



<https://doi.org/10.18778/2084-140X.13.11>

***Old Church Slavonic Heritage in Slavonic and Other Languages,*
ed. ILONA JANYŠKOVA, HELENA KARLIKOVA, VIT BOČEK, Nakladatelství
Lidové noviny, Praha 2021 [= *Studia etymologica Brunensia*, 25], p. 340*.**

Volume 25 of the *Studia etymologica Brunensia* collection contains materials from the conference held in Brno in 2020. It includes papers by leading paleoslavists focusing on the history of Slavic languages. The conference topic *Old Church Slavonic Heritage in Slavonic and Other Languages* opened up the possibility of addressing a wider range of issues.

The book opens with several theoretical surveys by renowned authors.

In a lengthy study entitled *N.S. Trubecokj und das Problem der Kirchenslavizität der slavischen Schriftsprachen* (p. 11–30), Helmut Keipert deals with the reception of Nikolai Trubetckoy's linguistic views in works by N. Durново, N. Tolstoy, A. Isachenko, V. Vinogradov, R. Jakobson, etc. In discussing Trubetckoy's understanding of the Russian literary language as a direct continuation of Church Slavonic, which was first advanced in his book *К проблеме русского самопознания* (*On the Problem of Russian Self-Knowledge*, 1927) and the article *Общеславянский элемент в русской культуре* (*The All-Slavonic Element in Russian Culture*), H. Keipert attempts to answer the question of why Trubetckoy's ideas often remained uncited. While silenced in the Soviet Union for political reasons, his works were known and used by European Slavists. However, difficulties in the acceptance of his views lay in their peculiar character. He claimed, for example, that

since Russian could function quite well as a literary language, there was no need to develop a Ukrainian form of this language. By way of illustrating Trubetskoj's views, Keipert reviews the semantic change in the Russian greeting *zdravstvujte* in relation to the underlying verb *sdravstvovati*, and its artificial forms *da zdravstvuyet*, *da zdravstvuyut* concluding that this form is deconstructed today.

In his article *Constantine and Methodius, 'silly Rus', and the vagaries of literary Ukrainian*, Andrii Danylenko develops George Y. Shevelev's ideas regarding Constantine and Methodius' "linguistic democratism" which, it is claimed, displayed itself in the Christianization of the Slavs in a comprehensible language of "their own". The article covers various linguistic processes to which the Ruthenians (Ukrainians) were subjected from 1600 to the present day. The author claims that the concept of "linguistic democratism" eventually played an important role in shaping both ecclesiastical and secular forms of the Ukrainian language. The specificity of the processes occurring in Ruthenia that was part of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth lay, beginning with the first Ruthenian translation of Church Slavonic (the *Peresopnytsia Gospel*), in the dynamics of the Church Slavonic norm, as evidenced in sermons, commentaries on the Orthodox Church texts or homilies. The efforts of Vasyl Hrečulevyč (1791–1870), one of the representatives of the "Little Russian Triad", undertaken with a view to democratizing Church Slavonic, are considered through the prism of his sermons. In trying to describe the successive attempts in the

* This review article has been written under the research project financed by the National Science Centre (Poland). Decision number: DEC2020/39/G/HS2/01652.

twentieth and twenty-first centuries to translate the Holy Scripture into the modern Ukrainian language, the author relies on the metaphor 'dialect Reconquista', which can also be encountered in works by Ukrainian contemporary dialectologists.

The role of language proximity as a factor in language contact is addressed by Vít Boček in the article *On language similarity as a factor in language contact, with a focus on the contact between (Old) Church Slavonic and other Slavonic languages* (p. 45–62). The issue is approached from the perspective of (Old) Church Slavonic and other Slavic languages. Contrary to the commonly held view that similarity facilitates transfer between languages, the author argues that it may also work differently, depending on the types of transfer induced through language contact, as claimed in Van Coetsen's (2000) theory.

