

Aliza HALIL (Sofia)

ON THE BALKAN CHARACTER OF NAMING THE TYPES OF WINE IN BULGARIAN
DIALECTS¹

Summary: The purpose of this study is to identify the naming structure of the traditional names of various types of wine in the Bulgarian dialects suggesting their Balkan character. In terms of composition, naming different types of wine takes place in several ways: by the use of phraseological units, by univerbalisation (or substantivisation of an adjective), by secondary naming (renaming) or by derivation. Based on the analysis conducted in this study, a conclusion is made that foreign-language elements are common in the naming system of wines and that this system displays a markedly Balkan nature.

Key words: Balkan, character, types, wine, Bulgarian, dialects

The Balkan region is a meeting point of various cultures: from Antiquity, medieval and contemporary, eastern and western; northern, central and southern.

In terms of wine (and of the names related to it) the present-day Bulgarian lands which since the remote past have boasted strongly developed viticulture and wine-making, occupied a central place in the peninsula. They came under influence from different directions and factors and as a result, the Bulgarian terminology of wine is dotted with loan-words from various languages, and in the first place, quite naturally, from the neighbouring ones.

During the Classical Antiquity, with both the Thracians and the Greeks, wine emerged as a symbol of fertility and vitality and this showed prominently in the early cult of Dionysus / Sabazius, later modified into a cult of God or of Christian Saint Tryphon.

As R. Popov (Popov 1994: 60) explains, “in the 5th century B.C., Sabazius was also identified with Zeus and evidence about it is found in monuments from the Thracian lands dated to the Roman era – Zeus Dionysus and Zeus Sabazius obviously denote one and the same supreme deity. The very exclamation “**сабой**” (*saboy*) was yelled at daybreak by the participants in the January Feast of Saint Athanasius (Atanasovden), an equivalent of the February-March Dionysias.” Saint Tryphon is celebrated by the Bulgarian people at a special feast of viticulture and wine. The saint is accepted as a successor of Sabazius (and the Greek Dionysus). Even today, rites on Saint Tryphon’s Feast (Trifonovden) include a ritual vine pruning, a **Tsar of the Vine** is nominated and an all-village table is arranged for the sake of fertility and plenty of wine. In the Christian religion wine is conceptualized as a symbol of His blood, i.e. the blood of the supreme deity – Christ. Together with the piece of bread (consecrated bread) – the symbol of Christ’s body – wine is part of the Holy Communion (**къмка**) given by the priest to the participants in various kinds of fasting for forgiveness of earthly sins.

¹ Тази статия е написана в рамките на проект „Интерактивна кулинарна карта на българската езикова територия“ на ФНИ N КП-06-Н30/7

During the Ottoman rule – with the mediation of the Turkish language – many orientalisms invaded the Bulgarian language from Arabic and Persian, mostly denoting different grape varieties and also types of wine metonymically related to them. The generic name *вѹно* (*wine*), which is of Indo-European origin with precise equivalents in Latin (*vinum*) and ancient Greek ((F)*οἶνος*) and consequently in other European languages, (Serbian *вѹно*; Slovenian *vino*; Russian *вино*; Czech *víno*; Polish, Upper Sorbian and Lower Sorbian *wino*) remained unchanged.

The purpose of this study is to identify the naming structure of the traditional names of various types of wine (native and foreign) in the Bulgarian dialects suggesting their Balkan character.

This study does not explore modern European names which have lately been flooding European markets and are uncommon in dialects. Numerous names in social dialects (secret “languages”, professional dialects and slang) are not analyzed here, because they are subject to a separate extensive study due to their specifics – way of origin and sphere of usage.

Identifying the naming structure of the names of different types of wine is done with the use of the synchronic method (for the transparent names, predominantly of native origin), and also by applying the diachronic method (for names non-transparent from a contemporary point of view, predominantly of foreign origin). With a view to the theory of naming the most common case is when the notion which has received a name becomes a nominate. Basically, nominates are two types: primary and secondary. The second type emerged by connecting the form of the old name with another notion, i.e. the name retains its form but acquires – by way of transfer – a second (third, etc.) new meaning.

The attributes based on which the new naming occurs during transfer, are called **naming attributes**. They reflect **generic** notions of time, space, material, taste, colour etc., i.e. they are close to the so-called universalia. Variants of naming attributes are **onomasiological** attributes (marks, motives) in which the form and meaning are preserved only in part, mainly through the base (theme) of the old lexical unit. The forms resulting predominantly from **word-formation** processes, are completely new words (new nominates). Onomasiological marks characterize mostly **specific notions**, and their number exceeds manifold the number of naming attributes. Being a variant of naming attributes they do not oppose them, but have more specific character and are related to the semantics of individual words.

