

Studies in the Vocabulary of the Byelorussian Translations of the Bible

BY

MOSHÉ ALTBAUER

The Byelorussian translation from the Hebrew of nine books of the Bible, dating from the late 15th or early 16th century, preserved in manuscript Codex 262 in the Central Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilna, offers much interesting material for the history of Byelorussian lexicology, and of East Slavonic lexicology in general. It is the purpose of the present article to provide a few examples of this from this manuscript in a comparative context, la) *A fioly puskajut' zapach* (S. of S., VII, 14; see fig. 1). In the King James Bible the phrase is translated as 'The mandrakes give a smell'. The Hebrew word *dūdā'im*, which occurs occasionally in the Bible (Gen. XXX, 14-16; S. of S. VII, 14) has been identified as the name of the plant *Mandrago officinalis* of the genus *Shlancea*, having light-blue and greenish-yellow flowers.¹ The Septuagint, and the Vulgate which follows it, use *hoi mandragorai* and *mandragorae* respectively.

The translator of the Song of Songs in Codex 262 preferred the name taken from the vernacular, *fioly*, to the bookish borrowing from the Greek, unlike the editor of the first printed Slavonic Bible of 1582 (the 'Ostrog Bible'), based, as is well-known, on earlier Slavonic translations. There we read *mandragore daša vonju*. Similarly, later, in the so-called Synodal Bible there is *mandragory daša vonju*; even the recent Russian version, published by the American Bible Society, has *mandragory uže pustili blagovonie*. The Polish Catholic translator Jakub Wujek (1599), who followed the Vulgate, also used the word *mandragora*, as did the editors of the most recent Polish Catholic Bible, the so-called *Biblia Millenii* (Poznań, 1965). The Polish Protestant version of 1632, on the other hand, has *polne jabuszka*, probably following *pěkná jablečka* of the Czech *Kralická Bible* of 1613. In the earliest Polish manuscript Bible of the 15th century (the so-called *Biblia królowej Zofii*) the page on which Gen. XXX, 14 would normally be found is missing. The Croatian Catholic Bibles — the earliest version by Daničić and the most recent one published in Zagreb in 1968 — have respectively

1. J. Löw, *Die Flora der Juden*, III, Vienna, 1924-35, pp. 365-68.

БЫ ІАКО ПРАВА НЕ СЪ ХЛОСѢ
 МОЕ И ЖЕ СЪ БЫ ЛЪ БЪ СМН БЪ СПИ
 ХЪ БЪ МОН : ШГЛАСА ВЪ СЪ ДЫ
 ХАННМОИ ПРИАНО А ІАКО СТЬ
 МОА ПЪ ЛЪ МОЕМО : РОВЕНЪ
 БЫ ЛЪ БЪ СМН КОЖА МЪ ОУ СЪ ДМНЕ
 ПОМЪ БЫ ІАКО ПОЧНЫ ВРО ВЪ Ш
 БЪ ХОЖЕНЫ : БДЪ ЛЪ БЪ СМН И
 БЫ ХЪ ІАКО ПІА ОУ СЪ ДМН МЫ И
 ВЪ БЪ ДОВАНЫ : ВЕСЪ ДНЬ ПО
 ПОСИЛИ МНѢ ВЪ РАДНМОИ И ГВА
 ЛШІИ МНѢ НА ПРОПТІ МЪ НЕ
 КА ГНЪ ПСА : И ЖЕ ПО ПЕ ЛЪ ІАКО
 БЫ ХЪ БЪ БЪ ДЪ И П ПЪ Е МОЕ
 СЪ НА АТО РАЗУ МЪ ША : ШАН
 ЦА ГНЪ БВА ІАРО СТИ ПТВО СЪ
 ІАКО ВЪ СЪ МЪ СЪ ШЕ Ш ПЪ СТИ АЪ
 ЕСИ МНѢ : ДНІ МОИ ІАКО ПЪ
 ПЪ СКА ОНИ А СЪ И ВЪ ІАКО СЪ МО
 СЪ СО ХЪ БЪ СМН : ШЫ ЖЕ ГИ ВЪ
 ВЪ КЫ ПРЪ БЫ ВЪ БШЕ И ПА МЪ
 ШВОА ВЪ ВСИ РОДЫ И РОДЫ :
 ШЫ ВЪ С ПІА ТЪ ГИ И П О М А ДЪ
 БШЕ СИ ША И ЖЕ ВРЕ МЪ МАРДО
 ВА НИ БЪ Г О ІАКО ПРИ Ш О Т А СЪ :
 ІАКО ОУ Г О Д И А И Р А БЪ ШВО И С А
 МЕНІ БЪ Г О И ЗЪ М А ЛЪ БЪ Г О ПО М И
 ЛЮ Ш С А : Н ОУ Б О І А Ш Е Л А СЪ
 КЫ И М Е Н И П О В О Г О Г И , И В С И
 Ц Р И СЪ М Н И С Л А В Ы ШВО Е И :
 ІАКО СЪ Д О В А Г Ъ С И Ш НЪ Н ОУ
 С Р И Ш Е А ВЪ С Л А ВЪ СВО Е И : П Р И
 С РЪ ЛЪ И А М А П Т ВЪ П О С К О РЪ Н Ы
 П И П Р Е С РЪ ЛЪ М О Д Н Ы А И : Н А
 П И Ш Е Т С А С И БЪ РЪ И Ш І И И

