

BULGARIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
INSTITUTE FOR BULGARIAN LANGUAGE “PROF. LYUBOMIR
ANDREYCHIN”
DEPARTMENT OF BULGARIAN DIALECTOLOGY AND LINGUISTIC
GEOGRAPHY

Snezhana Kocheva Aleksandrova

NAMES RELATED TO CLOTHING AND ITS MAKING
(Lexico-Semantic Characteristic)

Author's abstract of the dissertation for the award of the educational and
scientific PhD degree

Professional field: Philology, code 2.1.

Scientific field: Humanities

Scientific supervisor: Associate Professor Mariyana Hristova Vitanova, PhD

Sofia
2020

The dissertation was discussed at an extended session of the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography of the Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin” at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences on July 13, 2020 and was directed for public defence by Protocol No. 17 of July 16, 2020 of the Scientific Council of the Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin” at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

The dissertation consists of introduction and two chapters (theoretical basis of the survey, divided into three parts; classification of names related to clothing, divided into six parts), conclusions and summary, literature cited (393 titles) and sources (80 titles), a list of abbreviations (geographic regions, territorial dialects and authors), a reference of the academic merits and a list of publications on themes related to the dissertation. There are 220 pages (539 357 characters with spaces) in the dissertation.

The public defence will be held on November 16, 2020 (11 o'clock) at the Institute for Bulgarian Language “Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin”, BAS, 52 Shipchenski prohod Blvd., bl. 17.

Members of the Scientific Committee:

Professor Luchia Antonova-Vasileva, PhD – Chairman
Associate Professor Iliyana Garavalova, PhD
Professor Yordanka Zaharieva, PhD, D.Sc.
Associate Professor Tatyana Ilieva, PhD
Associate Professor Ani Kemalova, PhD

Reserve Members of the Scientific Committee:

Associate Professor Yoanna Kirilova, PhD
Professor Margaret Dimitrova, PhD

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
I. 1. Relevance of the Dissertation	4
I. 2. Area, Object, Goals, Tasks and Methods of Research.....	4
II. THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE RESEARCH.....	6
II. 1. Scientific Approaches, Methods, Criteria and Terminology for the Purposes of the Research	6
II. 2. Systemic Relations – Common Features and Differences at a Lexical Level in Bulgarian Dialects. Theoretical Formulations.....	10
II. 3. Review of the Scientific Research on Names Related to Clothing and its Making: Ethnological, Sociocultural, Linguistic and Lexicographic.....	15
III. CLASSIFICATION OF THE NAMES RELATED TO CLOTHING AND ITS MAKING (LEXICO-SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS).....	22
Summary.....	33
Conclusions.....	33
Literature cited in the dissertation.....	39
List of Abbreviations (geographic areas, regional dialects and authors).....	49
Reference of the Academic Merits of the Dissertation.....	51
List of Publications on the Topic of the Dissertation	52

I. INTRODUCTION

Clothing within the boundaries of a nation is the exponent of a larger or smaller unification of the language community and, compared to the other components of material culture, is in close relation with people, forming one of the first visual ideas of a given ethnos. By tracing the changes in the names of Bulgarian clothing (which, having a traditional constant value and being an essential element with established contents, is also a dynamic formal indicator of the way of living in recent times), we can find not only names that are part of the passive lexical fund, but implementations that are still active today.

The reason and need to study the names for clothing and its making in Bulgarian dialects are explained in **the introduction**. The area, object, goals, tasks and methods of research are formulated with respect to them.

I. 1. Relevance of the Topic of the Dissertation

The interest towards the dissertation's topic was provoked by the lack of thorough lexico-semantic research in a linguo-geographic aspect on the system of names of clothing in Bulgarian dialects. The lexical material on everyday and festive traditional clothing and its accessories was gathered through fieldwork in Gela village (Shiroka Laka region), from the archive of the historical museum in Smolyan and the archive of the Bulgarian dialect dictionary at the Department of Bulgarian Dialectology and Linguistic Geography at the Institute for Bulgarian Language "Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin", as well as from published sources – dialect dictionaries and monographs, lexical maps, ethnological studies etc., created over a period of more than a century.

I. 2. Object, Subject, Goals, Tasks and Methodology

The **object** of the dissertation includes Bulgarian dialect words related to clothing and its making and united through their common relation to the term "manmade item, used to cover or dress the body". The lexemes are divided into five thematic groups: general names for clothing, names for women's clothing, names of men's clothing, names of shoes and footwear and names of adornments. There are subgroups in the groups of names of shoes, footwear and adornments. The pre-processed data base of the empirical material provoked our scientific interest and names of colors for clothing and its accessories, for shoes and adornments were added experimentally to the research area.

The **subject** of the research covers the systemic relations in the lexico-semantic group of clothing and shows the ways of forming the meaning and the similarities and differences of the names in question in Bulgarian dialects by revealing the specific language features and systemic relations between the lexical units.

The main **goal** of this research was to classify the gathered names of clothing comprising the lexico-semantic group, into thematic groups and subgroups and to examine the paradigmatic relations between the lexical units by applying the systemic linguistic approach included in the methodological basis of component analysis.

This goal was achieved by completing the following **tasks**:

1. Presentation of theoretical formulations related to the examined problem – review of the literature and the chosen scientific approaches, methods, criteria and terminology for the purpose of the research.
2. Presentation of some scientific theses on examining and analyzing the specifics and changes in the lexical system of dialects, also valid with a view to names of clothing and its making;
3. Classification of the names of clothing into thematic groups and subgroups formed by applying semantic criteria and taking into account common semantic characteristics, and arranged on geographic principle.
4. Analysis of the lexical and semantic specifics of the vocabulary of dialects;
5. Summary of the observations and the results of the survey;
6. Perspectives for further research on this topic.

The **research method** is mainly analytical (descriptive), but in order to illustrate certain phenomena and tendencies, some qualitative indicators were used.

The **main approach** applied in the survey of dialect words was the onomasiological one, and it shows that the nominative word function is a result of interaction between extra and intra-linguistic factors. Also used is the semasiological approach for revealing the semantic volume and structure of lexemes and the character of the semantic relations between names in macro-dialectal aspect. The comparative method, the culturological approach and linguogeographic data are also included for the purpose of the research.

The study of the lexico-semantic characteristics and lexical specifics of the names for clothing in dialects is in close relation and interdependence with the intensity of changes in literary language, dialects, culture and development of social processes, which allows for the establishment of certain models in the enrichment and specifics of the dialect word-stock.

II. THEORETICAL BASIS OF THE RESEARCH

The **second chapter** consists of three parts and each one of them ends in conclusions.

II. 1. Scientific approaches, methods, criteria and terminology for the purpose of the research.

The first part consists of scientific approaches, methods, criteria and terminology used for the purpose of the research. The main theories on systemic approach, applied to the study of the vocabulary, are a unifying center of the study of related phenomena. Given the goals and tasks of the research, it is accepted that when a dialect vocabulary is included into thematic groups, relations can be revealed more thoroughly and the aggregate of established connections between language units can be determined within broader parameters. The compromise inclusion of names of colors in the group of names of clothing is an experimental attempt to use the features of denotations for studying designations. To make lexico-semantic analysis of the lexical units, theoretical formulations were examined which offer a reasonable prerequisite for the application of the systemic linguistic approach to the methodological basis of the component analysis applied to the specific terminology used within the research parameters. The use of the systemic approach was motivated by the inclusion of onomasiological, semasiological, comparative and synchrono-typological methods, as well as of linguo-geographic data and the culturological method. The research object was situated in the period between the late 19th century and the 1970s, and more recent examples were also included.

One of the eminent representatives of the Prague Linguistic Circle and founder of the Slavic School of Structural Linguistics – N. S. Trubetskoy, in his scientific essay “The Tower of Babel and Mixing of Languages”, when approving the law of fragmentation, emphasizes that „its application doesn’t lead to anarchic (disorderly) spread, but to an orderly and harmonious system in which every part, to the smallest one, preserves its outstanding but repetitive individuality and the unity of the whole is achieved not by the depersonalization of its parts but by the continuity of its varieties in the language net“ (Trubetskoy, 1925). With respect to the subject of the dissertation this is a unique exposition of viewing language and more specifically its vocabulary as a systemic structure of language units.

With regard to the system principle there exists a great variety of views about the type of language relations but the study of the related phenomena is a unifying center despite the various hypotheses of each language trend.

In this part scientific theories with an accent on lexicology by early adepts of systemic approach and their followers are presented, which were used as a conceptual basis of the dissertation (Pokrovski 1895; Trier 1931; Porzig 1934;

Weisgerber 1962; Shterba 1940; Vinogradov 1953; Koseriu 1990; Mutaľchiev 1971; Todorova 1977; Pernishka 1982; Mihaylova 1985; Vendina 2001).

The systemic approach is crucial not only in lexicology but in the study of the vocabulary of dialects. Today there is “a necessity to reveal the main characteristics of the lexical dialect system, the most important features of dialect which make it different from many other dialects and oppose it to literary language. Such clarification could be the result of comparing not separate words, but a very large presentation of word orders which differ with regard to their formation” (Sorokoletov, Kouznetsov 1987: 220).

There are various criteria for distributing words in combined unions which form the lexical system of language. **Given the goals and tasks of the research, it is assumed that with the help of a certain grouping of the dialect vocabulary the relations could be revealed in detail and the aggregate of established relations between language units could be determined.**

The classification of lexical material in thematic (TG) and lexico-semantic groups (LSG) is one of the most frequently applied models of studying the lexical system of language. **The main objects of research in this dissertation are names with prevailing denotation part, naming concrete objects which possess many qualities, relations and correlations and create endless differences.** The items with concrete names can be interpreted in many ways, since they possess individuality, unlimited distinctiveness and nonrepetitive particularity of qualities. This formulation is an important tool for grouping names of clothing and for studying their lexico-semantic characteristics. **The compromise inclusion of names of colors (with regard to accessories of clothing, shoes and adornments) as an additional research object of the dissertation helps to expand in advance the thematic scope of the examined branch vocabulary.** The additional inclusion of names of qualities related to the names of clothing is predetermined by the ability to identify the total volume and degree of detailed lexical word-stock in different thematic areas; and the study of the vocabulary in thematic aspect has the advantage of establishing more thoroughly and fully the interrelations between words and objects, and phenomena designated by them.

When looking at different opinions on the study of lexical units in TG or LSG, differences regarding their definition are observed. Some researchers like F. P. Filin perceive LSG as some kind of semantic field (Filin 1957). D. N. Shmelyov perceives the thematic and lexico-semantic groups as an expression of the systemacy in vocabulary, as well as an equally important object of its analysis, and outlines that language relations between components of TG are always present but demonstrated in a varying extent (Shmelyov 1964). Within the parameters of the semantic field and separating it from the thematic groups, R. Mutaľchiev adds many of the essential characteristics of LSG (Mutaľchiev 1971). V. G. Gak points at the hierarchical principle of forming the language categories, and his example for combinations of categorial type is LSG which is formed by

words combined according to similarity of meaning (Gak 1971), grammar homogeneity (one and the same part of speech), semantic homogeneity (presence of invariant seme) and homogeneity of paradigmatic relations (the interchangeability under certain conditions). El. Todorova presents LSG as a systematically organized semantic group (Todorova 1972). Y. Dapcheva accepts the definition for LSG and points out that quite many authors perceive the term “semantic field” as a lexico-semantic group, “id est as a combination of words with strong or not so strong paradigmatic relations” (Dapcheva 1986). For Em. Pernishka the definition of the essential features of lexical meaning is most precise when the words are examined in semantic fields or LSG (Pernishka 1993). According to A. A. Ufimtseva the two groups of words are equitable in the language system (Ufimtseva 1968). The reason for this is more likely to be found in the qualities of the lexico-semantic system of language. L. V. Bistrova, N. D. Kapatruck and V. V. Levitski offer two types of LSG whose elements are united by the meaning of a certain word (called an identifier, a dominant and a core of the group) and have a common meaning of the semantic component (Bistrova, Kapatruck 1980: 75, 77). P. Legurska, on the other hand, claims that in the extra-linguistic approach the generic seme is the semantic theme and the words with denotative meaning are classified in thematic groups in a specified object classification (Legurska 2002).

For the purposes of this research most applicable was the scientific thesis of V. V. Bankevich, according to which LSG can be defined as an invariant and a functional group of lexical units with denotative and significative types of meanings, and a TG, on the other hand, can be defined as a functional and significative group of lexical units (including phrases) reflecting a certain area of reality, with meanings of denotative type, connected mainly through generic-specific relations (Bankevich 1985: 35).

With regard to the presented theoretical problems and for the purposes of this scientific thesis **the classification and the lexico-semantic characteristics of the names in Bulgarian dialects, related to clothing and its making, were made within thematic groups** in which the object names reflect a certain area of reality, an object of the material culture, the so called artifacts, possess a denotative type of meanings (in whose core are observed semantic and motivation features), and are connected mainly with the hierarchic classification of relations between words as generic-specific or as a part to a whole. The experimental inclusion of names for colors in addition to names for clothing has an integrated place in the suggested classification scheme according to the concept described herein for a possible wider thematic scope of lexical material related to accessories of clothing, shoes and adornment.

The study of the lexico-semantic characteristics of names for clothing in Bulgarian dialects predetermines the usage of the method of component analysis (MCA) which is related to the composite structure of lexical meaning, and the term seme, invented by Vl. Skalichka (Guliga, Shendels 1976: 294, quoted from

Sternin 1985: 34) in this work is used as a marginal semantic unit that reflects a certain feature of the designated object or term. In the dissertation the thesis of I. A. Sternin (Sternin 2015) is maintained: that **the component analysis is not limited only to differentiating and studying the individual components of meaning, but includes their interrelations**, the hierarchy and correlations between them, taking into account the relative manifestation of specific meaning. The application of MCA enables to find the interconnection of meaning on the basis of certain differentiation features, and despite the differences in terminology (Kuznetsov 1980, 1988; Shmelyov 1973; Shram 1981; Gak 1971b, 1972, 1976; Borodina, Gak 1979; Pernishka 1993) all authors accept the hierarchical structure of meaning which represents a consistent subordination of the semantic components to a different level of abstraction.

This research is based to a great extent on the position of Em. Pernishka: according to her, **lexical meaning has a center (core) built up by generic (archeseme) and aspectual semes (differentiated) and a periphery** which includes potential semes reflecting possible characteristics of the denotation (Pernishka 1993: 43). For the purpose of the lexico-semantic analysis of the names for clothing yet another semantic indicator was applied that combines two meanings and is defined as **motivational**, “as a rule it is nonexplicit, unbroken, not formally expressed” (Pernishka 1993: 126).

In the component analysis of polysemantic words the term “lexico-semantic variant of the word” (LSV) was used, invented by A. I. Smirnitski (Smirnitski 1954), which can be defined as an elementary lexical unit, uniting all grammatical forms of a given word in correlation with one of its meanings. In this dissertation a point is made that **between LSV of polysemantic words exist complex and multidimensional relations of** crossing (metonymy and metaphor); of inclusion (expanding and narrowing the meaning, generic and specific dependencies); of phenomena characterized with enantiosemy; of relative equivalence (different usages of one and the same LSV in speech).

In interpreting the semantic structure of the examined vocabulary **the principle of conditionality** (with regard to revealing systemic relations and differentiation of meanings) was applied, since fixed usages are not found in one and the same dialect (compare Radeva 1982: 20) and are viewed as a part of the macro-dialectal system of Bulgarian language.

