Education

TEACHING SLAVONIC IN 17TH CENTURY ROMANIA: TEACHING MATERIAL BY STAICO, PROFESSOR AT TÂRGOVIȘTE

Mădălina UNGUREANU

Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași; Institute of Interdisciplinary Research

e-mail: madandronic@gmail.com

Abstract:

The aim of this study is to present, based on the Rom. ms. 312 from the Academy Library in Bucharest, the teaching material used by a teacher of Slavonic in the second half of the 17th century. Rom. ms. 312 BAR is well-known particularly because it contains the largest dictionary belonging to the group of the first bilingual Romanian dictionaries. The elaboration of these dictionaries should be considered in relation to the political and cultural context of the reign of Matei Basarab, in a period in which Wallachia was influenced by the cultural prestige of Kyiv and of the metropolitan Petru Movilă, who influenced the cultural development of the Romanian Principalities. Matei Basarab wanted to restore the dominance of the Slavonic language and culture, by encouraging the development of schools, among other measures. The necessary linguistic tools were provided by Kyiv, namely the Slavonic-Ruthenian lexicon and Meletius Smotrytsky's Slavonic grammar (1619). These tools, besides being used as such in schools, provide models for the first Romanian dictionaries and the first Slavonic grammar translated into Romanian. Six Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries have survived, all written in the second half of the 17th century (except for one dating from 1649) in Wallachia, based on the Slavonic-Ruthenian lexicon published by Pamvo Berynda in 1627, which these six works adapted both in terms of the number of entries and the content of the Romanian definitions. Except for the lexicon issued in 1649, the others seem to be modified copies based on a single version. Two manuscripts containing the first Romanian bilingual lexicons also include copies after the same Romanian redaction of the Slavonic grammar. The Rom. ms. 312 comprises the lexicon, part of the grammar, and other lexicographical components, organized as additions to the main word lists. There are several studies on the content of Rom. ms. 312, yet previous research only presents it from a general perspective without much detail on its components. We shall demonstrate that its content is also more complex than that of the other lexicons, indicating and presenting its parts: the first list of words taken from the Slavonic-Ruthenian lexicon; a second list which is independent of it, but which can also be found in three of the other lexicons included in the group; three

146

thematic lists and two lists without a specific theme, plus a dictionary of proper names translated into Slavonic, which has never been studied. Furthermore, we also present opinions on the author of the grammar included in this lexicon. A comparative analysis of the Slavonic grammar of Rom. ms. 312 and the one in Rom. ms. 3473 from the Romanian Academy Library allowed us to advance the hypothesis that these are copies of a previous writing, which was not preserved.

Keywords: Slavonic; bilingual dictionaries; 17th century; Romanian; school.

1. Introduction: Political and cultural context of the elaboration of the first Romanian lexicons

The first decades of the 17th century, after Michael the Brave's failed attempt to unite the Romanian Principalities, were dominated in Wallachia by political and social instability and, as a consequence, by cultural poverty (see Cândea 1968: 240-243); in contrast, the second half of the century brought development of the scholarly activity, manifested mainly through translations, the most important event being, undoubtedly, the publication of the first Romanian Bible in 1688. To the precarious conditions at the beginning of the century must be added the state of the religious knowledge, as reflected in the testimonies of foreign travellers, along with the reflections of local scholars, such as Udriște Năsturel or Metropolitan Ștefan (Cândea 1968: 244-246), for instance, expressed in the prefaces of the books they published, such as *Mystirio sau Sacrament* (*Mystirio or Sacrament*), Târgoviște, 1651, which deplore the priests' poor knowledge of the Slavonic language, on the one hand, and, on the other, the superficial manner in which they perform the divine service. In this context, the reign of Matei Basarab stood for a cultural revival, as he followed the model of the forefathers[1], which also means a return to the Slavonic sources of faith. Papacostea (1962: 183) sees the revival of Slavonic in the first half of the 17th century as part of the movement of economic and military emancipation of the native nobility from the Turkish-Phanariots. Another contextualization of this phenomenon is the integration into the Counter-Reformation process according to the Kyiv model provided by the metropolitan Petru Movilă (1597-1647)[2] who was of Moldavian origin. As a reaction against the growing influence of Catholicism and Protestantism, he wrote and translated a series of works on dogmatics. At the time, the development of linguistic tools for studying the Slavonic language (Pamvo Berynda's Slavonic-Ruthenian dictionary, 1627, and Meletius Smotrytsky's grammar, 1619) was also linked to the Orthodox

---

[1] His model was Neagoe Basarab; Cândea (1968: 246-247) states that this was in fact a process of restoration).

[2] For the cultural relations between Petru Movilă and the Romanian Countries, see Panaitescu 1996.

