

# The Staicu lexicon in relation to lexicons belonging to the Berynda family: orthography and structure<sup>†</sup>

Ion-Mihai Felea\*

*Faculty of Letters, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Bd. Carol I 11, 700506 Iași, Romania*

## Article info

### History:

Received May 12, 2021

Accepted July 5, 2021

Published August 18, 2021

### Key words:

historical lexicology  
comparative analysis

## Abstract

The first manuscripts with Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries date from the 17<sup>th</sup> century and six of these have been preserved to the present day almost intact. They are all based on Pamvo Berynda's lexicon (1627), to which several word lists were added in some of the manuscripts. These manuscripts have mostly been studied from a lexical point of view.

Our study aims at describing the way in which the lexicons were elaborated, at observing the significant orthographic variations and also at becoming an additional tool for establishing the network of filiations from which the Romanian lexicons resulted. Our observations focus on the entries for the first three letters in the above-mentioned lexicons. As all these lexicons were available in electronic format, we identified the propagation of several errors in the Romanian antigraphs, emphasized various aspects related to spelling and compared the additional lists.

The data indicates that Romanian manuscripts preserve the orthography of Berynda's Lexicon and the additional lists to a different degree. These variations suggest the existence of at least one protograph between the source and the Romanian lexicons. Applied to the entire content of the manuscripts, the investigation of these variations could contribute to the identification of the manuscript that is the closest to the initial version.

## 1. Introduction

The "Berynda family" designates the Slavonian-Ruthenian lexicon of Pamvo Berynda [= BER], printed for the first time in 1627 in Kiev, as well as a group of Slavonic-Romanian lexicons from the 17<sup>th</sup> century which were based on the Ruthenian edition. The following works are included: The Staicu Lexicon (Romanian manuscript 312 BAR, mentioned in our study as *Lex.Sta.*), the lexicon in Romanian manuscript 1348 BAR written by Mihai Logofătul (= *Lex.1348*), the lexicon in Romanian manuscript 3473 BAR copied by a certain Mihaiu (= *Lex.3473*), the lexicon of Petersburg (OP Q.XVI.5 BNR, mentioned in our study as *Lex.Pet.*), the lexicon of Mardarie in the Romanian manuscript 450 BAR (= *Lex.Mard.*) and the lexicon of Moscow (F.188, Op.1. nr.1383, RGADA, mentioned in our study as *Lex.Mosc.*). The Romanian manuscripts have benefitted of inconsistent attention throughout the years, mainly because of the fact that two of them are located in Russia. Although the list is far from thoroughgoing, we should mention that *Lex.Mard.* was edited by Crețu (1900) in a volume that still proves useful, whereas *Lex.Mosc.* was partly studied by Ciobanu (1914). *Lex.Sta.* and its author were studied by Strungaru (1973) and Gînsac & Ungureanu (2019). Overall perspectives were provided by Strungaru (1966), Левичкин & Сухачев (2015) and Gînsac & Ungureanu (2018). Since the above-mentioned works focused primarily on the lexical component of the dictionaries, we considered that the filiation should also be approached from the less exploited perspective of orthography. Several manuscripts have become accessible through

<sup>†</sup>This paper was funded by a grant provided by the Romanian Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitalization, CNCS/CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project no. PN III-P1.1-TE-2019-0517, within the PNCD III programme.

\*Email address: [imfelea@gmail.com](mailto:imfelea@gmail.com).

digitization processes, more information is available about the orthographic norms of the time, and fonts such as those created within the Ponomar project<sup>1</sup> provide us with an opportunity to explain differences that used to be overlooked. Our secondary aim was to catalogue those divergences that cannot be explained solely by the degree of freedom that scholars took when copying from one manuscript to another.

Before the issue of the complete comparative edition we intend to elaborate within the eRomLex project (see [scriptadacoromanica.ro](http://scriptadacoromanica.ro)), this study used the material for the first three letters: **А**, **Б** and **В**. All the Slavonic words were transcribed taking into account the whole range of orthographic details whenever fidelity was deemed necessary. The translations from the Romanian manuscripts are rendered in Italics.

## 2. Structure

The Staicu Lexicon, which can be found on pages 41<sup>v</sup>–216<sup>v</sup> of the Romanian manuscript 312 **BAR**, represents a collaborative endeavour of several people. It contains around 6,000 proper names, Slavonic common nouns and a smaller percentage of Greek and Hebrew nouns listed according to the Slavonic alphabet. Towards the end, it includes two additional wordlists, considerably shorter than the basic lexicon. These are followed by a series of thematic lexical lists, such as the translation of animal names from *Lev*, 11. The basic lexicon is an adaptation of the **BER**, with a few notable differences. Compared to the Ruthenian edition, the proper names are listed immediately after the common ones, not separately. The second notable difference is the fact that after the material in **BER**, each letter contains at least one page of content that is independent from the Ruthenian lexicon. These additional entries were definitely written by the same hand and most of them are Slavonic, Russian and Ruthenian words. Further on we shall use the convention *Staicu*<sub>1</sub> for the definitions with an equivalent in **BER**, whereas the ones copied from an unidentified source shall be considered written by *Staicu*<sub>2</sub>, without overlooking the fact that this is actually the same person. The content taken from **BER** by *Staicu*<sub>1</sub> varies, yet for certain letters it is retrieved almost completely. The words written by *Staicu*<sub>2</sub> are arranged almost alphabetically, meaning that they appear in groups of 3–5 words listed in alphabetical order, between which some words that do not seem to be in the right place were added. This apparently chaotic organization could be explained in relation to other types of early lexicons. It is possible that our lexicons completed the lexical lists in Berynda with entries taken from one or several Slavonic proto-dictionaries. In order to justify this hypothesis, a variety of information can be considered. This hypothesis is supported by information on the structure of medieval lexicons, which were not always arranged according to the expectations one may have today with regard to a dictionary (Ковтун, 1989, p. 23). A common method was to organize the entries in chapters where words were grouped according to their initial and the second vowel they contained (Карпов, 1877, p. 137); in other cases, the definitions were separated according to thematic categories: months of the year, body parts, proper names, plants, etc. The first principle could explain why in *Lex.Sta.* we come across successive entries that seem to be organized without any particular logic, such as *Амфилохій*, *Алупій*, *Акиндунъ* or *Артёмъ*, *Аверкій*, *Аред.д.* The *Staicu*<sub>2</sub> section for **В** starts with the following sequence: *ВѢТИ*, *ВЕЗЛОБИЕ*, *ВДЕНІЕ*, *ВДИТ*, *ВОК*, *БРОД*, *ВЛИСТАНІЕ*, *ВДЮ*, *ВѢСЪ*, *ВЕЗЩАДІЙ*, *ВЕЗПЕЧАЛІЕ*, *ВОС*, *ВЪБЕН*, *ВѢЛКА*, *БЕРВНО*, *ВЪДЪ*, *ВЪДЕШИ*, *ВЪДИ*, *ВЪДЕТ*, *ВЫХ*. The first term is a paradigm supplement of the *ВУДУЦІЙ* entry, the last one in **BER**. If we accept that *ВЛИСТАНІЕ* is a paradigm supplement for *ВЛѢСКЪ* and reconstruct the historical forms of some words (*ВЪВЪНЪ*, *ВЪРЪВЪНО*), we obtain two almost regular consecutive series: *ѐ, ѐ, и, о, о, ѡ, ѡ*, (*ю*), *ѣ / ѐ, ѐ, ѡ, ѡ, ѣ, ѣ, ѡ, ѡ, ѡ, ѡ, ѡ*. This approach can only partially explain the order in *Staicu*<sub>2</sub> and the other Romanian manuscripts, respectively; however, if this hypothesis proves to be true, it indicates that the entries in *Staicu*<sub>2</sub> were copied from at least one early Slavonic lexicon. The definitions copied by *Staicu*<sub>2</sub> do not seem to be grouped thematically, yet some of them appear where one would expect to find them in a thematic dictionary. For instance, at the end of **Б**, we find the succession *БОНИФАНТИЙ*, *БОРИС*, *БОРИДЪ*. The proper names categories are also placed at the end of the entries for one letter in other Slavonic dictionaries (Карпов, 1877, p. 136; for the classification of Russian lexicons, see Ковтун, 1989, p. 9). A similar

