

**BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE FOR BULGARIAN LANGUAGE
“PROF. LYUBOMIR ANDREYCHIN”**

Krasimira Georgieva Fuchedzhieva

**SEMANTIC ASPECTS OF ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
OF BULGARIAN VERBS
(ON MATERIAL FROM THE BULGARIAN
ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY)**

ABSTRACT

of a dissertation for the award
of the educational and scientific degree PhD
Professional field: 2. 1. Philology
Scientific field: General and Comparative Linguistics

Scientific supervisor:
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Hristina Deykova

Sofia, 2023

The dissertation has been discussed on an extended session of the Department for Bulgarian Etymology of the Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. L. Andreychin" at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences on 11.05.2023 and it was directed for public defense.

The dissertation contains 381 pages and consists of an Introductory part (pp. 7 – 80), Statement (pp. 81 – 309), Conclusion (pp. 310 – 319), Appendix (pp. 320 – 363), Bibliography (pp. 364 – 376), a Contribution summary (pp. 377 – 380), and Statement of data reliability (p. 381).

The dissertation defense is scheduled for 20.07.2023 at 14:00 in „Prof. Al. Teodorov-Balan“ at the Institute of Bulgarian Language „Prof. Lyubomir Andreichin“ at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences. It will be held in an open session of a scientific jury composed of:

1. Prof. Dr. Elka Mircheva
2. Prof. Dr. Siya Kolkovska
3. Prof. Dr. Marinela Mladenova
4. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Biljana Mihaylova
5. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Albena Mircheva

CONTENTS

I. Introductory part	5
Introduction	5
1. Object, subject, goals and tasks of the study	5
2. Theoretical framework	7
2.1. General linguistic methodological principles	7
2.2. Basic theoretical assumptions on lexical meaning	7
2.3. Semantic aspect of etymological analysis	10
3. State-of-the-art	13
4. Research methodology. Approaches and methods	14
II. Statement	17
Chapter One. Semantic development of Bulgarian verbs from the Proto-Slavic etymological word family *per-/ *pъr-/ *par-	18
Chapter Two. Semantic development of verbs from the etymological word family of <i>npàckam</i> (< Proto-Slavic *prāskāti)	19
1. Meanings of the verbs <i>npàckam</i> and <i>npaщя</i> and their derivatives	19
2. Etymology of the verbs <i>npàckam</i> and <i>npaщя</i>	19
3. Semantic analysis of the verb <i>npàckam</i> and semantic shifts in its etymological word family	20
3.1. Meanings derived on the basis of the semantic feature 'hit (hard)'	21
3.2. Meanings derived on the basis of the semantic feature 'sound'	21
Chapter Three. Semantic development of Bulgarian verbs of heterogeneous origins from the same lexical-semantic field	22
1. Lexical-semantic field 'hit (hard)'	22
2. Lexical-semantic field 'eat'	25
2.1. Metaphorical shifts	25
2.2. Metonymic shifts	25
2.3. Metaphorical-metonymic shifts.....	26
3. Lexical-semantic field 'speak'	27
3.1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with the meaning 'talk foolishly or at tedious length about something, prate'	28
3.2. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with a reduplicated root meaning 'gab, gabble'	29
3.3. Verbs with the meaning ' speak unintelligibly, unclearly '	29
3.3.1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with a reduplicated root	30
3.3.2. Verbs with the initial meaning 'chew'	31
3.4. Verbs with the meaning ' speak with a loud voice ' (→ 'speak')	31
3.5. Verbs with the meaning ' scold '	32
3.5.1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin	32
3.5.2. Verbs with the initial meaning 'bark'	32
3.5.3. Verbs with the initial meaning 'pollute, besmirch'	33
3.5.4. Verbs with the initial meaning 'injure'	33
3.6. Verbs with the meaning ' offend '	34
3.7. Verbs with the meaning ' slander, calumniate, defame '	35
3.7.1. Verbs with the initial meaning 'slubber, pollute, bedaub'	35
3.7.2. Verbs with the initial meaning 'pierce, puncture'	35
3.7.3. Verbs with the initial meaning 'make a noise'	36
3.8. Etymological studies related to verbs of speaking	37

3.8.1. On the origin of the verb <i>лапардѡсвам</i> 'chatter' (an attempt at elucidation by means of semantic parallels).....	37
3.8.2. The meaning of the verb <i>ка̀звам</i> 'say' as a result of semantic development	37
3.8.3. Meanings of the verb <i>ва̀дя</i> 'slander, defame' and its derivative <i>оба̀ждам (се)</i> 'call'	37
3.8.4. On the possible domestic origin of the words <i>ваджѣя</i> and <i>ваджѣишки</i>	38
III. Conclusion	39
IV. Appendix. Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research	39
Contribution summary	40
List of publications on the topic of the dissertation	42
Bibliography	43

Abbreviations:

AI – Ancient Indian
Alb. – Albanian
Av. – Avestan
Cz. – Czech
Eng. – English
Germ. – German
Goth. – Gothic
Gr. – Greek
It. – Italian
Lat. – Latin
Latv.– Latvian
Lith. – Lithuanian
OBulg. – Old Bulgarian
OCS – Old Church Slavonic
OIc – Old Icelandic
OPol. – Old Polish
OPrus. – Old Prussian
Pers. – Persian
PIE – Proto-Indo-European
PS – Proto-Slavic
San. – Sanskrit
SCr. – Serbo-Croatian
Tur. – Turkish

I. INTRODUCTORY PART

The introductory part (pp. 7 – 80) starts with **Introduction** (pp. 7 – 9) and includes the chapters **Object, subject, goals and tasks of the study** (pp. 9 – 11), **Theoretical framework** (pp. 12 – 67), **State-of-the-art** (pp. 68 – 73) and **Research methodology. Approaches and methods** (pp. 73 – 80).

Introduction

The Introduction points out that etymology, as a branch of linguistics concerned with the study of the sources of the formation of the vocabulary of a language and the processes involved, aims to reconstruct the vocabulary of a language at its most ancient prescriptive stage of development. It is emphasized that in this period the inevitable phonetic, word-formation and semantic changes in the language are most intense and manifold. It is pointed out that the main methodological criterion for successful etymologization of words is the application of **complex etymological analysis**, which combines the methods of **phonetic, word-formation and semantic analysis**. It is noted that at the modern stage of the development of etymology more and more attention is paid to the semantic aspect of etymological analysis, which has long been underestimated in comparison with the phonetic and word-formation aspect of analysis. The main focus of the study is also pointed out, which is devoted to **the semantic aspect of the etymological analysis of Bulgarian verb lexis** and is oriented to the etymological lexicographical practice in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary (hereinafter BED).

1. Object, subject, goals and tasks

The object of the present study are Bulgarian verbs from the common and dialectal lexicon, which are included in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary. These are mainly polysemous verbs of domestic origin. On the one hand, verbs from the etymological word family of *непà*, which accend the Proto Slavic (henceforth PS) ablaut sequence **per-/ *p̥r-/ *par-*, whose initial PIE root has a conventional primary meaning 'hit'. On the other hand, the object of analysis is some verbs from the etymological word family of the verb *нрàскам*, whose primary root, traditionally defined as onomatopoeic, has an unsettled primary meaning. Examples of analogous development in other verbs of different origins but similar semantics are given as evidence for the presumed different degrees of semantic development in verbs from these etymological families. Verbs of different origin from the lexical-semantic fields 'hit', 'eat', 'speak', which are widely represented among the vocabulary included in BER, are also analyzed.

The starting point for the selection of these lexical-semantic fields is some of the discerned degrees in the semantic development of the verbs mentioned above.

The main **subject** of the research is the diachronic semantic changes in this fragment of the Bulgarian verb lexis and the semantic reconstruction in its broad understanding, i.e. aimed not only at establishing the primary meaning, but also at the individual stages in the semantic development.

The **goal** of the study is to identify semantic shifts, which can be defined as regular in the Bulgarian language and in a more general typological plan, on the basis of specific lexical material, examined systematically.

As a more specific goal, the compilation of a *Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research* which could be useful for etymological practice in the Bulgarian etymological dictionary, is noted. The examples in such a list of possible semantic changes could be used as evidence in favor of one or another etymological hypothesis. On the one hand, the revelation of regular semantic-derivational processes in the diachronic plan can assist in the semantic aspect of the etymological analysis of specific words, especially words of obscure etymology, as well as in the differentiation of ancient and later homonymic roots, which is essential when compiling dictionaries built on the principle of etymological word family such as BED. Since this catalogue has been compiled only on the basis of the material researched in this particular work, it should rather be taken as a basis which *can be subsequently supplemented and extended on the basis of additional lexical material*.

In order to achieve the set goals, the following **tasks** are carried out:

1. The etymology of the verbs under consideration is clarified within the chosen etymological word family or the corresponding lexico-semantic field;
2. The primary meaning in the etymological word family of the verbs under study is restored and the directions and degrees of semantic development in their etymological word family are traced on the basis of all attested meanings in Bulgarian and in the related Slavic languages;
3. An attempt is made to be clarified the mechanisms of semantic derivation in diachronic terms by revealing the specific semantic features existing in the primary meaning;
4. The constructed hypotheses about the possible derivational relations between meanings are verified by means of semantic parallels;
5. The regularity of certain types of semantic shifts is disclosed by bringing in other typological parallels, including from other languages;
6. Other possible paths of semantic derivation leading to synonymous meaning within a lexical-semantic field are also identified;
7. The regular semantic shifts found on the basis of the analyzed examples are systematized.

2. Theoretical framework

2. 1. General linguistic methodological principles

In this section, some general linguistic methodological principles are outlined which are used as the **initial theoretical basis for the study**. It is specified that the starting point is the understanding of the **system-structural character of language**, i.e. “the internal “orderliness” of the language system, of the totality of intra-systemic and inter-systemic relations” (Boyadzhiev 1995: 42). The research itself is conducted at the level of the lexical system, and more precisely – at the subsystem of content words, which includes the verbal lexis.

Another common position from which the work proceeds is the idea of the **unity between synchrony and diachrony** in linguistic research, overcoming the limitations imposed by Saussure's sharp distinction between these two approaches to the study of linguistic phenomena. T. Todorov's view is shared that the combination of synchronic and diachronic approaches in etymological research leads to “particularly beneficial linguistic searches”, and this corresponds to “the dialectical unity of diachrony and synchrony and contains great cognitive power” (Todorov 2002: 24).

2. 2. Basic theoretical assumptions on lexical meaning

This part clarifies the notion of lexical semantics, comments on the specifics of verb meaning, the dynamics of lexical meaning, semantic denotation and its associated polysemy, and the expedience of applying component analysis of lexical meaning in diachronic semantic studies.

Insofar as the object of study in the present work is individual lexical units (mainly polysemous verbs), and in particular their semantics, some basic theoretical propositions about **the nature of lexical semantics** are taken into account. The starting point is the current notion of lexical meaning as a component structure (*a structure of semantic components*) or as a *complex of semantic features*, also called *semes*, *semantic multipliers*, *semantic markers* (Pernishka 1993: 40) (in the present study the term *semantic feature* is adopted). They are located in the core and in the periphery of meaning, and certain hierarchical relations exist between them. Crucial to this thesis is the understanding that “the semes of lexical meaning are usually implicit, hidden” (in the sense that the linguistic sign is arbitrary); however, there are also overt signs which, in derivative (“formally motivated”) words, are manifested in the word-formational (structural) meaning, partly visible from the form” (BL 2013: 412).

Attention is also drawn to **some specifics of verb meaning**, given that the semantic type of meanings has potentials that determine the relations and

development of these meanings in speech (Pernishka 1993: 60). As an essential characteristic of the verbal meaning is taken its *predicativity*, connected with the fact that it names intangible, most often abstract concepts, and its communicative value is *characterizing*. An essential feature of verbs in semantic aspect is that “in polysemy their meaning is “shifted”, associated with a new nominative function mainly due to the adoption of semantic features from the context, while retaining many of their original features” (Pernishka 1993: 60). Related to this is Ufimtseva’s observation that “every content verb is a potential syntagm”, since regarding the content, predicative denominations form their signification in the very “act of signification, in the denomination, in which the carrier (subject, object) of this semantic feature is taken into account”. Moreover, when used in speech, this meaning is “further specified, concretized and formed by the very range of names of objects which it is combined with” (Ufimtseva 1986: 137). This peculiarity of verb meanings undoubtedly underlies the observation that “among the content words, it is the predicative words that develop polysemy the most“, and especially verbs (BL 2013: 523).

In connection with the polysemy typical of verbs, the problem of the **dynamics of lexical meaning** is also touched upon in the introductory part. It must be understood in the context of the general idea of any living language as a constantly changing system in which “something is always being born and something is always dying – clearly or dimly, more slowly or more rapidly” (Boyadzhiev 1995: 44). This observation accentuates the fact that although it is a strict hierarchical construction of interrelated components, the lexical system (and lexical meaning in particular) is a structure that is subject to various evolutionary processes. It can be supplemented, rearranged, or destroyed, which some scholars have even described as a natural “aim” of the linguistic sign: “The sign strives to acquire other functions instead of its own”, and meaning “strives to express itself by other means instead of its own sign. They are asymmetrical; forming a pair, they find themselves in a state of unstable balance” (Kartsevsky 1965). This is precisely what Zh. Boyadzhiev has in mind when he concludes that, as a rule, in the language system “sections of “disturbed balance, zones of “increased tension” arise, which are usually the germs of new phenomena and processes”, which is why “in language, the systematic and the anti-systematic, rules and exceptions complement and permeate each other” (Boyadzhiev 1995: 44).

