Review

Walter Riggs Thompson. *Epifanii Slavinetskii's Greek-Slavonic-Latin Lexicon between East and West*. Volume 8 of *Empirie und Theorie der Sprachwissenschaft*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag, 2024. 412 pp. ISBN 978-38-2539-596-4.

Reviewed by Cynthia M. Vakareliyska

This is a hefty and extremely well-researched doctoral dissertation for the Faculty of Modern Languages at Heidelberg University, published with minimal revision, as is the practice in Germany, and clearly written for the doctoral supervisor and dissertation committee rather than for a reading audience of other specialists in one or more fields. It is no fault of the author, of course, that this *tour-de-force* dissertation looks like a dissertation, but it raises a philosophical question regarding the criteria for writing book reviews of published dissertations. It is hardly the place of a book reviewer to evaluate a dissertation, yet treating a dissertation as a scholarly book in a review requires the pointing out of some features that may be appropriate for a dissertation but that are less than ideal in a peer-reviewed scholarly book.

The goal of the book, as the author states (p. 18), is to examine cultural processes and historical issues concerning the creation, use, and reception of the Ruthenian monk Epifanij Slavineckij's draft copy of his 17th-century *Greek-Slavonic-Latin Lexicon* (*GSL*, in the author's abbreviation). The hypotheses that the book seeks to prove are (a) that Slavineckij (ca. 1600–1675) was not a Graecophile (i.e., a member of the school that stressed the Greek language and Orthodoxy and was opposed to Latin/Roman Catholic influence coming from Poland), as claimed by some scholars, but that he used and translated Latin texts and lexemes, presumably from Western European sources, and that Latin influence is demonstrated by Slavic calques from Latin in the *GSL*, including Greek loanwords transmitted via Latin into Early Modern written European languages ("internationalisms"); (b) that Slavineckij used a variant of Ruthenian Church Slavonic in the draft manuscript, which was later Russified in copies of the finished manuscript produced by Muscovite scribes; and (c) that the dictionary contains features of a developed Church Slavonic "academic," i.e., scholarly, language, particularly in the grammatical terms used.

The book consists of nine chapters, a bibliography, and two appendices. The table of contents is followed by an index of tables and an index of figures (i.e., writing samples) that appear in the text. The individual chapters analyze the *GSL* exhaustively from the perspectives of different disciplines, including history, lexicography, and Slavic linguistics.

Chapter 1 is an introduction focusing on research goals and methods, and the conventions used in the book. Chapter 2 presents a thorough summary of the historical and cultural background of the *GSL* and a detailed review of the scholarly literature, covering lexicography, language attitudes of the early modern East Slavs and of Muscovy during Nikon's reforms, Latin and Greek as languages of communication in Muscovy, and Slavineckij's lexicographic works.

Chapter 3 is a description of the draft *GSL* manuscript at the State Historical Museum in Moscow (Sin. Gr. 383). The chapter provides a detailed codicological and paleographic analysis of the manuscript, comparing it with Titov 67 at the Russian National Library, which is one of the two extant Muscovite clean copies of Slavineckij's now-lost final manuscript and the subject of an article by Olga Strakhov (2006). Chapter 4, "Formal Structural Description," gives an overview of the various types and structures of dictionaries, focusing on issues including the resolution of orthographic and phonetic variation, and the macro-, medio-, and microstructure of dictionaries, based on the model in Wiegand (1984; cited as 1983) and Wiegand et al. (2010). Chapter 5 proposes specific Greek-Latin dictionaries that Slavineckij most likely consulted in the compilation of the *GSL* and looks at his use of primary sources. Thompson compares random alphabetical lemma stretches in the *GSL* to each possible dictionary source proposed by earlier scholars, concluding that Constantin's 1592 Greek-Latin dictionary was the *GSL*'s primary source for the lemmas, with Scapula's 1652 dictionary as a supplemental source rather than as the main source for the *GSL*, as some have argued.