<sup>1</sup>Information on the mission and achievements of the project is available at [ponomar.net](http://ponomar.net).

pseudo-alphabetical order can be found in manuscript no. 1649 of the Pogodin collection belonging to the Russian National Library, a small lexicon dating from mid-16<sup>th</sup> century<sup>2</sup>. We therefore believe that it is possible for the translation from Staicu<sub>2</sub> to have been done after a manuscript which was similar in form and content to the ones that appeared in the Russian area starting with the 15<sup>th</sup> century. To provide such an example we shall refer to the entry **вори.дъ** (translated *o iarbă ascuțită la miros* [a sharp-smelling type of grass] in **Lex.Mosc.**, **Lex.1348**, and *o iarbă iute la miros* [a pungent-smelling type of grass] in **Lex.Sta.**), relating it to Sergey's lexicon, a manuscript copied around the year 1650 at the Russian Solovetsky Monastery<sup>3</sup> and described by **Левичкин & Сухачев** (2015, p. 440) as the most comprehensive Russian medieval lexicon. Sergey's lexicon has the structure described above and section **Бо** includes the entry **Бори.д.**, **зелье ѳстрыя слаستی, к мышью способно, ѳакоже ѳ на мѣло. ѳ вчищению силѳ ѳмѣетъ, ѳакоже силѳтра. Іерѳ, ѳ ѳ**, which translates: "Borith. plantă iute la gust și utilizabilă la spălat, cum e la noi sărunul, și putere de curățare are precum silitra. Ierem 2" [Borith. A sharp-tasting plant that can be used for washing, as we use soap, which cleans as well as salpêtre. Jerem 2]. We can thus infer that two of our lexicons selected the first meaning of **острый**, namely 'ascuțit' [sharp], whereas Staicu opted for the other meaning, which is more appropriate 'iute' [pungent], either because he had the Slavonic text in front of him or because he understood the source of the error. **Бори.д.** and a few other adjacent entries are missing from **Lex.1348**, yet the latter still contains around 30 definitions that are not recorded in other manuscripts. This entry cannot be found in either **Lex.Mard.** or **Lex.Pet.**

Obviously, the source of the definitions copied by Staicu<sub>2</sub> cannot possibly be Sergey's lexicon, yet the fact that most entries for **Б** can also be found, although in a different order, in the Russian manuscript, is still relevant. It is possible that they were part of a common body of definitions that migrated from one Slavonic lexicon to the other, in some instances becoming simpler, as in the Romanian manuscripts and in others gaining an encyclopaedic character, as in the Solovetsky dictionary. These additional lists from Staicu do not necessarily originate from the same source. In **Lex.Mard.** the letter **Б** ends with the entries **водець, воденець** and **водеж**. In his lexicon, Staicu<sub>2</sub> draws the line after the last entry in the succession **водець, воденець, воище**, then continues to copy entries that can also be found in the other Romanian lexicons. We cannot be certain that Staicu<sub>2</sub> used two different lists, but the line can as well signal the end of a list that was related to **Lex.Mard.**

### 3. The scribes of the Staicu lexicon

Besides the text of the scribe, the lexicon was modified by several readers. Some of these interventions consisted in definitions or observations inserted sporadically, while others produced consistent changes regarding the content of the dictionary. It is difficult to assess how many people contributed to the content of the manuscript, as the handwriting style can be modified by several factors: the writing instrument, the type of intervention – side note, end note or restoration of the manuscript, the language in which it is written.

#### 3.1. The Lupașcu hand

The first two pages of letter **A**, between **ѳзъ** and **ѳгрипнѳа**, were written by the same hand. According to a note on page 41<sup>v</sup> from May, 1, 1758, the manuscript was owned by a certain priest, Lupașcu. Although the orthography is much neater, one can recognize in it the hand that will add numerous entries to the lexicon. Page 41<sup>v</sup> was left half blank and subsequently another hand added some etymological notes. Definitions 1–9, up to **ѳлчѳа**, can also be found in **BER**. The others, up to **ѳгрипнѳа**, were most probably copied from another manuscript, with little connection to **BER**. This conclusion is supported by: the approximate alphabetical order, the extremely tenuous selection, if it were to be explained through **BER**, differences in the translation of the same terms as compared to Staicu – **ѳпѳль**: *solul* [the envoy] (41<sup>v</sup>) vs

<sup>2</sup>The digital format of the text is available here: [oldlexicons.ru](http://oldlexicons.ru).

<sup>3</sup>The RNB site provides an excellent digital copy under listing ОП СоЛ. 18/18 ([nlr.ru](http://nlr.ru)).

*sol* [envoy] (43<sup>v</sup>), **АЛЕКТУР**: *cocoș* [rooster] (41<sup>v</sup>) vs *cîntător, cocoș* [singer, rooster] (42<sup>v</sup>), **АРХИТРИКЛИН**: *nunul, mai marele nuntei* [groomsman, overseer of a wedding] (41<sup>v</sup>) vs *nunul* [groomsman] (44<sup>f</sup>) and **АЛЛАВСТР**: *sticlă, marmură* [glass, marble] vs *șip de sticlă sau de marmură* [bottle made of glass or marble] (42<sup>v</sup>), the entry **АГАВИЕ**, which does not exist in **BER**, the Ruthenian lexicon recording just two entries for **АГАВЪ**. **АГАВИЕ** and **АГАВЪ** are probably different saints, as in **Lex.Mosc.**, **Lex.Pet.** and **Lex.Sta.** there is at least one entry that coincides with Berynda for **АГАВЪ**, while the translations differ (**АГАВИЕ**: *batjocură* [taunt / scorn] as opposed to **АГАВЪ**: *luminat* [enlightened]).