147

Counter-Reformation. One of Matei Basarab's lines of action was to consolidate the teaching of Slavonic, for the very reasons explained by Metropolitan Ștefan in the preface to the aforementioned work (priests no longer understood the Slavonic language, they barely knew what they were reading, did not understand dogmas, and were unable to explain subtleties to the churchgoers). Petru Movilă supported the foundation of a printing house in Târgoviște by sending material aid and qualified workers. This relation of Romanian-Ukrainian cooperation contributed to the extension of the period in which Slavonic dominated the Romanian culture (Cazacu 1984: 211; Panaitescu 1965: 192). Pamvo Berynda's lexicon was one of the books used to teach the Slavonic language in the college founded by Petru Movilă in Kyiv (Ševčenko 1984: 22), which explains its use in Wallachia and its success among the Romanian scholars, alongside Meletius Smotrytsky's grammar.

Of the Slavonic schools of the time in Wallachia, the best known was the princely school in Târgoviște. Data on the structure of the education system in Wallachia at that time is rather scarce. It is certain that Slavonic schools functioned along some of the monasteries, such as the Cozia monastery, where the first known Slavonic-Romanian dictionary, written (or copied) by Mardarie in 1649, has been preserved. Even concerning the princely schools, information is limited to a few teacher names, a few names of pupils, and very little detail regarding the teaching materials used. About the latter, it must be said that the first linguistic instruments written in Romanian[3] date from the mid and late 17th century. In addition to Mardarie Cozianul's lexicon mentioned above, five other bilingual lexicons[4] and two Romanian translations of Smotrytsky's Grammar are known (both grammars are preserved in miscellanea together with a lexicon, in Rom. ms. BAR 312, respectively Rom. ms. BAR 3473). The purpose of the elaboration of these lexicons is believed to be related to the schools existing at the time (Mihăilă 1972: 323; Gînsac & Ungureanu 2018: 873), to the translations of liturgical texts of the time and to "the massive translation of Slavonic property documents, which was a common practiced at the time" (Gherman 2021: 2). All these lexicons are of great interest in the sense that they present elements of originality in terms of content in relation to each other. Except for

---

[3] The first Slavonic-Romanian lexicon is contemporary with the first Romanian-Latin lexicon (ca. 1650). On the early stages of Romanian lexicography, see Seche 1966: 7; Gînsac & Ungureanu 2018: 847.

[4] For a presentation of the group of 17th-century Slavonic-Romanian lexicons, see Gînsac & Ungureanu 2018: 850-853. These works were edited within the *eRomLex* project ("The first Romanian bilingual dictionaries (17th century). Digitally processed and aligned corpus") and are available at: http://www.scriptadacoromanica.ro/bin/view/eRomLex/. All of them are translations of Pamvo Berynda's lexicon, in fact five of them seem to be modified copies of the same translation.

Mardarie's lexicon, the best known is the lexicon in Rom. ms. 312 BAR, which makes the subject of our analysis.

Several names of teachers of the Slavonic school in Târgoviște are known today, from various sources. One is Daniil, whom Ursu (2003a) identifies as Daniil Panoneanul, the translator of the *Îndreptarea legii* (*The Guidance of the Law*) (Târgoviște, 1652) and allegedly, also according to Ursu, the translator of the Old Testament from Slavonic and Latin, preserved in Rom. ms. 4389[5]. Another name is that of Teodor, whom Pascu et al. (1983: 142) believe was probably the teacher of Udriște Năsturel's children, himself a scholar and translator from Slavonic.

2. A teacher of Slavonic: Staico the Grammarian

The best known is the name of Staico Grămăticul, who signs one of his works: "eu, mult păcătosul și în toate greșitul Staico grămaticul și slujitoriu besearecii domnești tocma den unghii moi și den coconie pînă la bătrîneațe slujitoriu besearecii" [I, the most humble Staico Grămăticul, servant of the church from childhood to the old age] (Rom. ms. BAR 1570, 166ʳ). The noun *grămătic*, from the Slavonic граматикъ ('grammaticus'), had in Romanian both the meaning 'scholar', and 'clerk in a chancellery' (public or private), with which it is recorded in 15th-century Slavonic-Romanian documents (Djamo & Stoicovici 1962: 85), whereas in later writings it also meant 'church singer' (DLR, s.v.).

In addition to being a teacher of Slavonic, Staico was also a diligent translator of Slavonic. Six manuscripts preserved in the Library of the Romanian Academy are attributed to him. Four of these are autographs and two are attributed based on linguistic examination; the list of his translations is available in Mareș 2014. As Rom. ms. 312 will be extensively described in this study, we shall briefly present the others in this section.

(a) *Cartea cea grăită hronograf, ce se zice început scripturilor neamurilor împărătești* (*The book known as The Chronograph, which speaks of the beginnings of the peoples*) (Rom. ms. B.A.R. 1385)

The text is the oldest Romanian chronograph translated from Russian. Strungaru (1964) attributes this translation to Staico, based on its spelling and language characteristics, an opinion also supported by N.A. Ursu (1985: 520).

