

Mihai-Alex Moruz/Mădălina Ungureanu

17TH-CENTURY ROMANIAN LEXICAL RESOURCES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON ROMANIAN WRITTEN TRADITION

Abstract This paper focusses on the first Slavonic-Romanian lexicons, compiled in the second half of the 17th century and their use(rs), proposing a method of investigating the manner in which lexical information available in the above corpus relates, if at all, to the vocabulary of texts from the same period. We chose to investigate their relation to an anonymous Old Testament translation made from Church Slavonic, also from the second half of the 17th century, which was supposed to be produced in the same geographical area, in the same Church Slavonic school or even by the same author as the lexicons. After applying a lemmatizer on both the Biblical text (Books of Genesis and Daniel) and the Romanian material from the lexicons, we analyse the results and double the statistical analysis with a series of case studies, focusing on some common lexemes that might be an indicator of the relatedness of the texts. Even if the analysis points out that the lexicons might not have been compiled as a tool for the translation of religious texts, it proves to be a useful method that reveals interesting data and provides the basis for more extensive approaches.

Keywords 17th century; Church Slavonic; bilingual dictionaries; Old Testament; Old Romanian

1. Introduction

1.1 An overview on the beginnings of the Romanian lexicography

In Romanian culture, as was generally the case, the starting point of lexicographical practice can be identified in the vernacular glosses on texts written in the culture language of the time, according to the following stages: glosses → glossaries → bilingual dictionaries (Adamska-Sałaciak 2014, p. 1; see also Kovalenko 2016, p. 275, for the Russian culture context; Gruszczyński/Saloni 2013 for Poland). Drafting bilingual dictionaries is a direct consequence of the contact between two languages: in the case of the first Romanian dictionaries (17th century) the language of culture (Latin in Transylvania, Church Slavonic in Moldavia and Wallachia), used also in administration, blended with Romanian and the vernacular language tended to assimilate the status of the other language. The Romanian glosses on Slavonic texts illustrate the first stage of this contact. The brief rudimentary glossaries following the model of similar Slavonic works mark the second stage: two such works dating from the 16th century are known (see Strungaru 1966, p. 146; Mihăilă 1972, p. 308; Gînsac/Ungureanu 2018, p. 847, n. 4). In both cases, the words are not listed in alphabetical order. Large bilingual dictionaries, with words arranged alphabetically, appear in the third stage (17th century). This category includes bilingual lexicons, such as Anonymus Caransebesiensis, a Romanian-Latin dictionary dating from the mid-17th century; a Latin-Romanian one, from the end of the same century; an Italian-Romanian lexicon compiled a few years before 1700 and a trilingual dictionary, Latin-Romanian-Hungarian, compiled at the end of the 17th century as well. This category also includes the six Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries which are the object of our research.

We can thus note that most of the dictionaries issued at the time are of the L2-L1 type (in which L2 is either Latin, Italian, Hungarian or Slavonic) and only one of these dictionaries is L1-L2 (Romanian-Latin); referring to the purpose of the latter, Chivu (2008, p. 34) states

that it “aimed at the most detailed presentation of the Romanian language with the help of Latin glosses”, as opposed to L2-L1 dictionaries that seem to have been working tools used in translation (Chivu 2012, p. 45), both of liturgical texts and of administrative documents (Gherman 2021, p. 2). We shall focus our analysis on the Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries dating from the 17th century.

1.2 The features of the Slavonic-Romanian lexicons from the 17th century

All six Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries were compiled in the second half of the century (except for *Lex.Mard.*, dating from 1649), in the same geographical area (Wallachia), following the model of the Slavonic-Ruthenian lexicon published in 1627 in Kyiv by Pamvo Berynda, a reference work for the 17th century, containing around 7,000 entries grouped in two alphabetical lists, i. e. a list of old common names and a list of proper names and terminology borrowed from Hebrew, Greek and Latin (Stankiewicz 1984, p. 152). Popular at the time, this lexicon played an essential role in the Ukrainian, Romanian, Russian, Byelorussian, and Polish lexicography (*ibid.*, p. 52). Along with the Slavonic Grammar written by Meletie Smotrički (1619), this dictionary was used as an instrument for learning Slavonic in Petru Movilă’s Academy in Kyiv (Ševčenko 1984, p. 22), and thus it was only natural to serve as a model for Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries. All six dictionaries are preserved as manuscripts, two of them in Russian libraries and the remaining four at the Romanian Academy Library in Bucharest (see their complete list in the Bibliography section). They are works of large dimensions, preserved almost completely (the leaves corresponding to letter A are missing from *Lex.3473*, and a few leaves from the same letter are also missing from *Lex.St.*). These works are obviously related (with the possible exception of *Lex.Mard.*), most likely being processed copies of a unique Slavonic-Romanian intermediate work that was either lost or not yet found (see Gînsac/Ungureanu 2018, p. 872).

