

Институт славяноведения РАН
Балканские чтения. 16

СТРАТЕГИИ МЕЖБАЛКАНСКОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ: ПЕРЕВОД. ПЕРЕСКАЗ. УМОЛЧАНИЕ



Институт славяноведения РАН

Балканские чтения. 16

СТРАТЕГИИ
МЕЖБАЛКАНСКОЙ
КОММУНИКАЦИИ:
ПЕРЕВОД. ПЕРЕСКАЗ.
УМОЛЧАНИЕ



«ИНДРИК»

МОСКВА

2021

УДК 81-13
ББК 81-67(47)
С83

РЕКОМЕНДОВАНО К ПЕЧАТИ УЧЕНЫМ СОВЕТОМ
ИНСТИТУТА СЛАВЯНОВЕДЕНИЯ РАН

РЕЦЕНЗЕНТЫ:

к.ф.н. *М. В. Завьялова*,
чл.-корр. РАН *А. Л. Топорков*

РЕДКОЛЛЕГИЯ:

И. А. Седакова (отв. ред.), *М. М. Макартцев*, *Т. В. Цивьян*

Стратегии межбалканской коммуникации: Перевод. Пересказ. Умолчание / Отв. ред. И. А. Седакова, ред. М. М. Макартцев, Т. В. Цивьян. — М.: Институт славяноведения РАН : Индрик, 2021. (Балканские чтения. 16.) — 168 с.

ISBN 978-5-91674-625-9

DOI 10.31168/2618-8597.2021.16

В сборник вошли материалы к очередным Балканским чтениям (Балканские чтения 16. «Стратегии межбалканской коммуникации: Перевод. Пересказ. Умолчание». Москва, Институт славяноведения РАН, 20–22 апреля 2021), организованным Центром лингвокультурных исследований Balcanica и посвященным проблемам перевода в коммуникативном аспекте.

The strategies of inter-Balkan communication: Translation. Retelling. Paralipsis / Ed.-in-chief I. A. Sedakova, eds. M. M. Makartsev, T. V. Civjan. Moscow: Institute of Slavic Studies : INDRIK, 2021. (Series Balcanica. 16.) — 168 p.

The book includes preliminary materials for the biannual Balkan conference (Balcanische chteniia / Series Balcanica 16. “The strategies of inter-Balkan communication: Translation. Retelling. Paralipsis”. Moscow, Institute of Slavic Studies, April, 20–22, 2021), organized by the Centre for Linguocultural Research “Balcanica” and dedicated to the communicative aspect of translation problems.

УДК 81-13
ББК 81-67(47)

В оформлении обложки использован фрагмент волютного кратера из Канозы (Мастер Дарий. Волютный кратер из Канозы с изображением трагедии «Персы». Ок. 340 г. до н.э. Неаполь, Национальный археологический музей).

ISSN 2618-8597

© Коллектив авторов, текст, 2021
© Институт славяноведения РАН, 2021
© Оформление,
Издательство «Индрик», 2021

СОДЕРЖАНИЕ

ПЕРЕВОД — ПЕРЕСКАЗ — УМОЛЧАНИЕ В БАЛКАНСКОЙ АНТИЧНОСТИ

- Н. Н. Казанский* (Санкт-Петербург).
Дословная передача чужой речи в гомеровском эпосе
(Микенский комментарий к *Ил.* 9 122 sq. = *Ил.* 9 264 sq. = *Ил.* 19 243 sq.) ... 11
- М. Н. Казанская* (Санкт-Петербург).
Недопонимание или переосмысление?
Отражение гесиодовского описания Стикса (Theog. 789) у Вергилия ... 18
- Л. И. Акимова* (Москва).
«Собрание богов» на греческих вазах: Аттика vs Апулия 23
- А. А. Новохатько* (Салоники / Фрейбург-в-Брейзгау).
«Послание Аристее» и концепт перевода в Древней Греции 28

БАЛКАНСКАЯ ГРАММАТИКА И ПРОБЛЕМЫ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