(b) A book on heretics, without title (Rom. ms. B.A.R. 1570)

The book is dated 1667-1669, according to the afterword written by the translator (165ᵛ); it contains texts of religious polemics. Ms. 1570 translates part of *Kniga Kirilla* (*The Book of Kiril*) (Moscow, 1644). The text

---

[5] Dated 1665-1672, the manuscript was published in the "Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Bible 1688" series, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University of Iasi, 1988-2014.

is arranged in two columns, the first displaying the Slavonic source and the second rendering the Romanian version. This seems to be the work Pascu et al. (1985, 149) refered to when claiming that for the same didactic purposes Staico compiled a collection of texts translated from Slavonic.

(c) *Dioptra carea să chiamă Oglindă sau închipuirea cea adevărată a vieţii omeneşti în lume* (*Dioptra, also known as Mirror, or The true image of human life in this world*) (Rom. ms. B.A.R. 2341)

This is a gnomic book, translated from a 17th century Slavonic version by Vitalij of Dubna. The signature of the translator can be found on f. 6^{r}, in the cryptogram (Ursu 1981: 516-518).

(d) Paterikon (Rom. ms. BAR 1429)

This is a copy containing the Paterikon and the lives of saints. The translation of the texts was first attributed to Staico by Ursu 1981 (527-528), based on linguistic examination; later evidence was provided by D. Mihăescu (2006) and Mareş 2014 (251-252). Copied in 1676 by Vlad the Logothete (Ursu 1981: 526).

(e) Tablet of the law (Rom. ms. BAR 1324)

Originally associated with Antim Ivireanul, it was attributed to Staico by Mareș (2014: 252-255), who points both to the grammarian's writing style and to specific lexical elements. It represents the translation of a part of *Skrižal* [Tablet], published in Moscow in 1655 by order of Patriarch Nikon.

Although extremely diverse, Staico's texts have not been studied in terms of content, so we can hardly speculate as to the purpose of the translation; in the case of the bilingual texts in Rom. ms. 1570, their bilingual presentation, in parallel columns, leads us to believe that they also had a didactic purpose.

3. Teaching material: Rom. ms. 312 from the Romanian Academy Library

The following sections will be dedicated to the content of the Rom. ms. 312. Although the title page is missing, as well as the first pages of the lexicon, we believe it displays clear didactic features.

3.1. Description of the miscellany

Rom. ms. 312 from the Romanian Academy Library (henceforth: BAR) is a 19x14 cm miscellany; it has 285 leaves. Leaves 7^{v}-23^{v} contain entries in Slavonic and Romanian by various hands: copies of old documents, possession notes, and geographical and lexicographical notes. On 3^{r}, there is a recipe "for jaundice", dated 7 April 1825; on 3^{v}, there is a note from 1814. From 24^{r} to 40^{v}, at the top of the page, there are dictionary entries by another hand than the one which wrote the main text. The actual lexicon elaborated by Staico (= Lex.St.) is included between 41^{r}-216^{v}. Leaf 41 contains an

addition made in 1740 by another hand, with entries from letter A, which Crețu (1900) attributes to a monk named Laurentie. Leaves 217ᵛ-254ʳ include *Tălmăcirea sau arătarea grammaticii slovenești* (*The translation or explanation of the Slavonic grammar*). The leaves 254ᵛ-255ᵣ, 256ʳ⁻ᵛ contain exercises of calligraphy. On l. 255ᵛ, in Staico's handwriting (as in the following sections) there is *Stihiri den izvodul grecesc la Paraclisul Preacistii* (*Stichera from the Greek source for the Paraklesis to the Theotokos*), a text in Slavonic, but the title is in Romanian. On 257ʳ-258ʳ: medical prescriptions. On 258ᵛ: a Greek text in Cyrillic alphabet. On 259ʳ-260ᵛ: Катавáсїє ла ро҃дество хв҃о (*Octoechos on the Birth of Christ*), a Greek text in Cyrillic alphabet. On 260ᵛ-261ᵛ: notes on the calculation of some religious events.

Entries by other hands are added throughout the manuscript, including notes on possession (41ʳ: "Ce livre appartient a Mr. Jean de Talmatzy 1797 maiu 20" [This book belongs to Mr. Jean de Talmatzy, May, 20, 1797]; "Acest lipsihon să să știe că iaste a dascalului Nichitei" [It should be known that this dictionary belongs to parish teacher Nichita]); throughout the lexicon, there are marginal or interlinear additions to entries or additions to definitions written by other hands.

The text is written in black ink. In the lexicon, the initial of the headword is written with cinnabar. The lexicon is written in two columns, with around 23 lines (or less) per page. It has been dated about 1660-1670 (Crețu 1900: 33, based on watermarks); also accepted by later scholars, this dating has been questioned by Gheție (1977), who also questions the authorship.