Lupașcu also left some lexicographic attempts in the form of small groups of words on the pages that precede the lexicon. Many of these have a correspondent in **BER**, yet some are obviously Ruthenian, without any relation with the Slavonic or Southern-Slavonic languages: **КЛАА**: *glonț* [bullet] (31<sup>r</sup>), **РЕЕСТРЪ ИЛИ САА**: *rînduială, –ire* [order]. The former is attested with its military meaning, according to **GSBM** (s.v. *куля*), as early as the 16<sup>th</sup> century, while the latter is attested in Russian in 1665 (**Vasmer**, s.v. *реецм*). Both examples were borrowed in Russian from Polish, either directly or through a Ruthenian intermediary. **MDA<sub>2</sub>** attests *glonț* in Costin's *Chronicle*, but it would be interesting to find out if any occurrences can be detected prior to 1670.

Lupașcu also noted an entry at the end of letter A and several entries at the end of B, of which some are worth mentioning:

- **БЕЗМЕЗДНО**: *în zadar, în har* [in vain]. Attested in Russian texts from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, although the lexical family is also represented in Southern-Slavonic texts as early as the 10<sup>th</sup> century, according to **SJS**, s.v. **ВЕЗМЪЗДЪНИКЪ** and **МІКЛ**, s.v. **ВЕЗМЪЗДЪНО**.
- **БОТЫ**: *cizme* [boots]. After **Vasmer**, borrowed by Russian from Polish around the 15<sup>th</sup> century, where it had in turn been borrowed from French. Non-attested in Bulgarian, where, for instance, *ботуш* is considered a borrowing from Romanian (**DEB**, s.v. *ботуш*).
- **БЪТЫЛКА**: *sticlă* [bottle]. Also borrowed in Russian from French, either directly or through a Polish or Ruthenian intermediary.
- **БЫК**: *taur*. Cf. ru./bel. *бык*, but ucr./bg./sr-cr. *бик*. OCS **БЫКЪ**.
- **БАРАБАН**: *alăută* [psaltery]. In **DEB** the word is considered a borrowing from Russian, although neither the period of the borrowing, nor the first attestation are specified.
- **БАГАЖ**: *odor din casă* [jewel, precious thing from one's home]. In **Vasmer** (s.v. *багаж*) the first attestation dates from 1706. The term was borrowed from French via Polish or German. The Romanian translation is quite interesting, especially corroborated with the meaning 'bagaj, calabalic' [baggage, stuff] for *pilotă* [quilt] in the area of Moldova (**MDA<sub>2</sub>**, s.v. *pilotă*).
- **БАШМАКИ ИЛИ ОБЪВИ**: *papuci* [shoes]. According to **Vasmer** (s.v. *баушмак*), the first word is borrowed from a Turanian language, such as Chagatai.

It is almost a certainty that most of the constant interventions to be found on the Staicu text belong to Lupașcu. Comparing the writing at the beginning of A, at the end of B and the side notes: **ВЫХОВАНЕЦ**, **ПИТОМЕЦ**: *fecior de suflet* [adopted son] (58<sup>v</sup>)<sup>4</sup>, **ВЕКША**: *veveriță*<sup>5</sup> [squirrel], **ВРАВИА**: *stîlpare* [sallows], **ВЪНО**: *zeastre* [dowry], **ВОСКЪЛЪ ПЪ**: *va chelălăi ciinele* [the dog will yelp] a.o., a few graphical traits stand out. The capital **В** with protruding serif, **М** with three legs and a serif at the upper end of the left leg, the **Б**, the triangle-shaped **Ф**, the **Л**, the slightly bent **Ъ**, the **Ц**, the **К** with sinuous strokes, the overwritten **Р** with its leg bent at approximately 45 degrees from the horizontal, all these letters must have been written by the same hand or at least by people with extremely similar writing styles. Some words can be found on the entire Slavonic areal, such as **ВЪНО** or **ВРАВИА**. The former exists both in pre-modern Russian (**SDI**, s.v. *въно*) and in Bulgarian, its use being currently dialectal and obsolete. The latter is a Greek borrowing of a Southern-Slavonic ecclesiastic background, from *βραβεῖον*, which meant 'prize' (accompanied by a palm-leaves garland, cf. *palmares*) in Slavonic and pre-modern Russian and then evolved towards 'palm-

<sup>4</sup>Cf. ucr. *вихованець* and bel. *выхаванець*.

<sup>5</sup>Word from Eastern Slavonic, not recorded in Bulgarian.

tree branch' or any convenient substitute for the celebration of Palm Sunday (**SRS18**, s.v. *вравие*). Other marginal glosses are related exclusively to the North-Eastern Slavic area. In the phrase **Воскѣлѣ пѣ:** *va chelălăi cîinele* [the dog will yelp], the verb is an Ukrainian regional version (**SUM**, s.v. *скімлити*), where the vowels often close at [i]. It could be a Biblical gloss extracted from *Ex*, 11, 7.

### 3.2. The *апфо* hand

At the end of letter A we find two entries, one noted by Lupaşcu—**Архивах: писмо хранилищах:** *cămări de scrisori* [letter rooms]—and one by an unknown author—**апфо:** *acum încă* [now yet]—, an entry which is missing from **BER** and which notes a difficult term from the second book of Kings. In the Hebrew text (**BHS**, 2*Rg*, 2, 14) we find the combination 'אָפּ הַיּ, which **SEPT** leaves untranslated, rendering it by *αφρω*. This phrasing was also challenging for the Slavic translators. Some Slavic texts render it as **апфо** – **BIS**<sup>6</sup>, for instance, or **лффо**, **OST** and **PAN** avoid it completely, the Moscow Bible (a re-editing from 1663 of **OST**) omits it, yet notes **лфδ** on the side. **SEPT.FRANK** transcribes it as *αφω*, whereas **VULG** translates it by “etiam nunc”, meaning “right now”.

This *апфо* hand occasionally notes at the end of a letter definitions that present pleophony and at times complete the definitions provided by Staicu [**брашно:** *bucate, mîncare* [food] (Staicu), *făină* [flour] (*апфо*)].

### 3.3. Hands of uncertain origin

Other additions that seem to have a Ruthenian origin are **влинница** and **врѣтка**. The first example is actually a rewriting of a Staicu entry, placed one line above. The entry changes the **ѣ** into **и** and slightly rephrases the translation. The intervention does not enrich the lexicon, yet the closing **ѣ** indicates a speaker who was familiar with the Slavic languages spoken north of Moldova: rusn. *білий*, ucr. *білий*, seh. *bilý*. However, south of the Danube, the isogloss of **ѣ** divided the speakers into two large groups: eastern speakers, who pronounce an Iotated *a* (bg. *вял*), and western speakers, who pronounce the sound as *e*<sup>7</sup>. In the second case, next to the **Lex.Sta.** translation: *ţeavie sau duda*, someone added **оулою или рѣра**. Over *ръци* there seems to be another level, with the letter **у**. As *rură* is placed by **DLRLC** in the northern dialects (Moldova or Bukovina) and the etymon is a Ruthenian one, entered via Polish from the German *Rohr* = ‘ţeavă’ [pipe] (**WSJP**, s.v. *rura*), we can assume that the person who wrote that gloss was a scholar from the Northern part of the country. The lexicons **Lex.Mosc.**, **Lex.Pet.**, **Lex.3473** and **Lex.1348** translate it identically by *ţeavie de aramă* [brass pipe], with no additional explanation, whereas **Lex.Mard.** erroneously notes *îndemînă* [handy], probably under the influence of the previous entry **врѣченіе**.