ЛЮ ДІ Е СЪ С Д А М Н И ВЪ С Х В А Л А
 Г А : ІАКО Ш Б О С РЪ ЛЪ С В Ы С О Б Ы
 С П Ы А С В О Е А Г Ъ С И Б Е СЪ П А СЪ
 М А І О П Р И С РЪ ЛЪ : ОУ С Л Ы Ш А
 Ш И ВЪ С Д Ы Х А Н І Е Ш К О В А Н Ы
 И Р А С РЪ Ш И П И С Ы ОУ М РЪ Ш В А
 Н Ы : Н ВЪ С А БЪ С П И Ш И ВЪ С И
 Ш П Т Е И М А Г Н Е И Х В А Л О БЪ Г О ВЪ
 С Р О СЪ С А МЪ : ВЪ ВЪ С Р О Т Е Н Ы О
 Л О Д Е И ВЪ Ш А Д Н О С Ы И Ц Р І Е
 ІАКО С А Б Ж А Ш Е Г Е И : Ш ВЪ Т А
 С М О Н А П О Ш И К РЪ П О С Т И С В О
 Е И ОУ М А А Г Н І Е Д Н Е И М О И ВЪ
 С ВЪ С П И М НѢ : Н ВЪ С В Е Д И
 М Е Н Е ВЪ Ш О Л О В И Ц И Д Н І К И М О И
 В Р О И Р О Л Е П І А Т В О И : ВЪ П О
 Т А П І КЪ Ш Ы Г И СЪ М А І О Ш С Н О В А
 ЕСИ И Д Е Л О РЪ КЪ ШВО И СЪ Ш
 Н Е С А : П О С П О Г И Б НЪ ПЪ Ш Ы
 Ж І Г Н ВЪ ВЪ КЫ П Р Е Б Ы В А Е Ш Е
 И Б С И ІАКО Р І С А Ш Е Ш П Ш А П
 ПЪ : И ІАКО Ш А ДЪ РЪ Ш И Н Ы
 И И П О РЪ Ш А Ш Е А Ш Ы Ж Е Г И С А
 Б С И Н А ВЪ П А ШВО И П Е С К О П Т А
 Ю П Е А : С И ВЪ С И ВЪ ШВО И В С Е
 Л А П С А Н Е С Е М А И ВЪ ВЪ КЫ И
 С П Р А В І С А :
 І А Г И В А Ш А М О Л Г А П Е С А В Н О
 П Р Е Н А І А М О А И М А Ш О БЪ Г О :
 І А Г И В А Ш А М О Л Г А И П Е С А
 Б Ы В А Н С Е БЪ ВЪ С Д А П І Е Г О :
 И ЖЕ М А П Т ВЪ Ш И БЪ ІАКО П И
 Б П Ш О І И Ц Р І А Л Е С Т Ы В С И П Е
 М О Ц И П Ш О И : И ЖЕ И СЪ Б А В А
 С И Ш П І А Т Е Н І А Ж Ы В О Ш П Ш О И

fig. 1. Codex 262 of the Central Library, the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, Vilna. Folio 85v. S. of S. VI—VII, 6.