Operating on this premise, the author critically assesses the work of A. Rabus (*Die Rolle des Sprachkontakts für die slavischen (Standard-) Sprachen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des innerslavischen Kontakts*, Habilitation thesis, University of Freiburg, 2013), while at the same time offering his own theory of the rapprochement and interaction between Church Slavonic and Russian. By specifying the process's main factors – transfer directions, transfer types, types of bilingualism, language consciousness, language similarities and language dissimilarities, – V. Boček puts forward a convincing scheme of the possible types of interaction between genetically related languages.

Some of the works mentioned below address various problems arising in the reconstruction of the Proto-Slavic language. Mariola Jakubowicz's article entitled *On the limitations of the role of the Old Church Slavonic lexicon in the reconstruction of Proto-Slavic semantics* discusses the limitations encountered in the use of the Old Church Slavonic lexicon to reconstruct the semantics of Proto-Slavic lexemes. The issue is dealt with by analyzing words that were meant to convey religious meaning such as *grěch* 'sin', *kaditi* 'to spread smoke and scents during the religious service', *gověti* 'to abstain from food and prepare for confession', etc. Her analysis

shows that the original Proto-Slavic meanings were often displaced by the religious ones. In reconstructing the former, it is thus necessary to examine a wide range of cognates and to consider the development of analogous cases in other Indo-European languages. The author provides a lot of examples of words whose semantics changed or narrowed to the point of losing their original meanings.

In her article *К проблеме сложных слов в праславянском (On the Problem of Compound Words in Proto-Slavonic*, p. 73–94), Svetlana Mikhailovna Tolstaya analyzes the varieties of Proto-Slavic composites using materials from the EDSL. Once the structural types of the composites are arranged according to the descending order of numerical indicators (taking into account specific conventions), it becomes clear that only two types can be quantitatively productive: noun + verb S+V (194) and adjective + noun A+S (134).

The composites-appellatives reconstructed in the dictionary allow us to develop some understanding not only of the vocabulary of the Proto-Slavic language, but also of the language's morphological and word-formation mechanisms (i.e., word-base selection, word truncations, ways of combining word-bases, connecting vowels, etc.). This is also the basis from which to explore the process of forming Old Church Slavonic counterparts of Greek composites and word combinations. By adopting the approach, it is also possible to reproduce the microsyntax and minimal textual units, i.e., word combinations on which particular composites were based: **biti maslo* 'to whip butter' (**maslobojъn'a* 'butter maker'), **koni pasti* 'to graze horses' (**konopasъ* 'horse-grazer'), **kostъ lomiti* 'to break bones' (**kostolomъ* 'he who breaks bones'), **kozijъ rogъ* 'goat horn' (**kozorogъ* 'goat-horned'), **krъvъ piti* 'to drink blood' (**krъvopija* 'he who drinks blood') etc. Appended to the article is a dictionary of reconstructed composites.

Aleksandar Loma offers a new view of the etymology of the Proto-Slavic word **brakъ* (*К этимологии ст.-сл. Бракъ*, p. 95–118), arguing that the primary form **ob-rakъ* 'arranged marriage' should be interpreted as a de-

verbative from **ob-rekti* (*se*) ‘promise’ or, more specifically, from the equally frequently used **obrĕkati se*, which is indicative of its long o-vocalism. The author gives a detailed account of scholarly debates regarding the origin of the word and shows how the views of its origin crystallized in works by G. Curtius, F. Miklosich, I. Sreznevsky, A. Meyer, E.K. Berneker, A. Sobolevsky and other authors. The author’s analysis is complicated by the fact that the word *брак/brak* ‘marriage’, while it is thought to have been assimilated into East Slavic and Serbo-Croatian from Church Slavonic, remains completely unknown in West Slavic. Indicating in detail the weaknesses of Georg Curtius’ etymological interpretation of it, Loma develops Oleg Nikolaevich Trubachev’s ideas regarding the relationship between the word’s meaning and the hapax *обракъ* which appears in a fourteenth-century document. Analysis of folklore and ethnographic materials has led him to the conclusion that the word is derived from Russian. The article reveals its multidimensional potential in providing eight different meanings of the hypothetical Proto-Slavic **ob-rokъ* in comparison with the semantics of the proposed **ob-rakъ*.