In systemizing and classifying the names of objects **the onomasiological approach** was used, which makes the extralinguistic facts available in the system and structure of language, id est the same fact of reality was examined by taking into account the relation of the concept (as a cognitive category) to the name and by looking for all words that express its meaning. For the study of the semantic characteristics (volume and structure) of the names and for discovering the semantic relations between them at macro-dialectal level the **semasiological approach** was applied.

The research of names for clothing with respect to their origin and loanwords from foreign languages, reasons for creating certain words and their disappearance, constant changes in lexical semantics, clarification of dialect varieties in the development stages and within the range of vocabulary spread suggests that it should also be made within a diachronic range by using the comparative method, although in this thesis the **synchrono-typological method was mainly applied**.

Linguo-geographic data in this dissertation play an important role in the defining of the areal characteristics of the names for clothing and the boundaries of their spread, and the mapping of regularities and changes (BDA 1988: Map No. 15, Map No. 23; BDA 2001: Maps from No. L 77 to No. L 83) illustrates the specifics of lexical phenomena by outlining different isoglosses, which contributes to the more thorough description of dialect units.

The study of the vocabulary of clothing within the context of the **culturological approach** makes possible to establish the role of extra-linguistic factors which affect the nomination of individual objects and phenomena.

In this part of the study the research object is situated in conditional time limits (the traditional period from the late 19th century to the 1970s and also recent events); the chronological frame reflects the written registration of the language data. The study of this continuous fragment of time shows that (as a result of changes undergone in all spheres of public life) clothing loses its discreteness, its strict individuality and tradition; the movement to modernity inevitably affects the names of new types of clothing and reflects the new tendencies. The study also includes newer vocabulary of modern clothing in order to show the “displacements” and “incorporations” that took place in the names in the last decades.

This review of the scientific approaches, methods, criteria and terminology for the purposes of the research doesn't include all theoretical works on the topic of the paper, but only the ones which help the research with respect to its goals and tasks.

II. 2. Systemic relations – common features and differences at lexical level in Bulgarian dialects. Theoretical formulations

The second part of the second chapter is focused on the systemic relations between common features and differences at lexical level in Bulgarian dialects. Scientific theses are presented that are directly applied in the examined dialect vocabulary of clothing with respect to the types of lexical relations, the criteria of separation, the linguo-geographic presentation, as well as the common points of contact between language processes and ethnocultural ones.

Broadly, lexicology is defined “as a science of the systemic organization of a vocabulary. On one hand it studies the semantic structure of words, defines their

different features, their closeness and logical relations, and on the other hand analyses and shows the tendencies in the development of the lexical system, its functioning, the frequency of words and their usage in the various spheres and language styles” (Boyadzhiev 2002: 9).

The Bulgarian dialectal lexical system in the entire language area preserves its wholeness (in which words are interconnected and interactive, following language regularities), but shows more mobile character and a significant language fragmentation of the names as regards the usage of a great diversity of forms as a result of development tendencies with different chronology in all its dialects.

St. Stoykov set a new basis for the theoretical approach to the study of Bulgarian dialects, and for the first time used dialect vocabulary for defining the main dialect division of Bulgarian language and showed its significant role by applying the methods of linguistic geography (Stoykov 1963: 105-119). The position of St. Stoykov as a whole is that “dialects are formed as language units and are separated from each other (first, on the basis of phonetic and vocabulary specifics and then by morphological and syntax features), but always have (as common features) the same grammatical structure and basic word stock” (Stoykov 1993: 12).

Prior to the appearance of this well established thesis, L. Miletich (Miletich 1984), when describing the most constant manifestations of dialects in the Bulgarian language, doesn’t mention the lexical level but points out that the toponymic data are yet another proof for the old unity of language despite the great variety of dialects. B. Tsonev, on the other hand, thinks that it is possible for the vocabulary to serve as a divisible criterion, but doesn’t go further because of his belief that lexical differences should affect a larger circle of words. Later Maksim Sl. Mladenov explains that the natural reason for the establishment of this theory from the 30s of the 20th century comes from the poorly researched dialect vocabulary and geographic spread (Mladenov 1978a: 67). Tsv. Todorov (Todorov 1957) 1984) doesn’t study the lexical differences in particular but makes his contribution to the methods in dialectology by setting the main tasks – defining the language borders and the borders of dialects, their description and historical development, taking into account the view that not all aspects of language are developed evenly in degree, time and place – and emphasizing that the ethnographic, historical and archeological data have mainly supportive role; the language data is what is important in defining language similarities and differences.

In the first systemic review of the problems of the general and the Bulgarian dialectology St. Stoykov (Stoykov (1968) 1993) invents an orderly theoretical concept about the study and the classification of dialects, as well as about the methodology of examining the specific features of Bulgarian dialects. In his study of the dialect differences in the vocabulary, the author emphasizes that language is in a state of constant movement and changes in the word stock and phonetic

characteristics are very intensive, while the grammatical structure changes very slowly. In Bulgarian (one of the most differentiated languages in a dialectal aspect) the lexical differences between dialects are expressed through the structural and semantic character of words and within their range of distribution. By organizing a systematic distribution according to the type of dialect words – structural, semantic and territorial, the researcher lays a stable foundation for all further dialect studies in the field of lexicology. As far as dialect vocabulary is concerned, St. Stoykov summarizes that it preserves its archaic specifics and is much richer with regard to individual specific names. Its main difference from literary language is not in the quantity of words but in their character.

To help reveal the great and varied word stock of Bulgarian language and to gather more detailed lexical material from the Bulgarian dialects, St. Stoykov and M. Sl. Mladenov create “A Research Guide to Dialect Vocabulary” (Stoykov, Mladenov 1971) which is a complete methodological model for gathering, processing, composing and analyzing the vocabulary. This guide is still used as a matrix model for the study of dialect vocabulary.

A more detailed study of the types of lexical differences between Bulgarian dialects in eastern Bulgaria was started by Maksim Sl. Mladenov (Mladenov 1968). Based on a systematically gathered, unified and comparable material from the first two volumes of the Bulgarian Dialect Atlas (BDA 1964; BDA 1966), Mladenov defines several types of differences in the object (terminological) vocabulary: structural, geographic (territorial) and etymological (origin of the vocabulary), and they are used in this research. He also calls the different names of one and the same object “dialectal lexical multitude” (DLM) and the individual meanings of one and the same name – “dialectal semantic multitude” (DSM) (Mladenov 1968: 262). Later M. Sl. Mladenov (Mladenov 1978b) enriches this research of dialectal lexical differences by pointing out the reasons which haven’t acted simultaneously and in one and the same place, but within a large chronological range of over a millennium on the Bulgarian language territory, assisting the formation of the entire body of lexical differences between Bulgarian dialects. In this research only the term “lexical orders” is used, as a synonym of DLM invented in his previous formulations (Mladenov 1978b: 223). In twelve points, schematically, without areas, the factors responsible for the dialectal lexical differences, such as old-time lexical differences in the dialectal two-member lexical orders (риза-кошуля *riza-koshulya*, делва-врѣчва *delva-vrachva*); word-forming processes of common (прежда-прежба-прело *prezhda-prezhba-prelo*) and different initial base (димеш-кадеш-турмеш-чуреш *dimesh-kadesh-turmesh-churesh*); typical cases of borrowing from foreign languages (червен-ален-кникат *cherven-alen-knikat*); the formation of new names through transferity (metaphor, metonymy) of meanings (for example in the names for stovepipe – кавал *kaval*, калам *kalam*, лула *lula*, мъсур *masur*, etc.); the creation of compound names; the different phonetic and morphological variants of individual names in the lexical orders, etc. (Mladenov 1978b) are pointed out.

Hr. Haliolchev (Haliolchev 1978) talks about *diatopy* (id est the spacial dimension of language in its uniformity and territorial variations) in addition to synchrony and diachrony. According to him the suggestions of A. Weinen and Y. Goossens present better terminological solutions than these of DLM and DSM of M. Sl. Mladenov (Mladenov 1968), and they are: “heteronymy, heteronyms as parallel terms with respect to synonymy, synonyms and heterosemy, and heterosemes as parallel terms with respect to polysemy and semes” (Haliolchev 1978: 170). The theoretical postulate defines the different geographically fixed dialect names of one and the same designation as diatopic synonyms, heteronyms or members of the same DLM, and the different geographically fixed dialect meanings of a word form as diatopic semes, heterosemes or members of the same DSM.

The advantage of Iv. Kochev’s research (Kochev 1984) is that it was performed on the entire language territory and not only on a part of it, and as a main feature of the dialect division of Bulgarian language is pointed the vocal-consonant interaction in the sound *ya* (ѣ) isogloss belt through which the isoglosses of many different phenomena of accentual, morphological, lexical and word forming character run. The author specifies that the territorial division based on grammatical criteria is not strongly expressed and the division of dialects, based only on few of the thousands lexical units is not helpful, because the result is “different opposites in the different areas” (Kochev 1984: 42).

In the study of the lexical differences between Bulgarian literary language and its territorial dialects V. Radeva (Radeva 1979a) applies St. Stoykov’s argumentation that the distinctive features between dialects are related to their phonetic characteristics and vocabulary. The study of the agricultural vocabulary in the Central Balkan Region in correlation with the literary vocabulary presents the typological differences between them, which is predetermined by the different segmentation of the extra-lingual reality. Using the concept of the lexical system as a unified entity with intersystem relations, V. Radeva presents the formation of the lexical groups (LSG) and by applying the component analysis for defining the semantic features of the words included in them, reveals the equivalence of their meanings and their different participation in semantic orders and lexico-semantic paradigms with the other members in the lexical groups. The significant number of specific dialect names within one LSG, uncharacteristic of the literary vocabulary, are also related to objects and phenomena important for the dialect speakers. The differences in the semantic structure of words common both for literary and dialect vocabulary, presented by V. Radeva and revealed by applying the theory of LSV, to a certain extent resemble the semantic study of the vocabulary in Smochevo village, Kyustendil region, made by R. Zlatanova (Zlatanova 1970) who supports the essential position of N. I. Tolstoy that “the less the number of lexemes in a closed semantic space (field) the broader the semantic volume of the words, and the bigger the number of lexemes in that space,

the narrower and more specific the semantic volume of the words” (Tolstoy 1968: 346, cited by Zlatanova 1970: 765).

In the monograph “Lexical Richness of Bulgarian Dialects” V. Radeva (Radeva 1982) makes a consistent review of the essence of dialect vocabulary and the types of dialect words, the specifics of the thematic diversity, the system character and the semantic structure, as well as the creation of dialect words and the relation of dialect lexical units to the history of language. The author explains the language parameters of the dialect vocabulary by illustrating the lexical differences in Bulgarian dialects. Using the thematic correlation of the dialect groups, V. Radeva, in her study, forms eight thematic groups, among which there are names related to clothing and its making, for example *карѹга karuga* ‘apron’ (Rh.); *литàк litak* ‘tight pinafore dress’ (Sof., God.); *копарàн koparan* ‘men’s long woollen overcoat’ (Sofia region); *гàлусник galusnik* ‘shirt front’ (Vr.); *косìчн’ак kosichnyak* ‘women’s head adornment made of braids with coins attached to them’ (Sof.) etc. (Radeva 1982: 33–35). In this research was made additional and more detailed study of the thematic group for clothing, including names of aprons, parts of clothes and adornments.

Sl. Keremedchieva and M. Vacheva-Hoteva (Vacheva-Hoteva, Keremedchieva 2000) also adopt thematic principles in studying the lexical system of Zarovo village, Thessaloniki region. The dialect vocabulary is represented in 14 thematic groups and the group including the names for clothing is united with that of adornments (Vacheva-Hoteva, Keremedchieva 2000: 71–72), and this is yet another example of thematic linkage of a larger circle of areas from one material region, which supports this research. The material duly gathered by immigrants from the former Zarovo village is represented in a dictionary consisting of approximately 8000 lexemes.

The study of the territorial spread of language phenomena and lexical units in particular is related to the development of linguistic geography whose methods were applied even in the early 20th century, though sporadically (Mladenov 1969: 413). The summarizing volume of Bulgarian Dialect Atlas (BDA 1988) is based on all existing publications and ready to be published research papers, and includes areas from the entire language continuum (Mizia, Trakia and Macedonia). More detailed representation of the dialect division zones is made in BDA 2001, Summarizing volume, I – III, Phonetics, Accentology. Vocabulary. The thematic circle of dialect vocabulary for clothing and adornments (the object of this dissertation) in part III, Vocabulary (108 maps) of the Summarizing volume of BDA is represented in seven maps from No. L 77 to No. L 83 respectfully for the names of *риза riza*, *калпак kalpak*, *цървул tsarvul*, *ямурлук yamurluk*, *обуци obitsi*, *гривна grivna*, *мъниста manista* (shirt, hat, traditional peasant shoes, hooded cloak, earrings, bracelet, beads). The main approach applied to that type of maps is the onomasiological one which shows the path from the area to the name and its different nominations in the dialects. The digital map of the dialect division of Bulgarian language (Antonova-Vasileva,

Keremedchieva, Vasileva, Kocheva 2014), as well as the later research of Luchia Antonova-Vasileva and Iliana Garavalova (Antonova-Vasileva, Garavalova 2012) affirms the position of linguistic geography in studying the specific features of Bulgarian language.

A valuable source for the comparative study of Slavic languages and Bulgarian language and its dialects in particular, is the “Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия лексико-словообразовательная. Выпуск 10. Народные обычаи” 2015 (ОЛА 2015) [All-Slavic Linguistic Atlas. Lexical and Word-Forming Series. 10th Issue. Folk Customs 2015 (OLA 2015)] which presents fragments of the vocabulary system of Slavic dialects with respect to the traditional culture of Slavs. Its lexical maps for names of “a ring with a stone” (OLA 2015, map No. 14: 76) and “a wedding ring” (OLA 2015, map No. 15: 80) and the maps of names for “a woman on the day of her wedding” (OLA 2015, map 11) and “a young woman, recently married (OLA 2015, map No. 13: 73) support the research material in this thesis.

Over the last few years differences and interactions of the dialect system in studies of similarities are often revealed with respect to interaction with ethnology, ethnolinguistics and the newer branch, linguistic culturology. The relation between dialectology and ethnography is not contested: still, in the studies carried out before the 1980s, language data was what was important for defining language similarities or differences, and the ethnodisciplines have a supportive role. The common points of contact between language (at a dialect level) and ethnocultural processes are interpreted in the studies of Iv. Kochev (Kochev 1980), St. Genchev (Genchev 1980), M. Sl. Mladenov (Mladenov 1981), S. Tellalova (Tellalova 1995), N. Pavlova (Pavlova 1995), M. Vitanova (Vitanova 2012).

The presented theoretical formulations don't cover all studies of the systemacy of dialect words, the differences and how they come into being in the vocabulary of Bulgarian dialects, but show well established theses in the development of linguistic thought, examining the dialect vocabulary system in dialectal unity with literary language and with respect to material culture and national worldview, which is directly reflected in the researched vocabulary of clothing.

II. 3. Review of the scientific studies of names related to clothing and its making: ethnological, sociocultural, linguistic and lexicographic

In **part three** of the second chapter a review is made of the scientific studies of names related to clothing and its making in ethnological, sociocultural, linguistic and lexicographic aspect; the various scientific angles of presenting the object show the exceptional diversity of the space of clothes in the so called foremic vocabulary.

