. This „other person“ is often the hearer, but it may also be a generic holder of society’s mainstream opinion. This function is extremely interesting for scholars aiming to reconstruct the shared views of a society. In our case, легома and легоми appear as the signs of two worldviews in conflict: they are used not only by exponents of Christianity but also by their adversaries. There can be no clearer linguistic expression of the dominance of religion as a basis of identity in Bulgarian traditional society than this use of легома and легоми in the damaskin literature.

Function B is an indicator of a speaker-bound subdomain, presented to the hearer for assessment. In other words, it is a sign that the necessary overlap of speaker-bound and other person-bound domains needs explicit confirmation. Function A and function B occupy extreme positions in regard to their alleged fit with reality: if function A indicates that the factual statement of the utterance corresponds to reality, function B indicates that it does not; not according to the current speaker and, one hopes, his or her audience.

Function C attributes to the subdomain of which it is an indicator an intermediary status between true and false. The speaker relies either on his or her
own conviction that the factual content of the statement has a good chance of corresponding with reality (сигурно) or on evidence coming from other sources (съжаля, както че ли), most notably the opinion of the hearer, in the form the speaker sees it, as in example (7). One can claim that here again there is an overlap of the speaker-bound and the person-bound subdomains, because in both cases without a certain corroboration of the speaker’s intuitions coming from other persons he or she could not have displayed even a limited commitment. The different degrees of certainty may be explained by the alternative ordering of the two subdomains: in the сигурно scenario the speaker-bound subdomain has precedence, whereas in the съжаля, както че ли scenario, it is the person-bound subdomain that comes to the fore.

Thus, the hallmark of λεγομα and λεγομи as modal particles is that they necessarily indicate interaction between two subdomains: a speaker-bound one and a person-bound one. They indicate the dependence of the speaker on the society of which he or she is a member.

***

There is a final question that needs to be considered: how does this usage tally with the existing etymologies of λεγομα and λεγομи? Let us start with their proposed Greek origin. As I was saying above in connection with Bulgarian мисер, in order to accept an etymological solution, we need to identify clearly the context in which the transition from the source to the target expression could have taken place. The Greek text of Damaskenos Stoudites does not offer the opportunity to equate λέγω μή with λεγομι, but in the New Testament there are several instances in which λέγω and μή appear in close proximity or even side by side: Matthew 6:25; Luke 12:22; Romans 10:18, 10:19, 11:1 and 2 Corinthians 11:16. The first two coincide almost literally with example (12). Here is the Greek text of Matthew 6:25, followed by the New International Version of the English translation:

14. ἐὰν τοῦτο σάς λέγω, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε περὶ τῆς ζωῆς σας, τί πάντα γίνεται καὶ τί νά πίνετε; μὴ δὲ περὶ τοῦ σώματός σας, τί νά ἐνδυθήτε. ~ Therefore I tell you, do not worry about your life, what you will eat or drink; or about your body, what you will wear.

Another instance of imperative illocutionary force is found in 2 Corinthians 11:16. The examples from the Epistle to the Romans represent function B as described above. I shall illustrate it with Romans 10:18:

15. Λέγω δὲ μᾶς, μὴ δὲν ἥκουσαν; Μάλιστα. ~ But I ask, Did they not hear? Of course they did.
This set of data allows us to identify two intersections of λέγω μή with λεγομι. The first seems to be more fortuitous, as λέγω μή and λεγομι continue to have their distinct meanings but they both happen to fit in the same context. Given the popularity of the New Testament, it would surprise me if the compiler of the Moesian proto-collection, from which the Свиштов damaskin stems, did not recollect the Greek text of the New Testament while working on this sentence of the damaskin. Nevertheless, as one can see in (12), he produced a Modern Bulgarian equivalent to his source and not to the Gospel text sounding in his ears. So, it can only be argued that the cause for this intersection was a curious coincidence.

The second intersection is much more promising, because it provides a functional overlap to complement the formal one. There is nothing improbable in the evolution postulated by the transition λέγω μή > λεγομι. Verbs are capable of making new careers in the role of modal particles, as Bulgarian сказаи 'as if' ~ сказам 'to think' and Russian ведь 'you see, you know' ~ ведать 'to know' can show.