- Ekaterina Tarpomanova, Bilyana Mihaylova* (Sofia).
Found in translation: encoding the source of fear
by cases and prepositions in the Balkan languagess 35
- Ronelle Alexander* (Berkeley, USA).
Digital analysis of Balkan phraseology 43

БАЛКАНСКАЯ ПРАГМАТИКА И ПРОБЛЕМЫ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ КОНТАКТОВ

- С. А. Борисов, Г. П. Пилипенко* (Москва).
Peti/Petci в румынско-сербском окружении:
село Златица в Банате 49
- М. М. Макарецев* (Москва).
Найденное в переводе: (полу)структурированные опросники
и грамматикализация продолженного вида
в неалбанских диалектах Албании 54
- М. С. Морозова* (Санкт-Петербург).
В поисках ограничений на переключение кодов:
из наблюдений над речью албанско-славянских билингвов 62

М. Л. Кисилиер (Санкт-Петербург).

Недиалектные центры цаконского диалектного сообщества:
парадоксы идентификации 68

БАЛКАНСКАЯ СОВРЕМЕННОСТЬ: ПЕРЕВОД И ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ

П. Асенова (София), *Х. Марку* (Комотини).

Стратегии перевода с „эвиденциальных“
на „не-эвиденциальные“ балканские языки
(на материале художественных текстов албанского,
болгарского и греческого) 77

Н. Г. Голант, *М. М. Рыжова*, *Н. Л. Сухачев* (Санкт-Петербург).

Диалектная специфика «влашских» (тимокских) вариантов
«Миорицы» (проблемы перевода) 84

А. А. Новик (Санкт-Петербург).

Фитоним и феномен: трудности перевода
в албанско-греческом пограничье (Химара, Южная Албания) 89

А. В. Жугра (Санкт-Петербург), *А. И. Чиварзина* (Москва).

Зеленое сердце, зеленая кровь в албанском поэтическом дискурсе:
к вопросу о переводимости образов 95

И. А. Седакова (Москва).

Перевод с балканского на балканские и небалканские языки
(на примере романа Петре М. Андреевского «Пирей») 101

Е. А. Сартори (Афины).

«Αἴσιος»: об одной многоязычной антологии балканской поэзии
и балканском фольклоре 107

Н. В. Злыднева (Москва).

Концепт перевода-перехода в балканской модели мира 112

РЕЛИГИОЗНАЯ И ОБРЯДОВАЯ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ НА БАЛКАНАХ

А. С. Дугушина (Санкт-Петербург).

“Lutu ashtu si thotë zemër”: сценарии ритуального поведения
в этнически и религиозно смешанном святилище
в с. Летница (Косово) 119

К. П. Трофимова (Москва).

Вернакулярная герменевтика: споры о толковании снов
в суфийских традициях Центральных Балкан 125

А. А. Леонтьева (Москва).

Головные уборы в имущественных описях мусульман
и христиан Софии XVIII в.: перекличка культур и конфессий 132

Ю. А. Аверьянов (Москва).

Лингвокультурные особенности создания образов иноверцев
(христиан) в “Вилайет-наме-и Отман Баба” (XV в.) 137

Ахмет Таишгын (Анкара).

Бекташи на Балканах: передача смыслов в устных
и письменных текстах традиции бекташи 142

Е. Э. Будовская (Вашингтон), *К. С. Задоя* (Дюссельдорф).

Слово и молчание как средства коммуникации
с потусторонним существом в карпатской традиции 144

НАУЧНАЯ КОММУНИКАЦИЯ И ИЗУЧЕНИЕ БАЛКАН

Magdalena Reksć (Łódź).

Narracje pamięci i ich etnokulturowe interpretacje
w Muzeum Wojennego Dzieciństwa w Sarajewie 153

Vladislava Warditz (Potsdam).

Imperial patterns in the circulation
of grammatical knowledge in the Balkans 157

Мотоки Номати (Саппоро).

