

WALKER RIGGS THOMPSON

Epifanii Slavinetzkii's Greek–Slavonic–Latin Lexicon between East and West

EMPIRIE UND THEORIE
DER SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT
BAND 8

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg



EMPIRIE UND THEORIE
DER SPRACHWISSENSCHAFT



Band 8
Herausgegeben von
Jadranka Gvozdanović

Editorial Board
Peter Auer
James P. Blevins



WALKER RIGGS THOMPSON

Epifanii Slavinetiskii's
Greek–Slavonic–Latin
Lexicon
between East
and West

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Modern Languages
of Heidelberg University on 19.12.2023

Published with the support
of the German Academic Exchange Service.

UMSCHLAGBILD

First folio of manuscript Syn. Gr. 383
(State Historical Museum, Moscow),
showing initial entries for alpha.

ISBN 978-3-8253-9596-4

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt ins-
besondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

© 2024 Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg
Imprimé en Allemagne · Printed in Germany
Druck: Memminger MedienCentrum, 87700 Memmingen
Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlorfrei gebleichtem
und alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Den Verlag erreichen Sie im Internet unter:
www.winter-verlag.de

Аз настоящему труду чрез шесть лет подлежю, ибо первые три лета на чтении книг, яко выше воспоминах [...] се уже третий год в|сочинении сего дела изнуряю и вся дни и вся ночи непрестанно и з самым малейшим иногда плоти упокоением на сие дело иждивая, тяжкими недуги на всяк год одержим бех, паче же сими тремя последними леты. И перваго суффусию, или темную воду очесам случайную, втораго — звук во ушесех, третиего — скорбут, или цынготную болезнь теми приснорачительными стяжах себе трудами.

Subjecting myself to this work over the course of six years, the first three reading books, as I mentioned above [...] behold, I have been wearing myself out for over two years already in composing this work, and, spending every day and every night on this task incessantly, with only the very slightest rest for my flesh, I have been gripped by grievous infirmities each year, all the more so during these last three years: first, suffusio, or dark water in the eyes; second, ringing in the years; and third, scurvy — this is what I have earned through these ever-ardent labours.

(Ioann Maksymovych on his lexicographical labours,
quoted from NIKOLAEV 2009: 87)

Table of Contents

Preface and Acknowledgments	13
1 Introduction	17
1.1 Research Goals and Methods	17
1.2 Formal Conventions	24
2 Background and State of Research	29
2.1 Primary Sources and Manuscript Tradition	29
2.2 Epifanii Slavinskii's Trilingual Dictionary in Context	41
2.2.1 Lexicography as a Cultural Practice	41
2.2.2 Language Attitudes among the Early Modern East Slavs	43
2.2.3 Language Attitudes in Muscovy in the Era of Nikon's Reforms	50
2.2.4 Latin and Greek as Languages of Communication in Muscovy	59
2.2.5 Epifanii Slavinskii: 'Graecophile' or 'Latinizer'?	63
2.2.6 Epifanii Slavinskii's Latin Lexicographical Works	72
3 Description of Ms. Syn. Gr. 383	81
3.1 General Description	81
3.1.1 Pagination and Foliation	82
3.1.2 Writing Systems Used	82
3.1.3 Corrections and Insertions	83
3.1.4 Insertions and Re-ordering of Entries	84
3.1.5 The Signature of Ivan Arbenev	86
3.2 Grapholinguistic Analysis	87
3.2.1 Introduction and Theoretical Premises	87
3.2.2 Writing Samples and Analysis of Individual Characters	90
3.2.3 Greek and Latin Diacritics	127
3.2.4 Punctuation and Separation of Semantic Units	128
3.2.5 Numerals	129
3.3 Comparison with the Copy Titov 67	129
3.4 Summary	134
4 Formal Structural Description	135
4.1 Dictionary Production in Early Modern Europe	135
4.2 Dictionary Structures and Why They Matter	137
4.3 Types of Dictionaries	138
4.4 Macrostructure	141
4.4.1 Resolution of Orthographic and Phonetic Variation	142

4.4.2 Diacritics	143
4.4.3 Space Between Words	146
4.5 Mediostructure	147
4.6 Microstructure	151
4.6.1 Components of Dictionary Articles	151
4.6.2 Lemmata and Items Giving Orthography	154
4.6.3 Grammatical Information and Morphology	155
4.6.4 Items Giving Meaning	161
4.6.5 Example Microstructures	162
4.6.6 Structural Precursors of the GSL	168
5 Analysis of Sources	173
5.1 Preliminary Considerations and State of Research	173
5.2 Johann Scapula's Lexicon and Nesting Structures	175
5.3 Other Sources Mentioned in Previous Studies	182
5.4 Previously Unconsidered Sources	188
5.5 Descriptive Texts and Their Sources	201
5.6 Epifanii's Use of Primary Sources	224
5.6.1 References to the Old Testament	226
5.6.2 References to the New Testament	237
5.6.3 References to Patristic Texts	240
5.6.4 Preliminary Conclusions	246
5.6.5 The System of References as a Feature of Academic Language	247
6 The Slavonic Variety in Epifanii's Dictionary	253
6.1 Preliminary Remarks and Terminological Clarifications	253
6.1.1 Epifanii Slavinetskii and Ruthenian	253
6.1.2 "Church Slavonic" and "Book Language"	255
6.2 Vocabulary (Lexis)	257
6.3 Phonology	260
6.4 Inflectional Morphology	266
6.4.1 Verbal Morphology	266
6.4.2 Nominal Morphology	271
6.5 Derivational Morphology	271
6.5.1 Comparative and Superlative Adjectives	271
6.5.2 Polish/Ruthenian Influence on Suffixation	273
6.5.3 Doublets and the Formation of Abstract Vocabulary	277
6.5.4 Suffixation and Word Families	281
7 Latin Influence on Vocabulary and Borrowing	285
7.1 Latin Vocabulary and 'Internationalisms'	285
7.2 Specific Types of Latin Influence	287
7.2.1 Greek Loanwords in Latin	287

7.2.2 Latin Borrowings without a Greek Model	293
7.2.3 Greek Elements in Compounds with Latin Motivation	293
7.2.4 Greek Loanwords in Latin but not in Slavonic	296
7.2.5 Latin Equivalents and the Choice of Slavonic Translations	296
8 Academic Vocabulary in the GSL	301
8.1 Case Study I: Terms for Academic Disciplines	302
8.2 Case Study II: Grammatical Terminology	307
8.3 Case Study III: Poetic and Metrical Terminology	314
9 Summary and Future Prospects	317
Bibliography	323
Appendix 1. Tables for Sources Analysis	359
Appendix 2. HTR Models for Syn. Gr. 383	393
Index of Names	409

Index of Tables

Table 3.1. Writing Samples: Correction Markers in Syn. Gr. 383	85
Table 3.2. The Signature of <i>d'iak</i> Ivan Arbenev	86
Table 3.3. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨α⟩, Cyrillic ⟨а⟩, Latin ⟨a⟩	90
Table 3.4. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨б⟩, Latin ⟨b⟩	92
Table 3.5. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨β⟩, Cyrillic ⟨в⟩, Latin ⟨u⟩	93
Table 3.6. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨γ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨г⟩ and ⟨r⟩, Latin ⟨g⟩	95
Table 3.7. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨δ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨д⟩, Latin ⟨d⟩	98
Table 3.8. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ε⟩, Cyrillic ⟨е⟩, Latin ⟨e⟩	99
Table 3.9. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨ж⟩	100
Table 3.10. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ζ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨з⟩ and ⟨s⟩, Latin ⟨z⟩	101
Table 3.11. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨θ⟩	103
Table 3.12. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨η⟩, Cyrillic ⟨н⟩	103
Table 3.13. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ι⟩, Cyrillic ⟨и⟩, Latin ⟨i⟩	104
Table 3.14. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨й⟩	105
Table 3.15. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨κ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨к⟩, Latin ⟨k⟩	105
Table 3.16. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨λ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨л⟩, Latin ⟨l⟩	106
Table 3.17. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨μ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨м⟩, Latin ⟨m⟩	107
Table 3.18. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ν⟩, Cyrillic ⟨н⟩, Latin ⟨n⟩	108
Table 3.19. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ξ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨ξ⟩, Latin ⟨x⟩	109
Table 3.20. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ο⟩, Cyrillic ⟨о⟩, Latin ⟨o⟩	110
Table 3.21. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨π⟩, Cyrillic ⟨п⟩, Latin ⟨p⟩	110
Table 3.22. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ρ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨р⟩, Latin ⟨r⟩	111
Table 3.23. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨σ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨с⟩, Latin ⟨s⟩	112
Table 3.24. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨τ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨т⟩, Latin ⟨t⟩	114
Table 3.25. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ου⟩, Cyrillic ⟨у⟩ / ⟨8⟩, Latin ⟨u⟩	116
Table 3.26. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨υ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨у⟩, Latin ⟨y⟩	117
Table 3.27. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨φ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨ф⟩ and ⟨ø⟩, Latin ⟨f⟩	118
Table 3.28. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨χ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨х⟩	119
Table 3.29. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ψ⟩, Cyrillic ⟨ψ⟩	119
Table 3.30. Writing Samples: Greek ⟨ω⟩, Cyrillic ⟨ω⟩	120
Table 3.31. Writing Samples: Cyrillic Ligature ⟨ѿ⟩	121
Table 3.32. Writing Samples: ⟨иї⟩	122
Table 3.33. Writing Samples: ⟨чч⟩	122
Table 3.34. Writing Samples: ⟨иш⟩	122
Table 3.35. Writing Samples: ⟨иш⟩	122
Table 3.36. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨ѣ⟩	122
Table 3.37. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨ѣа⟩ and ⟨ѣа⟩	123
Table 3.38. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨ю⟩	123