The main “anti-systemic” processes in the field of semantics that are the subject of observation in the current paper are the *narrowing and extending of the semantic scope of a word* that take place throughout language development. A consequence of the expansion of the semantic scope of a word is *polysemy*, which is also related to the ability of a linguistic sign to acquire a secondary function

(through processes such as metaphor, metonymy, etc.). This ability, in turn, is a prerequisite for the phenomenon of secondary (semantic) nomination, in which the word is used secondarily, with a secondary function to denote a single feature of that lexical meaning or of another concept, thus falling into new paradigmatic relations. Underlying this change are processes such as the *displacement, dropping out, inclusion or substitution of individual semes*, which occurs “under the influence of the quantitative and qualitative relations between objects discerned in the reflective activity of man and thanks to the natural ability of thinking to synthesize and decompose in the process of human cognition and concept formation” (BL 2013: 521). Important for this particular work is the observation of J. Apresyan that “a feature that appears associative and pragmatic in one lexical meaning becomes essential and semantic in another” (Apressian 1974: 68).

It is also taken into account that semantic development can be *chained* or *radial*: in chained development, each new meaning is motivated by the previous one, whereas in radial development, the same initial meaning can motivate several secondary meanings (BL 2013: 523). Moreover, we share the view that the structure of a polysemantic word is characterized by a certain *orderliness and structural organization of content*, which, according to Ufimtseva, is a basic property of polysemantic words, ensuring their synchronicity and historical identity (Ufimtseva 1986: 29). In other words, “the meanings of a polysemous word are related to each other and in a certain systematic hierarchy according to the motivational links between the initial and the more than one secondary (figurative) meanings derived from it“, while the lexeme still “remains identical to itself” (BL 2013: 522-523). It is the orderliness and organization of content that is a prerequisite for the **regularity of semantic development** found in the verbs examined here. The view is also shared that the polysemous word can be seen as a link in a whole chain of „meaning-engenderings“, which accommodates motivating meanings from producing bases – and simultaneously transmits its motivational potential to its own derivatives (see Berezovich 2014: 203).

Another theoretical proposition guiding the study is the understanding that word meaning can be decomposed into semantically charged **components**. Each component represents an elementary, as small as possible meaning unit that participates in the semantic structure of a particular lexeme or lexical-semantic group. This analytical approach is in line with some basic principles of structuralism, which “aims to analyze the functional features in languages and to establish the paradigms of the relevant functional units by reducing them to their most elementary particles (elements) through certain operations of identification and analysis” (Coşeriu 1990: 173). With the development of the notion of lexical meaning as a set of semantic features (semes) organized in a certain hierarchy

and related respectively to specific features of the signified, the method of **component analysis**, still considered one of the relatively accurate approaches to the study of lexical meaning, was developed in the last century. It is no coincidence that Lyons makes an interesting comparison with terms from the so-called exact sciences: “Insofar as component analysis is associated with conceptualism, components of meaning (for which there is as yet no generally accepted term) can be thought of as atomic, and the meanings of particular lexemes as molecular concepts” (Lyons 1977: 317). We also share Leech’s perception that, in combination with other levels of analysis, component analysis can be an element of building a “more powerful model of meaning” (Leech 1981: 117 – 118). Component analysis is also defined as “the most used method of semantic analysis” by I. Kasabov (Kasabov 2006: 45).

2. 3. Semantic aspect of etymological analysis

In sec. **2. 3. Semantic aspect of etymological analysis**, attention is paid to semantic reconstruction and the phenomenon of de-etymologization, to semantic typology and semantic parallelism, as well as to the cognitive theory of lexical meaning in the context of etymological studies.

It is clarified that *semantic reconstruction* means the recovery of an older or previous meaning of a word, which in the broader understanding of the concept requires taking into account various intermediate stages in the evolution of semantics, for the existence of which, however, evidence cannot always be found. Therefore, the question of diachronic semantic reconstruction has no clear-cut solution, nor has any particular mechanism been received by which it should be conducted. Some theoretical propositions related to diachronic semantic reconstruction, summarized in methodological aspect by Zh. Koleva-Zlateva (Koleva-Zlateva 1998), are also mentioned. We share, for example, the understanding expressed by her of “the existence of certain regularities in lexical-semantic diachrony, which concern both the evolution of language and lexis in general and affect the causes and mechanisms of lexical-semantic changes, as well as to the essence of the changes themselves”, and also with the conclusion that “strict prescriptions concerning the procedure of etymological research in general and semantic reconstruction in particular cannot be derived because it depends on the specific lexical material” (Koleva-Zlateva 1998: 86).

We also rely on Berezovich's view, according to which “the reconstruction of motivation can be carried out once shifts and parallels are disclosed “statically” – as pairs of “points” between which lines of meaning were once drawn (or are currently being drawn, even along a new trajectory)” (Berezovich 2014: 204). Important for our work is also her view that semantic parallels can be seen as “lexical lines demonstrating similar patterns of meaning development of words,

within which both the actual shifts of meaning and its motivation are reproduced” (Berezovich, *ibid.*). A view that we fully share in the current work, which aims to make a small contribution to the larger theme of *systematizing semantic parallelism to be useful for etymological research*. In doing so, our efforts are focused at detecting not obligatory but *possible semantic changes* arising from the primary semantic content of the etymon.

The obscuring of the connection between form and meaning, also known as **de-etymologization**, is the result of historical changes in the form of the word, as well as in many cases of changes in its primary meaning, and also of the inevitable evolution of the lexical and grammatical system of the language. It is pointed out that some of the secondary meanings that have arisen within an etymological family should also be regarded as a manifestation of **de-etymologisation**, especially when the specific motivation for their emergence cannot be determined with certainty. There are also situations in which a word drops out of the generic word family and acquires a completely new meaning, giving rise to so-called semantic homonyms.

All the listed phenomena are elements of one of the specific functions of language as a sign system – linguistic derivation, which refers primarily to word formation, but is also a widespread in every natural language fundamental principle for the formation of new meanings of any word on the basis of already existing in the language initial, grammatically simple root words (Kasabov 2006: 16). It is derivation that accounts both for the vitality of a language system and for the irreversible process by which, in the course of thousands of years of history, words sometimes lose their original meaning altogether, the primary onomasiological motivation becomes obscure or remaining only as background memory, as subconscious knowledge of the possible circumstances and concrete details attending a primary action, process or perception. To a much greater extent, this applies to the predicative lexis (as compared to object lexis) because of the enormous potential of predicative meanings to be further associated with new concepts, to “overgrow” with new meanings, and on the other hand “to get rid of” their primary semantics in each use, to take on semantic features from the context, while retaining to a large extent their most essential core features. Such elusive, mutable, diffuse and wide ranging matter, defying unambiguous and clearly outlined systematization, is in fact dealt with in the semantic aspect of etymological analysis.

For the semantic aspect of the etymological analysis, the possibility of establishing a certain **typology of semantic changes** is of particular importance. S. Tolstaya, according to whom semantic reconstruction requires “to make clear the logic of the development of the Proto-Slavic word, to determine the impulses and mechanisms underlying semantic processes (metaphorical and metonymic

transferences, semantic radiation, competition and mutual influence of different semantic patterns, external influence, loan-translation, etc.), to structure the elements of meaning and to reveal its internal hierarchy, and finally to demarcate the “typical” combinations of meanings associated with the phenomena of regular (categorical) polysemy from the individual cases of reconciliation of different meanings within a lexical unit“ (Tolstaya: 2008: 13 – 14). A particularly productive approach in semantic typology research is the establishment of parallels between specific semantic shifts, and the idea of creating a handbook of **possible semantic parallels** is becoming increasingly relevant. In an attempt to typify semantic changes in general, some scholars have tried to identify a set of universal semes (semantic universals) that constitute the meaning of words in any language (Greenberg 1970: 39). Starting, however, from the view that “synchronic and diachronic regularities are obviously interrelated”, Greenberg, Osgood and Jenkins conclude: ”The most general statement of this interrelationship is in the form of limitations, namely, that no synchronic state can exist which is not the outcome of possible diachronic processes (except perhaps de novo for artificial and pidgin languages) and no diachronic process can be posited which could lead to a synchronic state which violates a universally valid synchronic norm” (Greenberg 1970: 40).

The opinion is shared that one of the mechanisms for reducing the hypotheticality and increasing the reliability of etymological theses is the application of *a systematic approach in diachronic semantic research and semantic reconstruction, etymologization of whole lexical groups*, clustered by different principles (etymological word family, lexico-semantic group) and expanding the background of the etymologization of a word to the dimensions of a *morpho-semantic field*, covering all the words that by form or by meaning can be correlated with the analyzed word and prove to be the cause of its modification (synonyms, antonyms, paronyms, words derived from the analyzed word, context). A similar modest attempt to systematize some regular semantic shifts in Bulgarian verbs is made in the current work, which focuses on diachronic semantic evolution. It is investigated within specific etymological word families and lexico-semantic groups. The study is monolingualistic, based on Bulgarian linguistic material and is diachronically oriented, but in a number of cases a synchronic approach of analysis is also applied in order to bring out some typological features that are also projected at the diachronic level.

Some contemporary semantic theories consider language in the context of human cognitive abilities, i.e. in the context of perceiving and rationalizing of reality through the lens of of human consciousness. Conceptualisation of the same fragment of reality, however, can be different. Insofar as it is closely related to particular human experience and to the environment, and therefore to the time in

which the conceptualization of reality takes place, this approach to the study of semantics is difficult to apply in diachronic terms, and especially to the most ancient linguistic strata. A major reason for this is the fact that conceptualization can be different not only in different eras, but also in different human communities, even if they speak the same language. It is for this reason that in etymological research this kind of semantic analysis should be approached very carefully and always with an eye to presumably ancient concepts, tailored as far as possible to the particular culture. Without underestimating the effectiveness and heuristic power of the cognitive approach, we believe that it could not be equally applicable to etymologizing a huge volume of heterogeneous linguistic material in view of lexicographic etymological practice, which is the focus of the present study. It is from this point of view that we believe that a much broader application would be the gradual cataloguing of semantic parallels disclosed on the basis of rich empirical material, and, of course, also taking into account the results of research in the field of cognitive science, where possible.

3. State-of-the-art

In general, Bulgarian etymology lacks a more comprehensive study focused specifically to the semantic aspect of etymological analysis, which would cover a larger volume of material and have wider practical application in etymological practice. The verb lexicon in particular has also not been the subject of such a study in the semantic aspect. A theoretical study in the methodological aspect focused to semantic reconstruction is the work of Zh. Koleva-Zlateva “Semantic reconstruction. Methodological aspects” (Koleva-Zlateva 1998). However, the author’s approach is deductive.

Within the framework of individual etymological studies, verbal lexemes have been explained by reconstructing their primary meaning and clarifying the semantic development, applying mainly the method of semantic parallels, retrieved by the authors for specific cases. Such are, for example, a large part of the etymological studies of T. Todorov, who traditionally adduces parallels from various closely related and more distantly related languages, cf. e.g. his articles on the Bulgarian verbs *мàча* (Todorov 1994: 11 – 18), *хìтам* ‘hurry’ (Todorov 1995), *отмалявам* and *премалявам* (Todorov 2003), etc.

Problems related to the semantic aspect of the etymological analysis of Bulgarian verbs are also considered by Hr. Deykova. In some of her publications, oriented to the development of etymological dictionary entries in the BED, peculiarities of semantic development in homonymous verb forms are clarified. She also mainly applies the method of semantic parallels to reveal the different origins of some basic and derived homonymous forms (see Deykova 2004, Deykova 2010).

In the field of Slavic etymology, similar studies of the origin of individual Proto-Slavic verbs have also been carried out using the method of semantic parallels (cf. e.g. Varbot 2012c, Kurkina 1971, etc.). As particularly promising in view of semantic reconstruction Zh. Varbot points to the comparative study of semantic characteristics of etymological word families ascending to synonymous verb roots (e.g. verbs with the initial meaning 'burn', 'curve, bend, twist', 'tie, knit', etc.). Such studies have been done in more recent times by a number of researchers of the Russian etymological school, such as Chernysh, Saltyanite, Kalashnikov, Pyataeva, Galinova, etc., cited by Zh. Varbot (Varbot 2012b). According to her, "the revelation of constant meanings reproduced in the history of each group of such etymological word families and common to the whole group, which is accompanied by the reconstruction of word-formation relations, is a reliable basis for justifying and correcting motivational patterns within different fields" (Varbot, *ibid.*).

Jasna Vlajić-Popović applies a similar methodological approach in her monograph on the historical semantics of verbs with the principal meaning 'hit, beat' in Serbo-Croatian language. Tracing the diverse semantic development of verbs with the primary meaning 'hit, beat', she attempts to construct a model of semasiological dictionary (see Vlajić-Popović 2002).

Another type of research on verb lexicon in the semantic aspect is oriented towards the study of discrete etymological word families. A similar study of the verbs of the Proto-Slavic ablaut sequence **tur-*, **tǔr-*, **tyr-* is made by Hr. Deykova, who proves the theoretical proposition that semantically distant but formally and structurally correlated verbs in Slavic languages can be assigned by semantic reconstruction to the same Proto-Slavic etymological word family, which, however, is possible only on the basis of rich linguistic material (Deykova 2015).

A semantic characterization of the continuants of the Proto-Slavic etymological word family **gyb-*, **gub-* **gǔb-* in Serbo-Croatian is made by M. Vučković (Vučković 2013), applying a cognitive approach to her study. The polysemy observed within is presented by the researcher as a radial network organized around a main central meaning. The semantic aspect of the analysis is also leading at the etymologization of Slavic verbs in some individual works of L. Kurkina (cf. e.g. Kurkina 2021).

4. Research methodology. Approaches and methods

In this work, a **systematic research approach** is applied. The semantic reconstruction of verbs (in its broad perception, i.e. as the recovery of primary meaning and the clarification of every single stage in the semantic development) is carried out, on the one hand, within the etymological word families, and, on

the other hand, within the lexico-semantic fields, which include verbs heterogeneous in origin but identical in meaning. Zh. Varbot emphasizes the genetic-historical relation between etymological word families and lexico-semantic fields. According to her, “each lexical-semantic field turns out to be a historical stimulus for the growth of a whole set of etymological word families, and each etymological family – a basis for the realization of the needs in the formation of the lexicon of several fields, reflecting the notion of the ethnos about individual phenomena, concepts – the different fragments of the picture of the world” (Varbot 2012b: 147). That is why she defines as the actual task of lexical research the conduct of complex analysis of interrelated lexical-semantic fields and etymological word families (Varbot, *ibid.*). Taking into account the complicity of these relations, she proposes two aspects of the analysis: the analysis of a set of semantic fields giving rise to one etymological family, and the analysis of a set of etymological families giving rise to one lexical-semantic field (Varbot 2012b: 145). This approach is also applied in the present study.