Loma’s analysis is followed by Aleksandr Konstantinovich Shaposhnikov’s article entitled *Способы адаптации церковнославянских лексических проникновений в живых славянских языках: книжные и изустные заимствования* (*Ways of Adapting Church Slavonic Lexical Penetrations in Living Slavic Languages: Book and Oral Borrowings*, p. 119–130). Shaposhnikov argues that Church Slavonicisms may not always be Proto-Slavic in origin, but that, conversely, there are many neologisms to be found in the language that are areally and diachronically restricted. The article’s general tone is set by the author’s polemic with views expressed by W. Mańczak in *Przedhistoryczne migracje Słowian i pochodzenie języka staro-cerkiewno-słowiańskiego* (Kraków, 2004). In discussing the data provided by the latter with regard to the mutual penetration of East Slavic and Church Slavonic elements, he argues for linking it with the Smolyani and Dregoviches’ early migrations into the region of Thessalonica

in the 580s (p. 123). The article’s theses are illustrated with a list of about one hundred Russian lexemes of Church Slavonic origin. It is indicated that the lexemes show a high degree of adaptation and are not viewed by speakers of Modern Russian as Church Slavonic. At this point, we unexpectedly find the author drawing on the outdated imperial opuses to differentiate the Slavic linguistic space. We are told that in the fourteenth century the “common Russian language” began to branch off into its “Great Russian, Belarusian and Little Russian dialects” (sic!) (p. 119). No less surprising are the claims regarding the situation of diglossia in Kyivan Rus, where a small number of educated people, it is claimed, not only wrote but also spoke (sic!) in Church Slavonic (p. 120). Whatever evidence the author may have to support these views, he fails to share it with the reader. The insignificant number of common lexical isoglosses shared by Church Slavonic and Belarusian as well as by Church Slavonic and Ukrainian is adduced to prove the following statement: *The latter two languages are Russian-Polish and Polish-Russian hybrids respectively, so the Church Slavonic lexical heritage in them is noticeably reduced by the leading status of the Polish language* (p. 123). Paradoxically, by rejecting the genetic self-sufficiency of the East Slavic languages, the author puts in doubt the scholarly character of his own study.

Viktorovna Kurkina’s aim in her article *Семантика слов с полногласием и неполногласием как один из источников восстановления внутренней формы слова* (*Semantics of words with pleophony and non-pleophony as one of the sources for the reconstruction of the internal form of words*, p. 131–140) is to reconstruct the internal form of some Proto-Slavic words. According to the author, the formal divergence of historically identical lexemes arising from the Slavic liquid metathesis entailed the emergence of homogeneous homonyms functioning in parallel and independently in different linguistic systems. An interesting example of this is provided by words commonly used today: *борошно* (*boroshno* – ‘flour’), *мука* (*muca* – ‘flour’), *брань-борона* (*bran-borona* – ‘harrow’), *прагъ-порог* (*prag-porog* – ‘doorstep’). These operations enable us to reconstruct the signs of reality that underlay nomination processes.

In the article by Anna Viktorovna Alekseyevich entitled *Церковнославянские заимствования в старобелорусском языке на фоне исконной лексики (Foreign Slavonic borrowings in the Old Belarusian language on the background of the original vocabulary)*, p. 141–152), Old Belarusian borrowings from Church Slavonic, Polish, and Czech are shown using the example of derivatives from the Proto-Slavic root **vold*. They may be either very close, or identical in meaning: *володату* (*volodati*), *володету* (*volodeti*), *володеть* (*volodet*), *владати* (*vladati*), *владету* (*vladeti*) ‘own’; or overlap only partially: *владарь* (*vladar*), *владарь* (*vladar*), *влодарь* (*vloдар*), *влодарь* (*vloдар*), *влодерь* (*vloдер*) ‘one who has power’; and *владька* (*vladyka*), *владика* (*vladika*), *уладька* (*uladyka*) ‘lord’; *волость* (*volost*) ‘province’ and *владза* (*vladza*), *власть* (*vlast*) ‘power’.

