Translating and adapting the lexicographic definitions in the *Slavonic–Romanian Lexicon* from the Ms no 3473[†]

Dinu Moscal[1★], Ana-Maria Gînsac[2]

[1] *"A. Philippide" Institute of Romanian Philology, Str. Th. Codrescu 2, 700481 Iași, Romania*
[2] *Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Str. Al. Lăpușneanu 26, 700057 Iași, Romania*

Abstract

The late 17th century *Slavonic–Romanian Lexicon* preserved in the Ms no 3473 from the Romanian Academy Library belongs to a group of six Slavonic–Romanian lexicons translated following Pamvo Berynda's *Slavonic–Ruthenian Lexicon* (Kyiv, 1627). These dictionaries most likely originate from a common unpreserved translation, having been studied mainly from the perspective of their filiation. The present study surveys aspects of the lexicographic approach in Ms no 3473, discussing the strategies adopted by the Romanian compiler(s) and their cultural determinant, the criteria applied in establishing the Romanian definitions and the semantic evolution of a few Romanian words. The examined examples reveal that the source was modified by simplification or, less often, amplification. Although the supplementary explanations mainly concern culture-specific terms and neologisms whose definitions often imply challenges, the definition techniques vary. Bilingual lexicons' type definitions alternate with those of monolingual dictionaries type, which may be due both to the model and to the intervention of the translator and/ or the copyist.

1. Introduction

The first Slavonic–Romanian lexicons[1] date from the 17th century and are adaptations[2] of the *Slavonic–Ruthenian Lexicon* printed by Pamvo Berynda in Kyiv in 1627 (Ber.)[3]. Crețu (1900) describes them in the introductory study to the edition of *Mardarie's Lexicon* (1649), the only one of the six lexicons edited in full. There are obvious relations between these six lexicons, which are based on a common source[4]. Studies have mainly focused on individual descriptions of each lexicon and comparative analysis of small samples, which have attempted to establish the relation between lexicons based on the statistical analysis of similarities and differences between them with regard to entries and definitions: Pet. (Bogdan, 1891), Mosc. (Ciobanu, 1914), Staicu (Strungaru, 1966), the fragment called "Cipariu" (Mihăilă, 1972), the

---

[1]There are six manuscript lexicons which are currently being edited as part of the project "The first bilingual Romanian lexicons (the 17th century). Annotated and aligned digital corpus" (*eRomLex*). On the status of their editing process, see Gînsac (2021).

[2]The term accentuates that these lexicons are not merely translations, as the source material was either reduced or augmented (Gînsac & Ungureanu, 2018, p. 845).

[3]Berynda's lexicon is the first large-scale lexicographic work in the Eastern Slavonic area (Leeming, 1973, p. 182), and also the most important work dating from the 16th and 17th centuries in this region (Rozumnyj, 1968, p. III); the lexical inventory comprises about 7000 entries arranged in two parts: the lexicon proper and a glossary of proper names and terms mostly of Hebrew, Greek (in some instances spelled with Greek characters) and Latin origin belonging to the biblical and Greek-Roman culture. Berynda used various sources in elaborating his lexicon, including the *Ostrog Bible* (1581), Latin and polyglot bibles, sermon books and various glossaries available at the time (*ibidem*, p. 1 *et seq.*).

[4]See Gînsac & Ungureanu (2018, p. 850–853), who provide a brief overview of the literature on the topic.

relation between the lexicons (Gînsac & Ungureanu, 2018; Ungureanu & Gînsac, 2019; Felea, 2021) and the purpose of their compilation (Chivu, 2021, p. 4). As the scholars focused primarily on the relations between these lexicons, far less attention was paid to how they rendered their model at the level of definition. In this respect, although there are obvious similarities, one may note differences. The source definitions are generally simplified, but there are instances where they are amplified, the additions being either common to several lexicons or, more rarely, specific to one of them. The Romanian equivalence of the source provides new linguistic and cultural information. Based on the lexical inventory in the Slavonic–Romanian lexicon from Ms. no. 3473 B.A.R. (f. 1–369), we aim to discuss how the lexicographic definitions from the source are processed into Romanian based on the linguistic and cultural perception at the time.

Ms. 3473 from the Romanian Academy Library[5] was described by Crețu (1900, p. 40–46), who made a list of the missing pages (the letter ⱃ is fully missing), noting that the number 1672 is written on the side of f. 189ᵛ in Arabic characters (except for the first character, rendered in the Cyrillic). Ștrempel (1987, p. 138) inventoried two other such notes which, according to him, would indicate the identity of the copyist and the date when the text was copied: "Pisah az Mihaiu ‹Am scris eu, Mihai›" [Written by me, Mihai] (f. 17ᵛ) and "Să să știe că acest Lexion iaste al popei Efthemie. Și l-am scris eu, Mihai, vă dni ‹în zilele lui› Io Gligorie Ghica voevoda. Leat 7181 ‹1673›" [To be known that this lexicon belongs to priest Efthemie. And it was written by me, Mihai, in the days of Prince Grigorie Ghica. Year 7181 ‹1673›] (f. 346ᵛ).