In the early 20th century studies related to clothing, accentuated mostly on the complex character of its description in ethnographic, sociological, cultural, historical and semiotic aspect. In the first half of the 20th century clothing was actively studied by wide circles of ethnographers, folklorists and scientists, in order to reveal the typology of Bulgarian folk costumes, to outline their spread areas, to reveal their common features, as well as differences, and to identify their social significance in our material and spiritual culture.

The data from pre- and post-liberation texts (written during the Bulgarian National Revival and after the liberation from the Turkish yoke), as well as contemporary texts, gathered in „Източници за българската етнография“ (*Sources of Bulgarian Ethnography*), „Етнография на България“ (*Ethnography of Bulgaria*), „Етнография на Македония“ (*Ethnography of Macedonia*), „Етнографски проблеми на народната духовна култура“ (*Ethnographic problems of the folk culture*), the four volumes of „Български народни носии“ (1960-1988) (*Bulgarian Folk Costumes*), parts of the corpuses on Dobrudzha, Pirin region, Kapantsi, Plovdiv region, Sofia region, the Rhodopes, Strandzha and Lovech region etc., are rich sources of lexical material on traditional Bulgarian costumes.

The sociopsychological portrait of Bulgarian folk clothing, represented in the studies of D. Marinov „Национална религиозна вяра и религиозни народни обичаи“ (*National Religious Faith and Religious Folk Customs*) (Marinov 1994) and Iv. Hadzhiyski „Бит и душевност на нашия народ“ (*Lifestyle and Mentality of Our People*) (Hadzhiyski 2002) is used in the dissertation to reveal the characteristic features of clothing with respect to national worldview. Researches in the field of family and calendar rituals, made by Iv. Georgieva, G. Mihaylova, R. Ivanova, St. Genchev, N. Kolev, Sl. Grebenarova, Kr. Krastanova, M. Decheva etc., help this thesis with regard to the study of ritual clothing through the presented lexical units, a study that is more detailed thanks to the elements of traditional culture.

In this research on the more detailed representation of clothing within the boundaries of the Bulgarian lexical community, names from the descriptions of L. Miletich, M. and K. Telbizovi, N. S. Derzhavin, Hr. Vakarelski, St. L. Kostov, Al. Pizhev, P. Koruev, K. Grancharova and M. Decheva were included, which present costumes of Bulgarians in Banat, Bessarabia, Sea of Azov region, Asia Minor, Macedonia, in the southwestern part of the Southern Rhodopes – Krustopole village (Yeniköy) and in Gabrovo village, in Xanthi region; in Zarovo village (northeast of Thessaloniki) and in the western Bulgarian areas (Piriot region, Tsaribrod region and the western part of Znepole valley). Numerous ethnographic studies on the traditional clothing in a particular village or in a larger geographic region, for example in the Middle Rhodopes (Raykova 1981, 1986; Mareva 2005), the Eastern Rhodopes (Veleva 1969), the Western Rhodopes (Krasteva-Nozharova 1969), the villages and towns along the middle portion of the Struma river and the western Bulgarian areas (Grancharova 2002) etc., as well

as those on the various elements of clothing are an inexhaustible source of the type and role of Bulgarian folk costumes and their accessories.

The structural-functional approach applied to studies of clothing is best illustrated in the scientific paper of P. G. Bogatiryov “Funkcie kroja na Moravskom Slovensku”, 1937 (Bogatiryov 1971). The researcher describes in detail the different variations of folk costumes – everyday, festive, official and ritual – and examines their function. In their scientific formulations G. Mihaylova (Mihaylova 1983) and R. Ganeva (Ganeva 2003) cover all functions of Bulgarian traditional clothing and its hidden meanings. M. Veleva, one of the best experts on traditional Bulgarian costumes in all their variations, describes and analyses them in detail both in territorial and functional aspect (Veleva 1956, 1963).

The first classification of Bulgarian folk costumes was suggested by Hr. Vakarelski and D. Ivanov (Vakarelski, Ivanov 1941), and since then it was often an object of scientific interest in the works of M. Veleva, G. Mihaylova, M. Nikolchovska, A. Komitska, K. Grancharova, etc. Further systemic formulations made by these Bulgarian scientists form our ideas of the typology of Bulgarian traditional clothing by defining three main types of Bulgarian women’s clothing – two-apron costume, pinafore dress and sayan costume, and two types of Bulgarian men’s clothing – white and black costumes, cited numerous times in the dissertation.

N. I. Gagen-Torn carried out an interesting comparative study (with regard to clothing’s ethnogenesis) among the multiple populations in the large Volga Region – an ancient trade route and the territory of the Cuman, Hazara, Bulgarian and Kazan khanates. Examples from the works of the Bulgarian ethnographers Hr. Vakarelski and D. Ivanov, M. Veleva, V. Sharenkov, St. L. Kostov and IV. Koev and the large number of existing parallels between clothing and its accessories reveal not only accidental coincidences, but also established historical and cultural relations between the forefathers of the peoples living in the Volga Region (mainly the Chuvash ethnos) and the ancestors of the Danube Bulgarians. According to N. I. Gagen-Torn elements of Bulgarian clothing haven’t penetrated simultaneously and equally in the various tribe groups, but the astounding similarities of the traditional shirts, hats and headscarves, as well as the types of adornments are an indisputable proof of Bulgarian influence (Gagen-Torn 1960: 225–227).

The historical periodization in the art analyses of V. Naslednikova and P. Dimitrova-Popska, and in the ethnological research of M. Decheva, D. Gancheva, R. Ganeva etc., are important elements of the presentation of clothing with regard to tradition and perspective, since in addition to the information about the ethnocultural identity of the people who wear it, it “contains a memory of its own development” (Decheva 2005: 40). The traditional Bulgarian clothing which had mainly ethno consolidating functions, endured transformational processes and was “displaced” when the so called “shortage of civilization” was overcome with the help of the binary oppositions Europe – the Orient, West – East, capitalism –

feudalism, traditional – industrial, which included innovational events as a result of the spread of European fashion standard extrinsic to the traditional cultural environment (Gancheva 2004: 158, 160).

The ethnographic, ethnological and art history studies, mentioned here, are not only a source of rich lexical material, but play a complex role in the formation of the identificational characteristics of traditional Bulgarian clothing in ethnocultural, functional and historical aspect.

The academic period of scientific studies related to clothing actually started with Iv. Shishmanov's abstract "Към терминологията на българските народни носии" (*On the Terminology of Bulgarian Traditional Costumes*) (Shishmanov 1933). The famous Bulgarian scientist explained the necessity for more thorough and correct description of the national, regional and local forms of folk costumes and the need of a new science which he called *forematology* (Shishmanov 1933: 108). By showing the importance of traditional costumes in the aspect of national psychology, social tendencies and foreign influences, the author pointed out that "the national costumes have undoubtedly their own language and even their own dialects" (Shishmanov 1933: 109). In support of this postulate some time earlier L. Miletich, in order to ascertain where the population is old and where – new, used "a more reliable approach – id est dialects and clothing, mainly women's clothing" (Miletich 1902: 23). Prof. Iv. Shishmanov suggests a detailed plan of 7 points for the systematic scientific research of national costumes. In conclusion the scientist gives two examples of terms for national costumes: *кабаница kabanitsa* and *кавад kavad*, registers their spread, compares their various forms and examines their etymology (Shishmanov 1933: 115–119). He also notes that the information given in his abstract is only a small part of his larger research on the terminology of Bulgarian national costumes (which remained unpublished) and underlines that his study is a contribution to the history of the material and partly to our aesthetic culture and the future Bulgarian etymological dictionary (Shishmanov 1933: 114–115).

The further studies of Bulgarian national costumes in Northern Macedonia (in Tetovo field region) made by M. Arnaudov (Arnaudov 1938) and men's clothing from the First Bulgarian Kingdom, made by Y. Ivanov (Ivanov 1941) continue the tradition of systematic description of clothing.

Linguistic studies on the dialect Bulgarian names for clothing and its accessories are not too many, but contain a valuable lexical material and explanations of the undergone changes and influences in a language and sociocultural context; a material that presents various scientific approaches for description, including the geographic spread of names.

The study of T. Boyadzhiev (Boyadzhiev 1967) on dialect names of aprons in Bulgarian language (with an attached linguo-geographic map of the gathered material) presents one of the first examples of analysis of the terminological vocabulary related to clothing. The author reports common features in the function and purpose of aprons, but the varieties of styles, making, seasons and

social status register names which don't obey the same differentiation features and dissect considerably the general name of this piece of realia. The emergence of two or more names is due to loanwords adopted during the merging of populations, to the influence and exchange of neighboring national costumes and, if the name is *п̀рестѝлка prestilka*, a literary influence is possible. After a thorough study of lexemes, T. Boyadzhiev points out that the widely spread *п̀рестѝлка prestilka* и *ф̀ѝма f̀̀ma* coincide with some important lexical isoglosses, such as *р̀ѝза—кошѝл'а riza-koshulya*, *стан—разб̀̀ѝ stan-razb̀̀ѝ*, etc. (Stoykov 1963: 111–112, quoted from Boyadzhiev 1967: 71) in the direction “north-west – south-east”, but what is specific here, is that the name *ф̀ѝма f̀̀ma* is found on the territory of Moesia dialects.

In her scientific research Z. Barbolova examines around 270 names in the “headscarf” LSG and studies the etymological, word-forming, semantic, semiotic and ethnocultural characteristics. The author presents the oldest names for a headscarf, such as *к̀р̀на karpa*, and this meaning is preserved not only in Serbo-Croatian and Slovene but can be found in Albanian, Romanian and Turkish dialects, most probably as a loanword adopted from Bulgarian. The results of the studies show that the main motivational factors in naming the various types of headscarves could be: the type of fabric or material used for making the headscarves; the decoration; the color; the shape; the ways of wearing; the symbolism and the purpose; loanwords from other languages, etc. The analyzed rich vocabulary material shows how most names of a given piece of realia enter the passive fund of the lexical system and after a period of time disappear or get another meaning, which is “an indisputable proof that language doesn't exist independently of culture, and culture, on the other hand, always finds expression in language” (Barbolova 2006: 130).

Y. Zaharieva, after many years of research, registers the development of names for clothing (with respect to their existence in literary Bulgarian language) by using a large archive of written sources from the time of the Bulgarian National Revival, mainly “Речник на б̀̀лгарския език” (*Dictionary of Bulgarian Language*) of N. Gerov and “Градиво за б̀̀лгарски речник” (*Material for a Bulgarian Dictionary*) of K. Shapkarov. The consistent use of the terms *forema* and *foremic space* is well-substantiated by Shishmanov's scientific formulation of *forematology* as a science of clothes (Zaharieva 2006: 28; compare Shishmanov 1933: 108) mentioned again by prof. T. Iv. Zhivkov (Zhivkov 2000: 213, quoted from Zaharieva 2006: 29). Y. Zaharieva underlines the substantial “distance between the meaning of the term *clothing* during the Renaissance and its meaning in modern Bulgarian language” (Zaharieva 2006: 19). In the linguistic apparatus of her research she also includes the term *polymorphy* – the most precise characteristics of literary language during the Revival, which plays the role of an indicator for the presence of forms and words of different origin (literary, traditional and from different dialects) in a period of different types of transiencies and the formation of literary language (Zaharieva 2006: 17) and is used for the

goals and purposes of the dissertation. By distributing the foremic vocabulary, the author presents a possible classification of 15 separate foremic spaces and subspaces, examines the semantics of the Revival's foremic unit and pays attention to the new variations, such as *панталон pantalon* (trousers), *жакет zhaket* (jacket), *жилетка zhiletka* (cardigan), *полка/пола polka/pola* (skirt), etc., explaining their emergence with "the influence of modern times" (Zaharieva 2006: 88).

The classification schemes, discussed in the dissertation, present clothing as an object of study from different research positions: from its appearance in the world's vocabulary register (Hallig, R., W. von Wartburg 1963) through unfolding its semiotic contents (Bart 1991 a, 1991b; Kochieva 2013) and its social identification in the consumer society (Ilin 1998) and ending in creating a complex, non-isolated and overall typology of a system of subsystems with specific models of functioning and formation (Davidova 2001a, 2001b), thus assisting to direct our choice towards uniting the names for clothing in thematic generic and aspectual groups for the purposes of this research.

Special attention should be paid to studies of the foreign words in Bulgarian language, used in this study – mainly from Italian, French and English – and also to the work of L. Vankov who adopts the term *necessary loanwords* (Vankov 1959: 215) and examines the ones related to clothing, such as *боти boti*, *блуза bluza*, *сако sako*, *фanela fanela*, *костюм kostyum*, *палто palto*, *рокля roklya*, *панталон pantalon*, *жилетка zhiletka*, *пуловер pulover*, *калеври kalevri*, *фустан fustan*, *салтамарка saltamarka* (*ankle boots, blouse, jacket, dress, trousers, cardigan, pullover, shoes without laces, pinafore made of thin fabric, fur trimmed short coat*), etc. The etymological studies of loanwords from other languages (Mirchev 1952; Parashkevov 1979, 2008; Kocheva-Lefedzhieva 2004; Mollova 1964; Racheva 1979; Kyuvlieva 1980; Filipova-Bayrova 1969 etc.) as well as the valuable study of foreign words used in the Bulgarian sewing industry by N. Nameranov (Nameranov 1962) to a great extent assisted this thesis with respect to the origin of foreign names for different types of clothes and accessories, their migration and "settling" in Bulgarian language and the national dialects.

The lexicographic researches which play the role of identifiers of the state of language in a given period of its existence, of the lexical features of a given dialect or a group of dialects, as well as of the lexical picture in an ethnolinguistic aspect (Gerov 1975–1978; Shapkarev 2001; Mladenov 1941, 1947, 1951; Stoykov 1968; Mladenov 1967; Antonova-Vasileva 1998; Antonova-Vasileva, Keremedchieva 2001; Kitanova, Legurska 2008; Kirilova 2011; Legurska, Pavlova, Kitanova 2012; Vitanova 2014, 2016, Keremedchieva, Kocheva, Vasileva, Parvanov, Sertova, Garavalova, Cherneva 2012; RRODD 1974; RSDDBG 1990; IDRBE 2012; RNDKB 2018, etc.) are of high importance for the study of the names of clothing in Bulgarian dialects, and together with the materials on dialect vocabulary in the corpuses and publications of the Institute

for Bulgarian language at the BAS during the period 1962-2020, the Bulgarian Monolingual Dictionary, the 8 volumes of the Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary and the 15 volumes of the Dictionary of the Bulgarian language show the lexical richness of Bulgarian language during the last 170 years in its stylistic and functional diversity, and a considerable part of them are used in this dissertation with respect to the lexical data base of names related to clothing and its making.

As regards the study of the clothing's vocabulary, special attention should be paid to the current project "Local Industry, Clothing and Vocabulary Richness (Contribution to the Historical Linguistics and Anthropology of Clothing)" supervised by prof. M. Dimitrova, PhD (Obleklo I ezikovo bogatstvo 2018/Clothing and Language Richness 2018). The project aims at analyzing in detail and to scientifically acknowledge through an electronic edition (the creation of a virtual library based on unique, specially devised data base) an unknown and so far unexamined bulk of 1112 written pages, presenting in several comparatively similar ways the clothing of different social and ethnic groups in Bulgaria during the administration of Stefan Stambolov in the period 1888-1889. The documents in question are a valuable proof of the state of Bulgarian literary language which was beginning to take shape, and to a great extent of Bulgarian dialects, as well as of our historical vocabulary, since the language bearers of the time give current information about the forms, uses, synonyms and meanings of clothing which exist at that time on a given territory (Luleyska 2017; Aleksandrova, Dimitrova 2018).

