

Moshe TAUBE

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Israel, Jerusalem)
moshe.taube@mail.huji.ac.il

William Francis RYAN

Warburg Institute, School of Advanced Study, University of London (UK, London)
will.ryan.home@gmail.com

Chancellor Timofej Kamenevič and the Russification of the *Тайная тайных*

Timofej Kamenevič-Rvovskij was a late 17th-century cleric, minor writer, and eccentric historian, of whom very little is known — and even that little is problematic. In particular, for the purposes of this article, he was the text reviser and copyist of a distinctive manuscript of the *Тайная тайных* (henceforth *TT*), the East Slavic version of the medieval pseudo-Aristotelian *Secret of Secrets*, which was translated from the Hebrew version with major interpolations from Rhazes and Maimonides, and of which we recently published a critical edition with an analytical glossary [Ryan & Taube 2019].

In their authoritative entry on Timofej Kamenevič-Rvovskij in the *Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси* D. M. Bulanin and E. M. Matveeva assert that in spite of the general agreement among historians that Kamenevič (dates unknown but late 17th – early 18th century) was a native of Moscow, a consensus relying on the authority of Karamzin that he was ‘a Muscovite by birth’ (родом москвитянин), there are several indications that he might be, like many of his learned clerical contemporaries then living in Moscow, of Ruthenian origin (выходцем из Литовской Руси). Furthermore, in favour of a possible Grand Duchy origin for Kamenevič, Bulanin and Matveeva point tentatively to some Polishisms in his works, e. g. лист, власный, рок etc., some details of orthography like еллинокгрецкая, and rhyming of духи — други, reflecting a fricative pronunciation of the letter г [Bulanin, Matveeva 2004].

In addition to the above-mentioned linguistic evidence which might support a ‘West Russian’ origin for Kamenevič, we must also consider the fact that he uses Polish sources in his historical writings, e. g. Maciej Strykowski’s *Kronika* and Caesar Baronius’s *Annales ecclesiastici* (translated into Russian in 1678 by Ignatij Muromskij), and refers to Latin Fathers of the Church such as St Augustine of Hippo and St Ambrose of Milan, neither well known in Muscovite Russia before the 17th century. However, all these sources became available in Ruthenian or Muscovite Russian translations in Kamenevič’s lifetime, and indeed one pseudo-Augustine text was translated by the cleric, writer, and translator Karion Istomin, who was probably the errant monk Karion, an acquaintance of Kamenevič, who wished to be married and was the target of Kamenevič’s *Bozhii grad*, described by Lidija Sazonova as ‘very modest both in size and in talent’ [Sazonova 2006: 546]. The narrative style of Kamenevič’s historical accounts is similar, according to Bulanin and

Matveeva (basing themselves on Vadim I. Lestvicyn [Lestvicyn 1875]), to that found in Ruthenian books and sermons (в книгах и проповедях Литовской Руси).

Bulanin and Matveeva note Kamenevič's penchant for florid language, ornamental neologisms, and the use of calque and cryptography, as well as his idiosyncratic syntactic style, all of which suggest that he was flaunting his supposed knowledge of the classical languages and showing off his erudition by using transliterated Greek words (e. g. монахос, девтер) and refined figures of speech [Bulanin, Matveeva 2004]. Whether or not Kamenevič was really competent in Greek, and where he learned it, is open to question — we know nothing of his early life and education — although he may have had access to the large library of Nikon's New Jerusalem monastery.

Bulanin and Matveeva's conclusions have been supplemented by subsequent published research by O. L. Novikova on newly discovered manuscripts written by Kamenevič, and his handwriting styles [Novikova 2018; 2019].

Our intention in the present paper is to examine the various claims about Timofej Kamenevič's origins, language, style and erudition on the basis of his self-proclaimed "transposition" (преложишася) of the *Secret of Secrets* from "the Belorussian dialect" into the "[Russian]-Slavonic¹ idiom" (изъ бѣлоросійскаго діалекта ... во словенскую рѣчь), a text which he copied (from a somewhat Russified Muscovite manuscript, as we will demonstrate below), glossed and annotated in 1686. This text is MS St Petersburg, Library of the Academy of Sciences, Archeographic Commission Collection 97 (229) — hereafter MS A.

This Archeographic Commission copy was the subject of Varvara Adrianova's 1911 study on the history of the text of the *Gates of Aristotle* (following the title of Speranskij's 1908 edition «*Аристотелевы врата*», или «*Тайная тайных*»; on the two Russian titles in use for the Slavic *Secret of Secrets* see [Ryan & Taube 2019: 8–15]). In that study, Adrianova affirms [Adrianova 1911: 1] that the Slavic translation of the *Secret of Secrets* was made into the "Belorussian dialect" (наречіе белорусское) towards the end of the fifteenth century by a person of Belorussian origin, probably within the area where Belorussian was spoken, and thereafter in Muscovite Russia the language of the text underwent Russification. She was well aware [Adrianova 1911: 1 fn. 4] of A. Krymskij's claim, in a review of Speranskij's edition in *Ėtnografičeskoe obozrenie*, 1910, that the translator was a "Little-Russian" (sc. Ukrainian) Jew from Kiev and that the earliest witness (MS Vilnius 222–272, now Minsk, National Library of Belarus, MS 096/276K) was only a 16th-century Belorussian copy of an earlier Kievan translation, in which many glaring Ukrainian features were observable, and considered that the first part of Krymskij's claim (the one about the translator) needed careful examination. Going a step further than Speranskij, who in his edition [Speranskij 1908: 117–18] contented himself with observing that the underlying text of MS A, like the rest of the Muscovite

¹ Kamenevič uses in his works the expressions Славеноруский and Славянороссийский for 'Russian'. For example (cf. [Novikova 2018: 133]), in the title of his 1684 account Книга, именуемая история еллино-грецкая и греко-словенская в память предбудущим родом, от кого и в кая лета зачася наша **славеноруская** земля и кто в ней первый начат княжити, as well as in the title of his 1699 historical account О начале **славянороссийского** народа.

copies he used, was a “West-Russian” text, in which some words and expressions were replaced with Great Russian or bookish Church Slavic forms, Adrianova goes on to compare Speranskij’s main text (MS V) with Kamenevič’s “transposition” (MS A), as well as with a copy discovered by N. N. Petrov, MS Kiev, Duhovnaja akademija, Muz. No. 837 (now lost), apparently written in Moscow *circa* 1598–1605 (hereafter MS K).

Regarding the peculiarities of Kamenevič’s MS A, she notices [Adrianova 1911: 4] its numerous additions in the margins, most of which supply Russian glosses of Belorussian forms, while a few provide explanations of incomprehensible words. She also notes the many personal remarks to the reader, like ‘pay attention!’, ‘beware these things!’ etc. In these remarks she sees an indication of the vivid interest in the text on the part of the copyist, who evidently tries to draw the attention of his future reader to some instructive passages.

Adrianova affirms that MSS K and A are based on some “West-Russian” original and do not present any significant difference in their make-up. In order to demonstrate the closeness of A, K and V, she compares [Ibid.: 4–6] several excerpts from the three witnesses. Her conclusions [Ibid.: 6] are that the language of A and K is so different from that of all the witnesses used by Speranskij, that we should consider them a separate, specifically Great-Russian branch of the text, which emerged in stages. While already in Speranskij’s (17th-c.) MS U (Ундольское собрание 750) there are some instances of replacing Belorussian forms with Russian ones, MS K clearly demonstrates the tendency to give the text a Great Russian tint by carefully removing “West-Russian” features, growing less careful only in the second part. MS A, finally, goes further still. The copyist clearly states his aim in the afterword, where he addresses his reader with the words:

For you, our most dear child, I have laboured much over these most philosophical books and for the sake of more convenient comprehension I have translated them from the Belorussian dialect [*dialekta*], that is idiom [*glagola*], into the Slavonic [*slovenskij*, here = Russian Church Slavonic] language [*rěč*], insofar as this was possible for my poor understanding, except for strange terms which it was not proper for me to discuss. And now, farewell.

However, few such strange terms, she states [Ibid.: 6], remained, and most of them were replaced by the copyist in the margins with corresponding Great Russian or bookish forms. The next step must have been the insertion of the glosses into the text, but such a copy has not yet been found (Ibid.).

She then supplies [Ibid.: 7–9] a comparative table of “new words” in A and K, replacing the Belorussian turns of phrase in copies of the Und. 750-type, a comparison meant to demonstrate the gradual change of language on Great Russian territory). The conclusion she draws from this table [Ibid.: 9] is that:

“in the overwhelming majority of cases the two texts translate identically the corresponding expressions of the West Russian original. There is reason to think that if these (innovations) are the work of the copyist of K, then the second (copyist, sc. A) was using already available (sc. Great-Russian) material in the adduced examples. He had (p. 10) in front of him a text which was already subject to the

influence of Great Russian. One cannot but observe though that the original (sc. exemplar) of A is closer than K to V and to the copies serving as variants in Speranskij's edition, preserving Belorussian forms which disappeared from the latter. This observation allows us to assume that A and K are not directly related to one another. MS K and the exemplar of A are independent of each other, but guided by a common goal they modified the West-Russian text adapting it to the understanding of the readers."

She points [Adrianova 1911: 10] to the numerous marginal glosses in A containing Russian equivalents and explanations of "West Russian expressions" and characterizes them as the original work (самостоятельную работу) of the copyist. On pages 11–13 she gives a list of readings in A with their glosses and explanations. She summarizes [Ibid.: 13] the list by the statement that the copyist brought the language of the *Gates of Aristotle* considerably nearer to the (Russian-)Slavonic language (словенскую рѣчь).