On the first page for letter B, someone wrote the note **вацанъ, pe bulgărie zice tată** [in Bulgarian it is called father]. It is not clear whether the author is a Bulgarian speaker or, on the contrary, a Russian or Ruthenian speaker who notes a form he is unfamiliar with. The second hypothesis could be supported by the modern Ukrainian *бацтан* ‘harbuzărie’ [watermelon farm]. The Romanian manuscripts provide many examples of homophone pairs, both in the sections translated after **BER**, and in the other sections. It is also possible that the person who noted **вацанъ** wanted to oppose the Bulgarian word to a Ruthenian one he was already familiar with.

In **Lex.Pet.**, at the end of letter **В** there are three entries that cannot be found in any other dictionary, one of them being **веприни:** *agrişu* [gooseberry bush]. Most probably, the scribe was already familiar with the term **веприна** ‘carne de mistreţ’ [wild boar meat] or ‘femela porcului mistreţ’ [female wild boar], common to several Slavonic languages (ucr., sb. etc. cf. **вепрь:** *porcu, gliganu* in **Lex.Pet.**) and wanted to add a regionalism that was specific to South-Western Ukraine, an adjacent area of the Northern Romanian areal (**SUM**, s.v. 2. *веприна*).

The most plausible scenario is the one according to which the first pages from the original Staicu lexicon had been lost or were not copied at all, and Lupaşcu compensated these gaps subsequently, selectively extracting several definitions from at least two sources and completing the dictionary with a series

<sup>6</sup>оуво гдѣ ѣ бг іліиъ, апфо, pag. 261 r9.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. mc. *бел*, sb-cr. *bělo, bijěl, běl*, but dialectally also *būo*.

of definitions either at the beginning or at the end of a letter. His additions are generally placed at the beginning, right after the Staicu version, but in some cases, as it happens at the end of the letter Г, entries were added between two of his interventions. In this scenario, Lupaşcu is also the one who eliminates two of Staicu's definitions – **АЗОК** and **АЛЕКТОР**, as these had already been noted and translated in his reconstructed version.

Finally, on manuscript 312, at least two other owners left their graphic imprint in a later epoch. One of them, Jean de Talmatzy<sup>8</sup>, has rare interventions with equivalents in Latin and French. On page 50<sup>r</sup>, the entry **БРАЗНА**: *holdă* [fields] is surrounded by a frame containing translations into Greek and Latin, French (*champ laboure*), Russian (*земля обработанная*) and Romanian (*holdă, pămînt lucrat*), to which another writer added a second frame containing the translations *holdă sau dealniţă*.

### 3.4. The Staicu hand

On page 42<sup>r</sup> the manuscript continues with the entry **АДОНАЙ** written by an author we identified as Staicu. Our choice indicates that we accept the demonstration of **Strungaru (1966)**, who attributed the paternity of this writing to the scribe from Tîrgovişte. The lexicon owes over 95% of its content to Staicu. After he finished processing the lexical material in **BER**, Staicu<sub>2</sub> adds 66 entries in which we can distinguish around five groups arranged in an approximately alphabetical order. The Staicu<sub>2</sub> additions are not found in **Lex.Pet.**, **Lex.1348** or **Lex.Mosc.** (in **Lex.3473** the letter A was not preserved, whereas in **Lex.Mard.** it is abruptly interrupted). With only two exceptions, **АГАДѢ** and **АНАЖИВЪ**<sup>9</sup>, all the entries added by Staicu<sub>2</sub> are also found in **BER**. Of these 64 entries, only five are new, the rest being duplicates of previously entries, some of them repeated even twice. It is almost as if we are looking at the notebook of a student who tries to learn a list of names, translating them repeatedly until he acquires them properly.

## 4. Orthography

Generally, the orthography of the Slavonic content in Romanian manuscripts differs from the one in **BER**. Even if we were to accept the hypothesis of a Romanian protograph which would be extremely faithful to **BER**, the successive antigraphs gradually took distance from it by applying the Slavonic orthography of Romanian redaction. In **Lex.Sta.**, unlike **BER**, the combination breathing mark – acute accent (˘) is consequently placed on the initial vowel, consonants in adjacent positions coda – onset at the border-line between syllables are relatively consequently separated by Staicu with a payerok (˘) or even an yer (**АМЪМА**)—as it also happens in **BER**, owever, only sporadically—, in some instances the consonants are doubled: **Lex.Sta.** **АММАЛІ** vs **BER** **АМАЛИКЪ**, and in some cases the Greek letters are phonetically adapted:

- v by и, в or ф: **АВЗЕНТІИ** vs **АВЗЕНТІИ**, **АФТОНѢ** for **АВТОНѢ**, which in two other cases Staicu had, however, transcribed with v. As Staicu<sub>1</sub> writes **АВТОНОМ** right after **АВЗЕНТІИ**, we can assume that the scribe was either accustomed to write в instead of v, or to pronounce it as such.
- д by т: **АНТИНОГѢ** vs **АДИНОГѢИ**.
- х by ф: **АМФИЛОХІИ** vs **АФФИЛОФІЕ**.
- в by п: **АНЕВОДИТЬ** vs **АНЕМОДИТЬ**. All the three occurrences in **Lex.Sta.** appear with в.
- The group гг written нг. **АГАДАГГЕЛЪ** is noted as in Greek only in **Lex.Pet.**, all the other manuscripts we analyzed operated the replacement.
- The groups liquid–yer (**РЪ/ЛЪ/РЪ/ЛЪ**) are often noted as we believe they used to be pronounced at the time, namely with the vocalization of the yer before the liquid sound, depending on the etymon: *ăr, er, or, ăl, el, ol* etc.

In any case, substitutions as the ones emphasized above indicate the possibility that the lexicon was copied after dictation.

<sup>8</sup>Jean de Talmatzy wrote on March, 20, 1797 a note of appartenance on page 41<sup>r</sup>.

<sup>9</sup>Both entries can be found in various Slavonic and Slavonic-Russian lexicons: [oldlexicons.ru/node/2355](http://oldlexicons.ru/node/2355) and [oldlexicons.ru/node/1038](http://oldlexicons.ru/node/1038).

