The Konikovo Gospel: Konikovsko evangelie (Bibl. Patr. Alex. 268). Jouko Lindstedt, Ljudmil Spasov, and Juhani Nuorluoto, eds. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 2008. 439 pp., 82 pp. color plates. [*Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum*, 125.]

Reviewed by Joseph Schallert

Since its recent discovery in the Patriarchal Library in Alexandria in 2003, the *Konikovo Gospel* (henceforth KG) has been the object of intensive study by a team of Finnish and Macedonian scholars (headed respectively by Jouko Lindstedt and Ljudmil Spasov and joined by the American Balkanist Victor Friedman). Although KG's history and potential significance were made known to the scholarly world by Lindstedt (2006), little of this collective research has been published. The book under review (henceforth KG-2008) now presents not only the full Greek and Macedonian texts of KG in a variety of useful formats, but also the findings of the research teams, which pertain to a range of subjects, including the authorship, function, graphemics, phonology, morphology, lexicon, and dialect features of this intriguing document, as well as its cultural-historical significance. Although KG is written in Greek script and one of its authors refers to the language of the translation as "Bulgarian", it is in fact "the oldest known text of greater scope that directly reflects the living Slavic dialects of what is today Greek Macedonia" (Introduction, p. 9) and also the oldest known Gospel translation in what we would today term Modern Macedonian. As such, it is a document of considerable importance for the history of the Macedonian language. KG-2008 will prove to be a valuable resource not only for specialists working in the latter field, but also for those with an interest in Balkan Slavic dialectology, Greco-Macedonian translation, the rendering of Balkan Slavic through Greek orthography, and the production of both Greek and Slavic vernacular Gospels in the Balkans.[1]

---

[1] The publication of KG-2008 also has a certain significance within the sphere of Greco-Macedonian cultural cooperation, since (as the *Introduction*, p. 10, acknowledges) the research which led to the publication of this work would not have been possible

In composition, KG-2008 is a somewhat heterogeneous anthology rather than a centrally coordinated monograph. This has led to some duplication of descriptive effort and the inclusion of some topics peripheral to KG itself, particularly in chapter 5 ("Study of the Macedonian Text"). In addition, despite the undeniable contributions which KG-2008 makes to our knowledge, the level of scholarship in some sections of chapter 5 is at times uneven. One chiefly regrets that, with the exception primarily of Lindstedt (Introduction and sec. 5.9, especially pp. 396–97), the authors make comparatively little reference to a previous landmark in this field, the published edition of the Paris manuscript of the Kulakia Gospel (Mazon and Vaillant 1938), which includes a detailed and valuable linguistic commentary by Vaillant (pp. 16–250). Closer study of the latter would have been all the more beneficial inasmuch as KG and the Kulakia Gospel share fundamental similarities in language, provenance, date of origin, script, and content (the Kulakia Gospel includes all but one of the lections found in KG, in addition to many others).

Due to the complexity of KG as a historical document, I summarize certain key facts and findings which are presented chiefly in chapter 3 (by Lindstedt and Wahlström) and sec. 5.9 (by Lindstedt). First, KG is a late 18th–early 19th centuries bilingual manuscript of 39 folia, which consists of a vernacular Greek Gospel *aprakos* lectionary rendered in facing columns into a local Macedonian idiom of the Lower Vardar region (spoken to the northwest of Solun/Thessaloniki) by an anonymous translator who used Greek script (see ch. 3 and sec. 5.9). Second, KG contains a number of interlinear and marginal emendations written in a second hand, which can be identified with that of Pavel Božigropski (ca. 1800–71, henceforth PB), a widely traveled ecclesiastical activist (see sec. 5.10) and native of the Lower Vardar village of Konikovo (Greek Dytiko) (called Kónikvo, in the extant pronunciation of Macedonian speakers in the nearby village of Griva; see Introduction, p. 9). Third, PB evidently intended to have the revised lectionary published in Solun/Thessaloniki by Kirijak Držiloviḱ, but succeeded only in having the first four lections of the Slavic translation printed, without the Greek original, near the end of 1852 (see again ch. 3 and 5.9). Fourth, in 1917 Jordan Ivanov (1917: 267–68) produced a facsimile of

---

without the friendly assistance rendered to the Finnish team by the Patriarch of Alexandria, Theodoros II.

the title page of these same printed lections (but not the lections them-selves) and referred to the text as a "Sunday gospel" (since this brief but important reference is mentioned, but not quoted in KG-2008, we provide it here: "Prez 1852 g. bilo pečatano v Solun nedelno evangelie po govora v s. Konikovo…"). The ensuing transcriptions by various scholars of all or part of this text did nothing to dispel what Lindstedt and Wahlström (ch. 3, p. 235) characterize as the "myth" of a whole printed book. This combination of circumstances led most subsequent researchers to make two erroneous assumptions: (i) that the 1852/1853 printed text was an *extended* Gospel lectionary of which Ivanov had published only a sample (despite the cautionary remarks of Jireček 1876 and Šaldev 1931) and (ii) that PB was the original translator. The publication and analysis of KG lays to rest all such misconceptions. Fifth, as Lindstedt felicitously observes (sec. 5.9, p. 393), we thus in ef-fect have *two* KG texts, the first of which is represented by the uned-ited version of the original KG manuscript (as produced by the first anonymous hand, ca. 1800), while the other is the same manuscript as edited by the hand of PB at an unknown subsequent date (ca. 1850?) and also by the printed excerpt which PB published in 1852–53.

Chapter 1, "Introduction and the Description of the Manuscript" (Jouko Lindstedt, Ljudmil Spasov, pp. 9–17; Macedonian version "Voved i opis na rakopisot", pp. 17–27) introduces the manuscript of KG and its problematic history. We learn here that the original KG manuscript contained perhaps 136 pages or 68 folia (of which 39 folia have survived) and that prior to the manuscript's (re)discovery by Mika Hakkarainen at the end of 2003, it had already been described as early as 1945 by Moschonas in a catalogue of the Patriarchal Library. Although the authors refer the reader to chapter 3 and 5.9 for a full discussion of the textual issues, they here provide two key details not mentioned elsewhere: (i) the handwriting of the second hand in KG (the "editing" hand which produced the interlinear and marginal emendations) is very similar to that of a Church Slavonic apostle which PB copied in 1841 (see photocopy of sample, p. 13), and (ii) al-though the date of the KG manuscript is not indicated in the document itself, nor can its watermark be precisely determined, the style and layout of the manuscript point to the last quarter of the 18th century, and thus the work may actually predate Hadži Daniil of Moschopolis' well-known *Lexikon Tetraglosson* of 1802 (p. 13). In support of this latter estimate, Lindstedt and Spasov (with reference to sec. 5.4.25) also ad-

duce the preservation of x in the text, since available textual evidence for most other regions of Macedonia indicates that weakening and loss of -x- was in process in the 18th century (see Koneski 2001: 93). Note, however, that even the Kulakia Gospel (a document of Lower Vardar provenance from ca. 1863), still preserves this sound in auslaut and partially restores it in medial position, despite extensive evidence for the loss of -x- (see Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 46–48).