Not all the entries in Ms. 3473 can be found in the inventory of Ber. Seche (1966, p. 8), re-evaluating Crețu (1900, p. 36–37), compares this lexicon with Staicu's version concluding that they could be modified copies of the same version or even independent versions of the same source. Resuming this hypothesis, Strungaru (1966, p. 151) considers this manuscript a "faithful reproduction of the manuscript elaborated by Staicu," as is the lexicon included in Ms. 1348 (*idem*, p. 153). Mihăilă (1972, p. 313) believes that both Ms. 3473 and Mosc. represent a single version, close to that in Ms. 1348 (*idem*, p. 322), concluding that either Ms. 3473 was copied following Mosc., or they are copies from a common source that has not been preserved.

2. Treatment of lexicographic definitions

The Slavonic–Romanian lexicon from Ms. 3473 is not a mere translation of its source. Although it follows it closely, it is rather a processed version that modifies the source by either simplifying the material or amplifying it with linguistic and culturally specific interpretations. The new entries are not always new words compared to Ber., but rather parts of verbal paradigms (present, future, past or past continuous forms) or nominal paradigms (plural and feminine forms). Some are comprised in the part following the source, while the Romanian translator/ copyist adds new ones at the end of each letter. The paradigms, especially the verbal ones, are strong arguments in favour of using the lexicon as a handbook for learning Slavonic, their function being analogous to that of the introductory sections of modern bilingual and monolingual dictionaries, which contain inflectional paradigms, explanations of the lexicographic terms, grammatical and language history information. At the level of definitions, these additions, which relate to the language system, are supplemented by the translator' (and/ or copyist') interventions, which relate to their linguistic intuition, knowledge, culture and mentality. These attributes place the Slavonic–Romanian lexicon between a bilingual and a monolingual dictionary.

2.1. *Placement in the language system*

The first information that a modern dictionary provides right after the title-word concern the position of the word in the language system: grammatical category (and subcategory), grammatical forms and

---

[5]Before the first file was notted: "Received from Direcțiunea Muzeului Național de Antichități with the address no 241 of November 4ᵗʰ 1909." The text is written in black ink and the initials of the words are sometimes written in red.

language level (Bidu-Vrănceanu, 1986, p. 113). Similar information occurs in the old lexicons, although differently organised. The lexical inventory from Ber. contains the usual forms of the title-words and occasionally their grammatical forms. Ms. 3473 preserves this information (1) and often augments it with new forms, resulting in more or less extended paradigms; for instance (2), the singular and plural forms вдо́вь și вдꙹ́вь (cf. Ber. 19) are added the feminine singular form вдꙹ́вва:

(1) по́ле – cîmpu [field]
по́лꙗ – cîm*p*ii [fields] (219ᵛ);

(2) вдо́вь – o*m* văduv [widow-man/ widower]
вдꙹ́вь – vădu*i* mu*l*ți [many widowers]
вдꙹ́вва – văduo [widow] (19ᵛ).

Doubling the information for the plural by the adjective *mulți* [many] (2–4) frequently marks the plural of the third person singular in the present tense. One can notice the specification of the singular by actualising the semantic affinity relation (4, the third example).

(3) вот꙽ѣ́ю – mă îngraș [I gain weight]
вот꙽ѣ́еть – să î*n*graș[ă] [he/ she gains weight]
вот꙽ѣ́ю̈ – să î*n*graș[ă] mu*l*ți [many gain weight] (10ᵛ);

(4) вы́ю – urlu [I howl]
вы́ю̈ – urlă mu*l*ți [many howl]
вы́ѥ̈ – urlă cî*i*ne [a dog howls] (42ᵛ).

The personal pronoun (placed after the verb) is a recurring mark marking the person and the number of the forms included in the verbal paradigms:

(5) рыда́нїе (cf. Ber. 211) – plîngere [cry/ weeping]
рыда́ютъ – plî*n*gu e*i* [they cry]
рыда́ймо – să plî*n*ge*m* [let us cry]
рыда́й – plî*n*ge [cries]
рыдӑ́ – a*m* plî*n*su [we cried] (233ᵛ);

(6) острю̀ – ascu*ț* e*u* [I sharpen]
острꙟ̈ – ascute e*l* [he sharpens]
острꙗ̈ – ascu*ț* ei [they sharpen] (179ʳ).