ВОТВОЕ ВОРУХЪ ПШЕ НИШИ
 ШГОРОЖОНЪ ВЪ РОЖА: ДѢ
 ПЕРСИ ТВОИ ЯКОЖЪ ДѢШЛЕ
 МАТТАБАНЪ ШЫЦИ АЛЪИНЫ:
 ШИМА ТВОЯ ЯКО ВЕЖА СЪ БО
 ВА ШТИ ТВОИ СПАБЪ ВЪ
 ХЪЖЕОНЪ НА ВОРУХЪ ДО
 ТЫКИ ВЕЛЕНЪ МОЗ ТВОИ
 ЯКО ВЕЖА ЛИНОВА ВЪ ИРАЕ
 ТЬ НАДА МАСКЪ: ГОЛОВА
 ТВОЯ МАТТОВЪ ЯКО АДРО
 А ПУПЕЦЪ ГОЛОВЫ ТВОЕИ
 ЯКО БАГОРЪ ЦРЬ ИНА ТЫИ
 ОУ ПРИРИСТАНЪ ХЪ: КОЛЬ
 КРАСНА ЕИ ИКОЛЬ ОУДА ТНА
 ЕИ МИЛОСТНА А ВЪ КОХА
 НЪИ: ШВОСТАНЪ ТВОИ ПО
 ДОКЕНЪ ФЪНИКЪ А ПЕРСИ
 НИКЪ ГРОЗДО: РЕКАЗЪ ЕСТЬ
 ВЪ ЦЫДНА ФЪНИКЪ ИИ МЪ
 ЗА ПРИСАДЫ ЕГО И БУДЪТЬ
 ГОЖЪ ПЕРСИ ТВОИ ГРОЗДЫ
 ВИННЫ НА ЗАПАХЪ МОЗ А РЕИ
 ТВОИХЪ ЯКО МАБЛОКА: НЕ
 БЦО ПЕШЕ ЯКО ВИМОДО БРОЕ
 ИДЕТЬ МИЛОСТНО МОУ МАЕ
 МЪ НА ТРА МАСТЬ ПОДВИТЯ
 ЕПЪ ОУСТА СПАТИИ: А МИ
 ЛОСТНОМУ МОЕМУ АНАМА
 ЛАСКА ЕГО: ПОИДИ МИЛО
 СТИИ МОИ ВЪИДЕ МЪ НА
 ПОЛЕ ШЕКИ ПЪСЕМЪ ВЪ АМБА
 РЕХЪ: ПОРАНИ МЪ ЕАКЪ ВЪ ИНО
 ГРАДЪ МЪ НОУЗРИ МЪ ТИ ПРО
 ЦЕ ШЕЛОВНИШОТИ ШВОРИАН

САРУСИ КЪ ТИ СПИ ИТИ ШЦ
 ВЪ АН МАРИСТАМЪ ПТАМЪ
 ЗАМЪ ЛАСКУ МОЮ ПТО БЪ:
 А ДМ ШАЛЫ ПЪДЕКА ШПЪ ЗАПА
 ХЪ НА ДВЕРЕХЪ МАШИ ВЕСЛО
 ДОСТИ И МОШЫ ИИ ВЪ ПШАНЫ
 И МИЛОСТНЫИ МОИ ДОУВА
 ЛАСКИ ПТО БЪ: КТО БЫ
 ПТА ДАЛЪ ЯКО БРА ПТАМИЕ
 СЪ СЪЩАГО ПЕРСИ МАТКИ
 МОИ НАШАА БЫ ПТА ПУАН
 ЦИ ПЦЕ ШЕЛОВАА БЫ ПТА И
 ПЕЖЪ НЕ ГАН ИА БЫМИЕ:
 ПОВЕДУ ПТА И ПРИВЕДУ ПТА
 КЪ ДОМУ МЪ ПРИ МОЕМУ МАТИ
 ШЪ МА НА ПОШЕ ПЕШЕ ШВИМА
 А ПТА ЧНОГО И ШСОКУ МАРЪ
 КЪ ГРАМО МОЕГО: А БЪ ВЪ ЦАЕ
 ГО ПОДЪ ГЛАЗОМОЕГО А ПРА
 ВИЦА ЕГО ШЕШ МА ЕСТЬ МЪ
 НЕ: ЗА ПРИСАДА ГЛАЗА СЪ ДО
 ТЫКИ И ЕРЪСОЛИМОВЫ ШПТО ПО
 БУЖА ЕСТЬ ЕА ИШ ПТО ПОВЕ
 ЖА ЕСТЬ ЕА ШЕ ВЪ ДОКУ ШЕ
 ЛИТЬ: КО ПТО РА ЛАСА ВЪ
 СХОДИТЬ Ш ПЪСТИ ИИИ ВЪ
 ЗАЕГА ЕТЬ НА МИЛОСТНИКА
 ШЕГО ПОДЪ ЯБЛОНИ ШЕ
 ДИХЪ ПТА ПТАМО БОЛЪ А БО
 КО МАТИ ПТВОА: ПОЛОЖИ
 МА ЯКО ПЕТАТЪ НА СРЦИ
 ТВОЕМЪ ЯКО ПЕТАТЪ НА
 МЫЩИ ТВОИ И ЖЕ СИ НА
 ЯКО СМРТЬ МИЛОСТЬ И ЖЕ
 СПКА ЯКО АДЪ РЕ ВЪ МОСТЬ И
 Ш ПТАМЪ БОЛЪ А РОШЕ
 АНИЦА ПТВОА:

fig. 2. Codex 262. Folio 67. Psalms CI, 5 — CII, 4.

mandragore puštaju miris and *mandragore šire miris*. In the latest Lithuanian Catholic Bible, translated by Archbishop Juozapas Jonas Skvireckas, *mandragore* is retained in Gen. XXX, 14, but in the Song of Songs the Lithuanian expression *kukeliai duoda kvapą* unexpectedly appears.