The following works are devoted to the discussion of the problems of the development of territorial recensions of Church Slavonic.

The first to be mentioned among these is the article by Halyna Mykhailivna Naienko *Переводы Симона Тодорского и церковнославянский язык в философском дискурсе Украины XVII–XVIII вв. (Translations by Simon Todorski and the Church Slavonic Language in the Philosophical Discourse of Ukraine in the seventeenth–eighteenth centuries)*, p. 153–162).

Bohumil Vykypěl’s article entitled “*Südslavische Einflüsse*” auf das Tschechische (p. 163–166) discusses a number of examples of South Slavic languages’ influence on Czech. The author finds the influence weak, a conclusion that is corroborated by his analysis of the parallel examples of the languages’ influence on Russian. Church Slavonic’s role in Bohemia, we are told, was ceremonial and experimental only, while the Czechs’ everyday life was linguistically defined by adherence to *Slavia Latina*.

Three questions are dealt with in the article by Miroslav Vepřek *On the dative absolute in Czech Church Slavonic and Old Czech* (p. 167–178). The author asks whether the independent dative could appear by chance, created by Old Czech authors ad hoc, or whether it was a relic of an older grammatical feature, or whether it was an element inherited from

Church Slavonic. All the possibilities are carefully examined by analyzing materials from the Old Czech Text Bank (*Staročeská textová banka*, STB). While concluding that all of the options are plausible, the author gives priority to the specific archaic structure.

A similar problem is raised by Kateřina Voleková and Hana Kreisingerová in *Palaeoslovenisms in the second translation of the Old Czech Psalter* (p. 179–192). The authors investigate Old Slavic and Church Slavonic’s influence on the translations of the Old Czech Psalter, paying special attention to the second translation found in the Clementinum Psalter and the Chapter Psalter. The examples of previously unknown “paleocroatisms” are regarded by the authors as pointing to the possible connection between the manuscripts and the Slavonic Monastery.

Helena Karlíková’s *Ein alttschechischer Palaeoslavismus mit Übersetzungsfehler* (p. 193–198) analyzes errors in Old Slavonic and Old Czech translations from Greek and Latin. For example, the so-called Clementine Psalter contains the Old Czech verb *vnoziti* ‘to crash into, to enter’, which is a formal and semantic parallel to the Old Church Slavic verb *вънозити*. If the author’s line of reasoning is correct, then *vnoziti* may be an Old Czech paleoslovenism. Its peculiarity lies in the fact that the translator, in translating the original Latin text, mistook the verb *figere* ‘create, make’ for the verb *figere* ‘to thrust, pierce’, thus distorting the meaning of the translated text. Deep semantic analysis is accompanied by a polemic over J. Gebauer’s etymological explanations.

Jiří Rejzek’s article *Is Old Czech hlahol a Church Slavonicism?* (p. 199–204) discusses a possible Old Slavonic influence on the semantics and the frequency of the Old Czech word *hlahol*, tracing the development of its meaning in Slavic languages, old Czech sources. It is unique for the word to assume the meaning of ‘idiom, language’, and the same can be said of a number of other meanings developed from Proto-Slavonic **golgolъ*. The branch semantics found in the sources from before the fifteenth century are explained by the Old Slavic influence emanating from the Sázava Monastery or the Emauzy Monastery.

Irena Fuková and Štěpán Šimek provide an in-depth study of *Old Czech adjectives přěsný/přiesný and přísny* (p. 205–216). Drawing on the extensive lexical material from the StČS card catalog, the authors focus on the etymology and the semantic development of the adjectives in question. The reconstruction of their formal development makes it possible to clearly define the relationship between their forms, to distinguish between their obsolete or archaic meanings, and to show how these forms are lexicographically represented.