The feminine gender of pronouns is sometimes marked by a word designating a female person (7), strategy that is not applied to masculine pronouns (8):

(7) ю̈: ю́же – care muiare [which woman] (337ᵛ)
ѻ̈на̀ – ea, muiare [she, woman] (177ᵛ);

(8) ѻ̈нѐ – e*l* [he] (177ʳ)
ѻ̈нъсица – cutarele [he/ him]
ѻ̈ный – acela [him/ that (man)] (177ᵛ).

At the level of language, the information occurs in two cases: the origin of loans (9) and the specification of the language for a title-word from another language than Slavonic (10), as usually occurs in a modern dictionary:

(9) ѵссꙹ́пъ – iaste o iarbă de să chiamă așa jidoveaște [it is an herb that is called like this in Jewish] (342ᵛ);

(10) сі́лва – lat. pădure [Lat. forest] (265ᵛ).

2.2. The relation with the source

A bilingual dictionary provides the equivalent of a title-word in a second language by a corresponding term. As they are translations, the 17th century Romanian lexicons follow their Slavonic source, which often joins the equivalence with a definition or even an illustration of the designated concept or object. In some instances, the equivalence is omitted in favour of a definition, which may include examples. The lexicon from the Ms. 3473 frequently processes this information from the source by either simplifying or, occasionally, augmenting it:

(11) мѵ́рта или мѵрсі́а – iaste u*n* lemn de să chiamă aşa, care lemnu miroseaşte foa*r*te frumo*s* şi face poame dulci, şi de*n* poamele lu*i* fac şi vi*n* [it is a type of tree/ shrub that is named like this, which smells beautifully and bears sweet fruit, and from its fruits wine is also made] (148ᵛ);

(12) ŏловинà – fiece bă*u*tură să chiamă aşa alegî*n*du numa*i* vinu*l*; beare sau olovină [the name of a beverage apart from wine; beer or a fermented beverage] (177ʳ);

(13) финиꙁ̆ъ – finicu*l*; ia*s*te şi o pasăre de să chiamă aşa ş*i* să află în Ţara Hărăpească, aproape de I*n*dee, ş*i* petreace în chedri Livanulu*i*, nemî*n*cî*n*du nimi*c*, ni*ci* bî*n*du, numa*i* ci iaste viu cu d[u]h; şi deaca tre*c* 500 de ani, mearge în Iliopolie, ş*i* acolò la sf[î]*n*tu*l* ji*r*tăvni*c* a*r*de sî*n*gu*r*; ş*i* după aceea di*n* cenuşă iară să va face, şi pe*s*te 500 de ani iară să înnoiaşte într-ace*s*t chi*p* [date palm; it is also a bird that is called like this and it is found in Arabia, close to India; it lives in the cedars of Lebanon; it does not eat or drink, it only lives as a spirit; after 500 years it goes to Heliopolis and there it dies in flames on the sacred altar; and will be born again from the ashes, regenerating again this way after another 500 years] (299ᵛ).

The definition in example (11) contains an additional detail to Ber. (437): "lemnu miroseaşte foa*r*te frumo*s*" [the tree smells beautifully]. In example (12), the initial part of the definition from Ber. (150) is translated, and the Slavonic title-word is rendered as a borrowing (*olovină* 'beer, fermented beverage'). In the last example, the Romanian lexicon partially translates the definition from Ber. (468); the first meaning is rendered by "finic" [date palm], which differs from the definition in Ber. ("date palm and its fruit or palm tree and its fruits it has a dark red, brown or cherry colour"); it is followed by a second meaning ("part of Syria where Sidon and Tyre are located") and the definition for the meaning 'bird', translated in the Romanian lexicon. It also adds the information: "so writes Saint Epiphanius; see also Орéлъ[6]". The lexicographic treatment of финиꙁ̆ъ is significant, as it reveals a different formal adaptation of the Greek word φοῖνιξ (Bailly, *s.v.*) for each of its two meanings: *finic* 'tree', cf. *fenix* 'phoenix (bird)' (DLR, *s.v.*). Ms. 3473 does not display the loan for the second meaning, but only the definition. The same treatment applies to *mandragoră* [mandrake] (14), which is not used for the equivalence of мандрагóра, , although it is attested in Old Romanian (1581, PO 119/4); instead of an equivalent for Slv. покрымь ('Lat. *margo panni*', Mikl. *s.v.* покромь) from Berynda's definition, a description of the object is provided:

(14) мандрагóра – ia*s*te u*n* fe*l* de pomi de să chiamă aşa [it is a type of tree called this way] (146ᵛ).