Of these works, only *Lex.Mard.* has been edited so far, by Crețu (1900). The other lexicons have been studied only partially and solely with regard to a series of specific aspects (the connections between the six lexicons established by analysing certain fragments; hypotheses regarding their paternity; their connection with *Lex.Ber.*; see Strungaru 1966; Mihăilă 1972; Gînsac/Ungureanu 2018, p. 850). The lack of interest in editing these lexicons derives most probably from the idea that they are pretty similar and tributary to their source (see, for instance, Chivu 2012, p. 45). Ever since the end of the 19th century, several researchers have suggested the idea to elaborate a comparative edition (Mihăilă 1972, p. 324), in order to better illustrate the relations between these lexicons, on the one hand, and their connections with the Ruthenian model, on the other.

On a closer look, however, one may observe that these lexicons do not follow the model as faithfully as previously thought (see, for instance, Gînsac/Ungureanu 2018; Gînsac/Moruz/Ungureanu 2021), and each of them actually includes an innovative component. As a general observation, some of the entries from *Lex.Ber.* are omitted and new entries are added, but these new entries are not always the same in all six Romanian lexicons. Furthermore, the content of the definitions is modified. We must also mention that, despite being a bilingual dictionary, *Lex.Ber.* does not only render the Ruthenian equivalents of the Slavonic terms, but also indicates polysemous terms, figurative meanings, usage contexts (by quotations), bibliographic references, explanations. Romanian lexicons have a general tendency of simplifying the definitions in the model, yet in some cases more extensive explanations are provided.

One of the challenges in studying the Slavonic-Romanian lexicons is that they have not been edited so far; the parallel study of six large texts, with a rich lexical inventory, is a difficult task. Starting from this idea, a comparative digital edition has been created in which the entries are aligned at headword level, allowing parallel viewing (see <http://www.scrip-tadacoromanica.ro/bin/view/eRomLex/> and also Gînsac/Moruz/Ungureanu 2021). Besides being the first lexicographic works in the Romanian culture and thus an important part of the Romanian cultural heritage, the 17th century Slavonic-Romanian lexicons contain a vast amount of lexical material that has to be inventoried and exploited in the Thesaurus Dictionary of the Romanian Language (DLR), in works on the history of the Romanian language, etc. This corpus is also a valuable resource for the study of the lexicographical activity of the time from the standpoint of its social and cultural function: its analysis in relation to other writings or translations of the time can yield clues with regards to the authorship of certain texts.

2. The relation between these lexicons and other writings of the time

2.1 Why were the lexicons compiled?

In this study we shall regard the dictionaries as “tools in an integrated network” (Varantola 2002, p. 30), focusing on a specific element of this network, namely the context in which these dictionaries were produced (by “context” we understand the other texts produced in the same period, within the same geographical area), for the study of which we propose a specific work method. The study of this context may undoubtedly lead to the identification of the type of users the dictionaries targeted and also to the identification of their authors. Given the lack of paratextual elements,¹ the identification of the other elements of the functional network that the 17th-century Slavonic-Romanian dictionaries belong to² is based on the analysis of the lexicon contents and the cultural context in which they were produced.

As far as the purpose of the first bilingual Romanian dictionaries is concerned, we should note that they could have been connected to the activity of the Church Slavonic schools existing in Wallachia (where they could have served as didactic instruments) and also to the translation activity of both religious and administrative texts.³ This idea was motivated by the (so far partial) analysis of the entry inventory. However, we believe that these hypotheses need to be validated by several methods: an exhaustive analysis of the entry inventory of the Romanian lexicons in relation to the inventory of the model (in other words: which entries from Lex.Ber. are preserved, which are ignored?); a qualitative analysis of the defini-

¹ The title is actually mentioned in just two dictionaries: Lex.Mard. and Lex.Pet.; the author’s name is recorded only in Lex.Mard., whereas Lex.3473 has a name mention that could belong to the copyist and in the case of Lex.St. the author is only presumed based on the orthography and the very brief study of the vocabulary, see Strungaru (1966).