Table 3.39. Writing Samples: Latin ⟨æ⟩	124
Table 3.40. Writing Samples: Latin ⟨α⟩	124
Table 3.41. Writing Samples: Latin ⟨h⟩	125
Table 3.42. Writing Samples: Latin ⟨qu⟩	125
Table 3.43. Writing Samples: Cyrillic yers	126
Table 3.44. Writing Samples: Cyrillic ⟨ѣ⟩	126
Table 3.45. Comparison of Lemma Stretch β - $\beta\alpha\beta$ -	130
Table 4.1. α with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 1 ^r)	144
Table 4.2. $\alpha\iota$ with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 21 ^r)	144
Table 4.3. $\epsilon\omega$ with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 316 ^v)	144
Table 4.4. η with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 319 ^v)	144
Table 4.5. $\omicron\iota$ with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 489 ^v)	144
Table 4.6. ω with Diacritics (Ordering of Entries) (Syn. Gr. 383, f. 751 ^r)	145
Table 4.7. Most Frequent Comments on Nominal Morphology	156
Table 4.8. Most Frequent Comments on Verbal Morphology	157
Table 5.1. Lemma Stretch $\alpha\epsilon\theta\lambda$ - in the Scapula Dictionary	180
Table 5.2. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\alpha\alpha\sigma\iota$ - $\alpha\alpha\tau\alpha$ -	186
Table 5.3. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\alpha\alpha$ -	192
Table 5.4. Initial Articles for Alpha	202
Table 5.5. Greek Examples in the Initial Article for Alpha (Comparison)	211
Table 5.6. Entries for $\omega\alpha$ with Diacritics in the GSL	213
Table 5.7. Comparison of Entries for α with Diacritics ($\tilde{\alpha}$ - $\check{\alpha}\alpha$)	214
Table 5.8. Comparison of Entries for ω with Diacritics (ω - $\tilde{\omega}$)	216
Table 5.9. Outward Form of References	249
Table 5.10. Summary Abbreviations in References	250
Table 6.1. Select Greek Past-tense Forms and their Slavonic Renderings	270
Table 7.1. Latin-Influenced Translations of Greek Compounds	298
Table 7.2. Latin Predication of Slavonic Translation Equivalents	298
Table 8.1. Terms for Phonetics/Phonology and Accentuation	308
Table 8.2. Terms for Diacritics	309
Table 8.3. Terms for Parts of Speech	310
Table 8.4. Terms for Grammatical Gender	311
Table 8.5. Terms for Number	311
Table 8.6. Terms for Case	312
Table 8.7. Terms for Comparison of Adjectives	312
Table 8.8. Terms for Verbal Categories	313
Table A1.1. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\alpha\alpha$ - in Six Dictionaries	360
Table A1.2. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\alpha\gamma\alpha$ - $\alpha\gamma\alpha\pi$ -	367
Table A1.3. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\beta\alpha\theta\upsilon$ - in Five Dictionaries	373
Table A1.4. Comparison of Lemma Stretch $\kappa\epsilon\kappa$ - in Three Dictionaries	381
Table A1.5. Comparison of Stretch $\tau\upsilon\phi$ - in Three Dictionaries	388
Table A2.1. Training Process for GSL Transkribus HTR+ Models	396

Index of Figures

Figure 2.1. Writing Sample from Epifanii's Philological Lexicon	75
Figure 3.1. Example of Inline Reordering	84
Figure 3.2. Example of Reordered Lemmata	84
Figure 3.3. Writing Sample from Ms. Titov 67 (f. 240 ^v)	133
Figure 4.1. General Abstract Mediostructure	148
Figure 4.2. Mediostructure of the GSL (Cross-references)	149
Figure 4.3. Example Mediostructure from Leymarie (1583)	150
Figure 4.4. Example Mediostructure from PamBerLex	150
Figure 4.5. Hierarchical Microstructure (GSL, 1)	163
Figure 4.6. Abstract Hierarchical Simple Microstructure (GSL, 1)	163
Figure 4.7. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (GSL, 2)	164
Figure 4.8. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (GSL, 3)	165
Figure 4.9. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (GSL, 4)	165
Figure 4.10. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (Crastone)	169
Figure 4.11. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (ES/Calepino)	170
Figure 4.12. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (Knapiusz, 1626)	171
Figure 4.13. Graph of Hierarchical Microstructure (Calepino, 1598)	171
Figure 5.1. Nesting Microstructure of Scapula (1652)	176
Figure 5.2. Example Nesting Microstructure from Scapula (1652)	178
Figure 5.3. Wordlist from Calepino (1598)	185
Figure A2.1. Progression of Performance Across Model Versions	397
Figure A2.2. Learning Curve for the Model <i>Slavineckij_PyLala_test</i>	398
Figure A2.3. Test Fragment 1, Transkribus Layout/Segmentation	399
Figure A2.4. Test Fragment 2, Transkribus Layout/Segmentation	401
Figure A2.5. Kraken Training Curve	404
Figure A2.6. Calamari Deep3 Training Curve	405

Preface and Acknowledgments

In multiple ways, it is an ideal situation for a young researcher to be handed a virtually unstudied manuscript of great significance and told, “make of it what you can”. Such a stroke of good fortune befell Tamila Mgaloblishvili, my first true academic mentor. For her doctoral project, she had the privilege of being the first to study the Klarjeti Polycephalaion, an Old Georgian miscellany harbouring essential clues to the early history of the Antiochene and Jerusalem liturgies. The world suddenly and tragically lost this brilliant scholar in 2018 at the age of 74. She was a formative, inspiring, and nurturing figure for me. I owe much – not least my decision to undertake a Master’s degree and doctorate in the first place – to her personal example, guidance, and friendship.

And so in 2019, when my future supervisor, Prof. Irina Podtergera, suggested that I come to Heidelberg to write my own doctoral thesis (of which this book is a gently altered version) on Epifanii Slavinskii’s barely studied trilingual Greek–Slavonic–Latin Lexicon, I was inclined to regard it as a symmetric opportunity, and a golden one withal. Yet as soon became clear, such a task implies considerable responsibility. In undertaking an extensive study of a large, under-researched source, one is, in a certain sense, out on one’s own, lacking the company and assurance of other scholars. This leaves one prone to error, due as much to excessive self-reliance as to uncertainty and incomplete information. At the same time, one constantly runs the risk of producing a timid, descriptive work that does not probe under the surface or contextualize the documented facts and material with reference to scholarly opinion. I hope that I have been able to navigate these risks here. If I have succeeded in doing so, however imperfectly, it is due in no small part to the guidance I have received from Prof. Podtergera, who has often urged me at crucial junctures to look farther and deeper. All the same, it would be futile to attempt to disguise the fact that Epifanii’s lexicon, in all its richness and complexity, remains the centerpiece of this study and the focal point to which all of the discussion and analysis ultimately return. Given the historical significance, monumental character, and – dare I say – beauty of this dictionary, I hope that I have been able to do it justice.

The strenuous nature of some of the tasks involved in the work on this project has certainly engendered sympathy for Ioann Maksymovych, whose reflections on the travails of composing his own dictionary in 18th-century Muscovy were quoted as an epigraph above. Indeed, reaching this point has entailed a non-trivial expenditure of effort. In particular, the transcription of tens of thousands of Greek, Slavonic, and Latin lexemes from Epifanii's dictionary, took the better part of a year and a half alongside other preparatory work. This is not to mention the 10,000 words from Johann Scapula's lexicon that then had to be input in order to make an adequate comparison with this key (supposed) source. Yet these steps were indispensable in order to generate a halfway representative set of machine-readable data for further computer-assisted comparative and statistical analysis.

It would hardly have been possible to accomplish any of this without the generous support of a number of individuals and organizations, to whom I would like to express my sincere gratitude here.

The majority of the direct work on my thesis was financed by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) after I was nominated in 2020 for a DAAD–GSSP scholarship by the Heidelberg Graduate School for the Humanities and Social Sciences (HGGS). The DAAD has also generously defrayed part of the costs of the publication of this book. In this connection, I would specially like to thank Dr. Astrid Wind, the director of the HGGS, for her kind mentorship and practical assistance with the affairs surrounding my scholarship. Beyond this, funding for developing some of our internal digital infrastructure and a methodological basis for digital lexicography was provided by Heidelberg University's Research Council Field of Focus 3 and the Heidelberg Forum for Digital Humanities, as part of the project *OCR-Technologien im Vergleich* (ExU 3.28; principal investigator: Prof. Dr. Irina Podtergera).