The adjective *přěsný/přiesný* is primarily meant to convey the meaning of ‘fresh, unfermented’, which is considered to be bound up with the noun *honey*. This basic meaning is believed to have given rise to that of ‘fresh, new, recent’ and, in conjunction with the noun, *bread*, ‘baked without leaven’. The further emergence of abstract meanings such as ‘correct, true’, ‘accurate’, ‘original’, ‘stern, unfunny’, and ‘strict, uncompromising’ is convincingly illustrated drawing on contexts imposed by religious sources. The primary meaning of the adjective **prisnъ* ‘to be someone’ evolved toward ‘inherent in someone’, ‘identical’.

The authors have also traced the evolution of these adjectives’ derivatives: the nouns *přěsnost/přiesnost* and *přěsniceň*, and the adverbs *přěsně/přiesně* and *přísny* > *přisně*. The derivatives are considered from the perspective of the emergence of identical meanings and overlapping semantics. The article provides grounds for discussion of the proposed semantic chains. The authors’ search is also documented in a more concise form in ESSČ.

A ramified lexical group is discussed by Petr Nejedlý in *Some names of winds in Early Modern Czech* (p. 217–226). After describing their semantics and usage, the author points to the discontinuity in the use of the names of winds and cardinal directions. The article contains valuable observations regarding how Church Slavonic affected the modern Czech language, both in terms of the way it is used today, as well as in terms of such phenomena as linguistic reduction and frequency attenuation.

Roman Krivko’s article entitled *Гимн “Вогуродіца”: (церковно-?) славянские, латинские и германские параллели* (*Гимн “Vogurodzica”: (Church-?) Slavonic, Latin, and Germanic Parallels*, p. 227–252) focuses on the origin of the hymn which, according to the author, bear traces of Old Czech, Latin, and Middle High German influences. The hymn’s linguistic features indicate its archaic nature, that is, its creation in the early period of the development of Polish literature. The author’s analysis of lexical dialectisms, archaisms, and the hymn’s phonetic, syntactic and morphological features is consistent and convincing. The possibility that the hymn may be Byzantine or Church Slavonic in origin is rejected based on the specificity of the genre to which it belongs and which is modeled on Old Czech spiritual chants. The latter, in turn, are closest in form to Middle Upper German non-liturgical religious poems. For this reason, the author refers to the hymn as “the Polish answer to German poetry”.

Ilona Janyšková explores the etymology of Old Church Slavonic *ključьnъ* and Old Bohemian *ključný* ‘suitable, convenient’ (*Церковнославянское ključьnъ и старочешское kl’učny ‘artius’ с точки зрения этимологии*, p. 253–258). Suggesting that these words are derived from the Proto-Slavonic verb **kl’učiti (sę)* ‘will happen’, she proposes considering the semantic shift **will happen* → ‘to happen, to take place at a suitable moment’ → ‘suitable’, to which the Czech *přihodit se* ‘to happen’ may serve as a parallel: *přihodný* ‘approaching’. This root is also present in East Slavonic words: Old Russian *ключитися (klyuchitsya)* ‘to happen’, Russian *приключиться (priključitsya)*, ‘to happen’, *приключаться (priključatsya)* ‘to take place, to happen’, Ukrainian *ключитися (klyuchitisa)* ‘to take place, to happen’. The author believes that the Croatian Glagolitic *ključьnъ* is derived from Czech-Slavonic *ključьnъ*.

Petra Stankovska’s article entitled *Выражения для наименования избранных сосудов, их распределение и значение в старославянских и церковнославянских текстах в сравнении со значением в старочешском языке*

(*Expressions for the naming of selected vessels, their distribution and meaning in Old Slavonic and Church Slavonic texts in comparison with the meaning in Old Czech*, p. 259–270) compares lexemes denoting the names of vessels encountered in Macedonian and Croatian editions of Church Slavonic literary monuments with expressions from the Old Slavonic Dictionary. The article's focus is on the names of four vessels: 'basket', 'masters' bucket', 'cauldron for cooking meat', 'drinking bowl', all of which appear in the biblical book of Exodus to be found in the Croatian-Glagolic breviaries and missals from the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The author extensively characterizes contexts in which such lexemes as *košijb*, *krabica*, *krabii*, *kovčegv*, *ošitka*, *s'sudb*, *súdec*, *osudie*, *čban'c*, *lon'cv*, *skudělnica*, *kočlv*, *hrnъcvъ*, *koryto*, *žlab* are used. In the Old Czech translation, these designata are referred to with entirely different words, which, in Stankovska's opinion, indicates its independence from Old Slavic.