Her conclusion [Ibid.: 13–14] is that the language of the *Gates of Aristotle* underwent in Muscovy a significant reworking "for the sake of more convenient comprehension" (удобнѣйшаго ради познания in K-R's words). This process probably began soon after the text emerged in the territories of Great Russian dialects, yielding copies such as Und. 750; towards the end of the sixteenth century it added to the language a noticeable Great Russian colouration, found in the exemplar of A and in K, while towards the end of the seventeenth century it led to an almost complete obliteration of traces of the West Russian original, as can be seen from MS A.

If one adds to this [Ibid.: 13–14] the fact that a Great Russian copyist made (as demonstrated by [Speranskij 1908: 77]) two additions to the text of the *Gates of Aristotle*, namely the *Account of the making of this Book* (Сказание о сотворении книги сея) and the *Account of the Hellenic philosopher, the most wise Aristotle* (Сказание о еллинском философе о премудром Аристотеле), together with the change in language discussed above, we may reasonably conclude that this text aroused serious interest among Russian readers. This summarizes Adrianova's 1911 discussion.

While we subscribe to Adrianova's suggestion of a gradual change in the language of the text soon after its arrival in Muscovy, reflected in lexical and grammatical replacements found in many Russified copies of the 16th and 17th centuries which are not necessarily copied from one another, we cannot agree with her statement that the particular replacements and glosses in MS A are the work of the copyist (though from her wording it is not absolutely clear whether she has in mind Timofej Kamenevič-Rvovskij or possibly the anonymous copyist of A's "original" exemplar). We will show that many of (but not all) the Great-Russian words replacing Ruthenisms in A appear also in a manuscript written in Moscow at some time between 1579 and 1587, MS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 45.

The examples given below will be marked by chapter and verse as they are in our 2019 edition of the *Secret of Secrets* (rather than by folio number in the MSS, as does Adrianova)². Speranskij in his 1908 edition of the *TT* did list some variants from

² The following sigla are used (for details of the manuscripts see [Ryan & Taube 2019: 69–77]):

A = St Petersburg, Library of the Academy of Sciences, Archeographic Commission Collection 97 (229). 1686.

several manuscripts but unfortunately not all, and his statement [Speranskij 1908: 66, n. 1] that MSS V, A, S, S₂ and U are almost identical must be taken as referring not to their language but to their content and structure, and even the latter is not entirely true, since he seems to have been using MSS S and S₂ very sparingly, with many pages of his edition never mentioning a variant from either.

* * *

The position of Kamenevič's 1686 manuscript, MS A, within the group of Muscovite copies of the *TT* in terms of degree of Russification and of uniqueness is far from being clear. While there are a few instances of a unique Russified reading in A, most of them are shared with other copies, among them the late-16th c. MS O, and in still other instances A does not Russify a word that other Muscovite copies replace by a Great-Russian equivalent.³ From the automatic frequency analysis of A's distinct variant readings in our edition it transpires that their total amounts to 1177 (vs. 894 readings shared with other copies). This large number, however, is mostly made up of cases where A differs from the other copies we used in the spelling of the same word, sometimes corrupting it. In order to single out the cases where a Ruthenian word is replaced by a Russian one, we had to resort to a manual scrutiny, which apprised us that in only some 15 cases does A replace a Ruthenian word with a Russian equivalent differing from the readings in O, Q, S, S₂, and U. Even these cannot be unconditionally qualified as unique contributions by the copyist of A, given that 1. we do not know what was in the manuscript from which Kamenevič made his copy; and 2. we cannot be sure about the readings in S, S₂ and U, since we know them only through Speranskij's edition, in which the variants are supplied rather selectively. In contrast to this modest quantity of some 15 distinct, perhaps unique readings in A, we observe 430 cases where A shares a reading (mostly a Russicism) with O and Q, 40 cases where A shares a reading with O only, another 177 cases where A shares a reading with Q, and 10 cases where A shares a reading with U (with the reservation mentioned earlier about the selectivity of Speranskij's variants). In a large number of cases (we could not automatically count them) MS A retains a Ruthenian word Russified in other Muscovite copies. We may then classify A's position with regard to Russification as follows (we give only selected examples):

K = Kiev, Duhovnaja akademija, Muzej MS 837. End of sixteenth–beginning of 17th c.

O = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 45. Last quarter of the sixteenth century.

Q = St Petersburg, Russian National Library, Q XVII 56. 17th century.

S = Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal Collection 723. Dated 1640.

S₂ = Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal Collection 359. 17th century.

U = Moscow, Russian State Library, fond 310 (Undol'skij coll.), no. 750. End of 17th century.

V = Minsk, National Library of Belarus, MS 096/276K (formerly Vilnius Public Library 222–272). 1560s.

MS K is known to us only through Adrianova's 1911 excerpts.

MSS S, S₂, U are known to us only through Speranskij's 1908 variants.

³ In the examples that follow, the main text represents MS V unless marked otherwise.

1. MS A preserves the Ruthenian form as attested in V, while other copies Russify it:

- ТТ2.3.14 ущепаєть ‘excludes’ A marg. gloss: лишитъ — O, Q, U: прѣстѣпаєть
 ТТ2.4.8 дворки ‘jokes’ — O, Q: шѣтки
 ТТ2.16.1 в лѣвѣю ‘on your left’ — O, Q, U: о шѣю
 ТТ3.1.1 справедливость ‘justice’ — O, Q, U: правда
 МА4.1.4 а запѣвно ‘for sure’ A: а сапѣвно and marg. gloss: во праѣду — O: а вѣдомо; Q: а вѣдаю

2. MS A has unique Russified form:

- ТТ1.0.6 воином и гетманом ‘of soldiers and high commanders’ A: слугъ и боар и витязѣи O: ввиновъ и гетмановъ; Q: воиновъ і етмановъ;
 ТТ1.2.8 побачиѣ ‘recognizes’ A: познал; O, Q: помнѣл
 ТТ3.2.9 вырыто ‘carved’ A: вырѣсано; O, Q, U: написано
 ТТ4.8.1 листы ‘letters’ A: грамоты; O: епистолии; Q: спистолии
 RM7.18.4 подлоуѣ ‘on account of’ A: по; O, Q: поѣмѣрѣ

3. MS A shares Russified form with other Muscovite copies, including the 16th-c. MS O:

- ТТ0.4.3 просишь ‘you ask’ — A, O, Q, S, U: молиши
 ТТ0.4.10 запислагаю ‘I adjure’ — A, O, Q, S, U: завѣщаю
 ТТ0.4.11 оуховаи ‘[may God] defend [us from it]’ — A, O, Q, S, S₂: сохрани
 ТТ1.1.2 ган’бы ‘shame’ — A: хулы; O: хоулы; Q, S, U: хѣлы
 ТТ2.9.2 зълюбѣи всакомѣ смиренномѣ миръ и ласкою свою ‘promise peace and love to all obedient men’ зълюбѣи A, Q: обѣцаи; O: обещаи; ласкою A marg. gloss: любовь; O, Q: любовь
 ТТ2.4.16 налѣпшии ‘the best’ — A, O, Q: лѣчши
 ТТ2.4.16 напѣщи ‘the worst’ — A: хѣждѣши O: хоудшеи Q: хѣждшеи
 ТТ2.13.4 шкодѣ свою ‘your losses’ — A, O, Q: оубытокъ свои
 ТТ2.15.1 присаги ‘oath’ — A, O, Q, U: клятвы
 ТТ2.22.1 прото иже ‘because’ — A, O, Q: того ради иже
 ТТ2.22.8 змилоуетса ‘[God] will have mercy’ — A, O, Q: умилосердитса
 ТТ2.23.7 порсоуна ‘image’ — A, O, Q, U: образъ
 ТТ3.1.5 милѣа ‘loving’ — A, O, Q: люба
 ТТ3.1.5 милоѣтникъ ‘favourite’ — A, O, Q: возлюбленикъ
 ТТ3.2.8 пожиточнеи ‘more useful’ — A, O, Q: оугоднѣе
 ТТ4.3.2 свѣтскими ‘worldly’ — A, O, Q: житѣйскими
 ТТ4.3.4 чѣмѣ то рада ‘why the counsel’ — A, O: чѣмѣ то мысль; Q: чѣмѣ помысль
 ТТ4.3.18 светской ‘worldly’ — A, Q: житѣйской; O: житѣйской
 ТТ4.5.32 прото иже ‘because’ — A, O, Q: того ради иже
 ТТ4.5.12 скарбъ ‘treasury’ — A: сокровища; O: съкрвище; Q: сокровище
 ТТ4.5.13 радить ‘advises’ — A, O, Q: придѣмаєть
 ТТ6.3.2 ган’бы ‘scandals’ — A, O, Q: хѣлы
 ТТ6.6.2 налѣпши ‘the best’ — A, O, Q, U: предоброє

ТТ7.2.1 в'браѣ 'clad' — A, O, Q, U: воорѡженъ 'armed'

ТТ7.2.15 слюбѡи 'promise' — A, O, Q: обѡцаи

Not only does MS A share Russicisms with other Muscovite copies, but also omissions and other textual modifications, including with the 16th-c. MS O. This is an indication of their sharing a common, albeit indirect, Muscovite ancestor.