As stated above, the idea and inspiration for this project were provided by my supervisor, Prof. Podtergera. Her support, practical and academic alike, has been indispensable throughout the process. I also wholeheartedly thank the two examiners of my thesis, Prof. Sebastian Kempgen and Prof. Vittorio Springfield Tomelleri, for their careful reading and prompt assessment of my work, for travelling to Heidelberg for the viva voce exam, and for their advice and suggestions prior to and during the publication process. Special thanks go to my colleague Marina Samsonova, for her steadfast friendship in fair weather and foul, her intelligent suggestions on the content of my thesis, and for helping me

overcome mental roadblocks on the way to finishing it. Further thanks for helping me to access hard-to-find texts or other information go to Prof. Aleksei Pentkovskii, Dr. Aleksandr Levichkin, Prof. Achim Rabus, Dr. Tatiana Popova, Prof. Rainer Stichel, Dr. Nikolai Antonov, Rev. Prof. Pavel Khondzinskii, Rev. Maksim Pliakin, and Olga Hailova. Feedback from my erstwhile Church Slavonic tutor, Dr. Catherine Mary MacRobert, led to some important fine-tuning on points of linguistic detail. Prof. Tino Licht gave extremely helpful tips on some difficult palaeographical matters. I further profited from exchanges of ideas with Prof. Paul Bushkovitch, Prof. Aleksandr Grishchenko, Dr. Evgenii Filimonov, Dr. Howard Jones, and Stefan Schneck. I am deeply indebted to my Heidelberg friends and colleagues Nicolas Jansens, Alexander Böh-nisch, and Richard Dean for their moral support and valuable feedback on my texts and presentations in our graduate research colloquium – and to Nicolas in particular for thoroughly reviewing the entire manuscript immediately prior to publication. Last but certainly not least, I am immensely grateful to my good friends Elizabeth Langeron and John Pumphrey for assiduously reading through several chapters and offering their thoughts and suggestions on them.

On a technical level, Achim Rabus and I have a long and fruitful collaboration on handwritten text-recognition (HTR) that fed into the discussion of these topics in Appendix 2. I was assisted in implementing the open-source HTR tools Kraken and eScriptorium, and in tweaking the training hyperparameters for them, by Benjamin Kiessling and Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (Paris), the respective creators of these platforms. In general, I have relied heavily for text-processing tasks on the core UNIX/POSIX utilities provided with the FreeBSD operating system, as well as on open-source programs such as LibreOffice, GIMP, FontForge, and RStudio for producing this book. I would thus like to express my gratitude to all the developers and maintainers of these and other software tools from which I have benefited at no cost to myself.

Yet above all others, it is my parents, Benjamin and Rebecca (a tireless editor who helped to check over my drafts), and my sister, Honor, who have supported me unfailingly and unconditionally in all my endeavours, however arcane or abstruse, and not least throughout the past decade of my undergraduate and postgraduate studies. It is thus unthinkable that this book could be dedicated to anyone but them.

1 Introduction

1.1 Research Goals and Methods

The main object of study in the present work is Epifanii Slavinetiskii's trilingual Greek–Slavonic–Latin Lexicon (hereinafter: GSL). The GSL is the first known East Slavic dictionary in three languages. It was compiled in Moscow in the mid-17th century by Epifanii, a learned Ruthenian monk who had previously been a highly regarded teacher and cleric in Kiev (BRAILOVSKII 1890a: 286; PANCHENKO 1992: 310; STRAKHOV 2002: 5). After being summoned to Muscovy by Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich, he became an eminent figure in cultural and ecclesiastical life there, something akin to what we would perhaps now term a 'public intellectual'. He was one of the foremost participants in Patriarch Nikon's mid-17th-century reforms of the Muscovite Church Slavonic service books and attended the Moscow Councils of 1660 and 1666–1667 that divided the Russian Church (on this context, see § 2.2.3). In philological debates and discussions, his intellectual stature and authority at the church councils and in the liturgical reforms were comparable with that of such prominent figures as Simeon of Polotsk and Paisios Ligarides. Because of this authority, he exerted a decisive outcome on the events surrounding Patriarch Nikon's deposition (PANCHENKO 1992: 310). At the same time, Epifanii is known for his achievements as a lexicographer and translator of Greek and Latin works – secular and religious alike – into the written language of the East Slavs.

The GSL is the largest of Epifanii Slavinetiskii's works, lexicographical or otherwise, running to 744 manuscript leaves *in folio*. The sheer volume of vocabulary it contains is no less impressive. According to statistics gleaned from transcriptions of the alpha, beta, and gamma alphabetical stretches of the dictionary, the 85 folios from these three sections alone contain 11,243 Greek lemmata, 25,340 Slavonic translations, and 21,000 Latin translations, or an average of ~677 translations per folio. Extrapolating from this, one comes to a total estimate exceeding 500,000 entries across all three languages. This is a truly gigantic

trove of lexical material which promises to provide new insights into the development of the written language of the East Slavs.

What is more, the GSL's direct and indirect impact on the subsequent development of Russian lexicography, and beyond, has been long since established in scholarship. First and foremost, Fedor Polikarpov-Orlov's well-known Slavonic-Greek-Latin *Dictionarium trilingue* was a direct reworking of the GSL (KEIPERT 1988a: VI, XVIII; EISMANN 1991: 3071; KOVTUN 1998: 55–56). Polikarpov's Lexicon then served as a source for other Russian translation dictionaries, such as that of Antiochus Canteмир for Russian-French (compiled in the 1730s; ed. BABAEVA 2004; cf. OTTEN 2010: 2). In this way, the vocabulary in Epifanii's dictionary, based on Greek and Latin models, was inherited by other East Slavic dictionaries for both ancient and vernacular languages.

And yet, despite its obvious significance and impact, the GSL itself has remained largely outside of the scope of scholarship. Essential aspects of its structure and linguistic profile have barely been described. Though a fair few 19th- and 20th-century scholars have referred to it in passing in their research (cf. § 2.1), to date, there have been only two original studies dedicated to it specifically: those of Brailovskii, in two parts (BRAILOVSKII 1890a–b), and STRAKHOV (2006). Both attempted to identify some of the dictionary's sources, but, even by their own admission, hardly exhausted this topic. This deficiency in research may be attributable to the size of the GSL, limited direct access to the manuscript, or the rather daunting task of approaching a largely unstudied lexicographical work in three pre-modern written languages, two of which are non-Slavic.

This book seeks to fill these gaps by investigating, in addition to the dictionary's sources, its linguistic character and select aspects of the development of academic (specifically, linguistic) vocabulary in it. The intention in doing so is not merely to give a more complete characterization of the dictionary *per se*, but also to describe more completely and rigorously the cultural processes and historical issues surrounding its creation, use, and reception. The primary timeframe under consideration will be what we might call the 'long' 17th c. of (Church) Slavonic lexicography and grammaticography in Ruthenia and Muscovy,¹ beginning

¹ The origin of this usage of 'long' in historical scholarship is a matter of some uncertainty. Despite isolated earlier attestations, Fernand Braudel is usually credited with popularizing it for the 16th century in his 1949

with the appearance of the *Adelphotes* grammar in Lviv in 1591 and ending with Polikarpov's dictionary in 1704. Looming large over this whole period, not least in the Ruthenian context, is Meletii Smotryts'kyi's 1619 *Hrammatiki Slavenskiia pravilnoie syntagma* (herein = SmotrGram1619); its influence will be traced throughout the GSL. The time-span will, moreover, be secondarily extended all the way back to the latter half of the 15th century, in relation to the Early Modern humanist lexicographical tradition that became the foundation for Epifanii's own dictionaries. Earlier grammatical works and traditions, such as those identified by KOCIUBA (1975) as sources for the Smotryts'kyi grammar, will likewise be taken into account in passing.

The ensuing discussion of these issues will touch on diverse topics spanning not only traditional philology and historical linguistics, but also contact linguistics and sociolinguistics. These include, but are not limited to: multilingualism and multilingual lexicography, the latter of which is drastically understudied with respect to the Early Modern Era (PRĘDOTA 2004: 7); contact amongst written languages (cf. the theory of 'literacies in contact', WETH / BÖHM / BUNČIĆ 2020); lexical borrowing (for conceptual and terminological overviews, see, e.g., THOMASON 2001: 70–71 *et passim* or DURKIN 2020), especially the distinction between assimilated and unassimilated loanwords, on the one hand, and literal/morphematic/verbatim calques (loan translations, Ger. *Lehnübersetzungen*) and loan formations (*Lehnprägungen*) on the other (BETZ 1944; 1949; 1974; etc.); language attitudes (e.g., GARVIN / MATHIOT 1968: 372–374; cf. FISHMAN 1972: 1) and deliberate reflection on language (Ger. *Sprachreflexion*; cf. ROELCKE 2014); formalistic approaches to classifying dictionaries (SCHERBA [1940] 2003) and describing their structure (GOUWS 2002; 2005, etc.; ENGELBERG / LEMNITZER 2005; WIEGAND et al. 2010), applied here, very possibly for the first time, to Early Modern bi- and trilingual dictionaries; and, last but not least, lexicography as a cultural practice (HAB-ZUMKEHR 2001; MÜLLER 2008; CONSIDINE 2008). It is hoped that the material presented in this work will provide useful new points of comparison for scholars working on such topics.

At the same time, several new hypotheses about Epifanii himself and his dictionary will serve as unifying threads throughout. The first of

book *La Méditerranée et le Monde Méditerranéen à l'Époque de Philippe II* (cf. LIBERMAN 2013).

these hypotheses is that, despite the persistent view in the scholarship that Epifanii Slavinetskii was a ‘Graecophile’ (STRAKHOV 1998: 44–49; USPENSKII 2002: 426; ISACHENKO 2004: XXIII; SAZONOVA 2009: 92, 110; KUZMINOVA 2013; etc.), Latin and Greek influences can be seen existing side-by-side and interacting in his written works. It was assumed traditionally that Epifanii had a personal preference for Greek over Latin literacy. This is partly because the real nature of his work was obscured by subsequent debates between factions within the Russian Church (§ 2.2.5). However, we will explore how, in compiling the GSL, Epifanii translated not only Greek lemmata and definitions, but also Latin texts and lexical equivalents from his presumed Western European sources. In particular, we may anticipate that this Latin influence will be manifested in the dictionary lexically through Slavonic morphematic calques from Latin or so-called ‘internationalisms’ (or ‘Europeanisms’) – that is, Greek loanwords transmitted via Latin into the new European written languages of the Early Modern era (cf., e.g., MUNSKE / KIRKNESS 1996; KEIPERT 2010; SCHMITT 2010; and § 7.1).