I have only two objections to this etymology; one pertains to form and the other to meaning, but they both have the same underlying logic. If we accept the Greek λέγω μή as the only source of the series of Bulgarian particles/conjunctions, we are leaving too many variations of meaning and form unexplained. Function Б is the only function of λεγομι that supposes denial of the factual content of the utterance. This makes perfect sense in view of the Greek negative particle μή, but leaves wide open the question of how λεγομи could later have expanded to include all the other functions. On the other hand, even the two forms known to the damaskins (λεγοма and λεγοми) are not easy to reconcile. The task becomes daunting if we include the whole series: λεγοмá, λαгомá, λђумá, лаумá, логомá, логоми, легоми, леғоми and perhaps лема. Greek λέγω μή can only account for λεгоми, лёгоми and the disappearance of intervocalic fricative γ, which would produce Bulgarian forms like *лёгоми, *лёуми, *лёгоми, *лёуми. It would still remain to bridge the gap between these and лђумá and лаумá. Bulgarian phonetic laws do not provide easy solutions for the derivation of the forms лёгомá, логомá, логоми and логоми.

In view of the enlightening analysis of Slavic particles offered by Tatjana Nikolaeva (Николаева 1985), it is high time we started thinking in different terms about the etymology of functional categories in general and modal particles in particular. Even though there are many newcomers to the category of particles, Nikolaeva argues that the archaic nucleus of Slavic particles is characterized by the syllabic structure CV, where C can be represented by j, n, l, m, b, t (d), g (ž, z), k (č, c) and V by a, i, u e (о). Furthermore, particles often group together to form complexes that are prone to showing variation; see, for instance, Old Bulgarian
*jelšti – jelšta – jelšto* (ESJS 5: 282), *kolšti – kolšta* (Николаева 1985: 139). Bulgarian нелешил ~ него ~ нелоги ~ нелга (БЕР 4: 595, 600, 607–8) etc. Against this background, it becomes imperative to consider from another angle the connection proposed in БЕР between легома and лема, especially since a conjunction and particle lego is known to Čakavian and some Slovenian dialects (ESSJ 2: 400–401), cf. also Čakavian lego 'sonder' in Kastav and Istra (Šimunović–Olesch 1983: 536). This would make the Bulgarian легона, легоши, лема and their variations members of a peripheral South Slavic complex of particles. It must have had functions both as a conjunction and a modal particle, used in a different form and with a varying combination of functions across the Bulgarian dialects and to the west in Čakavian and Slovenian. Contact with Greek λέγω μή added to легоши function B, which fitted in well with its previously available range of functions, or perhaps just reinforced its use (consider лема, whose only function is B). From легоши, function B could have spread to other members of this complex of particles; namely, to легона, легоши, лаума, логон and лагома, which according to БЕР have this meaning. Note that my data from the Тихонравов damaskin do not include tokens of легона in function B, although Gerov claims that легона too is used in this way.

NOTES

1 It is also used throughout the Trojan damaskin (see Иванова 1967) and the Koprivštica damaskin (see Мiletich 1908), other published representatives of the first group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins.


Additional argument in support of this claim is provided by the presence of λεγόμη in the so-called Berlin damaskin of the fourth group of Modern Bulgarian damaskins (Демина 1968: 118).

"Is it really you, my lord Elijah?" (New International Version, 1 Kings 18:7).

Note that the order in which these clauses appear in Greek is different from that in the Сливов damaskin. The clause in question is omitted from the text in the Adžar damaskin (БАН 24.4.32: 333).

The other example is in Демина (1971: 194). It corresponds to γάρ in the Greek text (Σωφρόνιος 1991: 64).

Here is the complete list of their locations: Милети (1923: 132 [= επειδή], Δαμасκνός 1971: 534), 145 [= επειδή], Δαμасκнός 1971: 162), 155, 156, 184, 228 (second instance), 269, 298 and 300.
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