The manuscript has no title and contains no signature, nor any indication of when it was compiled. Based on its linguistic features and the fact that Strungaru (1966) identified the author as being Staico, the manuscript has been localized in Wallachia.

The first to describe the miscellany was M. Eminescu: librarian at the Central University Library of Iași, he wrote to the Ministry of Public Instruction in 1875, asking for the purchase of the miscellany (the letter is reproduced in Mihăilă 1972: 72). B.P. Hasdeu (1878/1983) describes the manuscript, dates it around 1600-1630, claims that the author of the Sturza miscellany (so named because it was given to the Library of the Academy by D.A. Sturza) and Berynda processed the same source and makes observations on spelling, phonetics and vocabulary. This dictionary was treated in more detail by Crețu (1900), who briefly describes all the components of the lexicon, which actually represents the most detailed description of the Sturza miscellany in the literature. The most important contribution is the dating of the lexicon following the study of watermarks. Showing that the watermarks in the miscellany were identified in documents preserved at the Romanian

Academy from the period 1651-1670, Crețu (1900: 33) dates the Lex.St. to the period 1660-1670. Strungaru (1966) is the one who identified the author, comparing the writing with that in ms. 1570 kept at the Romanian Academy Library, which specifies the date, the place of writing and the author. He considers Lex.St. to be the basis for other two Slavonic-Romanian lexicons, which in turn were the model for the two lexicons preserved in Russia (for the description of the lexicons see Gînsac & Ungureanu 2018).

3.2. The lexicon in Rom. ms. 312

In the following section, we will refer to the central part of the lexicon rather than to later additions, which do not belong to Staico. The lexicon begins at 42^r and has several components, which we will describe below.

3.2.1. List 1 (the main list) is included between leaves 42^r-176^v. It is similar to the other 17th century Slavonic-Romanian lexicons based on the model provided by Lex.Ber. (with slight differences in terms of inventory of entries and definitions). The two lists in Lex.Ber. are combined into a single one, with the inventory of common names separate from the inventory of proper names.[6] In a few cases, fragments of definition are written with cinnabar (e.g. 47^r, 49^r, 50^r, 50^v etc.). Some entries are written as a continuation of the previous definition, without a red initial in the headword. Some headwords have no definition. The entries are arranged alphabetically, yet the list of common nouns under each letter is immediately followed by the list of proper names.

It simplifies the list from the Slavonic source but introduces new words and forms from verbal or noun paradigms (see Gînsac & Ungureanu 2018). This section of the lexicon contains about 7000 entries.

3.2.2. A second (additional) list is contained between 176^v-186^v. It includes words that are no longer taken from Lex.Ber. The list is similar (with slight differences) to the additional lists in Lex.3473, Lex.Pet. and Lex.Mosc. Entries are arranged alphabetically; it has the same editorial features as the main list.

---

[6] Lex.Ber. is structured in two lists. The first contains common nouns and the second proper names and terminology originating from Greek, Latin etc. In total, its inventory contains about 7000 entries (7233 entries in eRomLex database). Not all entries are found in the Romanian lexicons and not all retrieved entries are found in all lexicons. Moreover, the Romanian lexicons also include entries that are not found in Lex.Ber., not necessarily the same in all lexicons.

The coincidences between the additional lists in the four lexicons we mentioned[7] indicate that five lexicons from the second half of the century are modified copies of the same work, which was lost. If we consider Ursu's hypothesis (1995: 170) that Daniil Panoneanul is the author of the Romanian version of Smotrytsky's grammar copied by Staico in Rom. ms. BAR 312, also taking into account the preliminary finding that derivatives with *-ame*, regarded as a characteristic of Staico's writing, are not found in the lexicon of Rom. ms. 312, then one could think of the possibility that the author of this first redaction of the Slavonic-Romanian lexicon was Daniil himself[8]. In any case, each of those who copied the five lexicons later did not faithfully follow the model, but either expanded or reduced the inventory of entries, processed the definitions, kept or, conversely, removed bibliographical references (supposing that these would have occurred in the first redaction) etc.

This list contains about 350 entries.

3.2.3. A third list, specific only to this lexicon, is found between 187^v-201^v. The entries have the same editorial features as those in lists 1 and 2. They are ordered alphabetically, with some exceptions. This list contains about 850 entries.