Chapter 2, "Edition of the Manuscript/Izdanie na rakopisot", 2.1 "Transcription of the Greek Text", and "Basic Transcription of the Macedonian Text" (2.1 by Martti Leiwo and Maria Basdekis, 2.2 by Jouko Lindstedt and Max Wahlström, pp. 27–179), constitutes the solid core of KG-2008, which provides ample and reliable material for future research. It consists of a full transliteration of the manuscript Greek into modern Greek printed characters, faced by a modified Latin-character phonetic transliteration of the manuscript's full Macedonian text. Both transliterations are meticulous and accurate. The layout is well designed to facilitate comparison of the two texts. In addition, each of the texts is provided with an *apparatus criticus* which captures palaeographic details of the original manuscript and all of the emendations made by PB in the Macedonian text for the apparent purpose of preparing a "print-ready" version (see chapter 3). Provision of these emendations in the *apparatus* greatly facilitates linguistic comparison of the two hands.

Section 2.3, "Dijalektna transcripcija na makedonskiot tekst spored prvata i vtorata raka" (by Mito Argirovski, Elka Jačeva, Violeta Krstevska, Ljudmil Spasov, and Marija Čičeva-Aleksiḱ, Text pp. 179–224, Notes pp. 224–35), consists of a Cyrillic "dialect transcription" of the two Slavic Macedonian texts which can be generated from the manuscript. The text of the first hand is displayed on the left, while that of the second hand (PB's) is on the right with PB's emendations shown in boldface. Both texts are moderately interpreted in the light of the contemporary standard Macedonian alphabet and Enidže Vardar dialect features which could not be rendered by the Greek alphabet, such as the distinction between /a/ and /ă/ (where /ă/ designates a schwa-like vowel, equivalent to Bulgarian /ъ/, as per the current practice in Macedonian dialectology).

Chapter 3, "The Printed Pages" (by Jouko Lindstedt and Max Wahlström, pp. 235–49), is devoted to the four lections with title page which were published in Thessaloniki in 1852–53 as a monolingual

Slavic text rendered with Greek characters. This material has since been available to scholars only in various transcriptions, some partial, others complete, but all of which contain inaccuracies. Here the complete text is conveyed in two formats. The first is a photo reprint of a hitherto unpublished copy which is preserved in the Šafařík collection of Greek publications at the Czech National Museum (first identified by Danova in 2005). This copy is critical, since the printed pages which had been kept in the Sofia Ethnographic Museum were lost during the Second World War. The second format presents the text in parallel columns in the original Greek letters and a Latin alphabet transcription. The authors also cite interesting evidence from the newspaper *Carigradski vestnik* (1860) to show that the term "Macedonian" was used locally to refer to the language spoken by Slavs in the vicinity of Thessaloniki.

The title page of the printed text is itself a document of considerable interest. It declares that the lectionary (*evangelie*) is "printed in the Bulgarian language" and "copied and corrected (*prepisano i diortosano*) by me, Pavel Hieromonakh, a protosingel of the Holy Sepulchre, born (in the diocese of) Voden, the village of Konikovo". The authors take pains to show that (contrary to assumptions by some previous scholars) the latter clause cannot be taken to mean that PB was the original translator. Of particular linguistic note here is the form μπογαρσκοιγεζικ, which Lindstedt and Wahlström transcribe as *bugarski jezik* (although elsewhere Lindstedt, p. 394, and Friedman, p. 387, employ the more cautiously accurate *bogarski*).

Chapter 4, "Study of the Greek texts" (by Martti Leiwo, pp. 249–57), will be of benefit to the Slavist with some knowledge of New Testament Greek but no prior acquaintance with subsequent vernacular Greek translations. It summarizes the history of Greek vernacular Bible translations, then proceeds to a cogent discussion of the palaeographic evidence pertaining to the possible date of the Greek version which served as the basis for the Greek text in KG. Leiwo first demonstrates that the KG Greek text is closer to the 1710 translation by Anastasios Mikhail than to Seraphim's 1703 revision of Maximos Kallioupolitis' landmark version. Leiwo then notes that the last translation in the lineage of the 1710 version was published in 1810 and that even though the two editions are "almost identical" there are actually three forms which can connect KG to the 1810 edition rather than that of 1710. He states emphatically that the new and "totally different"

translation of 1830 could not have served as the basis for the Greek of KG. He thus concludes that the period 1810–30 is our best guess for KG. This estimate is somewhat later than the one proposed by Lindstedt and Spasov (see above, pp. 12–13).

The scope of chapter 5, "Study of the Macedonian Text" (pp. 257–431), is broader than the title suggests, since it contains a fairly extensive description of the Enidže Vardar dialect (sec. 5.3) and a prolonged historical survey of the Macedonian literary language (sec. 5.10), neither of which pertain directly to the Macedonian text of KG. There is considerable overlap in the treatment of topics pertaining to the language of KG and its relation to Macedonian dialects.

Section 5.1, "Graphemics" (by Max Wahlström, pp. 257–67), is a concise and informative account of how the Greek alphabet was used to render most but not all of the phonetic features of the Lower Vardar dialect which served as the primary vehicle for the composition of KG. In general, for consonants KG has recourse to Greek digraphs only when necessary. Thus, Gk δ and γ render Mac /d/ and /g/, respectively (rather than ModGk voiced fricatives, contrast ModGk $\nu\tau$ = d, $\gamma\kappa$ = g), whereas Gk β = Mac /v/ and $\mu\pi$ = /b/. Of particular note is the use of an iota ligature to denote soft consonants before non-front vowels (e.g., $\kappa o \upsilon \kappa \iota$-$\alpha$ = kuḱa/kukja, p. 260) and word-initial position (e.g., ι-$\alpha\zeta\dot\eta\tau\zeta\eta$ = jazíci), a trait which cannot be attributed to Greek tradition but instead indicates familiarity with Church Slavonic. Voiced and voiceless affricates are not distinguished from one another (as Wahlström observes, p. 261, this would be only a small impediment for the native speaker, since the voiced affricates occur rarely in the text), while hushing consonants are distinguished from sibilants by a mark placed after the following vowel and consisting of an arc (‿) with a superimposed dot. (Thus, Slavic c/dz = Gk $\tau\zeta$, č/dž = Gk $\tau\zeta$ + arc, š = σ + arc, ž = ζ + arc). On the other hand, the writing of vowels betrays the influence of Greek in the sense that Mac /i/ is designated by the full range of Greek options representing the legacy of earlier shifts and mergers (ι, η, $\varepsilon\iota$, $o\iota$, υ). Neither the original translator nor PB make any consistent effort to distinguish /a/ from /ă/ (p. 259–60). This contrasts with the graphemic system subsequently employed in the Kulakia Gospel, where some attempt is made to render a schwa-like vowel in the reflexes of the back nasal and syllabic liquids (see Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 20–21). Wahlström (p. 265) also notes crucial paleographic details which distinguish PB's hand from that of the original translator, e.g.,