The issue of Serbian Church Slavonic's influence on the style of charters and letters written in Old Serbian is discussed by Jasmina Grković-Major in *Serbian Church Slavonic influence on the Old Serbian language* (p. 271–280). The author proves that the phonological, phonetic, morphological, lexical, and syntactical borrowings discussed in the article had a normative character. Loan words became incorporated in the *invocatio*, *salutatio*, *intitulatio*, *oaths*, *sanctio*, and *datum*, giving these a generally solemn character. Only in exceptional cases and in special contexts were the words in question included in *dispositio*: with the names and titles of rulers and nobles, the names of Christian saints, the word "God", and with the solemn promises made in the charters issued by rulers and noblemen. At the same time, they served as a model for the creation of structural or semantic Old Slavonic neologisms, such as composites with *mnogo-*, *prě-* and *vse-*. Borrowed words denoting Christian concepts (*anděl* 'angel', *kaluđer* 'monk', *episkup* 'bishop' etc.) were fully incorporated into the Old Slavonic vocabulary. Finally, the situation of homogeneous diglossia led to the polysemy of a number of lexemes (such as *milost-*, *milosrđd-*, *svet-*), which, depending

on the context, were used in the meaning inherited from Proto-Slavic or Church Slavonic.

The purpose of Marija Vučković's article entitled *Compounds with the intensifying component 'three' in Serbian and Old Church Slavonic heritage* (p. 281–292) is to examine compound adjectives that are part of the (Old) Church Slavonic heritage in modern Serbian, and have the augmentative or intensifying component 'three', 'thrice', 'triple'. Focusing on the cultural meaning of number 3, the author considers the semantics of adjectives in modern Serbian and discusses words with intensifying component in Old Slavonic. According to the author, the status of Church Slavonic in the modern Serbian language is determined by a variety of factors: diglossia and, later, polyglossia between Church Slavonic, Serbian and Russian Church Slavonic, the orientation of modern literary language exclusively to the vernacular basis entailing the displacement of Church Slavonic words, etc. Old Slavonic, Serbian Church Slavonic, and Russian Church Slavonic lexemes are compared in the article with the help of about 20 words. The analysis of phonetic-phonological features makes it possible to determine the source of borrowing – Serbian or Russian Church Slavonic.

As is clearly indicated by the title of her article *Церковнославянское наследие в сербских диалектах: существительные среднего рода на -ије* (*Church Slavonic Heritage in Serbian Dialects: Neuter Nouns ending with -ije*, p. 293–306), Marta Bjeletić examines Church Slavonic heritage in Serbian dialects, paying special attention to nouns with the suffix *-ije*. Bjeletić is interested to investigate the etymological, formal, semantic, and functional aspects of the vocabulary under discussion. A Russian-Slavic or Serbian-Slavic origin of the examples examined in her article is borne out by the analysis of their etymological features, while their orthoepy shows adaptation to dialectal norms. Although most of the words analyzed by the author remain semantically stable, some are shown to have undergone semantic shifts or even significant semantic changes. For example, the word *наказаније* (*nakazaniye* 'punishment') was originally meant to convey the meaning of 'education, instruction, admonition'.

However, on dialectal grounds, under the influence of phonetically close, but etymologically different forms *наказа, наказан, унаказити* (*nakaza, nakazan, unakaziti*), it assumed the meaning of ‘ugly, monster’ (p. 302). Because of the nouns’ expressive coloring, their areas of functioning are limited: phraseological units *божје наказаније* (‘God’s punishment’), *скончаније света* (‘the end of the world’), *Исусово страданије* (‘Jesus’ suffering’), *тоаста на спасеније душе* (‘to the soul’s salvation’), *на здравље и спасеније* (‘to health and salvation’), and *цурса на усјеченије му било*.