In a bilingual lexicon prevails the equivalence by the corresponding word in language B or synonyms[7]. The specialized lexicons, which designate less common, cultural realities, process the source in various ways (see the examples under 15). Ber. provides Greek, Czech, Polish and Croatian equivalents for маргарíта (433), a detailed definition for смѵ́рна (456) and the same equivalence for сѵкомóръ "fruitless fig" (459).

(15) маргарíта – mă*r*gărita*r* [pearl] (146ᵛ)
     смѵ́рна – smirnă [myrrh] (266ᵛ; cf. Ber. 456)
     сѵкомо̊ – zmochinu*l* să*l*bate*c* [the wild fig] (268ᵛ).

---

[6]Slavonic word rendered in Ms. 3473 by "vîltur" [eagle] (177ᵛ).

[7]Annotation by synonyms is also one of the basic methods used in definitions in any type of dictionary. For different applications of this method, see Forăscu (1986).

Some Slavonic terms (16) used to have borrowed equivalents with the same meaning in Old Romanian. However, they are not rendered by the corresponding Old Romanian words, but by translating the equivalent or the definition from the source:

(16) митрополӥ – ma*i* mare pe*s*te epi*sc*opi [the head of the bishops] (148ʳ)
октѡӥ – carte cu o*pt* glasur*i* [(liturgical) book containing eight echoi] (178ʳ)
мⷹченӥ – carele a*u* ră*b*da*t* mu*n*ci pe*n*tru H[risto]s, mucenicu*l* [who suffered torments for Christ, the martyr] (144ᵛ).

The definition of митрополӥ is translated from Ber. (436), and that for октѡӥ is the literal translation of the first of the three terms mentioned in the source (Ber. 440), namely осмогла́сникъ; the term was in use in the ecclesiastical milieu of the time, as DLR attests it in 1682–1686 (Dosoftei, *Viețile Sfinților*) and in 1700 as a synonym for *octoih*: "Octoih, ce să zice osmoglasnicul, care acum întîiu s-au tipărit" [Octoechos, that is *osmoglasnic*, which was printed for the first time]. When the Romanian equivalent occurs, it usually follows the definition from the source (see мⷹченӥ).

Choosing the equivalence by definition rather than by the corresponding term already existing in Romanian makes the treatment of these entries similar to that in monolingual dictionaries. The processed model, which contains equivalences and concise definitions with variations from one entrance to another, undoubtedly influenced this technique.

Besides culture-specific terms, words belonging to the common vocabulary are also rendered by definitions specific to monolingual dictionaries. There are numerous instances (17) where the Romanian equivalent is a noun built using an agent suffix:

(17) ризоше́цъ – cosăto*r* de ha*i*ne, cro*i*tor [one who sews clothes, tailor] (231ᵛ; Ber. 209 крае́цъ)
сапо́жникъ и сапогошӗⷹ – cizmariu, cusăto*r* de cizme [cobbler, one who sews boots (shoe-maker)] (239ʳ; Ber. 214 сапо́жникъ = чоботáръ)
прирⷪ́готворӗⷹ – fãcăto*r* de plăci*n*te [one who bakes pies] (222ᵛ; Ber. –)
ше́цъ – cosăto*r*[8], cizma*r* [one who sews, cobbler] (335*r*; Ber. –);
(18) штáнба – casă u*n*de să tipărescu cărțile [house where the books are printed] (334ᵛ).

It is worth noting the equivalence in Ber. by the Romanian term *ciobotar* [cobbler] (чоботáръ), which proves the circulation of this Romanian term in the Ruthenian language. In example (18), a definition is preferred, although the word *tiparniță* [typography] was in use at the time; it is attested in 1680, in the title of Dosoftei's *Psaltirea de-nțăles* a lui Dosoftei: "cu posluşaniia smerenii noastre, Dosothei mitropolitul Sucevei, în tiparnița s[fi]ntei mitropolii" [with our humility, Dosothei, in the typography of the Holy Metropolitan Church] (DLR, *s.v.*). The definition does not follow the source (Ber. 307), where штáнба has two equivalents: the derivative печáтня and the loan дрⷹкáриа (< Germ. *Druckerei*).

2.3. *Reflecting the scientific perception and the cultural-religious mentality*

Words designating cultural realities (generally mythical or religious, given the specific of the lexicon) or related to the scientific field[9] are often provided with a descriptive definition, to which encyclopaedic information is often added. From a lexicographic viewpoint, they are treated according to the model in Ber.