Sreznevskij in his *Materialy dlja slovarja drevnerusskogo jazyka* does not include either *fioly* or *mandragory*, but the second word is recorded by both Dal' and Vasmer in their dictionaries.²

One can thus assume that *fioly* in Codex 262 is the first deliberate use of this word in Byelorussian, and in East Slavonic languages in general. A similar expression in Polish, written variously as *fiotek*, *fijotek* and *fijatek* was known from the 15th century with the connotation *viola ododrata L.* It corresponds to the later Russian loan word from Polish *fialka* and *fiol'*, and to the Ukrainian *fjalka*, *fjalok* (*Cheirantus cheiri*). No use was made, however, of these expressions in the Bible translations into these two East Slavonic languages.

Finally it should be noted that, like the Jewish translator of the Song of Songs into Byelorussian in Codex 262, the Yiddish translation of the *Cremona Pentateuch* (1560) renders the Hebrew *dūdā'im* with the expression *wj'ln*, corresponding to the New High German *Veilen*, which in its turn is derived from the High German *viol*, *viöle*, and the Middle Latin *fiola*. It is possible to find more, similar lexical and textual analogies between the Byelorussian version of Codex 262 and the older traditional translations of the Bible into Yiddish³ (see below).

The use of vernacular expressions in preference to the 'bookish' borrowings, and in particular hellenisms, is a characteristic feature of the language of Codex 262. The following are a few examples, also taken from the field of botanical and zoological terminology,

1b) In place of *vjazanie stakti* (S. of S. I, 13) of the Ostrog Bible, later repeated in the Synodal Bible, corresponding to the Septuagint *apodesmos tēs staktēs* from the Hebrew *tseror hammor*, the translator of the Byelorussian codex 262 used the expression *hruda pi žma*.⁴ In Skaryna the same expression is translated as *svjazok mirry*, while the new Russian translation has *mirrovyy puček*.
1c) Instead of *okrida* (Eccl. XI, 5) as in the Ostrog Bible, corresponding to the Greek *hē akris* and Hebrew *hāgāb*, Codex 262 has the word *kobylica*, a term encountered in many Slavonic languages signifying 'locust'⁵ (in this instance it means the genus *Calliptamus palestinesis Rammae*). Skaryna translates *akris* by *kobyłka*, and the new Russian version uses the word *kuznečik*. In the Synodal Slavonic version, of

2. V. Dal', *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka*, StP., 1903, II, p. 269; M. Vasmer, *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, II, Moscow, 1967, p. 569.

3. See M. Altbauer, *Some Methodological Problems in Research of the East Slavic Bible Translations (Vilnius Codex 262)* (A paper read at the VI Intern. Congress of Slavists), Jerusalem, 1968. (On the word *gim* in those translations.)

4. On the origin and meaning of the word *pižma* see Vasmer, op. cit., III, Moscow, 1971, p. 259.

5. On this meaning of *kobylica* see A. Brückner, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Warsaw, 1957, p. 241 (under the entry *kobyła*); also Vasmer, op. cit., II, p. 269, also under *kobyła*).

more recent date than the Ostrog Bible, the Greek word is replaced by *pruzi*, a plural form, whereas both in the Hebrew original and the Septuagint the word is in the singular. The word *pruzi*, or *pruŕi*, for the Hebrew 'arbe, which is the general name for 'locust' in the Bible, is found in several East Slavonic translations of the Psalms (CVIII, 23). It is written variously as *prozi* (Pogodin psalter), *prougii* (13th century Simonovski Psalter), *prouzi*, *prouŕie*, *proug*, etc.⁶. In Byelorussian versions *pruŕi* is found in Codex 262, and *pruzi* in Skaryna. The new Russian version has the word *saranča*: *gonjal menja kak saranču*.

