



## REVIEW

of a PhD dissertation in professional field 2.1. Philology,

Doctoral Program “Bulgarian Language (Cyrillo-Methodian Studies)”

**title: Lexis in Manuscript No. 3/14 from the Library of the Rila Monastery as a Source for the History of the Text of "Barlaam and Joasaph"**

*PhD student: Monia Camuglia Ribarov*

*consultant: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Tatiana Mostrova*

*reviewer: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aneta Gergova Dimitrova, Department of Cyrillo-Methodian Studies, Faculty of Slavic Studies, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”*

The submitted dissertation is accompanied by all the necessary documents and materials according to the requirements of the Regulations for acquisition of scientific degrees and for occupation of academic positions in the Cyrillo-Methodian Research Center at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (CMRS – BAS). It has been discussed before the Council of CMRS – BAS in an extended sitting on June 4, 2024 and has been proposed for defense by the decision of the Institute for Historical Research at BAS, protocol No. 1, item 5 / 12.06.2024.

The dissertation is the result of a long-term study of the vocabulary of the narrative "Barlaam and Joasaph" in a Middle Bulgarian copy, a manuscript from the collection of Rila Monastery RM 3/14 from the 1360s. In its structure, content, and methodology it follows the established example of previous studies on lexis and word formation in Old and Middle Bulgarian written monuments.

The work runs to 292 pages and is accompanied by 275 pages of appendices. It consists of an introduction (with 5 sub-chapters), three main chapters (with 25 sub-chapters), a conclusion and a 22-page bibliography which covers both a wide range of research on the subject and source and reference material, mainly dictionaries.

The introductory section (pp. 4-15) provides general background to the narrative of Barlaam and Joasaph and briefly traces the history of research on its Eastern and Western traditions, focusing especially on the question of its origins, authorship, and its supposed (but now rejected in scholarship) connection to Buddha's biography. Of particular importance for the development of studies is the first edition of the Greek text in 1832 (see p. 6), as well as research on the Georgian and other earlier Eastern versions. This, albeit brief, survey of previous scholarly attempts to establish the complex relationships between the various traditions of the narrative shows that the study of a text so rich in contexts invariably draws on the achievements of other

research traditions. This also applies to the study of the Slavonic tradition of the narrative in relation to its immediate Byzantine source.

The introduction briefly discusses unresolved questions about the existence of the narrative in a Slavic milieu, especially the number of translations and the time and place of their origin (pp. 9-11). The opinions of various scholars are presented, but the author does not take a position on these controversial issues. However, a few sentences can be found in the conclusion of the dissertation that reveal to some extent her opinion specifically about the text in the manuscript she is working with.

The introductory part continues with a characterization of the manuscript RM 3/14 -dating, localization and orthography, and with the definition of the object, purpose, tasks and method of the research. Here a specification of the otherwise broad title of the dissertation is also made: the study covers part of the vocabulary of Barlaam and Joasaph in this particular manuscript, specifically nouns, with the main focus on derivative and especially suffixal nouns.

The main part of the work is entitled “Word Formation of Nouns” (pp. 16-262) and is organized into three chapters. Chapter One, “Nouns for Persons and Others” (pp. 16-74), and Chapter Two, “Nouns with Concrete and Abstract Meanings” (pp. 74-255), have a further internal division by grammatical gender, and within each of the genders there is a division by suffix in a total of 25 subchapters. The nouns analysed total over 1500 and, in addition to word-formation patterns (i.e. suffixes, bases, grammatical gender), they are also classified according to “the specific lexical groups they represent” (p. 13). Combining several classification principles from different levels and especially dividing the chapters according to the semantics of the derivative nouns inevitably leads to some compromises in the classification, which is also reflected in the chapter headings. The author recognizes this in specifying that some suffixes are polysemantic, so that the group of nouns for persons also includes “nouns for specific objects and phenomena” (p. 16).

The suffixes discussed in Chapter One are predominantly for persons in the masculine grammatical gender: -ѢННІКЪ (-ѢННІКЪ), -ѢЦЬ, -ТЕЛЪ, -ѢЦА/ -НЦА, -АРЬ, -ННЪ/ -АНННЪ, -НЦЬ and other non-productive suffixes; for persons of the feminine grammatical gender the suffixes -НЦА, -ѢННЦА and -ѢННН are included. In the study of nouns with the suffix -ѢННІКЪ and the grouping of nouns according to their bases (from nouns, adjectives, verbs, or participles), the interesting issue is raised that “in some word-formation units [however] it is possible to discern several derivation bases,” i.e., the base can be interpreted in several ways (e.g. *грѣшѢннѣкъ* < *грѣшѢннѣкъ*, *грѣшнѣтъ*,

ГРЪХЪ; ВЛЖДЪННЪ < ВЛЖДЪНЪ, ВЛЖДЪ, ВЛЖДНТИ, etc., p. 19). This issue opens a wider field for further investigation of the sequence of the formation of derivatives from the same root, e.g. a noun with a simple morphemic structure (ГРЪХЪ, ВЛЖДЪ) from which an adjective is formed with the suffix -ЪН- (ГРЪШЪНЪ, ВЛЖДЪНЪ) and a new noun for persons (ГРЪШЪННЪ, ВЛЖДЪННЪ) with the addition of another suffix -НН-. On the other hand, the already established compound suffix -ЪННЪ is extremely productive and can be added to purely verbal bases, cf. e.g. ОРЖЖЕНОСЪННЪ (from ОРЖЖЕ + НОСИТИ).