In this work, both **diachronic and synchronic research approaches** are applied. Given the etymological nature of the research, the diachronic approach is the leading one; it is related to the application of a **comparative-historical method** in the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic forms and Indo-European roots and / or the evaluation of the reconstructed forms in the BED and the found correspondences in Slavic and other Indo-European languages.

With regard to the semantic aspects of the etymological analysis, which is the real subject of the study, **the method of semantic parallels** is applied. It is accepted as one of the basic methodological approaches to the study of semantic processes in language, and in diachronic terms it is considered to be the most objective possible criterion by which the assumed semantic development could be proved (see Havlova 1979: 51, Trubachev 1980: 5, Abayev 1986: 22, Varbot 1986: 33), which is why Zh. Varbot also defines it as “one of the most used tools of semantic analysis in etymology” (Varbot 2012a: 69). The method of semantic parallels involves bringing examples of analogical development in unrelated verbs with synonymous meanings as an evidential argument in favor of an assumed semantic development. In applying this method, we try to avoid the practice of adducing as parallels only “the semantic relations of the word to the source semantics of the etymological word family, which obviously reduces the evidentiality of the parallels” (Varbot 2012a: 71). Therefore we seek to reconstruct the *stages of semantic development* as well as the *onomasiological motivations* for secondary denotation, and we argue the hypotheses constructed in the course of the study with examples attesting to the existence of analogous changes and similar motivation in other, unrelated verbs. *The finding of at least two cases of parallel development in words of different origin is taken as a sign of regularity*

of the particular semantic shift. The regularity of semantic development thus disclosed is the basis from which the *Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research* is compiled. A similar criterion is adopted by Zaliznyak in her development of the Database of Semantic Shifts in the languages of the world, where every semantic derivation is supported by “at least two realizations” of the same semantic shift (Zaliznyak 2001: 20).

A complex onomasiological-semasiological approach is applied in the analysis of lexical meaning. With the help of a *semasiological approach*, the regularities of the changes of meanings, “the types of logical relations between the initial and subsequent meanings” (Ufimtseva 1986: 25) are sought. On the other hand, an *onomasiological approach* is applied in clarifying the possible features, the *nominative motives* underlying the nomination (BL 2013: 399). We also proceed from the understanding that *it is possible to detect recurrent, regular types of semantic changes* with respect to the content of a particular semantics, which are, of course, the result of general semantic processes and mechanisms.

Consistently, **the method of component analysis** is also applied in order to isolate the core and peripheral semantic features existing in the meanings of the verbs under consideration, which give rise to the semantic fields within the etymological families. The specific onomasiological motives for the emergence of the secondary meanings are sought, and the relations of derivation or independent parallel development within a given etymological family are also determined. Although it is a technique in descriptive semantics, the method of component analysis has also been successfully applied in diachronic semantic studies by some scholars such as Tolstoy, Němec and Blanár (Tolstoy 1968, Němec 1980, Blanár 1984), and in recent years by Tolstaya when she talks about structuring the elements of meaning and its internal hierarchy in terms of the typology of semantic changes (Tolstaya: 2008). In the present study, in certain cases, we lean on the techniques of component analysis, because we share the view that the semantic relations existing at the synchronic level are usually a projection of some diachronic changes. From which it follows that a synchronic approach to the study of meaning would also extend the possibilities of diachronic semantic studies.

In view of our work, the smallest components of lexical meaning are assumed to be semantic features evidenced by dictionary definitions of words. In doing so, we share the understanding that “every definition is constructed by a set of semantic features corresponding to elementary concepts” (Katz 1981: 36). In some cases, however, implicit semantic features that for one reason or another are not registered by a given dictionary interpretation are also outlined.

Being aware of the complexity of combining the above methods and approaches and of semantic analysis in general (in synchronic and even more so

in diachronic terms), of the additional difficulties involved in the practical determination of specific semantic features, especially with regard to verb semantics and polysemantic verbs in particular, an attempt is made to systematize some types of semantic shifts that we consider regular. Broadly speaking, in the present work we seek an answer to the question *which meanings regularly give rise to specific other meanings*; we also try to understand *why this happens*, i.e. what are the logical connections between two meanings (primary and secondary) in order to be able to establish possible derivational relations that could optimize the work on the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary.

II. STATEMENT

The structure of the exposition in the main analytical part of the present work reflects the adopted systematic approach of research, in which a complex analysis of certain *etymological word families* and *lexico-semantic fields* is conducted. **Chapter One** traces the semantic development of Bulgarian verbs from the PS word family **per-/ *pъr-/ *par-* (pp. 82 – 103), first of all clarifying the etymology of the verb *пeпà* and paying particular attention to some of its derivatives (*пèркам, пeпàстим, пpàщам*). **Chapter Two** (pp. 104–159) examines in detail the semantic development of verbs from the etymological family of *пpàскам* (<PS **prāskāti*), at first reviewing the meanings of the verbs *пpàскам* and *пpащà* and their derivatives, clarifying their word-formation and etymology, and reconstructing the possible primary meaning of the verb *пpàскам*. Its main semantic features are outlined and specific semantic shifts based on these features are traced. **Chapter Three** (pp. 160 – 309) examines the semantic development in Bulgarian verbs of different origin from three main lexical-semantic fields: 'hit', 'eat' and 'speak'. At the end of the chapter (pp. 278 – 309) there are four etymological studies related to verbs of speaking and their derivatives.

CHAPTER ONE. Semantic development of Bulgarian verbs from the Proto-Slavic etymological word family **per-/ *pbr-/ *par-*¹

Chapter One deals with Bulgarian verbs that refer to the Proto-Slavic ablaut sequence **per-/ *pbr-/ *par-*, descending to the Indo-European root **per-* 'hit'. Some of the continuants in this etymological word family are presented, their multidirectional semantic development is traced, and specific semantic shifts that are also observed in verbs from other etymological families are highlighted. On the basis of specific meanings, a set of semantic fields generated by this etymological word family is formed, which further (in Chapter Three) serves as a basis for the analysis of a set of etymological word families giving rise to certain lexico-semantic fields.

The method of semantic parallels discloses the regularity of some semantic shifts observed within the etymological word family, namely: 'to hit hard, to beat' → 'to work hard', 'to hit, beat' → 'to scold', ('to hit, to beat') → 'to be struck' → 'mad' (less frequently also 'to hit myself' → 'to go mad'), 'to hit, beat' → 'to kill', 'to hit' → 'to throw', 'to hit, to beat' → 'to remove something from its place (with a blow)', 'to throw' → 'to send someone somewhere else', 'to throw myself' → 'to lunge'. Attention is drawn to the fact that in some of the secondarily derived meanings the semantic features of the primary verb are transformed beyond recognition [as in бѣхтя coll. 'hit someone with all my strength to cause him great physical pain, beat' → бѣхтя 'do hard physical work, travail'; бѣя 'hit a person or animal with the aim of causing pain; hit, beat something or someone' (RBL) → бѣя obs. dial. 'kill, ruin', coll. 'kill with a firearm, usually game during hunting'], or disappear completely (as in непà coll. 'strike, hit, baste' → непà 'clean with water and, typically, soap or detergent'; непàстим pejor. 'beat' → зàнепàстà 'to start doing something intensely', etc. In other cases, however, they are preserved in the secondary meanings, which may differ from the initial one only in their expressiveness, also displayed by various morphological means (непà coll. 'to strike, hit, baste' → непàстим neg. 'beat').

On the basis of the disclosed parallel between the meanings 'hit' → 'throw' and 'throw' → 'send someone somewhere else', a different semantic explanation is proposed for the emergence of the meaning of the verb *нр̀ащам, нр̀ащя*. It is connected directly to the meaning of PIE **per-* 'hit', without the need for the mediation of meanings attested in West Slavic languages (**partjā* > Cz. *práce* 'labor, work; occupation', OPol. *proca*, etc.), which represent another direction of development (for which see in more detail BED 5: 617 – 619). Instead, the

¹ In the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic forms, the practice in BER is followed according to the theory of V.I. Georgiev on Proto-Slavic akavism (absence of vowel *o* and presence of the correlation *ǎ – ā*). The reconstructed Indo-European roots are given according to the cited sources.

semantic development **per-* 'hit' → *прàщам* dial. 'to throw' (= 'to direct (something) with force through the air by a movement of the arm and hand') → *прàщам* 'to cause to go or be taken to a particular destination' is suggested. For the second and third degrees of development, a parallel is drawn with the analogous shift in English *send* 'to propel or throw in a particular direction' → *send* 'to cause (to force) to go'.

CHAPTER TWO. Semantic development of verbs from the etymological word family of *прàскам* (< Proto-Slavic **prāskāti*)

Chapter Two deals with verbs from the etymological word family of the verb *прàскам* (< Proto-Slavic **prāskāti*, *prāskājq*, **prāsknqti*, **prāsknq*), in which a multidirectional and multi-level semantic development is observed.

1. Meanings of the verbs *прàскам* and *пращя* and their derivatives

In this section the semantics of the etymological word family of the verbs *прàскам* and *пращя* is outlined in detail, and the meanings of their derivatives are given. Based on this, the paper proceeds to clarify the etymology of the two verbs and to a more in-depth semantic analysis of the polysemous verb *прàскам* and its derivatives.

2. Etymology of the verbs *прàскам* and *пращя*

In this section attention is drawn to the fact that the verb *прàскам* is traditionally etymologized as onomatopoeic, and this provides little information about its primary meaning, i.e., the semantics of its etymon, which makes it very difficult to investigate the diverse semantic development and to establish the semantic-derivational links within the etymological family. The reason for this is that the etymon with its specific meaning is a basic semantic motive not only for the emergence of the word, but also for the internal development of its meanings (Kasabov 2013: 123). Without specifying of its qualitative semantic feature (or features) that characterizes the primary meaning of the verb, it is not only difficult to explain the derivational relations and motivation for the emergence of its secondary meanings, but the question also arises whether there is any grounds for bringing all these diverse meanings to the same etymological family, or whether they can be seen as having emerged in parallel from homonymous roots². We also have in mind Zh. Varbot's observation that, according to her long experience as an etymologist, "a whole range of Proto-Slavic and Slavic verbs, for which a phonologically similar origin is usually assumed, rather have primary (in any case, at the Indo-European level) content roots or bases" (Varbot 2012a: 71).

² As an example of such hesitation, the verb *фўкам*, *фўкна* is indicated, presented, unfounded in our opinion, within six homonymous dictionary entry in BER 8: 848.

In the context of these considerations and based also on the observed parallelism between the development in the etymological word family of PS **per- / *pbr- / *par-* 'to hit / strike' and the PS **prāskāti* an attempt is made to reconstruct a specific primary meaning of the source Proto-Slavic verb. It proceeds from the consideration that "the so-called general meaning of the word potentially (invariantly) contains and makes possible all (...) meanings (as meaning variants), and it does not allow the meaning relations between the different meanings to loosen to the point of breaking" (Kasabov 2013: 237). Two possible explanations are proposed. In the first one, the PS **prāskāti* (> Bulg. *npàckam*) is seen as a continuant of a specific ancient root with a well-defined meaning that could be the basis and source for any of the secondary meanings listed. Secondly, it is assumed that **prāskāti* is based on an ancient (Balto-Slavic) onomatopoeic root, which, however, is correlated with "some typical situation" (after Wierzbicka³), allowing reconstruction of a specific primary meaning. Whether or not, it is assumed to be appropriately PS **prāskāti* to be regarded as a continuation of PS stem **prāsk-*, for which there are semantic grounds to reconstruct the meaning '*hit hard, with a sound*', as it is preserved today in Bulgarian, Czech, Slovenian and Polish.

In this context, the relation between the verbs *npàckam* and *npaщя* is also clarified, and it is noted that *npaщя* and its derivatives are mostly attested to have meanings with the basic semantic feature 'sound'.

3. Semantic analysis of the verb *npàckam* and semantic shifts in its etymological word family

This section examines in detail the secondary meanings in the etymological word family of the verb *npàckam*, starting from the consideration that each of the semantic features existing in the initial meaning of the verb is the basis for the diverse and multidirectional semantic development that occurs within the etymological family. In the course of the study, *an attempt is made to systematize the different directions of development and the results of semantic shifts, and to clarify the relations between the different meanings and the derivational relations between them motivated by the specific semantic features.*

As a first step, a *component analysis* is conducted, the aim of which is to identify the individual "elementary concepts" that construct the primary meaning. As a second step, a *semantic-motivational reconstruction* is attempted, through

³ We have in mind Wierzbicka's opinion that „the semantic structure of most **verbs for sound** is based on relating to some typical situation“. As an example of this, she points to the verb *rustle* 'to make or cause a rustle', representing, according to her, a typical situation which "apparently involves movement in contact with dry leaves" (Wierzbicka 1980: 111).

which the logical connections underlying the semantic-derivational links between any two meanings within the family are revealed. Hypotheses about onomasiological motivation and, consequently, about the regularity of the semantic changes identified are verified by examples of analogous developments in other, unrelated words. Two or more cases of parallel development are taken as evidence for the regularity of the corresponding shifts and for its inclusion in the *Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research* supplemented as an appendix of the dissertation. Some observations are also made on the different ways in which certain lexical-semantic fields are formed within the etymological word family under consideration. The possible ways in which each particular semantic shift takes place (by extending or narrowing the initial meaning, by metaphor or metonymy, by changing the object or subject of the action, and in some cases as a result of the combination of two separate features) are also commented upon.

Semantic shifts are investigated, the basis of which are two of the features in the source meaning: 'hit (hard)' and 'sound'.