different colored ink, the ligatures <ατ>, <δι>, etc., even though the sum of PB's interventions still does not suffice to reconstruct his paleographic system as a whole. In his discussion of the inconsistent notation of double accent, Wahlström (p. 263) claims that the single notable type of exception is the occurrence of trisyllabic noun plus clitic (e.g., *učenícité mu*), but the phenomenon is also common in sequences composed of the imperative sg. + clitic (e.g., *prémestí sa* 57). [2]

Section 5.2, "Phonology" (by Juhani Nuorluoto, pp. 267–77), provides a compact, informative description of the reflexes of those elements of the Proto-Macedonian phonological system which occur in KG, with some reference to the broader context of Macedonian dialects, followed by a brief synchronic summary of word stress. The derivation from a proto-system renders a critical service to the reader, since diachrony of this time depth is otherwise almost completely lacking in sections 5.3 (on the Enidže Vardar dialect) and 5.4 (a comparative linguistic analysis of the Enidže Vardar dialect and KG). Nuorluoto wisely refrains from specifically identifying the village of Konikovo itself as KG's dialect base, thereby recanting (p. 268, fn. 1) his earlier claim (Nuorluoto 2003). One can only agree with Nuorluoto's general conclusion (pp. 267–68) that the Lower Vardar region to the south of Kukuš and to the east of Voden remains the best approximation of this base, although the summary introduction offers no specific proof to support this claim (perhaps the Voden dialect is excluded because of its consistent variable *-ăr-* reflex, to which Nuorluoto refers on p. 273). The description of "the main sources of information about the Lower Vardar dialect complex" makes no reference to the extensive late 19th and early 20th century literature on the subject (see my discussion of sec. 5.4), nor to Peev's (1979) major study of the Dojran dialect. It should also be made clear that only two or three of the "ten Southern Macedonian" points in FO 1981 are situated in the Lower Vardar region (Furka/Gevgelija, Kroncelevo/Voden, and, marginally, Tremno/ Kajlar, the inclusion of which would also require mention of Drvošanov 1993).

Nuorluoto demonstrates how the development of the vocalic system reflected in KG is consistent with that of Lower Vardar dialects. Thus, in stressed position, the principal reflexes are as follows: (i) *ǫ >

---

[2] When citing forms from KG, I list the page of the *original manuscript* rather than the page of KG-2008.

schwa /ǎ/ (although the graphemic rendering of this reflex is ambiguous, Nuorluoto observes that the modern dialect evidence supports it overwhelmingly, to which one may add the testimony of the Kulakia Gospel), with the probable exception of /a/ in suffixes and morphological categories (the phenomenon is in fact typical of Southeast Macedonian as a whole and even occurs in Sub-Balkan Bulgarian dialects, see Stojkov 1968: 20); (ii) where vocalized *ъ > o (Nuorluoto, p. 269, notes the rarity of examples, citing only *sonut* and *sobrani*, to which one can add *né sa sopnûva* [*sъ-pъn-*] 'does not stumble', 112); (iii) stressed *ę > e; (iv) stressed *ě > e (Nuorluoto does not preclude the possibility that the local dialect had a broad pronunciation of the reflex of *jat'*, but there is no textual evidence for this, in contradistinction to the 16th c. lexicon of the Kostur dialect published in Giannelli and Vaillant 1958); (v) *ṛ > ăr/ră (cf. *sárce*, *utfárli ~ prástut*, vs. Russian Church Slavic *er*, cf. *mertvite*), *ḷ > ăl, attested in only one root (cf. *pálni*, *sa napalní* vs. RuChSl *ol*, cf. *ispolnénietó*; the Kulakia Gospel testifies to *ăl/lă* as the normal mid-19th c. Lower Vardar reflexes under stress, cf. *kĭ́lni*, *kạlná ~ sḷ́ínci̧*, *mḷạknáa*; Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 25).

For vowels in unstressed position other than auslaut, Nuorluoto notes the occurrence of vowel reduction in the case of *e > i ("the majority of cases") and *o > u ("tends to be reduced"), and justifiably assumes the same is "highly probable" for * a > ă (the modern Lower Vardar dialect evidence warrants this assumption, even though the distinction cannot be rendered in KG's graphemic notation). Regarding unstressed vowels in auslaut, Nuorluoto (p. 269) notes (with reference only to *e) that the reduction to -i is "slightly controversial" in the dialectological material, but that in KG the second hand "nearly always" restores unstressed *e in this position. In fact, the level of reduction of *e* in auslaut in the first hand of KG exceeds that of most Lower Vardar dialects (see Peev 1979: 18–20), but does not extend to as many morphological categories as we observe in the modern Enidže Vardar dialect (notably the *-ove* plural, sec. 5.3, p. 284, and, in comparison to eastern Enidže Vardar, the 1pl and 2pl of the verb, sec. 5.3, p. 300). Thus, by correcting *i* to *e* in auslaut (in contradistinction to his far less thoroughgoing restoration of *o*), PB only brings KG into the regional mainstream. Unstressed *ę is also said to be reduced to *i* 'in some positions' (*sfétiut* 'the holy one' is mistakenly listed here, p. 270). These general remarks are accurate as far as they go, except that reduction of unstressed *ę is attested in virtually all positions, including

auslaut (cf. post-tonic *mésice* 28, *ímito* 45, *vrémi* passim, pre-tonic *devit-diséttu*; for the stress of the latter, compare BCS *devedèseti* and Ru *vos'midesjátyj*). However, reference should have been made to the fact that even in non-auslaut there is considerable variation within each hand and between the two hands according to morphological environment (e.g., the reduction of *e* in auslaut, regardless of its origin, varies according to category, from non-existent in masc. pl. *-ove,* to rare in 1pl and 2pl verbal forms, to quite common in neut. *e*). In general, Nuorluoto is careful to distinguish between the usage of the two hands in KG, but does not seem to take into account the possibility that some of the differences in this usage are due at least in part to small differences in their respective dialect bases. Thus, at one point (p. 271) it is claimed that "in the dialect of the Konikovo Gospel […] the vowels /e/ and /u/ [JS: a misprint for /o/] tend to be reduced even in open final syllables", even though the treatment of /e/ (and even, albeit to a far lesser degree, of /o/) in this position in the two hands is actually quite different. The discussion of unstressed **o* omits one interesting phenomenon, namely the sporadic occurrence of *o* for unstressed *u* in the 2nd hand (that of PB, e.g., *rébrutó-mu > rébrutó-mo* 38).