The scientific studies focused on the Rhodopean dialect and vocabulary and the Rup dialects as a whole (Shishkov 1887-1892; Miletich 2013; Stoychev 1965, 1970; Kabasanov 1956; Popstoilov 1979; Vrabie 1974; Sobolev 2001; Vitanova 1986; Vacheva-Hoteva, Keremedchieva 2000; Radichev 2004; Antonova-Vasileva, Mitrinov 2011, etc.) are a valuable source for this thesis, since its material is gathered mostly from the Rhodopes and through fieldwork in Gela village, Shiroka Laka region.

III. CLASSIFICATION OF NAMES RELATED TO CLOTHING AND ITS MAKING (LEXICO-SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS)

In the **third chapter** of the dissertation a thematic classification is made of the gathered material (consisting of 1673 lexical units from the Bulgarian dialects) by applying the onomasiological approach which is based on the nomination of one and the same fact from the extralingual reality and on showing all its variants. The studied names are divided into six groups – general names of clothing, names of women's clothing, names of men's clothing, names of shoes and footwear in three subgroups, names of adornments in three subgroups and names of colors of accessories for clothing, shoes and adornments – and the lexico-semantic and etymological features in each one of them were analyzed. Within the thematic selection of lexemes the spread of all names (united according to logical criteria and belonging semantically to a given group) is presented. The categorization scheme of names for objects is made mainly according to their equal function and affiliation with respect to gender and age. The common characteristics defining the geography of names and their lexico-semantic development is summarized by conclusions for each thematic group.

In this annex based on the thematic classification, the lexemes from the LSG of clothing, united by their common relation to the name 'manmade item for covering or dressing the body' are divided into the following thematic groups (with selected examples):

1. General Names for Clothing

- clothing, dress – *òpèa drèa* Sh. L.; *нъртѣкѣи' purtukèsh*, Str.; *pyfèem rufèt*, Kyust.;
- full clothing set typical of a given settlement (national costumes) – *ògizda ògizda*, Str.;
- set of clothing, trousseau (bride's gift, pridan) – *базàи bagàsh*, Sh. L.; *нрук'è prikye*, Str.;
- set of clothing for the deceased – *pyòba rùba*, Batak, Pesht.; Sm.; Varn.; Blagoevgr.; Petr.; Tran region; Kilk.
- well-worn clothing – *κ'υρδ'υφè kyurdyufè*, Zarovo, Thess.; *нàвлек nàvlek*, Str.;

2. Names for Women's Outer Clothing

- long outer piece of clothing – *вълнѣк vulnik*, Todorovo, Plev.; *з'убета gyubeta*, Nikudin, Blagoevgr.; *з'υρδὺια gyurdia*, Sil.; Kast.; *κςαχè kusachè* (ankle long), Kyust.;

- short outer piece of clothing, waist length or above waist length, sleeveless – *елѐк' elèk*, MRh; Xant.; Kilkis;
- long outer piece of clothing with an open front all the way down, with sleeves or sleeveless, usually the front is buttoned in the chest area, saya type of clothing (varieties – according to the cut, fabric, decoration, festive or everyday) – *сайà saya*, *саз'а saga*, SW; *клашнѐк klashnik* /white woollen, sleeveless/, Razl.;
- long outer piece of clothing from homewoven or industrial woollen fabric, pinafore type of clothing, pinafore (varieties – according to the cut, fabric, decoration, festive or everyday) – *вòл'нѐник vòlnenik*, MRh.; *фустàн' fustàn*, Ivaylovgr.; *шайà shaya*, Radilovo, Pesht.;
- dress – *бинѐи binish*, Trastenik, Plev.; *кафтàн' kaftàn*, Sm.; *рòк'уе ròkye*, Novo Selo, Vid.;

3. Names of Men's Outer Clothing

- long outer piece of clothing, sleeveless or with sleeves, of thick homemade woollen material (with a hood or hoodless, protects from rain) – *зѐн'а gownya*, along the Maritsa river valley;
- short outer piece of open front clothing of homewoven material (varieties – according to the cut, sleeve length and decoration) – *дуламò dulamo*, Sh.L.; *копарàн koparàn*, MRh.;
- men's pants (with broad bottom), made of thick woollen material (varieties – according to the cut, material, color and decoration) – *демѐи demii*, Varnik, Svilengr.; *nam̀ype pat̀ure*, Sm.; Mad.; Ard.; Asenovgr.; Samokov; *чешѐри cheshiri*, MWB; *шалв̀àпу shalv̀àri*, Razl.; Kot.; Debar.;

4. Names of Shoes and Footwear

4. 1. Names of Shoes

- boatlike, shallow mouth leather shoes, attached to the leg by strings (varieties – according to shape and material) – *опѐнци opintsi*, NWB; *цървѐли tsurv̀eli*, Kula, Vid.; EB;
- men's leather shoes – *кундѐри kunduri*, Str.; Svilengr.; *калѐври kalèvri*, Zarovo, Thess.; MRh.;
- women's leather shoes – *еменѐи emenii*, Samokov.; *панѐцъ pap̀itsa* pl. /older/, Sh. L.;
- shabby shoes (worn-out, deformed) – *пашм̀àци pashm̀àtsi*, Varn.; *хлепал̀à hlepàl̀à*, Str.;

4. 2. Names of Footwear Made of Fabric, Yarn and Other Materials

- socks (varieties – according to material, crafting, length, ornaments, gender) – *зòкѐма зòкѐта* pl., Tsareva Koria, V. Tarn.; *ка̀лѐци kàltsi*, Svirachi, Ivaylovgr.; *чур̀àнѐци chur̀àptsi*, Gabr.;

4. 3. Main Parts of Shoes and Footwear

●soles, made of thin leather or thick woollen fabric, or knitted with woollen yarn – *дабàн’ dabàn* /of home shoes and knitted slippers/, Sh. L.; *пету̀на petùna* /of knitted slippers/, Str.;

5. Names of Adornments

5. 1. General Names of Adornments

●adornment (general name) – *гиздòлò gizdilo*, MRh.; *мержàне merzhàne*, Rh.; *на̀кита nàkita*, Str.;

5. 2. Names of Head and Clothing Adornments

●crownlike high wedding adornment with various decorations – *аскùйа askia* /worn by “lazarki” – girls who take part in a ritual dedicated to St. Lazarus/, Varn.; Burg.; *сòкай sòkay*, Ohrid; Struga; Prilep; Debar.; Kich.;

●hair and plaits adornments made of metal – *дукàтник dukàtnik*, Str.; *калèм kalèm*, Sm.;

●adornment made with small coins attached to chains, with a religious symbol (little cross) or a silver plate (charm) in the middle, fastened to the shoulders and decorating the chest – *манòкору manòkuru*, Sh. L.; *тълъсèм talasèm*, Zarovo, Thess.;

●wedding or engagement string of gold coins, necklace – *на̀нис алтòн’ê nànis altònye*, MRh.;

5. 3. Names of Ear and Hand Adornments

●ear adornment, earrings – *менг’ушè mengushè*, Brezn.; *обетка obetka*, Vel.; Kast.; *òбици, обицѝ òbitsi, obitsi*, Plov.; St. Z.; N. Zag.; Sliv.; *у̀шнички ùshnichki*, Mad., SEB; *чърча̀ни churchàni*, Oresh, Svisht.;

●hand adornment, bracelet – *белезìк belezik*, Dervent, Dedeag.; *бурмалъ burmala*, Rh.; *ентешè enteshè*, Krivnya, Razgr.; Dupn.; *кòлбъ kòlba*, Zarovo, Thess.; *сърчѝ sarchi*, Rus.; Tutrak.;

●engagement ring – *менò menò*, Velinigr.; *милòвен пр̀стен milòven pràsten*, Lilkovo, Plov.; *нишàн nishàn*, Samokov; *раву̀н ravùn, рау̀н raùn*, Prilep; Kast.; *раву̀нцки пр̀стени ravùntski pràsteni*, Bansko;

6. Names of Colors of Clothing, Shoes and Adornments

●color (general name) – *ба̀гра bàgra*, Bostinya, Sm.; *крàска kràska*, Zheravna, Sliv.;

●multicolor, mixture of colors – *ка̀чурпì kàchurì*, Str.; *сип̀н sipan*, Karl.; *сур sur*, Pernik;

- white color – *бѐл'ко, бѐлко bѐlko*, Sh.L.; *млѐчав mlèchav*, Botevgr.;
- light yellow – *крѐмов krèmov*, Trastenik, Plev.; *блет blet*, Vidrar, Tran region; *рус rus*, Banat;
- pink – *бел'асто belyasto*, Koprina, Lov.; *бимб'ану bimbyànu*, Zarovo, Thess.;
- red – *г'увезно gyuvezno*, Deb.; *кникàт knikat*, Str.; *кървен karven*, Graovo; Kostel, Elen.;
- lilac – *мòрѐн mòren*, Chepelare, Sm.; *мòртопращена mòrtoprachena*, Str.; *лìл'аво lilyavo*, Sh. L.;
- greenish – *зелен'ав zelenyàv*, Vasilitsa, Iht.; *мòдър mòdar*, Aldomorovtsi, Sof.;
- light blue (sky blue) – *мàви mavi*, WD; *русò сùnò русò sino*, Sh. L.; *сùn'а блèда sinya blèda*, Sof.;
- brownish (wool's natural color) – *бòзинеv bozinev*, MRh.; *лìсо liso*, Kom.;
- grey, ash – *плаф plaf*, Iht.; *сùn'o sinyo*, Karnalovo, Blagoevgr.; *сурул'ав surulyav*, Troyan;
- black – *мор мор*, Velingr.; *мòр'ан mòryan*, Karabunar, N. Paz.; *ч'òрно chyorno*, *ч'òрнко chyornko*, Sh. L.;
- dark (not quite black, unspecified) – *мургъл'àф murgalyàv* /for fabric/, Zarovo, Thess.;

In all six groups after the classification of the names follows the description of their lexico-semantic characteristic.

An attempt is made in this research to reveal the systemic character of the specialized vocabulary for clothing by taking into account its versatility. In each thematic group unified criteria with regard to onomasiology and semasiology (when presenting the structure and the character of the meaning) and etymology (when defining the origin) of the examined names are applied. These criteria create a composition frame for the consistent review of the independent lexemes and the nominative word combinations in each group, relatively separately. Defining the semantic features of the lexemes reveals the identity of their meaning as a base for their unification, and at the same time helps to express the difference existing between them. The different types of foremic denotations interpreted in this research determine the differentiated features of the words that define them.

The dialect differences between the members of the created lexical orders in each thematic group, based on their relation with a certain sememe, were examined onomasiologically and three main types were defined: structural (lexemic, phonetic, grammar, word formation) territorial (according to the boundaries of the area) and etymological (determining the ratio between local words and loanwords by including oppositions of newer versus older names) expressed by correlations with respect to the character of the differentiation features; on the basis of these correlations, words are compared, separated or united and form relations of variability, differentiation and sameness.

The semantic nature of the words is revealed in the course of the analysis by examining the semantic volume (the aggregate of their separate meanings) and the semantic structure (the relations between their separate meanings) in semasiological aspect, and this helps to distinguish the contents of the lexical units according to their differentiation features and to determine their semantic similarity and difference and also to form semantic oppositions according to the presence or lack of functional meanings of the names (organized in thematic groups) in Bulgarian dialects in correlation with literary language.

When the word origin is the differentiation feature, the names in the presented thematic groups are viewed as domestic or borrowed from foreign languages (Mladenov 1968: 270; Radeva 1979b: 107). The etymological analysis of the words' origin in the thematic groups is based on deriving facts from generic or other languages and reveals the words' history through ancient forms and meanings, as well as through those with expired motivational ground in modern language, undergone phonetic, morphological, word formation and semantic changes.

In this chapter of the research, the article for general names of clothing in the dissertation is presented as an example of lexico-semantic analysis.

The general names of clothing are combined in thematic groups comprising five subgroups.

The relations between the lexemes belonging to this group are these of similarity and variability, and all other names in the thematic groups (included in the LSG for clothing) show hierarchic semantic relations (based on their common generic features) and can be ascertained as hypernyms, following the applied principle of revealing the stable uses of names, not in one and the same dialects but in the macrodialectal system of Bulgarian language (see II. 1: 9; compare Radeva 1982: 20). The most widely spread all-Bulgarian name *clothing* is accepted as a relative lexical invariant, and all other members within the created subgroups are its lexical variants.

Generic and specific relations are formed between the members of the group, and the semantic core becomes the prototype of the general generic name through the collective name *clothing* around which the respective types of general names are arranged. On the one hand the lexical orders in the group combine language forms (with respect to the existing synonym relations between words) for denoting one and the same object, id est the common denotation, and, on the other hand, they oppose each other through different semantic features, such as generic – specific, part – whole, male – female, everyday – festive, old – new, domestic – foreign, etc., and this results in their leaving “the paradigmatic synonym order and acquiring the status of independent nominative units” (Stoichkova 1995: 416).

The few groups of general names for clothing consecutively express the differences between their common semantic features (SF), id est presence or lack

The various general names for clothing, united by equal meaning, create lexical orders, and for the most part of the names the correlation is: sememe – two or more lexemes, for example ‘set of clothes, dowry’ – *καλὸν’ kalop, πρικ’è prikye, πῦθα ρῦβα, cnan’ spap*, etc., while the corresponding lexeme for the sememe ‘clothes for the deceased’ is *πῦθα ρῦβα* with fixed larger dialect spread.

Single composite names are represented by *гиздѝлни др̀уне гиздилне дрипе* ‘festive clothing’ in the Rhodopes and *турл̀ачка прем’̀ана турл̀ачка премьана* ‘festive clothing (men’s)’ in Strandzha, and are similar not only because of their common semantic feature ‘clothing’, but also because of their differentiation feature ‘traditional costume’. At the same time, though, these names differ because of the semantic features which reflect important characteristics of the object denoted by them – the gender. The dialect words *гиздѝлни др̀уне гиздилни дрипе* from the Rhodopes have no gender, while *турл̀ачка прем’̀ана турл̀ачка премьана* from Strandzha is male and its description is ‘Turkish city attire with broad *poturi* (full-bottomed breeches)’.

27

also included in them. The three lexemes are present in several thematic groups and within them they have the same lexical semantics as the other names. Their semantic inequivalence is revealed through the opposition of their most eminent semantic features which form the meanings in the lexical subgroups where the same lexemes formally exist simultaneously, for example, *pybà ruba* ‘clothing, clothes’, ‘traditional costume’, ‘set of clothes, dowry’ и ‘set of clothes for the deceased’; *òpùnu dripi* ‘clothing, clothes’, ‘traditional costume’ и ‘worn-out or ragged clothes’; *npem’àna premyana* ‘clothing, clothes (usually new or festive)’, ‘traditional costume’, ‘set of clothes, dowry’. With their other meanings: ‘rag’ и ‘headscarf’ for *òpùnu dripi*; ‘dress’ for *pybà rùba*; ‘woven fabric for men’s clothing made of pure wool’ for *npem’àna premyàna* (expressed by the phonetic variant *npèmena prèmena* in Kostandovo, Rakitovo, Velingr.), the names are included in other thematic groups related to clothing and its making. In the semantic range of the names *pybà rùba*, *òpùnu dripi* and *npem’àna premyana* is included more than one meaning, which speaks of a complex semantic structure. Some of the meanings have analogs in various dialects and in literary language, but *òpùnu dripi* as a general name for clothing exists only in the dialect system of the Bulgarian language. It is largely used in the Rup dialects and therefore can be determined as a semantic dialectism.