1d) Another zoological name, which occurs in Psalm CI, 7, is of considerable interest both for the history of Byelorussian lexicology and because of the light it sheds on the translation techniques of the author of Codex 262. The Hebrew word *qā'āt* occurs five times in the Old Testament. In the Septuagint it is fairly consistently translated as *pelekan*: *ōmoiōten pelekanī erēmikō* (Ps. CI, 7). In the corresponding passage the Vulgate has the word *pellicanus*: *similis jactus sum pellicano solitudinis*; in other places, however (Lev. XI, 18; I. XXXIV, 11; Zeph. II, 14), a different word is used: *onocrotalus*. Old Church Slavonic versions have the word *nejesyť*: *upodobich się nejesyti pustyněi* (Psalt. Sinaiticum); *neQsyti* (Psalt. Boloniense); *nejasyti* (Pogodin Psalter), etc. One of the manuscripts has *nejesyti* in the text with *pellikanovi* as a marginal note. Skaryna's version, *upodobich sja nejasyti pustynnorau*, is in accordance with the East Slavonic tradition. The word *pelikan* is used in new Slavonic Bible translations, e.g. in the recent Russian version: *ja upodobilsja pelekānu na pustyni*; and the Polish *Biblia Millenii*: *jestem podobny do pelekana z pustyni*. The new Croat version has the word *čaplja* instead: *slican sam čapljī u pustynji*.

The term *qā'āt* was understood in a completely different manner by the author of the Byelorussian Codex 262. Being well versed in Hebrew Biblical exegesis,⁷ he knew that the word in question had nothing to do with a 'pelican'. All Hebrew exegetes, past and present, agree that *qā'āt* belongs to a group of nocturnal birds of prey. Some members of this group devour their prey (e.g. field mice) whole and afterwards disgorge the skin and bones. This is reflected in the etymological link between the noun *qā'āt* and the verb derived from the same stem, *qī* — 'to disgorge, vomit'. Recently *qā'āt* has been identified with a bird of the family *Strigidae*, to which also belongs the Biblical *kōs* (*Athene noctua*, according to the ornithologists) mentioned in the same Psalm verse, and called in the Septuagint *nuktkorax*. Both *qā'āt* and *kōs* are regarded by the Jews as unclean and forbidden to be eaten (cf. Lev. XI, 17; Deut. XIV, 17). In the same category is also included the bat (Hebrew 'atalēf; cf. Lev. XI, 19)

6. Amflochij, *Drevne-slavjanskaja psaltyr' XIII veka*, Moscow, 1874-9, II, p. 293.

7. On the question of the knowledge of Hebrew exegesis by the author of Codex 262 see notes 3 and 16.

which, according to the Jewish biblical and post-biblical tradition, is considered to be a bird. All this must have been familiar to the author of Codex 262. Accordingly, he did not follow the traditional Greek and Slavonic biblical versions, but translated the Hebrew *qā'āt* by *kožan*, which is Byelorussian for 'bat'.⁸ In fact the whole verse 7 of Psalm CI in Codex 262 is differently worded than in other Slavonic texts: *roven byl esmi kožanu uedinennomu, bych jako nočny voron v obchoženii* (see fig. 2).

Thus the author of Codex 262, who was hardly an ornithologist, in translating the Hebrew word *qā'āt*, chose the name of the 'bird' of prey which must have been familiar to him from everyday Byelorussian. Moreover he did not follow the established Slavonic tradition in another point, and used the adjective *uedinennomu* ('solitary') instead of *pustyněi* or *pustynomu* ('desert'). The possibility of the existence of another meaning of the word *kožan*, closer to the Hebrew *qā'āt*, cannot be definitely excluded at this stage. If it exists, however, it has yet to be discovered.

Again we find a parallel between the translation of Codex 262 and the old translation into Yiddish; the word *qā'āt* is translated by a Yiddish word which means a bird of prey (as for instance *tol* or *dol* corresponding to the New High German *toll*).

1e) Instead of *ot sredy skumen* (Ps. LVI, 5) as in earlier East Slavonic versions, corresponding to the Greek *ek mesou skumon*, Codex 262 uses the native expression *ot jadei lvovych*. The word *jad'* is synonymous with *synove*, as can be seen from the expression *jad' tula svoego* (Lam. III, 13) in the manuscript Bible of 1499, to which the corresponding text in Codex 262 is *synov tula svoego* (for Hebrew *bene 'ašpātō*, which is translated in the Septuagint as *ious faretras autou*). Skaryna uses the Greek expression with the addition of *lvovych*: *ot sredy skimen lvovych*. It should be noted, however, that in other places in Codex 262 the hellenism is used. Thus in Psalm CIII, 21 one finds *skumen lvovyi*, and again in Psalm XVI, 2, but this time without *lvovyi*. The corresponding texts in the Skaryna Psalter have *skimen* and *skimen lvov* respectively. In the recent Russian version the word *lev* is used throughout.