² See Lew (2015, p. 2): “Dictionary use occurs in a particular context, and users reaching for dictionaries are typically immersed in a particular kind of activity”.

³ In turn, Lex.Ber. would have been compiled as a tool for a new edition of the Slavonic Bible (as the existing edition, the Ostrog Bible, 1580, was perceived as being too obscure), on the initiative of Feodor Balaban, Berynda’s patron. In any case, Berynda did not limit his approach to the Biblical text, but consulted a much more diverse corpus (see V. Nimciuk, Introduction to Lex.Ber., online: <http://litopys.org.ua/berlex/be01.htm>, accessed on 09-03-2022); further on, V. Nimciuk argues that Lex.Ber. was used not only for didactic purposes but also by a wide range of readers of Slavonic texts, for whom the Lexis published by Lavrentii Zizanyi in 1596 was no longer adequate.

tions (how do the authors of the lexicons process the information in the source?); a statistical analysis of the Romanian definitions' content (what words did they use?), by comparison with the same type of analysis applied to other texts from the same period. In our study we shall focus on the last of these strategies, analysing the relation between the lexical content of these dictionaries and the content of a significant work in the Romanian culture of the time, also translated into Romanian from Slavonic, namely a translation of the Old Testament, from the same period and the same geographical area as the lexicons.

2.2 Premises

The first texts preserved in the Romanian language date from the 16th century and are mainly versions of the Psalters and Apostles and other religious texts, most of them translated from Slavonic and some from Hungarian. During the 17th century, the source languages also include Greek and Latin. Religious translations are still most numerous (liturgical, homiletics, canon law texts and catechisms, etc.), mainly from Slavonic, yet other works are also issued, such as civil law works, popular books and even some original texts (chronicles and poetry). The first translation of the New Testament is published in 1648, followed in 1688 by the first full translation of the Bible in Romanian (henceforth: B 1688). As for the Old Testament, the first translations into Romanian date from the second half of the 17th century: a translation from Greek (henceforth: OT 45), and a second translation having as sources the Church Slavonic Bible from Ostrog, a Latin version published in Anvers and the above-mentioned translation from Greek (henceforth OT 4389)⁴.

The presumed author of OT 4389 is Daniil Panoneanul (Andriescu 1998, p. 14), a professor of Church Slavonic (before 1660) at the school in Târgoviște, in Wallachia (Ursu 1995, 2003), translator and subsequently Bishop. Furthermore, based on certain linguistic particularities, Ursu (2003, p. 198) advances the hypothesis that Daniil Panoneanul could have been the professor of Staicu Grămăticul, presumed author of one of the six Slavonic-Romanian lexicons (Lex.St.) and that Daniil Panoneanul could actually have been the author of a lexicon that was in fact lost and from which all the other preserved lexicons derived, except for Lex.Mard. (the hypothesis of a Romanian lexicon which could have been the source for the other five was also formulated in Gînsac/Ungureanu 2018). The hypothesis regarding the common authorship of the translation of the Old Testament from Church Slavonic and the lost Slavonic-Romanian lexicon should be verified by comparing the lexical inventory of this OT version and the Romanian lexicons; it is the aim of this article, it being a first step (and a proof of concept) for a broader investigation into the relatedness of these writings and also into the purpose for which these lexicons were compiled (as instruments for translation from Church Slavonic, to be used as a teaching tool in Slavonic language schools, or simply in the act of reading Slavonic texts). Our hypothesis is that a common authorship could be proven by common lexemes, especially if these were specific to a small geographic area, and by common translation choices.