A quotation from the article by Đorđić *Из историје нашег књижевног језика. Именице типа бденије* (1936) regarding the fate of Church Slavonic words in the formation of the new literary languages of Serbs and Ukrainians indicates that Slavic scholars continue to use the polysemous term *русский* (Russian), not always realizing it. Bjeletić writes: *The formation of these two literary languages meant at the same time their separation from the former literary languages, the Slavic-Serbian for Serbs and the Russian literary language for Ukrainians. Undoubtedly, such a striking feature of the church language as the ending -uje was clearly felt to be foreign and therefore was not included in either the new Serbian or Ukrainian languages* (p. 294). If one does not distinguish between *Ruthenian* and *Russian*, then the conclusions from the quoted passage can be very unexpected: does it mean that modern Ukrainian comes from *Russian* as the “former” language, or have the Russians assimilated the refined Ukrainian Church Slavonic along with the *-ue* (*-iye*) forms, as discussed in the above-mentioned work by H. Keipert?

Vladislav Knoll’s article entitled *The “Romanian Slavonic language” and lexicography* (p. 307–324) is an overview of the most important lexicographical works devoted to the Romanian form of Church Slavonic. The author opens his study with glosses and short dictionaries surviving in manuscript form, identifying F. Miklosic with his *Lexicon* (1862–1865) as a pioneer in the field. The author lists all the

appended sources published in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by P. Lavrov (1904), I. Bogdan (1922), G. Ghibănescu (1912), etc. A separate section details the conception, preparation, sources, and the publication of the *Romanian Slavonic Dictionary*.


An ambitious initiative undertaken during the Fourth Slavonic Congress held in Moscow in 1958 was to create an international Church Slavonic dictionary. Its first volume appeared in 1981 under the title *A Dictionary of the Romanian elements from Romanian-Slavonic documents 1374–1600* (DERS). Although the second volume was announced in 1983, it has not yet been published. Moldavian documents were studied by Ukrainian lexicographers as sources for the *Old Ukrainian Dictionary* (SSUM, Kyiv 1977–1978) and the *Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language of the sixteenth-seventeenth centuries* (SUM 16–17 c., Lviv 1994–2017). Particularly interesting is the section specifying the stages to be followed in creating a modern dictionary of Romanian Slavonic. According to the author one should proceed by classifying three groups of texts respectively: Middle Church Slavonic texts, Wallachian (and Transylvanian) documents and Moldavian documents. The author is right to point out that modern lexicography should be digital. Upon completion, his project may turn out to be very successful.

The article by Sandra Požar *(Old) Church Slavonic compounds in the Romanian language of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries* (p. 325–339) provides a detailed classification of linguistic composites. The classification draws on a dictionary found in the work by A. Oczko, *Rumuńska Słowiańszczyzna: Zapozyczenia południowosłowiańskie w języku rumuńskim w XVI i XVII w.* (Kraków, 2014). The article includes a short dictionary of these lexemes. The authoress specifies borrowings from Greek, which were mediated by (Old) Church Slavonic; composites identical (or almost identical) to their (Old) Church Slavonic models; morphologically adapted composites; and calques based on Church Slavonic models. By describing the compounds’ phonetic and

morphological changes and by demonstrating their Greek equivalents, the author opens up a possibility of making convincing generalizations about the quantitative ratio of different kinds of linguistic adaptations.

The abundance of the material and the variety of topics discussed in this volume make this publication an impressive contribution to the field of Slavic studies.

*Halyna Naienko (Łódź)***

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0485-5068>

** University of Lodz, Faculty of Philology, Department of Slavic Philology; Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology, Department of the Ukrainian Language and Applied Linguistics



© by the author, licensee University of Lodz – Lodz University Press, Lodz, Poland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)