2) The word *kaldor* is of considerable interest both from the lexical and morphological point of view, on account of its suffix. It does not appear to be recorded in any dictionary, either 'ordinary', or etymological. The word corresponds to the Hebrew *gat* meaning 'a place excavated in the earth or rock for the treading of grapes or other agricultural products' (Latin *torcular*). It is found in Codex 262 in the expression *Kaldor toptal adonai děvce doččě ihudinoi* (Lam.

8. See A. Bachaňkoŭ, M. Hajdukievič, P. Šuba, *Tumačalny sloŭnik bielaruskaj movy*, Minsk, 1966, p. 122. The word *kožan* is also recorded by Dal', *op. cit.*, II, p. 327, Vasmer *op. cit.*, II, p. 277, and A. Preobrazenskij, *Etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*, Moscow, 1910-14, I, p. 329. According to Dal' (*loc. cit.*) the term is archaic and comes from the western and southern regions (i. e. Byelorussia and the Ukraine). Vasmer sees a possible etymological link between the name *kožan* and the word *koža* — 'skin'.

I, 15), which is a literal translation from the Hebrew. In the King James Bible the translation is somewhat freer: *'The Lord hath trodden the virgin, the daughter of Judah, as in a wine press'*. The other East Slavonic versions, either contemporary with, or later than, Codex 262 translate the Hebrew *gat* by *točilo*, e.g.: *Točilo točil est Hospod' devici dščere Iudine* (Skaryna); *Točilo izbra G(ospo)d' d(ě)vicy dsceri ioudině* (Ostrog Bible); *Točilo istopta G(ospo)d' děvicě dsceri iudinoj* (Synodal Bible). Also the new Russian Bible has *Kak v točile istopta devu, doč ludy*.

Early Polish Bibles use the word *prasa* from the German *Presse*, e.g. *Prasę deptał Pan pannie, córce Judzkiej* (Wujek's version of 1599), *Pan tłoczył jako w prasie pannę, córkę Juclzką* (Protestant version of 1632). In the most recent *Biblia Millenii*, the word *prasa* is changed to *tłocznia*: *Pan, jak w tłoczni podeptał dziewicę, córę Judy*. The Czech *Kralická Bible* (1613) has *Tlačil Pan presem pannu dcem judsku*. In the Croat translation by Daničić it reads *kao groždje u kaci izgazi Gospodin djevkoju kćer Judinu*, and in the 1968 version *U tijesku izgazi Gospod mene, djevicu kćerku Judinu*.

The word *kaldor* — provided the suffix *-or* is not a mistake of the copyist — is no doubt related to the Byelorussian *kaldobina*, meaning 'furrow, hole filled with water'. It also exists in Russian dialects under the forms *kaldoba*, *kałdobina*, *koldobina* as attested by Dal', Preobraženskij and Vasmer⁹. Sławski sees a possible connection between *kaldobina* and Polish *kadlub*.¹⁰

While refraining from any rash attempt to give an etymological explanation of the word *kaldor*, it is worth pointing out that its use in the Byelorussian Codex 262 helps towards a better understanding of this and other East Slavonic words belonging to the semantic group in question.

3) *Protoż ijudejane ottvoristy (sic!) što sedjat v horodech otvorených* (Esther IX, 19). The King James Bible has: *'Therefore the Jews of the villages, that dwell in the unwall'd towns'*.

The word *otvoristy* occurs only in Codex 262 and is a literal and faithful translation of the Hebrew *haperāzīm*.¹¹ The same passage in Skaryna's version reads: *No tyi iudei iže vo inych mestach i selach byša*, etc. Skaryna, probably following his Czech model, does not translate the word *haperāzīm* at all.

In an earlier translation of the Book of Esther,¹² preserved in several manuscripts from the 14th century onwards (e.g. in the 15th

9. Dal', *op. cit.*, II, p. 77; Vasmer, *op. cit.*, II, p. 287; Preobraženskij, *op. cit.*, I, p. 285.

10. Fr. Sławski, *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*, Cracow, 1952, II, pp. 16-17.

11. According to the corrected — the so-called *qerī* — reading, instead of the incorrect *haperāvozīm* found in the text.