The motivation features (MF) used in the creation of lexemes, show the way by which characteristic qualities of various objects from the environment are selected to name them. The analysis of the different motivation features reveals another aspect of the word, the relation between the phonetic form and the contents it expresses. This helps to recognize the principles of denotation in the thematic group for general names of clothing. The motivation features of the general names for clothing are divided into several groups:

1. Names motivated by the qualitative features of the object (*гиздѝло gizdilo* ‘a full set of clothing in a given settlement (traditional costume)’ from the noun *гиздѝло gizdilo* ‘clothes or adornment’, adjective *гиздав gizdav* ‘pretty, uptight, neat, decorated’ и verb *гиздя gizdya* ‘adorn oneself’);

2. Names motivated by the quantitative features of the object (*бага̀ш bagàsh* ‘a set of clothes, dowry’ from the noun *багаж bagazh* ‘baggage’; *пармакѝш partakèsh* ‘clothes’ from the noun *пармакѝши partakeshi* ‘items, luggage’; *макѝм takàm* ‘traditional costume’ from the noun *макѝм takam* ‘a set of items and accessories intended for work’;

3. Names motivated by the shape of the object (*калѡн' kalòp* 'a set of clothes, dowry' from the noun *калѣн kalap* 'a mold, a model' by external resemblance to the shape of the assembled pile of clothes for the dowry);

4. Names motivated by the types of outer clothing and the additional material for its decoration (*антерѣѡ anteria* from the noun *антерѣя anteria* 'a type of outer clothing'; *вѡлненѣк volnenik* from the noun *вѡлненѣк valnenik* 'a piece of woollen clothing; a type of women's outer clothing', from the noun *вѡлна valna*; *потѣри poturi* from the noun *потѣри poturi* 'full-bottomed breeches'; *пѡнделѣиште pàndelishte* 'a piece of clothing' from the noun *пѡнделѣка pandelka* 'a ribbon made of fabric or yarn');

5. Names motivated by associative relations with names for food and food products (*карантѣѡ karantia* 'a set of clothes, dowry' from the noun *карантѣя karantia* 'offal');

6. Names motivated by the names of specific activities (*нѡвлек nàvlek* 'worn-out or ragged clothes' from the verb *влекѡ vleka* 'draw, drag').

The etymon of the names *ѡдѣр ѡder*, *ѡдѣр ѡdàr*, *ѡдѣр ѡdur* 'a set of clothes, dowry' is obliterated and today their motivational features cannot be specified (compare BER I: 343 и BER IV: 809–812).

In Bulgarian dialects the general names for clothing are divided into domestic and borrowed from foreign languages.

The most widespread general names for clothing and traditional costumes in Bulgarian dialects are *дрѣха drèha* and *носѣѡ nosia* whose origin is related to the development of the Proto-Slavonic forms **drebъxā* (or **drebъxā*) (BER I: 426–427) и **nasiti* from **nesti*, *nesa* (BER IV: 688 – 692). The narrower names *гѣздѣло gīzdilo*, *гѣздѣлка gīzdilka*, *гѣздѣл'ни drūne dīzdilne dripi* and *ѡгѣзда ogizda* (from Old Bulgarian *гѣзда* 'adornnemt, decoration') confine themselves to the meaning of 'traditional costume', becoming more specific by adding DF for 'festive set of clothing'. The word *гѣздѣло gīzdilo* (with Slavic origin, compare BER I: 241; Mladenov 1941: 99; Fasmer 1986, I: 405), has a polarized meaning in Slovak language – *ohyzdnost* and dialect *hyzd* 'ugliness, ugly thing', in Czech language – *hyzd* 'ugliness' and in Polish – *gīzd* 'dirt, disgust', and is a rare example of interlingual enantiosemy (Ripka 1986). This language phenomenon brings up the question of whether the words that have opposite meanings were once positive and then acquired negative meaning, or the reverse process is observed. This example of the so called "amazing ambiguity" refutes Čeněk Šercl's assertion that "if the language is more developed and the people who speak it are better educated, they are able to differentiate more clearly

the various conceptual categories” (Stamenov 2013, quoted from Nikolova 2015: 684), and in fact shows the richness and the dynamics of language as a whole.

The existing names for ‘garments, clothing (a piece of clothing)’ such as *pỳxo ruho* in Sveta Petka, Velinigr., *pyvo ruvo* in Kuman region, *pỳo rùo* in Sofia region, *pyò rùo* in Banat and *opỳxo orùho* in Samokov region show interesting semantic development in addition to their morphophonological variants. The transfer of the meaning of the Proto-Slavic form **ruha* ‘movable property’ (registered in the Old Russian *рѣхлo rùhlo*) on clothing is typical only for Slavs (compare BER VI: 355 and Fasmer 1987, III: 524), for example Slovak *rúcho* ‘clothing’; Czech *roucho* ‘church attire’; Polish *roucho*, Serbo-Croatian *pỳxo* ‘item of clothing’; Russian *рѣхо* ‘item of clothing’; Slovene *rúho* ‘cloth, sheet’. The name *pỳxo rùho* is borrowed in Romanian (*rúfă* ‘underwear, undergarment; rag (dialect)’) and in Modern Greek (*ροῦχα* ‘item of clothing’). The etymological studies reveal the common Indo-European origin of the lexemes for clothing *pỳxo rùho* and *pỳba rùba* (compare BER VI: 345, 355, 358, 361) and the interception points with regard to their origin can be observed by tracing the long transition of the widely used name for clothing *pỳba rùba*, which through the Turkish *rubaruba* ‘item of clothing’ is borrowed from the Italian *roba* ‘item of clothing’ which is borrowed from Old High German *roub* ‘loot’, in modern German *Raub* ‘plunder’ – Indo-European **reus-* < **reu-* (BER VI: 276, 332, 345). The name *pỳba rùba* is related not only with *pyxo ruho*, but also with *роба roba*, *руно ruho*, *руша rúsha*, *ръвѣм ravam* (BER VI: 355).

The domestic names include the lexemes: *вѣлненик volnenik*, *гиздѣло gizdilo*, *дрѣну dripi*, *на̀влек nàvlek*, *òдѣр òdar*, *прем’ана premyana*.

Most of the general names for clothing are of Turkish origin: *карантѣя karantia*, from the Turkish word *kırıntı* ‘a chunk of something, remainder; offal’ (BER II: 239); *нѣтѣпу poturi* from the Turkish word *potur* ‘full-bottomed woollen breeches’ (BER V: 560); *на̀ртал’ partàl*, *на̀рѣал’ partsàl* from the Turkish word *partal* ‘rag’ (BER V: 74, 76); *но̀сат’ posat* from the Turkish word *pusat* ‘weapon; instrument, tool’ (BER V: 537); *сѣнан’ spar* from the Turkish word *espar* ‘стока’ (BER VII: 382); *такѣм takam* from the Turkish word *takım* ‘utensil; set; accessory kit, set of utensils; chibuk (dialect word for tobacco pipe)’ (BER VII: 773–774).

The word *антерѣя anteria*, included in almost all thematic groups with meanings for different types of outer clothing, is of Arab or Persian origin. It comes from the Turkish *antari*, *entari*, *entary* ‘women’s item of clothing, made from a single piece of fabric; long men’s outer item of clothing in the Arab

countries', possibly from the Arab word *Antari* (named after Antar, a character from the Arab fairy tales) or *antari* 'women's item of underwear' (compare BER I: 12; Mladenov 1947: 27; Nameranov 1962: 230; Racheva 1979: 164; Aleksandrova 2003: 99), and so does the general name for clothing *pyfè̃m rufet* – it comes from the Turkish dialect word *ürfet*, *urfet*, *hirfet* 'profession, art, undertaking; the general name for various crafts' from the Arab word *ḥirfä* (BER VI: 354).

The lexemes *npùk'ê* // *npuk'è prikye* 'dowry' were borrowed from the Greek word with the same meaning (BER V: 713, 714, 716).

In the thematic group of general names for clothing are included names which were borrowed multiple times, and the indirect borrowing of foreign words was made mostly through Turkish and Greek, for example *kalòn' kalòp* through the Turkish word *kalip*, *kalup* 'casting mold; something cast in a mold; a piece of wood, carved in the shape of a foot and put in shoes to keep their form' from the Arab word *qalib* 'metal mold; shoe mold' which comes from the Middle Greek *καλόπους*, comprising of *κᾱλόν* 'wood' и *πούς* 'foot', id est 'wooden foot' (BER II: 179).

When foreign names are included in the Bulgarian dialects, they often adapt to the specific features of the language system, for example the name *òpma òrma* 'traditional costume' (probably from the Italian word *arma* 'equipment/appliance', BER IV: 924) is a form still used in Dobrudzha and Razgrad region, as are its phonetic variants *vòpma vòrma* in Sachanli, Komotini region, and *xòpma hòrma* in Asia Minor.

The loanwords from Europe are also included in the group of general names for clothing, for example *nopmàlu portàli* in Thessaloniki region, probably directly or indirectly through modern Greek, Middle Greek *πόρτα* 'door' from the Latin word *porta* 'door' (BER V: 532); *bagàui bagàsh* in the Shiroka Laka region from the French word *bagage* (BER I: 24); *màhma mànta* in Nikopol region through the Romanian word *mántă* 'cloak' from the French word *mante* 'long women's cloak', derived from Latin (compare BER III: 655; Parashkevov 2008: 250-251); *napmakèui partakèsh* in Kesarevo, Gorna Oryahovitsa region, possibly from the German word *Parteke*, a diminutive from the French word *part* 'portion' (BER V: 73); *nàndeluuume pàndelishte* in Dolna Riksa, Montana region, through the Romanian dialect word *pandilka* 'ribbon' from the Hungarian word *pantlika* which was borrowed from the Bavarian-Austrian *Bandl*, diminutive for *Band* 'band, strip, ribbon' (BER V: 41).

In recent times the Roman loanword for a more specific name of a set of clothes *костюм kostyum* is actively used and is all-Bulgarian.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Within the thematic group of general names for clothing 68 examined lexemes were included (with defined boundaries of spread) united by the general generic name ‘clothing’ and yet opposed to each other with respect to different semantic features such as ‘generic – specific’, ‘male – female’, ‘everyday – festive’, ‘casual – worn-out’, ‘domestic – foreign’.
2. At a macrodialectal level most lexemes form multimember lexical orders (sememe – lexemes) and are comparable, the only example for noncomparable dialectism (sememe – lexeme) is a name which is more widely spread: *pyòba rùba* ‘a set of clothing for the deceased’.
3. General dialect names for clothing reflect structural (phonetic, word formation) and semantic features (for example *òpùnu dripi* ‘clothing’, Rhodopes), uncharacteristic for the standard language. Most of them are nominative dialectisms which have corresponding meanings in the standard language and other dialects.
4. According to their origin, a considerable part of the names are Oriental or European loanwords, the domestic words are relatively less and some of them are used very often and nationwide, which is still valid today, for example *òpèxa dreha* and *носия nosia*.
5. The word *зиздùло* which is of Slavic origin and means ‘a set of clothes (traditional costume); ornament, adornment’ has a polarized meaning in other related languages and is a rare example of interlingual enantiosemy.

SUMMARY

The study of dialect lexical units related to clothing and its making helps to establish specific features and tendencies in the development of Bulgarian language system and to examine the interdialectal, literary and foreign influences with a different chronology, varied intensity and spread boundaries.

In this dissertation, by applying an appropriate theoretical frame, lexical material is organized and described, which combines language and nonlanguage relations and transformations between words of Bulgarian dialects in a relatively independent object system comprising the multicomponent structure of clothing. The approach used is provoked by the subject and object of the dissertation – lexico-semantic characteristics with respect to the names related to clothing and its making.

Part of the study reflects the coexistence, correlation and interconnection between language and culture by creating language space within the nationality. Some of the indicators of this space define the place, the features and the functioning of the names and create a unified and at the same time many-sided picture of the researched object.

The analysis of the clothing vocabulary is directed towards the details of its motivational potential, the narrowing and widening of its semantic boundaries, the migrational language processes and geographic zones of spread in Bulgarian dialects, and reveals the selective nature of the nominative processes and significant details of the names with respect to the importance of the existing specific elements for the bearers of a given dialect or a group of dialects.

This study and its results lead to the conclusion that the tasks set at the beginning of the dissertation, are fulfilled, and this is proved by the accomplished objective of revealing the existing systemic relations in the created lexico-thematic groups for names related to clothing and its making in Bulgarian dialects, including all criteria: with respect to the formal, lexical, semantic and etymological characteristics of the studied lexemes.

As a result of the analysed empiric material the following **conclusions** were made:

1. For the purpose of this dissertation 1673 lexical units were examined, classified into six thematic groups – general names of clothing; names of women's outer clothing; names of men's outer clothing; names of shoes and

footwear, divided into three subgroups; names of adornments, divided into three subgroups; names of colors of clothing, footwear and adornments – arranged by geographic principle.

2. By applying theoretical knowledge for the examination of the gathered empirical material, a consistent conclusion was made that the language of clothing reflects the objective reality – the lifestyle of Bulgarian people, their culture and mentality. The endless breakdown of names with respect to various models, fabrics, ornaments and ways of making, dressing sequence, colors and seasonal, everyday and festive purpose in fact presents the existence of clothing traditions followed by larger or smaller groups of people who are bearers of their own dialect in the Bulgarian language map.
3. The names, organized in thematic groups, are distributed in relatively unified systems of objects with specific features related to clothing. The lexical units are united in their equal meaning, generic and specific relations and oppositions, such as ‘piece – whole’, ‘male – female’, ‘short – long’, ‘old – new’, ‘casual – worn-out’, ‘winter – summer’, ‘everyday – festive’, ‘domestic – foreign’.
4. The semantic theme of each group is defined by the generic seme, and the specific seme is a complex reflection both of the functional resemblance of the objects and the additional features that distinguish them from each other.
5. In onomasiological aspect multimember lexical orders were created at macrodialectal level in the studied thematic groups, based on the sememe-lexemes (comparable dialectisms) correlation. The incomparable dialectisms characterized by the correlation sememe-lexemes are a very small part (44 or 2,6% of all names). Some of them are registered in only one dialect (long tight outer piece of clothing – *сакъл’ка sakùlka*, Asenovgr.), and others – in several dialects (a set of clothing for the deceased’ – *пѣѡа рѹба*, Batak, Peshtera; Sm.; Varn.; Blagoevgr.; Petr.; Tran region; Kilkis).
6. A central place in the study is given to nominative (terminological) dialectisms which define the specifics of the dialect vocabulary.
 - 6.1. The main group of the names examined can be determined as opposed dialectisms, since they denote specialized terms (for which there are other lexemes in other dialects and less often a literary equivalent) and create heteronymic relations in interdialectal aspect.
 - 6.2. The incomparable dialectisms, which don’t have equivalents in other dialects, are relatively few but show the rich abilities for expressiveness of standard language (*кѹп̀р̀н̀’ѡ̀н̀ѹѡа kuprinenitsa* ‘thin silk outer piece of

clothing decorated with silk thread (“lamé”)’ Kasaka, Devin region; *пудлугàр’ pudlugàr* ‘insoles for the traditional peasant shoes’, Shiroka Laka region; *плеснѝк plesnik* ‘a bridal adornment made of a piece of fabric edged with old coins and tied behind the ears’, Todorovo, Pleven region; *турунджòво turundzhòvo* ‘dark blue-lilac’, Gnoynitsa, Lom region, etc.).