3. 1. Meanings derived on the basis of the semantic feature 'hit (hard)'

The shifts on the basis of the semantic feature 'hit (hard)' are:

'to hit hard, with a sound and usually break (something)' → 'to hit hard';

'to hit hard' → 'to perform some specific action with a hard blow';

'to hit hard' → 'to stuff, to cram';

'to hit hard' → 'to stuff, to eat or drink a lot'.

3. 2. Meanings derived on the basis of the semantic feature 'sound'

The shifts on the basis of the feature 'sound' are:

'to hit hard, with a sound, and usually break (something)' → 'to make sound (while / when breaking something)';

'to hit hard, with a sound, and usually break (something)' → 'to make sound while/when perform some other action';

['to hit hard, with a sound'] → 'to make a loud sound (while / when hitting or doing something else)';

['to hit hard, with a sound'] → 'to make a loud sustained sound (hitting or doing something else)' → 'to speak idle talk / nonsense'.

CHAPTER THREE. Semantic development of Bulgarian verbs of heterogeneous origins from the same lexical-semantic field

In Chapter Three, the lexical-semantic fields 'hit', 'eat' and 'speak' are examined in detail. The selection of these fields was motivated by some of the secondary meanings already disclosed in the verbs presented above. We have also taken into account that lexico-semantic fields mentioned are related to common household activities and because of this they are widely represented in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary. The aim is to trace the semantic development of each verb, to establish the mechanisms by which it takes place, and to outline a parallelism that confirms the regularity of each of the semantic shifts resulting in the meanings indicated. On this basis, corrections to some etymological conclusions in the BED are also proposed, including with regard to the lexicographical representation of verbs and their derivatives in accordance with the principle of dictionary organization.

1. Lexical-semantic field 'hit (hard)'

With regard to the first lexical-semantic field 'hit' (and 'hit hard') studied, the observation is made that it includes not only verbs for which this meaning is primary (such as *бѣя*, *непѣ*, etc.), but also those in which it is a result of some semantic development. Some common examples of such a development are presented, and attention is drawn to the scepticism that sometimes accompanies hypotheses of the secondary meaning of the meaning 'hit' (on which cf. e.g. Vlajić-Popović 2002: 25).

The verbs *лѹскам*, *лѹщя*, *лѹскам*, *лѹщя*, *лѹзгам* are examined in more detail, some more specific conclusions are made and arguments are given for one or another hypothesis about the origin of a given word. For example, the view expressed in the BED that the verb *лѹщя* is a denominative formation is rejected (in BED 3: 533-534 PS **luščiti*, **luščq* is presented as derived from **luskā* 'husk, scale, pod') and Vaillant's thesis that the Proto-Slavic **luskā* is a deverbative of **luskāti* (Vaillant 1974: 22) is supported. This view is also shared in the EDSL, where, for example, under **luskāti* (*se*) it is noted that "the presence of the formant *-sk-*, characteristic of the verbal intensive, does not allow to maintain the version of the denominative origin of the verb and testifies to the probability of a reverse process: **luskāti* → **luskā*" (EDSL 16: 192 – 194), which suggests a revision of this dictionary entry in the BER. Arguments are also made for the fact that Proto-Slavic **luzgā* 'husk' should be etymologized as a derivative of PS **luzgāti*, **luzgājq* 'peel', the source of the dialectal verb *лѹзгам*, and not vice versa, as the BED suggests (BED 3: 492), and concludes that *лѹзгам* and *лѹскам* have the same origin (and thus the same primary meaning), and differ only in the phonetic characteristics of the word-formation formant. This also allows their

secondary meanings to be etymologized as resulting from the same or similar semantic development. Further, a parallel examination of the meanings of *лю̀скам*, *лю̀щя*, *лу̀згам*, *лу̀скам*, *лу̀щя*, *лу̀нзим*, which all derive from the same primary root and therefore have the same initial semantics, helps us to establish the motivation for the emergence of the secondary meaning 'hit' in each of these verbs. This would not be possible for some of them, which have lost their initial meaning over time and therefore the motivation for the secondary meaning does not seem quite clear (e.g. *лу̀скам*, *лу̀нзим*). The typological comparison of their etymological word families is used as a tool that allows to define more clearly the range of related lexemes and to investigate their word-formation and semantic possibilities, the directions of derivation and the chain of permissible semantic shifts.

The regularity of the semantic shift 'to perform some specific action (separate, grind, crush and so on) with a hard blow' → 'to hit hard', disclosed in the analysis, and specifically of the the shift between the meanings 'to separate the outer shell' → 'to hit', on the other hand, provides further grounds for defining as untenable Meyer's assumption that the Bulgarian verb *лу̀щя* with the meaning 'hit' is a borrowing from the Alb. *luftë* 'fight, war; battle' (Meyer 1891: 250), also rejected by BED (BED 3: 533 –534).

The verbs *лу̀ня*, *лу̀нам*, *лю̀ня* are also analyzed. It is found that the parallel semantic development in different Bulgarian continuants of PIE **leu-*, **lou-* 'to cut off, separate, free' (Pokorny 1959: 681 – 682) testifies to the fact that regardless of what phonetic and semantic-derivational changes they have been subjected to over time, they all retain primary semantic features ('cut off', 'separate') that underlie their identical secondary meanings. It also raises the question of why in the BED the verb *лу̀нам*¹ dial. coll. 'punch, beat, thump, pound' is etymologized, on the one hand, as a continuant of **lupāti*, **lupāja*, "originally an iterative of **lupiti*" (> *лу̀ня*¹ dial. 'peel, husk', *лу̀ня*³ dial. 'beat, strike'), and on the other hand, the etymological entry on the interjection *лун* states that PS **lupъ* is "an onomatopoeia along with the verbs **lupiti* (cf. *лу̀ня*¹, *лу̀ня*², *лу̀ня*³, *лу̀ня*⁴) and **lupāti* (cf. *лу̀нам*¹, *лу̀нам*², *лу̀нам*³, *лу̀нам*⁴, *лу̀нам*⁵)", given that an unquestionable connection with the primary etymon (PIE **leu-p-*) can be discerned. The proviso that "in some cases" PS **lupъ* "has arisen secondary to the verbs **lupiti*, **lupāti*" (BED 3: 514) is in our opinion insufficiently clear, at least as far as the semantic-derivational relations between the verbs and the interjection are concerned. The view is expressed that the direction of semantic and word-formational development is from the verb to the interjection (*лун* from *лу̀нам*). A similar semantic development is observed in the verbs *жу̀ля* and *дѐра̀*.

Another clearly delineated semantic shift, resulting in the meaning 'hit hard', is the shift 'shine, flash' → 'hit hard'. As a result of it have arisen the meanings of the verb *блѣскам* obs. 'shove; wrestle fiercely with someone in order to defeat him; to beat, to slog; (for wind, rain, water, etc.) to strike hard at someone, something; to strike hard at something, knock, beat', etc. On the basis of this development, an attempt is made to specify the etymology of the dialect verbs *млѣскам* 'strike' (Stanyovtzi, Breznik; Tran; Krlev dol, Pernik), 'shove someone; have a headache' (Sofia), *млѣскам*, *млѣснам* secret mason speech 'beat', *млѣсвам* 'hit suddenly' (Dolna Banya, Ihtiman), *мѣлскам* 'shove someone; a part of my body hurts a lot' (Iskrets, Sofia), *млѣсна го* 'bumped him, hit it' (Raduil, Ihtiman), *млсвам* 'hit hard with a hand; hit suddenly; head (hurts)' (Dobroslavtzi, Sofia). In the BED, the verbs mentioned are defined as onomatopoeic and compared with *млѣщем* 'smack, part (one's lips) noisily in eager anticipation or enjoyment of food or drink', *млѣскам* same, *мляскам* 'make a particular sound with tongue and lips when eating', etc. (BED 4: 173). The not entirely convincing hypothesis that all the above meanings arise from an indefinite onomatopoeia is revised on the basis of the etymological relation between OBulg. *мльньн* 'thunderbolt', OPrus. *mealde* 'thunderbolt', OBulg. *меляж*, *мелеши*, Inf. *млѣти* 'grind, mill', OIc. *myln* 'fire, lightning, celestial fire', OIc. *Mjollnir* 'the hammer with which the god Thor defeated the world dragon' and OBulg. *млатъ* 'hammer', respectively *млатя* 'strike something or someone hard, beat' (BED 4: 163 – 164) – all of them continuants of PIE **mel-*, **mol-*, **ml-* 'grind, hit'. These meanings delineate a semantic paradigm in which the initial verbal meaning 'grind, hit' can be a source of secondary meanings related both to striking in a more general sense (as in *млѣскам* 'strike', etc.) and to the striking power of celestial fire (*мѣлскам* 'scintillate', etc.). In this paradigm, the verbs mentioned above (*млѣскам*, *млѣсвам*, *мѣлскам*, etc.), as well as *мѣлскам* '(of a light or something that reflects light) shine in a bright but brief, sudden, or intermittent way', *молоскоти* 'shine blindingly', *молскавица* 'thunderbolt', find their natural place. In this case, the etymological connection between the verb *мълсне* 'light up, shine' (Veles) and the OBulg. *мльннн* 'thunderbolt' assumed by N. Reiter (Reiter 1964: 177) and rejected in the BED as inconclusive (BED 4: 391), can be confirmed.

2. Lexical-semantic field 'eat'

The extensive lexico-semantic field 'eat' is also considered, in which three larger groups are distinguished depending on the type of semantic change: 1) Metaphorical shifts; 2) Metonymic shifts; 3) Metaphorical-metonymic shifts. Each of these groups is represented by several examples.

2. 1. Metaphorical shifts

In the first group the regularity of two semantic shifts which we define as metaphorical are disclosed. The first of them – '*to stuff, to cram*' → '*to eat greedily, to drink much*' – is attested by the verbs *мѣнча* fig. 'make someone forcibly eat a lot', pejor. 'eat' (Trastenik, Pleven; Lenkovo, Nikopol); *натѣнквам* coll. 'make someone eat too much, make someone swallow too much food or medicine, etc.' (RBL), *натѣнквам се* 'fed up, fed to overfullness' (RBL); *натлѣскам се, натлѣсквам се, натлѣскувам се* fig. 'get drunk, overeat, stuff myself' (Gerov). The second shift '*to tuck in, to poke*' → '*to eat / to drink much*' is observed in the verbs *натѣкам се, натѣкна се, натѣквам се, натѣкувам се, натѣкнувам се* 'become drunk, lush' (BED 8: 31 – 32), *притѣкнувам* fig. 'swallow' (Smolyan, Ardino, Asenovgrad, Madan, Devin); *мѣам* 'gobble, eat greedily' (Trun; Govedartsi, Samokov; Smolsko, Pirdop), etc. The etymology of the verb *мѣша* (and, accordingly, of its dialectal variants *мѣхам, мѣам*) allows us to restore the three-level semantic development '*to strike, beat*' → '*to tuck in, to poke*' → '*to eat a lot, gluttonously*'.

2. 2. Metonymic shifts

Through the mechanism of verbal metonymy, the meaning 'eat' arise in verbs with the meanings 'bite', 'gnaw', 'chew', i.e. verbs naming single stages of the eating process. It can also develop from verbs naming single activities of the complete and more general process of obtaining and processing food, i.e. verbs with meanings 'peel', 'husk', 'tear off, break off', 'pry, tear away', etc.

In this group are considered verbs in which the *shift 'to peel, remove the inedible part of something' → 'to eat'* is observed: *грѣхам* 'eat noisily' (Rhodope, Malko Tarnovo), *мѣнам* fig. 'eat quickly and much' (Khvoyna, Pavelsko, Asenovgrad), *олющвам* dial. pejor. 'eat up, engorge' (RBL), *жѣля* dial. 'eat' (RBL). A similar shift is suggested for the verb *лѣнам* 'gobble, eat much' (Radovene, Vratsa; Strandzha; Debarsko), iron. 'eat' (Kyustendil), 'drink much' (Debar), *лѣнкам* 'gobble, eat greedily' (Malko Tarnovo) (BED 3: 516), although today it does not retain the original meaning 'peel, husk'.

Another shift observed in this subset of meanings is the shift '*forcefully tear away*' → '*eat*', represented by the verbs *дѣргам* 'eat greedily' (Vratsa), *дѣрлям* '(for a dog) to bite, pull, rop something, eating it' (Dobroslavtsi, Rebrovo,

Sofia), *одрѣнквам* fig. '(for a predatory animal) tear apart and eat an animal, a person'. A similar development is suggested for the verb *рѣнам* 'eat much, guzzle' (Kostur), for which a specific semantic explanation is also offered. The disclosed regularity of this semantic shift is also adduced as semantic evidence for the etymological connection between the dialectal verb *лѣнам* 'grasp, snatch' and *лѣнам* coll. 'eat a large amount of food eat quickly and greedily', ext. 'eat', fig. pejor. 'greedily appropriate something' (RBL).

In other verbs, the meaning 'eat' arises secondarily from the original meaning 'make into pieces'. The development in these cases could be motivated by the notion that food is shared with others, i.e. "from the notion of 'partake of', with specialization to 'partake of food'" (Buck 1949: 327), as e.g. in Eng. *partake in* 'to take part in or experience something along with others', *partake with* 'to share', *partake (of)* 'to take a part, portion or share in common with others'. The semantic development '*to make in pieces*' (→ '*to take a piece*') → *to/when* → '*eat*' can be assumed for the verbs *кѣснам* 'eat a little' (Ohrid), *кѣснучам* 'eat a bit' (Kalaydzidere, Monastery, Chadarli, Kushlani, Gyumurdzhyna; Chobankyoy, Dedeagach), 'eat hastily and a little' (Sachanli, Gyumurdzhyna), *кѣскам* 'eat a little' (Progled, Chepelare, Asenovgrad), *покѣсна* dial. 'eat a little', *ломѣтя* 'slurp' (Bansko), *лѣмам* 'chew without teeth, ruminate' (Samokov), *секѣ* 'eat' (Prilep), *закѣривам (си)* 'eat a little' (Kazanlak), etc. It is found that the semantic shift '*to do in pieces*' → '*to take part of something*' → '*to eat*' can also be part of a more complex and longer semantic chain. This is observed with verbs *мѣрвя (мѣрвим)* 'take some' (Stanyovtsi, Breznik; Bralozhnica, Sofia), with derivatives *измѣрвя, измѣрвям* 'choose the morsels (of meat) from a dish and eat them' (Vratsa), *помрѣфкувам* 'take a little of something (mainly to eat)' (Samokov), *помрѣфкувам* 'eat a little, eat some sweets' (BED 4: 287, under *мрѣвка*), etc.