The second hypothesis concerns the written variety of Slavonic used by Epifanii Slavinetskii. A more detailed conceptualization and characterization of what exactly this variety was, and its relation to Ruthenian and Church Slavonic, will be given in the relevant section (§ 6.1). The main manuscript of the dictionary, Syn. Gr. 383, is a very valuable resource for clarifying this issue, in that it is Epifanii’s autograph. It should thus preserve characteristics of his language, including vernacular-written language interference phenomena. Given Epifanii’s Ruthenian origins, we can anticipate that Ms. Syn Gr. 383 exhibits distinctively Ruthenian (ortho)graphical, phonetic/phonological, and morphological features that set it apart from the prevalent Muscovite (Russian) Church Slavonic variety of the era. It is primarily the handwriting, spelling, and phonetic realizations of certain lexical items in the manuscript that will be examined in this light (§§ 3.2 and 6.3), but so, too, will derivational and inflectional morphology. Among other things, the word-formation strategies employed in the GSL will be analysed statistically as well as qualitatively through the lens of deliberately chosen examples, to show whether and how they represent an amalgamation of traditional written-language (Church) Slavonic models with Latin, Ruthenian, and Polish ones (§ 6.5). The investigation of these aspects should provide new source material substantiating the extensive transmission of Ruthenian (Church) Slavonic literacy to Muscovy in the 16th and 17th centuries

through the activities of Ukrainian and Belarusian scholars there. This is the same phenomenon that has alternately been dubbed the 'Third Church Slavonic Influence' (SHEVELOV 1960: 78) and 'Third South Slavonic Influence' (USPENSKII 2002: 411) on written Russian and Russian Church Slavonic; this impact of Ruthenian translators in Muscovy was also earlier identified by SOBOLEVSKII (1903: 43–44, 49), as well.

The third and final hypothesis is that the GSL exhibits features of a developed (Church) Slavonic academic (i.e., scholarly or 'scientific', in the broad sense of *wissenschaftlich* / *научный*) language. The development of scientific terminology and scholarly conventions was a process that was common across Early Modern European linguistic communities (cf., e.g., on 17th-century German, VON POLENZ 1988). It is reasonable to assume that Epifanii's dictionary played some role in this process for the East Slavic written language of the time, or at least reflected existing processes and trends. A preliminary attempt will be made at ascertaining what precisely this role was, by means of description and comparison of lexical items in the GSL, Epifanii's own Latin–Slavonic dictionary, and prior East Slavic reference works (especially Meletii Smotryts'kyi's Slavonic grammar). A particular focus will be terminology for grammatical categories – not only in the dictionary entries themselves (§ 8.2), but also in the metalinguistic capacity of conveying information about the morphology and semantics of lemmata (§ 4.5). Another area of interest is the format of references and the functional text segments that make up part of the dictionary's medio- and microstructure (§§ 4.6 and 5.6.5).

Generally, through the lens of these and other aspects, the present disquisition will shed new light on Epifanii Slavinetskii's philological legacy as the product of the interaction of different written traditions and inter-Slavic interaction (on this concept, see MOSER 2004). For Epifanii's lexicographical and translation works did not come into being in isolation, but rather at the intersection of South, West, and East Slavic literacy, and of (Neo-)Latin and Greek, Byzantine and Western European humanist culture. It is our conviction that a close, impartial look at the linguistic evidence in the GSL leads inevitably to a deeper understanding of the mid-17th-century Muscovite state as being far from an autarkic reserve of fossilized Graeco-Slavic culture, but rather a zone of intense cultural and linguistic contact in which different cultural influences and literacies from both East and West met and competed for space. This is supported by the fact that Moscow under Aleksei Mikhailovich was a vitally multilingual environment, in which Latin, Greek,

(Church) Slavonic, and Polish co-existed as written languages. Various historical documents testifying to this have been considered in bits and pieces by various scholars before, but never considered together as a single cohesive whole.

This very historical, cultural, and linguistic context, as well as the current state of research on the GSL, its historical creation and subsequent manuscript tradition, will be the subject of the first main chapter (Chapter 2). A particular focus will be on the prevalence of multilingualism in the learned milieu of mid-17th-century Muscovy, the time of Nikon's reforms of the Church books. This will primarily be accomplished on the basis of direct and indirect evidence from contemporary documents and historical accounts of the Church Councils in the 1660s. Descriptions of multilingualism in Early Modern Western Europe have been the subject of several book-length studies (for example, AMBROSCH-BAROUA 2013; GLÜCK et al. 2013; AMBROSCH-BAROUA et al. 2017; SCHARINGER 2018). The scope here will, obviously, be much narrower than in these studies, which are devoted exclusively to the topic and consider a wider range of sources. Nevertheless, the general principle of reconstructing situations of historical multilingualism is highly pertinent.

Following on from this background to the dictionary's creation, Chapter 3 will give a formal description of Ms. Syn. Gr. 383, the primary manuscript witness to the dictionary and Epifanii's own autograph, with a special focus on its graphical features and orthography. This description relies on both formal terminology and concepts from grapholinguistics (e.g., ZALIZNIAK 1979; REZEC 2009; MELETIS 2020; MELETIS /DÜRSCHIED 2022), and comparisons with writing samples in existing palaeographical manuals for the East Slavic Cyrillic scripts (SHCHEPKIN [1913] 1967; KARSKII [1928] 1978; CHEREPNIN 1956) and especially for Ruthenian cursive (PANASHENKO 1974). Another reference point is provided by Meletii Smotryts'kyi's 1619 grammar of Church Slavonic. As will be argued, Smotryts'kyi's work supplied many of the norms – orthographic, morphological, terminological – to which Epifanii Slavivetskii adhered in his manuscript of the GSL.

There follows an investigation of how the GSL adopts and adapts practices from the Western European Early Modern learned (humanist) lexicographical tradition, in terms of both structure (Chapter 4) and content (Chapter 5). This analysis of the dictionary's structure will make use of the terminology and methods for describing dictionary macro-

medio-, and microstructures that have been elaborated recently, especially in German-language research (above all, ENGELBERG / LEMNITZER 2005 and WIEGAND et al. 2010, but also GOUWS 2002; 2005). In ascertaining which dictionaries likely served as sources for the GSL, the approach applied is that of juxtaposition of alphabetical lemma stretches (Ger. *Lemmastrecken*; cf. WIEGAND et al. 2010: 187) from the GSL and its respective potential sources. This will be supplemented by a detailed comparison of Latin translation items (equivalents) and longer prose texts, which have been overlooked to a large extent in previous research. This will reveal how Epifanii Slavinetskii creatively synthesised composite Slavonic translation texts on the basis of multiple Latin sources – in other words, how he made an original contribution as a lexicographer at the same time as producing a derivative work. This investigation will be rounded off by an examination of references to primary sources (Patristic and Biblical, Greek and Slavonic) that were discovered in the process of transcribing large sections of the dictionary. These references help us to understand Epifanii Slavinetskii's mode of working on the GSL and his original contribution to lexicography and Greek–Church Slavonic translation more deeply.

The final part will focus on the language of the dictionary, with a focus on its particularly Ruthenian features (Chapter 6) and the role and functions of Latin (Chapter 7). With respect to the former, significant reference points are provided by academic descriptions of exemplars of written Ruthenian and Ruthenian Church Slavonic (BULICH [1893] 1986; GRÖSCHEL 1972; BUNČIĆ 2006; BOUNATIROU 2018; CITKO 2019; etc.). Given the likelihood that Epifanii Slavinetskii himself was born in a Ruthenian dialect area within the confines of modern-day Belarus (ROTAR 1900a: 4–6; IAKIMOVICH 1975: 7; cf. § 6.1.1), works on the historical development of Belarusian will also be consulted (e.g., KARSKII 1908; 1911; WEXLER 1977). The investigation of the latter topic – the role of Latin in the dictionary – will be facilitated in particular by frameworks for classifying lexical borrowings, whether loanwords or loan translations. These include the traditional schemes of BETZ (e.g., 1944) and concepts from the modern field of Eurolinguistics (e.g., the contributions in HINRICHS 2010). The approach sketched out by KEIPERT (1973) is followed in identifying Latin loanwords borrowed through Polish and Ruthenian. Furthermore, existing historical and etymological dictionaries of Ukrainian and Belarusian will serve as central resources for tracing the lexemes' origins and the history of their use. The discus-

sion of the dictionary's lexis concludes with three case studies on academic, grammatical/linguistic, and poetic/metrical terminology (Chapter 8). These categories were chosen to convey some aspects of the development of scholarly or academic vocabulary as witnessed in the dictionary.

The focus thus spans several diverse areas of historical linguistics and philology, including (historical) lexicography, language contact, lexicology, and grapholinguistics.

1.2 Formal Conventions

Here, at the outset, it is expedient to state several principles concerning the modes of citation, transliteration, and other conventions.

The current accepted standard for encoding pre-modern Cyrillic texts (and not only), which is also used in this book, is Unicode (UTF-8, version 15.1 as of writing). It was decided from the very beginning to make full use of the range of available Unicode characters for all three scripts in the manuscript (Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic), in order to replicate the text of the manuscript with the greatest possible visual fidelity. Diacritics and supralinear letters in all three scripts have been consistently included in the transcriptions. Period spellings have not been normalized or 'corrected' according to modern conventions; in particular, Greek breathings written over the first vowel in diphthongs in Syn. Gr. 383 have been left 'as is'.