**BER** occasionally uses the spelling with vocalization when a word has a vernacular correspondent (**В**ОЛА = 'lînă' [wool]), but generally preserves the yer in words belonging to standard Slavonic (**В**ЛЪНЕНІЕ = 'vălurire' [waving], **В**ЛЪХВЪ = 'vrăjitor' [wizard]). Moreover, it preserves the traditional spelling even in cases where the pronunciation with metathesis and vocalization is obvious; for instance, between the entries **ВЕРІГА** and **ВЕСЬ** the following six terms are printed: **ВРЪСТА**, **ВРЪТЕНЪ**, **ВРЪТОГРА**, **ВРЪТОГРАДАРЪ**, **ВРЪХОВНЫЙ** and **ВРЪШВА**. A significant detail is the fact that almost all these terms have an oversized/ tall version of the back yer. **BER** does not signal the vocalization using a tall back yer as a rule, yet this tendency can be observed, especially in the combination liquid sound–yer and it could reflect the orthography of the sources from which Pamvo Berynda extracted his definitions. With a single exception, our lexicons do not seem to use a tall yer, although they occasionally seem to distinguish between a vocalized yer and a final yer or between back yer and front yer, especially where the distinction is exemplified with minimal pairs in **BER** (**Lex.Pet.**: **В**ОНЪ: *afară* [outside], **В**ОНЬ: *intr-insu* [in it/him]); **Lex.3473**: **ВЕСЬ**: *sat* [village], **ВЕСЬ**: *de tot* [entirely]). This succession of six definitions occurs in all instances exactly as in **BER** between **ВЕРІГА** and **ВЕСЬ**. The entries are transcribed in **Lex.Pet.**, **Lex.1348**, **Lex.3473** and **Lex.Mosc.** also with a yer, either as in **BER**, or with metathesis (**Lex.Mosc.**, **Lex.3473**: **ВЪРТЕПЪ**; **Lex.3473**: **ВЪРХОВНЫЙ**), or by vocalizing the yer either selectively (**Lex.1348**, **Lex.Pet.**: **ВЕРХОВНЫЙ**; **Lex.Pet.**: **ВЕРТЕПЪ**) or in all instances (**Lex.Sta.**, except for the first entry – **ВРЪШВА**).

The exception mentioned above is **Lex.Mard**. Whereas in all the other sources, as in all manuscripts, it is difficult to make a comprehensive inventory of the set of characters, in **Lex.Mard** it is obvious that the scribe was familiar with the difference between tall and normal back yers, on the one hand, and the front yers, on the other hand. The tall back yer is also used in the group of words we analysed above from where only the entry **ВРЪШВА** is omitted, although it is not exclusively used in a strong position (cf. **ВЪСАНИКЪ**) and occasionally it is conveyed in an orthographic dimension that differs from **BER** (cf. **ВЪНЬ**: *afară* [outside], **ВЪНЬ**: *intr-insul* [in it/him]).

The Romanian manuscripts incorporate the graphic signs overwritten in **BER** in different degrees. An interesting case is that of the kamora (˘), which marked for a long time in Slavonic the stress or the palatalization. In the first half of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Smotrički grammars propose its introduction in the antistoechon, namely its transformation into a symbol that would emphasize morphological homophony. The new norm was rapidly adopted by the texts printed in Kiev (**Kusmaul'**, 2017). For instance, Berynda uses it to differentiate between **В**ДОВЪ ('văduv' [widower], masc. nom. sg.) de **В**ДОВЪ (dat. pl.). The Romanian texts treat this pair in various ways. First of all, **Lex.Mosc.**, **Lex.Sta.** and **Lex.3473** have an extra entry – **В**ДОВА (fem. sg.). **Lex.Pet.** and **Lex.1348** preserve **В**ДОВА, but eliminate the entry **В**ДОВЪ, whereas **Lex.Mard** preserves the version in **BER**, including the diacritics. Of all the entries, only **В**ДОВА in **Lex.Mosc.** can be described with no doubt as having an inverted breve<sup>10</sup>; on **В**ДОВЪ, the previous entry in the same manuscript, it rather looks like a smooth breathing mark. The author of **Lex.1348** also seems to use a smooth breathing mark, **Lex.Sta.** and **Lex.1348** use the acute accent, whereas **Lex.Pet.** adopts a slightly different orthographic convention, placing the acute accent on **ó** and a double acute accent or a double grave accent on **ǒ**. We cannot be sure that the Romanian authors had a good understanding of the use of the inverted breve in **BER**, although attempts were made, at least at the beginning, to transcribe it; in the instances they did not understand it, they chose to transcribe it according to their own norms.

Unlike in the case of **BER**, some proper names in *Staicu* are rendered with a suffix: **А**ГЛАДГЕЛЪ vs **А**ГЛАДАНГЕЛЪ, **А**КИНДУНЪ vs **А**КИНДИНЪ, **А**НЕКЪ vs **А**НЕКТЪ.

Proper names are often adapted to Romanian in **Lex.Sta.**, the endings in **ѣ**, **ѧ** being replaced by **иѣ** and **ѣѧ**. This observation is valid almost with no exception for the last groups in *Staicu*<sub>2</sub>: **А**ЛОНІЙ vs **А**ЛОНІЕ, and so on. Other Romanian lexicons are more conservative from this viewpoint.

Another error that could be explained in relation to **BER** is the spelling of **А**ВЕЛЪ, where, at one point

<sup>10</sup>This sign is called *камора* in Slavonic. I take this opportunity to thank Alexandr Andreev and father Nikita Simmons for their kindness and help in clarifying all these aspects related to the use of the inverted breve.

in the history of the text, a Romanian scribe mistook the front yer for o, and obviously the next step was to render it by ω.

All the manuscripts contain sections in which they do not follow exactly the order in **BER**. These cases are not necessarily frequent and could have been caused by negligence.

A series of hilarious errors in **Lex.Pet.** shed light on the work process of medieval scribes. Each Slavonic entry starts with a cinnabar, yet in some instances the initial is missing and in others it is placed before a Romanian word at the beginning of a line:

Ѳфродіта: дѣнезіѡа  
 Ѳмилей: лѣчѣфѣрьѣ  
 or  
 Ѥдѣй: чѣла чѣ ѡ фѣлѣ  
 кѣларѣ

In the first example, the entry *Afrodita* had the explanation *dumnezioaia milei, Luceafărul* [the goddess of mercy, Morning Star]. The scribe added by mistake an A with cinnabar to the next line, turning one entry into two. In the second example, the letter **Ѳ** was obviously omitted. The scribe first wrote the entries without initial, then added the initial in cinnabar, thus making mistakes as the ones mentioned above. Strangely enough, he inserted a colon after *milei*, as if *luceafărul* would have actually explained the term *Amilei*, so it is actually possible that the error was not his, but it was instead perpetuated from another manuscript.

## 5. Wording

The entry **Ѳ(в)дѣй**, translated as *cărunteațe* [hoariness] in **Lex.Pet.** and **Lex.Mosc.**, illustrate the way in which the first Romanian translators related to the Ruthenian text. In **BER**, **Ѳдѣй** is not a separate entry, but part of the entry for **Ѳвдѣй**, the chief cook of King Ahab. Berynda specifies that **Ѳвдѣй** is a prophet celebrated on the 19<sup>th</sup> of November and provides his description in **Подлѣвник**<sup>11</sup>: “cărunt, cu barbă nu prea mare, rotundă, părul vîlvoi, haina de culoarea ocrului, verzuie la poale, ținînd în mîna un sul” [grey-haired, with a round beard that was not so long, ruffled hair, with an ochre coat with green edges, holding a roll]. As the proper name is placed at the beginning of the line, the Romanian translator selected the first word of the quotation – **Сѣдѣ** and translated it, not necessarily accurately, by “cărunteațe”. As the original version was no longer available, the other lexicons assumed this modification without any changes; **Lex.Pet.** even omitted the **в**, as it is probably following a manuscript similar to **Lex.Mosc.**, where **в** is overwritten in a way that pushes it towards the previous entry. This manner of translating at most one of the Ruthenian synonyms, namely the one the Romanian translator is most familiar with, can be observed in several instances in the Romanian lexicons. Another error can be observed at the entry **Ѳзмодеосъ**, where the Romanian manuscripts mistake the Ruthenian **казѣтель** ‘cel care strică’ [the one who breaks] for **казнѣтель** ‘cel care chinuie’ [the one who tortures] and consequently mistranslate it: *muncitor, căzător* [harasser, one who submits to ordeals]. This strategy alternates with one in which the Ruthenian part is ignored, a (sometimes literal) translation being provided for the Slavonic entry.