От пересказа к рассказу (через умолчание): зигзаги взглядов
С. Б. Бернштейна на «македонский вопрос» 162

CONTENTS

TRANSLATION – RETELLING – PARALIPSIS IN THE BALKAN ANTIQUITY

<i>Nikolai N. Kazansky</i> (Saint Petersburg). Verbatim quotation in Homeric speeches (a commentary from Mycenaean perspective on Hom. <i>Il.</i> 9 122 sq. = <i>Il.</i> 9 264 sq. = <i>Il.</i> 19 243 sq.)	11
<i>Maria N. Kazanskaya</i> (Saint Petersburg). Misunderstanding or reinterpretation? Reflections of Hesiod's description of the Styx (Theog. 789) in Vergil	18
<i>Lyudmila I. Akimova</i> (Moscow). “The Assembly of the Gods” in Greek Vase-Painting: Attica vs Apulia	23
<i>Anna A. Novokhatko</i> (Thessaloniki / Freiburg). The “Letter of Aristeeas” and the concept of translation in Ancient Greece ...	28

BALKAN GRAMMAR AND PROBLEMS OF COMMUNICATION

<i>Ekaterina Tarpomanova, Bilyana Mihaylova</i> (Sofia). Found in translation: encoding the source of fear by cases and prepositions in the Balkan languages	35
<i>Ronelle Alexander</i> (Berkeley, USA). Digital analysis of Balkan phraseology	43
<i>Sergey A. Borisov, Gleb P. Pilipenko</i> (Moscow). <i>Pemi/Pemci</i> in the Romanian-Serbian environment: the village of Zlatița in Banat	47
<i>Maxim M. Makartsev</i> (Moscow / Oldenburg). Found in translation: (Semi)structured questionnaires and the grammaticalization of the continuous aspect in non-Albanian dialects in Albania	54
<i>Maria S. Morozova</i> (Saint Petersburg). In search of linguistic constraints on code-switching: Some observations on Albanian-Slavic bilingual speech	62
<i>Maxim L. Kisilier</i> (Saint Petersburg). Non-dialectal centers of the Tsakonian dialectal community: A Paradox of identification	68

**CONTEMPORARY BALKANS:
TRANSLATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS**

- Petya Assenova* (Sofia), *Christina Markou* (Komotini).
Translation strategies from “evidential” to “non-evidential”
Balkan languages (based on literary texts in Albanian,
Bulgarian and Greek) 77
- Natalia G. Golant*, *Maria M. Ryzhova*, *Nikolai L. Sukhachev* (Saint Petersburg).
The dialectal specificity of the “Vlach” versions of the ballad “Miorița”
from the Timok valley (translation problems) 84
- Alexander A. Novik* (Saint Petersburg).
Phytonym and phenomenon: Difficulties of translation
in the Albanian-Greek borderlands (Himara, Southern Albania) 89
- Alvina V. Zhugra* (Saint Petersburg), *Alexandra I. Chivarzina* (Moscow).
Green heart, green blood in Albanian poetic discourse:
On the translatability of images 95
- Irina A. Sedakova* (Moscow).
Translation from Balkan languages into Balkan and non-Balkan
(the case of the novel by Petre M. Andreevski) 101
- Elena A. Sartori* (Athens).
“Αἴτιος”: On a multilingual anthology of Balkan poetry
and Balkan folklore 107
- Nataliya V. Zlydneva* (Moscow).
The concept of translation–transition in the Balkan Model of the World 112

**RELIGIOUS AND RITUAL COMMUNICATION
IN THE BALKANS**

- Aleksandra S. Dugushina* (Saint Petersburg).
“Lutu ashtu si thotë zemër”: ritual scenarios in the ethically
and religiously mixed shrine in Letnica (Kosovo) 119
- Ksenia P. Trofimova* (Moscow).
Vernacular hermeneutics: Contesting dream interpretations
in the Sufi traditions of the Central Balkans 125
- Anna A. Leontyeva* (Moscow).
Muslims and Christians’ headgear in the asset registers
of kadi’s courts in the 18th century Sofia:
An interplay of cultures and confessions 132

Iurii A. Averianov (Moscow).