In printing the Latin texts of the GSL and its source dictionaries, an effort has been made to convey instances of variation such as that between ⟨s⟩ and long ⟨ſ⟩, on the grounds that this information is palaeographically significant. Nevertheless, some compromises and simplifications have been made, mostly in the face of technical limitations. With certain exceptions like stigma ⟨ς⟩ and the *και* ligature ⟨ϗ⟩, or the common Latin digraphs ⟨Æ⟩ / ⟨æ⟩ and ⟨Œ⟩ / ⟨œ⟩, the Unicode standard does not feature so many ligatures for Greek and Latin (cf. also THOMPSON 2021: 220). Even ⟨8⟩, which is very common in Greek, is designated in Unicode for Latin only (under codepoint U+0223). On these grounds, most of the Latin and Greek ligatures found in Syn. Gr. 383 are resolved into their constituent letters, as in ⟨*que*⟩ for ⟨ϗ⟩ or ⟨*σθαι*⟩ for ⟨ϗϑ⟩ (cf. § 3.2.2). While lacking Unicode support was the primary motivation for this unification, an analogous practice was followed by Bunčić and Keipert in their edition of Ivan Uževych's Berlaimont translation (*Roz-*

mova / Besěda) (BUNČIĆ / KEIPERT 2005: XXXIX). Another convention borrowed from this edition is the insertion of a dashed vertical bar (|) at expected word boundaries per modern spelling rules, by analogy with the vertical bar (|) notation for line breaks in the original text (ibid.: XX–XXI).

The coverage for pre-modern Cyrillic graphemes and glyphs is rather more complete, and so the respective characters ⟨Ѣ⟩, ⟨Ѧ⟩, etc. are generally used where relevant. With respect to Epifanii's GSL, it is particularly worth paying attention to the existence of several specifically Ruthenian glyphic variants: 'rounded *vědě*' ⟨Ѣ⟩ (U+1C80), 'wide *slovo*' ⟨ѣ⟩ (U+1C83), 'tall *tverdo*' ⟨Ѥ⟩ (U+1C84), and 'tall *yer*' ⟨Ѧ⟩ (U+1C86). Since 2016, these have been encoded in the Unicode block Cyrillic Extended-C (ANDREEV et al. 2013; 2014). The decision to encode these characters has been the subject of some controversy (cf. BIRNBAUM / CLEMINSON 2013). Regardless of the intricacies of graphematics and the Unicode philosophy, it is undeniable that these written signs occur, above all, in Ruthenian printed books and manuscripts (ANDREEV et al. 2014). The corresponding characters now exist in Unicode and in fonts developed within the Ponomar Project or by Sebastian Kempgen (among them Bukyvede, which is used for the Cyrillic texts in this document).² Therefore, it makes sense to avail oneself of them in digitally replicating the text of Syn. Gr. 383. Two other characters from this block that are *not* used herein are the 'three-legged *tverdo*' ⟨Ѣ⟩ (U+1C85) and 'tall *yat*' ⟨Ѧ⟩ (U+1C87). While they do occur in Syn. Gr. 383, they do so exclusively, i.e., they do not alternate as glyphic variants with ⟨Ѥ⟩ and ⟨Ѧ⟩ (cf. § 3.2.2).

It is imperative to adhere to the right standards when encoding not only letters, but also diacritics and punctuation. Here, there is considerable potential for confusion of visually similar characters. To give one example, the middle dot ⟨·⟩ used to separate translation items in the dictionary is properly encoded with the codepoint U+00B7 rather than the superficially similar U+0387, which represents the Greek colon or *ano teleia* (PODTERGERA 2015b: 393). It is also critical to use the correct combining/modifier characters for Cyrillic accents and other supralinear signs like the *titlo*, as well as the combing Cyrillic superscript letters from the blocks Extended-A and Extended-B (as throughout).

² Available publicly on the author's *Kodeks* server hosted at the University of Bamberg: <<https://kodeks.uni-bamberg.de/AKSL/AKSL/Schrift.htm>> (accessed 12.08.2022).

The transliteration scheme used, except in direct quotations from academic works, is the ALA-LC Romanization for Cyrillic (Belarusian, Russian, or Ukrainian, as relevant), without diacritics or ligatures. The one exception is that the ‘prime’ sign (‘) is generally omitted from the transliteration of the names of the authors of works cited, following a widespread *de facto* practice adopted by many English-language publications. Where relevant, preference is given to authors’ own romanizations of their surnames (especially in endings, e.g., *-sky* instead of *-skii*, *-aya* instead of *-aia*, etc.). In transliterating etymologically reconstructed Proto-Slavic or Old Church Slavonic forms, the accepted academic standard is applied (i.e., the ‘yers’ ъ and ь are left ‘as is’).

The transliteration of Epifanii Slavynetskii’s name requires some special comment. In the present study, his name is not rendered according to a Belarusian or Ukrainian transliteration scheme, e.g. as (*J*)*epifanij Slavyneč'skyj* (as in STRAKHOV 2006: *passim*; though it should be noted that the Greek-derived Ukrainian – primarily monastic – name *Епифанію* ought to be transliterated as [J]epifanii). The reason for this decision is that, in the only known sources in which Epifanii’s name occurs, it is written as *ѢПІФАНІЙ СЛАВІНЦКІЙ* in the Old Cyrillic alphabet. We have no way of verifying how it would have been written in Ruthenian or Russian, much less how it would have been pronounced in Epifanii’s native dialect or how it then ought to be transcribed. Unequivocally Ruthenian surnames such as *Smotryts'kyi*, *Zyzanii*, and *Berynda* are duly transliterated according to the ALA-LC rules for Ukrainian.

As a further matter, the use of *Slavonic* to refer to the language of the dictionary requires some clarification. This is intended as a maximally close rendering of the endonym *словѣньскѣ / slavěňskѣ / slavianьskѣ*, traditionally used for Slavic written varieties, including among the East Slavs (see §§ 2.2.2 and 6.1, as well as KEIPERT 2014: 1220). The glottonym *Church Slavonic* is used quite sparingly, mostly to refer specifically to the language of the Church books. Not only was no such term known in the period under consideration (cf. KEIPERT 2014: 1215; BOUNATIROU 2020), but it does not capture the full breadth of the functions of the learned written variety of Slavonic (cf. ZHIVOV 2017: 887) employed by Epifanii (q.v. § 6.1). Therefore, the term *Slavonic* is preferred throughout, barring places where there is a risk of ambiguity.

In the main text, English spelling follows Oxford/OED rules (i.e., *organize* and *honour* but *analyse*), which appear preferable in light of their maximal fidelity to etymology (whether Latin, Greek, or French). In all

direct quotations from academic literature in modern languages, the original orthography has been left untouched unless otherwise noted. While inline references to secondary literature are generally offset in small capitals, those to primary sources (as listed in the first subsection of the bibliography) are not, so as to create an additional visual distinction between the two types.

2 Background and State of Research

2.1 Primary Sources and Manuscript Tradition

A vital prerequisite for working with any historical text is understanding the context in which it was produced and in what form it has come down to us today.

In the case of the GSL, there are just three known manuscript witnesses: 1) Epifanii Slavinetiskii's autograph; 2) the Titov manuscript; and 3) what we will call the 'Moscow Manuscript'. The first, Epifanii Slavinetiskii's own autograph and working copy, is Ms. Syn. Gr. 383 from the Russian State Historical Museum. It was catalogued by Archimandrite Vladimir Filantropov as Ms. Syn. 488 (ARCHIM. VLADIMIR 1894: 716); even relatively recent pieces of research (e.g., FONKICH 1994: 25; STRAKHOV 2006: 271) may still refer to the manuscript using his numbering. Here, we will adhere to the current numbering adopted by the State Historical Museum (i.e. Syn. Gr. 383). The second is the two-volume *codex descriptus* Ms. Titov 67–68 from the collections of the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg. It is a complete early copy of Epifanii's autograph. The third, dated 1766 (FONKICH 1994: 26 fn. 22), is kept in the collections of Moscow State University. According to STRAKHOV (2006: 271), it is a near exact copy of the second and thus of lesser interest to researchers. Mss. Syn. Gr. 383 and Titov 67–68 have formed the basis for almost all prior research, and they are the main objects of study here. Lack of access to the third copy meant that it was impossible to take it into consideration; all discussion of it is based on existing secondary literature.

The circumstances in which Epifanii's original manuscript and these early copies were produced are less than certain. As previous academic literature on this topic contains contradictory opinions and cites sources inconsistently or incompletely, it would be expedient here to collate and reanalyse all known historical witnesses to the creation of the GSL and its copies.

The view that the GSL was originally commissioned by the Boyar Fedor Mikhailovich Rtishchev (1826–1673), a well-known patron of culture in 17th-century Moscow, is commonly found in 19th-century Russian academic literature (e.g., METR. EVGENII 1827: 172 fn. 1; GALAKHOV 1863: 235; CHUDINOV 1872: 203). This same notion has been adopted, seemingly without scrutiny, in more recent scholarship (e.g., FONKICH 1994: 26). This association between Epifanii and Rtishchev in the literature can be traced back to a passage from the *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika*, a miscellany of historical texts compiled by Nikolai Novikov and published in 1791:

Еще же призва [Ртищевъ – W.T.] отъ Кіева, изъ Святыя Лавры Печерскія, Священномонаха Епифанія, мужа мудраго, и въ языкѣ Славенскомъ и Греческомъ и во иныхъ изящнаго, къ сему же и другихъ иноковъ во ученіи Грамматики Славенской и Греческой, даже до Риторики и Философіи, хотящимъ тому ученію внимати. [...] Епифаній же, за его же прошеніемъ, многимъ трудомъ и тщаніемъ сочини книгу Лексиконъ, реченій языка Славенска и Греческа, и со инѣми языки, въ наученіе и во уразумѣніе учащимся потребный.