The Ruthenian lexicographer explains the entry **Ѳкѣла** as follows: “Bolnav sau ce tinde spre pierdere. Bun și drept. Fapt. 18. Iul 14, ian. 20, feb. 13. Lat: **аквіла**, vultur.” [Ill or about to lose his life. Good and fair. Acts 18. Jul. 14, Jan. 20, Feb. 13. Lat: **аквіла**, eagle]. **Staicu**<sub>1</sub>, as all the other Romanian lexicons, translates **Ѳкила** with *bolnav* [ill], whereas the Latin reference constitutes a separate entry. **Staicu**<sub>2</sub> copies the term three times, and each time it is spelled and translated differently: 1. **Ѳкила**: *vultur* [eagle], 2. **Ѳкѣла**: *bun și drept* [good and fair], 3. **Ѳкѣла**: *bun sau prost* [good or simple], the last two definitions being based on the second half of the explanation provided in **BER**.

<sup>11</sup> Slavonic manual of iconography, partially corresponding to the Byzantine guide Herminia.



In the case of **Асѣръ**, **Lex.Sta.**, **Lex.Pet.**, **Lex.Mosc.** and **Lex.1348** (with the mention that the last manuscript in the series transcribes it **Арѣсь**) combine the two entries in **BER** about which the Ruthenian scholar tells us that they are written differently in Hebrew, one with samekh and the other with shin.

There are often cases when the Romanian manuscripts contain additional words when compared to **BER**. Most of these words are extended paradigms of terms included in **BER**, various verbal forms, adjectives derived from nouns or nouns derived from adjectives. The Ruthenian printing contains grammatical notes related to aspects such as the voice of the verb, gender, etymological origin, orthographic explanations, and bibliographic references. Some of these notes are also conveyed in the Romanian texts. There are instances in which the Romanian author inserts such notes on his own initiative, without taking them from **BER**; for instance, in the case of **бл҃го**: *bine, bun* [well, good]. **среда**, the addition **среда** (= slav. 'neutral') has no correspondent in **BER**.

## 6. Case study

Let us consider a succession of 12 definitions printed in **BER** on column 355<sup>12</sup>:

<b>BER</b>	<b>Lex.Mosc.</b>	<b>Lex.Pet.</b>	<b>Lex.Sta.</b>	<b>Lex.1348</b>	<b>Lex.Mard.</b>
<b>Ассарій</b>	<b>Ассарій</b> : banul	<b>Ассарій</b> : banul	<b>Ассаріи</b> : banul, mangăr	—	Fileariu, mangăr
<b>Ассарій</b>	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Астарсѣвъ</b>	—	—	—	—	[end of letter]
<b>Астартъ</b>	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Астерій</b>	<b>Астерій</b> : de steale	<b>Астерій</b> : de steale	<b>Астеріи</b> : de steale	<b>Астерій</b> : de steale	—
—	—	—	—	<b>Ассарій</b> : banul, fost-au și niște bani de lut și piiale la Rîm de s-au chiebat assari.	—
<b>Астрологія</b>	<b>Астрологія</b> : de steale cetire	<b>Астрологія</b> : de steale cetire	<b>Астрологія</b> : cetitor de steale	<b>Астрологія</b> : <sup>13</sup> cetire de steale	—
<b>Астрологъ</b>	<b>Астрологъ</b> : cetitor de steale	—	—	<b>Астрологъ</b> : cetitoriu de steale	—
—	<b>Ассарій</b> : banul, fost-au și niște bani de lut și de piiale la Rîm de s-au chemat assarii	<b>Ассарій</b> : banul, fost-au și niște bani de lut și de piiale la Rîm de s-au chemat assarii	<b>Ассаріи</b> : banii, fost-au și niște bani de lut și de piiale la Rîm de s-au chiebat assarii	—	—
<b>Астрономія</b>	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Асвѣкрї</b>	<b>Асвѣкрї</b> : mai slăvit	<b>Асвѣкрї</b> : mai slăvit	<b>Асвѣкрї</b> : eșeșeț mai slăvit	<b>Асвѣкрї</b> : mai slăvit	—
<b>Атѣла</b>	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Атѣлаи</b>	<b>Атѣла</b> : crescut	<b>Атѣла</b> : crescutu	<b>Атѣла</b> : crescut	<b>Атѣла</b> : crescut	—

<sup>12</sup>**BER** assigned numbers to the columns, placing two on each page, so that for localization we used the same numbering system. However, we should consider the fact that the printing consisted of several stages, with various revisions, so the copies available today are not absolutely identical.

<sup>13</sup>In **Lex.1348** this entry and the following one are written with a ligature **Тр**. Unfortunately, such ligatures are difficult to render in a text typed on a computer. For some fonts they are included in Private Area, a solution that could be regarded as acceptable, although suboptimal. The Ponomar font allows the display of some of the ligatures by inserting a zero width joiner (ZWJ: U+200D) between the following pairs of letters: **ѣ ѣ**, yet only in **TeX** and **LibreOffice Writer**, but not in **Microsoft Word**. Until better solutions are available, we inserted a ZWJ between **тврѣдо** and **ръци**.

Πτάλβ	Πτάλνα: stricătoriu	Πτάλνα: stricătoriu	Πτάλνα: stricătoriu	Πτάλνα: stricătoriu
-------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

The table emphasizes a series of aspects. First of all, *Lex.Sta.* is certainly a copy of at least the second generation of Romanian lexicons. The author's tendency is to reduce the number of definitions, while increasing the number of explanations. Staicu<sub>1</sub> omits the entry *Ἰστρολόγъ*, but copies by mistake the corresponding explanation at the entry *Ἰστρολόγια*. Right after this he repeats the mistake, translating *Ἰσίγκρη* by *crescut* [grown] from the following definition and correcting it by crossing it with a line.

The second obvious aspect is the fact that *Lex.Mard.* is the result of a different redaction.

The third aspect beyond doubt is that *Lex.Mosc.* cannot possibly be a copy after any of the manuscripts we analysed. The possibility of a filiation from *Lex.1348* is significantly diminished by examples provided elsewhere.