Linguocultural features of the creation of images of the infidels (Christians) in “Vilayet-name-i Otman Baba” (15th century)	137
--	-----

Ahmet Taşgün (Ankara).

Bektashi in the Balkans: the transmission of meanings in oral and written texts of the Bektashi tradition	142
--	-----

Elena E. Boudovskaia (Washington), *Kira S. Sadoja* (Düsseldorf).

Word and silence as means of communication with supernatural creatures in Carpathian tradition	144
---	-----

ACADEMIC COMMUNICATION AND BALKAN STUDIES

Magdalena Reksć (Łódź).

Memory narratives and their ethno-cultural interpretations at the War Childhood Museum in Sarajevo	153
---	-----

Vladislava Warditz (Potsdam).

Imperial patterns in the circulation of grammatical knowledge in the Balkans	157
---	-----

Motoki Nomachi (Sapporo).

From retelling to telling (via silence): Zigzags of Samuil B. Bernštejn’s views on the “Macedonian Question”	162
--	-----

FOUND IN TRANSLATION:
ENCODING THE SOURCE OF FEAR BY CASES AND PREPOSITIONS
IN THE BALKAN LANGUAGES

Ekaterina Tarpomanova

Saint Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia (Bulgaria)
tochitsaaa@gmail.com

Bilyana Mihaylova

Saint Kliment Ohridski University of Sofia (Bulgaria)
bilydim@gmail.com

0. FEAR AND ITS REPRESENTATION IN LANGUAGE

In all psychological classifications, fear is presented as one of basic and most universal human emotions. It causes standard reactions, known as fight-or-flight response, which, to all appearances, have similar lexicalizations in languages. The semantic development of words denoting fear is often transparent: the words meaning ‘fear, fright’ in human languages commonly originate from lexemes with primary semantics connected to the physical actions or expressions of this emotion as ‘go away, run’, ‘tremble, shake; be cold, chilly shiver’, ‘freeze, be stiff, be paralysed; catch, grasp’, ‘be struck’ (Buck 1949: 1153). The human behaviour as a response of fear may be encoded in grammar, too. In a previous work we analyzed the verb diathesis in fear constructions, which, in our view, represents the fear as an inner experience in the languages of the Balkan *Sprachbund* (Tarpomanova, Mihaylova, Krastev 2019). In this paper we will focus on the way the universal reaction of distancing from the source of fear may be represented by grammatical means. In many languages, the fear constructions are a metaphorization of the avoidance response to fear. Our aim is to show how the psychological reaction and the resulting behaviour are translated by means of grammatical features and furthermore the correspondences of those metaphorical translations between the Balkan languages that are due to the processes of interference in the development towards analytism of their noun systems.

1. TWO STRATEGIES TO ENCODE THE STIMULUS IN FEAR CONSTRUCTIONS

The argument structure of predicates denoting the emotion of fear involves two participants: the experiencer and the stimulus. The experiencer of the psychological state can appear as either the subject (ES: *Mark fears Mary*) or the direct object (EO: *Mary frightens Mark*). Verbs like *fear* describe a habitual attitude towards some entity whereas verbs like *frighten* describe an externally caused emotional episode (Hartshorne et al. 2016: 268). Here we will explore the reaction of the verbs from the *fear*-type where the experiencer is mapped as subject.

The patterns by which semantic structures of fear verbs are conceptualized syntactically in human languages are different. Two main strategies may be outlined in the syntactic expression of the stimuli of fear when the experiencer appears as subject: (i) The stimulus is encoded as direct object in opposition to the higher thematic role of the experiencer (Grimshaw 1990: 16, Temme 2018: 13) as a consequence of a cognitive process where the experiencer pre-existed the stimulus. (ii) The stimulus is introduced by oblique cases (genitive/ablative and more rarely by instrumental) or prepositions expressing distancing behaviour (Lakey 2016: 42) the fleeing being the most common reaction to the fear.