12. On the problem of the authorship of this translation as well as the original from which it was translated see N. A. Meščerskij, 'K voprosu ob izučenii perevodnoj pis'mennosti Kievskogo perioda', *Vcenyje zapisky Karelo-Finskogo Pedagogičeskogo Instituta*, II, 1, 1955, pp. 198-219. The article gives an extensive bibliography of the subject.

century manuscript 2 (2027), formerly from the Troicko-Sergeevskaja monastery, now in the Lenin State Library in Moscow), the word *raspraščenicí* is used in place of *otvoristy*: *Togo radi ijudei raspraščenicí iže sědjachu po gradom rasprašenym*. Sreznevskij gives the following explanation: *raspraščenic* — *vm. rasprašenik* — *razsejannyj*. After having quoted the above-mentioned phrase, he adds in parentheses: *v nov. razsejanii; hoi diesparmenoi, dispersi; tak i v Evr.*¹³ He is mistaken, however, in his assertion about *dispersi* and *tak i v Evr.* (i.e. 'similarly in the Hebrew text'). The expression in the Vulgate is *qui in oppidis non muratis ac villis morabuntur*. Other Catholic versions follow the Vulgate, e.g. Wujek: *Ci lepak żydowie którzy w miasteczkach niemurowanych i po wsiach*. The Hebrew word *haperāzīm* does not mean 'dispersed', but 'open, not walled in, an inhabitant of an open place'.¹⁴ Sreznevskij's remark about *raspraščenic* and his equating it with the Greek *hoi diesparmenoi* does not accord well with the general opinion of Russian scholars (with the exception of Sobolevskij) that the above-mentioned translation of the Book of Esther was made on the basis of the Masoretic text.¹⁵ How can one explain this literal dependence on the Septuagint? Such dependence is also evident in the later Synodal version (the quotation is taken from the 1856 edition): *Iudei razsejannii vo vsjakoj straně vněšnej*. In the Ostrog Bible chapter IX of the Book of Esther ends on verse 16, and thus the verse in question is missing.

Thus, if the hypothesis of a Hebrew basis for the Slavonic translation of the 'Muscovite' text of the Book of Esther is retained, it is necessary to reject Sreznevskij's remark about the word *raspraščenic*, in which he equates it with *rasprašenik*. One should accept rather the reading of the Codex RKF-52 in the Central Library of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences in Vilna: *Togo radi ijudei rasprjaščanicí iže sědjachu po gradom rasprašenym*; it is possible that *rasprjaščanicí* (singular suffix *-anicí*) is a deverbalised derivative from **raspreti* (stem **preğ*), which is nearer to the Hebrew *haperāzīm* than Sreznevskij's *rasprašenik*.

Reverting to the word *otvoristy*, it is, as has already been said, a literal translation of the Hebrew *haperāzīm*.¹⁶ Its formation by means

13. I. Sreznevskij, *Materialy dlja slovarja drevne-russkogo jazyka*, III, StP., 1903, p. 81.
14. The new Hebrew-Russian dictionary has: *perāzī*: *neukreplennyj* (napr. o gorode); *perāzōt*, 'ir *perazōt*': *gorod bez krepostnoj steny* (*Ivrit-russkij slovar'*, Moscow, 1963, p. 503).
15. Meščerskij has this to say about the author of the translation and its original text: 'I tak, perevod, nesomnenno, sdelan neposredstvenno s evrejskogo originala, pričem perevodčikom, dlja kotorogo russkij jazyk byl bliže i ponjatnee, čem jazyk evrejskij' (Meščerskij, *op. cit.*, p. 211).
16. According to the Hebrew Biblical exegesis. The renowned exegete *Rashi* (Rabbi Shelomo Yitshaki, 1040-1105) provides the following comments on this point: '*Haperāzīm* (are those) Who do not dwell in walled cities'. On the characteristic features of the Biblical exegesis in the Byelorussian Codex 262, see M. Altbauer, 'Traces of Hebrew Commentaries in the Slavonic Translations of the Bible' (in Hebrew with a summary in English), *Tabriz*, Jerusalem, 1965, pp. 379-81 & IX-X.

of the suffix *-ist-yj*, which is productive and quite common in the East Slavonic languages, is clear and presents no difficulties.¹⁷

The word *otvoristyj* is not recorded in any of the East Slavonic dictionaries (Dal', Sreznevskij, Ušakov). It was known, on the other hand, in 16th century Polish, and was recorded in dictionaries such as the Latin-Polish dictionary of Jan Mączyński of 1564¹⁸ and Polish-Latin dictionary of Bartoimiej of Bydgoszcz of 1532 (publ. by B. Rzepka, Poznań, 1900).¹⁹ It also appears in Bible translations, e.g. in Wujek: *jako miasto otworzyste a bez murów* (Prov. XXV, 28), as compared with *miasto rozwalone bez murów* in the Gdańsk Bible. In the Slavonic Synodal version (ed. 1858) the same passage reads *jakoze grad stenami razoren i ne ograżden*, while the new Russian translation has *čto gorod razrušennyj bez sten*. The Byelorussian version of Codex 262, *horod prolomlenyi bez mura*, faithfully renders the Hebrew original 'ir *perūcā* (not *perūuzā!*) *ēn hōmā*.