⁴ This translation is kept in Rom. ms. no 4389 from the Library of the Romanian Academy in Bucharest. All three translations were edited within the "Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688" series (Iași, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Press, 24 vol., 1988-2015). For further information on this version, see Ursu 1995; Ursu 2003; Căndea 1979, pp. 129–134. The OT 4389 translation is dated 1665–1672 (Căndea 1979, p. 131); for comparison, Lex.St. was dated 1669 (Strungaru 1966) or cca 1660–1670 (Mihăilă 1972, p. 313); Lex.Pet.: around 1693 (Crețu 1900, p. 50) or ante 1693 (Mihăilă 1972, p. 315); Lex.3473: 1672-1673 (according to two marginal notes); Lex.1348: 1678 (Mihăilă 1972, p. 313).

2.3 Analysis

2.3.1 Methodology

In order to extract the relevant static data for our intended analysis, both OT 4389 and the lexicons themselves had to be pre-processed. Firstly, OT 4389 was available in rich text format, in an unstructured file. The text needed to be separated into separate biblical books, and then transformed into the appropriate XML format for the lemmatizer and POS tagger. In our initial runs, we used the current structured form of the lexicons (i. e., without lemmatization of the glosses), but in later iterations we have also added the sequence of lemmatized words from the gloss.

For each of the books, we have then searched for each autosemantic word in the glosses from each of the lexicons. Initially, we intended to forego the lemmatization of the lexicons, seeing that, in most cases, they do not contain full sentences but rather disparate words and phrases, and, as such, a POS tagger might not yield accurate results. In order to account for variations on word forms, we have employed a set of similarity measures (such as Levenshtein or Cosine), but on analysing the results, we determined that the matches obtained were poor. We had, therefore, to also lemmatize the Romanian glosses in the lexicons, regardless of the low accuracy of obtained data, and, upon checking the results, we have found that this choice yielded significantly better accuracy. Below, we have given our analysis on two of the biblical books, Genesis and Daniel.

We chose to perform the comparison on the Book of Genesis (= Gen.) because the text is longer, the lexis is quite diverse and also because it is mentioned several times as a reference in the body of definitions in Lex.Ber. (and also in the Romanian lexicons). Another characteristic is the high number of proper names, yet this particular difficulty was overcome by eliminating them manually. We opted for the elimination of proper names so that we could avoid providing an erroneous perspective on the relation between the lexis units that made the object of our analysis. The fact that the authors of Romanian lexicons retain just a small number of the proper names included in Lex.Ber. is already known. Moreover, the authors of Romanian lexicons do not retain ethnonyms, the names of Biblical peoples. The few proper names and ethnonyms that still occur are included in the definitions of other words.

The same operations were performed for the Book of Daniel (= Dan.), which we chose because it is from the second part of OT 4389, it is shorter, and it is a prophetic book, the discourse having other linguistic characteristics than in Genesis. We aimed at verifying the validity of the results obtained for Gen. on another book.

The outcomes of automatic lemmatization required manual correction. For instance, in one gloss from Lex.Pet., the lemma “a îngreca” (‘to get pregnant’) is extracted for the form “îngreez”, while the actual lemma is “a îngreuna” (‘to make difficult’). This is a case in which automatic processing results in ‘false friends’ that need to be eliminated manually for the sake of statistical accuracy.

Initially, prior to the elimination of proper names and ethnonyms, 1348 autosemantic words were identified in Gen. OT 4389 following automatic lemmatization. Subsequently, after the inventory analysis and the elimination of proper names and ethnonyms, there remained 1135 autosemantic words. Of these, 542 are found in Lex.Mosc., 773 in Lex.St., 859 in Lex.3473, 779 in Lex.Pet., 558 in Lex.1348, and 718 in Lex.Mard. A number of 167 words (around 10%) from Gen. OT 4389 were not found in any of the lexicons. The percentage

would have been much higher (around 30%), had we not eliminated the above-mentioned categories from the inventory.

Following automatic lemmatization, 770 autosemantic words were found in Dan. OT 4389. We eliminated the proper names, the Hebraisms (e.g., *mane*, *thekel*, *fares*), the ethnonyms. There remained 735 autosemantic words. Of these, 539 are to be found in Lex.Mosc.; 539 in Lex.St.; 597 in Lex.3473; 541 in Lex.Pet.; 418 in Lex.1348; 496 in Lex.Mard. 84 lexemes from Dan. OT 4389 were not found in any of the lexicons.