7. The dialect names have structural and semantic features uncharacteristic for standard language, and are compactly distributed in the thematic groups of names of phonetic (*сукмàн sukmàn, чукмàн chukmàn, чукмàн’ chukmàn*), word formation (*трèнка trèpka, трепѝшка trepùshka, треперѝшкѝ treperùshka* ‘a type of head adornment’) and semantic dialectisms (*òрѝну dripi* ‘clothes’, Rhodopes; *сукмàн sukmàn* ‘a skirt made of white calico’, Razlog region; *сандàли sandàli* ‘a type of leather peasant shoes’, Balgarene, Lovech region, etc).
8. When examining the semantic structure, nonderivative and derivative dialect names in unequal ratio are observed. When comparing the names of women’s outer clothing (*венчѝлник venchilnik* ‘wedding dress’) and of men’s outer clothing (*долàктеник dolàktenik* ‘men’s outer piece of clothing with sleeves above the elbows or elbow long sleeves’), names of shoes and footwear, a greater number of nonderived and nonmotivated words was observed (*кундѝри kundùri, еменѝи emenii, кѝтѝри katàri* ‘a type of shoes, etc.). Most general names for clothing (*гиздѝло gizdilo, прем’àна premyàna*), as well as names of jewelry (*прѝстен pràsten ring, грѝвни grivni bracelets, обѝци obitsi earrings*) and colors (*кѝрвав kàrvav bloody, теменѝжево temenùzhevo violet, гѝл’ѝбово galabovo dove color*) are derivatives in which the motivational basis and the derivative formant are observed.
- 8.1. In some of the names the nominational features are recognizable when their relation with the denote is determined – this helps to define the reasons for nominating the words according to motivational features [*касàк kasàk* ‘short women’s item of outer clothing’ (Strandzha), from the adjective *кѝс* ‘short’; *бѝсерчета bisercheta* ‘neck adornment, string, necklace’ (Nikudin, Blagoevgrad region), from the noun *бисер* ‘perl’, etc.]. The typical but irregular process observed in the thematic groups revealing the motivation as inherent to the object and as a reason for the naming is a result of the specifics of the examined dialect vocabulary in

the thematic groups – from old domestic and foreign language layers and with passive usage regarding synchrony.

- 8.2. Other names have derivative meanings, formed through a semantic differentiation and secondary nominations based on the metaphoric and metonymic transfer (*корденица kordenitsa* ‘a costume made from velvet, with a pleated skirt and sleeveless vest with straps’, Kula, Vidin region; *къдраф сукман kadràf sukmàn* ‘a dress, a long women’s item of outer clothing with folds’, Troyan; *кончелък kopchelàk* ‘item of men’s outer clothing, sleeveless’, Kravenik, Sevlievo region; *лустро lùstro* ‘a type of women’s patent leather shoes’, Strandzha; *мел’ tel* ‘a type of head adornment’, Devin region; *блак blak* ‘pink’, Kostandovo, Velingrad region; etc.).

9. As regards the semantic volume, the names are presented with the meanings with which they belong to the respective thematic group.

- 9.1. Most of the names have only one meaning, highly specialized.

- 9.2. Some of the names have different meanings in the different dialects and are included in several thematic groups, which can be observed in the names of women’s and men’s outer clothing (*антериѝа anteria*, *джамадан dzhamadàn*, *дулѝма dulamà*, *забѝн zabùn*, *минѝан mintàn*, *сайѝа sayà*, *салѝамарѝка saltamàrka*, *фередѝжѝ feredzhè* ‘a type of women’s outer clothing’ and ‘a type of men’s outer clothing’, etc.).

- 9.3. Within each name group considerable specific variations can be observed: in interdialectal aspect, one and the same name is used for different types of clothing, shoes, adornments and qualities (*абѝа abà* is used for various types of men’s outer clothing, short or long, with overlapping or nonoverlapping fronts, with sleeves or sleeveless; *нанѝѝи papùtsi* means shoes in general, slipperlike shoes, traditional shoes, different types of women’s or men’s shoes; *бѝрма bùrma* means ‘bracelet’ and ‘ring’, and *инѝиѝѝѝ intishe* means ‘earrings’ and ‘bracelet’; *ѝѝп ѝur* is associated with colors and means ‘multicolored’, ‘greenish’, ‘light brown’, ‘rusty brown’, ‘grey, ash-colored’, ‘grey-white’, ‘grey-black’, etc.).

10. The abundance of names for colors in the system of clothing reflects the characteristics of the objects and helps to identify them. The experimental inclusion of dialectisms which are names for colors in the vocabulary of clothing is an attempt to use the features of the denotations for studying the designations.

- 10.1. In the study of the names for colors of accessories of clothing, footwear and adornments all their possible meanings are examined and general rules with respect to the formation of lexical orders (red wine color – *бòрдено bòrdeno, бордовò bordovò, вìненè vinenè, вин’ànу vinyanu, мòран mòran, мòрна mòrna, моравìйа moravia*), the reflection of structural (*червèн chervèn, чървèн charvèn, цървèн tsarvèn*) and semantic dialect features (*рùса rùsa* ‘bright pink’, Rhodopes; *син бл’ад sin blyad* ‘light blue (for a pinafore dress)’, Yambol region; *плав plav* ‘brown’, Glavanovtsi, Leshnikovtsi, Tran region; Chepino, Velingrad region; etc.) and to a certain extent the motivation of names coming from such ones with material character (*ор’àхув oryàhuv* ‘brown’, Shilikovtsi, Elena region; *бъкър’ън bakàran* ‘copper red’, Zarovo, Thessaloniki; *карабàшеста karabashesta* ‘natural grey color (for wool)’, Gorna and Dolna Vasilitsa, Ihtiman region; *лàхнено làhneno* ‘green’, Radnevo, Stara Zagora region; *мàслен màslen* ‘olive color, oil green’, Troyan region; Elena region; etc.) can be observed with respect to the researched object vocabulary.
- 10.2. In most Bulgarian dialects names for colors with Proto-Slavic and Proto-Bulgarian origin are still used today, such as *плав plav, рус rus, рùмен rumen, руд rud, мòдър modar, сур sur*, etc. Most of them are not preserved in modern Bulgarian language, though.
11. In the vocabulary of traditional clothing, reflecting a specific area of the material culture in a more distant time perspective, names of different origin are included.
- 11.1. Widely included are the Oriental loanwords for names of women’s outer clothing, men’s outer clothing, shoes and footwear (*кафтàн kaftàn, контòш kontòsh, к’урдìйа kyurdia, либадè libadè, сàлта sàlta, терлìк terlik, шàêк shàek* ‘women’s outer clothing’; *абà abà, елèк elèk, йамурлùк yamurlùk, сепрè setrè, чепкèн chepkèn* ‘men’s outer clothing’; *катèре katàre, налèми nalàmi, нанùци rapùtsi, терлìци terlitsi, чìзми chizmi, чорàни* ‘a type of footwear’, etc.).
- 11.2. The European loanwords for traditional clothing are fewer in number. They are fully “incorporated” into the Bulgarian dialects, represent new clothing, such as *рокля roklya, блуза bluza, костюм kostyum, панталон pantalon, сако sako, палто palto, яке yake*, etc., and replace the name *накìти nakìti* with *бижùта bizhuta*, and the old

leather *ц̣р̣в̣ѣ̣л̣и tsarvuli* with *гал̣о̣ш̣и galoshi* ‘rubber shoes protecting from mud and rain’.

- 11.3. The nominative word combinations of mixed type occupy an important position, and some of them are more dynamic at replacing the old words with new ones (*namùpê pature* – *нанмòл'ê pantolye*, Middle Rhodopes; *алтòн'ê altonye* – *парù pari*, Zl.) or old loanwords with domestic names (*з'ум'ушени ушники gyumyusheni ùshniki* – *срèбрèни ушники srèbreni ùshniki*, Middle Rhodopes).
- 11.4. The domestic words prevail in the names of adornments (*в'èнèц vyenets*, *пудбрàдник pudbradnik*, *кùр'èшница kuryeshnitsa*, *чèлник chèlnik*, *кусичник kusichnik*, *грìвни grivni*, etc.) and the names for colors of clothing accessories, footwear and adornments (*б'ал byal*, *жлът zhlat*, *червèн chervèn*, *зил'èну zilyènu*, *сив siv*, *син sin*, *ч'òрно chyòrno*, *пèстър pàstar*, *шàрен shàren*, etc.). General domestic names such as *облèклò obleklò*, *дрèхи drèhi*, *обу̀вки obùvki*, *на̀кити nàkiti* and *цвèтовè tsvetovè* continue their active use today.
12. The dialect differences in the vocabulary and the ways of their formation show the language variety of the Bulgarian lexical system and, in particular, of the names related to clothing and its making.
13. The presented research type of analysis combines theoretical and methodological approaches. It is efficient for defining regular lexico-semantic features of object names and is applicable for studying the terminological vocabulary in the macrodialectal system of Bulgarian language.
14. The results and conclusions, presented in the scientific research of dialect names for clothing accessories, footwear and adornments could be of use for further studies of the remaining part of the specialized vocabulary in this sphere, gathered in person.

Literature Cited in the Dissertation

Aleksandrova 2003: *Александрова, Сн.* Турски заемки за названия на облекло в българските говори. – Във: В поисках „ориентального“ на Балканах. Античность. Средновековье. Новое время, Институт славяноведения РАН, Москва, 2003, 98–101.

Aleksandrova, Dimitrova 2018: *Александрова, М., М. Димитрова* (СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“). Ръкописен извор за названия на дрехи от края на XIX век от Тополовградска околия. – В: Български и румънски–балкански отпечатък в славянското и романското наследство, София, 2018, 139–150; ISBN 978-619-7433-26-5 (pdf), <http://digilib.nalis.bg/xmlui/handle/nls/30582>

Antonova-Vasileva 1998: *Антонова-Василева, Л.* Речник на прилепския говор (по материали на Марко Цепенков). – В: Марко Цепенков. Фолклорно наследство. Т. 1, С., 1998, 383–498.

Antonova-Vasileva, Garavalova 2012: *Антонова-Василева, Л., Ил. Гаравалова.* Мястото на лингвогеографията при проучването на отличителните особености на българския език (Посвещава се на 100-годишнината от рождението на проф. Стойко Стойков). – В: Списание на БАН, кн. 6, 2012, 46–49.

Antonova-Vasileva, Keremedchieva 2001: *Антонова-Василева, Л., Сл. Керемидчиева.* Кратък речник на диалектните думи. „Планета 3“, София, 2001.

Antonova-Vasileva, Keremedchieva, Vasileva, Kocheva 2014: *Антонова-Василева, Л., Сл. Керемидчиева, Л. Василева, А. Кочева-Лефеджиева.* Дигитална карта на диалектната делитба на българския език. София, Институт за български език „Проф. Л. Андрейчин“ при БАН, 2014, 130 с., http://ibl.bas.bg/bulgarian_dialects/

Antonova-Vasileva, Mitrinov 2011: *Антонова-Василева, Л., Г. Митринов.* Речник на българските говори в Южните Родопи, Драмско и Сярско. София, 2011.

Arnaudov 1938: *Арnaudов, М.* Названия на българската народна носия. – В: Родна реч, год. XI, книга 4, София, март–април 1938, 149–153.

Bankevich 1985: *Банкевич, В. В.* К вопросу о соотношении лексико-семантических и тематических групп. – В: Семантика слова и предложения. Ленинград, 1985, 30–35.

Barbolova 2006: *Барболова, З.* Имената за забрадка в българския език. София, 2006.

Bart 1991a: *Барт, Р.* Система на модата. – Във: Въображението на знака (есета), София, 1991, 482–486.

Bart 1991b: *Барт, Р.* Писмената дреха. – Във: Въображението на знака (есета), С., 1991, 487–504.

BDA 1988: Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том. Встъпителна част. София, 1988.

BDA 2001: Български диалектен атлас. Обобщаващ том. I – III. Фонетика. Акцентология. Лексика. София, 2001.

BER: Български етимологичен речник. Т. I – VIII. С., 1971–2017.

Bistrova, Kapatruck 1980: *Быстрова, Л. В., Н. Д. Капатрук, В. В. Левицкий.* К вопросу о принципах и методах выделения лексико-семантических групп слов. – В: Научные доклады высшей школы. Филологические науки, № 6, Москва, 1980, 75–78.

Bogatiryov 1971: *Богатырев, П. Г.* Функция национального костюма в Моравской Словакии (превод на руски). – Във: Вопросы теории народного искусства, Москва, 1971, 297–366.

Borodina, Gak 1979: *Бородина, М. А, В. Г. Гак.* К типологии и методике историко-семантических исследований. На материале лексики французского языка. „Наука“, Ленинград, 1979.

Boyadzhiev 1967: *Бояджиев, Т.* Диалектни названия на някои части на облеклото. Названия на престилката в българския език. – В: Език и литература, Кн. 6, С., 1967, 69–75.

Boyadzhiev 2002: *Бояджиев, Т.* Българска лексикология. „Анубис“, София, 2002.

Dapcheva 1986: *Дапчева, Й.* Някои проблеми при изследването на семантични полета. – В: Годишник на ИЧС, т. VI, 1986.

Davidova 2001a: *Давыдова В. В.* Опыт системного рассмотрения костюма. Серия „Symposium“, Методология гуманитарного знания в перспективе XXI века. Выпуск № 12/ К 80-летию профессора Моисея Самойловича Кагана. Материалы международной научной конференции, 18 мая 2001 г., Санкт-Петербург, 2001, 287–290.

Davidova 2001b: *Давыдова В. В.* Костюм как феномен культуры. Автореферат диссертации. Санкт-Петербург, 2001, <<http://www.dissercat.com/content/kostyum-kak-fenomen-kultury>>

Decheva 2005: *Дечева, М.* Етнология на облеклото в България – традиции и перспективи. – В: Българска етнология, бр. 3–4, София, 2005, 37–41.

Fasmer: *Фасмер, М.* Этимологический словарь русского языка. Т. I – IV. Москва, 1986–1987.

Filin 1957: *Филин, Ф. П.* О лексико-семантических группах слов. – В: Езиковедски изследвания в чест на Стефан Младенов. София, 1957, 523–538.

Filipova-Bayrova 1969: *Филипова-Байрова, М.* Гръцки заемки в съвременния български език. София, 1969.

Gagen-Torn 1960: *Гаген-Торн, Н. И.* Женская одежда народов Поволжья (материалы к этногенезу). Чебоксары, 1960.

Gak 1971: *Гак, В. Г.* К проблеме гносеологических аспектов семантики слова. – Ввв: Вопросы описания лексико-семантических систем языка, сборник статей ст. Ч. I., Москва, 1971, 104–110.