Of particular interest is Nuorluoto's assertion that the *jat'* reflex is never subject to vowel reduction (in contradistinction to the front nasal vowel) and that therefore at the time when vowel reduction occurred, the reflexes of the front nasal vowel and *jat'* must have still been distinct (in the sense that **ě* still had a low articulation, whereas the reflex of **ę* was raised). In support of this claim, Nuorluoto cites the verbal forms *begaá, izlekuvá, sejál, trebúva,* and *veruvá* (this list could be slightly expanded). However, a search of the text of KG uncovered one exception, cf. *sa utdilí* 'separated himself from them, left them, departed' 36 < **ot-děliti*. Further, if one looks at verbal roots containing **e* and **ę*, we find the same unreduced reflex (e.g., **e > dunesé* 10, 28, 66, etc., **ę > gledáïte* 42, 52, etc.). Once again there is only one exception, 3sg pr. **pečali- > pičále* 46. Thus the apparent difference in the treatment of the unstressed reflexes of **ě* and **ę, *e* is found only in a few commonly occurring words (typically numerals) which do not include forms with *jat'* in unstressed position (e.g., **e > idín* passim, *idná* 42, 68 ~ *edín* passim; **ę > devitdiséttu* 42 ~ *dévet* 42, 43, *déset* 10, 57, *-ettu* 67, 111), as well as in a small number of desinences, only one of which continues *jat'* (cf. consistent lack of reduction in *góre* 'upward" (6x)—to be kept dis-

tinct from 3sg *gori*?—vs. variation in neut. *ímito* passim ~ *íme* 117, 120, *vrémi* passim ~ *vréme* 30, 64, 68, 70, *vrémitu* 50, 61, *vrémito* 62).

With further respect to unstressed syllables, Nuorluoto makes the important observation (p. 273) that with a few lexicalized exceptions (such as *zardi* < **zaradi*, *kolku* < **koliko*) neither hand of KG exhibits the typical Lower Vardar dialect feature of vowel elision, which occurs in the modern dialects with particular frequency in the medial (semantically redundant) syllable of articular forms of nouns (e.g., *žénta*, *détto*, *vulóvto*). Nominal forms of this kind are also absent in the Kulakia Gospel, even though the latter occasionally reflects elision of the unstressed root vowel in the verbs **donese-* and **otgovori-*, cf. aor. *dunsóh*, pf. *dunsél* vs. pres. *dunése-*, aor. *ugvorí*, pf. *ugvoríle* (Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 42).

In his discussion of the reflexes of **ę*, Nuorluoto claims that, when jotated, this vowel yields the reflex *ja* (or *jă*?). As evidence thereof, Nuorluoto cites the forms *jazíci* (36), *jazicitu/jazícite* (111). Since the usual reflex of **językъ* in SEMac dialects is actually *ezik/izk/iziḱ* (cf. also Kulakia Gospel *iziḱ[jut]* Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 343), the KG forms require special discussion. Nuorluoto's appeal to a similar "special reduction" of /e/ (*sic!*) in the neighboring Voden dialect of Kroncelevo [FO 1981: 796] is groundless, since the latter is specifically limited to the position before the sonorants /l, r, n/, cf. *vétər*, *órəł* (FO 1981: 784).

As an example of the "epenthetic" or "secondary" *jer* Nuorluoto cites *sam* [*săm*] < **esmъ* (p. 269). This accurately represents the usual reflex (cf. also *vétar* 54, *vétarut* 47, 55bis), but *ógenut* (56, 76) is of greater diagnostic value, since the presence of a front epenthetic vowel in the case of **ognъ* is a characteristic (but not exclusive) feature of Lower Vardar dialects; cf. *ógin* Dojran (Peev 1979: 32), Kukuš (Peev 1987: 102).

The discussion of the development of consonants includes the following items of particular importance: (i) the preponderance of **tj/*kt'*, **dj > ḱ, ǵ*, cf. *megju* (passim), *isvagja* (99), *nokjata* (105), *ne ispagja* (109), *naogjaši/-še* (147), but also *Naprežen ut soborut* (Gk *arxōntas*) (155) (as in LitMac *naprežen*) and (ii) the frequent assimilation of *-dn- > -(n)n-* in the first hand (the chief exceptions are 3sg aor. *padná* 58bis and 3sg pr. *sédni* 44, 2pl pr. *sédnite* 45), which the second hand (that of PB) regularly corrects to *-dn-* (p. 273). The common occurrence of *ḱ* and *ǵ* as the reflexes of **tj/kt'* and **dj* fixes 1800 as our earliest approximate date for the penetration of this northern feature (attested also in the Kulakia Gospel) to the lower reaches of the Vardar valley, which appears to

have served as one major conduit for the spread of this development (see Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 54–58). With respect to the manner assimilation of the voiced dental stop, it should be emphasized that this is not generally typical of Lower Vardar dialects (as noted by Lindstedt, sec. 5.9, p. 398).

Nuorluoto's brief summary in "Accent" (sec. 5.2.4) cites data from thematic *e*-verbs to illustrate that KG exhibits the important morphophonemic opposition of stem stress in the present (*dáde*) vs. desinential stress in the aorist (*dadé*). While introducing this typical East Macedonian trait, Nuorluoto adduces the modern dialect examples: *zafáti* (present), *zafatí* (aorist), and *záfati* ("imperfect"). The last-mentioned form (with initial stress) must be intended to represent the imperative sg. rather than any form of the imperfect. The resulting three-fold stress distinction is indeed very common in the east, with the general exception of the north (Kumanovo, Kriva Palanka, Kratovo), where the imperative exhibits root stress (as in the present).