As far as names of sciences are concerned, descriptive definitions prevail (19), with rare exceptions (20), which also follow the source:

(19) геѡгра́фїa – scri*p*tura pămî*n*tulu*i* [writing about the Earth]
геѡметрї́a – măsura pămî*n*tulu*i* [the measure of the Earth] (52ʳ)

---

[8]Most probably, after "cosător" [the one who sews] the sequence "de cizme" [boots] was omitted.
[9]Referred to by Aixela (1996, p. 58) as "culture-specific items".

граммати́ка – învățătură a scrie şi a grăi bine [learning to write and speak well]. **Пе́рвое ѹче́нїе ѿ се̂ ми̂ свобо́дны хѹдо́жествъ:** învățătură întîiu de*n* ceale şapte meşte*r*şuguri slobode alease [the first of the seven liberal arts] (52ᵛ)

риторі́ка – gră*i*tor frumos [who speaks well] (235ᵛ);

(20) философі́а – înțelepție [wisdom] (300ᵛ).

The last two examples simplify the definitions from the source. Ber. (449) also specifies that риторі́ка is the third of the liberal arts. The title-word философі́а has three equivalents in Ber. (469): мѹ́дростъ meaning 'wisdom', любле́нїе мѹ́дрости and любомѹ́дрїе meaning 'love of wisdom.' Lexicographic definitions for science names by general information pertaining to the history of Western culture are a common feature of dictionaries of the time. This type of definition is similar to that in the modern encyclopaedic dictionaries.

In other cases, the definition mirrors the scientific environment (21–23) or the mentality of the cultural-religious milieu in which the lexicon was compiled (24–25).

(21) ма́гнетъ – ia*s*te o piatră de să chiamă aşa, care trage hieru*l* de depa*r*te cătră sine [there is a stone that is named like this, which attracts iron] (146ʳ);

(22) ѡкеа́нъ – marea carea încu*n*giură toată lumea [the sea that surrounds the whole world] (325ʳ);

(23) дíфѳонгъ – î*n*doit[10]; doao slove î*m*preunate de ceale glăsuitoare de să to*c*mesc o slovă cu*m* a*r* fi ю, оу [doubled; two letters written together and read as one letter, like ю, оу] (64ᵛ).

The definition of the term ма́гнетъ reflects a reality of the time, as it refers to the natural origin of the magnet (i.e. magnetite), which is why it is considered "a stone," information translated in full from Ber. (432). The entry ѡкеа́нъ, which does not appear in Ber., is explained by a definition meaning 'planetary ocean,' which is not treated separately in DLR. The term дíфѳонгъ is defined in Ber. (393) as follows: "which has two vowels; two vowels written together which make up one letter: га, оу, ѹ и проч"[11]. In Ms. 3473, the lexicographic definition begins with the equivalent "îndoit"[12] [doubled], followed by the translation of the definition from Ber., which shows confusion between the concepts 'sound' and 'letter, graphic sign/ character.' The Romanian definition maintains the confusion, but omits the letter ⬚ from the examples. It was probably not perceived as a digraph (ѹ < о + γ) as the other examples were. Its omission might also be attributed to a copyist error.

In other instances, Ms. 3473 is not just a translation, as the information the translator independently adds reflects a mentality specific to the background of translating and/ or copying the source. The definitions of entries designating realities belonging to the religious or mythical universe reflect the cultural-religious mentality of that time. The following examples show the significance of pre-Christian conceptions in that period, as well as how they were perceived in the Christian (Orthodox) milieu:

(24) стихѵ̀а – începătura fiecu*i*; pămî*n*tu*l*, apă, văzduhu*l* şi că*l*dura; de*n* ceaste patru ia*s*te zidi*t* omu*l*, şi de-ar li*p*si vruna di*n*tr-aceasta, ar peri toată lumea [the beginning of every thing; earth, water, air and fire; the man was created of these four elements; if one were missing, the whole world would disappear] (267ʳ);

(25) бⷢ҇оми́ли – ereticie, cumu-*s* papistaşii şi a*r*meanii [heresy, like the Papists and the Armenians are] (16ʳ).

Simply by not being emphasized in any way, the definition for стихѵ̀а reflects the cohabitation of pre-Christian and Christian ideas.

The lexicographical definition for "bogomili" (25) preserves the judgement from Ber. (364), е̂ретíци "heretics," without providing any further information; however, it adds illustrative examples ("like the

---

[10] Cuvînt care are ar trebui să fie introdus cu acest sens în DLR.

[11] Cf. Mard. 81: "doubled; two letters written together, like га, ю, оу, ѹ и проч".

[12] This does not occur as a meaning of *diftong* in DLR.

Papists and the Armenians are") that reflect a relatively intense non-ecumenical attitude specific to those times. The attitude towards Catholicism ("Papists") is well known, whereas the attitude towards the Armenians (Christianised in the 4th century) and implicitly towards the Eastern Orthodox non-Chalcedonian Church group concerns the Monophysite doctrine.