3.2.4. List 4, between 205^r-216^r, 820 entries. This is also a Slavonic-Romanian dictionary, in two columns, the initial of the headword being written with cinnabar, i.e. it has the same characteristics as the previous lists, except for the handwriting, which is somehow sloppier. The entries are not arranged alphabetically but by lexical fields, admittedly not very strictly: domestic universe, animals, parts of the human body, clothing, riding, domestic objects, wild birds, wild animals, fieldwork, cereals, horses, vegetables, fruits, insects, secular and religious landmarks, trees, degrees of kinship, administrative functions, human traits, domestic universe once more, colours. Phraseological units, verbs relating to current human actions, and greetings are also included. E.g. "ла́но є по́на́т lesne e să-l cunoști" [one can easily know him] (211^v); "тко́ є мудры cine e înțelept" [who is wise] (211^v); "тко се Бд вой cui e frică de Dumnezeu" [who has fear of God] (211^v); "и кто пома́ло говоры̀ și cine grăiaște puțin" [and who speaks few words] (211^v); "и кто є смерд și cine se smereaște" [and who is humbled] (211^v); other examples: "єстекло є мц҃ь răsărit-au luna" [the moon has risen] (214^v); "поидѝ

---

[7] The additional lists these are missing only from Lex.1348, which takes a more reductive approach to the content of the definitions anyway.
[8] This hypothesis must be pursued through a serious linguistic examination of all the texts involved; see also Ursu 2003a: 198.

съ бг҃о pasă cu Dumnezeu" [walk with God] (215ʳ); "ба́ млю҄ за твои҄ здра́вїє Dumnezeu rog pentru sănătate" [I pray to God for good health] (214ᵛ), etc.

Although the fact that this section also contains groups of words and even sentences might indicate that it was written in relation to a translation, the selection of these elements from the domestic, close, familiar universe (even those mentioning the divinity belong to the category of greetings) indicates that the list was written as a didactic guide rather than as a translation aid. The last examples seem to have the function of a conversation guide.

3.2.5. Other thematic material

3.2.5.1. On page 186ᵛ there is a list "entitled" *Levit 11* containing 36 entries, which are not arranged alphabetically; the list includes names of birds, reptiles, insects, and mammals. Comparing it with the biblical text, Camară (2022) has shown that the list is taken from Leviticus 11:13-30, where food-related prohibitions (repeated in Deuteronomium 14) are presented. The entries are not displayed in alphabetical order, but are arranged in the order in which they occur in the biblical text. The list is not based on the Old Testament in the Rom. ms. BAR 4389, this translation of the Old Testament follows the Latin text in this passage, which does not coincide with the Slavonic one.

3.2.5.2. On leaf 187ʳ there is a list of 16 entries "entitled" ст҃ы́и кири́ (*Saint Cyril*). The entries are not ordered alphabetically and refer to physical features; there are both words and phrases in the Slavonic column. E.g. "лице́ ꙗко промо́длꙗ la faţă cam smolit" [rather dark-faced]; "гроъби оугꙋ́щєни sprînceanele dease" [thick eyebrows]; "длъгою брадою cu barba lungă" [long-bearded]; "плѣши́ pleşiv" [bald-headed], etc.

We have not yet been able to identify the source of these terms and phrases, especially as the procedure is repeated on 216ᵛ.

3.2.5.2. On 216ᵛ there is a similar list of 12 entries under the title Ст҃ы́и аѳанасїе (*Saint Athanasius*). As in the previous list, the entries refer to human physical traits. It is written entirely in black. E.g.: "мєрє́ gîrbov" [hunched]; "брадою недо́гъ нъшире́ cu barba nu lungă, ce lată" [with a wide beard, not too long]; "нє ѕѣло сѣди́ nu foarte căruntă" [not all grey]; "и нє вѣ́ми бѣ́ şi nu foarte albă" [and not entirely white], etc.

The two lists seem to be taken from a manual of Byzantine painting (Camară 2022).

3.2.5.3. Manuil's list of names

Perhaps the most surprising part of Lex.St. is this dictionary of proper names with explanation in Slavonic included between 202^r-204^v, entitled Мануи́ла ри́то́ра тлъкова́нїе ст҃ы̀ и́менꙋ̀ (*Manuil the Orator's Interpretation of Holy Names*). Arranged in two columns, the entries are not written below each other but next to each other. The headword is written in cinnabar, as is the initial of the first word in the definition. Entries are not ordered alphabetically. The lexicographic material in this section consists of 236[9] proper names.

The lexicon, as such, is not found in the Lex.Ber., but Berynda mentions a Manuil among his sources. In his address to the reader, he states that he has gathered material from various works, especially from the exegesis of Maxim the Athonite, Manuil the Orator and others. In the lexicon, Manuil's name appears after several entries, confirming the veracity of the information in the preface.

On the occasion of the editing of Lex.Ber., V. Nimčuk (1961: XVII-XVIII) discusses the sources used by the 17th-century lexicographer. He points out that Berynda used all available lexicographical resources when compiling the dictionary: the Lexicon of Zizanii (1595); then "Инока Максима то(л)кование именамъ" [Monk Maksim's interpretation of names] by Maksim Grek, whose works were spread throughout Ruthenia. Another source mentioned is Manuel the Orator, whom Nimciuk briefly mentions as a Byzantine writer who lived at the end of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century, whom he identifies with Manuil the Corinthian, without providing arguments in this respect.