(NOVIKOV 1791: 401)

Furthermore, [Rtishchev] summoned the Priest-monk Epifanii of the Holy Monastery of the Caves in Kiev, a wise man skilled in Slavonic, Greek, and other languages, as well as other monks schooled in the grammar of Slavonic and Greek, even unto Rhetoric and Philosophy, who wished to pay heed to this teaching. Epifanii, for his part, at the bidding of the same [i.e. Rtishchev], through great labours and diligence compiled a book [called] the Lexicon of Words of the Slavonic and Greek Languages, together with other languages, for the purpose of teaching and instructing pupils.

This quotation was originally taken from the quasi-hagiography of Fedor Rtishchev titled *Zhitie muzha milostivogo* (cf. ROMODANOVSKAIA 1992). It was anthologized by Novikov and thence quoted by Metropolitan Evgenii Bolkhovitinov (METR. EVGENII 1827: 172 fn. 1), the author of an early historical study on Epifanii's philological works. This was apparently the immediate source of this piece of information for the later scholars who have restated it.

Nevertheless, as early as 1903, Sobolevskii rightly cast doubt on this 'hagiographicizing' narrative, noting the lack of sources cited (SOBO-

LEVSKII 1903: 121–2 fn. 1). He suggests instead that the dictionary was compiled at the Tsar's behest. Other historical sources and scholarship, notably KHARLAMPOVICH (1914: 128–132), likewise dispute the notion that Epifanii was summoned from Kiev by Rtishchev. According to a *gramota* found by ROTAR (1900a: 16–18, 21), Epifanii was summoned personally by Tsar Aleksei Mikhailovich in 1649 together with the other waves of Kievan monks between 1645–49. The Tsar provided him with an allowance and lodgings, initially an apartment at the Posol'skii Prikaz (ibid.; cf. IAKIMOVICH 1985: 8), rather than in the Andreev Monastery, as previously believed. On this subject, Metropolitan Evgenii quotes the preface by Evfimii of Chudov to the new Slavonic translation of the Gospels, which is traditionally ascribed to Epifanii Slavinetskii (Предисловіе на ѿаггеліе; cf. RNL *fonds* 310, No. 1291, f. 3^v, quoted in METR. EVGENII 1827: 177–178, FONKICH 1994: 25, and SOBOLEVSKII 1903: 290; see also the facsimile edition by STRAKHOV, 2002: 6, quoted in PODTERGERA 2006: 156 fn. 19):

ЛѢТА 7157 [=7157/1649], мѣца іюліа, въ дѣнь. [sic!] По изволѣнію великаго гдѣра цѣра и великаго княза Алексея михайловича всеа великіа и малыа и бѣлыа руссіи самодѣрж[ца] [*corr. err.*: -жна, W.T.], призванъ и кіева въ црѣтвѣдующій градъ москвѣ, ради надученіа славеноруссіискаго народа дѣтѣй ѣллинскомѣ наказанію, нѣкто іеромонахъ, именѣ епифаній славинѣцкій, мѣжъ многоученый (ѣще кто ины такѡвъ во врѣмени семъ) не токмо грамматіки, и рѣторики, но и філософіи, и самыа деологіи извѣстныи бысть испытатель и искѡнѣишій рѣсѣдатель, и ѡпасный претолковникъ, ѣллинскаго, латінскаго, славѣнскаго, и полскаго діалѣктѡвъ.

In the year 7157 [from Creation, = 1649] in the month of July, on the [??] day, at the behest of the Great Lord Tsar and Grand Duke Aleksei Mikhailovich, Autocrat of All Great and Little and White Russia, there was summoned from Kiev to the ruling city of Moscow, so as to instruct the children of the Slavic Russian people in Hellenistic teaching, a certain hieromonk by the name of Epifanii Slavinetskii, a very learned man, quite without parallel in our time, and a sure investigator and most skilled examiner not only of Grammar and Rhetoric, but also of Philosophy and Theology itself, and a diligent interpreter of the Greek [lit.: Hellenic], Latin, Slavonic and Polish languages [lit.: dialects].

There follows a description of Epifanii's work as a translator, in particular his literal (re-)translations of Biblical books. No explicit mention is

made of the GSL. However, the dictionary is mentioned in Evfimii's polemical treatise *Ostenъ*, which copies the precise wording of the above passage and continues it as follows:

[...] иже достоверно сочинѣнъ въ црѣствѣющемъ градѣ москвѣ книгѣ лексиконъ триглавсѣо, ѣллинославенолатинскѣи.

(GORSKII / NEVOSTRUEV 1859: 428)

[...] *who, in the reigning city of Moscow, certainly compiled the book Lexikonъ triglosson, in Greek, Slavonic, and Latin.*

Metr. Evgenii cites Evfimii's preface merely as "a historical record kept in the archive of the [Imperial] Russian College of Foreign Affairs" ("одн[а] старинн[ая] Записк[а], найденн[ая] въ Архивѣ Коллеги Иностранныхъ Дѣлъ"), the successor institution to the Posol'skii Prikaz. This passage refutes the notion that Rtishchev summoned Epifanii to Moscow and commissioned the dictionary, as, indeed, does the fact that it was discovered in a state archive.

Overall, the historical evidence we have does not allow us to associate the origin of the dictionary definitively with the person of Rtishchev, nor with any kind of educational programme. Even Rotar's more restrained suggestion that Rtishchev may have played a tangential role in the dictionary's genesis can be discounted. Rotar espouses the widespread but unverifiable myth (cf. BOGDANOV 2021: 33) of the existence of a formal school established by Rtishchev ("Ртищевск[ая] школ[а]") in the Andreev Monastery, for which he hypothesizes Epifanii might have compiled the dictionary (ROTAR 1900c: 381–383). This myth was taken up again recently by ISACHENKO (2009: 29, 230). In fact, there is no documentary evidence for such a relationship between Epifanii and Rtishchev or for Epifanii's having provided formal instruction in Greek whilst in Moscow, not even in the *vita* of Fedor Rtishchev (KAPTEREV [1889] 2008; FONKICH 2009: 45–47). Rtishchev *is* known to have had an interest in learning Greek, which attracted criticism from the conservative Moscow party who favoured the prestige and primacy of Russian written sources in a way not dissimilar to the Old Believers (e.g. the following complaint in a reported conversation between Ivan Vasil'evich Zasetskii, Luk'ian Timofeevich Golosov, and Konstantin Ivanov: "Fedor Rtishchev is learning Greek letters from the Kievans, and precisely in these letters resides heresy"; KOZLOVSKII 1906: 81;

KHARLAMPOVICH 1913: 16; 1914: 136; FONKICH 2009: 45; STRAKHOV 1998: 30). However, this does not mean that a formal Greek school necessarily existed in this monastery, much less that Epifanii taught at it.

Iakimovich, another scholar to touch upon the cultural import and context of Epifanii's dictionaries, does not make any explicit claims about the existence of a monastery school in which Epifanii might have taught. Nonetheless, she does give a speculative, Romanticizing characterization of the environment in which Epifanii and his contemporaries might have lived and worked in the Krutitsy Metochion (*Krutiiskoe podvor'ie*) in Moscow (IAKIMOVICH 1985: 11). She further makes certain unsubstantiated (politicized) claims about the “democratization” of the Russian language through Epifanii's dictionaries or Epifanii's work as an “educator” or “enlightenment” figure (*ibid.*: 18, 20). However, as noted by KHARLAMPOVICH (1914: 378), there is no evidence to support this characterization. On the contrary, Epifanii seems – barring exceptional circumstances such as the Church Councils – to have shunned the public eye in favour of purely intellectual pursuits (*ibid.*: 378–379).

While we again lack precise documentary evidence, the most likely time-frame for the completion of the GSL is in the 1660s. Rotar estimates that Epifanii Slavinetkii began work on the GSL in 1664. This estimate rests on the assumption that a 1663 copy of Johann Scapula's lexicon provided a large part of his material (ROTAR 1900c: 381 fn. 4; cf. BRAILOVSKII 1890a: 244 fn. 1; cf. STRAKHOV 2006: 274). However, as STRAKHOV (*ibid.*) states (and as will be further discussed in § 5.4), Scapula's lexicon, which existed in multiple versions from the late 16th century as well, was hardly the only source for the GSL. Therefore, one cannot rely upon it as a sole criterion for the dating of the manuscript.

At the same time, indirect evidence from Epifanii Slavinetkii's Calepino translation, which was carried out in Kiev, suggests that he may have begun to gather Greek lexical material at an earlier stage. Bovsunovskaia has shown how, in translating the Latin lemmata from Calepino's dictionary, Epifanii made use of Greek (and thereby also traditional written Slavonic) models to form new Slavonic words (especially compounds), and also included Greek loanwords among the dictionary's Latin lemmata (BOVSUNOVSKAIA 2009b: 34–35). One may feel compelled to question Bovsunovskaia's thesis that the formation of compounds occurred only under direct or indirect Greek influence and was not otherwise productive in Slavic languages. Moreover, these very Greek-based models, were, of course, already broadly established in

(Church) Slavonic literacy by the 17th century. Nevertheless, the examples she provides do seem to suggest overall that, as early as his Kievan period, Epifanii Slavinetskii was incorporating Greek data into his dictionaries – quite possibly on the basis of his own work as a translator. This may, in turn, have fed into his work on the GSL or even supplied some of the lexical material for it.