2.3.2 Interpretation of results

A first observation refers to the absence from the lexicons of the proper names occurring in Gen. OT 4389. We have selected those rare instances in which proper names were preserved, but, in the great majority of cases, Biblical proper names and names of Biblical peoples (occurring quite frequently in the Book of Genesis: Philistines, Canaanites, Egyptians, etc.) are omitted in the Romanian lexicons. For instance, *Eghipet* occurs in the lexicons in the explanation for the Slavonic лавириѡѣ, therefore with no reference to the Biblical text (in fact, it was an extremely well-known proper name); however, *eghiptean* ‘Egyptian’ has no occurrence whatsoever in the lexicons. *Iacov* occurs in lexicons in the definition for бѣноѡѣ (the name of one of Jacob’s sons), which is a reference to Gen. 25, 18. This anthroponym was also very common. *Iordan* (Gen. 32, 10) also occurs in a definition (for акриды – the name of a plant); *Isac* – in the definition for the Slavonic плумлюса ‘to walk’, as a reference to Gen. 24⁵.

One can note that the lexical inventory common to Gen. OT 4389 differs from one lexicon to another. Not surprisingly, the highest degree of commonality seems to be a feature of Lex.3473, which can be explained by the fact that this lexicon provides more extensive Romanian definitions; things are quite different in the case of Lex.1348, which most often indicates only the Romanian equivalent of the Slavonic headword, without further details, even when the definition in Lex.Ber. is extensive. The high degree of commonality between Gen. OT 4389 and Lex.Mard. is quite surprising, as the latter has a smaller inventory of entries compared to the other lexicons (see Gînsac/Moruz/Ungureanu 2021, pp. 5f.); however, the author of Lex.Mard. does not innovate with regard to the lexicon inventory, remaining the most faithful to the source (Lex.Ber.). Furthermore, we should note the small number of terms in Gen. OT 4389 which do not appear in lexicons; this aspect may indicate either that the texts originate from the same dialectal area or that their authors shared the same basic vocabulary. The 168 terms missing from the lexicons can be explained by the very nature of the texts, as these terms are specific to Biblical texts (e.g., *tîritoare* ‘crawlers’, *slujnic* ‘servant’); on the other hand, the lemmatizer separated inflectional forms (mostly participles) that have no equivalent in the lexicons because of the specificity of their (descriptive) definitions (for instance, *a spăla* ‘to wash’ occurs in the lexicons, whereas *spălat* ‘washed’ does not). Other words (e.g., *cinie* ‘tool’, *a se ciudi* ‘to wonder’) could have already had an archaic character in the second half of the 17th century; their presence in the translation of the OT

⁵ Whenever the context is indicated in the lexicons, it can be compared with its translation in Gen. OT 4389. In this particular case, OT 4389: “Și ieși Isaac îndeseară la cîmp să se primble” (= Isaac went out early in the evening to the field to walk). Lexicons: “Ieși Isaac a se primbla la cîmp îndesară” (= Isaac went out to the field to meditate early in the evening). The differences are related to word-order (the translation from OT 4389 does not follow the word order in the Slavonic text, as opposed to the lexicons, in which word order is faithfully preserved).

is due to the conservative nature of the religious language, while the lexicons were not governed by the same constraints.

The above observations are also valid for the Book of Daniel: the greatest number of common lexemes is to be found in Lex.3473, and the smallest – in Lex.1348, with a surprisingly high percentage in Lex.Mard. (given its relatively small number of entries). Some of the 84 lexemes missing from the lexicons are specific to the Biblical texts (*căpetenie* ‘chief, ruler’, *cioplitură* ‘pagan idol’, *greșeală* ‘sin’, *osîndă* ‘punishment’, a *pîngări* ‘to defile’, *prorocie* ‘prophecy’, etc.). Others might have already been considered archaic in the second half of the 17th century (*a conceni* ‘to destroy’, *concenire* ‘destruction’), specific to the religious texts, which were based on a tradition, but not to a dictionary that used the current language for equivalences and definitions. Equally interesting is the case of *a blagoslovi* ‘to bless’ (from Slavon. *благословити*), found in OT 4389, but missing from the lexicons, which give, for this exact Slavonic word, the equivalent *a binecuvînta*, calquing the Slavonic model, but with components of Latin origin.