Jaroslav Rozumnyj's work on proper names in Lex.Ber. does not bring any new data regarding the issue of Manuil's identity. The author (Rozumnyj 1968: 10) embraces Janów's opinion, also concerning the copy in Rom. ms. BAR 312.

Levičkin & Suhačev (2015: 240) note that in the afterword to the Lexicon, the author mentions "many books" belonging to Teodor Balaban's library, in particular Lavrentie Zizanii's dictionary, the Polyglot Bible (Antwerp, 1569-1573), the seventh volume of which contains a dictionary of proper names, to which are added Maksim Grek, Manuel the Orator and other sources. As far as Manuel is concerned, the authors just quote Nimciuk, who identifies him as the 15th – 16th century Byzantine writer.

In a recent contribution, Levičkin (2021: 1) briefly suggests the name Manuil Holobolos (1240-1310), without discussing this association in further

---

[9] Crețu (1900: 35) mentions "around 280 names".

detail, the identification being probably due to the reputation of this Byzantine scholar as a rhetorician and grammarian.

A more thorough investigation is therefore needed to identify the source from which this onomastic dictionary was compiled in Rom. ms. 312 BAR.

Thus, all the lexicographical material in Rom. ms. 312 BAR comprises eight sections. The first two, which represent the main part of the lexicon, are also found in the other lexicons. Of the other six, only one is arranged alphabetically and is thematically similar to the first, while another is arranged by lexical fields. Four of the lists bear titles, an indication of the (as yet unidentified) source: St. Cyril, St. Athanasius, Levit 11 and Manuil.

4. Slavonic grammar

Between l. 217ᵛ-254ᵛ there is a text entitled *Tîlcuirea sau arătarea grammaticii slovenești*/ Исто̑кованїе или и҆ꙗвле́нїе гра́ммꙗтики сла́ве́скїꙗ (*The translation or explanation of the Slavonic grammar*), a simplified reworking of a section of Meletius Smotrytsky's grammar, Eve, 1619 (Cobeț 1981-1982: 119), with a preface in both Slavonic and Romanian. The text is rendered bilingually, in Romanian and Slavonic, mirrored on adjoining pages (which, in our opinion, is another indication of the didactic purpose for which it was written). Moreover, the didactic purpose is also underlined in the preface. This preface does neither reproduce nor rework Smotrytsky's; here, the author explains why he considered it necessary to translate the Slavonic grammar: in order to help his disciples, to enable them to understand the subtleties of the Scripture, and to fulfill his own destiny as a teacher: "Deaca vreame ce întru învățătură chemat sînt ca întru chiemarea mea să petrec și cum îmi zic dascale, ca și cu lucrul și cu numele acesta să fiu plecaților ai miei ucenici întru învățătura grammatichiei" [I am called to teach and should act as a teacher, since they call me by this name, and through my work I will act in front of my disciples according to the name they call me, so I can teach my humble disciples about grammar] (217ᵛ). Of the four parts of Smotrytsky's grammar, Staico only writes about morphology (which is named "etimologhia").

According to Diomid Strungaru (1960), the grammar was compiled by Staico, for didactic purposes, between 1667-1669, based on Smotrytsky's grammar from 1619; furthermore, Strungaru believes that Staico is thus the author of the first Romanian grammar. According to the testimonies of the time, Smotrytsky's work was used by Daniil Panoneanul, teacher of Slavonic at the school of the Metropolitan church in Târgoviște (possibly teacher of Staico himself), as a Slavonic textbook. Hieromonk Ștefan, one of his students, is also known for a manuscript copy of the grammar of Smotrytsky. Based on some vague information in the preface to the grammar of ms. 312

156

and in that of *Îndreptarea legii* (*The Guidance of the Law*), a work by Daniil Panoneanul, N.A. Ursu (2003b: 90) advances the hypothesis that the translator of the grammar is Daniil Panoneanul himself, whereas Staico only copied and possibly completed it (Ursu 2003a: 130) and consequently the lexicon could also have been compiled by Daniil. Doina Cobeț (1981-1982) points out that this is not the first Romanian grammar, as D. Strungaru had thought, but the first translation (or, rather, translation by processing and simplification) into Romanian of a grammar of the Slavonic language, despite the fact that the examples are translated into Romanian (strangely, the author of the grammar does not preserve, as would be natural, the illustration of the rules of Slavonic grammar with examples in Slavonic, but translates - or adapts - them into Romanian).