Chapter 6 reverts from the *GSL* generally back to the features of the draft manuscript, giving a grammatical and lexical description of the manuscript with focus on its Ruthenian features in order to determine the Slavic variant employed in it. This chapter should be of the most interest to Slavic linguists. In it, Thompson argues, with support from secondary sources, that Slavineckij was more likely Belarusian than Ukrainian, and he identifies Ruthenianisms, Polonicisms, German loans via Polish, and Latin words via Polish in the draft *GSL* manuscript, noting that Slavineckij and other translators of the Čudov Circle to which he belonged used Polish texts in translating from Greek and Latin (p. 260). The chapter also looks for sources for Old Testament citations in the *GSL*, concluding that the most likely source was the printed Ostrog Bible (1581), as Pentkovskaja (2017) has suggested. The chapter also discusses

New Testament citations and the abbreviations that Slavineckij employed for references.

Chapter 7 is on the Latin influence on the lexicon and loanwords in the *GSL*, including Latin lexemes of Greek origin, and some lexemes which, Thompson argues, Slavineckij calqued or coined himself. This chapter presents Thompson's main argument: that *GSL* was influenced more by Latin than by Greek, indicating that Epifanij Slavineckij was not a member of the Graecophile school as some have argued. Upon conducting a search of nouns in *-ost-ъ* in the draft *GSL* manuscript, Thompson determines that these words do not calque a Greek suffix, as Strakhov (2006) proposed, but that they must be from Polish instead.

Chapter 8 is on what Thompson calls "academic vocabulary," that is, grammatical and poetic/metrical terminology in the *GSL*, as well as terms for academic disciplines. Chapter 9 presents conclusions. This last chapter is followed by Appendix 1, "Tables for Sources Analysis," which compares *GSL* sample lemma stretches to their equivalents in five relatively contemporaneous Greek-Latin dictionaries. Appendix 2 discusses the methodology for transcribing the 744-folio draft manuscript of the *GSL*, using various handwritten text recognition (HTR) models with various degrees of success.

Turning now to the features of the book that mark it as a dissertation, it should be stressed first that the prose in all the chapters is beautifully written and that the book is exhaustively researched. The chapter structure of the book, however, jumps back and forth among lexicography in general, the text of the *GSL* (as witnessed in Slavineckij's draft and the two Muscovite final copies), and the draft *GSL* manuscript itself, often with no indication of a boundary or a switch between the last two: for example, chapter 2 on lexicography analyzes the *GSL* generally rather than the draft manuscript.

This leads to the issue of the book's intended audience, if one is contemplated (in addition to the dissertation committee). The chapters on the place of the *GSL* within modern dictionary taxonomies appear likely to be of most interest to lexicographers, rather than historical Slavic linguists, for whom the chapters analyzing the draft manuscript should be of primary interest. The question of intended audience also arises on the microlevel because no English translation is provided for long quotations in Greek, Latin, and Church Slavonic, but an English translation follows the quotations in modern Russian, German, and French, even in the chapters that analyze the manuscript from a Slavic linguistic perspective (see, for example, p. 248). Are the translations of the quotations in modern languages for the benefit of the dissertation committee, and if so, did the committee members read Greek, Latin, and Church Slavonic well but not read the modern languages? Or, was this a required convention for dissertations?

The audience question also carries over into the linguistics chapters. Hypothetical morphological forms are given in Old Cyrillic font rather than in Roman transliteration, and when Roman transliteration is used, it is not a standard Slavic linguistics transliteration but the English system often used for history and literature publications, which does not have a letter-to-letter equivalency as linguistic transliteration does. For example, in the discussion of the draft *GSL* manuscript's morphological features, Thompson writes, "forms in *sh-* (comparative) and *-eish-* (superlative) […], even though the *neish-* forms were traditionally treated in (Church) Slavonic as the comparatives of adjectives in *-ьn-*" (p. 272). There is also inconsistency in the use of Roman vs. Cyrillic in the narrative prose: for example, why do Russian sample words appear in Cyrillic but the suffixes above are in Roman transliteration? (Cf. fn 44 on the same page, where the suffix *-im-* is provided in Old Cyrillic this time.) A quotation from a miscellany from 1791 by Nikolja Novikov preserves the *jers* and *jat´* (p. 30), but, as an example, a quotation from 18th-century Ioann Maksimovič appears without *jat´* or *jers* (p. 5).