We have given below a few lexemes that can be found both in OT 4389 and in the lexicons. We have correlated this information, whenever possible, with the occurrences in the Romanian language thesaurus (DLR) and compared it with the other version of the OT mentioned above (OT 45, which originated from a different geographic area, namely Moldavia) and with the 1688 Bible.

The noun *filosof* ‘philosopher’ is found in the OT 4389 in Gen. 41, where it is the equivalent of the Slavonic *сказатель*. This Slavonic term is equated in the Romanian lexicons by *spui-tor* (‘the one who speaks’), an etymological rendering (*сказати* = *a spune* ‘to speak’). However, the term *filosof* existed in the vocabulary of those who compiled the first lexicons, since it is used in a definition (for *бгъ* ‘God’), where it translates Slavon. *любомждрыцъ* (literal: ‘wisdom lover’). For this word DLR does not provide an exhaustive distribution of occurrences, but indicates as the first attestation a work dating from 1642. In any case, this was not a frequently used word.

The noun *posadnică* ‘mistress’ is common for the lexicons and the OT 4389; in all the cases, it equates the same Slavonic term, *зложница*. In the other two texts (OT 45 and B 1688), in the same context it is used the word *țiuțoarea* (also to be found in the OT 4389). In the DLR, the term is considered regional, the first attestations dating from the same period in Wallachia.

An equally interesting term is *venetic* ‘foreigner’ (occurring both in the lexicons and the OT 4389), for which the OT 45 uses *nemearnic*. According to the DLR, this term is also attested in Wallachia in the second half of the century.

The noun *pușcărie* ‘jail’ is used both in lexicons and in OT 4389; in lexicons it is used as the equivalent of Slavon. *темница* – this choice is interesting, since Rom. *temniță* was also available. According to DLR, the first attestation of *pușcărie* is in the second half of the 17th century, in texts from Wallachia, while *temniță* was registered since the 16th century. Also intriguing is the choice of the translator of OT 4389, who uses *temniță* and *pușcărie* in the same verse (Gen. 39, 22), both as translations of Slav. *темница* – probably in order to avoid repetition, while in the next verse *pușcărie* is used twice, which means that he used *temniță* due to the Slavonic word he had to translate, but *pușcărie* was more familiar to him.

3. Conclusions

The first conclusion derived from the comparison of the lexical inventory from OT 4389 (the Books of Genesis and Daniel) with the one in the lexicons is that these lexicons do not seem to have been conceived as translation tools or at least as translation tools for the Biblical text. The lack of specific terms, the absence of proper names and of names of Biblical peoples, the selection of the terms that seems to favour the fundamental vocabulary, all these aspects point to a type of user that was not necessarily a clergyman; to this we may add the observation that the definitions that are rather explicative indicate the fact that the lexicons were more likely drafted for text reception rather than text production.

We noted a few cases that could indicate a relation between the texts we analysed; however, we have insufficient proof to claim a common paternity of these texts; for relevant results, the investigation must be extended towards the entire Biblical text. Another possible approach would be the reverse one, in which the inventory of the lexicons would be related to the inventory of the OT. Last but not least, quantitative analysis is necessary, as it facilitates data extraction; nevertheless, it has to be correlated with a qualitative analysis that would focus on the Slavonic terms equated in each case (thus a translational approach to the resulting material must be added). The statistics, however, indicate interesting data that will provide the basis for a broader future approach.

References

Corpus

- Lex.1348 = The Lexicon from Rom. ms. no. 1348, Romanian Academy Library, Bucharest (1–84v).
- Lex.3473 = The Lexicon from Rom. ms. no. 3473, Romanian Academy Library, Bucharest (1–369).
- Lex.Ber. = Pamvo Berynda: Ле҃ѣиконѣ славеноросскій и именѣ тлѣкованіе, Kiev, 1627. Edition by V. Nimciuk, 1961. Online: <http://litopys.org.ua/berlex/be.htm>.
- Lex.Mard. = The Lexicon of Mardarie Cozianul, Rom. ms. no. 450, Romanian Academy Library, Bucharest, 1649.
- Lex.Mosc. = The Lexicon from Moscow, Russian State Archive of Old Documents, Fond 188, Оп. 1. Ч. 2., p. 491.
- Lex.Pet. = The Lexicon from Petersburg, the National Library of Russia in Sankt Petersburg (notice n° Q.XVI.5 – Славяно-молдавский словарь).
- Lex.St. = The Lexicon from Rom. ms. no. 312, Romanian Academy Library, Bucharest (41r–216v).
- OT 4389 = The Old Testament from Rom. ms. no. 4389, Romanian Academy Library, Bucharest.
- OT 45 = The Old Testament from Rom. ms. no. 45, Library of the Romanian Academy, Cluj-Napoca.