Gak 1971b: *Гак, В. Г.* Семантическая структура слова как компонент семантической структуры высказывания. – В: Семантическая структура слова. Психолингвистические исследования. Отв. ред. А. А. Леонтьев. „Наука“, Москва, 1971, 76–89.

Gak 1972: *Гак, В. Г.* К проблеме семантической синтагматики. – В: Проблемы структурной лингвистики, Москва, 1972, 367–395.

Gak 1976: *Гак, В. Г.* К диалектике семантических отношений в языке. – В: Принципы и методы семантических исследований, сборник статей, Москва, 1976, 89–101.

Gancheva 2004: *Ганчева, Д.* Западноевропейски влияния в облеклото на българите от Разград през втората половина на XIX век – семантичен израз на етнокултурните идентификационни процеси в обществото (по материали от периодичния печат). – В: Известия на Регионален исторически музей Русе, т. 8, Русе, 2004, 158–168.

Ganeva 2003: *Ганева, Р.* Знаците на българското традиционно облекло. София, 2003.

Genchev 1980: *Генчев, Ст.* Названието и мястото му в характеристиката на обичая. – Ввв: Въпроси на етнографията и фолклористиката, София, 1980, 190–195.

Gerov 1975–1978: *Геров, Н.* Речник на българския език с тълкуване речите на български и руски. Фототипно издание. Част 1–6, София, 1975–1978.

Grancharova 2002: *Грънчарова, К.* Един архаичен елемент от традиционното народно облекло. По материали от средното течение на Струма. – В: Известия на Исторически музей Кюстендил, т. VI, 2002, 49–55.

Guliga, Shendels 1976: *Гулыга Е. В., Шендельс Е. И.* О компонентном анализе значимых единиц языка. – В: Принципы и методы семантических исследований. Москва, 1976, 291–314.

Hadzhiyski 2002: *Хаджийски, Ив.* Бит и душевност на нашия народ. Т. 1, София, 2002.

Haliolchev 1978: *Халиолчев, Хр.* Диалектната лексика в тълковния речник на националния език. – В: Славистичен сборник, София, 1978, 163–170.

Hallig, Wartburg 1963: *Hallig, R., W. von Wartburg.* Begriffssystem als Grundlage für die Lexicographie. Berlin, (zweiten auflage), 1963.

IDRBE 2012: Идеографски диалектен речник на българския език. Т. I. А – Д. София: Български бестселър – Национален музей на българската книга и полиграфия, 2012.

Ilin 1998: *Ильин, В. И.* Поведение потребителей. Сыктывкар, 1998, <http://www.globalmedia51.ru/old/50behaviourofconsumers.pdf>

Ivanov 1941: *Иванов, Й.* Облеклото у старите българи. – В: Родина, кн. III, 1941, 1–12.

Kabasanov 1956: *Кабасанов, Ст.* Говорът на село Момчиловци, Смолянско. – В: Известия на Института за български език, Кн. IV, София, 1956, 5–101.

Keremedchieva, Kocheva, Vasileva, Parvanov, Sertova, Garavalova, Cherneva 2012: *Керемидчиева, Сл., А. Кочева, Л. Василева, К. Първанов, З. Сертова, Ил. Гаравалова и Р. Чернева.* Еркеч – паметта на езика. Традиции и устойчиви тенденции в един архаичен български говор – говора на с. Еркеч (днес Козичино), Поморийско. Изд. „Мултипъринт“, С., 2012, 300 с.

Kirilova 2011: *Кирилова, Й.* Пастирската терминология в Софийско. „Знак’94“, Велико Търново, 2011, 274 с.

Kitanova, Legurska 2008: *Китанова, М., П. Легурска.* Тематичен речник на термините на народния календар. АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов“, София, 2008.

Kochev 1980: *Кочев, Ив.* Десигнати, свързани с домашния бит като ономасиологичен мотив на десубстантивни словообразователни формации. – Във: Въпроси на етнографията и фолклористиката, София, 1980, 159–163.

Kochev 1984: *Кочев, Ив.* Основното диалектно деление на българския език. – В: Помагало по българска диалектология (препечатана статия), София, 1984, 31–42.

Kocheva-Lefedzhieva 2004: *Кочева-Лефеджиева, А.* Немски лексикални заемки в българските говори. София, 2004.

Kochieva 2013: *Кочиева, М.* Семиотичен анализ на модата като културен феномен. – В: Стъпки от началото, е-том II, <<https://naum.slav.uni-sofia.bg/liliseries/diss/2013/5>>

Koseriu 1990: *Косериу, Е.* Лекции по общо езикознание. „Наука и изкуство“, София, 1990.

Krasteva-Nozharova 1969: *Кръстева-Ножарова, Г.* Българската народна носия в Западните Родопи. – В: Народностна и битова общност на родопските българи, София, 1969, 119–149.

Kuznetsov 1980: *Кузнецов, А. М.* Проблемы компонентного анализа в лексике. Москва, 1980.

- Kuznetsov 1988:** *Кузнецов, А. М.* Методы сопоставительного изучения языков. „Наука“, М., 1988.
- Kyuvlieva 1980:** *Кювлиева, В.* Морфологична адаптация и асимилация на турски заемки – съществителни и прилагателни – в българския език. – В: ИИБЕ, кн. XXIV, 1980, 78–136.
- Legurska 2002:** *Легурска, П.* Анализ на предметните имена в руския и българския език (теоретични проблеми). – В: Българско езикознание. Кн. 3. Проблеми на българската лексикология, фразеология и лексикография. София, 2002, 89–149.
- Legurska, Pavlova, Kitanova 2012:** *Легурска, П., Н. Павлова, М. Китанова.* Човешкият живот – раждане, сватба, погребение. Тематичен речник на българската семейна обредност. АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов“, София, 2012.
- Luleyska 2017:** *Лулейска, И.* Един неизследван извор от края на XIX век. Принос към описанието на значенията на думи, назоваващи дрехи. – В: Език и литература, № 3–4, София, 2017, 223–232.
- Mareva 2005:** *Марева, Т.* Архивните снимки като извор за промените в родопското женско облекло през първите десетилетия на XX век (по материали от Средните Родопи). – В: Българска етнология, бр. 3-4, София, 2005, 50–61.
- Marinov 1994:** *Маринов, Д.* Народна религиозна вяра и религиозни народни обичаи. С., 1994.
- Mihaylova 1983:** *Михайлова, Ганка.* Функция на народните носии. – В: Българска етнография, II, София, 1983, 267–281.
- Mihaylova 1985:** *Михайлова, Гургана.* Системни отношения в лексиката. – В: Известия на Института за български език, кн. XXVI, 1985, 151–178.
- Miletich 1902:** *Милетич, Л.* Старото българско население в Североизточна България. С., 1902.
- Miletich 1984:** *Милетич, Л.* Единството на българския език в неговите наречия. – В: Помагало по българска диалектология (препечатана статия), София, 1984, 20–30.
- Miletich 2013:** *Милетич, Л.* Родопските говори на българския език. „Изток–Запад“, София, 2013.
- Mirchev 1952:** *Мирчев, К.* За съдбата на турцизмите в българския език. – В: Известия на Института за български език, кн. 2, 1952, 117–127.
- Mladenov 1941:** *Младенов, Ст.* Етимологически и правописен речник на българския книжовен език. София, 1941.
- Mladenov 1947:** *Младенов, Ст.* Речник на чуждите думи в българския език (с обяснения за потекло и състав). Трето допълнено издание, „Хемус“, С., 1947.

- Mladenov 1951:** *Младенов, Ст.* Български тълковен речник с оглед към народните говори. Т. I. (А–К). София, 1951.
- Mladenov 1967:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Лексиката на ихтиманския говор. – В: Българска диалектология. Проучвания и материали, кн. III, С., 1967, 3–196.
- Mladenov 1968:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Типове лексикални различия в източните български говори (По материали от БДА, т. I, II). – В: Славистичен сборник. София, 1968, 261–271.
- Mladenov 1969:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Лингвистична география. – В: Български език. Кн. 4–5, С., 1969.
- Mladenov 1978a:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Роль лексических данных в диалектном членении болгарского языка. – В: Восточнославянское и общее языкознание, Москва, 1978, 66–71.
- Mladenov 1978b:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Диалектните лексикални различия и причините за тяхното появяване. – В: Славистичен сборник. София, 1978, 223–228.
- Mladenov 1981:** *Младенов, М. Сл.* Отражение на елементи от народния мироглед в езика. – В: Българска етнография. Кн. 1, София, 1981, 39–51.
- Mollova 1964:** *Моллова, М.* Относно ориенталските заемки в „Български тълковен речник“. – В: Български език, 1964, № 6, 534–539.
- Mutafchiev 1971:** *Мутафчиев, Р.* Анализ на лексиката по семантични полета. – В: Език и литература, № 2, 1971, 27–38.
- Nameranov 1962:** *Намеранов, Н.* Чужди думи в професионалния говор на българските шивачи. – В: Българска диалектология. Проучвания и материали. Т. I, София, 1962, 219–240.
- Nikolova 2015:** *Николова, Магдалена.* Примери и начини за класификация на езиковия феномен енантосемия в английския и българския език. – В: Научни трудове на ПУ „Паисий Хилендарски“, Том 53, Кн. 1, Сб. А, Филология, Пловдив, 2015, 683–690.
- Obleklo I ezikovo bogatstvo 2018 /Clothing and Language Richness 2018:** *Димитрова, М. и екип.* Научен проект „Местно производство, облекло и езиково богатство (Принос към историческата лингвистика и антропологията на облеклото)“ на СУ „Св. Климент Охридски“ и Института за етнология и фолклористика с Етнографски музей при БАН, <http://vestiarium-bg.eu/>
- OLA 2015:** Общеславянский лингвистический атлас. Серия Лексико-словообразовательная. Выпуск 10. Народные обычаи. Отв. ред. Т. И. Вендина, Москва – Санкт-Петербург, 2015.
- Parashkevov 1979:** *Парашкевов, Б.* За произхода на думите сако и шушон. – В: Български език, Кн. 4, 1979, 329–331.

Parashkevov 2008: *Парашкевов, Б.* Етимологични дублети в българския език. Енциклопедичен речник на думи и имена с единно лексикално първоначало. София, 2008.

Pavlova 1995: *Павлова, Н.* Диалектология и етнокултура. – В: Българистични студии, София, 1995, 121-126.

Pernishka 1982: *Пернишка, Ем.* Лексиката като система. – В: Българско словно богатство. Т. 3, София, 1982, 5–8.

Pernishka 1993: *Пернишка, Ем.* За системността в лексикалната многозначност на съществителните имена. София, 1993.

Pokrovski 1896: *Покровский М. М.* Семасиологические исследования в области древних языков. Москва, 1896.

Popstoilov 1979: *Попстоилов, А.* Село Зарово, Солунско. Историко-фолклорно и езиковедско изследване. Ред. Костадин Динчев, София, 1979.

Porzig 1934: *Porzig, W.* Wesenhafte Bedeutungsbeziehungen. – В: Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, Bd. 58, 1934, 70–97.

Racheva 1979: *Рачева, М.* За заемките от арабски произход в българския език. – В: Помагало по българска лексикография, София, 1979, 161–167.

Radeva 1979a: *Радева, В.* За някои различия между книжовната и диалектната лексика. – В: Помагало по българска лексикология. София, 1979, 280–285.

Radeva 1979b: *Радева, В.* Селскостопанската лексика на централния балкански говор. – В: Българска диалектология. Проучвания и материали. Кн. IX. София, 1979, 79–222.

Radeva 1982: *Радева, В.* Лексикалното богатство на българските говори. София, 1982.

Radichev 2004: *Радичев, Р., Г. Паликъщов, Г. Радичев.* Широка лъка и говорът на широколъчани. София, 2004.

Raykova 1981: *Райкова, М.* Традиционното женско облекло в Девинско. – В: Българска етнография, год. VI, кн. 1, София, 1981, 31–38.

Raykova 1986: *Райкова, М. (съставител).* Традиционното народно облекло от Средните Родопи. Окръжен исторически музей – Смолян, 1986.

Ripka 1987: *Рипка, И.* За някои специфични черти в концепцията на общонародния диалектен речник. – Доклад, представен на българо-словашката конференция в ИБЕ при БАН, 28–29.IX.1987.

RNDKB 2018: *Барболова, З., М. Симеонова, М. Китанова, Н. Мутафчиева, П. Легурска.* Речник на народната духовна култура на българите. „Наука и изкуство“, София, 2018, 504 с.

RRODD 1974: Речник на редки, остарели и диалектни думи в литературата

ни от XIX и XX век. Под редакцията на Ст. Илчев, София, 1974.

RSDDBG 1990: *Мъжлекова, М.* Речник на старобългарски думи в днешните български говори. Изд. на БАН, Институт за български език, София, 1990.

Shapkarev 2001: *Шапкарев, К.* Градиво за български речник, София, 2001.

Shishkov 1887–1892: *Шишков, Ст.* Родопски старини. Кн. I. Пловдив, 1887; Кн. II. Пловдив, 1888; Кн. III. Пловдив, 1890; Кн. IV. Пловдив, 1892.

Shishmanov 1933: *Шишманов, Ив.* Към терминологията на българските народни носии (реферат, четен в Академията през 1928 г., докладван от М. Арnaudов през март 1933 г.). – В: Списание на БАН, Книга XLV, 1933, 107–120.

Shmelyov 1964: *Шмелев, Д. Н.* Очерки по семасиологии русского языка. „Просвещение“, Москва, 1964.

Shmelyov 1973: *Шмелев, Д. Н.* Проблемы семантического анализа лексики. На материале русского языка. „Наука“, Москва, 1973.

Shram 1981: *Шрам, А. Н.* Структурные типы лексических значений слова (На материале качественных прилагательных). – Вв: Филологические науки, № 2, 1981, 58–64.

Shterba 1940: *Щерба, Л. В.* Опыт общей теории лексикографии. – В: Изв. ОЛЯ АН СССР, № 3, Москва, 1940, 89–117.

Smirnitski 1954: *Смирницкий, А. И.* К вопросу о слове (проблема „тождества“ слова). – В: Труды Института языкознания АН СССР, Москва, 1954, 3–49.

Sobolev 2001: *Соболев, А. Н.* Болгарский широколышкий говор. Синтаксис. Лексика духовной культуры. Тексты. Biblion Verlag, Marburg an der Lahn, 2001.

Sorokoletov, Kuznetsov 1987: *Сороколетов Ф. П., О. Д. Кузнецов.* Очерки по русской диалектной лексикографии. „Наука“, Ленинград, 1987.

Stamenov 2013: *Stamenov, M.* Enantiosemy as a Phenomenon of Language (in Bulgarian). November, 2013. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/258925463_Enantiosemy_as_a_Phenomenon_of_Language_in_Bulgarian>

Sternin 1985: *Стернин, И. А.* Лексическое значение слова в речи. Воронеж, 1985.

Stoichkova 1995: *Стоичкова, Л.* Към въпроса за номинативните диалектизми в лексиката на бесарабските българи. – В: Българите в Северното Причерноморие, Том 4, бр. 1, УИ „Св. Св. Кирил и Методий“, Велико Търново, 1995, 415–421.

Stoychev 1965: *Стойчев, Т.* Родопски речник. – В: БДПМ, 2, 1965, 119–314.

Stoychev 1970: *Стойчев, Т.* Родопски речник. – В: БДПМ, 5, 1970, 153–220.