4. MS A shares omissions and textual modifications with other Muscovite copies, including the 16th-c. MS O

ТТ0.3.1 ко храмѡ слнечномуу 'to the Temple of the Sun' — A, O, Q, S: градѡ 'to the city [of the Sun]'

ТТ2.10.3 рвенїа 'fervour' A, O, Q omit

ТТ7.8.15 навѣртатса емѡ вчїю слезы 'tears well up in his eyes' — вчїю A, O, Q omit

М02.2.8 алюбѡ пропѡщенїе 'or diarrhoea' — A, O, Q omit

МА4.8.1 вбывае въ немощы '[their] effect on the disease' — A, O, Q omit

МА4.9.1 а потомъ дастса дрѡгомѡ лекарю а не кажетса в who^m лекари 'and then go to another doctor without telling (him) about that other doctor.' — лекарю A, O, Q omit; лекари A, O, Q omit.

Having at our disposal the Hebrew version (and the Arabic original) of the *Secret of Secrets* as well as of the four major interpolations: Rhazes' *Al-Mansuri*, Maimonides' *On Lethal Drugs*, *On Coitus* and *On Asthma*, we are in a position to go a step further than Adrianova could and make further distinctions, between correct and erroneous equivalents and explanations, some of the latter being the result of guesswork, while others resulting from faulty analogies. Thus, the examples of Russification adduced in sections 2 and 3 above represent the overwhelming majority of instances where a correct equivalent is given by the copyist of A (in most cases shared with other Muscovite copies). There are however quite a few instances where the Russian equivalent given in the text of A is incorrect. For certain terms A's rendering is inconsistent (apparently depending on the spelling in A's exemplar), and here too there are instances of incorrect equivalents shared with other Muscovite copies as opposed to unique ones.

As for the many marginal glosses in MS A, the picture here too is rather complex, much more so than Adrianova's three-way distinction between "translations", "explanations" and "remarks to the virtual reader". The majority of the glosses consists of Great Russian equivalents for Ruthenian words, while some supply an explanation for a Ruthenian word or for a bookish Russian word deemed unfamiliar, or having a meaning here that is different from its regular sense in Russian Church Slavonic. Here too, some glosses are correct while others are not, some are unique while others are shared with other Muscovite copies.

5. MS A has a unique correct gloss of a Ruthenism

ТТ0.2.3 пробавить ‘preserve’ — A marg. gloss: продолжит

ТТ2.3.15 зашкодитъ ‘harms’ — A marg. gloss: вредитъ

ТТ4.8.8 прислѣхаеть ‘it befits’ — A marg. gloss: достоин^г

РМ7.29.30 и щюпаль бы по чрѣвѣ ‘and you should feel all over his belly’ — A: щупаль and marg. gloss: осяса^г

6. MS A shares a correct gloss of a Ruthenism with O

ТТ02.1 рады ‘advice’ — A, O marg. gloss: совѣта

МО4.2.5 але ‘nevertheless’ — A, O marg. gloss: но

The insecurity of Muscovite scribes, including Kamenevič, facing an unfamiliar Ruthenian text can be demonstrated by a term inconsistently spelled, occasionally corrupted, and sometimes glossed in A and in O. This is the Ruthenian word поведение ‘conduct, regimen, regime’ (cf. Mod Ukr поведення ‘conduct, behaviour’) known also in Russian in various meanings (cf. Mod R поведение and entry in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.).

Kamenevič is rather inconsistent in his spelling of the word поведение, which appears over forty times in the *TT*, however, so must have been his exemplar, if we are to judge by the forms in V, where the spellings include поведение, повѣданиє, поведаніє and поведание. In A, one may add to these the spellings поведѣніє, повѣдєніє and повидѣніє. These spellings may naturally lead to an understanding of the term as ‘saying, story, admission, vision, outlook’ etc. No wonder therefore that in many instances where the context apparently did not supply Kamenevič (or his Muscovite exemplar) with an unambiguous clue to the meaning, the term is either erroneously glossed or replaced by an erroneous Great Russian equivalent. Let us see the range of different understandings of the term by Muscovite scribes, including Kamenevič:

- a. The term поведение ‘conduct’ appears in A, suggesting a correct understanding of its meaning in the given context, whereas other copyists Russify it incorrectly:

ТТ5.0.0 в поведаніи посольствиа ихъ ‘about the conduct of their embassies’ — A: повѣденіи; O: сканіи; Q, U: сказаніи

ТТ7.0.0 в поведаніи воєвно^м ‘Of the conduct of war’ — A: ѿ поведєніи воєвнмъ; O: в воєвноє^м сказаніи; Q: в воєвноє^м сказаніи

- b. In some instances, it is spelled in a manner that may have led the other Muscovite copies to an erroneous replacement by сказание ‘expression, saying’, yet it remains in A without comment (italics in the English translation, here and elsewhere, indicate words not found in the Hebrew original):

ТТ4.5.30 и повѣданіа вѣтажскаа ‘and the conduct of the knights’ — A: повѣдания; O: сказаніа; Q: сказаніа; U: сказаніа;

ТТ7.1.3 поведаніє воєвноє ‘military conduct’ — A: повѣданіа воєвнмъ; O: сказаніа ратаа; Q: сказаніа раднмъ; U: сказаніа ратная

МК0.1.1 написати собѣ повѣданіе в мжжствѣ ‘to write for him a regimen of sex’ — А: поведѣніе; О: сказаніе; Q: сказание

МК5.0.0 поведаніе же что подобаеѣ ‘The regimen that is appropriate’ — А: повѣдание; О, Q: сказаніе

c. In some instances, поведение is replaced in A, just as in the other Muscovite copies, by an erroneous equivalent, namely сказание ‘expression, saying’:

ТТ4.5.6 поведѣньем ‘in conduct’ — А, О, Q, U: сказаніемъ

ТТ4.9.12 чистъ поведѣніемъ вдеіаніа своего ‘clean in the manner of his dressing’ — А, О, Q: сказаніемъ

RM7.18.0 в поведаніи прѣмени^т слѣаніа ‘On conduct which changes the temperament’ — А: о скасаніи; О, Q: в сказаніи

RM7.26.5 и коли прѣменяють повѣданіе естывы своеа. ‘and when they change their conduct in matters of eating’ — А: скасаніе; О, Q: сказанія

d. In some instances A has a Great Russian replacement for the term different from other Muscovite copies, here namely дѣло ‘business’:

ТТ7.5.7 корень поведѣни{я} военого хитрованіа ‘the root of the conduct of war is cunning’ — А: дѣла; О, Q: сказанія; V: поведѣныи

e. Sometimes the term поведение, spelled somewhat differently, thus allowing a different interpretation, is accompanied by an erroneous gloss:

М00.0.1 в повѣданіи в трѣповомъ ‘concerning the regimen of the body’ — А: Повидѣнии трѣповомъ and marg. gloss: о видѣніи ‘on sight, vision’; О: в сказаніи трѣповомъ; Q: в сказаніи троповомъ

МА0.0.2 нѣжныя повѣданію з^дравію ‘necessary for the regimen of health’ — А: повидѣнію and marg. gloss: ра^зсу^жденію ‘for the reasoning’; О: сказанію; Q: сказанію

МА2.1.11 ѿ повѣданіа ‘of the regimen’ — А: ѿ повидѣніа and marg. gloss: о^т по^нанія ‘of the recognition, admission’ (for that meaning in Russian cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv sub* повѣдати sub-entry 3); О: ѿ сказаніа; Q: о^т сказаніа

МА2.2.10 а поведаніе доброе ‘and your regimen is good’ — А, О: а поведѣніе; А marg. gloss: а повѣ^ѣть ‘and the information’⁴; Q: а поведѣніе^{МА3.5.12} но толко спжстиса на доброе поведанье ‘but simply rely on a good regimen’ — А: поведѣніе and marg. gloss: и^воленіе ‘will, wish’; О: повѣ^дніе; Q: поведѣніе

МА3.7.10 споустивса на прироженіа и на доброе поведаніе ‘by relying on nature and a good regimen’ — А, О: повѣденіе; А marg. gloss: ра^зсу^жденіе ‘reasoning, judgement’; Q: повѣданіе

МА4.9.2 в поведаніи свое^м ‘in his regimen’ — А: поведѣніи and marg. gloss: въ совѣтѣ ‘in his counsel/consultation’; О: повѣдѣніи; Q: поведѣніи

⁴ Cf. the 12 different meanings of that word in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v. 1. *Весть, известіе*; 2. *Рассказ, повествованіе*; 3. *Разговор, беседа*; 4. *Предмет всеобщих толков, молва*; 5. *Речь, слова*; 6. *Имя существительное (нарицательное) (?)*; 7. *Указаніе, наставленіе*; 8. *Объясненіе*; 9. *Описаніе*; 10. *Пословица, поговорка*; 11. *Образец*; 12. *Передача Греч. τραγῳδία ‘трагедія’*.