A comparison (be it only partial) of the texts indicates that the grammar in ms. 312 BAR and the one in ms. 3473 BAR are copies of the same version, including the preface. Both copy a bilingual version, with the difference that in Staico's manuscript the Slavonic and the Romanian texts are mirrored on adjoining pages, whereas in Rom. ms. 3473 the Slavonic and the Romanian versions are displayed successively. A thorough comparison between the two texts is obviously required, yet our hypothesis is that the compiler of the first Slavonic grammar in Romanian is not Staico, but that he only copied the work of another author, also a professor (as indicated in the preface, which can be found in both manuscripts). Of course, there is also the hypothesis that the two manuscript versions of the grammar are copied one after the other. These assumptions remain to be verified in further research.

Conclusions

In the present study, we have followed the organization of the contents of a 17th-century Romanian miscellany, known especially for the fact that it contains one of the first Romanian bilingual lexicons - in any case, the most extensive of them. At least in part, the miscellany does not seem to have been compiled randomly; even in the part that does not coincide with the contents of the other Slavonic-Romanian lexicons of the period, the entries are presented in alphabetical order. The last list, namely the one that is not ordered alphabetically, may have been compiled rather for the purpose of a modern-day conversation guide. The fact that this is the record of a Slavonic teacher is also indicated by the inclusion in the miscellany of the grammar. It illustrates the manner in which a mid-17th century teacher of Slavonic from Wallachia organised his teaching material. To this is added (unlike other miscellanies which seem to fulfil the same function) the other materials (thematic content lists), which are likely to have functioned as translation aids.

In any case, how the lexicon was compiled indicates its didactic function. In contrast to Berynda's lexicon, the lexicon that makes the subject of our analysis (as the other Slavonic-Romanian lexicons of the time) indicates verbal and nominal paradigms, simplifies definitions and often suppresses biblical and bibliographical references. We believe that the lexicon and grammar were elaborated earlier and then copied (and processed) by Staico and by the authors of other miscellanies with similar content.

An extensive comparison between these manuscripts could further indicate what the author of the original lexicon considered he had to add to the content of Berynda's model, an aspect which could shed light on his cultural horizon and didactic perspective.

References:

Camară, I., (2022, 18-19 November). *Miscelaneul Staico (ms. rom. BAR 312): portofoliul unui dascăl de la sfârşitul secolului al XVII-lea/ The Staico Miscellany (Rom. ms. 312 BAR): the portfolio of a teacher from the end of the 17th century* [Paper Presentation]. The 22th International Conference of the Department of Linguistics, University of Bucharest: Synchronic, Diachronic and Typological Linguistics, Bucharest.

Cazacu, M. (1984). Pierre Mohyla (Petru Movilă) et la Roumanie: Essai historique et bibliographique/ Peter Mogyla and Romania: A historical and bibliographical essay. In *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 8(1/2). *The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 30th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*. 188-222.

Cândea, V. (1968). L'humanisme d'Udrişte Năsturel et l'agonie des lettres slavonnes en Valachie/ The humanisme of Udrişte Năsturel and the agony of the Slavonic letters in Wallachia. In *Revue des études sud-est européennes*, 6 (2). 239-287.

Cobeţ, D. (1981-1982). *De cînd datează prima gramatică a limbii române/ Since when the first grammar of Romanian dates. Anuar de Lingvistică şi Istorie Literară*, 28. 115-119.

Creţu, G. (1900). *Mardarie Cozianul. Lexicon slavo-românesc şi tîlcuirea numelor din 1649/ Mardarie Cozianul. Slavonic-Romanian lexicon and the explanation of names from 1649*. Bucuresci: Ediţiunea Academiei Române.

Djamo, L. & Stoicovici, O. (1962). Din terminologia socială a documentelor slavo-moldoveneşti din sec. al XIV-lea şi al XV-lea/ From the social terminology of the Slavonic-Moldavian documents in the 14th and the 15th centuries. In *Romanoslavica*, 2. 61-92.

DLR (2010). *Dicționarul limbii române/ Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, vols I-XIX. București: Editura Academiei Române.

Gherman, A.M. (2021). Lexicography and the history of culture (The case of Teodor Corbea's Romanian–Latin Dictionary). In *Diacronia*, 14, A189. 1–11. https://doi.org/10.17684/i14A189en. Retrieved March 15, 2023, from: https://www.diacronia.ro/ro/journal/issue/14.

Gheție, I. (1977). Derivatele cu sufixul *-ame* și o chestiune de paternitate/ The derivatives with the suffix *-ame* and a paternity problem. In *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, 28(5). 559-562.

Gînsac, A. & Ungureanu, M. (2018). La lexicographie slavonne-roumaine au XVIIᵉ siècle: Adaptations roumaines d'après le *Leksikon slavenorosskij* de Pamvo Berynda/ Slavonic-Romanian lexicography in the 17th century: Romanian adaptations of *Leksikon slavenorosskij by Pamvo Berynda*. In *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 134(3). 845-876. https://doi.org/10.1515/zrp-2018-0055.