Before an in-depth analysis of the entire lexicographic material is conducted, I shall only mention that the scheme proposed by *Ginsac & Ungureanu (2018)* seem to reflect the reality better than the filiations previously suggested in literature. These two researchers from Iași have advanced the theory of the existence of at least one intermediary between *BER* and the group *Lex.Pet., Lex.Sta.* and *Lex.3473*. The data presented above suggests the profile of a manuscript that is very close to *Lex.Mosc.*. Besides the fact that *Lex.Mosc.* has some entries that are missing from the other manuscripts and the translations of the other lexicographic witnesses are convergent with the ones in *Lex.Mosc.*, the spelling of the analysed entries is identical to the one in *BER*, whose letter variants are also often imitated. Unlike *Lex.Sta., Lex.Pet.* and *Lex.1348*, *Lex.Mosc.* does not use breathing marks on the initial; it does not replace *T* with *m* or *v* with *n/i* and does not insert a payerok between neighbouring consonants, as *Lex.Sta.* and *Lex.1348* (and occasionally *Lex.Pet.*), neither does it overwrite the final letter, or replace *λ* by *Λ* as *Lex.1348*. Furthermore, it seems to be the only manuscript that occasionally reproduces *r* with an upwards serif from the Ruthenian printing<sup>14</sup>, see *Ἰσνγκρη*, and also *Ἰρχνιναγwr*, where both versions occur, the difference between them being obvious.

However, two of the details contained in the table oppose the identification of the assumed intermediary as *Lex.Mosc.* The first detail is related to the correction *crescut* in *Lex.Sta.* In *Lex.Mosc.* the entry *Ἰσνγκρη* closes the page, whereas *Πτάλβ* is at the top of the next page, so Staicu could not possibly overlook it and go to the next definition. Nevertheless, I have to admit that one can as well imagine an explanation according to which the turning of the page causes the person copying the text to make a mistake. Moreover, it is not clear whether *Πτάλνα* in *BER* was transcribed with *n* or with *ñ* by the *Lex.Mosc.* copyist. I am almost sure that he opted for the wrong version. Fortunately, things are as clear as possible in the case of the other three manuscripts. *Lex.Pet.* and *Lex.1348* erroneously transcribe with *ñ* and this aspect is confirmed by the presence of the payerok after *λ*. In this case, the entry in *Lex.Sta.*, accurately and univocally transcribed with *ñ*, is revealed as important, as it motivates us to search for another protograph. Nonetheless, we can exclude neither the possibility of a correction by chance, nor that of an informed correction. Apart from his negligence, which can be frustrating at times, Staicu seems to have a good command of the Slavonic language and proves to be a competent scholar.

We should also mention the case of the proper name *Ἰχιάφскъ*, transcribed erroneously by all the Romanian manuscripts we analysed: *Ἰχιάφñ*: *fărmecător* [charming] (*Lex.Sta.*), *Ἰχιάφкъ*: *fărmecătoriu* (*Lex.Pet.*), *Ἰχιάфкъ*: *fărmecătoriu* (*Lex.1348*) and *Ἰχιάфкъ*: *fărmecătoriu* (*Lex.Mosc.*). This confusion is actually generated by Berynda himself, who wanted to enrich the entry *Achsaph: Veneficus*

<sup>14</sup>We have to specify that this type of *Ge* was used in the Slavonic books printed in the Polish-Lithuanian State Union to indicate *g* in words of Greek origin and was not part of the orthographic norms of the Slavonic spoken in the Romanian Principalities. Consequently, its occurrence on the Romanian territory can only indicate the contact with a Ruthenian original. For further details, see *Andreev et al. (2015, p. 11)*. In *BER* this character has the height of a capital letter, its height being actually the criterion according to which we identified it in *Lex.Mosc.* Unfortunately, the font used in our article does not reflect this difference.

[etc] from **СТЕПН**<sup>15</sup> with its equivalent in the Slavonic canon. In the Slavonic versions of *Ios*, 1, 11 we find **къ црѣю аѡи́аѡѡскѡ** (**OST**) or **къ царю аѡи́ѡскѡ** (**BIS** 152)<sup>16</sup>, meaning “on the king of Achshaph”, but Berynda interprets the adjectival suffix used for geographical localization –**ск** as part of the name (cf. **SEPT.FRANK**: *аѡи́аѡ*), and the Romanian copyists are thus challenged by a group of consonants they are unable to decipher. With regard to the aspects discussed above, the order of the events is relatively simple. **Lex.Mosc.** sees in **BER** **а ѡ** instead of **с**, **Lex.1348** overwrites the yer, whereas **Lex.Pet.** and **Lex.Sta.** vocalize it at **ї/и**.

## 7. Conclusions

The Berynda lexicon represented a remarkable intellectual achievement and, in the actual case of the Romanian manuscript **BAR** 312, it was the source of a text used for over a century by several users who improved it permanently. The significant number of Romanian lexicons issued in a relatively short period of time illustrates the notable impact it produced. They could be the result of a synthesis between the Ruthenian version and a Slavonic dictionary of small dimensions. The structure of this hypothetical dictionary differs from the one of the current dictionaries and, as many other similar proto-dictionaries belonging to the Slavonic cultural space, was probably the result of a collection of glosses. We are actually facing a double challenge: on the one hand, to describe this hypothetical proto-dictionary as accurately as possible and on the other hand to retrace the filiations network of the Romanian dictionaries belonging to the Berynda family. With regard to the first challenge, we should conduct a more thorough investigation of the Slavonic manuscripts to be found in Romania or abroad, hoping that we have the chance of discovering a manuscript that would explain as well as possible the lexical lists included in the Romanian manuscripts. The second challenge makes us wonder not only how related our lexicons are to each other, but also how close they are to Berynda’s edition. Besides the translation of the terms, other approaches are also worth exploring, which refer to the texts layout, the structure and organization of the lists, the interpretation, correction and perpetuation of errors. Apart from **Lex.Mard.**, which has a slightly different writing and is also the oldest, **Lex.Sta.** is estimated by most researchers to be from an earlier date than all the other lexicons. However, the other manuscripts contain numerous elements that indicate an older edition and are closer to **BER** in many respects. Previous studies place **Lex.Mosc.** between the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 18<sup>th</sup> century, yet its orthography, inventory of terms and the layout of lists composing it indicate an edition that was very close to the first Romanian translation. Although we should remain cautious and keep the number of hypothetical manuscripts as low as possible, the significant variations between the lists, translations and errors renders the hypothesis of only one protograph quite unsatisfactory for the attempt to provide a valid explanation regarding the filiations of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Romanian manuscripts.

## Bibliography

### A. Sources

**BER** = Pamvo Berinda, *Лексіконъ славенорѡскій и именъ Тълкованіе*, Kiev, 1627, [online].

**BHS** = *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartiensis*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997, [online].

**BIS** = *Ветхого Завета Книги: Моисеевы пять, Иисуса Навина, Судей, Руфь и четыре Царства*. Manuscript copied in Bistrița, kept today at the State Library of Russia, F. 256, no. 29, year 1537, [online].

**Lex.1348** = The lexicon in the Romanian manuscript 1348 from **BAR** (1–84<sup>v</sup>); without the title page.

**Lex.3473** = The lexicon in the Romanian manuscript 3473 from **BAR** (1–369<sup>v</sup>); without the title page.

**Lex.Mard.** = *Леѡиконъ славѣновлашѣскыи и имѣ тълкованіе*, in ms. 450 **BAR**, [online].

**Lex.Mosc.** = Slavonic-Romanian Lexicon, **RGADA**, collection 188, no. 1380, without the title page.

**Lex.Pet.** = *Леѡикѡ че се зиче квѡвѣте пе сквѡрѣ алѣсе дѣ лѣва словенѣкъ пре лѣва рѡмѣнѣскѣ дедалектикѣ тѣлѡкѣи*, **BNR**, OP Q.XVI.5.