Another issue is the length of the monograph, which would have benefited greatly from reduction. For instance, in chapter 3, the paleographic description of Slavineckij's draft manuscript, Thompson argues that close analysis of the specific manuscript is important because it contains corrections and insertions, and that the exhaustive examination of the paleographic features of Slavineckij's hand in the chapter may be of use in identifying other manuscripts that he had written. It is unclear, however, why it should be a task of this particular book, in addition to its stated goals, to provide a chapter-long paleographic analysis of the *GSL* draft manuscript as "the first complete, systematic documentation of Epifanii Slavinetskii's handwriting, which may prove useful for working with further manuscripts in his hand" (p. 134). Indeed, the chapter is a grapheme-by-grapheme analysis of the Greek, Latin, and Ruthenian Church Slavonic alphabet letters in the draft manuscript, with a separate illustration for each grapheme, in order to demonstrate that some of the Cyrillic graphemes in the manuscript display Latin influence. All the graphemes, however, could have been presented in a single table, with text commentary on only the more noteworthy of them, rather than on every one of them. The chapter also compares orthographic differences with the Muscovite copy Titov 67, even providing a two-page table of minor orthographic differences in specific words and phrases in the Slavic translation of Greek words, and examining the paleography, phonology, morphology, and lexicon of the latter manuscript, which, as one would expect, was adapted to Muscovite norms (pp. 132–33). The chapter then refers the reader to chapter 6, on morphology and lexicon, for the examination of Ruthenian features in Slavineckij's draft manuscript. The interruption of the linguistic analysis of the draft manuscript by two chapters on lexicographical issues contributes to the disjointed structure of the book.

As noted above, chapter 4, the first of the interrupting chapters, presents a long and detailed taxonomic analysis of the structure of the *GSL* generally and its place within the model of the *Wörterbuch zur Lexikographie und Wörterbuchforschung* (Wiegand et al. 2010); this chapter could have been reduced considerably by removing many or all of the diagrams and lexicographic tree structures in it. Chapter 5, which discusses exhaustively every known Greek-Latin dictionary contemporaneous to the *GSL* in order to speculate which ones likely were the sources that Slavineckij used for the *GSL*, could also have been shortened considerably, and then both shortened chapters could have been collapsed into a single chapter, since all of chapter 4 focuses on the reasons why Thompson proposes certain specific manuscripts as the sources for the *GSL* in chapter 5.

As is common in dissertations, the analysis leans heavily on others' models, including, in chapter 3, Rezec's (2009) four- and six-tier graphematics models for describing the modern German writing system (p. 88), and, over much of chapter 4, the taxonomy of modern dictionaries in Wiegand et al. (2010). The lengthy and very detailed review of the scholarly literature in chapter 2, which may well be required of dissertations in Germany in order to prove that the doctoral candidate has a firm grasp of the literature, also is overdone from the perspective of a scholarly book. The use of paraphrases rather than long quotations from secondary sources would have also reduced the impression of a dissertation.

Appendix 1, "Tables for Sources Analysis," compares *GSL* sample lemmas from a single folio to their equivalents in five relatively contemporaneous Greek-Latin dictionary sources, by Leymarie (1583); Constantin (1592); Scapula (1652); Hesychios (1514); and Favorino (1523), to support the conclusion that Slavineckij compiled the *GSL* from multiple dictionary sources and that Constantin's dictionary was likely his main source for the lemmas in the *GSL*. Appendix 2, which tracks the successes and failures of various HTR models in reproducing parts of the draft *GSL* manuscript, is essentially a book chapter: that is, it is a prose discussion containing tables which will probably be of interest mainly to scholars who work with HTR. This excursus would, however, make a nice article if republished in a Slavic journal that specializes in digital issues such as *Scripta & e-Scripta*.