МА4.10.6 ненави́дѣтъ повѣданіе людеи гро^дцки^х ‘[country-dwellers who] hate the conduct of city-dwellers’ — А: ненави́дѣтъ повѣдѣнія and marg. gloss: не любя^т накасания ‘do not like the instructions/injunctions’; О: ненави́дѣтъ сказаніа; Q: ненави́дѣтъ сказаніа

МО2.2.2 и ведисѣ ты^м же поведаніе^м ‘then follow the same regimen’ — А: поведѣніемъ and marg. gloss: поводо^м ‘direction’ (cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.); О: сказаніемъ; Q: сказаніем^м

f. Sometimes it is the erroneous equivalent that is accompanied by a gloss, equally wrong (probably referring to the reading of the Ruthenian form in the exemplar):

RM7.26.6 такоже поведаніе его питіе^м его ‘and so also his conduct with regard to drinking’ — А: скасаніе ‘saying’ and marg. gloss: желаніе ‘desire’; О, Q: сказаніе

g. Sometimes the term is accompanied by a gloss that could be considered a legitimate synonym:

ТТ8.12.0 поведѣнію цр^ккомѣ ‘the conduct of the king’ — А marg. gloss: уря^д ‘rules, customs’

ТТ8.12.8 поведаніе цр^кковѣ ‘the conduct of kings’ — А: поведѣніе and marg. gloss: уря^д ‘rules, customs’; О: сказаніе

h. Sometimes A provides a correct Great Russian gloss, in spite of the spelling being obviously wrong and misleading:

МО2.0.0 ѡ поведаньи того хто изъелъ вкормъ ‘On the regimen for one who has eaten poison’ — А: о повидѣнїи and marg. gloss: о вѣденїи ‘on the conduct’; О, Q: ѡ сказанїи

МК1.2.2 лекарство или поведанье ‘medicine or regimen’ — А: повидѣнїе его and marg. gloss: вѣденїе ‘conduct’; О: повѣдѣнїа; Q: повѣданія

i. Sometimes the spelling of the term and of the gloss do not allow us an unambiguous interpretation:

МА2.2.5 только бы поведѣніе добро было ‘provided that the regimen is good’ — А: повидѣнїе and marg. gloss: повѣданіе

j. Sometimes the gloss reflects a reasonable interpretation:

МО2.2.7 влиже приведешъ его к поведанію его ‘until you return him to his normal regimen’ — А: поведѣнію and marg. gloss: крѣпо^{сти} ‘[to his normal] strength’ О, Q: по^двѣнїю

Another term illustrating the difficulties of a Muscovite facing a Ruthenian text is the term поробник ‘lecher, womanizer, debauchee, fornicator’ and its derived abstract поробнитство ‘lechery, womanizing’, appearing eight times in the *ТТ*. It stems from Old Polish *porobnik* [Reczek 1968]. In Modern Polish we

Here the copyist could not possibly be aware of the fact that Hebrew דָּרוֹב , literally ‘drop’, is a euphemism for ‘semen, ejaculation’.

Similarly, terms for sexual activity, reflecting in Slavic the euphemisms of Hebrew usage, remain impenetrable to the Muscovite copyist. For example:

ТТ7.29.4 В НЕМЖЕ ПРИСТОИТЬ МНОГО МОУЖЕСТВО ‘In this (season) it is good to have much sexual activity’ — А: МЖЪСТВУ and marg. gloss: крѣпо^сть ‘strength’.

ТТ7.30.5 И ВМЕНШИТИ В НЪМ^м МОУЖЕСТВО ‘And in this (season) reduce sexual activity’ — А marg. gloss: силу ‘power’.

ТТ7.32.4 МЖЕСТВОВАТИ БОЛШЕ НИЖЕЛИ В^в ЛЕТѢ ‘(during winter) engage in sexual activity more than in the summer’ — А: МУЖЕСТВОВАТИ and marg. gloss: бодр^р[ствовати] ‘show courage, fortitude’ (cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv sub* бодрость³. — *смелость, мужество* ‘boldness, courage’).

Equally understandable is Kamenevič’s confusion when encountering untranslated Hebrew words and expressions.

ТТ8.3.1 ѡбразъ б’тоулинъ ‘the image of a maiden’⁵ — А: б’тѡлинъ and marg. gloss: свѣ^в и^и ино что ‘wild beast or something else’.

ТТ8.4.1 башми^и. се є^с арасимъ велики^х тол’ко же иже чюти <в> єд{є}нїи а не горекъ <ѡко> мара єѡєва и намєрова ‘Bashmin (aconite).⁶ This is one of the greatest poisons⁷ except that it is perceptible in eating, and is not bitter <as> the gall of the viper and the leopard.’⁸ — А: ибаш’манъ with left marg. gloss: ино^стра^иски ‘foreign’ [this form is not in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*] and right marg. gloss: со^ста^в или о^бра^з ‘compound or image’; А: арасимъ великихъ and marg. gloss: не превєдєно ‘not translated’.

It is not clear whether this last remark signifies that he recognized арасим as an untranslated foreign (Hebrew) word, or that it means: ‘I have not translated it’, since in the afterword Kamenevič speaks of his copy in terms of ‘transposition’ (or: ‘translation’ — *предложишася*). Surprisingly enough, he does not comment on the transliterated Hebrew forms for ‘the gall of the viper and the leopard’.

Our Muscovite copyist should also be excused for ignoring some idiosyncrasies limited to the works by the Kievan Jewish translator Zacharia b. Aharon, attested

⁵ Slavic б’тулинъ, is an adjective formed from the Hebrew noun בתולה [*betula*] ‘young girl; Virgo’ — it is not clear why the translator chose not to translate this word. The Hebrew text has: נערה מגולה [*na’ara megula*] ‘a bare/uncovered maiden’. This corresponds to the Arabic Short-Form text (MSS Suhāi 167 and CBL 4183) جارية مجلوة ‘an unveiled girl’, representing an inadequate transliteration of مجلوة [*mylwh* to be read *majlurwah*] by Heb מגולה [*mgwlh* to be read *megulah*]. The Arabic Long-Form text [Badawi, 1954: 160]: رجل امرد ‘a beardless man’, though Ismail Ali, (in [Steele 1920: 257]), renders it ‘black man’, perhaps reading امرد for اسود.

⁶ The poison Bish, aconite. On this see [Ruska 1926: 96–7], where *bish* is part of the ‘Treasure of Alexander the Great’; [Johnstone 1977: 67]. See OED, s.v. *bikh*; Hobson-Jobson, s.v. *bish*, *bikh*, says the word is of Sanskrit origin ‘*visha*’.

⁷ Slavic арасимъ is the transliteration of the plural of Heb ארס (*eres*) ‘poison; drops (of poison)’

⁸ The Slavic is an almost perfect transliteration of the Heb מררת האפעה ומררת הנמר lit. ‘gall [*marra*] of the viper [*ef’eh*] and the gall of the leopard [*namer*].

only in the *TT* and in the *Logika* (see [Taube 2016: 609]), for example *всячѣство* and *раздробѣнство*, respectively ‘genus; generality’ and ‘species; individuality’. For example:

МА4.4.9 и сакїи не исцѣлѣють всачѣство внои немощи но раздробѣнство. ‘Such (sc. learned physicians) do not treat the species of that disease but the individual (case thereof)’ — *всачѣство* А: *в’сачѣствѣ* and marg. gloss: *в’се^н* ‘the whole’; *раздробѣнство* А: *ра’дроблен’ство* and marg. gloss: *ра’слабленіе* ‘weakening’.

Some Polish (and Ruthenian) usage also seems to baffle the cleric Kamenevič. Thus in *On Coitus*, discussing the kind of atmosphere propitious for sex, Maimonides, in the best tradition of physicians, recommends, among other things, gaiety, laughter, coquetry etc. The word used by the translator of the *TT* for ‘coquetry, flirtatious talk’ is:

МК1.2.3 речи фриввнныи ‘flirtatious conversation’ — А: *рѣчи фривв’нныи* and marg. gloss: *слова полѣзныѣ* ‘helpful words’.

The adjective *фриввнныи* stems ultimately from German, cf. *freien* (MHG *vrien*) ‘to woo’, through Old Polish [Reczek 1968]: *fryjowny* ‘*kokieteryjny, nierządny, rozpustny, zalotny*’, i.e. ‘flirtatious, bawdy, dissolute, wheedling’. It does not appear in the Historical Dictionary of Belorussian, although the forms *Фриярь* and *Фриярка* are adduced there from the work *О поесехъ небесныхъ* in the same 16th-c. manuscript of the National Library in Minsk (09/276K), glossed respectively *Палубоўнік; спакуснік* ‘lover, seducer’ and *Палубоўніца; распусніца* ‘mistress; whore’ (cf. similar meanings for Old Polish *fryjer, fryjerz, fryjarz* and *fryjerka, fryjarka* given in [Reczek 1968]).⁹ Yet Kamenevič seems to be oblivious to all that, glossing it with the expression ‘helpful words’ (unless we are perhaps witnessing here an instance of prudery or censorship).

A similar example is the word (stemming from Old Polish)¹⁰ *старовати* ‘to concern oneself with’, admittedly a rare Ruthenian word, not attested in Russian (absent from the *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*). In the *HSBM*, s.v., [32: 336], the following example from the *TT* is the only occurrence, glossed *гнясці* ‘weigh, press; oppress’.

ТТ7.20.8 и не старѣеть на^д тобою ‘he does not impose himself on you’ — А marg. gloss: *и не лука’бнуеть* ‘he is not sly’, ‘he does not cheat’.

Kamenevič evidently did not know the meaning of *стравца* ‘wastrel’, known in Old Polish [Reczek 1968], and attested twice in our text, where A supplies guesses based on the meanings of the corresponding Russian verb:

⁹ One should also add here the etymologically related Modern (Western) Ukrainian *фраер* ‘sweet-heart, suitor, wooer, marriageable young man’, as well as Modern Polish *frajer* ‘sucker’ and Modern Russian slang *фраер, фрайер* ‘dupe, sucker; flashy dresser; non-criminal’ which has made its way, through Yiddish פרייער [*frajer*], into Contemporary Israeli Hebrew — פרייאר [*frajer*] ‘dupe, sucker’.