The first strategy may be seen in many languages of the world, see the data extracted in Valency Patterns Leipzig Online Database (ValPaL). Languages as Arabic, Japanese, Bora encode the fear stimuli in Accusative. Concerning the Balkan areal in Antiquity this was the common strategy in Ancient Greek and Latin.

The second strategy is attested in many Indo-European languages, including all the Slavic languages, Old Persian, Armenian, but also in Evenki (a Tungusic language) and Ket (a Dené-Yeniseian language).

2. TRANSLATING STIMULUS IN ANCIENT LANGUAGES ON THE BALKANS

2.1. The main Latin ES verbs for fear, regardless of their origin, are active and transitive, i.e. the fear stimulus is expressed in accusative: *timeō*, *metuō*, *paveō*, *formīdō* ‘fear, be afraid of’, *horreo* ‘stand erect, tremble at, be afraid of’, *tremo* ‘tremble at, be afraid of’, *trepidō* ‘tremble at, be afraid of’. In Latin only the verb *vereor* ‘feel awe of, reverence, revere, respect; fear, be afraid of’ is deponent, i.e. inactive.

2.2. In Ancient Greek we find both strategies of expression of the stimulus. However, it is most often encoded as direct object.

2.2.1. Stimulus encoded as direct object

δεῖδω (old perfect *δε-δFοια) ‘fear; be alarmed, be anxious’;

τρέμω ‘tremble, quake, quiver; tremble with fear; tremble at, fear’;

τρομέω ‘tremble, quake, quiver, esp. from fear’; c. acc. ‘tremble before or at a person, stand in awe of’;

τρέω ‘turn to flee, flee in terror, be afraid, fear.’

2.2.2. Stimulus introduced by the preposition *ὑπό* followed by genitive *ἀτύζομαι* ‘to be distraught from fear, bewildered, flee bewildered.’

2.2.3. State of transition

The mediopassive verb *φέβομαι* ‘flee in panic’, attested only in Homer and his imitators, the intransitive middle iterative *φοβέομαι* ‘to be put to flight (Hom), terrify, alarm (Hom+)’ and the transitive active causative *φοβέω* ‘put to flight (Hom), to be seized with fear, be affrighted (Hom+)’, which is a back-formation from *φοβέομαι* according to Jasanoff (2003: 134), are related to PSI. **bĕgati* < IE **b^hegw-* ‘run, flee’. The inactive verbs *φέβομαι* and *φοβέομαι* can be used with the preposition *ὑπό* plus dative/genitive, on the one hand, or as transitive with accusative, on the other.

The semantic transformation from movement (flight) to emotion (fear) has been accompanied by changes in the predicate structure of the medio-passive, which affected the realization of the internal argument. In Homer *φοβέομαι* is used with the genitive/dative, rarely with the accusative, or with the preposition *ὑπό*, while in Thucydides (5th century BC) the semantic change is already present: the active transitive verb means ‘terrify, alarm’, and the inactive one means ‘fear’ and is used with the accusative (see also Kitis 2009: 436 sqq.)

2.3. In Old Church Slavonic the stimulus of fear type verbs is expressed with ablative preposition or genitive case. It is well known that the ablative has been lost and its functions have been subsumed under the genitive marker.

БѢСѢ НЕ БОИЖ СѦ (CP)

‘I am not afraid of evil spirits.’

НЕ ОУБОИЖ СѦА ЗѢЛА БѢКО ТѢИ СѦ МНОИЖ ЕСИ (CP)

‘I am not afraid of evil if you are with me.’

ОУЖЕ НЕ СТРАШѢ СѦ ПРОТИВНААГО (CP)

‘I am no longer afraid of the enemy.’

2.4. In the ancient languages in the Balkan area, the predominance of the first strategy of marking the stimulus in fear constructions is obvious: the stimulus is encoded as a direct object in all Latin and in most Ancient Greek verbs, including *δειδω*, the basic verb expressing fear in Ancient Greek. In Old Church Slavonic, the second strategy which encodes distancing behavior is used exclusively.