In terms of composition, naming of different types of wine occurs (similar to types of rakiya – for more details see Halil 2018: 115-119) in the following ways:

1. **By using phraseological units** (in the broadest sense of the word), i.e. with combinations of a specific and generic name. **These are two-member structures** including an attributive name (most often an adjective) and a noun:

a) with native lexis: *червѹно вѹно* (*red wine*, Topolovgrad region); *Червѹн Петку* (*Red Petku*, Elena region); *чѹрно вѹно* (*black wine*, Byala Slatina region); *жѹнско вѹно* (*women’s wine*, Lovech region); *тѹнко вѹно* (*thin wine*, Lovech region); *стѹро вѹно* (*old wine*, Dupnitsa region); *дебѹло вѹно* (*thick wine*, Lovech region); *пресѹчено вѹно* (*turned wine*, Gabrovo region); *тѹжско вѹно* (*heavy wine*, Pleven region).

b) with lexis having a foreign element: *дамя̀тов̀о в̀ино* (cf. *Dimyat*, Greek, Pleven region); *г̀ьм̀зов̀о в̀ино* (cf. *Gamza wine*, via Turkish from Arabic, Pleven region); *ма̀вр̀уд̀о̀в̀о в̀ино* (cf. *Mavrud* (Greek) *wine*, Asenovgrad region).

2. By **univerbalisation**, notably **substantivisation of the adjective** after omission of the noun. Usually the adjective has a definite article: *Г̀ьм̀зов̀ото ѐ по̀-до̀бр̀о̀ от̀ дим̀я̀тов̀ото*. (*Gamzovoto is better than Dimyatovoto*, regions of Vidin and Lom); *Ма̀вр̀уд̀о̀в̀ото сѐ пра̀ви по̀ ва̀шитѐ мес̀та̀, к̀д̀ѐто̀ по̀ч̀вата̀ ѐ сѝлна*. (*Mavrudovoyo is made in your land where the soil is the strongest*, Melnik region).

More often this type of naming is related to the use of a substantivised adjective after a preposition: *На̀лѐй от̀ г̀ьм̀зов̀ото*. (*Pour me from Gamzovoto*, Pleven region); *С̀ да̀мя̀тов̀ото прѐка̀рах̀ ва̀ка̀нция̀та̀ л̀ятос̀ кра̀й̀ мо̀рѐто̀*. (*With Damyatovoto I spent the summer holidays off the sea*, Sofia region).

3. By **secondary naming** (renaming). As was already mentioned, this model reflects one of the basic ways of naming various types of wine. The most common case is the process of semantic metonymical derivation – the wine bears the name of the product (fruit) it is made of:

a) with native lexis: *пел̀йн* – 1. herb, wormwood; 2. drink made of this herb (the entire Bulgarian language territory); *ма̀лѝна* – 1. the raspberry fruit; 2. wine made of this fruit (Gotse Delchev region); *бо̀ровѝнка* – 1. the fruit of the blueberry; 2. wine made of blueberries (Sofia region).

б) with foreign lexis: *дим̀я̀т*; *г̀ьм̀за*; *ма̀вр̀уд* (see 2 b); *рѐзек̀ия̀* from ‘cut’, ‘be sharp’ (via Turkish from Persian); *ка̀рабу̀на̀р* (Turkish) – all names denote: 1. grape variety; 2. type of wine from this grape.

4. By derivation (word-formation)

a) from native lexis: regardless of the fact that the generic notion *wine* has neuter grammatical gender, most of the names of the types of wine have masculine gender. The exceptions (a few nouns which have feminine gender) are insignificant in number. Names in neuter gender have not been marked. Models formed with the suffixes for masculine gender are the following:

- with a suffix – **ак**// **‘ак**: *ц̀ипорак* (with an onomasiological mark *ц̀ипор(и)*), ‘marc’; *рѐза̀к* (with an onomasiological mark *рѐж(е)*); *рѐзн`а̀к* (with an onomasiological mark *(но)рѐзн(о)*, derived from ‘cut’, ‘being sharp’)

- with a suffix – **ин**// **-ник**: *пеленѝк* (with an onomasiological mark *пелин*, ‘wormwood wine’); *воднѝк* (with an onomasiological mark *водн(о)* or *вод(а)*, ‘water’);

- with a suffix – **аш**: *пелина̀ш* (with an onomasiological mark *пелин*, ‘wormwood wine’);

- with a suffix – **ач**: *пелина̀ч* (with an onomasiological mark *пелин*, ‘wormwood wine’);

- with a suffix – **ец**: *ма̀рец* (with an onomasiological mark *(о)мар(а)*, ‘haze’);

- with a suffix – **ул**: *маск̀ул* (with an onomasiological mark *маск(ам)* ‘press’);

- without a suffix (**zero suffix**): *са̀мото̀к* (with an onomasiological mark *сам(о) (се)точ(и)*, ‘trickles on it own’).

Models formed with the suffixes for feminine gender are three:

- with a suffix – **ина// - овина**: *медовина* (with an onomasiological mark *медов(о)* or *мед*, ‘honey’);
- with a suffix – **ушка**: *благушка* (with an onomasiological mark *благ(о)*, ‘sweet’);
- with a suffix – **ига**: *пеленига* (with an onomasiological mark *пелин*, ‘wormwood wine’).

b) from borrowed foreign lexis. With the native suffixes they naturally form hybrids (mixed formations). Unlike the previous item where material is mainly in the masculine gender, the feminine gender dominates in hybrids.