¹⁰ Cf. [Reczek 1968] (OPol) dictionary: *starowność* dbałość, staranie ‘attention, care, effort’.

ТТ1.2.1 стравца ‘wastrel’ A marg. gloss: вра^ждотворца ‘hate-instigator’

ТТ1.2.5 стравца ‘wastrel’ A marg. gloss: смутина ‘disturbance, confusion, trouble’;
Q: справца (‘administrator’).

Kamenevič makes his guesses on the basis of the meaning ‘stir up trouble between, provoke to fight’ of Russian стравити, well attested in his time (cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.). The particular form смутина ‘disturbance, confusion, trouble’ is not attested in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, but many other nouns from the stem смут are well attested in Russian (*ibidem*). In the single occurrence of the verb стравити in our text, Kamenevič’s guess is helped by the context, and he therefore has two approximate equivalents, the second being closer to the meaning of the Ruthenian:

ТТ4.5.14 а стравит ли того что добыѣ^т оу тебе ‘But if he spends what he has gained with you’ — A: изг^рбитъ ли, а сотратит^т ли; O, Q: а изг^рбитли

In the case of the Ruthenian word завада ‘obstacle’ (stemming from Polish *zawada*), rare in Old Russian (cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.) which occurs twice in the *TT*, the copyist of A seems to know its meaning, judging by his correct gloss in one case, but in the other case adds a questionable gloss, perhaps indicating his knowledge of Greek:

ТТ8.8.4 а завады далекїи ѿ него ‘then obstacles will be far from him’ — A marg. gloss: садѣ^ржания ‘delays, hindrances’.

Compare the surprising gloss:

МА4.10.5 зан^тже се завада болша^а ‘and this is a great obstacle’ — A marg. gloss: глупо^ть ‘stupidity’. Cf. Modern Greek ζαβ^αδα ‘stupidity’.

In instances where the Ruthenian term is distorted, the Muscovite’s copyist’s confusion and resorting to guessing are understandable. Such is the case of the term фоулсо ‘pulse’. We do not have an explanation for its form (*f* instead of *p*) but guess that it could be the contribution of the Kievan Jewish translator Zacharia b. Aharon who may have seen the word spelled פולס in a Hebrew medical text, where it could be a Romance (Italian) gloss for the native Hebrew term פקפ. The word *puls*, well attested in Polish, is probably the origin of пульс, attested since the early 17th century in Belorussian (cf. *HSBM*, s.v.), but not in Russian (not in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*; [Černyh 1993] s.v.: ‘beginning of 18th c.’), as well as of Modern Belorussian, Ukrainian and Russian пульс. Here is how the distorted term is treated by Kamenevič:

RM7.6.9 дыханье его и фоулсо его среднее ‘his breathing and his pulse are average’ — A: ѿдльсо and marg. gloss: и крѣпость ‘and strength’.

seeM7.7.2 фоулсо их^х мало ‘their pulse is faint’ — A: ѿдльсо and marg. gloss: пѣрси ‘chest’.

RM7.23.5 и фоулсо великое ‘and a strong pulse’ A: ѿдлсо and marg. gloss: жѣлудъ и пусы^p ‘stomach and bladder’.¹¹

RM7.23.9⁹ и бждеть ѿдлсо сѣреднее ‘and the pulse is average’ A: ѿдльсо and marg. gloss: и^{ли} удъ та^{ни}ны^и ‘or private member’.

A somewhat similar case of distortion leading to false word-division, corruption and resulting in failed guesswork, is the term for ‘henbane’ in Maimonides’ *On Lethal Drugs*. Here too the rendering in Slavic, reflecting in all evidence the term *jusquiamo*¹² (cf. Fr. *jusquiate*, It. *giusciamo*), should be attributed to the input of the Kievan Jewish translator Zacharia B. Aharon, who must have been searching for variants or glosses to clarify the sense of the unfamiliar word אלבנג [albang] ‘henbane’ found here in Hebrew (a precise transliteration of Arabic البنج), and was undoubtedly familiar with the form יישקאמי which appears as early as the 10th century in the collection of prescriptions called *Sefer ha-Yaqaar* ‘*Precious Book*’ by Shabbethai Donnolo,¹³ as well as in the Hebrew translation by Nathan Ha-Meati of Maimonides’ *Medical Aphorisms* (see [Bos 2020: 207]).

MO4.3.2 и та<кож> легка исхитрить <...> юшкамаѣ^м ‘and also it is easy to deceive with <...> henbane’ — A: юшки маѣмъ and marg. gloss: юхи имаѣ^м ‘we have soups(?)’; O: исхитри^т юшкима^нѣмъ; Q: исхитри^т юшкима^нѣмъ; V: и с хитрос^тью ш^кимаѣ^м.

It should be noted that the *HSBM*, considering only V, thinks this *hapax legomenon* could be a verb, the meaning of which, however, remains unknown (perhaps thinking of ‘scheme?’):

Шкимати дзѣясл. (?) ис хитростию шкимаѣм (cf. *HSBM* s.v.).

Another such case involving corruption in A (and perhaps in his exemplar) is the adjective гиюльный ‘material’, from Gr ὕλη ‘hyle’, ‘prime matter’, which is transliterated as היילי in Maimonides’ *Logical Terminology* and appears as гюль, гюли, гюлии in Zacharia b. Aharon’s translation of the *Logika* (see [Taube 2016: 614]). It is corrupted in A to гниюльный ‘?rotten’ leading to an erroneous gloss.

TT8.1.3 въ прирожѣнїи гию^лномъ ‘in material nature’ — A: г^нюльнѣмъ and marg. gloss: гнило^м худо^м то^ж ‘rotten as well as bad’; O: гюлно^м

Even some Great Russian words, attested in Old Russian texts, seem to puzzle the Muscovite copyist of MS A. Thus, in the chapter on urban warfare, where Aristotle urges Alexander to make catapults (пороковъ) for throwing stones and fire at the besieged city, Kamenevič seems to ignore the military terminology, although порокъ is attested in Old Russian Chronicles and in the translation of

¹¹ Cf. *SRJaXI–XVII*v, s.v. желудъ².

¹² Deriving from late Latin *jusquiamus*, also attested in the Latin translations of Maimonides’ *On Lethal Drugs* (cf. [Bos 2009]) rather than from the original Greek ὕσκιαμος, cf. English *jusquiam*, *Hyo*scyamus (niger), henbane (OED).

¹³ See online Historical Dictionary of Hebrew: <https://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/Pages/PMain.aspx?mishibbur=648001&mm15=000001000010%2000&mismilla=22>

Josephus, cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v. пороць² [17: 125], glossed *Метательное, стенобитное орудие* ‘projectile, battering weapon’.

ТТ7.5.1 оучини собѣ пороковъ много велики^x ‘make many great catapults’ — A marg. gloss: подкопо^б или щито^б ‘trenches or shields’.

Guesswork seems to be Kamenevič’s resort also in the case of the word прасъ (from Greek πράσον pl. πράσα), a *harax legomenon* appearing once in Maimonides’ *On Lethal Drugs*, in a list of ingredients for a mixture that should induce vomiting in someone who swallowed a poisonous substance. Hebrew has here [Bos 2009: 109]: ‘cabbage seed, asafoetida, borax, which is nitre.’ The Slavic прасъ corresponds here to Hebrew בורק ‘borax’. The word прасъ glossed *Лук-норей* ‘a variety of leek’ appears several times in the *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* and subsists to this day, yet Kamenevič glosses it ‘vitriol’.

М04.1.5а пото^м бы дати емѢ семѦ копоустное два золотники. а хренѢ золотникъ. прасѢ золотни^к — А: прасѢ золотни^к and marg. gloss: купоросъ ‘vitriol’.

Two particularly surprising explanations are the following:

ТТ7.23.7 разлѣеть бѣлоу ‘softens the white [phlegm]’ — А: ро^злиет^т бѣлу with gloss above the adjective: кро^б ‘blood’ and marg. gloss: сирѣ^ч млеко ‘i.e. milk’. (We were unable to find evidence for млеко signifying ‘white bile’, ‘phlegm’.)

ТТ7.23.2 пары ‘vapours’ (Hebrew קיטורים ‘vapours, steams’) — A marg. gloss: то е^стъ поры, сирѣчь та^нныя дыры на лицѣ и тѣлѣ и^зни^хже по^т и^зходитъ ‘that is pores, i.e. secret holes on the face and the body from which sweat issues.’

This gloss equates Russian пара (from German [or French?] *pore* ‘pore’, ultimately from Latin *porus* and Greek πόρος) with Russian пара ‘vapour, steam, gas, breath’ (both are adduced in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.). A similar explanation is given in *HSBM sub* пара²: *дробная адтуліна потавых залоз на паверхні скуры людзей і жывёл* ‘small hole of sweat-glands on the surface of the skin of humans and animals’, with 17th-century examples. However, пара is not glossed by Kamenevič, neither in RM7.15.4, where it means ‘gas’ for Hebrew נענע, nor in ТТ7.28.6 where it means ‘vapours’ for Hebrew קיטורים. In МК2.2.4 пары ‘vapours’ rendering Hebrew דא, is glossed in А: во^тгло^сти ‘humidity’, while in МА1.1.1 пары ‘vapours’ for Hebrew אירים ‘airs’, Kamenevič writes páры and adds ó in the margin.