3. TRANSLATING FEAR STIMULUS IN THE MODERN BALKAN LANGUAGES

3.1. Fear stimulus translated by cases

As it is well-known, one of the main common features in the analytical development of the noun system of the Balkan languages is the fusion of genitive and dative: in Bulgarian and Romanian they are formally expressed by the dative inflection, while in Greek it is the genitive that bears the functions of the dative (cf. Асенова 2002: 81). In Albanian the two cases do not differ formally, and additionally the ablative has a different inflection for the indefinite plural (-*sh*), which has emerged from an old Locative (Demiraj 1973: 64).

3.1.1. After the process of case fusion has been accomplished, the dative assumed the functions of the genitive (and the ablative) covering also the meaning of distancing in the case of verbs expressing fear. This outcome is particularly noticeable in Albanian, where the majority of the verbs for fear are used with the Dative. In Romanian the dative may be found in several periphrastic constructions.

Alb. *Nuk i frikem vdekjes*. 'I don't fear death.'; *Nuk u tutet vështirësive*. 'He is not afraid of the difficulties.'; *I trembej atij*. 'He was afraid of him.' (FShS)

Rom. *a duce frica cuiva* 'be afraid of somebody', lit. 'bring fear to somebody'; *a lua frica cuiva* 'be afraid of somebody', lit. 'take the fear of somebody' (РБФР 403); *Are frica lui Dumnezeu*. (collocation) 'He has fear of God.'

As in Bulgarian, the development towards analytical noun system resulted in complete loss of the cases, the correspondence of the dative pattern is a prepositional phrase headed by *на*, which may be replaced by a dative pronominal clitic.

Bulg. *Не му се плаша*. (МДАБЯ 186) 'I am not afraid of him'; *Никога не съм правила козунак, имам му страх от едно време*. (svatbata.bg) 'I have never made Easter cake, I have been afraid of it ever since.'

However, the dative pattern of fear constructions in Bulgarian is rather rare and limited to dialectal and colloquial use.

3.1.2. The accusative remains a sustainable strategy mainly for active verbs and, additionally, for the Greek deponent verb *φοβάμαι*.

Alb. *S'i druajmë armiqtë*. (FShS) 'We are not afraid of the enemies.'

Gr. *Φοβάμαι τα λάθη*. (athensnlp.gr) 'I am afraid of mistakes.'

In Old and Middle Romanian the verb *a teme* appears as active (inherited from Latin) or as reflexive (possibly a Slavic influence according to Pușcariu 1940: 277). The number of the reflexives increases in the Middle Romanian period (Pană Dindelegan 2016: 206–207). The verb can be used with the dative, with a prepositional phrase, and with the accusative (ib. 76). The raise of the Dative constructions are explained with Slavic influence (ib. 88). These variants were eliminated from standard Romanian (ib. 86) but are still maintained in XIX-century literature:

Tu, ce nu temi furtuna și durerea... (Mihai Eminescu, *Odin și poetul*) 'You, who don't fear fortune and suffering...'

N-ai frică de trăsnet? Teme pe zei? (George Coșbuc (trad.), Virgiliu, *Eneida*) 'Aren't you afraid of thunderbolts? Are you afraid of the gods?'

Interestingly enough, the Albanian expression *kam frikë* 'be afraid', lit. 'have fear', may also adhere a stimulus in the accusative, although the position of the direct object is already taken by the noun *frikë*, unlike the corresponding expressions in the other Balkan languages.

Nuk i urrej njerëzit, i kam frikë. (facebook) 'I don't hate people, I am afraid of them.'

A possible explanation could be the semantic bleaching of the noun and the higher degree of bondedness between the two elements of the construction, or in other words the grammaticalization of the expression, which allows the stimulus to be marked with the accusative.

3.2. From cases to prepositions

At a very early stage of the development of the Indo-European languages, the prepositions appeared to support the cases in order to express the syntactic relations in a more clear or detailed way. They gradually enlarged their functions and became the main means for the expression of syntactic relations, thus contributing for the weakening of the cases or fully replacing them in some languages (Meillet, Vendryes 1924: 481; Demiraj 1973: 63).