Section 5.3, "The Enidže Vardar Dialect" (by Maksim Karanfilovski, pp. 277–313), is devoted, as its title indicates, exclusively to a description of the Enidže Vardar dialect, for which Karanfilovski has produced the only existing (unpublished) monograph (1992). The relatively copious synchronic data provided here enrich our understanding of this interesting dialect, but a detailed discussion of the material would not be germane to the present review. In any event, a linguistic comparison of the KG with the Enidže Vardar dialect is undertaken in sec. 5.4 (see below).

Karanfilovski situates the Enidže Vardar dialect geographically in relation to dialect regions to the north (Gevgelija), east (Kukuš, Solun), northwest (Meglen), and west (Voden) but provides little detail on the distribution of linguistic features. In this regard, the reader would have benefited from a succinct summary of the linguistic features chosen for the internal articulation of the Enidže Vardar dialect on the map on p. 311. Further, the points which serve as the basis of Karanfilovski's dialect description are not marked distinctively on the map, nor are they ever listed in the text, so that one must deduce them from the abbreviations used after examples. The survey of previous scholarship on Lower Vardar dialects omits all mention of the work done by Bulgarian linguists in the first few decades of the 20th century (e.g., Romanski 1940, Dumev 1943, Ivanov 1932, Mirčev 1901, Xristov 1936),

although Mirčev (1901) and Dumev (1943) are referred to later in the discussion of accentuation (p. 280).

The brief (one page) "Phonology" (p. 279) presents the phonemic inventory and the broadest generalizations regarding vowel reduction and consonant cluster simplification. The discussion is quite summary, even allowing for the fact that some of the relevant diachrony has already been treated in sec. 5.2 (see above). As a result, phonological details emerge in the discussion of other levels, but not always in a co-ordinated fashion. Thus no mention is made here of regional differences in treatment of unstressed vowels in auslaut, even though this important feature is the only phonological one chosen for inclusion in the isogloss map (p. 311). These differences pertain not only to the presence of strong reduction, but also to its phonetic realization, e.g., *e > i* in the southeast vs. *e > ă* in the northeast (the absence of reduction of *e* in auslaut to schwa can be used as a potential diagnostic to exclude Northeast Enidže Vardar as KG's dialect base, see sec. 5.4).

The topic of "Accentuation" (pp. 279–86) is discussed in considerable detail and the examples are sufficient to provide the reader with an accurate sense of the dialect system, but the history of the question omits Ivković's fundamental work (1921, 1924). Particularly unexpected (if not a misprint) is the oxytonic variant in the pair *glávite ~ glavíti* (p. 281). Also, failing a misprint, it is not clear why there is a difference in stress in two adjacent examples of the 2–3sg. imperfect (*ḱe mu-a donéseše kutijắta* vs. *ḱi-mu-go dóneseše i to*, p. 303).

In "Syntax" (pp. 304–08), the discussion of non-concord of gender (p. 305) describes one particularly interesting (and apparently common) type, which involves neuter adjectives, numerals, and pronouns in attributive position before masculine nouns (*présno lem*, *béluto koĭn*, *mắndro čuvék*, etc.). The general phenomenon of non-concord in Lower Vardar dialects is one of long-standing interest to dialectologists and is attested *inter alia* in the Kulakia Gospel (Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 107–08, 111–14, 172), Voden (Dumev 1943: 43–44), Dojran (Peev 1979: 71, 97–100), and Kajlar (Drvošanov 1993: 92–93).

Section 5.4, "The Dialect of the Konikovo Gospel in Comparison with the Enidže Vardar Dialect" (by Maxim Karanfilovski, Ljudmil Spasov, and Borče Arsov; pp. 313–25), efficaciously summarizes the primary phonological, morphological, and accentual features which KG shares or does not share with the Enidže Vardar dialect. Most of the phonological features presented here are consistent with those

described for KG from a diachronic perspective by Nuorluoto in sec. 5.2, the only significant omission being **-dn- > -(n)n-* in the first hand of KG. In terms of interpretation, there are some problematic assertions in the area of vocalism. The authors attribute too much significance to the non-indication of elision of unstressed vowels as an indicator of dialect provenance (p. 315), citing this trait as evidence that the author of the first hand originated from the southwestern part of the "western belt" of southeast Macedonian dialects. This rather vague formulation could even be applied to Lerin and effectively displaces the dialect base of both scribes to the west of the Lower Vardar region, which is incompatible with all the other linguistic and textual-historical evidence (including the testimony of the Kulakia Gospel; see discussion in sec. 5.2). Since there is virtually no difference between the two hands with respect to elision, there are no grounds for claiming that the second hand's refraining from elision indicates a "tendency towards stylization" and "extension of the dialect basis of the text", unless these tendencies are also to be ascribed to the first hand. Finally, it should be noted somewhere that Konikovo is situated just to the east of the isogloss (p. 311) demarcating Enidže Vardar villages with vowel reduction in auslaut from those to the west which generally lack this feature. In the domain of consonantism, it is noteworthy that, with the exception of *nadzam*, all seven of the examples cited for *-dz-* are found in the root *văr(d)z-* 'tie' and thus constitute a single phenomenon, one consistent with the development of epenthetic *-d-* between other continuants.

Although the "Accent" section (5.4.13) correctly states that the KG and Enidže Vardar systems share the same morphologically fixed stress type (Vidoeski's "Štip-Voden" type; see Vidoeski 1998–99, v. 3: 105–07), the description of verbal prosody in its details is expressed chiefly in atomistic phonological terms which obscure the underlying rules (e.g., the verbal adjective forms *vizán*, *vizána* are said to exhibit stress on the ultima and penultima respectively, whereas the critical point is that *-an-* has become an accentually dominant morpheme). In the case of the imperative, this approach leads to the inaccurate generalization that stress is on the "penultima in all cases" (based on the non-prefixed examples *vídi-vidéjte*), whereas analysis of prefixed forms indicates the typical Lower Vardar pattern of a morphologically determined sg.-pl. stress alternation ("initial vs. desinential") stress (e.g., *íspanni* 74, *íspušti* 83, *óstavi* 119, etc., vs. *duneséiti* 53, *ispravéite* 5, etc.).

The assertion "the plural morpheme has no effect on position of stress" is true for KG in the case of masc. *-ove* but not in the coll. masc. pl. (cf. *grobíštata* 49, 78), whereas in Enidže Vardar there are isolated exceptions even with *-ove* in Common Slavic masc. oxytona (cf. *vulóvi*, *rugóvi*, sec. 5.3, p. 284), not to mention systematic shifts in neut. nouns of the type *védro-vidríjna* (p. 282).