- with a suffix – **ка**: *темянка* (with a Greek onomasiological mark *темян*, ‘frankincense’); *кадарка* (with an Albanian onomasiological mark, ‘from the city of Skadar/Shkodër’) *джурка* (with a French-Arabic onomasiological mark ‘from Algeria’);
- with a suffix – **уш**: *кочуш* (with a Greek onomasiological mark from *кок(ал)*, ‘bone’);
- with a suffix – **ак**: *зачинак* (with a Serbian onomasiological mark from *зачин(ем)* derived from the verb ‘flavour’).

The amount of foreign lexical elements for wines increases when the historical origin of the nominates is explored. This is suggested by the orientalisms *шаран*, *шор*, *шорè*, *шорабия*, *шос*, *шороман* related to the Turkish *Şıra*, ‘must’; *турфандà* (*турфандà*) ‘new, immature wine’ (Sevlievo region) from *turfanda* ‘rareripe fruits’; *мисилец* ‘triple sweet wine’ from *müselles* ‘triple’; *боямà* ‘dyed red wine’ from *boya* ‘dye’; *ардалè* ‘light wine turned with mustard’; *басмà* ‘non-alcoholic wine’ from *basma* < *basmak* v. ‘press’; borrowings from Greek *ùnсиме* ‘unfermented wine’ from *ύψωμα* ‘bread dipped with wine’; *кираца* ‘urban, refined wine’ (derived from *κυράτσα* ‘urban woman, landlady, matron’); borrowings from Romanian *турбурèл* ‘unsettled wine’ from *turburél* ‘unsettled wine’; *лунгур* ‘non-alcoholic wine’ (from Rumanian *lingurar*, ‘spoon maker’, derived from *lingura*, ‘spoon’ that goes down to the Latin *lingula*) etc.

The above review of the naming system formed by the names of different types of wine suggests that they have resulted not only from centuries-long native traditions in winemaking and in denoting wine distillates, but also from responding to influences of neighbouring languages spoken in the Balkans, more notably Greek, as well as Turkish as a mediator between the Arabic-Persian East and Europe. Compared to the naming system formed by the names of various types of *rakiya* which has predominantly Bulgarian character, the system of wines is richer in foreign-language elements and has markedly Balkan specifics.

REFERENCE

Mladenova 1998: Mladenova, O. *Grapes and wine in the Balkans: An Ethno-Linguistic Study*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag

БЕР= Български етимологичен речник. София: БАН. 1971-2017 [Balgarski etimologichen rechnik. Sofia: BAN, 1971-2017].

Илиева 2016: Илиева, Д. Концептът вино в българската паремейна картина на света. В: Тиен, М., (ред.): Виното- история и вдъхновение. Русе: Регионална библиотека „Любен Каравелов“, 287- 296 [Ilieva, D. Kontseptat vino v bulgarskata paremeijna kartina na sveta. V: Tien M., (red): Vinoto – istoriya i vdahnovenie, Ruse: Regionalna biblioteka “Lyuben Karavelov”, 287- 296].

Панчев 2016: Панчев, И. Още към въпроса за виното в българската лингвокултура. В: Тиен, М., (ред.): Виното- история и вдъхновение. Русе: Регионална библиотека „Любен Каравелов“, 297-302 [Panchv, I. Oshte kam vaprosa za vinoto v bulgarskata lingvokultura. V: Tien. M., (red.): Vinoto – istoriya i vdahnovenie, Ruse: Regionalna biblioteka “Lyuben Karavelov” 297-302].

Попов 1994: Попов, Р. Вино. В Стойнев, А., (ред.); Българска митология. Енциклопедичен речник. София: 7М+Логис, 60 [Popov, R. Vино. V. Stoynev, A. (red.); Balgarska mitologia, Entsiklopedichen rechnik, Sofia: 7M+Logis, 60]

Халил 2018: Халил, А., Номинационна характеристика на понятията за видовете ракии в българските говори. В: Стоилов, А., (ред.): Сборник с доклади от Националните филологически четения за студенти и докторанти Югозападен университет 2017-2018. Благоевград: Университетско издателство на Югозападния университет „Неофит Рилски“, 115-119 [Halil, A. Nominatsionna harakteristika na ponyatiyata za vidovete rakii v bulgarskite govori. V: Stoilov, A., (red.): Sbornik s dokladi ot Natsionalnite filologicheski chetenia za studenti I doktoranti Yugozapaden universitet 2017-2018. Blagoervgrad: Universitetsko izdatelstvo na Yugozapadnia universitet “Neofit Rilski” 115-119]

PLACE OF EMPLOYMENT OF THE AUTHOR

Aliza Halil, PhD student

"Prof. Lubomir Andreychin" Institute for Bulgarian Language, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

Sofia, Bulgaria

e-mail: aliza_halil@abv.bg