- Stoykov 1963:** *Стойков, Ст.* Основното диалектно деление на българския език. – В: Славянска филология, Т. III, Доклади, съобщения и статии по езикознание. София, 1963, 105–119.
- Stoykov 1968:** *Стойков, Ст.* Лексиката на банатския говор. – В: Трудове по българска диалектология, Кн. 4, София, 1968, 326 с.
- Stoykov 1993:** *Стойков, Ст.* Българска диалектология. София, 1993.
- Stoykov, Mladenov 1971:** *Стойков, Ст., М. Сл. Младенов.* Упътване за проучване лексиката на местен говор. София, 1971.
- Tellalova 1995:** *Теллалова, С.* Българските диалекти и етнокултурните региони. – В: Българистични студии, София, 1995, 158–161.
- Todorov 1984:** *Тодоров, Цв.* Принос към методика на диалектологията. – В: Помагало по българска диалектология (препечатана статия), София, 1984, 269–294.
- Todorova 1972:** *Тодорова, Ел.* Семантична характеристика на прилагателните за линеен размер. – В: Български език, № 1–2, 1972, 38–46.
- Todorova 1977:** *Тодорова, Ел.* Въпросът за лексиката като система в съвременното езикознание. – В: Български език, Кн. 1, 1977, 3–14.
- Tolstoy 1968:** *Толстой, Н. И.* Некоторые проблемы сравнительной славянской семасиологии. – В: Славянское языкознание. VI Международный съезд славистов (Прага, авг. 1968 г.). Доклады советской делегации. Москва, 1968, 339–365.
- Trier 1931:** *Trier, J.* Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: die Geschichte eines sprachlichen Feldes. Heidelberg, 1931.
- Trubetskoy 1925:** *Трубецкой, Н. С.* Вавилонская башня и смешение языков. – В: Наследие Чингисхана. Взгляд на русскую историю не с Запада, а с Востока. Берлин, 1925; препечатана статия на: <http://gumilevica.kulichki.net/TNS/tns13.htm>
- Tsonev 1984:** *Цонев, Б.* История на българския език. Т. I. „Наука и изкуство“, София, 1984.
- Ufimtseva 1968:** *Уфимцева, А. А.* Слово в лексико-семантической системе языка. Москва, 1968.
- Vacheva-Hoteva, Keremedchieva 2000:** *Вачева-Хотева, М., Сл. Керемидчиева.* Говорът на село Зарово, Солунско. София, 2000.
- Vakarelski, Ivanov 1941:** *Вакарелски, Хр., Д. Иванов.* История на облеклото. София, 1941.
- Vankov 1959:** *Ванков, Л.* Към историята на италианските заемки в български 1762–1860. – В: Годишник на Софийския университет, Филологически факултет, Т. 52/2, 1959, 201–321.

- Veleva 1956:** *Велева, М.* Български народни носии. Наука и изкуство, София, 1956.
- Veleva 1963:** *Велева, М.* Българската двупрестилчена носия. София, 1963.
- Veleva 1969:** *Велева, М.* Българската народна носия в Източните Родопи. – В: Народностна и битова общност на родопските българи, София, 1969, 57–115.
- Veleva, Lepavtsova 1960, 1974, 1979, 1988:** *Велева, М., Е. Лепавцова.* Български народни носии. Т. 1., София, 1960; Т. 2., София, 1974; Т. 3., София, 1979; Т. 4., София, 1988.
- Vendina 2001:** *Вендина, Т. И.* Введение в языкознание. Высшая школа, Москва, 2001.
- Vinogradov 1953:** *Виноградов В. В.* Основные типы лексических значений слова. – Във: Вопросы языкознания, № 5, 1953, 3–29.
- Vitanova 1986:** *Витанова, М.* Говорът на село Еникьой (Кръстополе), Ксантийско. Автореферат на дисертация за получаване на научната степен „кандидат на филологическите науки“. С., 1986.
- Vitanova 2012:** *Витанова, М.* Човек и свят. Лингвокултурологични проучвания. София, 2012.
- Vitanova 2014:** *Витанова, М.* Лексикалната система на говора на с. Еникьой (Кръстополе), Ксантийско. – В: Българска реч, кн. 2, София, 2014, 48–54.
- Vitanova 2016:** *Витанова, М.* Етнолингвистичен речник на народната медицина. – В: За словото – нови търсения и подходи. Юбилеен сборник в чест на чл.-кор. проф. д.ф.н. Е. Пернишка. Изд. на БАН „Проф. М. Дринов“, София, 2016, 120–123.
- Vrabie 1974:** *Врабие, Ем.* Из лексиката на говора в с. Широка лъка, Девинско. – Във: В памет на проф. Ст. Стойков (1912-1969). Езиковедски изследвания. София, 1974, 285–292.
- Weisgerber 1962:** *Weisgerber, L.* Grundzuge der inhaltbezogenen Grammatik. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1962.
- Zaharieva 2006:** *Захариева, Й.* Явното и скритото в думите за дрехи през Българското възраждане. София, 2006.
- Zhivkov 2000:** *Живков, Т. Ив.* Увод в етнологията. Пловдив, 2000.
- Zlatanova 1970:** *Златанова, Р.* За някои семантични особености на лексиката в говора на с. Смочево, Кюстендилско. – В: Известия на Института за български език, Книга XIX, 1970, 763–769.

List of Abbreviations

Geographic Regions, Territorial Dialects and Authors

Ard. – Ardino region	Gabr. – Gabrovo region
Asenovgrd. – Asenovgrad region	Gerov – Nayden Gerov
Ayt. – Aytos region	G. Tosh. – General Toshevo region
B. Slat. – Byala Slatina region	Gevgel. – Gevgeli region
Bab. – Babaeski region	God. – Godech region
Balch. – Balchik region	G. Oryah. – Gorna Oryahovitsa region
Bel. – Belene region	Harm. – Harmanli region
Belogr. – Belogradchik region	Hask. – Haskovo region
Berkov. – Berkovitsa region	Iht. – Ihtiman region
Blagoevgr. – Blagoevgrad region	Ivaylovgr. – Ivaylovgrad region
BLT – Bulgarian language territory	Karl. – Karlovo region
Bosilegr. – Bosilegrad region	Kazan. – Kazanlak region
Botevgr. – Botevgrad region	Kast. – Kastoria region
Brezn. – Breznik region	Kilk. – Kilis region
Burg. – Burgas region	Kom. – Komotini region
Chataldzh. – Chataldzhia region	Korch. – Korchan region
Chep. – Chipino region	Kot. – Kotel region
Chip. – Chiprovo region	Krumovgr. – Krumovgrad region
Chirp. – Chirpan region	Kul. – Kula region
Chorl. – Chorlen region	Kyust. – Kyustendil region
Deb. – Debar region	Lak. – Laki region
Dedeag. – Dedeagach region	Lom. – Lom region
Dev. – Devin region	Lov. – Lovech region
Dobr. – Dobrudzha	Luk. – Lukovit region
Dobr. – Dobrich region	L. Karavelov – Lyuben Karavelov
Dos. – Dospat region	M. Tarn. – Malko Tarnovo region
Dryan. – Dryanovo region	Maced. – Macedonia
Dupn. – Dupnitsa region	Mad. – Madan region
EB – Eastern Bulgaria	Malg. – Malgar region
ER – Eastern Rhodopes	MNB – Middle Northern Bulgaria
ET – Eastern Trakia	MRh. – Middle Rhodopes
Elen. – Elena region	MWB – Middle Western Bulgaria
G. Delch. – Gotse Delchev region	Momchilgr. – Momchilgrad region

Mont. – Montana region	Sh.L. – Shiroka laka region
NEB – Northeastern Bulgaria	Shum. – Shumen region
N. Haytov – Nikolay Haytov	Sil. – Silistra region
Nik. – Nikopol region	Sliv. – Sliven region
NB – Northern Bulgaria	Sm. – Smolyan region
NM – Northern Makedonia (region)	Sof. – Sofia region
NWB – Northwestern Bulgaria	ST – Southern Trakia
NWD – Northwestern dialects	Str. – Strandzha
N. Zag. – Nova Zagora region	Svilgr. – Svilengrad region
N. Paz. – Novi Pazar region	Svisht. – Svishtov region
Omurt. – Omurtag region	SWB – Southwestern Bulgaria
Oryah. – Oryahovo region	SWD – southwestern dialects
Panag. – Panagyurishte region	SWR – Southwestern Rhodopes
Parv. – Parvomay region	Targ. – Targovishte region
Pavlik. – Pavlikeni region	Terv. – Tervel region
Pazar. – Pazardzhik region	Tet. – Teteven region
Pern. – Pernik region	Thessal. – Thessaloniki region
Pesht. – Peshtera region	Tran. – Tran region
Petr. – Petrich region	Trojan. – Trojan region
Pird. – Pirdop region	Tryav. – Tryavna region
Plev. – Pleven region	Tsaribr. – Tsaribrod region
Plov. – Plovdiv region	Tutr. – Tutrakan region
Pomor. – Pomorie region	Varn. – Varna region
Pop. – Popovo region	Vel. – Veles region
Presl. – Preslav region	Velingr. – Velingrad region
Presl. planina – Preslavska planina mountain	V. Tarn. – Veliko Tarnovo region
Prov. – Provadia region	Vid. – Vidin region
Prov. plato – Provadiysko plato plateau	Vr. – Vratsa region
Radom. – Radomir region	WB – Western Bulgaria
Razgr. – Razgrad region	WD – Western dialects
Razl. – Razlog region	WD – Western Dobrudzha
Rhod. – the Rhodopes	Xant. – Xanthi
Rus. – Ruse region	Yamb. – Yambol region
Sam. – Samokov region	Zl. – Zlatograd region
Sand. – Sandanski region	
Sevl. – Sevlievo region	
SEB – Southeastern Bulgaria	
SET – Southeastern Trakia	

Reference of the Academic Merits of the Dissertation

1. The dissertation is a comprehensive scientific study of the dialect names related to clothing and its making and is the first made so far linguistically.
2. The development of different theories in the history of linguistics and in the studies of Bulgarian dialectology was examined and despite all differences in the scientific hypotheses, vocabulary and language were presented as a system of systems, which serves as a context in the analysis of the dialect lexical units.
3. The language data base of names in Bulgarian dialects contain a significant quality of lexical material gathered through fieldwork and from archives and published sources created in various time intervals over a period of one hundred years.
4. An attempt was made for the first time to systematize by thematic and linguo-geographic principle a circle of vocabulary characteristic for the Bulgarian ethnos as a whole; it shows to a certain extent the correlation between language and folk culture, their interaction and the various correspondences between them.
5. A typological frame was created for the classification of the names into thematic groups and a unified model of systemic and structural parameters was suggested, including specific features of vocabulary and semantics, in order to reveal the degree of systemacity in the dialect terminological vocabulary, which is a cogent base and perspective for further study of the language of clothing.

List of Publications on the Topic of the Dissertation

1. **Turkish Loanwords for Names of Clothing in Bulgarian Dialects** – In: Balkan Readings 7. Theses and Materials. In Search of the “Oriental” on the Balkans. Ancient Times. Medieval Times. Modern Times. Moscow, Institute for Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 24 – 26 March, 2003, p. 98-101.
2. **Names of Clothing in the Middle Rhodopes. From the Work on the Thematic Questionnaire.** – In: Studies on Slavic Dialectology. Terminological Vocabulary of the Material and Spiritual Culture of Slavs. Series 10. Moscow, Institute for Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2004, p. 204 – 211; ISBN: 5-7576-0160-4.
3. **Names of Adornments. Lexical Characteristics.** – In: Studies on Phraseology, Lexicology and Lexicography. A Tribute to Prof. Keti Ankova-Nicheva Phd. Sofia, University Publishing House Prof. “Marin Drinov“, 2008, p. 265 –271; ISBN: 978-954-322-166-0.
4. **Loanwords from Western Europe for Names of Clothing in Bulgarian Dialects** - In: Balkan Readings 7. Theses and Materials. In Search of the “Western” on the Balkans. Preliminary Materials. Moscow, Institute for Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 22 – 24 November 2005, p. 153 – 156; ISBN: 5-7576-0181-7.
5. **Names for Shoes and Footwear in Bulgarian Dialects.** – In: Scientific Researches of the Union of Scientists in Bulgaria – Plovdiv. Series B. Natural Sciences and the Humanities. Vol. VI, Plovdiv, 2006, p. 102 – 107; ISSN 1311-9192.
6. **Names for Colors in Bulgarian Dialects** – In: Scientific Works of Plovdiv University Paisii Hilendarski, Vol 44, Book 1, Corpus A, 2006 – Philology, Plovdiv, 2006, p. 145 – 151.
Electronic Magazine Liternet, October 20, 2007, No. 10 (95)
<[Http://Liternet.Bg/E-Zine/07_10.Htm](http://Liternet.Bg/E-Zine/07_10.Htm)>.
[Https://Liternet.Bg/Publish20/S_Aleksandrova/Nazvaniia.Htm](https://Liternet.Bg/Publish20/S_Aleksandrova/Nazvaniia.Htm)
7. **Turkish Loanwords for Names of Clothing and its Accessories in Bulgarian Dialects** (Thematic and Comparative Review) – In: Paisii Readings. International Slavistic Conference. Intercultural Dialog – Traditions and Perspectives. Linguistics, Plovdiv 27-28 November, 2008,

Scientific Works of Plovdiv University Paisii Hilendarski, Vol 46, Book 1, Corpus A, Plovdiv, 2009, p. 250 – 259; ISSN 0861-0029.

Electronic Magazine Liternet, July 10, 2010, No. 7 (128)

https://Spisanie.Liternet.Bg/10_07.Htm

https://Liternet.Bg/Publish20/S_Aleksandrova/Turski_Zaemki.Htm

Author's Participation in Conferences

1. Report on: **Turkish Loanwords for Names of Clothing in Bulgarian Dialects** – International Conference *Balkan Readings 7*. Theses and Materials. In Search of the Oriental on the Balkans. Ancient Times. Medieval Times. Modern Times at the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 24 – 26 March, 2003 (Published).
2. Report On: **Names of Adornments. Lexical Characteristics** – Third International Conference *Lexicology, Phraseology and Lexicography* (Tribute to Prof. Keti Ankova-Nicheva Phd), Sofia, 14 – 16 May, 2004 (Published).
3. Report On: **Names of Clothing in Bulgarian Dialects – XIV Colloquy For Young Linguists in Lodenitsa, Slovakia**, 8 – 10 December, 2004.
4. Report On: **Names of Shoes and Footwear in Bulgarian Dialects** – Balkan Conference for Young Scientists, 16 –18 June, 2005, Plovdiv (Published).
5. Report on: **Loanwords from Western Europe for Names of Clothing in Bulgarian Dialects at the** International Conference *Balkan Readings 7*. Theses and Materials. In Search of the “Western” on the Balkans. At the Institute of Slavic Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, 22 – 24 November, 2005 (Published).
6. Report On: **Names for Colors in Bulgarian Dialects** – International Conference *Paisii Readings 2006*, Plovdiv, 12 – 14 October, 2006 (Published).
7. Report on: **Turkish Loanwords for Names of Clothing and its Accessories in Bulgarian Dialects** (thematic and comparative review) – International Slavistic Conference *Paisii Readings 2008. Intercultural Dialog – Traditions and Perspectives*, Plovdiv, 27–28 November, 2008 (Published)