

three indexes: of subjects and terms, of names, and of geographic names. Well researched and written in a straight forward style, it should be welcomed by students of the Ottoman Empire's relations with Christian nations during the XVI century.

Brooklyn, New York

ARTHUR LEON HORNIKER

A Lexicon to the Glory of God, Greek-Russian (18th Century), Facsimile edition with a preface by Michael Samilov, London (Variorum Reprints), 1972.

«A Lexicon to the Glory of God and His Mother. Amen» has been published for the first time by the house «Variorum Reprints», in a photo-facsimile edition of the manuscript.

The manuscript in question is No. 1117 in Ch. Astruc and Marie-Louise Concasty's *Catalogue des manuscrits grecs, Le supplément grec III, nos. 901-1371*, (Paris 1960), in which we are informed that it is a papyrus manuscript of the eighteenth century consisting of 94 ff. measuring 157x100 mm each. The text occupies ff. 1-89v, 91rv, 90rv and 92. A note on folio 1, «Societatis Jesu», shows that the manuscript once belonged to the Jesuit College of Clermont; that it later passed into the University collection is indicated by the mark «in 8 U78» on the lower part of the inside cover. The Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris eventually acquired the manuscript in 1892.

Introducing the text, in his Prologue, (the pages are un-numbered), M. Samilov indicates that the manuscript dates from the end of the seventeenth—early eighteenth century; pointing out that nothing is known either of the identity of its author or of the purpose for which the work was compiled, he adds that even palaeographic examination of the manuscript fails to yield helpful information. He maintains the original existence of the Greek list of words, not all of which have been given their Russian equivalents (cf. ff. 67, 67v, 72v, 78, 86-87v, 89, 90-91); the gaps in the Russian list represent compound words with which the author was apparently not familiar, and the omission of the theological term Θέωσις=Oboženie is to be noted. He further reports that many of the words belong to a slavonic theological and ecclesiastical vocabulary, and that examination of the corresponding Russian words reveals that the majority of them are of central and northern Russian derivation. Finally, he mentions that the importance of the manuscript has been noted by L. S. Kovtun (*Russkaja leksikografija epohi srednevekov'ja*, Moscow 1963) and M. P. Alekseev (*Slovari inostrannyh jazykov v russkom azbukovnike XVIII veka*, Leningrad 1968).

The interesting note that follows the Prologue informs us that Dr. W. Ryan, of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, has maintained that the manuscript was written by a cleric, since it contains so many words of a theological and ecclesiastical character; he adds that it may have belonged to communities of Old Believers, and is probably a collation from earlier lexica and other sources. He reports that two separate opinions confirm the existence of variants on the seventeenth-century coat of arms of the city of Amsterdam, and that these parts of the manuscript are either of Dutch manufacture or Russian imitations. He further contends that a positive dating of the manuscript is not possible.

The text of the manuscript follows. On folio 1 the author opens with the phrase, «ΛΕΞΙΚΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΔΟΞΑΝ ΘΕΟΥ καὶ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ. ἀμήν» («Lexicon to the Glory of God and His Mother. Amen»), and concludes on folio 93 with the expressions, «ΘΕΩ ΔΟΤΗΡΗ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΟΞΑ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΕΩΣ» («Glory and Renown to God the Giver of All») and «τέλος, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ δόξα». («End, and Glory to God»).

The Greek words are set down on the left side of the page and their Russian equivalents

on the right. The author does not follow the Greek alphabet and separate the words into twenty-four divisions (A, B, Γ etc.), but arranges them into smaller groups classified according to the first two letters of the word; each section is then appropriately headed Α μετὰ τοῦ Β (ἀβάνης, ἀβάνια, ἀβανίζω) (A with B etc.) and so on.

Many Greek words do not have their Russian equivalents (cf. ff. 5r, 67rv, 70v, 71rv, 72v, 78r, 86rv, 87rv, 88r, 89v, 90rv, 91rv), whereas the contrary does not occur.

Examining the words as a whole, I am unable to agree with the assertion that the writer proposed to compile a theological-ecclesiastical lexicon. While it is a fact that many of the words have a theological-ecclesiastical character, the non-theological and non-ecclesiastical words are greater in number and quite unrelated to a theological-ecclesiastical terminology. I doubt that the following words, for example, would have found a place in an exclusively theological-ecclesiastical lexikon: ἀφάλι, ἀχαμνά, κακοπλερωτής, καμάκι, κανάκια, μητάράς, μουστάκι, μπαρμπέρης, ξεπαρθενεμένη, ξυράφι, ὄρχιδι, παστομένος, πουτανόπουλα, σούβλα, στραβοπόδας, τηγάνι, ψωμοπουλετής.

This factor renders it impossible for me to concur with Dr. Ryan's suggestion that the lexicon probably derives from some provincial centre of Old Believers. There is even greater certainty with regard to the omissions: as well as the word Θέωσις a whole host of theological and ecclesiastical terms are missing.