Secondary literature

- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2014): Bilingual lexicography: translation dictionaries. In: Hanks, P./de Schryver, G. M. (eds.): *International handbook of modern lexis and lexicography*. Berlin/Heidelberg, pp. 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4_6-1.
- Andriescu, Al. (1988): Locul Bibliei de la București în istoria culturii, literaturii și limbii române literare. In: Andriescu, Al. et al.: *Monumenta linguae Dacoromanorum. Biblia 1688. Pars I. Genesis*. Iași, pp. 7–45.

- Cândea, V. (1979): *Rațiunea dominantă*. Cluj-Napoca.
- Chivu, G. (2008): *Dictionarium valachico-latinum. Primul dicționar al limbii române*. Bucharest.
- Chivu, G. (2012): *Lexiconul de la Buda, primul dicționar modern al limbii române*. In: *Analele Universității "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iași. Secțiunea IIIe. Lingvistică* 58, pp. 45–56.
- Crețu, G. (ed.) (1900): *Mardarie Cozianul. Lexicon slavo-românesc și tâlcuirea numelor din 1649*. Bucharest.
- 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>.
- Gînsac, A.-M./Ungureanu, M. (2018): *La lexicographie slavonne-roumaine au XVIIe siècle*. In: *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 134 (3), pp. 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, A192, pp. 1–11, <https://doi.org/10.17684/i14A192en>.
- Gruszczyński, W./Saloni, Z. (2013): *From multilingual to monolingual dictionaries. A historical overview of Polish lexicography*. In: *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 8 (4), pp. 205–227.
- Kovalenko, K. (2016): *Sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Russian lexicons: peculiarities of the first representatives*. In: *Studia Slavica Hungarica* 61 (2), pp. 275–283.
- Lew, R. (2015): *Dictionaries and their users*. In: Hanks, P./de Schryver, G. M. (eds.): *International handbook of modern lexis and lexicography*. Berlin/Heidelberg, pp. 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-45369-4_11-2.
- Mihăilă, G. (1972): *Contribuții la istoria culturii și literaturii române vechi*. Bucharest.
- Romanian Academy (2010): *Dicționarul limbii române*. Bucharest (= DLR).
- Ševčenko, I. (1984): *The many worlds of Peter Mohyla*. In: *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 8 (1–2), pp. 9–44.
- Stankiewicz, E. (1984): *Grammars and dictionaries of the Slavic languages from the middle ages up to 1850: an annotated bibliography*. Berlin.
- Strungaru, D. (1966): *Începuturile lexicografiei române*. In: *Romanoslavica* 13, pp. 141–158.
- Ursu, N. A. (1995): *Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, traducătorul Îndreptării legii (Târgoviște, 1652) (I)*. In: *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 46 (1–6), pp. 157–173.
- Ursu, N. A. (2003): *Activitatea literară necunoscută a lui Daniil Andrean Panoneanul, traducătorul Îndreptării legii (Târgoviște, 1652) (IV)*. In: *Studii și cercetări lingvistice* 54 (1–2), pp. 189–201.
- Varantola, K. (2002): *Use and usability of dictionaries: common sense and context sensibility?*. In: Corréad, M. H. (ed.): *Lexicography and natural language processing. A festschrift in honour of B. T. S. Atkins*. Grenoble, pp. 30–44.

Contact information

Mihai-Alex Moruz

Faculty of Computer Science, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Iași
mmoruz@info.uaic.ro

Mădălina Ungureanu

Institute of Interdisciplinary Research, Department of Social Sciences and Humanities, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University, Iași
madandronic@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by a grant of the Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization, CNCS/CCCDI – UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P1-1.1-TE -2019-0517, within PNCDI III.