Linde in his dictionary, having recorded several meanings of *otworzysty*, compares it with Russian *otverstyj*.

The faithful adherence to the Hebrew original in the Byelorussian Codex 262 is not limited to the word *haperāzīm* of Esther IX, 19. The same applies to the word *perāzōt* in the expression *be'arei haperāzōt* in the same verse, which in the Byelorussian translation becomes *v horodech otvorenych*. In this, Codex 262 differs again from earlier Slavonic translations, as well as from the Synodal version. Only the new Russian translation comes nearer to the original: *Poetomu Iudei živuščie v selenijach otкрытых*. The new Ukrainian version (publ. by Brit, and Foreign Bible Soc.) is not literal: *Z tiej pričiny judex sil'ski, ščo živut' po silach ta prisil'kach*. Also non-literal is the translation in the Hebrew-Russian edition of the Book of Esther by J. I. Pirožkov (Vilna, 1903): *Poetomu Iudei oblastny e, živuščie v gorodach oblastnych*. On the other hand O. N. Šteinberg in his Russian translation of the Pentateuch gives an exact translation of the Hebrew expression 'arei *haperāzī* (Deut. III, 5): *vse eti goroda, krome gorodov otкрытых*. In the Synodal version the same expression is *do vesi Ferzeovy*, as if *haperāzī* were a proper name. This mistake was made under the influence of the Septuagint which has left the Hebrew word

17. See K. Atrachovič, M. Bułachaŭ (eds.), *Hramatyka bielaruskaj movy*, I, Minsk, 1962, pp. 204-5; *Grammatika russkogo jazyka*, I, Moscow, 1960, p. 330; also I. S. Morkur'eva, 'Slovoobrazovanie kačestvennyh imen prilagatel'nyh v russkim jazyke XI-XVI v. (Suffiksy s primetoj '-t-')', *Učenyje Zapiski* (Leningr. Pedagog. Inst. im. A. I. Hercena, Kafedra russkogo jazyka), 144, Leningrad, 1958, pp. 117-44. (See in particular pp. 134-36 about the suffix *-ist*. Among the examples in the article the word *otvoristyj* is not mentioned.)

13. Quoted from W. Kuraszkiewicz, *Wyrazy polskie w słowniku łacińsko-polskim Jana Mączyńskiego*. Część I: A-O, Wrocław, 1962, p. 288, column 2.

19. Quoted from St. Respond, *Studia nad językiem polskim XVI wieku*, Wrocław, 1949, pp. 129 & 203.

untranslated.²⁰ *plēn tōn poleōn tōn fereziōn.*²¹ The Vulgate translates the text correctly: *absque oppidis innumeratis, quae non habebant muros.* In the new Russian Bible the mistake of the Synodal version has been corrected: *Krome gorodov neukrep lennych.* Similarly the new Ukrainian version (1949) has *okrim mist neukreplennykh.*

The question arises as to whether the author of Codex 262 in his attempt at a literal translation²² of the Bible found the word *otvoristy* in the contemporary Byelorussian language, or whether he made a borrowing from the Polish. The present writer, having no access to the necessary material, is unable to solve this problem. It should be noted, however, that the language of Codex 262 is on the whole free from Polish lexical borrowings, and that it was written long before the appearance of the first Polish printed Bible.

It has been pointed out at the beginning of this article that the Byelorussian biblical texts in Codex 262 contain much interesting material for Byelorussian, and general East Slavonic, lexicology. It is to be hoped that the concordance of these texts, which is in the course of preparation by the present writer, as an appendix to the Codex 262 which is to be published in the near future by the Israeli Academy of Sciences, will contribute to the extension of our knowledge of the vocabulary of Byelorussian and other East Slavonic languages in the 15-16th centuries.

-
20. This is not an uncommon occurrence in the Septuagint. For another example of this (about the untranslated word *to felomouni* in LXX in Dan. VIII, 13) see Altbauer, 'Traces' (see above, note 16).
21. Also in 1 Sam. VI, 18: *krome gradov Ferezejskich.* Only in Ezech. XXXVIII, 11 the translation is somewhat more exact: *na zemlu otveržennuju,* following the Septuagint version *epi gēn aperrimmenēn.* In the Vulgate the same passage reads *ad terrain absque muros.*
22. See the reference to this kind of translation technique in Eugene A. Nida, *Bible Translating. An Analysis of Principles and Procedures,* New York, 1947, pp. 11-12 ('Rendering the same Hebrew or Greek word by the same English word').