* * *

We now move to cases where Kamenevič explicitly refers to the text as puzzling, by marking it in the margin with the word странно ‘strange’. These cases deserve special attention, for they include a variety of terms, not all of them foreign or strange. Here we find not only words of Hebrew, Greek and Latin origin, sometimes distorted beyond recognition by transliteration into Arabic and Hebrew script, but also Slavic words, sometime corrupted. In many cases where a word is marked ‘strange’ in one occurrence, it is accompanied in another occurrence by an attempted guessing, usually erroneous, of a Russian equivalent.

In *On Coitus*, Maimonides cites a compound aphrodisiac ascribed to Avenzoar, which includes among its ingredients ‘oxtongue flower, giant fennel and rocket’.
MK4.7.3 ЦВѢТЬ ІАЗЫКА ВОЛОВОГО И КАЛА^x и ороже ‘oxtongue flower, kalakh and rocket’ — A marg. gloss: стра^н

The Slavic form кала^x here is a transliteration of Hebrew כלך [kalkh/kalakh], itself a transliteration of Arabic كلخ [kalkh] ‘giant fennel’. Apparently the Kievan Jewish translator did not know the meaning of this Arabic word transliterated into Hebrew. No wonder Kamenevič glosses it ‘strange’.

MO4.2.5 афий^н ‘opium’ — A: аѡийнъ and marg. gloss: стра^н.

The Slavic here closely resembles Arabic أفیون [afyun]¹⁴, while Ibn Tibbon’s rendering ופי [ofi/opi/upi/ufi] suggests that the first vowel is [o] (though possibly also [u]), but allows both [f] and [p] as legitimate readings of the consonant. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* lists афиянъ, glossed *Опиум*, with a single example from 1652.

MO4.1.8 агарик^н и ерапигра ‘agaric and erapigra,’¹⁵ — A: агарокнъ и ерапигра and marg. gloss: спи, стра^нно. The Slavic here reflects a transliteration of the Hebrew transliteration of Romance terms. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* lists агарикъ, with an example from 1679.

MO4.3.7 кок шилиевъ ‘the mucilage of psyllium (fleawort)’¹⁶ — A: кохшилиевъ and correction in left marg. to: -к’ши and marg. gloss: стра^н; O: кокшилиевъ; Q: ко^кшилиемъ; V: кошилиевъ (Not in *HSBM*).

While the adjective шилиевъ is plainly an adaptation of the Romance form *psyllium* transliterated into Hebrew as שיליום [šilium], the origin of кок/кох, apparently ‘mucilage’, not attested in Polish, Ukrainian, Belorussian or Russian, remains a mystery (perhaps a misreading of сок ‘juice’).

The word марулия appears three times in *TT*, all of them marked ‘strange’ by Kamenevič: once in the pseudo-Aristotelian text proper (TT7.29.2), in a list of foods recommended for eating in springtime, where the Arabic original has الخصن ‘lettuce’ while the Hebrew has החזרת ‘horseradish’; once in Maimonides’ *On Coitus* (MK2.4.2), listed among foods to be avoided as harmful to sex, where the Arabic original has الخصن ‘lettuce’ while the Hebrew versions differ: some have החסא or החסות ‘lettuce’, while others have החזרת ‘horseradish’; and once (MK6.2.8) in a section of unknown provenance containing a list of the qualities of various foods added after the ‘Amen’ at the end of *On Coitus*, where it is listed among foods which fatten little, yet are beneficial. The *HSBM* s.v. has only the first two, glossed шаўкоўніца ‘mulberry’.

¹⁴ The unvocalized Arabic *waw* (و) is ambiguous here, permitting both [u] and [o].

¹⁵ ерапигра < Gr ἱερά πικρά, lit. ‘sacred bitter’. OED, s.v. *hiera picra*: ‘a name given to many medicines in the Greek pharmacopœia. A purgative drug composed of aloes and canella bark, sometimes mixed with honey and other ingredients.’

¹⁶ [Bos et al. 2019]: ‘mucilage of fleawort’ (*Plantago psyllium*). Heb: ריר השיליום ‘mucilage of psyllium’.

The *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v. gives the definition: Клубовая марулия — кочанный салат-латук, supplying a single testimony from 1705.

ТТ7,29.2 и марџлюю — А: марџлия and marg. gloss: стра^н

Compare with:

МК6.2.8 тонкий^ж мало кормащїи. оугодни си соу^т. іакобы марџліа. и іаблоко и нарѣ ‘and of thin things which fatten and are little beneficial are lettuce and apple and pomegranate’¹⁷

Here A has no comment. Compare however the following:

МК2.4.2 сочевицоу. и горо^х. и шпана^х и лобода. и марулюю на^{до} всіми. ‘lentils and peas and spinach and orach, and above all lettuce.’

сочевицоу ‘lentils’ — А marg. gloss: сокъ; шпана^х ‘spinach’ А marg. gloss: стра^н; лобода ‘orach, goosefoot’ А, Q: лѣбеда; марулюю ‘lettuce’ А: мураля and marg. gloss: стра^н; О: марџлюю; Q: марулюю.

In the last example, the copyist’s remark ‘strange’ for ‘lettuce’ is justified by the fact that the reading in A (or in its exemplar) is corrupted. Less justified is his remark ‘strange’ for ‘spinach’, since Ukrainian шпинат, Belorussian шпінат and Russian шпинат seem close enough forms. Kamenevič’s gloss сок ‘juice’ for сочевицоу ‘lentils’ could be an attempt at etymologizing (a similar link is suggested in Vasmer-Trubačev’s *Russian Etymological Dictionary* [Vasmer-Trubačev 1964–73] s.v. чечевица). Old Russian has сочевица (and сочивица, cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v.), while in Modern Russian it appears as a dialectal form beside the general чечевица.

In the unidentified section at the end of the Maimonides’ *On Coitus* interpolation we encounter another instance of an unfamiliar term, наранзы ‘pomegranates’,¹⁸ corrupted already in A’s exemplar, and consequently marked ‘strange’ by Kamenevič. The *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* has only наранжа, glossed *вид апельсина* ‘kind of orange’.

МК6.2.5 іаблоки и кидони и нара{нз}ы ‘apples, quince and pomegranates’ — А: кидони и нарасны and marg. gloss: стра^н О: кидони, ина различнаа; Q: кидони ина ра^зличнаа; V: ки^плина ра^зньни

The same corruption with the same resulting remark ‘strange’ appears also in the *TT* proper, in a list of fruit whose consumption is recommended in the summer: התפוחים החמוצים והרימונים החמוצים ‘sour apples and pears and sour pomegranates’. While apples are familiar enough, the word for ‘pomegranate’ was corrupted in Slavic.¹⁹

¹⁷ See *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v. нар (only in a text of 1642 describing fruit of Georgia).

¹⁸ The word наранзъ appears only once without corruption in the Slavic *TT*, in Maimonides’ *On Lethal Drugs* (МК1.2.6), where it renders Hebrew מי רימונים ‘grenadine’, literally ‘pomegranate water’. HSBM, misreading V and consequently corrupting it in its entry as наранзъ, glosses it гранат (?) ‘pomegranate (?)’. Kamenevič, rendering it нараснь (perhaps corrupted already in his exemplar), glosses it души тра^в ‘scents of herbs’. Cf. OED, s.v. orange: “C4. orange apple n. [compare Old French pomme d’orange (1314)] Obsolete (a) a pomegranate.”

¹⁹ Incidentally, the word אגסים ‘pears’ was rendered in Slavic as ‘plums’ for a reason still unclear. We can point out that the cognate of Hebrew (and Aramaic) אגס [aggas] which appears here in the Arabic

ТТ7.30.4 **дблока кислыи и сливы и нара{нз}ы кислыи** ‘sour apples and plums and sour pomegranates’ — А: и наряс’ныи and marg. gloss: стра^н; О omits; V: инаа разны^н

Among the aromatics recommended by Maimonides in the *On Coitus* interpolation as having aphrodisiacal qualities we find амбарь ‘amber’. This word, stemming ultimately from Arabic عنبر [*anbar*], is transliterated in the Hebrew versions as ענבר [*inbar*]. Neither Russian nor Ukrainian have it. In Kamenevič’s copy it is corrupted, which explains his remark ‘strange’.

МК5.1.3 амбарь ‘amber’ — А: мамъберъ and marg. gloss: стра^н; О: амбаръ; Q: инбирь ‘ginger’.

Another example of a corrupted reading in MS A (or already in its exemplar) is found in the noun-phrase for ‘hazelnuts’, where the qualifying adjective лесковый, together with орехи, signifying ‘hazelnuts’, literally ‘forest nuts’ (cf. *HSBM* s.v. Орехъ лесковый — *лясны арэх* ‘hazelnut’, with several examples beside ТТ)²⁰ was corrupted in A to лесговой, leading to the inevitable remark ‘strange’.

МК4.7.2 **врехи лесковии** ‘hazelnuts’ — А: орѣхи лес’г’оввы and marg. gloss: стра^н

In the section on alchemy of the Slavic ТТ we encounter once the word аррь-рись, ‘Aries, Mars’ as the alchemical name for iron. This transliteration from Gr ἄρης is commonly found in Old Russian in a variety of other forms, e.g. ареи, арьсь (listed in Sreznevskij’s *Materialy* [Sreznevskij 1893–1912] but not in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*). Kamenevič, in whose copy the word appears as аррьсь, has two glosses, one of them showing his familiarity with the meaning ‘Mars’, but the other betraying his poor knowledge of etymology by confusing ‘areo’ with ‘aero’.