In the domain of morphology, the important Macedonian dialect diagnostic of the present tense desinences is referred to here and elsewhere on several occasions in KG-2008 (sec. 5.5, 5.8), but no overview of the relatively complex dialect picture and its possible origins is provided anywhere (see Koneski 1967: 190–91). At issue here is the presence or absence of fusion between *e-* and *i*-verb desinences of the present tense, primarily in the 2sg and 3sg, but also in the 1pl and 2pl. Fusion is manifested in three basic types (allowing for a certain degree of regional variation), viz. (i) generalization of the *i*-type in much of the West; (ii) generalization of the *e*-type in the east Macedonian dialects of Štip-Strumica; (iii) generalization of a "mixed" type (*-iš, -e*) in the southeast (including the Lower Vardar), usually in combination with *-ime, -ite*, but less often with *-eme, -ete* or even with retention of the *e/i* distinction in the plural. The authors here claim that (in contradistinction to the modern Enidže Vardar dialect) in KG "homogeneity in the paradigms of certain *e-* and *i*-class verbs does not exist" (p. 321). This generalization presumably applies to the 3sg only, since in the 2sg, 1pl, and 2pl the predominance of *-i-* is almost without exception, cf. 2sg *dádiš*, etc., 1pl *dádime*, etc. (with the isolated exception of *úmremi* first hand ~ *úmrïme* second hand), 2pl *naïdite*, etc. The evidence pertaining to the pivotal 3rd sg. form in KG is far more complicated and in fact sheds light on historical changes which led to the modern Enidže Vardar systems (cf. sec. 5.5 for some details). Regarding the vocalism of the suffixal/stem vowel in the imperfect of *e-* and *i*-verbs, it should be observed that the second hand occasionally replaces *e* with *i* (e.g., *číneši/číniše* 34, *páseši/-iše* 79), a trend which apparently leads to the ultimate generalization of the latter in the modern Enidže Vardar dialect.

One interesting comparative detail that goes unobserved is the difference in the masc. forms of the numeral '1', where KG shows *edín*, *idín* (with the same full grade CSl vocalism in the stressed syllable as in Russian, OCS, Bulgarian, and most Lower Vardar dialects), but the Enidže Vardar dialect in Karanfilov's description (p. 294) has either *idén* (in most points, with the reflex of reduced grade vocalism, as in

most Macedonian and Serbian dialects) or *ădnó* (syncretistic with the neuter form, as attested only in Enidže Vardar town and Ramna; for the first syllable vocalism, cf. *adín* in Kukuš and Gevgelija; see Peev, 1999: 64). There is also no explicit discussion of the nom. sg. of the 1st person pronoun. The authors cite *jas* for all of Enidže Vardar with two enlarged variants *jaska* (most of the territory) ~ *jazika* (Enidže Vardar, Gumendže), the second of which seems to find its prototype in KG *jaze*. On the other hand, the authors draw due attention to the replacement of *ma/mă* 'me' by *me* in the second hand (p. 147), attributing this to "a stylization and a tendency to extend the dialect base", since *ma/mă* is a more markedly southern dialect feature, chiefly Aegean, which extends continuously from Eastern Lerin eastward into southern Bulgarian Rup speech territory, but is also found in peripheral Southwest Macedonian dialects, such as Ohrid and Prespa, whereas *me* is found elsewhere in the Macedonian speech territory (for a summary of the territory and theories of origin of *ma/mă*, see Vidoeski 3: 139, including map 10). In fact, the KG distribution of the two forms requires closer investigation, since PB does not replace *ma/mă* with *me* when the former bears the acute or circumflex sign.

Section 5.5, "Review of Morphology and the Function of Morphological Categories in the Konikovo Gospel" (by Ljudmil Spasov and Borče Arsov, pp. 325–63) provides a thorough and richly illustrated description of the morphology of KG. It consists of a series of morphological tables, each followed by examples, comments, and conclusions. As the authors acknowledge in a footnote on page 362, "not all of the forms quoted in the tables and comments can be found in the text of KG; some have been deduced from the attested forms". Although this approach is generally inadvisable when dealing with a finite corpus (as in a ms. such as KG) rather than with an open dialect system or language, it is partially remedied by the textual material cited in the examples. Spasov and Arsov are correct in their observation that the second hand replaces the coll. pl. masc. def. ending with that of the regular plural (e.g., *sinorito/sinorite*), but they leave the impression that the former is a dialectal form and the latter is not, whereas PB's preference for *-te* can be explained just as easily within the context of Enidže Vardar dialect variation, since *-to* is characteristic only of a small number of local dialects in this region. Unfortunately, the precise inventory of such points is unclear, since Karanfilovski (sec. 5.4) cites the eastern points of Ilidžievo, Kufalovo, and Gumendže

on page 289, but according to the map on page 311 forms in *-tu* (**-to*) are found only (predominantly) in three points to the west thereof (Krušari, Pilurik, Ramna).

With respect to the fundamental division into *a-*, *e-*, and *i*-groups in the present tense, the authors offer no morphologically principled justification for classifying imperfective and perfective verbs separately, since the triadic grouping is based on the desinences rather than on derivational distinctions. This renders unnecessary the curious assertion that perfective verbs have a separate *i*-group, while imperfective verbs have merged *i-* with *e-* (p. 342). With respect to the dialectally significant issue of fusion between the *e-* and *i*-groups, the authors' concluding remarks pertaining to the crucial ending of the 3sg require some correction (based on our own analysis of the text and on Wahlström's on-line concordance). Thus, with respect to the *e*-group (*plati* is mistakenly listed here), we read (p. 341): (i) "In the first hand, the third singular of the present tense ends in *-i*" (whereas 7 of 20 examples end in *-e* and 3 exhibit variation), and (ii) "In the second hand, the ending *-i* is sometimes replaced with *-e*, which can be an influence from the eastern part of the lower Vardar dialect area" (whereas there are no consistent examples of *-i* in the second hand, since 16 of 19 forms show *-e* and 3 exhibit variation). For the *i*-group, we read (p. 342): (i) "In the first hand, the third person singular of the present tense ends in *-i*" (whereas 6 of 28 verbs show *-e* and 4 show variation), and (ii) "In the second hand the ending *-i* is replaced with *-e*" (whereas 6 of 28 verbs show *-i* and one exhibits variation).