2.4. *The semantics of some Romanian terms*

The preference for particular Romanian words as equivalents shows their circulation in the language and also highlights the competing terms within their onomasiological series. At first sight, the equivalence of философі́а (20) with "înțelepție" [wisdom] does not seem to provide any interesting information. Nevertheless, the selection of the Romanian equivalent acquires a different value if we consider the definition from the source and the fact that the term *mîndrie* had the same meaning in that time (see the *Bible of 1688*). Therefore, the first of the three explanations (i.e., мꙋ́дрость, люблѐнїе мꙋ́дрости, любомꙋ́дрїе) from Ber. (469) is the equivalent of the term *mîndrie* 'wisdom'; the other two are phrases containing this term. It would have been easier and perhaps tempting for the translator (or copyist) to render it by *mîndrie*. Instead, the preference for *înțelepție* shows the historical limit of the circulation of the word *mîndrie* with the meaning 'wisdom' in Old Romanian and the fact that its use with this meaning in the ecclesiastical writings of the time represented a tradition (see also DLR, *s.v. mîndrie*). The term *înțelepție* is also used in a definition (26), in which Ber. uses мꙋ́дрость:

(26) философꙋ́ъ – iubito*r* la înțele*p*ție [who loves the wisdom] (300[v]).

It could therefore be concluded that the mid-17th century is most probably the moment when the word *mîndru* makes the transition from the meaning 'înțelept' [wise] to 'mîndru, orgolios' [proud]. The same approach could be applied to the following entrance:

(27) схоластꙋ́къ – da*sca*l, filoso*f* [teacher, philosopher] (269[v]),

which reflects the persistence of the synonymy relation between the terms *dascăl* [teacher] and *filosof* [philosopher], although the term *filozof* had already been attested with its current meaning (reflected in the definition "individual who has his own philosophical conception") in the 17th century in Varlaam and Dosoftei (see DLR, *s.v.*). The equivalence in Ms. 3473 becomes thus an argument for the culture language status of the term *filosof* in the writings of Varlaam and Dosoftei and for the fact that it preserved the meaning 'dascăl, grămătic' [teacher, writer in a chancellery] in the spoken language of the 17th century.

Another example concerns the semantics of the word *prost* [stupid], which had at the time the meaning 'simple, uneducated':

(28) ва́рваръ – pro*s*t, neî*n*văța*t* [simple, uneducated] (38[v]),
     посела́нин҄ – o*m* pro*s*t, moji*c*, moca*n* [uneducated person, churl, shepherd] (195[r]).

The association of *prost* with *neînvățat* in the first definition and with *mojic* and *mocan* are authentic, as the definitions of ва́рваръ (ѻбціи, грꙋ́бы, невꙋ́къ "simple/ common, rude, ignorant" Ber. 372) and посела́нин҄ (весна́к "villager"[13] Ber. 169) are not translated. The first attestation for *prost* meaning 'lacking intelligence' (DLR, under the meaning 4) dates from Neculce's *Chronicle* (1955 [1732–1744], 140): "Petriceico-vodă era bun și slabŭ, prost" [Voivode Peter was a kind-hearted, and weak, a common man]. However, a closer look at other texts shows that the meaning of *prost* was 'simple, uneducated': "Dar și aprodzii atunce nu era din oameni proști, cum sînt acum, ce era tot ficiori de boieri" [In those times, the officials at the court were not simple people as they are today, but sons of boyars] (p. 108), "ce nu numai a oameni proști, ci și a oameni de frunte" [not only simple people, but also leading men] (p. 151), "Costantin Cantemir cliuceriul, fiind om bătrîn, ca de șaptedzăci de ani, și om prost, mai de gios, că nice

---

[13]Cf. DSF, *s.v.* ве́сь[1].

carte nu ştiè" [Constantin Cantemir, the boyar in charge of the court household, an old man of around seventy years, a simple man, lower, because he was unlettered] (p. 168), "Acest domnu Cantemir-vodă au fost de oameni proşti de la ţinutul Fălciiului" [Prince Cantemir came from a (family of) simple people from Fălciu county] (p. 172), "Acestu Dosofteiu mitropolit nu era om prostu de felul lui. Şi era neam de mazîl; prè învăţat, multe limbi ştiè: elineşte, lătineşte, sloveneşte şi altă adîncă carte şi-nvăţătură" [Metropolitan Dosoftei was not a simple/ common man. He came from a family of boyars, was well-educated, spoke several languages as Greek, Latin, Slavonic and was a very educated man and an erudite] (p. 176), "Şi umbla pre gios, fără alaiu, ca un om prost" [and he used to walk, unaccompanied by a suite, like a simple/ common man] (p. 277) *et passim*.