Another claim made in the text from the *Drevniaia rossiiskaia vivliofika* is that the GSL was intended as a learning aid (NOVIKOV 1791: 401). This is presumably what Kharlampovich has in mind when he speaks of it as a “pedagogical” work (KHARLAMPOVICH 1914: 377–378). A more probable theory is that it was conceived as an aid to translators working on philological projects, as intimated by ISACHENKO (2009: 29), or in the Posol’skii Prikaz (CHUDINOV 1872: 203). A significant piece of indirect evidence to support the latter suggestion is a binding or seal (“скрѣпа”) on the margins of the dictionary that is mentioned by Archimandrite Vladimir in his catalogue (ARCHIM. VLADIMIR 1894: 716). This “скрѣпа” remains visible to this day (q.v. § 3.1.5) and it is possible to make out in it the initials of the *d’iak* (‘clerk’) Ivan Arbenev, which are repeated throughout Syn. Gr. 383. The fact that a *d’iak* was unequivocally a member of the civil service, gives cause to think that the dictionary was created for use in government institutions rather than the context of monastery education. Indeed, the “скрѣпа” explicitly states that the manuscript is state property (belonging to the Treasury House or *kazennyi dom*) and that Ivan Arbenev was employed by the Office (*prikaz*) for Book Printing. His signature is attested on other manuscripts from the years 1678 and 1679 (VZDORNOV 1968: 188; FONKICH 1977: 108, 167–168). This allows us to pinpoint his period of service as being nearly contemporaneous with Epifanii’s production of the GSL. Further evidence for the practical, administrative use of Epifanii’s works comes from the fact that, in addition to the copies of Epifanii’s Latin–Slavonic dictionary in Paris (*BNF Slave 9*; cf. STROEV 1841: 112, No. 57; HORBATSCH 1968), Prague, Uppsala and other locations (BIRGEGÅRD 1987: vii), one is kept in the RGADA, the ultimate successor archive to the Posol’skii Prikaz (even if the RGADA includes some documents of an administrative nature from the former Moscow Typography, cf. IAKIMOVICH 1985: 13).

BRAILOVSKII (1890b) and, after him, FONKICH (1994) provide historical evidence for the production of the two copies of the GSL as well as for early attempts to print the dictionary (in 1697–1698 and 1707).

Strakhov reproduces several of these same sources in her own article on the GSL (STRAKHOV 2006: 271–273, 285 fn. 11). The longest and most important of these, an *ukaz* of Patriarch Adrian found by Brailovskii in “one of the books of the Archive of the Moscow Typography”³, is worth reproducing in full here (cf. BRAILOVSKII 1890b: 231–232; cf. Кн. Зап. 67, f. 102^v–103^v; STRAKHOV 2006: 272):

Мирозданія ꙗже лѣта маія въ ꙗки великій Господинъ святѣйшій киръ Адрианъ архієпископъ Московскій и вся россіи и всѣхъ сѣверныхъ странъ патріархъ указалъ учащымъ вискомъ [sic!] учениковъ греческаго и славенскаго языка грамматическимъ искусствомъ Николаю Семенову да Ѳедору Поликарпову книгу Лексіконъ Греко–славено–латинскій которую писалъ своею рукою и преводилъ пославенски извѣстный въ богословіи учитель іеромонахъ Епифаній Славинецкій взявъ преписныя тетрати сначала того лексикона колико ихъ есть писма Флора Герасимова да монаха Іова Схоластика дописати весь подлинно по самому преводу. Прочести же и совершенно справити ежебы отдати кѣтпографскому содѣльванію въпридущее ꙗже лѣта вѣденъ воскресенія Господня святыхъ пасхи. а за таковой ихъ трудъ [f 103^r] и тшаніе [sic!] ныны [sic!] напредъ на дѣли [sic!] сіе указалъ святѣйшій патріархъ дати имъ Николаю да Ѳедору денегъ сто рублевъ и написто тоя книги бумаги колко надобно изприказу книгъ печатнаго [*i.e.*, книгопечатнаго – *W.T.*] дѣла. Егда же оні тое книгу дописавъ прочтутъ и въправа чисто по преводу іеромонаха Епифанія совершенну отдадутъ и имъ дать еще сто рублевъ истого же приказа. А имъ Николаю да Ѳедору той Епифаніевъ преводъ и писмо книгу леѣиконъ беречь и не морать и на то тшатися [sic!] чтобы кѣтому времяні совершити.

In the year 7105 [= 1697] from the Creation of the world, in [the month of] May on the 28th [day], His Holiness Kyr Adrian, Archbishop of Moscow and Patriarch of All Russia and all the northern lands, ordered that Nikolai Semionov and Fedor Polikarpov, who as heads of their class [? – this word, viskomъ, is ambiguous; the text is likely corrupted] teach students the arts of Greek and Slavonic grammar, to take the book [titled] Greek–Slavonic–Latin Lexicon, which the Hieromonk Epifanii Slavinskii, the famous teacher of theology, wrote with his own hand and translated into Slavonic, and to take all the pages in their entirety

³

Inventory 1 of RGADA *fonds* 1182 lists a document that appears to match this description.

from the copy begun by Flor Gerasimov and the monk Job the Scholastic and finish them in accordance with [Epifanii's] original translation, to read through it and correct it completely in order to submit it for printing in the coming year of 7106 [= 1698] on the day of Holy Pascha, the Resurrection of the Lord. And in exchange for these labours of theirs and their diligence, His Holiness, the Patriarch has ordered that they, Nikolai and Fedor, are to be given 100 roubles, and as much writing paper as they require, from the Office for Book Printing. And if they complete the writing of this book, and read it through [i.e. proofread it] and produce a clean copy in accordance with the translation of Hieromonk Epifanii, and turn in the complete book, they are to be given 100 more roubles from the same office. And Nikolai and Fedor are to take care of this translation by Epifanii and his autograph of the book "Lexicon", and not sully it, and to see to it that they complete the work in time.⁴

FONKICH (1994: 26) had already posited the existence of two copies, but had apparently not seen the one in Saint Petersburg and does not reference the shelfmark of this copy, either. STRAKHOV (2006) was the first to link the efforts to prepare the dictionary for printing with the copy from the Titov Collection of the Russian National Library (Ms. Titov 67–68). It is known that Fedor Polikarpov himself, a native Muscovite (BULANIN / ZIBOROV 2004: 105), had been tasked in 1697 with preparing the GSL for printing and likely took part in the production of the Titov copy. Strakhov, on the basis of the *ukaz* quoted above and Fonkich's research, identified the handwriting of the four scribes who worked on the first copy, including that of Fedor Polikarpov (STRAKHOV 2006: 284–285). Her analysis, although it could not be confirmed independently due to lack of access to necessary materials, comes across as convincing and is supported by the handwriting of selected sections of Ms. Titov 67 that could be viewed.⁵

The Moscow version (MSU 6 = 9Bi45, cf. FONKICH 1998: 26; STRAKHOV 2006: 272, 284–285 n. 11) was produced in a different context, after Polikarpov's death. The only known historical source concerning the production of the "Moscow" copy of the GSL is an inscription in

⁴ STRAKHOV (2006: 272) provides a translation of this passage that is broadly similar, except stylistically and in one or two points of substance, e.g. the translation of *prikazъ knigъ pečatnago děla* (Strakhov: 'the Department of Books [intended] to be printed').

⁵ This was only possible thanks to the kind support of Dr. Aleksandr Levichkin (RAS Institute for Linguistics, Saint Petersburg).

the manuscript (Vol. II, f. 129–145), quoted by FONKICH (1994: 26–27 fn. 22) with modernized orthography:

По писменной / от его превосходительства / господина обер. эгер-
мейстера / Семена Кирилловича Нарышкина / к преосвященному
Амвросию / архиепископу Крутицкому и Можайскому прозбе / тща-
нием его преосвященства / с находящагося / в московской Типогра-
фии / Греколатинославенскаго / рукописнаго Лексикона / в Крутицкой
и Троицкой / семинариях / Лексикон сей / состоящий в двух частях /
переписан / 1766 года

At the written request of his excellency lord Oberjägermeister Semion Kirillovich Naryshkin to the Right Reverend Amvrosii, Archbishop of Krutitsy and Mozhaïsk, this lexicon in two parts was copied, through the diligent efforts of His Reverence, in the Krutitsy and Holy Trinity seminaries from the handwritten Greek–Latin–Slavonic [sic!] Lexicon in the Moscow Printing House, in the year 1766.

A similar inscription in the first volume (f. 1) states that Archbishop Amvrosii († 16.09.1771) and Semion Naryshkin († 27.11.1775) had already died by the time these remarks were written, dating either the inscription, the first volume of the manuscript, or both, to no earlier than 1775 (*ibid.*). STRAKHOV (2006: 271), citing Fonkich's study, claims that the “Moscow” copy was made from the “Petersburg” one (STRAKHOV 2006: 271), which is indeed supported by the text of this inscription.