2. 3. Metaphorical-metonymic shifts

As metaphorical-metonymic are defined the changes in which the meaning 'eat' arises in some verbs with meanings 'bite off', 'grind', 'mash, squash', etc. Metaphorically, these verbs are used to denote single stages of the eating process such as chewing, crushing the food with the teeth, etc., which are compared to similar processes performed in some household activities. However, denoting the whole eating process by individual stages of this process such as biting off, chewing ('*to chew*' → *to/when* → *eat*'), swallowing, etc. should be regarded as the result of metonymy. Some of the verb meanings observed in this subgroup could also be seen as the result of specialization of meaning through concretization of the instrument of action ('*to crush*' → '*to crush (food) with teeth*' → *to/when* → '*eat*').

The following semantic shifts are observed in this subgroup:

'bite off, tear off with the teeth (with the beak)' → **'eat'** in the verbs *рѣнам* 'to slurp hastily' (Trstenik, Pleven), *урѣфѣм* 'eat' (Voinyagovo, Karlovo), *хѣнвам* 'eat a little or hastily; to taste, by eating, taste' (RBL), *кѣлвѣ* '(for a bird) take and swallow food with the beak' (RBL), *дѣбам* 'break with teeth and chew, crunch' (Bansko);

'to shatter, chop, grind, grate' → **'to eat'** in verbs *мѣля* 'eat' (BED 3: 729), *премілям* 'chew continuously' (Sofia), *грѣзѣ* 'eat something hard by biting off a little' (RBL), *грѣзкам* sl. 'eat' (RBL), *млѣтем* fig. 'eat very quickly' (Smolyan, Ardino, Asenovgrad, Madan, Devin, Momchilgrad), *млѣти* dial. 'eats', *млѣтнувам* 'eat very quickly' (Smolyan, Ardino, Asenovgrad, Madan, Devin), *намлѣтъвам*, *намлѣтювам* fig. 'surfeit' (Smolyan, Ardino, Madan, Asenovgrad), *намлѣкъвам*, *намлѣкювам* fig. 'surfeit' (Shiroka Laka region) etc.;

'to crush, smash, fold' → **'to eat'** in verbs *мѣчкам* sl. 'eat, gorge' (RBL), 'eat a lot' (Slaveyno, Vievo, Kutela, Smolyan), soldier speech 'eat' (Momchilgrad), *намѣчках се* 'I have eaten contentedly' (Kalofer), *гнетѣ* 'eat a lot' (RBL), *мотѣя*, *мѣтам* 'gobble, eat, swallow' (Teteven), etc. A similar semantic development is suggested for the verb *нагѣвам* coll. 'eat or drink something greedily and in great quantity' (RBL), ext. iron. 'eat or drink; devour' (RBL), dial. *угѣна*, *угѣвам* 'eat quickly, greedily', where the etymological connection between the verbs *нагѣвам*, *угѣна*, *угѣвам* and OBulg. *гѣнати*, *женѣ* 'drive, spur on' (< PIE *g^when²- 'hit'), proposed by V. Georgiev, is seen as less likely (Georgiev 1958: 27–28). It is assumed that some verbs in which the path for the emergence of the secondary meaning 'eat' is not quite clear, such as the dialectal verbs *плѣдскам* 'eat, drink' (Lilyache, Vratsa) and *плѣскам*, *плѣсвам*, *плѣсна* 'eat a lot' (Samokov), *оплѣскам*, *оплѣсквам*, *оплѣскувам* 'engorge greedily' (Malko Tarnovo), *оплѣща* 'engorge, eat up' (Smolsko, Pirdop), can also be assigned to this subgroup;

'to swallow' → **'to eat'** in the verbs *гѣлтам* ext. 'eat or drink greedily in large, big gulps, gobble' (RBL), *поглѣщам* 'eat up, drink a certain amount of food, liquid, etc., ingest' (RBL);

3. Lexical-semantic field 'speak'

This part is devoted to the vast field of verbs for speaking in the Bulgarian language, formed as a result of various semantic changes that have taken place at different stages in the history of the language. It considers both verbs with a neutral meaning 'speak' and those that have additional semantic features characterizing the action of speaking. Many of them are evaluative and expressive.

The verbs presented are grouped into several larger subgroups: verbs of onomatopoeic origin meaning 'to talk (too much), to twaddle' (3.1.), verbs of onomatopoeic origin with a reduplicated root meaning 'to twitter' ('to chatter' or 'to speak indistinctly') (3.2.), verbs with the meaning 'to speak unintelligibly, unclearly' (3.3.), verbs with the meaning 'to speak loudly' (→ 'to speak') (3.4.), verbs with the meaning 'to scold' (3.5.), verbs with the meaning 'to offend' (3.6.) and verbs with the meaning 'to slander, to defame, calumniate' (3.7.). Four etymological etudes are placed at the end of this chapter (3.8.).

3. 1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with the meaning 'talk foolishly or at tedious length about something, prate'

In this section, some verbs are presented whose etymon is a primary onomatopoeia, and the secondary meaning 'talk foolishly or at tedious length about something' is motivated by the feature 'sound'. In some cases, the same semantic feature may underlie the later neutral meaning 'talk'. This is the case, for example, with the verb *говоря*, whose meaning 'to express or exchange ideas by means of spoken words' is etymologically associated with the onomatopoeic PIE root **g'ou-* (EDSL 7: 75 – 76) / PIE **gōu-*, **gouə-*, **gū-* 'cry, scream' (Pokorny 1959: 403). The following semantic development is suggested:

PIE onomatopoeia **gōu-*, **gouə-*, **gū* (**g'ou-*) 'cry, scream' →
 → (PS **gavarь* / **gavara* →) PS **gavariti* →
 → (OBulg. *говоръ* 'displeasure, grumbling, murmuring; noise, uproar, tumult' →) OBulg. *говорити*, OCS *говорити* 'to make noise' (XI c.) →
 → *говоря* 'to use oral speech as a means of communication; utter, say something, say; express in words, by oral speech my thoughts, express myself aloud in accordance with the peculiarities of my thinking, character, temperament, etc., talk; express something orally, express some thought, communicate some fact, etc.' (RBL).

The dialectal verbs *врѣвя* 'chatter, speak', *врѣвя* 'have a talk' (Bansko), 'talk' (Karnalovo, Petrich; Solun), *заврѣвя* 'start to speak', *изврѣвя* 'speak, say', *отврѣвя*, *отврѣвям* 'respond' (Syar) are registered with neutral but also evaluative meanings for speaking. The verb *врѣвя* is associated with PIE **werw-(ī)jō*, formed from the ie root **wer-* (BED 1: 183 – 184) (in Pokorny 1959: 1162 **uer-б* 'feierlich sagen, sprechen', in LIV 2001: 689 – 690 - **uerh₁-* 'say' > Rus. *врать* 'lie'). Based on the meanings of the cognate nouns *врѣва* and *врѣськ* (BED 1: 193 – 194), as well as on other extensions of the primary PIE root (Av. *urvata-* 'order', San. *vrata-* 'order, vow', Gr. *rhētōr* 'public speaker, orator', *rhētra* 'agreement, covenant', *εἶρω* 'speak', Lith. *vardas* 'name', Goth. *waurd*, Eng. *word* 'дума') the more specific meaning including a semantic feature of loud, noisy speech (e.g. 'speak declaratively, imperatively, persuasively', i.e. 'say solemnly') is also assumed for the primary root. In all cases, a relationship is disclosed

between the meanings 'speak' and 'shout' based on the semantic feature 'sound' common to them, which might or might not be reflected in the interpretations of the source and secondary meanings.

Verbs with a pejorative meaning, such as *плямтам* coll. 'speak, talk a lot and idle talk; chatter, twaddle, prattle, sputter' (RBL), *изплямвам* 'say something inappropriate suddenly, babble' (RBL), *плямпòра* 'talk nonsense' (Ihtiman), are also associated with primary onomatopoeia (and accordingly with the feature 'sound')

3. 2. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with a reduplicated root meaning 'gab, gabble'

In the extraction of lexical material from the BED, a large group of expressive verbs for speaking was also formed, which are distinguished both in their semantics, loaded with additional features ('too much' or 'meaningless'), and in word-formation. These verbs are onomatopoeic and most often are formed by means of expressive morphological devices such as full or partial root reduplication and various expressive suffixes (cf. e.g. *мърм-òр-я*, *бърб-òл-я*, *дърò-òс-я*, etc.). The mechanism by which the meanings in this subgroup arise is largely similar to the pattern discussed above (in *говòря*, *плямтам*), in which speech is compared to some indeterminate primary sound. In semantic terms, however, the reduplication of a primary onomatopoeia emphasizes additional semantic features characterizing the primary action differently. The following verbs are considered in this subgroup: *òрòðра* 'to chatter, babble', *дърòðря* 'to talk a lot about insignificant and unnecessary things, chatter, babble' (PBE), *бòбря* 'twaddle, babble', *бърбòря* 'to talk a lot about insignificant and superfluous things, babble' (RBL), *бърбòля* 'babble', *бърбòстя* 'babble' (Veliko Tarnovo), *пòпра* 'to chatter' (Borovan, Vratsa; Mahalata, Pleven), *пърпòря* 'talk boringly and meaninglessly' (Braknitsa, Popovo), *фòфря* 'talk vaguely; talk a lot', *фърфòря* 'talk vaguely' (BED 8: 878), *кòкря* dial. 'chatter, jabber, prate' (RBL), etc. Three of the common meanings of the verb *мърмòря* may also be connected with a primary onomatopoeia: 'to speak quietly, vaguely, usually to myself, because of some displeasure, anger, agitation, etc.', 'to speak or read something aloud monotonously, usually quietly, unintelligibly, vaguely' and 'to speak intrusively, annoyingly, expressing one's dissatisfaction with someone or something, disagreement with someone or something' (RBL). To the same root may be referred the verbs *мърмря* dial. 'to murmur', *мърмрем* 'to murmur' (Bansko), *мърмòсвам* 'to murmur', etc.

3. 3. Verbs with the meaning 'speak unintelligibly, unclearly'

Verbs in which the secondary meaning 'speak unintelligibly, unclearly' arises can be divided into two main subgroups. The first includes onomatopoeic verbs with a reduplicated root, some of which (since they have more than one meaning of speaking) are also represented above in the corresponding group. In

the second subgroup the semantic shift *'to chew' → 'to speak unintelligibly, unclearly'* is discerned.

3. 3. 1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin with a reduplicated root

The meaning 'speak unintelligibly, unclearly' regularly arises in verbs formed with a reduplicated onomatopoeic root. The motivation for this development is also clearly evident in the case of the Gr. *βάρβαρος* 'non-Greek, foreign; ignorant' (from which the borrowing in Bulgarian *в̄рварин* 'the derogatory name which the ancient Greeks and Romans gave to every foreigner' (RBL). In BED Gr. *βάρβαρος* is compared with the verb *б̄рб̄оря* 'speak obscurely and unintelligibly', formed by a complete doubling of the root (BED 1: 119). The verbs referred to may be related to the primitive PIE root **baba-*, an onomatopoeia for naming slurred or unintelligible speech. This root, as well as the variants **bal-bal-*, **bar-bar-*, which have undergone "numerous dissimilations," Pokorny points to as the source of words such as Gr. *βαβάζω* 'chatter, speak unclear', Lat. *babiger* 'stupid', Alb. *bebë* 'newborn child', Eng. *baby*, SCr. *bòboćem*, *bobòtati* 'clatter with teeth', Latv. *bibināt* 'bubbling, mumbling', AI *balbalā-karōti* 'stammer', Lith. *blābositi* 'stammer', Eng. *babble*, AI *barbara-h-* 'stuttering', in the plural to name „non-Aryan peoples“, Gr. *βάρβαρος* 'not Greek, in an unintelligible language' (> Lat. *barbarus*), Gr. *βαρβαρόφωνος* 'who speaks unintelligibly', Lat. *baburrus* 'stupid', etc. (Pokorny 1959: 91 – 92). It is likely, however, that similar typological parallels can be found in all languages.

To this subgroup are assigned the verbs *б̄лб̄оля* 'speak weakly, incorrectly (for some foreign language)' (RBL), which is associated with the meaning of the interjection *б̄л-бук* and doubled or tripled *б̄л-б̄л-б̄л-бук* to resemble a gentle, permanent sound from a river, stream (RBL). It is inferred that the sounds made by quietly flowing water are usually compared to quiet talking, as in *ромоня* '(for a rivulet, stream, spring, rain, etc.) to make a burble as flows, or to be accompanied by a ripple, murmur' and dial. 'speak, talk softly, whisper' (RBL), *ромоня* 'speak softly, talk' (Stoykite, Shiroka Laka, Smolyan; Chepelare; Chernichevo, Krumovgrad; Mandritsa, Ortakyoy; Satchanli, Gyumurdzhyna), while the sound of a violent and loud stream of water can be compared to loud talking, with booming voice, cf. Engl. *chatter* '(for a stream, jet) flowing turbulently/noisily' and *chatter* 'talk informally about unimportant matters', Eng. *brawl* 'scold noisily' and *brawl* '(of a stream) flow noisily, roar'.