It has been claimed that in the Balkan languages many prepositions have been grammaticalized to express certain abstract and general relations

(cf. Асенова 2002: 97). One of the grammaticalized prepositions of the Balkan linguistic area is Bulg. *om*, Gr. *από*, Rom. *de* (*de la, din*), Alb. *nga, prej*, which among its other functions is the main means to introduce the stimulus in fear constructions. The primary and the earlier meaning of those prepositions, known since Ancient Greek, Latin and Old Church Slavonic, is that of moving away. From that particular meaning further related and more general meanings have been developed, such as possessive, partitive, origin, starting point in time or space, and some more recent senses, not directly connected to the initial one, like transgression, quantity, time scope, way of action (Асенова 1972: 235–236). The same prepositions have been grammaticalized to denote the agent in passive constructions and the so-called standard NP (Stassen 2013) in comparative constructions.

In the modern Balkan languages, the preposition Bulg. *om*, Gr. *από*, Rom. *de*, Alb. *nga, prej* is one of the main means to denote the stimulus in fear constructions.

Bulg. *Тя се страхуваше от него.* (alle.bg) ‘She was afraid of him.’; *Плаша се от тъмното.* (ask.fm) ‘I’m afraid of the dark.’

Alb. *Nuk frikësohem nga lartësia.* (FShS) ‘I am not afraid of height.’; *Tutet prej tij.* (FShS) ‘He is afraid of him.’ *Tutet nga hija e vet.* (FShS) ‘He is afraid of his own shadow.’ *Kam frikë prej danajve edhe kur sjellin dhurata.* (Virgjili, *Eneida*) ‘I fear the Danaans, even when bringing gifts.’

Rom. *Nu mă tem de moarte, dimpotrivă.* (George Topîrceanu, *Balade vesele și triste, Infernul*) ‘I am not afraid of death, on the contrary.’; *Se sperie și de umbra lui.* (collocation) ‘He is afraid even of his shadow.’

Gr. *Τρομάζω από την δύναμη αυτής της αγάπης.* (facebook) ‘I fear the strength of that love.’; *Αλλά έχω μάθει να μη σκιάζομαι από τέτοια φαινόμενα.* (tanea.gr) ‘But I learned not to be afraid of such events.’

The preposition *από* in Greek may even occur with the verb *φοβάμαι*, which as a rule requires a direct object marked by the accusative.

Ποιος φοβάται από την πολιτική βία; (epohi.gr) ‘Who is afraid of the political life?’; *fov’ame ap’o to sk’ilo su.* (МДАБЯ 186) ‘I am afraid of your dog.’

There are two reasons for the establishment of the prepositions as a main strategy to express the stimulus in fear constructions: a semantic and a syntactic one. Considering the semantic side, the prototypical meaning of the prepositions fully corresponds to the avoidance response to the fear, i.e. moving away from the stimulus. On the other hand, the fact that the prepositions under consideration occur mostly with inactive verbs expressing fear could also be connected with their grammaticalization in passive constructions.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In the Balkan area, a diachronic tendency is well observed. The ancient languages (Latin and Greek) show a preference for the first strategy in marking the stimulus of fear constructions, i.e. the stimulus is encoded as direct object, while in the modern Balkan languages clearly predominates the second strategy which translates by grammatical means the avoiding behaviour as physical reaction to the fear. The course of this process is clearly seen in the development of Gk. *φοβάμαι* u Rom. *a teme*.

The development towards analytism of the noun systems of the Balkan languages resulted in the domination of the prepositional expression of the stimulus in fear constructions. In Greek, Bulgarian and Romanian the prepositional expression is the most frequent pattern, which in Greek may be found even with the traditionally deponent verb *φοβάμαι* instead of the accusative. In Albanian, the case (dative) and the prepositional (*nga, prej*) pattern compete, both occurring in fear constructions as they code the metaphor of distancing.