Section 5.6, "Vocabulary" (by Marija Čičeva-Aleksiḱ and Elka Jačeva-Ulčar, pp. 363–71), provides a clear, informative account of KG's lexicon, sub-divided according to origin (Greek, Turkish, Hebrew, Romance, Church Slavonic, dialectal). There are many interesting points of detail, supported by reference to sources such as Argirovski (1998) and Jašar-Nasteva (2001). Attention is drawn to the frequent use of Turkish loanwords in both hands, e.g., *kumšijata* 'neighbor' (vs. modern Mac New Testament *bližnite*), *logos* 'word' > *lakardijata* (except for *rečta* 'the Word' in the beginning of John I), *kalabalak(ut)* 'crowd' (cf. modern Mac 'ruckus'). On some occasions PB emends the first hand by replacing a Church Slavonicism with a Turkism (*otvet* > *karšalak*) or native form (*otvešta* > *odgovori*), or by replacing one loanword with another (Gk *talas* > Turk *dalga*). As elsewhere in KG-2008, at times the discussion would have benefited from

consulting Mazon and Vaillant 1938: 244–48 (with references to Sand-feld 1930 and Papahagi 1908), where we learn that Balkan loan transla-tions motivate PB's replacement of the Gk loanword *pati* 'suffer' in the first hand with metaphorical *tegli* 'pull' (cf. Gk *travō*) or the frequent use of *ispanni* 'go out' (lit. 'fall out') in both hands (cf. Gk *peftō*), and that shared folk beliefs underlie the rendering of *daimonismenōn* 'possessed' > *nadvornéšen* 52, pl. *nadvorníčevi* 49, cf. Kulakia Gospel *nadvorešnite*, Demotic Gk *ta eksōtika*, Alb *jashtësme*, Mac *nadvorštinje* 'demonic possession; evil spirits'.

Section 5.7, "Onomastics" (by Elka Jačeva-Ulčar, pp. 371–85), con-sists of a catalogue of all anthroponyms, toponyms, and ethnonyms occurring in KG. Each entry consists of a headword (provided with etymology and brief historical definition) plus its attested occurrence (each cited in full sentential context as attested in KG and the modern Macedonian New Testament). The authors make the interesting point that the specifying toponymical adjective usually follows the generic noun, as in OCS, cf. *G'olut Gennisarecki* 'Lake Gennesaret' (note the Turkish loanword for 'lake', contrast Mac *Genesaretsko ezero*).

In section 5.8, "The Konikovo Gospel and the Macedonian Identity in the Late Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries" (by Victor Friedman, pp. 385–93), Friedman makes due allowance for the some-what discordant paleographic and textual evidence pertaining to the date of composition of KG. He points out the irony of the fact that the decline of traditional Cyrillic script culture in Aegean Macedonia as a result of Hellenizing cultural policy opened the door for use of the vernacular on the part of Slavic translators who employed Greek script. The discussion of the complex language identity topic is insight-ful and nuanced, drawing upon a wide range of historical sources. Friedman's three-fold distinction separates the clearly stated helleno-philic didactic purpose of a document such as Hadži Daniil's *Tetra-glosson* (1802) from both the uncertain intentions of KG's original translator (although Friedman doubts they were the same as Daniil's) and the certainty of purpose which must have motivated PB's decision to edit KG with a view to publishing a monolingual Slavic version. Friedman also summarizes linguistic evidence to suggest that PB took pains to move away from the dialect base seen in the first hand of KG. The most convincing trait cited here is PB's tendency to reverse the effect of vowel reduction in unstressed syllables (with *e* restored more frequently than *o*), although we are still left with the common "failure"

on PB's part to correct reduction of *e* to *i* in the penult (cf. *vrémito* vs. *vreme*). On the other hand, the confusion of *e-* and *i*-conjugation present tense desinences can be accounted for more narrowly within the Lower Vardar context.

Section 5.9, "The Translator and the Editor in their Historical Settings" (by Jouko Lindstedt, pp. 393–403), is a particularly fine piece of philology. It gives not only a well-argued summary of the relationship between the complete manuscript original (Bibl. Patr. Alex. 268) and the pages printed in Thessaloniki, but also a concise and well-informed interpretation of the incorporation and omission of Lower Vardar dialect features in the text (one significant omission is *ma/mă > me*, cf. sec. 5.5). Lindstedt's assessment here of the *-dn- > -(n)n* assimilation ("perhaps the most narrowly marked dialectal feature in the text") is the most accurate in KG-2008. Lindstedt recapitulates several convincing arguments to establish beyond doubt that PB was not the original translator. Of these the most fundamental are palaeographic (KG's second hand, that of the corrector, matches that of PB; see chapter 1) and textual (the pages PB arranged for print in Thessaloniki reflect directly the emendations of the second hand in KG; see chapter 3). Lindstedt also adduces new arguments of a practical nature (e.g., KG is not a mere typesetter's copy, but rather a finely bound large book, which has been damaged by much use) and telling orthographic and linguistic details as well (such as the rendering of *jot* by *gamma* in *ГEZIK* [jezik], which is unattested in KG, or the repeated use of orthotonic possessive pronouns, such as *Zevajte jaremot moj*, from a short Gospel passage (Mt. 11: 29–30) which PB translated to serve as a motto for the printed edition). Lindstedt (p. 398) provides a mature assessment of the language identification issue, emphasizing that the main distinction that would have motivated a cleric such as PB at the time of KG's editing was not between Macedonian and Bulgarian, but rather between the Slavic-speaking common folk and the Greek clergy (recall that the published lections are only in Slavic, a choice that was also made by Evstatia Kypriadi, the translator of the Kulakia Gospel). The motives and goals of the original translator are said to be more obscure. Lindstedt points out that KG in its overall design is primarily a Greek manuscript, in which the main titles, running headings, and liturgical instructions are all in Greek, while the Macedonian text closely and literally follows the original (as if designed to facilitate its understanding), but that the choice of vernacular rather than standard New

Testament Greek means that perhaps either the Greek or the Macedonian could have been read during the liturgy. Lindstedt (pace Ristovski 1989) reconfirms that KG did not serve as a model for the Kulakia Gospel, since the latter is a new translation and textually completely independent of the KG (as observed in Ivanov 1931) with a graphemic system which is at times inferior to that of the KG. Parallel passages are cited from the beginning of KG and the Kulakia Gospel (Paris edition) to prove that the latter was translated from the official Greek text (unlike KG, which is manifestly translated from the vernacular version).