The exact history and provenance of both manuscripts is not known with certainty. The Titov manuscript may at some point have been kept in the library of Evfimii of Chudov. In a historical inventory of his book collection, we find the following entry under the heading “Книги Лексиконы в десть”: “Лексикон Грекославенской списанъ съ Епиѳаніева [sic!] Лексикона жъ, въ доскахъ, прикрыты кожею, по обрѣзу кино-варъ, держанъ, корень ветхъ, безъ застежекъ” (“Greek–Slavic–Latin lexicon copied from Epifanii's lexicon [...] in boards, covered with leather, cinnabar cut, used, old spine, without clasps”; quoted in VIKTOROV / TIKHONRAVOV 1863: Vol. V, Pt. 3, 52; *cit.* FONKICH 1994: 26). Sobolevskii refers to a copy of the GSL that was sometime in the possession of the Arkhangelsk Theological Seminary and contained a petition by the scribe Nikolai Golovin to Patriarch Adrian about having the dictionary printed (SOBOLEVSKII 1903: 121; *cf.* FONKICH 1994: 26 fn. 22). His source for this is Stroeв's Bibliographical Dictionary (published

posthumously in 1882). However, Stroev does not specify the contents of this manuscript, merely giving its catalogue number (511/178) and mentioning a petition to Patriarch Adrian “from after 1691” concerning the production of a copy of the GSL (STROEV 1882: 108). This petition perhaps provided the impetus for the 1697 *ukaz* reproduced above. If – however uncertain the evidence may be – Stroev’s Ms. No. 511 from the Arkhangelsk Seminary is in fact one and the same as the “Petersburg” copy Titov 67–68, it may subsequently have found its way from Arkhangelsk into the hands of the eponymous bibliophile and entrepreneur Andrei Titov (1844–1911), and thence into the Public Library in Saint Petersburg (now the National Library of Russia).⁶

Finally, it is worth noting that as late as the 1820s, Metropolitan Evgenii refers to a manuscript of the dictionary kept in the Synodal (former Patriarchal) library (“Полный Лексиконъ Греко–Славено–Латинскій въ двухъ Томахъ, коего списокъ начисто переписанный сохраняется вмѣстѣ с черновыми Епифаніевыми тетрадами в Патриаршей же библиотекѣ”) (METR. EVGENII 1827: 175). Because he describes it as being “in two volumes”, it must be one of the two copies rather than Epifanii’s autograph. While it is impossible to determine which of the two copies he saw, it is noteworthy that as late as the 1820s, at least one of them was still kept in the Patriarchal (later, Synodal) collection.

Whatever the subsequent fate of the manuscript, this project to print the GSL was ultimately abandoned for unknown reasons, and never taken up again. On this subject, STRAKHOV (2006: 273) writes:

In August 1698, Tsar Peter I came back from his European tour after almost two years of absence. He was preoccupied with new, westernizing ideas, and a *Greek–Slavic–Latin* dictionary might have seemed to him to be out of the mainstream of his new cultural policy.

(emphasis original)

This notion, that a shift in cultural policy led to abandonment of the project, is difficult to verify, and is possibly contradicted by Peter’s interest in the dictionary, as demonstrated in Metropolitan Job’s first

⁶ On the history of the collection, see: “Postuplenie sobraniia Andreia Aleksandrovicha Titova v Imperatorskuiu publichnuuiu biblioteku”. *Russian National Library*. Online. URL: <https://expositions.nlr.ru/ex_manus/titov/ipb.php> (accessed 11.09.2023).

letter (below). It is equally plausible that economic calculus or a decision to redirect material resources and personnel for the typesetting of Polikarpov's own *Dictionarium trilingue* (= FedPolLex; facsimile ed. KEIPERT 1988b) played a role.

Letters by Metropolitan Job of Novgorod from 1707, analysed by Brailovskii, reveal not only how the GSL was used, but also that it was regarded as a rare and highly prized book. In a letter to Peter I, the Metropolitan wrote:

По имянному твоему указу, великій Государь, ради лексикона Епифаніевскаго... послахъ къ Москвѣ Софронія учителя Лихудіева... Молю убо царское твое Величество, яко да укажеша реченный лексиконъ съ печатнаго двора на время... отдати Софронію.
(BRAILOVSKII 1890a: 249–250; quoted from CHISTOVICH 1861: 81)

In accordance with your decree issued in your own name, great Sovereign, concerning Epifanii's lexicon... I have sent the teacher Sophronios Leichoudes to Moscow... I entreat your royal Majesty to order the aforementioned lexicon to be loaned out to Sophronios on a temporary basis from the Printing House.

This is presumably the same attempt to print the dictionary “under the supervision of the Leichoudes [brothers]” (“подъ надзираніемъ Лихудовъ”) to which Metropolitan Evgenii also refers, albeit without citing any sources (METR. EVGENII 1827: 175–176). This attempt came to nought (ibid.). We know from this petition that the Leichoudes brothers asked the Sovereign for permission to take the GSL with them to Novgorod, and that this petition was approved (SMENTSOVSKII 1899: 350). In light of this, an intriguing possibility is that the manuscript in question was the very copy (i.e. the future Titov 67–68) that eventually made its way to Saint Petersburg via the Russian North, specifically Novgorod and Arkhangelsk,⁷ which would support Sobolevskii and Fonkich's theory about the entry in Stroev's catalogue.

Other pieces of peripheral information tell us more about the GSL's reception in 18th and early 19th century Russia. A letter from Metropolitan Job to a certain Admiral Apraksin, discovered by CHISTOVICH (1861: 81, quoted in BRAILOVSKII 1890a: 249–250 fn. 1), reads:

⁷ This happened with other manuscripts, too (cf. PODTERGERA 2009b: 272, 281).

Великій государь въ Санктъ-Петербургъ... пожаловаль мнѣ на время лексиконъ Епифаніевской съ печатнаго двора [...] Просимъ тебе господина — изволь его Царскаго Величества доложить, чтобъ государь пожаловаль — повелѣль отписать къ боярину Ивану Алексіевичу Мусину-Пушкину объ отдачѣ ко мнѣ на самое малое время... съ распискою съ печатнаго двора лексикона Епифаніевского для совершеннаго по переводѣ [...] латинскихъ книгъ исправленія.

The great sovereign in Saint Petersburg... has lent me Epifanii's lexicon from the [Moscow] Printing House. [...] We beseech you, our lord, please report to His Royal Majesty that he should grant our request and write to Boyar Ivan Alekseevich Musin-Pushkin telling him to issue to me for but the shortest time... with a receipt from the printing house, Epifanii's lexicon for the purpose of the final correction of books translated from Latin.

This letter reveals that the GSL was widely known and greatly valued among men of letters in the early Russian Empire, was used as a tool for translation (rather than, say, instruction in schools, cf. above), and could only be taken out with permission from the Tsar (cf. KOVTUN 1998: 55). Other historical sources and archaeological evidence demonstrate in what high regard Epifanii's contemporaries held the GSL (as noted by SOBOLEVSKII 1903: 121). In a 1727 catalogue of the Synodal Library, the GSL is deemed to be "worthy of great esteem" ("великія эстимы достойная") (BRAILOVSKII 1890a: 250; UNDOLSKII 1846: 7; RUMIANTSEV 1870: 15). In the store rooms in the Moscow Printing House, there were special carved and gold-plated boxes for the keeping of especially valuable books. One of the boxes was used to store Epifanii's dictionary alongside a valuable Greek Gospel lectionary (RUMIANTSEV 1870: 15). Moreover, the title of an anthology of Epifanii's works belonging to the Kiev Caves Lavra refers to Epifanii with the clause, "who compiled the great trilingual lexicon" ("иже и великій лексиконъ триглоссонъ написа"; quoted in PEVNITSKII 1861: 432),⁸ suggesting that his achievement in compiling the GSL was, for some at least, synonymous with his person (see also PANCHENKO 1992: 312–313).

⁸

Perhaps based on the similar phrase quoted above from the *Ostень* (cf. GORSKII / NEVOSTRUEV 1859: 428).

2.2 Epifanii Slavivetskii's Trilingual Dictionary in Context

2.2.1 Lexicography as a Cultural Practice

Dictionaries do not exist in a vacuum; rather, they are the products of specific peoples, eras, and traditions. They are not mere vessels for transmitting vocabulary and knowledge in the abstract, but cultural objects that came into being in a particular time and place, and in a particular cultural context or environment. Lexicography, whether we understand this as meaning the 'art and craft' or the 'science' of dictionary-making (cf. TARP 2017: 19–20), or in any other sense, is thus inherently a cultural practice. Anyone engaged in the academic study of lexicography, sometimes called 'metalexigraphy' (WIEGAND et al. 2010: 125), must take account of this fact. Thus, in order to grasp the historical significance of the GSL, it is essential to understand how it fits into the broader cultural context of Early Modern lexicography, both Western European and East Slavic.

An overarching theoretical groundwork for analysing the relationship between lexicography and culture is provided by HAB-ZUMKEHR (2001). The examples she considers in depth are mostly German dictionaries from a later period, but in the general introduction to her study, she gives a framework for considering the relationship between dictionaries and culture. Using definitions from the modern field of cultural studies, she regards culture as a "self-spun web of meanings" (GEERTZ 1987: 9) and a system of signs and symbols that are endowed with meaning by groups of people (HAB-ZUMKEHR 2001: 14); alternatively, we can consider it as a 'configuration of meanings' (*Sinnkonfiguration*; LUCKMANN 1988: 38). Against this backdrop, dictionaries are culturally significant in two ways: first, they set down meanings of words within the semantic and semiotic system of a given culture; second, they are themselves a type of text and a sign (*signifiant*) within the semiotics of that culture (HAB-ZUMKEHR 2001: 14). Dictionaries thus both contain signs and are signs in themselves. In addition to this, they serve as a venue for debates about language and language use, and did so already long before linguistics was formalized as an academic discipline (ibid.: 1). Therefore, lexicography is arguably a part of the 'culture' and 'practice of knowledge' (Ger. *Wissenskultur* and *Wissenspraxis*, respectively) of a particular time and place. As defined broadly in recent scholarship on the Early Modern Era, knowledge culture can encompass not