In conclusion, this book covers Slavineckij's draft *GSL* manuscript, and the *GSL* itself in its extant copies, from nearly every conceivable perspective: linguistic, historical/cultural, lexicographic, and HTR. It is a definitive source on the manuscript that may turn out to be of most interest to lexicographers, particularly those who study Greek-Latin dictionaries. It also provides a meticulous paleographic and linguistic analysis of the draft manuscript. From the perspective of a Slavic linguist, however, one is left wondering whether

readers can follow such an exhaustive close study from so many different angles without feeling overwhelmed, regardless of their specialization.

The monograph has been researched, written, and proofread very meticulously; although I was not actively searching for them, I did not notice any typographical errors in any of the languages, which is remarkable for a 412-page book. I have just one minor quibble: page 232 refers to the "Rylsk Monastery" for the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria.

Manuscript Sources

Sin. Gr. 383. Slavineckij, Epifanii. "Greek-Slavonic-Latin lexicon". State Historical Museum, Moscow, Synodal collection. Copy, ca. 1660's.

Titov 67 and 68. Slavinetskij, Epifanij. Draft of "Greek-Slavonic-Latin lexicon". Russian National Library, St. Petersburg, Titov Collection, nos. 67 and 68, vols. I and II. Late 17th/early 18th century.

Printed Sources

Constantin, Robert [Robertus Constantinus]. (1592) *Lexicon sive dictionarium graecolatinum.* 2nd ed., expanded by Franciscus Portus. Paris.

Favorino, Guarino [Guarino da Fevera/Favorino]. (1523) *Magnum ac perutile dictionarium.* Rome.

Hesychios [Hesychiius Alexandrinus]. (1514) Λεξικὸν. Venice.

Leymarie, Guillaume [Guillielmus Leimarius]. (1583) *Lexicon Graecolatinum recens constructum.* Geneva.

Novikov, Nikolja. (1791) *Drevnjaja rossijskaja vivliofika, soderžaščaja v sebe sobranie drevnostej rossijskix, do istorii, geografii i genealogii rossijskija kasajuščixsja.* Part 1. Moscow.

Ostrog Bible. (1581) Printed by Ivan Fedorov. Ostroh.

Pentkovskaja, Tat´jana. (2017) "Tolkovanija na poslanija apostola Pavla v perevode Epifanija Slavineckogo kak istočnik Novogo Zaveta poslednej četverti XVII v". *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta* 9. *Filologija* 2: 27–52.

Rezec, Oliver. (2009) *Zur Struktur des deutschen Schriftsystems: Warum das Graphem nicht drei Funktionen gleichzeitig haben kann, warum ein <a> kein <a> ist und andere Konstruktionsfehler des etablierten Beschreibungsmodells. Ein Verbesserungsvorschlag.* Dissertation, Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich.

Scapula, Johannes. (1652/1580) *Lexicon graeco latinum novum.* Amsterdam.

Strakhov, Olga. (2006) "Jepyfanij Slavynec´kyj's Greek-Slavic-Latin lexicon: The history, contents, and principles underlying the composition of its Greek portion (preliminary remarks)". *Harvard Ukrainian studies* 28(1/4): 269–85.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst. (1984) "On the structure and contents of a general theory of lexicography". Reinhard R. K. Hartmann, ed. *LEXeter '83: Proceedings*. Tübingen, Germany: Max Niemeyer, 13–30.

Wiegand, Herbert Ernst, et al., eds. (2010) *Wörterbuch zur Lexikographie und Wörterbuchforschung/Dictionary of lexicography and dictionary research*. Vol. 1 of *Systematische Einführung/Systematic introduction, A–C*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.

Cynthia M. Vakareliyska
Uppsala, Sweden
and
Department of Linguistics
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR, USA
vakarel@uoregon.edu