Hasdeu, B.P. (1983). *Specimen de „dicționar etimologic al limbei române"/ A sample of "etymological dictionary of Romanian"*. In G. Mihăilă (ed.), *Cuvente den bătrâni. Limba română vorbită între 1550-1600/* Words from the old times. Romanian language between 1550-1600. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică. (Original work published in 1878).

Levičkin, A.N. & Suhačev, N.L. (2015). Лексикон славеноросский Памвы Берынды и румынская Лексикография/ Slavonic-Ruthenian lexicon by Pamvo Berynda and the Romanian Lexicography. In: Российская Академия Наук, *Академик А.А. Шахматов : жизнь, творество, научное наследие (к 150-лето со дня рождения)/* Academician A.A. Shakhmatov: life, works, scientific heritage (150 years from his birth), Sankt-Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia. 434–452.

Levichkin, A. (2021). Comments upon the sources of the Church Slavonic–Ruthenian Lexicon by Pamvo Berynda. *Diacronia* 14, A191. 1–9. https://doi.org/10.17684/i14A191en. Retrieved March 15, 2023 from: https://www.diacronia.ro/ro/journal/issue/14.

Mareș, A. (2014). *Note filologice despre Staico Grămăticul/ Philological notes on Staico Grămăticul*. In: O. Uță Bărbulescu & G. Chivu (eds), *Ion Coteanu - in memoriam*. București: Editura Universității din București. 249-259.

Mihăescu, D. (2006). *Cronografele românești/* Romanian Chronographs, București: Editura Academiei Române.

159

Mihăilă, G. (1972). *Contribuţii la studiul lexicografiei slavo-române din secolul al XVII-lea/ Contributions to the study of Slavonic-Romanian lexicography from the 17th century*. In *Contribuţii la istoria culturii şi literaturii române vechi/ Contributions to the history of the old Romanian culture and literature*. București: Minerva. 307-324.

Nimčuk, V.V. (1961). *Leksikon slovenoros'kij Pamvi Berindi/* The Slavonic-Ruthenian Lexicon by Pamvo Berynda. Kijv: Vydavnytstvo Akademiï nauk Ukraïns'koï.

Panaitescu, P.P. (1965). *Începuturile şi biruinţa scrisului în limba română/* The beginnings and the victory of writing in Romanian. București: Editura Academiei Române.

Panaitescu, P.P. (1996). Influența operei lui Petru Movilă, arhiepiscop al Kievului, în Principatele Române/ The influence of the work of Petr Mogyla, Archibishop of Kyiv, in the Romanian Principalities. In Șt. Gorovei & Maria Magdalena Székely (eds), *Petru Movilă. Studii/ Petr Mogyla. Studies*. București: Editura Enciclopedică. 9-75.

Papacostea, V. (1962). O școală de limbă și cultură slavonă la Târgoviște în timpul domniei lui Matei Basarab/ A school of Slavonic language and culture in Târgoviște during the reign of Matei Basarab. In *Romanoslavica*, V. 183-194.

Pascu, Ș. & Manolache, A. & Pârnuță, G. & Verdeș, I. 1983. *Istoria învăţământului din România/ History of the Education in Romania*. vol. I. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

Rozumnyj, J. (1968). *Proper Names in Pamvo Berynda's « Leksikon slavenorosskij i imen tlkovanie » of 1627*, thesis presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Ottawa through the Department of Slavic Studies, Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

Ševčenko, I. (1984). The Many Worlds of Peter Mohyla. In *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 8 (1/2). In *The Kiev Mohyla Academy: Commemorating the 30th Anniversary of its Founding (1632)*. 9-44.

Strungaru, D. (1964). Cel mai vechi cronograf românesc de proveniență rusă/ The oldest Romanian chronograph of Russian origin. *Romanoslavica*, București, anul X, 1964. 89-99

Strungaru, D. (1966). *Începuturile lexicografiei române/ The beginnings of the Romanian Lexicography*. In *Romanoslavica*, 13. 141-158.

160

Ursu, N.A. (1981). Un cărturar puțin cunoscut, de la mijlocul secolului al XVIII-lea: Daniil Andrean Panoneanul/ A lesser known scholar from mid- 17th century: Daniil Andrean Panoneanul. In *Cronica*, 43. 5-8.

Ursu, N.A. (1995). Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Panoneanul (I)/ The unknown literary activity of Daniil Panoneanul. In *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, 46 (1-6). 157-173.

Ursu, N.A. (2003a). Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Panoneanul (V)/ The unknown literary activity of Daniil Panoneanul. In *Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, 54(1-2). 189-201.

Ursu, N.A. (2003b). Contribuții la istoria culturii românești în secolul al XVII-lea/ Contributions to the history of the Romanian culture in the 17th century. In *Studii filologice*, Iași: Cronica.