Acknowledgement: The research is supported by the Scientific Research Fund of the Ministry of Education and Science of Bulgaria, project *The Balkan languages as emanation of the ethno-cultural community of the Balkans (Verb typology)*, contract DN 20/9/11.12.2017.

REFERENCES

- Buck 1949 — *Buck C. D.* A Dictionary of selected synonyms in the principal Indo-European languages. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Demiraj 1973 — *Demiraj Sh.* Morfologjia historike e gjuhës shqipe. Pjesa I. Tirana: Drejtoria Qendrore e Poligrafisë, 1973.
- FShS — Fjalor i shqipes së sotme. Tirana: Botimet Toena, 2002.
- Grimshaw 1990 — *Grimshaw J.* Argument structure. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1990. (Linguistic inquiry monographs.)
- Hartshorne et al. 2016. — *Hartshorne J. K., O'Donnell T. J., Sudo Y., Uruwashi M., Lee M., Snedeker J.* Psych verbs, the linking problem, and the acquisition of language // *Cognition* 157, 2016. P. 268–288.
- Kitis 2009 — *Kitis E.* From motion to emotion to interpersonal function: The case of fear predicates // Pishwa H. (ed.). *Language and social cognition: Expression of the social mind*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009. P. 433–454.

- Lahey 2016 — *Lahey H. A.* The grammar of fear: Morphosyntactic metaphor in fear constructions. (PhD Dissertation), Available online at https://www.academia.edu/32864441/THE_GRAMMAR_OF_FEAR_MORPHOSYNTACTIC_METAPHOR_IN_FEAR_CONSTRUCTIONS, Accessed on 2021-02-23.
- Stassen 2013 — *Stassen L.* Comparative constructions // Dryer M. S., Haspelmath M. (eds.). The world atlas of language structures online. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, 2013. (Available online at: <http://wals.info/chapter/121>, Accessed on 2021-02-21.)
- Meillet & Vendryes 1924 — *Meillet A., Vendryes J.* Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques. Paris: Champion, 1924.
- Pană Dindelegan 2016 — *Pană Dindelegan G.* (ed.). The syntax of Old Romanian. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Pușcariu 1940 — *Pușcari, S.* Limba română. Vol I. Privire generală. București: Fundația pentru Literatură și Artă „Regele Carol II”, 1940.
- Tarpomanova, Mihaylova, Krastev 2019 — *Tarpomanova E., Mihaylova B., Krastev N.* Emotions in grammar: fear in the Balkan languages // Балканский тезаурус: коммуникация в сложно-культурных обществах на Балканах / Отв. ред. И. А. Седакова, ред. М. М. Макаревич, Т. В. Цивьян. М.: Институт славяноведения РАН, 2019. P. 68–74. (Балканские чтения. 15.)
- Temme 2018 — *Temme A.* The peculiar nature of psych verbs and experiencer object structures. (PhD Dissertations, Humboldt University). (Available online at https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/20689/dissertation_temme_anne.pdf?sequence=3, Accessed on 2021-02-21.)
- ValPaL — Valency patterns Leipzig online database. (Available online at: <http://valpal.info/>, Accessed on 2021-02-23.)
- Асенова 1972 — *Асенова П.* Общност в употребата на най-характерните граматикализирани предлози в балканските езици // Годишник на Софийския университет. Факултет по славянски филологии 66/1, 1972. С. 179–250.
- Асенова 2002 — *Асенова П.* Балканско езикознание. Велико Търново: Фабер, 2002.
- БРФР — *Калдиева-Захариева, С.* Румънско-български фразеологичен речник. София: АИ „Проф. Марин Дринов“, 1997.
- СР — *Cyrrillomethodiana.* Старобългарски речник. Available online at: <https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/oldbgdict>, Accessed on 2021-03-01.
- МДАБА — Малый диалектологический атлас балканских языков. Под редакцией А. Н. Соболева. Серия грамматическая Том I. Категории имени существительного. München: Biblion Verlag, 2005.