**Lex.Sta.** = *Леѡикон словѣнскои*, in the Romanian manuscript 312 from **BAR** (41<sup>r</sup>–216<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>15</sup>Work from which Berynda borrows a great part of the proper names material.

<sup>16</sup>*lib-fond.ru*.

- OST = *ОСТРОЗЬКА БІБЛІЯ* [Ostrog Bible]. Edition with transcription, facsimile and parallel Ukrainian translation supervised by archimandrite Rafail (Роман Торкоњак), Liov, 2006.
- PAN = *Vechiul Testament* [The Old Testament] translated by Daniil Andrei Panoneanu, Romanian manuscript 4389 [BAR](#), [online].
- SEPT = *Septuaginta. Id est vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX Interpretes*, A. Rahlfs (ed.), Wurttembergische Bibelstalt, 1971, [online].
- SEPT.FRANK = *ΤΗΣ ΘΕΙΑΣ ΓΡΑΦΗΣ. Divinae scripturae, nempe veteris ac novi testamenti*, Frankfurt, 1597.
- STEPH = Robert Stephanus, *Hebraea, Chaldea, Graeca et Latina nomina virorum, mulierum, populorum, idolorum, urbium, fluviorum, montium, ceterorumque locorum quae in Bibliis leguntur, restituta, cum Latina interpretatione*, 1537.
- VULG = *Biblia Sacra Vulgate editionis, Sixti V Pontificis Maximi jussu recognita et edita*, Typographus Vaticanus, 1598, [online].

### B. Dictionaries

- DEB = *Български етимологичен речник* [Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary], ed. Вл. И. Георгиев et al., 9 vol., Sofia, 1971–present.
- DLRLC = *Dicționarul limbii române literare contemporane* (sub direcția prof. univ. Dimitrie Macrea și acad. Emil Petrovici). Volumul I: A–C, 1955; volumul al II-lea: D–L, 1956; volumul al III-lea: M–R, 1957; volumul al IV-lea: S–Z, 1958, Editura Academiei, [București].
- GSBM = *Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы* [Historical Dictionary of Belarusian Language], Minsk, 1986, [online].
- MDA<sub>2</sub> = *Micul Dicționar Academic* [Little Academic Dictionary], 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, red. M. Sala, I. Dănilă, Univers Enciclopedic Publishing House, București, 2010.
- MIKL = Miklosich, Fr. (1862–1865). *Lexicon Palaeslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Guilelmus Braumueller, Vindobonæ, [online].
- SDI = *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI–XIV вв.)* [Dictionary of old Russian (11<sup>th</sup>–14<sup>th</sup> centuries)], Academia de Științe a URSS, Institutul limbii ruse, Editura Русский язык, Moscova, 1988.
- SJS = *Elektronický slovník jazyk staroslověnského* [Electronic Dictionary of Old Slavonic], digital dictionary created within the Gorazd Project under the patronage of the Czech Academy of Science's Institute of Slavonic Studies, [online].
- SRS18 = *Словарь русского языка XVIII века* [Dictionary of the 17<sup>th</sup> century Russian], Academia de Științe a URSS, Institutul limbii ruse, Editura Наука, Sankt Petersburg, 1984–1991.
- SUM = *Словник української мови* [Dictionary of the Ukrainian Language], 11 vol., Editura Наукова думка, Kiev, 1970–1980.
- Vasmer = Vasmer, M. (2004). *Этимологический словарь русского языка* [Etymological Dictionary of the Russian Language], ed. О. Н. Трубачёв, АСТ.
- WSJP = *Wielki słownik języka polskiego* [The Great Dictionary of the Polish Language], ed. P. Źmigrodzki, online dictionary curated by the Polish Language Institute of the Polish Academy of Sciences, 2012–present.

### C. Secondary literature

- Andreev, A., Shardt, Y. & Simmons, N. (2015). *Church Slavonic Typography in Unicode*, Unicode Technical Note #41, [online].
- Ciobanu, Șt. (1914). *Славяно-румынский словарь библиотеки Московского Общества Истории и Древностей по 240* [Slavonic-Romanian Dictionary found in the Moscow Society of History and Antiquity], in “Русский филологический вестник”, **LXXI** (1), p. 75–88.
- Crețu, G. (ed.) (1900). *Mardarie Cozianul. Lexicon slavo-românesc și tilcuirea numelor din 1649*, Edițiunea Academiei Române, Institutul de Arte Grafice “Carol Göbl”, București.
- Ginsac, A.-M. & Ungureanu, M. (2018). *La lexicographie slavonne-roumaine au XVIIe siècle*, in “Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie”, **134** (3), p. 845–876.
- Ginsac, A.-M. & Ungureanu, M. (2019). *Lexiconul de la Moscova în raport cu celelalte lexicoane slavo-române din secolul al XVII-lea* [The Moscow Lexicon in relation with other Slavonic-Romanian lexicons of the 17<sup>th</sup> century], in “Philologica Jassyensia”, **XV** (2), p. 245–258.
- Карпов, А. П. (1877). *Азбуковники или алфавиты иностранных речей по спискам Соловецкой библиотеки* [Lexicons and Alphabets of foreign languages in Solovetsky Monastery's Library], Printing House of the Imperial University, Kazani.
- Ковтун, А. С. (1989). *Азбуковники XVI–XVII вв.: Старшая разновидность* [16<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> century lexicons. Old Redaction], Editura Наука, Sankt Petersburg.
- Kusmaul, S. (2017). *Evolution of the Functions of the Kamora Sign In Liturgical Books from the Late 16th To the First Half of the 17th Centuries*, in “St. Tikhons' University Review”, series III. Philology, **51**, p. 21–47.
- Левичкин, А. Н. & Сухачев, Н. А. (2015). „Лексикон славеноросский” Памвы Беринды и румынская лексикография [Pamvo Berynda's “Slavonorussian Lexicon” and the Romanian Lexicography], in *Академик А. А. Шахматов: жизнь, творчество, научное наследие. Сборник статей к 150-летию со дня рождения ученого*, ed. О. Н. Крылова, М. Н. Приемышев, Sankt Petersburg.
- Strungaru, D. (1966). *Începuturile lexicografiei române* [Inceptions of Romanian Lexicography], in “Romanoslavica”, **XIII**, p. 141–158.
- Strungaru, D. (1973). *Staicu Grămăticul. Contribuții la istoria scrisului românesc din secolul al XVII-lea* [Staicu the Amanuensis. Contributions to the history of Romanian writings of the 17<sup>th</sup> century], doctoral thesis, University of Bucharest's Typolitoğrafya Center, Bucharest.

*D. Acronyms*

BAR = Biblioteca Academiei Române [Romanian Academy Library]

BNR = Biblioteca Națională a Rusiei [Russian National Library]

RGADA = Arhiva Rusă de Stat a Actelor Vechi [Russian State Archive of Old Documents]