2.5. Confusions

Sometimes, the definition may be less accurate or even confusing. These cases are quite rare, and we illustrate them with two examples: a definition that corresponds neither to the title-word in Ber. (29) nor to the solution in Ms. 3473, and a confusion occurring in the Slavonic–Romanian lexicon (31).

The Ruthenian definition "a fruit, pomegranate, full of seeds, with a pleasant taste" of шѝпокъ (cf. Scr. *шипак*) "rosehip" Ber. (307) does not accurately express the reality designated by the title-word. The Romanian translator, however, follows the source closely while providing a more accurate type of information:

(29) шѝпокъ – ia*s*te u*n* feliu de meare pline de sî*m*buri, zic unii tra*n*dafi*r* [it is a kind of apple fruit full of seeds; some call it rose] (334ʳ).

The first part renders the definition from Ber. (307),in which the translator replaces the specification "pomegranate" with the generalisation "resembles an apple fruit" and eliminates the quality of this fruit, which is "flavourful and has a pleasant taste," a characteristic of the pomegranate. In this way, the (impersonal) addition "some call it rose" – a clear clue to the notion of 'rosehip' – is in no contradiction with the definition. We can assume that the author of these changes did not want to stray too far from the source providing the equivalent *măceş* [rosehip], a term that occurs, however, in the definition of two other Slavonic words:

(30) боде́нецъ – măceşu*l*, zi*c* unii că di*n* cesta făcură ovrei[i] şi cununa lu*i* H[ri]s[tos] [rosehip, some say that from this (thorn) the Jews made the Jesus' crown] (16ᵛ),
дра́чїе – măcieşu*l* sa*u* dracilă [rosehip or barberry] (60ᵛ).

In few cases, confusions may arise in the interpretation of the source, as in the definition for връшба́, where the two terms are not the equivalents of the title-word, but have different meanings:

(31) връшба́ – obî*r*şirea sau nuiale [origin or rods] (21ʳ).

The term is defined in Ber. (21) by вершѝтба, мольтба "threshing" (cf. Rus. *молотьба*). Most probably, the title-word was not (accurately) identified, and the solution is confusing precisely because of the two explanations: "obîrşirea", which could be related to the Slv. връхъ 'obîrşie, izvor' [origin, source] ("vîrful" unui pîrîu ["peak" of a river]) or to the Slv. връша, with the Romanian corresponding term *vîrşă* "coş de nuiele folosit ca unealtă de pescuit" [wicker basket used as a fishing tool] (cf. DLR, *s.v. vîrşă*[1]).

3. Conclusion

The examples confirm that the definitions in the Slavonic–Romanian lexicon preserved in Ms. 3473 are not merely translations but also adaptations following Pamvo Berynda's *Slavonic–Ruthenian Lexicon* (Kyiv, 1627), the source of the Slavonic–Romanian lexicons from the 17th century. Processing usually involves the reduction of definitions or, more rarely, their amplification by the Romanian translator/ copyist.

Definitions specific to a bilingual lexicon are predominant. However, culture-specific terms or neologisms for which equivalents were challenging to provide are defined by explanatory periphrases or examples, an approach typical of monolingual dictionaries. The source also influences this technique. Explanatory periphrases translated from the source or added by the Romanian translator/ copyist emphasize the cultural-religious mentality of the time and the milieu of translation, as well as the scientific perception of certain realities. The motivation and treatment of these equivalences by multiple synonyms and their relation to the source point to the semantic stage in some words' evolution.

Bibliography

Aixela, J. F. (1996). *Culture-specific items in translation*, in Alvarez, R. & Carmen-África Vidal, M. (eds), *Translation, power, subversion*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon / Philadelphia / Adelaide, p. 52–78.

Bailly = Bailly, A. (1950). *Dictionnaire grec-français*, Hachette, Paris.

Ber. = Pamvo Berynda, Λεξιконъ славенорѡ́сскїй и́менъ толъкова́нїе [...], Kyiv, 1627 (Kutein, ²1653).

Bidu-Vrănceanu, A. (1986). *Probleme ale definirii cuvintelor din perspectiva relației dintre lexicografie și semantică*, in "Studii și cercetări lingvistice", **37** (2), p. 113–121.

Bogdan, I. (1891). *Un lexicon slavo-român din secolul XVII*, in "Convorbiri literare", **25**, p. 193–204.

Chivu, Gh. (2021). *Dictionarium Valachico-Latinum, the first original bilingual lexicon in Romanian*, in "Diacronia", **14**, art. A188, p. 1–5, Crossref.