Similar is the semantics of the verb *б̄б̄ля*, which also has the meaning of speaking and of the sound of water: 'speak in a low voice, indistinctly, unintelligibly' (RBL), 'speak indistinctly; stutter' (BER) and '(of river, stream) flow, making a low, permanent, even sound without interruption' (RBL). In this subgroup also falls the dialectal onomatopoeic verb *ф̄ф̄ла* 'speak unintelligibly, like being without teeth' (Gabrovo) with the prefixed forms *заф̄ф̄ля*, *заф̄ф̄лям* 'start speaking unintelligibly', *изф̄ф̄ля*, *изф̄ф̄лям* 'say something unclearly',

нафѣвля се dial. 'speak a lot and unintelligibly', *пофѣфля, пофѣфлям* 'speak vaguely for a short time', *профѣфля, профѣфлям* 'say something vaguely, unintelligibly', *разфѣфля се, разфѣфлям се* 'speak vaguely, unintelligibly'.

3. 3. 2. Verbs with the initial meaning 'chew'

The meaning 'speak unintelligibly, unclearly' arises regularly in verbs with the meaning 'chew'. For example, the verb *дѣвча* 'bite and work (food) in the mouth with the teeth, especially to make it easier to swallow' has also figurative colloquial meanings 'speak unintelligibly, do not pronounce clearly, mumble' and 'repeat all the same' (RBL). A connection between the meanings 'chew' and 'speak unintelligibly' exists in other languages as well, cf. e.g. Eng. *mouth* 'eat; chew' and *mouth* 'mumble, mutter'.

This shift (as part of a longer chain of semantic development) is also observed in the dialectal verb *мелявам* 'speak unintelligibly and unrelatedly' (Barlozhitsa, Dobroslavtsi, Sofia). It belongs to the etymological word family of the verb *меля* 'grind cereals or other grains into powder or smaller particles' (BED 3: 730). The connection between the two meanings could be mediated by the meaning 'chew', derived from the semantic pattern '*to shatter, chop, grind, grate*' → '*to eat*' presented above. That is, the putative semantic development might look like this:

PIE **mel-* 'crush, grind, especially grain' (1) →
 → *меля* 'grind cereals or other grains into powder or smaller particles' (2) →
 → *меля* 'grind cereals or other grains into powder or smaller particles with the mouth, chew' (3) →
 → *мелявам* 'speak unintelligibly and incoherently' (4).

The third degree of this development is represented by the meanings of some common and dialectal forms related to the source i.e. root **mel-*: *меля* 'feed' (BED 3: 729), 'eat', *премиям* 'chew continuously' (Sofia), etc. To this subgroup are also referred the verbs *ломѣтя* 'speak, utter, pronounce vaguely, unintelligibly' (RBL), *мўлям* 'secret master speech 'say'', which is associated with *мўлям* 'chew, eat (fruit)' (Smolsko, Pirdop), and *мъмулиѣжа*, borrowed from Gr. *μαμουλιζω* (formed with the suffix *-ιζω* from It. *matto* 'baby', BED 3: 634) and attested with the meanings 'eat slowly, chewing a lot' and 'speak slowly, through teeth, monotonously' (Kazanlak).

3. 4. Verbs with the meaning 'speak with a loud voice' (→ 'speak')

A large number of verbs with the meaning 'speak with a loud voice; scold' can be associated with primary onomatopoeic roots without definite initial semantics. They are usually formed with the suffix *-k-* (as e.g. *сѣскам* 'make a sound similar to a continuous *s-s-s*', RBE) and their primary meaning can be summarized as 'emit certain sound'. Often the newly acquired meaning of *verba dicendi* is evaluative or complemented by secondary semantic features, but

sometimes these are subsequently neutralized. To this subgroup may be referred the verbs *òкам*, *òкна* 'speak loudly' (Samokov; Gorna Lyubata, Bosiligrad; Iskrets, Sofia; Kyustendil, etc.), *вìкам* 'yell, shout, scream', 'express loud discontent, indignation with someone or something, speak loudly and angrily to someone, scold' (RBL), coll. 'express aloud what I think, what excites me', *ýкам* 'yell, say' (Gabrovo, Krastopole, Xanthi), *к̀̀̀кам* dial. 'say, say something in a loud voice; utter, make cries, shout; name, call' (RBL), 'say, speak' (Dramsko, Breznik), 'name by name' (Graovo). The etymology of the verb *пекà* suggests that it should also be seen as the result of the semantic development discussed in the subgroup: PIE. onom. **rei-*, **rē(i)-* 'shout, roar' → PS **rekti* → Bulg. *пекà* 'use words, linguistic expressions, to convey to someone by voice, oral utterance with varied purpose or intent, say, utter' (RBL). Also included here is the verb *певà* pejor. 'cry out, shout something deafeningly, usually as an expression of very strong feeling; (of a multitude, a crowd) shout out, shout loudly, continuously, as an expression of some feeling, of approval or disapproval' (RBL), a continuant of the PS. **reuti*, **rjuti*, **revq* < i.e. onomatopoeia **reu-*, source also of OEng. *ryn* 'roar', *ryn*, *ryan* 'to roar', Av. *rāvati* 'he roars', Lat. *rumor* 'noise; cry; rumor', etc. (BED 6: 197 – 198).

3. 5. Verbs with the meaning 'scold'

Some of the verbs presented in the previous subgroup with the initial meaning 'cry, shout' also have the secondary meaning 'scold'. It usually arises in onomatopoeic verbs in the pattern '*cry, shout*' → '*scold*', and also in verbs with the meanings 'bark', 'besmirch' and 'hurt'.

3. 5. 1. Verbs of onomatopoeic origin

Here refer the verbs *òкам*, *òкна* 'revile, vituperate' (Trastenik, Pleven), 'rebuke' (Kravenik, Sevlievo), 'scold' (Koprivshtitsa; Chelopech, Pirdop), *вìкам* 'express loud dissatisfaction, indignation with someone or something, speak loudly and angrily to someone, scold, scold, hoot' (RBL), *навìккам* 'criticise someone; scold, hoot' (RBL), *ýкам* 'vituperate' (Korovo, Velingrad), *ýкьм* 'scold someone all the time' (Braknitsa, Popovo), *нар̀̀̀ккам (ca)*, *нар̀̀̀ккам (ca)* 'scold' (Smolyan; Arda; Asenovgrad; Madan; Devin; Nova Nadezhda, Haskovo), *ср̀̀̀ккам ca* 'scold someone rudely' (Haskovo), *р̀̀̀ккам* obs. dial. 'accusing, reproaching someone for something' (RBL), *прѐ̀̀к̀̀̀вам ce* dial. 'argue', *спор̀̀̀чам ce* 'miff' (Samokov).

3. 5. 2. Verbs with the initial meaning 'bark'

In some cases, the relationship between the initial onomatopoeia and the secondary meaning 'scold' can be mediated by verb meanings such as 'bark' and similar, i.e. by sound-alike verbs to indicate animal sounds. In these verbs, however, parallel independent development of two distinct meanings ('bark' and 'scold') from the initial onomatopoeia can also be assumed. Such meanings are

given by the verbs *л̀ая* '(of dog, wolf, fox and some other animals) bark' (RBL) and fig. coll. 'speak fiercely against someone or something; attack, scold' (RBL). A similar semantic change is observed in the verb *д̀жа̀фкам*. Its main meaning is '(of a dog) bark fragmentarily and insistently, usually with a thin voice' (RBL). The verb also has a figurative colloquial meaning 'attack someone, quarrel with someone'.

3. 5. 3. Verbs with the initial meaning 'pollute, besmirch'

In some cases the secondary meaning 'scold' develops in verbs with the meaning 'pollute, besmirch'. To this subgroup is referred the verb *мур̀д̀арим* 'revile, vituperate' (Novo Selo, Vidin), a denominative from *мур̀д̀ар* 'dirty, unclean, unkempt (person)', which is a loan word from Tur. *murdar* 'dirty, unclean, nasty' from Pers. *murdār* 'decayed corpse, carrion'. The presumed semantic development is '**besmirch**' → '**muck (someone)**' → '**treat badly (someone)**' → '**scold, revile**' (BED 4: 333 – 334). Also included here is the verb *мун̀д̀з̀о̀сам, мун̀д̀з̀о̀свам* 'revile, vituperate, quarrel with someone' (Veliko Tarnovo) – a borrowing formed from the aorist stem of Gr. *μουντζώνω* 'pollute, defile; make an offensive gesture with the hand', for which an analogous semantic development is assumed ('pollute, defile' → 'hook, scold'). The semantic development 'offend' → 'quarrel' → 'get angry' assumed in BED (4: 326 – 327) is rejected, since the meanings 'offend' and 'get angry' are not attested for the Bulgarian dialect verb, nor for the closely related *м̀н̀д̀з̀о̀сам* 'mumble, mutter something intrusively' (Sliven), 'reproach, nag, grumble, cavil' (Sliven), *м̀н̀д̀з̀о̀сам* 'gossip about' (Lyubimets, Haskovo). To this subgroup is also referred the verb *б̀р̀ля̀вим* 'scold, niggle' (Tran), which is supposed to have an etymological connection with *б̀р̀л̀о̀г* 'slop, uncleanness' (Ostrets, Troyan; Berievo, Sevlievo), *б̀р̀р̀л̀о̀г* 'unclean, dirty', cognate with SCr. *бр̀лог, б̀р̀ля̀ти* 'besmirch, smear', pol. *barłóg* 'pile of chaff, rubbish, mud', etc., as well as *д̀р̀ля̀се* coll. pejor. 'quarrel with somebody, cavil', 'answer naggingly' (Elena), which is connected with *д̀р̀ля̀вим се* 'get dirty myself', *разд̀р̀ля̀вим се* 'draggle myself' (Breznik), etc.

3. 5. 4. Verbs with initial meaning 'injure'

The meaning 'scold' also regularly arises as a result of the semantic shift '**injure**' → '**scold**'. The first degree of this development can be expressed by different verbs with the common semantic feature 'perform an action that damages the integrity of the object of the action'. Such meanings have the verbs *ка̀стря* fig. col 'strictly reprimand someone, revile, scold' (RBL), *изка̀стрям* dial. 'scold, rebuke, berate someone' (Gerov 2: 219), *нака̀стрям* fig. coll. 'criticize, accuse someone, scold someone harshly, berate', *ока̀стрям* fig. coll. 'scold sternly, chide someone' (RBL); *д̀я̀лам* 'scold someone, reprimand' (BED 1: 339), *од̀я̀лвам* fig. obs. dial. 'criticize someone, scold' (RBL), *над̀я̀лвам* fig. cil. 'criticize, revile, chide'; *жу̀ля* 'criticize harshly' (RBL), 'denounce, scold'

(Dobroslavtsi, Sofia). This semantic shift also explains the meaning of *натривам* in the expression *Натривам / натрия носа / муцуната / мутрата на някого* (*To rub someone's nose / muzzle / mouth of someone*) coll. roughly 'vituperate, put someone in his place' (RBL), which is derived from the semantics of *трия* 'continuously move something on some surface, rub' (RBL), 'by rubbing make something fine, sow; cut wood with a saw' (BED 8: 265), dial. *триям* 'shelling corn kernels' (Slashchen, Blagoevgrad), *трийъм* 'scaling the husks of wheat plants' (Trunchovitsa, Nikopol).

The feature 'injure, impair the integrity', which underlies the secondary meanings 'scold' in this subgroup, can also be found in verbs with the meaning 'bite, bite off'. A similar shift can be observed in the verb *гриза̀* 'gnaw, nibble' with the figurative meaning 'cause persistent and wearing distress or anxiety'; cf. also the meaning of the derivative prefixed verb *сгризвам* fig. coll. 'wound' (RBL). Analogous semantic shifts can be found in other languages, cf. e.g. Eng. *nibble* 'bite, take a bite' and *nibble* 'criticize, cavil'.

3. 6. Verbs with the meaning 'offend'

The notion of a bad word hurting is a motivating feature for semantic development in verbs with secondary meaning 'offend, insult, hurt by words' as well. The newly acquired meanings must be seen as figurative, the result of a metaphor in which a physical wound is compared to a mental trauma. A link between injury in the direct and figurative sense can be discerned for a number of verbs, cf. e.g. the meanings of the verb *депа̀* 'make into parts (canvas, paper, etc.), with a sharp, strong pull flay, tear, rend' (BER), 'peel the skin off (a corpse or carcass), flay' → *депа̀* 'strictly rebuke, revile, scold' (RBL). Included here are the verbs *ранявам* 'deeply offend, insult someone, upset someone' (RBL), *наранявам* 'deeply offend, insult someone, upset someone, injure' (RBL), *уязвявам* 'deeply offend by words or deeds, offend' (RBL), *хана̀* 'hurt by words, offend' (RBL), *захана̀вам* 'hurt by words, offend, insult' (RBL), *ухана̀вам* fig. 'strongly insult, hurt by words' (RBL), *нара̀нам* 'speak insulting words for no reason' (Bresnik, Tarn), *кълва̀* 'hurt, offend or insult someone with harsh, insulting words and expressions', *кълва̀вам* fig. 'offend, insult someone with harsh, biting words, affect' (RBL). With PIE **(s)ker-* 'cut' is associated the noun *скръб* 'sorrow, a feeling of deep distress caused by loss, disappointment, or other misfortune suffered by oneself or others' and the derived verb *скърбя̀* 'grieve, feel or display deep distress' and *оскърбя̀вам* 'cause, inflict insult, offend someone with my actions or with my words, offend, embitter, abuse' (RBL). A similar semantic motif underlies the secondary meanings of the verbs *кърня̀* 'offend, affect' (RBL), *накърня̀вам се* 'suffer humiliation, offence' (RBL); *бодà* '(for words, facts, etc.) cause someone a strong unpleasant feeling; affect, annoy, embitter' and 'offend, affect someone with words, facts, etc.' (RBL).

The meaning of the verb *обиждам* 'offend' is an impressive reflection of ancient beliefs. Etymologically, it is associated with the verb *виждам* 'see,

perceive with the eyes’, and the semantic explanation is based on folk notions about the existence of so-called “bad eyes” – “harmful magical influence on man and his economy, causing illness, cooling of family relations, bad harvests, failure, disintegration of the home, and in the most severe cases – death of people and animals” (Levkievskaya 2002). In support of this explanation is adduced the OBulg. *обидѣти, обиждѣ, обидиши*, attested with the meaning ‘do harm, do mischief to someone or something’. Close to the above meanings are those of the cognate Lat. *invidēre* ‘envy, wish evil’, *invidia* ‘envy, ill-will’ (BED 4: 742). Indirect evidence of the verb meaning ‘harm’ lost in modern verb semantics is rom. dial. *obéjdie, obéjdii* ‘danger, misadventure, mischief’ borrowed from Bulgarian (BED 4: 742).