Another research aspect that deserves attention is added to the same part of the dissertation (pp. 25-26). A comparison with another published copy of the narrative (of a different recension or translation) is appended to the survey on the composita with the suffix -ЪННЪ, which shows the great variation in word formation and the significant differences that can be observed between the different copies. Although the author explicitly notes that it is not her intention to make textual comparisons, the large differences between the texts compared suggest that this approach could provide rich additional material for investigation in other sections of the study.

Among the nouns examined in Chapter One of the dissertation, there are several borrowings that do not belong to the word-formation patterns mentioned above, although they have a similar appearance and meaning. Such are, for example, ОЛЪТАРЪ (from Lat. altar, here together with other words with the Latin suffix -arius, such as ЗЛАТАРЪ etc., p. 48), ЕЛННЪ (from Gr. Ἑλλην, along with ethnic names with the suffix -ННЪ, p. 50), КЪНАЗЪ (a Germanic loanword with the third palatalization, here together with nouns with the suffix -Ъ, p. 56), ПЛАСТЪРЪ and МОНАСТЪРЪ (from Gr. ἔμπλαστρον and μοναστήριον, respectively, in the same group as ПАСТЪРЪ, pp. 64-65). For some of these the author notes their different origins (p. 64), and these words undoubtedly have a place in the lexical analysis of the narrative, as they provide an opportunity to address the ability of Proto-Slavic and Old Bulgarian to adapt borrowings to the available word-formation repertoire.

The second chapter of the dissertation is devoted to “nouns with concrete and abstract meanings” (pp. 74-255). This is the most voluminous part of the work and covers mostly nouns of the neuter and feminine gender and considerably fewer masculine nouns. The suffixes considered are as follows: for n. -ННЪ, -ТНЪ, -НЪ, -ЪСТВО / -ЪСТВЕНЪ, -НЦЪ, -ЛО; for f. -ОСТЬ / -ЕСТЬ, -ОТА / -ЕТА, -ННА (-ОТННА), -НЬ / -СНЬ / -ЗНЬ, -ЪВА / -ОВА, -ТВА; for m. -ЪКЪ (-ТЪКЪ) and conversion formations (without a suffix) of f. and m. grammatical gender.

The largest share is accounted for by the nouns with the suffix **-нѣ** and its extended variants (**-ннѣ**, **-тнѣ**, etc.), and this reflects the state not only of the text under study, but also of "the whole word-formation system of nouns in the Bulgarian literary language in the 14th century" (p. 74). Nouns of **-ннѣ** derive from a verb base and denote actions (*nomina actionis*) and results of actions (*nomina resultativa*). In this respect, of interest are the nouns which have homonymous action and resultative meanings, e.g. **внѣдѣннѣ** 'seeing' and 'vision'; **проповѣданнѣ** 'preaching' and 'sermon'; **сѣзѣданнѣ** 'creating' and 'creation', etc. (p. 148). In this case, it would be interesting to address other factors (such as context, valence, Greek correspondence) that differentiate these homonymous meanings. A pronounced feature of the **-ннѣ** derivatives is that almost 50% of them derive from prefixed verbs. This characteristic and the productivity of this suffix in general stand out as typical of word-formation features in the fourteenth century. According to the author, "this is further evidence for the belonging of the text (...) to the newly translated/newly edited works of this period" (p. 156). In this respect, it is significant that this most productive suffix is not among those studied by R. M. Tseytlin's word-formation patterns in the Old Bulgarian language in the manuscripts of the X-XI centuries.

On the contrary, well known from the earliest texts is the suffix for abstract nouns **-кѣтво** (less often the competing **-кѣтвнѣ**). In the text under study we also find a parallel use of the two suffixes, with the former predominating. Special attention is also paid to their productivity in the formation of new verbs with the suffix **-(кѣтв)ѡвати**, including verbs whose motivating noun is not attested in the consulted dictionaries (p. 181).

The two chapters of the dissertation, which catalogue the derivative nouns of the text by suffix, are structured in a similar way and provide the same information in a comprehensive exposition. In addition to their grouping by gender and suffix, the data on the meaning of the words of the different groups, the motivating base, the presence of prefixes (including for negation), the ability to form compound words and their relative proportion are summarized, the word's frequency in the text is indicated, their presence (or absence) in a number of dictionaries (including Old Bulgarian classical monuments and individual authors and works) is indicated, and all examples are given in context. In this way, despite the stated synchronic approach to the material, a comparison with the presence of the lexemes in the earlier stages of the development of the Bulgarian language is also provided.