ТТ8.2.7 **̄ ар’ррьса** ‘of Mars’ — А: ар’риаца with left marg. gloss: ае^р то е^с во^зду^х ‘aer that is air’ and right marg. gloss: а^ррьсь свѣ^зда ‘Arris is a star’; О: аррьса.

The word in the ТТ for waterlily (a.k.a as nenuphar) is нелофарь, reflecting the form נילופר [*nilofar*] found in some of the Hebrew witnesses (while others have נינופר [*ninofar*]).²¹ The *HSBM* gives only this one example, with the gloss (?) for meaning. The word is unknown in East Slavic (cf. Belorussian гарлачык, Ukrainian латаття and Russian кувшинка), though the word *nenufar* is attested in Modern Polish.

МК2.4.5 нелофарь ‘nenuphar’ — А: нилооарь and marg. gloss: стра^нно; О: нелафарь; Q: нелаоарь

original, إجاجس [*ijjās*] may mean both ‘pear’ and ‘a variety of plum’, the latter current in Syrian Arabic dialects. Considering that the presumed translator Zacharia b. Aharon’s name makes its final appearance in a colophon of a text copied in Damascus in 1485 (for details see [Ryan and Taube 2019: 18]), we may look for an explanation there, although in other instances Zacharia does not demonstrate knowledge of Arabic.

²⁰ *SRJaXI–XVII* lacks the adjective, but has the noun леска, glossed *nocox* ‘staff’.

²¹ The word comes ultimately from Sanskrit *nilotpala* (cf. OED), with the form *nilufar* appearing, i.a. in Persian.

The word in the *TT* for the kernels of pine, циноварь, transliterates Hebrew צינובר [*cinobar*], in its turn transliterating Arabic الصنوبر [*al-šanaubar*] ‘pine kernels’. For the Ruthenian who first wrote it down from the oral dictation²² of the Kievan Jewish translator and for subsequent copyists it may have appeared to be a familiar word denoting ‘cinnabar; red ink,’ cf. Polish *cy노ber*, Belorussian цинобра (but Ukrainian кінобар, Russian киноварь). It appears to be unknown to Kamenevič, who in one instance marks it as ‘strange’, while wrongly glossing it ‘cinnamon’ in another:

МКЗ.7.2 ІАдро цыноварево ‘kernel of pine’ — А: ІАдрw Цынwварево and marg. gloss: стра^н

МК2.1.6 и циноварь великїи ‘and great pine nuts’ А marg. gloss: цынамо^н ‘cinnamon’.

Another example of a word known in various meanings in both in Ruthenian and Russian yet marked as ‘strange’ by Kamenevič is чернушка, here ‘black cumин’ (cf. Pol *czarnuszka* ‘nigella, fennel’, R чернушка, ‘nigella, fennel, black cumин’, Ukr чернушка ‘fennel’).

МКЗ.7.3 чернушка ‘black cumин’ — А: чернуш'ка and marg. gloss: и се стра^н ‘this too is strange’.

The word for ‘theriac’ appears twice in the Slavic *TT*, both times in the somewhat modified form триакъ, and although Modern Russian does have териак,²³ it does not appear in the *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* nor is it to be found in the *HSBM*. Kamenevič marks the word ‘strange’ in one instance, while in another he supplies a detailed description and an equivalent ‘in our usage’ (по нашему). The equivalent which he supplies in the gloss, оирястикъ, looks like a transliteration from Greek, from which the term ‘theriac’ indeed derives, but the specific form suggested, θηριαστικός/θηριαστικόν, is not attested.

МА4.8.1 триакъ ‘theriac’ — А marg. gloss: стра^н

МА4.8.6 триа^к ‘theriac’ — А, Q: триакъ. А marg. gloss: со^тта^б страннѣй сотвореныи с' саломъ челоуѣчи^м по нашему оиря^стикъ ‘a strange/foreign mixture made with human fat, in our usage *theriastic*’.

The word зарнихъ for ‘arsenic’ in our text is a transliteration of Hebrew זרניך, in its turn a transliteration of Arabic زرنیخ [*zarnikh*]. *HSBM*, guessing,²⁴ glosses this харах каштоўны камень ‘precious stone’. Not in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* No wonder Kamenevič marks the unfamiliar word ‘strange’.

ТТ8.2.4 зарнихъ ‘arsenic’ — А: зар'нихъ and marg. gloss: стра^нно

²² For indications of such oral dictation both in the *TT* and in the *Logika* cf. [Ryan & Taube 2019: 16–17] and further references there.

²³ Cf. Russian Wikipedia s.v. for description, spelled териак in Vasmer-Trubačev's *Russian Etymological Dictionary*, s.v.

²⁴ The section in which the word appears discusses, *i.a.*, the magical properties of precious stones.

In a recipe for an aphrodisiacal massaging cream, Maimonides lists *i.a.* ‘euphorbia’, a.k.a. spurge. The form attested in our Slavic text, парамион, corresponds (with a difference in the middle consonant that could be the result of oral dictation) to Hebrew פֶּרְבִּיּוֹן [*parabion*], a transliteration of Ar فریبون [*farabiun*] ‘euphorbia’. *HSBM* glosses this *hapaх від зѣлак* ‘kind of herb’. Kamenevič marks the unfamiliar word ‘strange’.

МК4.9.1 парамио^н ‘paramion’ — A marg. gloss: стра^н;

Among the ingredients of an aphrodisiacal electuary in Maimonides’ *On Coitus* interpolation, the Slavic has багманъ ‘behen’, a.k.a. ben, which Kamenevič appropriately marks ‘strange/foreign herbs’.

МК4.1.6 багманъ бѣлыи и черлѣныи ‘white and red behen’ — A marg. gloss: стран^ныѣ слаки ‘strange/foreign herbs’.

Among the seeds and spices recommended in Maimonides’ *On Coitus* interpolation, the Slavic has галганъ ‘galangal’, a.k.a. galingale, which Kamenevič marks ‘strange’, although it appears in Russian texts from the 16th c. onward, see *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v., glossed *Лекарственное растение* ‘medicinal plant’.

МК 2.3.4 га^лганъ — A: галъганъ ‘galangal’ and marg. gloss: стра^н; O: галганъ; Q: гаганъ.

Among the ingredients of an aphrodisiacal compound recommended in Maimonides’ *On Coitus* interpolation, the Slavic has сѣма гаденово ‘seed of asparagus’. The adjective гаденово is a corruption of галивоново ‘of halivon’, a derived adjective of the transliterated form of the Arabic name for asparagus (هليون) [*hilyaūn*] which appears as הליון [*haliyon*] in Hebrew. The transliterated noun галивонъ ‘asparagus’ for the same Hebrew word appears in МК2.1.5, where MS A omits it.

МК4.3.1 сѣма га^деново ‘seed of asparagus’ — A: гдаеново and marg. gloss: стра^н

One of the ingredients of several aphrodisiacal compounds mentioned five times in Maimonides’ ‘On Coitus’ is ‘skin’.²⁵ The Slavic form саканкур, sometimes corrupted, is a twice-over transliteration of Arabic سقنقور [*saqanqūr*] through Hebrew סקנקור. Kamenevič is rather inconsistent in his treatment, though his version is sometime corrupted. In the first instance (not corrupted) he copies the form without comment. In the next two occurrences he marks the word ‘strange’, while in the final two he ventures some infelicitous guesses:

МК4.6.3 и такоже мѣсо саканкѣрово прославлено в си^м ‘And skink’s meat is also famed for this’ — A: саканкѣрѣво; O: сакнѣрово; Q: сакунѣруво;

МК4.1.9 саканкоурова ‘of the skink’ A са^нканкѣрова and marg. gloss: стра^н; Q: сака и курова; V: санкоуровъ

²⁵ Cf. OED: a small lizard, *Scincus scincus* (family Scincidae), common in northern Africa and the Middle East, and formerly regarded as having medicinal value.

МК4.7.3 сака^ѣкжра ‘skink’ — А: сака^ѣтѣра and marg. gloss: стра^ѣ; О: саканкѣра;
Q: сака^ѣтура;

МК3.5.6 а коли бы была соль саканкѣрова. ино бы лепшии ‘and if this is skink’s
salt so much the better’ — А, О: сакан^ѣтѣрова; А marg. gloss: самоса^ѣка ‘found
in natural deposits’ (cf. *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*, s.v. самосадка); Q: сака^ѣтурова; V:
са^ѣкжрова

МК4.3.2 цибжла печенаѣ и вмочена во саканкѣрѣ ‘onion baked and soaked in
skink’ — А: въ саканкѣрѣ and marg. gloss: во^ѣка и^ѣ сахару ‘vodka made
from sugar’.

Kamenevič seems to have had difficulties with the forms appearing in Slavic for ‘raisins’. He marks as ‘strange’ the word стафилия, a transliteration of the Greek σταφύλια ‘grapes’ apparently known to the Kievan Jewish translator,²⁶ but he also marks as ‘strange’ the Ruthenian word розинки, a word well attested in the *HSBM* (cf. s.v. розинки) and current in Polish, Ukrainian and Belorussian (for Old Polish see [Reczek 1968]: *rozynki*, *rozynki*, Modern Polish *rodzynki*; Ukrainian родзинки; Belorussian разинкі). Apparently Kamenevič knew only изюм.