3. 7. Verbs with the meaning ‘slander, calumniate, defame’

Verbs with this meaning can also be divided into several subgroups depending on the initial meaning underlying the secondary ‘slander, calumniate, defame’.

3. 7. 1. Verbs with the initial meaning ‘slubber, pollute, bedaub’

The meaning ‘pollute, besmirch’ can be the basis for the secondary meaning ‘scold’, as already clarified above (section 3. 5. 3.). In addition, however, the figurative meaning ‘slander’ (= ‘make false and defamatory statements damaging to a person’s reputation’) can also arise from the same initial meaning. Such a development is observed in the verbs *калям* fig. decl. ‘deliberately slander, blaspheme vilify, disgrace’ (RBL) (< *калям* ‘cause to become covered in or full of mud’), *петня* ‘slander someone or something by words or actions, undermine their prestige, their authority, expose, discredit, disgrace, dishonor’ (RBL) (< *петня* ‘make stains’), *мърся* ‘defile, stain, profane someone or something by some deed or words’ (RBL) (< *мърся* ‘make dirty’), *чёрня* fig. ‘speak ill of someone, dishonor, shame, blacken someone’s name’ (RBL) (< *чёрня* ‘make something black; blacken’), *очёрням* fig. ‘slander, shame, disgrace, denigrate’ (RBL) (< *очёрням* ‘blacken’), *наплёсquam* fig. pejor. ‘talk or write bad words about someone, slander, denigrate, smear’ (RBL) (< *наплёсquam* ‘coat or mark something messily or carelessly with a greasy or sticky substance’), *цапам* fig. dial. ‘vilify, speak indecent, or ill-considered words’ (RBL) (< *цапам* ‘make dirty’), *нацапам* fig. coll. ‘say bad things about someone, slander, defame’ (RBL) (< *нацапам* ‘make dirty’).

3. 7. 2. Verbs with the initial meaning ‘pierce, puncture’

The figurative meaning ‘slander’ also arises in some verbs with the meaning ‘pierce, puncture’, i.e. ‘injure with something sharp’. Such a development is observed in the verbs *напѣшquam*, *напѣшкам*, *напѣшкувам* ‘slander, disgrace’ (Smolyan, Devin, Madan), ‘slander, delate’ (Satchanli, Gyumurdzhyna), derivative from *пѣшкам* ‘prickle’ (Smolyan, Asenovgrad,

Ardino, Devin; Sachanli, Gyumurdzhina); also in *одунвам* 'slander' (Shumen), derived from *дунвам* 'stab, pierce, drill' (Momino, Varna), *дуня* dial. 'puncture' (RBL), *нашляям* 'slander' (Zarnevo, Drama; Lyaski, Gotse Delchev), which is suggested to be related to an unattested verb **ишля* with the probable meaning 'pierce, puncture'.

3. 7. 3. Verbs with the initial meaning 'make a noise'

The meaning of 'slander' (= 'speak, spread slander against someone', coll. 'divulge someone's fault; report that someone has done something wrong in order to offend him', RBE) regularly develops also on the basis of the semantic feature 'make a noise'. The shift is motivated by the notion of attracting attention to something by making a loud sound, as in the expression *Вдигам шум около нещо* 'make a fuss about something, loudly announce something'. To this subgroup may be assigned the verb *клѐня* coll. 'slander someone, gossip' (RBL), 'slander; spread lies, lie' (Gerov 2: 369). Indicative of the motivation of the semantic shift is the meaning of OBulg. *клепати, клепаж, клепеши* 'make it clear, indicate, display'. The common meaning of *клѐня* 'beat, strike a church or monastery clapper to make a sound' could also be the source for a number of derivatives with the meaning 'slander', some of which are also further formed with expressive suffixes: *клепосвам* 'spread gossip, gossiping' (Asenovgrad), *наклѐпувам* 'speak against someone or slander someone' (Samokov), *наклѐпа, наклѐпвам* 'gossip about, slander' (Pirdop, Haskovo), 'slander' (Smolyan, Xanthi), etc.

Apart from the meaning 'gossip', the verb *клѐня* is also attested with the dialectal meaning 'talk vainly, speak idle talk' (Sofia) with the corresponding nominal derivatives *клѐнчо* 'stupid, chatty person' (Lukovit), *клепатоль* 'a person who talks a lot' (Rakitovo, Peshtera). These meanings represent another direction of semantic development, the basis of which is also the semantic feature '(loud) sound' and which was presented above. One can also assume the presence of certain nuances in the motivational features of the secondary meanings 'speak idle talk/nonsense' and 'slander': in the first case the basis for the shift could be the notion of a permanent, annoying and mostly meaningless sound, while the meaning 'slander' could arise on the basis of the feature 'making a lot of noise about something, drawing attention to something by making a loud sound'.

A similar semantic shift is observed in the verbs *кльокам* 'gossip' (RBL), *кльокарствам* 'spread gossip, to be engaged in gossip' (RBL), cf. and the meanings of the corresponding nouns *кльока* 'a piece of gossip', *кюка* same (Trstenik, Pleven), etc. The semantic feature '(loud) sound' is also motivating for the meanings of *дрѐнкам* 'speak offensively untrue things about someone or something, gossip about someone or something without being right' (RBL) (< *дрѐнкам* 'jingle'), *раздрѐнквам се* coll. pejor. 'disclose, spill the beans', *тропѐра* 'gossip about someone' (Gorna and Dolna Vasilitsa, Ihtiman), *клеветя* 'spread slander against someone' and coll. 'divulge someone's fault; report that someone has done something wrong in order to offend him' (RBL).

3. 8. Etymological studies related to verbs of speaking

Related to the meaning 'speak' are the four etymological studies with which the analytical part of the exposition ends. Some of the verbs presented in them have a well-defined etymology, while different hypotheses can be constructed about the origin of others on the basis of the semantic parallels presented in the study.

3. 8. 1. On the origin of the verb *лапардòсвам* 'chatter' (an attempt at elucidation by means of semantic parallels)

In the first study the etymology of the dialect verb *лапардòсвам*, *лапардòсам* 'chatter' is examined as an example of the fact that semantic parallels can be used to confirm or reject a hypothesis about the origin of a word whose history is not quite clear. Several possible hypotheses about its origin are constructed on the basis of the semantic parallels disclosed so far. The etymological word family of the verb includes some verbal and nominal forms such as *лапàцам* 'talk nonsense; twaddler, chatter idly' (Malko Tarnovo; Montana; Vratsa; Koprivshitsa), 'jabber, palaver, talk nonsense', *лепàцам* 'talk nonsense, rattle' (Koprivshitsa), etc.

3. 8. 2. The meaning of the verb *кàзвам* 'say' as a result of semantic development

The second study traces the history of the verb *кàзвам* and discerns the regularity of the relationship between the meanings 'show up, make myself noticed' and 'say', which is also found in verbs such as *явявам се* 'appear, show up' → *явявам* obs. 'announce, let somebody know', as in the prefixed derivatives *заявявам се* 'make myself seen, noticeable; show myself, appear' → *заявявам* 'announce, say something to someone, usually emphatically or solemnly' (RBL), etc. A parallel semantic development is also observed in the etymological word family of the verb *сòча* 'by a movement, a gesture, a finger, or otherwise draw someone's attention to something, point at'. In the BED it is associated with PIE **sok(w)-*, **sek(w)-* (**sok(u)-*, **sek(u)-*, **soqu-*, **sequ-*) for which the meaning 'say, show' is restored (BED 7: 377). In other Indo-European languages different verbs with the meanings 'speak' have developed from this root: Lith. *sakýti*, *sakaũ* 'speak', *saka* 'tale', Latv. *sacít*, *saku* same, Germ. *sagen* 'say', Eng. *say* same, Gr. *ἐννέπω* 'speak, tell', etc.

3. 8. 3. Meanings of the verb *вàдя* 'slander, defame' and its derivative *обàждам (се)* 'call'

The third etymological study is focused on the meanings of the dialectal verb *вàдя* 'slander, defame' and its derivative *обàждам (се)* 'call', *свàдам* 'cause a quarrel between two or more persons', *свàдя* 'ruining someone's relationship', *свадè* *се* dial. 'start a quarrel with someone', *свàждам* obs. dial. 'cause a quarrel between two or more persons or parties, quarrel', *свàда* 'quarrel', etc. It has been

discerned that the meanings mentioned are not primary to the etymological word family: the verb *ва̀дя* is a continuant of PS **vāditi*, **vādjā* (BED 1: 112), which J. Pokorny connects with the PIE root **au-*, **aued-* 'speak' (Pokorny 1959: 76 – 77). This primary meaning is preserved in some related words such as Gr. *αὐδή* 'sound, voice, speech', Gr. *αὐδάω* 'call, speak', AI *vādati* 'he speaks, says, communicates, utters' (in Pokorni – 'leaves the voice to sound'), *vādáyati* 'sounds, speaks' (BED 1: 112). For the Bulgarian verb, the shift '**make a noise, make something heard**' → '*gossip*', found in other verbs above (Chapter Three, 3. 7. 3.), is assumed

3. 8. 4. On the possible domestic origin of the words *ваджѝя* and *ваджѝшки*

On the basis of the etymological and semantic connections presented within the etymological word family of the verb *ва̀дя* 'slander, defame' the words *ваджѝя* 'reproachful or endearing name for something or somebody, mischief-maker' and *ваджѝшки* 'who / what evokes unpleasant feelings, hostility, mischievous, plaguy' are also related to it. For their origin no sufficiently convincing etymological hypotheses have yet been proposed. Previous attempts to etymologize the words as borrowings from Turkish or Italian are rejected, and arguments for the domestic origin of the words in question are presented.

III. Conclusion

The Conclusion summarizes the most important observations made within the study. It is emphasized that based on the semantic analysis of the verbs discussed in the three chapters, semantic shifts have been disclosed, which can be defined as regular in the Bulgarian language and in a more general typological sense. The parallelism in the observed semantic shifts confirms the theses put forward about the existence of *a diachronic semantic typology*, which should be investigated both in view of the general semantic typology and in view of *the semantic aspect of etymological analysis* in etymological research. It is argued that the identification of diachronic trends and regularities in the semantic development of lexis and their consideration in etymological research would contribute to a more convincing interpretation of the origin of words, especially those that do not have a unified etymology. Systematizing the results of such diachronic semantic studies, on the other hand, would also contribute to the improvement of etymological practice, especially in dealing with the issue of homonyms in lexicographic terms. The semantic shifts identified in the framework of the study, albeit based on a limited fragment of the vocabulary, would in particular also contribute to the optimization of the work on the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary, which covers a huge amount of dialectal material and lexicographical organization on a basis of etymological word families sometimes causes difficulties.

It is also pointed out that the diachronic aspect of semantic analysis can also help in the synchronic interpretation of polysemous verbs in terms of the direction of semantic derivation, as is the case, for example, with *nepà*, whose coll. meaning 'hit' in the RBL is defined as figurative, while in fact from a diachronic point of view it appears to be primary.

IV. Appendix. *Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research*

The semantic shifts detected in the course of the study, supported by all the semantic parallels retrieved, are systematized in a *Catalogue of Semantic shifts identified in the study*. Its compilation was noted as one of the specific goals of our work. It includes 42 semantic shifts and has an open character, i.e. it could be gradually supplemented and expanded on the basis of additional lexical material in order to be used as a guide to possible semantic-derivational processes in diachronic terms in the practical work on the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary.

Contribution summary

1. For the first time in Bulgarian etymology a verb lexicon included in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary is the subject of a monographic study, with emphasis on the semantic aspect of the etymological analysis.

2. The dissertation applies a systematic approach to the study of the semantic evolution of the verbs under consideration, in both possible aspects of the analysis proposed by Zh. Varbot. A semantic reconstruction of the verbs with the recovery of the primary meaning and the clarification of the single stages in the semantic evolution is carried out, on the one hand, within an etymological word family and, on the other hand, within the same lexical-semantic field including verbs from different etymological families. In this respect, the study is a contribution to the etymological study of Bulgarian verbal lexis in methodological terms.

3. Proceeding from the undeniable role of dialectal vocabulary in etymological studies, we rely on a large amount of dialectal linguistic material included in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary to reveal possible regular semantic-derivational processes in the diachronic plan. Thus, we apply both vertical and horizontal approaches of analysis, guided by the conception that dialectal data is “diachrony unfolded in space” (after Tolstoy). The analysis of dialectal material makes it possible to trace different stages in the semantic development of words to their primary meaning, attested often only at the dialectal level. On the other hand, the semantic shifts identified at the dialectal level serve as evidence of suggested possible directions in the semantic evolution of words of uncertain origin.

4. The dissertation applies both diachronic and synchronic research approaches, combining the comparative-historical method with the method of semantic parallels as one of the main typological criteria in the study of diachronic semantic changes. More general typological criteria related to the mechanisms and modes of semantic derivation such as narrowing and broadening of meaning, metaphor, metonymy are also considered. In determination of a certain regularity in semantic diachronic changes, we also proceed from the semantic relations observed at the synchronic level, both with regard to polysemy (and in particular to the semantic structure of the polysemous word) and with regard to so-called semantic homonymy. In elucidating the mechanisms of semantic changes we proceed from the systematicity in lexical polysemy at the synchronic level.

Driven by the belief that the synchronic approach to the study of semantics can also extend the possibilities of diachronic semantic studies, in this work we apply the method of component analysis as one of the main techniques in descriptive semantics. The differentiation of the core and peripheral semantic features existing in the meanings of the verbs under consideration, which give rise to different semantic fields within an etymological family, leads to the

identification of the mechanisms of semantic changes, and this in turn is a contribution to diachronic semantic typology and also to the methodology of semantic reconstruction in etymological research.