It is my opinion that the author of this lexicon was a Greek. I base this suggestion on the following evidence:

a) What we have here is a Greek-Russian lexicon. In itself, of course, this is not enough for us to conclude that its author was a Greek; but there is the title on the frontispiece—«ΛΕΞΙΚΟΝ ΕΙΣ ΔΟΞΑΝ ΘΕΟΥ καὶ τῆς μητρός αὐτοῦ. ἀμήν»—and the lexicon also ends with the two phrases, «ΘΕΩ ΔΟΤΗΡΙ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΔΟΞΑ ΚΑΙ ΚΛΕΩΣ» and «Τέλος, καὶ τῷ Θεῷ δόξα». The obvious question is, why isn't there some word or phrase in Russian at the beginning and the end?

b) The first column, on the left side of the page, has Greek words and the second, on the right, their equivalents in Russian; but the writer has left a number of unknown or incomplete Russian words. Were he Russian, the opposite would be expected to occur.

c) The writer is closely familiar with Greek words to be found in medieval popular literature and even in modern Greek, such as ἀγάλια, ἀποράδα, ἀφάλι, γάδαρος, ἔτσι, ζουμάκι, θυγατερόπουλα, καβαλαρέοι, καθάγια, κακομριγισμένος, καμάκι, κλειδονιά, κοπέλα, κοπελούδα, κρομυδόφυλλον, λαβωματιά, ματάκι, μικρούτζικος, μονέδα, μπαρμπέρης, μπάσταρδος, μπλάστρι, νάισκε, ὀμορφάδα, οὐζάρω (=χρησιμοποιῶ), οὐζάρισμα (=χρησιμοποίησις), πατουχα, περιβολάκι, σκαφίδι, σκουτέλι, τζαγκάρης, τζουκαλαριό, τρελάδα, φθοναράκι, φλούμπα, φηκάρι, φοῦρκα, φυλλάδα, φουσούνι, χαρτάκι, χειρόκτι, χρυσοχαλιναράτος, ψιλούτζικος, χωργιάτης.

d) It is not easy to ascertain whether the writer was lay or cleric. The assumption that he was a Greek in the process of learning Russian in Russia, however, presents less difficulties; I would suggest that he drew up his own word-list as an aid to his personal studies. The fact that he used many theological-ecclesiastical words does not induce me to believe that it is a specifically theological-ecclesiastical lexicon for, as is well known, most of the teachers of that period were clerics and the bulk of the examples they used in grammars and in classes were related in some way to the church.

e) In conclusion, I should like to cite certain words which, I feel, lend support to my suggestion that the author was Greek:

i. The word ἔλληνας is rendered as «Ellin», The word ἑλληνικά is rendered as «no ellinskij», The word ἑλληνική is rendered as «ellinskaja».

ii. The word ρωμαῖος is rendered as «Grek». The word ρωμαῖκά is rendered as «no grečeskij». The word ρωμαῖκός is rendered as «Grečeskij».

On the other hand, «Rim» is given for Ρώμη, and as a final indication, the words Ρῶσ(σ)ος, Ρῶσ(σ)ία, ῥωσ(σ)ικός or Ροῦσ(σ)ος, Ρουσ(σ)ία, ρουσ(σ)ικός are not mentioned at all.

Thessaloniki
Institute for Balkan Studies

CONSTANTINE PAPOULIDIS

Russko-Francuzskij Slovar, Sostavili akad. L. V. Ščerba i M. I. Matucevič pod obščej redakcijej akad. L. V. Ščerby, Izdanie četvortoe ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe pod redakcijej D. V. Sezemana, Okolo 50.000 slov, Moskva 1955 (Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannyh i nacional'nyh slovaroj).

Opening this work is an advertisement of the editors and a «Predislovie k tret'emu izdaniju» by M. Matucevič (p. 3); this is followed by the «Predislovie ko vtoromu izdaniju» of L. Ščerba (pp. 4-7), the «Glavnejšie leksikografičeskie posobija» (p. 8), the «Struktura slovarja» (pp. 9-10) and the «Uslovnye sokraščeniija» (pp. 11-12). The Russian-French Dictionary, from A to ja, occupies pp. 13-746; also included is a «Geografičeskoe nazvanija» (pp. 747-753), a «Krarkie svedenija po francuzskoj grammatike» (pp. 754-783), and the work is completed with a list of *errata* and information relating to its publication (p. 784).

I trust that I shall be permitted to suggest a minor amendment: on p. 667 we read «Tureckij turc (f. turque); de Turquie; — jazyk le turc, langue turque», which is quite correct; but p. 668 has «Tjurk//i mn. Turks m. pl; — skij turc (f. turque); — skii jazyki langues turques»—which is not correct, and this entry should read as follows: «Tjurk//i mn. Touraniens m. pl.; — skij touranien (f. touranienne); — skie jazyki langues touraniennes». From the «Petit Robert» (*Dictionnaire de la langue française par P. Robert*, Paris 1973), we learn that the term *touranien-ienne*, has been accepted in France since 1854.

The confusion between the terms tjurskij jazyk and tureckij jazyk is common amongst those starting to learn the Russian language; often they translate both terms with the phrase *langue turque*, whereas in fact *langue turque* in Russian is tureckij jazyk and the term tjurskij jazyk denotes *langue touranienne* (=Ouraloaltaïque).

Thessaloniki
Institute for Balkan Studies

CONSTANTINE PAPOULIDIS

R. Harris Smith, *OSS: The Secret History of America's First Central Intelligence Agency*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1972, pp. xii + 458, Bibliography, Index.

At the outset it is important to note that though *OSS* is hardly the last word on its topic it may well be the first. That is, it may represent the first collection of this much needed material on so many facets of the world-wide activities of the Office of Strategic Services. Some may depreciate the form and treatment as presented by Mr. Smith but serious students will be drawn back to this volume when they seek to trace the *OSS* and its operations in the region of their own interest. Here they will find the cast of characters and key events — here and perhaps nowhere else for the author has done an impressive job of bringing together the