A considerable part of the nouns with productive and especially with non-productive suffixes and with simple morphemic structure are a legacy of the development of the literary

Bulgarian language from the earlier period. Against this background, nouns with low frequency but with very productive suffixes (such as *-нне, -ство*) and with a high degree of competition with other suffixes stand out. They testify to the word-formation process in the 14th century, when neologisms competing with other synonyms appeared according to established patterns (cf. e.g. p. 259).

The third chapter of the dissertation, "Suffix competition in word-formation synonyms" (pp. 255-262), is devoted specifically to competing suffixes. The phenomenon has been well-known since the Old Bulgarian period, but in the text under study we observe double, triple and even quadruple synonymic series in which some of the members have a low frequency of use, but which testify to "a process in the direction of enriching the language of the text" (p. 263). The data are presented in tabular form (pp. 255-258), grouped by suffix, and the frequency of use in the text is noted. It can be seen that lexemes with the suffix *-нне* enter the most synonymic groups, but there is also competition among the less productive suffixes. Among the more typical pairs and triples of synonyms are *-нне / -ство / -ствне* (e.g. *мжвенне / мжвнтельство, поспѣшенне / поспѣшьство, дѣянне / дѣнство, окаянне / окаянство / окаянствне*, etc.), *-ость / -ынн* (e.g. *грѣдость / грѣдынн, мнлость / мнлостынн*), *-тель / -ць* (*датель / давць, мнродръжнтель / мнродръжць*), nouns with or without suffixes, etc.

Among the synonymous lexical pairs stand out also those in which one member is usually defined in the scholarly literature as Preslav words; the author pays special attention to them (pp. 261-263). Among her observations is that the variants "have parallel usage, but with higher frequency in Cyrillo-Methodian lexis" (p. 262). It should be stressed that according to the studies in recent years, the Preslav lexis should not be limited to listing pairs of synonyms, and besides, the non-Preslav member of these pairs is not a representative of a specific "Cyrillo-Methodian" language, but is usually part of the general lexical fund of the Old Bulgarian language, hence a large part of this lexis can be considered to be in common use.

The main body of the dissertation concludes with a Conclusion (pp. 263-269) that summarizes the interim observations made in the previous three chapters. I find the conclusion that the material 'shows continuity' with the earlier tradition, with differences in the degree of productivity and frequency of use of individual formants (p. 264), entirely convincing. In this respect, important information is contained in the data on the percentage of lexemes in the narrative absent from the dictionaries used (25%), respectively 75% of the vocabulary studied is shared with other works. It has been suggested that the Proto-Bulgarian lexemes in the text are

inherited from an earlier Preslav translation, and this is the final conclusion, which answers one of the questions posed at the beginning: according to the author, the text under study is a thorough 14th-century reworking of an earlier Old Bulgarian translation (p. 269). This claim, however, would need to be supported by additional arguments beyond the level of word formation.

Without underestimating the chosen approach and the exhaustive analysis of the voluminous vocabulary material in the work, I have two main remarks. First, it would have been useful to highlight the biblical citations, since some of the studied vocabulary is inherited or, on the contrary, diverges from earlier known translations, and these relationships are part of the dynamics of the development of the word-formation patterns. Second and more important is the exhaustive alignment of the lexemes to their Greek counterparts. This has only been done in isolated cases, and in a translated text with a known Greek source, the relations to the original (especially in compound words) are essential.

The dissertation is accompanied by 11 appendices with a total of 275 pages. 1. Repertory of the graphemes of the manuscript 2. Diplomatic edition of the text (the first 30 folia of the manuscript are given, out of a total of 268 folia); 3. Glossary of the nouns; 4. Reverse glossary; 5. Alphabetical list of word-formation synonyms; 6. Table of units studied by suffix; 7. List of lexemes not attested in the used dictionaries; 8. List of lexemes not attested in the Old Bulgarian canon; 9. Words of Proto-Bulgarian origin; 10. Alphabetical list of untranslated Greek words; 11. Alphabetical list of anthroponyms, ethnonyms and toponyms. The appendices are not only a useful reference tool and facilitate the search, but also systematize the material presented in the main exposition, enabling further research on it.

The abstract accurately conveys the content and structure of the dissertation, the scholarly contributions are clearly and adequately formulated. The author has six publications.

The dissertation of Monia Camuglia Ribarov "The Lexis in Manuscript No. 3/14 from the Library of the Rila Monastery as a Source for the History of the Text of "Barlaam and Joasaph"" meets all the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, therefore I recommend the distinguished members of the jury to vote with "yes".

10.09.2024 г.

Reviewer:

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Aneta Dimitrova