5. The semantic shifts found in the process of the analysis are supported by semantic parallels from the Bulgarian language as well as from various other Slavic and Indo-European languages, thus verifying and confirming the assumed logical relations of derivation in synchronic and diachronic terms. In this sense, the study is a contribution to semantic typology in terms of both synchronic lexical studies and diachronic studies in the fields of historical lexicology and etymology.

6. The results of the semantic aspect of the analysis, applied jointly with the phonetic and word-formation aspect in the etymological interpretation of the verbs under consideration, allow to supplement and correct some of the existing explanations in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary and in other sources, as well as to propose new etymological explanations of some of the verbs and related words. In this way the study is a contribution to Bulgarian and Slavic etymology.

7. The systematization of the identified semantic shifts, supported by various semantic parallels, in the *Catalogue of the semantic shifts identified in the course of the research*, would have a concrete application in the elaboration of the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary. The identified shifts and their parallels can serve as evidence in support of one or another etymological hypothesis in the case of words that are obscure in origin, can help in the correct assignment of the heterogeneous dialectal material to a corresponding etymological word family, or dictionary entry, and also in the identification and dictionary representation of etymological and non-etymological homonyms. In this sense, the work is a contribution to lexicographical practice in the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary.

List of Publications

1. Фучеджиева, К. За произхода на някои експресивни глаголи за говорене в българския език (семантични аспекти на анализа) (On the origin of some expressive verbs of speaking in the Bulgarian language. Ssemantic aspects of the analysis). – В: Доклади от Паисиеви четения 2017, Научни трудове, том 55, кн. 1, сб. А, Филология. Пловдив, 2017, 59 – 68.

2. Фучеджиева, К. Семантичен развой на експресивни глаголи със значение 'ям' и 'пия' в българския език (Semantic development of expressive verbs meaning 'eat' and 'drink' in the Bulgarian language). – В: Доклади от Четиринадесетите национални славистични четения „Стереотипът в славянските езици, литература и култури“ (26 – 28 април 2018 г.). Том първи. Езикознание. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“ 2019, 276 – 286.

3. Фучеджиева, К. Семантичен развой при глаголи за движение. Наблюдение върху материал от „Българския етимологичен речник“ (Semantic development in verbs of motion. Observation on material from the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary). – В: Доклади от Международната годишна конференция на Института за български език „Проф. Любомир Андрейчин“ (София, 2020 година), II том. София: Издателство на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2020, 38 – 42.

4. Фучеджиева, К. За произхода на глагола *лапардѡсвам* 'бърборя' (опит за обяснение чрез семантични паралели) (On the origin of the verb *лапардѡсвам* 'chatter'. An attempt at elucidation by means of semantic parallels). – В: Българският език – исторически и съвременни аспекти“. Сборник в чест на 140 години от рождението на акад. Стефан Младенов. София: ИБЕ, 2020, 275 – 282.

5. Фучеджиева, К. За възможния домашен произход на *ваджия* и *ваджийки* (On the possible domestic origins of *ваджия* and *ваджийки*). – Дзяло, е-списание в областта на хуманитаристиката, год. IX, 2021, бр. 21.

Bibliography:

1. **Abayev 1986:** Абаев, В. Как можно улучшить этимологические словари (How etymological dictionaries can be improved). – In: Этимология, Москва, изд. „Наука“, 1984, 7–27
2. **Apresyan 1974:** Апресян, Ю. Лексическая семантика. Синонимические средства языка (Lexical semantics. Synonymic means of language). – Москва, изд. „Наука“, 1974.
3. **BED 1-8-:** Български етимологичен речник. Т. 1 – 8– (Bulgarian etymological dictionary. V. 1 – 8 –). – София, Издателство на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 1971 – 2017.
4. **Berezovich 2014:** Березович, Е. Русская лексика на общеславянском фоне: семантико-мотивационная реконструкция (Russian vocabulary on a pan-Slavic background: a semantic-motivational reconstruction). – Москва, изд. „Русский фонд содействия образованию и науке“, 2014.
5. **BL 2013:** Българска лексикология (Bulgarian Lexicology). Крумова-Цветкова, Л., Д. Благоева, С. Колковска, Е. Пернишка, М. Божилова. – София, Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2013.
6. **Blanár 1984:** Blanár, V. Lexikálno-sémantická rekonstrukcia. Bratislava, 1984.
7. **Boyadzhiev 1995:** Бояджиев, Ж. Увод в езикованието (Introduction to Linguistics). Пловдив, изд. „Хр. Г. Данов“, 1995.
8. **Buck 1949:** Buck, C. A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages. A contribution to the history of ideas. Chicago, University of Chicago Press 1949.
9. **Coşeriu 1990:** Косериу, Е. Лекции по общо езикованието (Lectures in General Linguistics). – София, изд. „Наука и изкуство“, 1990.
10. **Deykova 2004:** Дейкова, Хр. Проблеми при производните в етимологична статия от гнездови тип (върху материал от БЕР) (Problems of Derivatives in an Etymological Entry of Word Family Type Type (on Material from Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary) – В: Български език 51/4, 74–78, 2004.
11. **Deykova 2010:** Дейкова, Хр. За някои проблеми при разработване на етимологична статия от гнездови тип (върху материал от БЕР) (On some Problems in Elaborating of an Etymological Entry of Word Family Type (on Material from Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary) – Български език 57/4, 2010, 62–67.
12. **Deykova 2015:** Deykova, Hr. Slavic continuants of the ProtoSlavic ablaut sequence **tur-*, **tʰr-*, **tyr-*. – In: Studia etymologica Brunensia 18, Etymological Research into Old Church Slavonic. Proceedings of the Etymological Symposium Brno 2014, 9-11 September 2014. Brno. Praha, “Nakladatelství Lidové noviny”, 2015, 113 – 127.
13. **EDSL:** Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праславянский лексический фонд (Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages: Proto-Slavic Lexical Stock) < <https://etymolog.ruslang.ru/index.php?act=essja> > [24.06.2023].
14. **Georgiev 1958:** Георгиев, Вл. Въпроси на българската етимология (Issues of Bulgarian Etymology). София, Издателство на БАН, 1958.
15. **GeroV:** Геров, Н. Речник на българския език (Dictionary of the Bulgarian language). – София, изд. „Български писател“, Т. 1– 5 (1975 – 1978).
16. **Greenberg 1970:** Greenberg, J., C. Osgood, J. Jenkins. (1970). Memorandum on language universals. In: New in Linguistics (V) Moscow, „Progress“, pp. 31 – 44.
17. **Havlová 1979:** Havlová, E. Zum Problem der Homonymie in der etymologischen Forschung. – Zeitschrift für Slawistik, Bd. 24, Heft 1, 51–54.
18. **Kartsevsky 1965:** Карцевский, С. Об асимметричном дуализме лингвистического знака (On the asymmetrical dualism of the linguistic sign). – В: История языкознания XIX-XX веков в очерках и извлечениях, 2, Звегинцев В. (ред.). Москва, 1965, 85–93 <<http://project.phil.spbu.ru/lib/data/ru/karcevskiy/dualizm.html>>.

19. **Kasabov 2006:** Касабов, И. Граматика на семантиката (A Grammar of Semantics). – София, Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“, 2006.
20. **Kasabov 2013:** Касабов, И. Българска лексикология и фразеология. Том 3. Проблеми на общата лексикология (Bulgarian lexicology and phraseology. Volume 3. Problems of general lexicology). – София, Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2013.
21. **Katz 1981:** Катц, Дж. Семантическа теория (Semantic Theory). – Новое в зарубежной лингвистике, 10, Лингвистическая семантика. Москва, изд. „Прогресс“, 1981, 33 – 49.
22. **Koleva-Zlateva 1998:** Колева-Златева, Ж. Семантична реконструкция. Методологични аспекти (Semantic reconstruction. Methodological aspects). Велико Търново, ИК „Знак ‘94“, 1998.
23. **Kurkina 1971:** Куркина, Л. К реконструкции и этимологии некоторых праславянских глагольных основ и отглагольных имен. I (Towards the reconstruction and etymology of some Proto-Slavic verb stem and verbal nouns. I) – In: Этимология, Москва, изд. „Наука“, 1971, 3–19.
24. **Kurkina 2021:** Куркина, Л. Славянское слово во времени и пространстве (The Slavic language in time and space). – Москва, изд. „Индрик“, 2021 г.
25. **Leech 1981:** Leech, G. Semantics: The Study of Meaning. – Bungay, Suffolk, Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press) Ltd, 1981.
26. **Levkievskaya 2002:** Левкиевская, Е. „Сглаз, порча“ в Славянская мифология („Evil eye, spoilage“) in Slavic mythology. – В: Энциклопедический словарь. А – Я. Москва, изд. Международные отношения, 2002, 429.
27. **LIV 2001:** Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primarstammbildungen (Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmerle und Helmut Rix). Weisbaden 2001.
28. **Lyons 1977:** John Lyons, Semantics, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
29. **Meyer 1891:** Meyer, G. Etymologisches Wörterbuch der albanesischen Sprache. Strassburg, 1891
30. **Němec 1980:** Němec, I. Rekonstrukce lexikálního vývoje. Praha, 1980.
31. **Pernishka 1993:** Пернишка, Е. За системността в лексикалната многозначност на съществителните имена (On systematicity in lexical polysemy of nouns). – София, Издателство на БАН, 1993 г.
32. **Pokorny 1959:** Pokorny, J. Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bern, 1959.
33. **Reiter 1964:** Reiter, N. Der dialekt von Titov Veles. Berlin, 1964.
34. **RBL:** Речник на българския език (електронен ресурс) (Dictionary of the Bulgarian language – electronic resource) < <https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/> > [24.06.2023].
35. **Todorov 1994:** Тодоров, Т. Ат. Етимологични етюди. Произход на български думи (Etymological studies. Origins of Bulgarian words). – София, изд. „Диос“, 1994.
36. **Todorov 1995:** Тодоров, Т. Ат. Диалектният български глагол хитам ’бързам’: произход, сродни думи, семантични паралели (The dialectal Bulgarian verb *хитам* ’hurry’: origin, related words, semantic parallels). – Български език, 45, 1995, 4, 321 – 325.
37. **Todorov 2002:** Тодоров, Т. Ат. Старобългарското анафорично местоимение и неговите новобългарски застъпници. Произход на формите (Old Bulgarian anaphoric pronoun and its New Bulgarian continuants. Origin of the forms). – София, Академично издателство „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 2002 г.
38. **Todorov 2003:** Относно произхода на българските глаголи *отмалявам* (в св. *отмалея*), *премалявам* (в св. в. *премалея*) и на други форми (On the origin of the Bulgarian verbs *отмалявам* (perf. *отмалея*), *премалявам* (perf. *премалея*) and other forms). – In: Studia etymologica Brunensia 2, Praha, 2003, 127–136.

39. **Tolstaya 2008:** Толстая, Св. Пространство слова. Лексическая семантика в общеславянской перспективе (The Space of the Word. Lexical semantics in the pan-Slavic perspective). – Москва, изд. „Индрик“, 2008.
40. **Tolstoy 1968:** Толстой, Н. Некоторые проблемы сравнительной славянской семасиологии (Some Problems of Comparative Slavic Semasiology).. – В: Славянское языкознание. VI Международной съезд славистов. – Москва, 1968.
41. **Trubachev 1980:** Трубачев, О. Реконструкция слов и их значений (On reconstruction of words and their meanings). – Вопросы языкознания 29, 3, изд. „Наука“, 1980, 3–14.
42. **Ufimtseva 1986:** Уфимцева, А. Лексическое значение (принцип семиологического описания лексики) (Lexical meaning – the principle of semiological lexical description). – Москва, изд. „Наука“ 1986.
43. **Vaillant 1974:** Vaillant, A. La Grammaire comparée des langues slaves, 4: La formation des noms. Paris, 1974.
44. **Varbot 1986:** Варбот, Ж. О возможностях реконструкции этимологического гнезда на семантических основаниях (On the possibilities of reconstructing an etymological word family on semantic grounds). – В: Этимология. Москва, изд. „Наука“, 1984, 33–40.
45. **Varbot 2012a:** Варбот, Ж. Из семантического опыта этимологии (From the semantic experience of etymology). – В: Исследования по русской и славянской этимологии Москва – Санкт Петербург, изд. „Нестор – История“, 2012, 69 – 75.
46. **Varbot 2012b:** Варбот, Ж. Этимологические гнезда и лексикосемантические поля в диахронии и синхронии (Etymological word families and lexico-semantic fields in diachrony and synchrony). – В: Исследования по русской и славянской этимологии. Москва – Санкт Петербург, изд. „Нестор–История“, 2012, 145–153.
47. **Varbot 2012c:** Варбот, Ж. Индоевропейские и праславянские архаизмы в славянских нерегулярных преобразованиях (Indo-European and Proto-Slavic archaisms in Slavic irregular transformations. In: Studies in Russian and Slavic Etymology). – В: Исследования по русской и славянской этимологии, Москва – Санкт Петербург, изд. „Нестор-История“, 2012, 165–170.
48. **Vlajić-Popović 2002:** Историјска семантика глагола ударања у српском језику: преко етимологије до модела семасиолошког речника (Historical semantics of SCr. verbs with the principal meaning 'to hit, to beat'). – Београд, изд. Институт за српски језик САНУ, 2002..
49. **Vučković 2013:** Вучковић, М. Континуанте прасловенских основа *gъb-, *gyb- и *gub- у српском језику (Reflexes of the Proto-Slavic bases *gъb-, *gyb-, *gub- in the Serbian language). – Београд, 2013.
50. **Wierzbicka 1980:** Wierzbicka, A. Lingua Mentalis: The Semantics of Natural Language, Sydney, Academic Press, 1980.
51. **Zalizniak 2001:** Зализняк, А. Семантическая деривация в синхронии и диахронии: проект „Каталога семантических переходов“ (Semantic derivation in synchrony and diachrony: a project of „The Catalogue of semantic shifts“). – In: Вопросы языкознания 2001, 2, 13–25.