Section 5.10, "The Konikovo Gospel in Macedonian Cultural History" (by Ljudmil Spasov, pp. 403–31), consists of several parts. Most relevant to the purpose of KG-2008 is Part Two ("Notes on the Life and Work of Pavel Božigropski in the Context of the Konikovo Gospel Manuscript", pp. 423–26), which provides far more biographical details on PB (as per Ristovski 1989) than any other section of the anthology. We learn that prior to the publication of the excerpts from KG in 1852, PB had first studied on Mt. Athos, then worked as a teacher in the village of Patiška Reka south of Skopje (where the local dialect is Karšijak Central Macedonian), and as of 1850 was the orthodox priest of the Jerusalem Monastery in Salonika. The lengthy "Historical Survey of the Macedonian Written Language" (pp. 403–22) begins with Cyril and Methodius and ends with the present day. It will serve to orient the uninitiated reader to the purported millennium of written Macedonian, but the exposition is repetitious and, while the catalogues of cultural landmarks are impressive enough to whet the appetite, they contain almost no references to published editions or criticism. In addition, although the Damascenes are justly singled out as a particularly important initial phase in the emergence of a vernacular-based standard language, there is no reference to the works of the eminent Macedonian Damascene scholar, Petar Ilievski (1988), nor to others, such as the Bulgarian Ljubomir Miletič or the Russian E. I. Demina, who have specialized in the study of these important texts. Part Three ("Translations of the Bible into the Vernaculars of the Balkan Peoples in the Ottoman Empire", pp. 426–31) offers very little on Greco-Macedonian translation technique in KG and less in the way of comparison of the language of KG with that of the Kulakia Gospel.

Chapter 6 (Katerina Mitiḱ, Max Wahlström, pp. 431–39) is a bibliography, which is generally very thorough, but omits reference to

Ilievski (1988) and Sandfeld (1930). Chapter 7 presents a splendidly reproduced color facsimile of the manuscript (photos by Mika Hakkarainen), 80 pages. The book does not contain an Index, since a complete KWIC (key words in context) concordance of the first hand of the Macedonian text prepared by Wahlström is available on the Internet (http://www.helsinki.fi/~jslindst/268/koni-kwic.xls). The complete Macedonian text according to the first hand is available at http://www.helsinki.fi/~jslindst/268/. The book is handsomely bound in hard cover.

References

Argirovski, Mito. (1998) *Grcizmite vo makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Drvošanov, Vasil. (1993) *Kajlarskiot govor*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

Dumev, V. (1943) "Vodenskijat govor". *Makedonski pregled* 13(3): 8–42; 13(4): 35–87.

FO 1981 = *Fonološki opisi srpskohrvatskih/hrvatskosrpskih, slovenačkih, i makedonskih govora obuhvaćenih opšteslovenskim lingvističkim atlasom*. (1981) Sarajevo: Akademija nauka i umjetnosti Bosne i Hercegovine. [*Posebna izdanja*, 55; *Odjeljenje društvenih nauka*, 9.]

Giannelli, Ciro and André Vaillant. (1958) *Un lexique macédonien du XVIe siècle*. Paris: L'Institut d'études slaves de l'Université de Paris.

Ilievski, Petar. (1988) "Balkanološki lingvistični studii so poseben osvrt kon istoriskiot razvoj na makedonskiot jazik". Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik "Krste Misirkov". [*Posebni izdanija*, 14.]

Ivanov, Jordan. (1917) *Bŭlgarite v Makedonija*. Sofia: Carska pridvorna pečatnica. (Reprint Sofia: Izdatelstvo nauka i izkustvo, 1986.)

⸻. (1931) *Bŭlgarski starini iz Makedonija*. 2nd, revised ed. Sofia Dŭržavna pečatnica.

Ivanov, Dimitsr. (1932) *Gevgelijskijat govor*. Sofia: Makedonski naučen institut.

Ivković, M. (1921, 1924) "Akcentski sistemi srpsko-makedonskih govora". *Južnoslovenski filolog* 2: 254–71; 4: 46–71.

Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. (2001) *Turskite leksički elementi vo makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje.

Jireček, Konstantin. (1876) *Geschichte der Bulgaren*. Prague: V. Tempsky. (Reprint and translation: *Istorija na bŭlgarite, s popravki i dobavki ot samijat avtor*. Sofia: Nauka i izjustvo, 1978.)

Koneska, Milica. (1951) *Mariovskiot govor*. Skopje: Filologičeski fakultet na Universitetot.

Koneski, Blaže. (1967) *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.

———. (2001) *Istoriska fonologija na makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Kultura.

Lindstedt, Jouko. (2006) "Za istorijata na Konikovskoto evangelie". *Predavanja na 38 meǵunaroden seminar za makedonski jazik, literatura, i kultura*. Skopje: Univerzitet "Sveti Kiril i Metodij".

Mazon, André and André Vaillant. (1938) *L'Évangéliare de Kulakia: Un parler slave du Bas-Vardar*. Paris: Libraire Droz. [*Bibliotheque d'ètudes balkaniques*, 6.]

Mirčev, D. (1901) "Beležki po kukuško-vodenskija govor". *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka, i knižnina* 18: 426–70.

Nuorluoto, Juhani. (2003) "Rakopisot na Konikovskoto evangelie kako izvor za fonološki opis na egejskite makedonski govori". *MANU, Oddelenie za lingvistika i literaturna nauka* 28: 69–79.

Papahagi, Pericle. (1908) *Parallele Ausdrücke und Redensarten im rumä-nischen, albanesischen, neugriechischen, und bulgarischen*. Leipzig: J. Barth.

Peev, Kosta. (1979) *Dojranskiot govor*. Skopje: Institut za makedonski jazik.

———. (1987) *Kukuškiot govor*. Vol. 1–2. Skopje: Studentski zbor.

Ristovski, Blaže. (1989) *Portreti od makedonskata literaturna i nacionalna istorija*. Skopje.

Romanski, St. (1930) "Narodnopisni materiali ot Dolnovardarsko". *Makedonski pregled* 6(4): 91–116.

———. (1940) "Dolnovardarskijat govor". *Makedonski pregled* 8(1): 99–140.

Sandfeld, Kristian. (1930) *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris: É. Champion. (Reprinted Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1968.)

Stojkov, Stojko. (1968) "Bŭlgarska dialektologija". 2nd, revised ed. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Šaldev, Xristo. (1931) "Narodno probuždane v Bojmija". *Makedonski pregled* 6(4): 50–69.

Vidoeski, Bozidar. (1998–99) *Dijalektite na makedonskiot jazik.* Vol. 1–3. Skopje: Makedonska akademija na naukite i umetnostite.

Xristov, P. G. (1936) "Po-zabeležitelni osobenosti na kukuško-dojranskija govor." *Makedonski pregled* 10(1–2): 103–18.

Department of Slavic Languages   Received: January 2011
    and Literatures
University of Toronto
Toronto, ON M5S 1J4
Canada
Joseph.schallert@utoronto.ca