Ciobanu, Şt. (1914). *Славяно-румынскій словарь библіотеки Московскаго Общества Исторіи и Древностей No 240*, in "Русскій филологическій вѣстникъ", **71** (1), p. 75–88.

Creţu, G. (1900). *Mardarie Cozianul. Lexicon slavo-românesc și tîlcuirea numelor din 1649*, Ediţiunea Academiei Române, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Carol Göbl", Bucuresci.

DLR = *Dicţionarul limbii române* (ediţie anastatică), 19 vol., Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti, 2010.

DSF = Deschler, J.-P. (2003). *Manuel du slavon liturgique*. II. *Dictionnaire slavon-français*, en collaboration avec Anastasia Weulersse, Institut d'études slaves, Paris.

Felea, I.-M. (2021). *The Staicu lexicon in relation to lexicons belonging to the Berynda family: orthography and structure*, in "Diacronia", **13**, art. A181, p. 1–13, Crossref.

Forăscu, N. (1986). *Sinonimia ca modalitate de definire în dicţionare*, in "Studii și cercetări lingvistice", **37** (2), p. 122–128.

Gînsac, A.-M. & Ungureanu, M. (2018). *La lexicographie slavonne-roumaine au XVIIe siècle*, in "Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie", **134** (3), p. 845–876.

Gînsac, A.-M., Moruz, M.-A. & Ungureanu, M. (2021). Slavonic–Romanian lexicons of the 17th century and their comparative digital edition (the eRomLex project), in "Diacronia", **14**, art. A192, p. 1–11, Crossref.

Leeming, M. (1973). *Greek and Latin Elements in Pamvo Berynda's Lexicon of 1627*, in "The Slavonic and East European Review", **51** (123), p. 182–213.

Mard. = Λεξиконъ славеновлашескыи и имѐ тлъкова́нїе, in Ms. Rom. 450, Romanian Academy Library, [online].

Mihăilă, G. (1972). *Contribuţii la studiul lexicografiei slavo-române din secolul al XVII-lea*, in *Contribuţii la istoria culturii și literaturii române vechi*, Editura Minerva, Bucureşti, p. 307–324.

Mikl. = *Lexicon Palæoslovenico-Græco-Latinum*, emendatum auctum edidit Fr. Miklosich, Guilelmus Braumueller, Vindobonæ, 1862–1865.

Mosc. = ‹*Lexicon slavo-român*›, Russian State Archives of Ancient Documents (RGADA), Moscow, ф. 188, оп. 1, ч. 2, 491 p.

Ms. 3473 = ‹*Lexicon slavo-român*›, in Ms. Rom. 3473, Romanian Academy Library, Bucureşti, f. 1–369ᵛ.

Neculce, I. (1955 [1732–1744]). *Letopiseţul Ţării Moldovei* și *O samă de cuvinte*, ediţie îngrijită, cu glosar, indice și o introducere de Iorgu Iordan, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, Bucureşti.

Negrescu, I. (1961). *Limba slavă veche. Perioada slavonă la români. Texte paleoslave și româno-slave. Glosar slavo-român*, Editura Institutul Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, Bucureşti.

Pet. = *Lexicon ce să zice cuvinte pe scurt alese din limba slovenească pre limba rumînească diialectică tîlcuite*, The National Library of Russia, Saint-Petersburg, Ms. no Q.XVI.5 – Славяно-молдавский словарь, 100 листов, составлен в 1695 году.

PO = Pamfil, V. (ed.) (1968). *Palia de la Orăştie, 1581–1582. Text, facsimile, indice*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucureşti.

Rozumnyj, J. (1968). *Proper names in Pamvo Berynda's „Leksikon slavenorosskij i imen tlkovanie" of 1627*, PhD thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa.

Seche, M. (1966). *Schiţă de istorie a lexicografiei române*, vol. I: *De la origini pînă la 1880*, Editura Ştiinţifică, Bucureşti.

Staicu = Λεξиконъ слове́нской, in Ms. Rom. 312, Romanian Academy Library, Bucureşti, f. 41ʳ–216ᵛ.

Strungaru, D. (1966). *Începuturile lexicografiei române*, in "Romanoslavica", **13**, p. 141–158.

Ştrempel, G. (1987). *Catalogul manuscriselor româneşti. B.A.R. 3101–4413*, vol. III, Editura Ştiinţifică și Enciclopedică, Bucureşti.

Ungureanu, M. & Gînsac, A.-M. (2019). *Lexiconul de la Moscova în raport cu celelalte lexicoanele slavo-române din secolul al XVII-lea*, in "Philologica Jassyensia", **15** (2), p. 245–258.