МК4.5.2 стафилиѣ ‘raisins’ — А: стаѣилиѣ and marg. gloss: стра^ѣ

ТТ732.2 розинки ‘raisins’ — А: росин^ѣки and marg. gloss: стра^ѣ

In the alchemical section of the *ТТ* Kamenevič marks two words as ‘strange’, one of them a corrupted form of the familiar word луна ‘Moon’, and the other the foreign word сараф ‘Saraf.’²⁷

ТТ8.3.2 а лѣна бы во вбразѣ сарафѣ ‘and the Moon should be in the image (sc.
sign) of Saraf’ — А: ланѣ and marg. gloss: стра^ѣно ‘strange’; А: в^ѣрасѣ сараѣ and marg. gloss: и се (sc. стра^ѣно) ‘and this one too [sc. is strange]’

The additional value of Kamenevič’s glosses with Russicisms for Ruthenian words, whether correct or erroneous, lies in their being early testimonies, sometimes the earliest we have,²⁸ of forms or meanings (or both) attested in later Russian texts. Such are, e.g., the following glosses:

ТТ1.2.5 смутина ‘disturbance’ for стравца ‘wastrel’

ТТ4.3.12 тратѣля²⁹ for трача ‘weaver’

ТТ4.5.48 зорко for сѣрко ‘blue’ (А’s variant of вко зѣрко)

ТТ5.1.8 потаковства то естъ подговорства и хульствивства for похлебѣства ‘sycophancy’

²⁶ Стафиди for ‘raisins’, from Greek σταφίδες, is still the Bulgarian word for ‘raisins’.

²⁷ Sl: сарафъ < Arabic شَرَف [šaraf], ‘exaltation’. In astrology the exaltation of the Moon is in the 3rd degree of Taurus. The word seems to have bothered all the translators; [Gaster 1908] has for בערבי שרף ‘Shrf in Arabic’, Achillini’s Latin edition has: *in gradu decimo celi, quod vocatur Seraph in Arabico* ‘in the tenth degree of the heaven called Seraph in Arabic’.

²⁸ “Earliest testimony” is perforce a conditional qualification, allowing, indeed assuming “until an earlier one is found”. This is particularly true for words beginning with the final letters of the Russian alphabet, since the *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* has so far reached only the word улокъ.

²⁹ *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* has only one example, from 1683.

- ТТ7.8.1 зоркими for свѣтлыми: сѣркыми ‘light-blue’ (A’s variant of со wчима зѣркыми)
 ТТ7.8.4 скулова^т for скволопородъ (A’s variant of скоулотородъ)³⁰
 ТТ7.9.4 смортаніе³¹ лица ‘wrinkling face’ for смѣдость ‘swarthinness’
 RM7.21.4 жилицы for вожки ‘sinews’
 RM7.21.4 переполки for плѣвы ‘membranes’
 RM7.24.2 чири for прыщи ‘ulcers’
 RM7.49.5 о^склабно for засмѣшно ‘amused’
 RM7.50.4 щѣк^к for челюсти ‘jaws, cheeks’
 МА2.1.8 плѣнина^{ми} ‘mould’ for садохлинами (A’s variant of за^тхлинами ‘decay’)
 МА2.1.9 от чюла^нца for в̄ хижкы ‘from the closet’

* * *

Of great interest are the personal remarks abounding in the margins of MS A. They may teach us something about Kamenevič and his self-image, about the intended reader and the image Kamenevič has of his personality and of his desired path, and of the relationship between the copyist and his reader. Let us stress that, in contrast to Adrianova’s statements, the personal remarks in the margins of Kamenevič’s MS A are not merely made for a virtual potential reader, but are addressed to a very specific person. This is Kamenevič’s pupil, apparently a young Muscovite of aristocratic status, whose name, somewhat disguised, appears three times in the text:

First, in the dedication at the beginning, addressed to рачителнѣйшему писмень сѣ^тыхъ подражителю и читателю вѣнцу побѣдителивицю ‘to the zealous imitator and reader of holy scriptures Crown, Son of the Conqueror’;

Second, in a marginal note to ТТ7.7.1 which speaks about the science of physiognomy as being ‘more necessary to a king (црю) than to any other man’, on which Kamenevič remarks: и ты знаи вѣнче желателю сего щастливѣишии ‘and you too should know, Crown, desirer of this, most fortunate’.

Third, in a marginal note to ТТ7.19.4 where the physiognomy of the arms is discussed: мышки долгѣа алижъ досагнеть дланію до колена, оуказуеъ на щедрость и оучивость. и добродушіе ‘Arms long enough for the palms to reach the knees betoken generosity and virtue and good nature’. Kamenevič remarks: зри о се^м, се самъ ты еси, вѣн^че побѣдистеле^скоровичю ‘See about this. This is you yourself (i.e. the very picture of you), о Crown, son of the Victory-bearer[?]’

The addressee’s name is given in etymological cipher, by translating the Greek-origin forms that make up his first name and patronym into Russian ones [probably = Stefan Nikiforovič]. We have not been able so far to make an identification, but the adulatory remarks point to a member of the Muscovite nobility destined for a distinguished career in the clerical or lay administration. Here are the remarks to the reader:

³⁰ This we assume to be скудотородъ ‘thin-bearded’ corrupted to скулотородъ, lit. ‘cheek-bearded’. *HSBM* under скулотородый cites just this one occurrence, glossing it *скулабароды* (perhaps ‘with bearded cheekbones’). The *SRJaXI–XVIIvv* does have скудотородый and скудобрадый, but no скулотородый.

³¹ Not in *SRJaXI–XVIIvv*.

At the very beginning of the text, A precedes the title with the following words:

Книга вельпремудраа и доб(ро)полезная умови разсѣдителейномѣ, сѣло потребная именуема: тайнаа тайныхъ. списася рѣкою смирен'наго кеньсѣлира каменевича рачительнѣйшемѣ писменъ сѣтыхъ подражителю и читателю вѣнцѣ побѣдителейвию в любопаметное прочитаніе к познанію в' неи пишемъ^х вбразо^в. рѣд^т. де^кбря дня кѣ^т.

‘A book most learned and beneficial to the discerning mind (and) very necessary, named the Secret of Secrets, written by the hand of the humble chancellor Kamenevič to the zealous imitator and reader of holy scriptures Crown, Son of the Conqueror [= Stefan Nikiforovič], for memory-loving reading towards the understanding of the images inscribed therein, 1686, 25th day of December. [25.12.1686 (Julian)= 4.1.1687 CE]

ТТ0.5.8 гѣи по^дмози рѣце твоєи чествовати премѣдрость и превозносити мѣдрыхъ аминь. ‘May the Lord help your hand to honour wisdom and raise up the wise, Amen.’ — A marg. gloss: помни ‘remember’.

ТТ1.2.3 смышленіе^ж в щедрости трждно є^с ‘The concept of liberality is difficult’ — A marg. gloss: зри. зри: сего и размысли ‘See, see: consider this also’.

ТТ1.5.3 вѣдаи иже умъ то єсть верхъ каждому смыслу ‘Know that reason is the source of all judgement.’ — A marg. gloss: спи ума си. ‘See your own intellect’.

ТТ1.5.16 а изъ сего родится гроза, а изъ грозы справедливость, а изъ сего соединаченіе, а се родить честь, а честь родить пристатіе ‘and from this is born awe, and from awe, justice, and from this consensus, and this yields respect, and respect gives rise to affection.’ изъ грозы справедливость — A marg. gloss: спи ‘see’; а честь родить пристатіе A marg. gloss: спи ‘see’.

ТТ4.5.36 дабы бы^т набоженъ. нбобоазнивъ. верѣа речи бжїи. ‘he (sc. your chief minister) should be religious and godfearing,³² trusting in the words of God’ — A: вѣрѣа глѣомъ бжїимъ and marg. gloss: спи ‘see’.

ТТ4.8.5 зан’же слово исходитъ з оумысла. а говореніе его се є^с телествїе вного слова. а писмо вбразъ его ‘because the word proceeds from the intention³³ and the speaking of it is the embodiment of that word and writing is its image’ — A marg. gloss: помни ты о се^м о любезныи мои ‘Bear this in mind, my dear friend.’

ТТ6.6.12 а постави правителя на^д витези члѣвѣка мѣра верна и не горда ‘And set a minister over your knights, a man wise and true, and not proud’ — A marg. gloss: спи, смотри, внемли, исполни ‘see, observe, listen, do)’

ТТ7.5.8 и тѣрковѣ сердыи и глѣпыи. ‘and the Turks are bad-hearted and stupid’ — A marg. gloss: помни о ни^х ‘remember about them’.

ТТ7.7.1 ведаи, иже моудрость сѣа ноужнаа црїю болшии нижели иномѣ члѣкоу ‘know that this science (sc. Physiognomy) is more necessary to a king than to any other man’ — A marg. gloss: и ты знаи вѣнче, желателю сего, щастливѣиши. ‘and you too should know, Crown, desirer of this, most fortunate’.

³² Lit. ‘heaven-fearing’, calquing Heb שמ״ם אר׳.

³³ Heb: ‘and the meaning of the utterance is its spirit and its words are its body’.

ТТ7.7.6 а ближній разумномъ тѣшитса разумомъ своимъ, вн же е^с блг^нть бж^га
 ‘A man close to a reasonable man rejoices in his reason which is the grace of God’ —
 A marg. gloss: внимаи семъ. ‘Listen to this.’

ТТ7.13.4 зобы^ж правыи и редкїи, оуказъ на разум и вѣрность. ‘Teeth which are
 straight and spaced are a sign of good sense and loyalty’ — A marg. gloss: спи мя.
 ‘Look at me!’

ТТ7.15.2 чюжєлюбєць ‘covetous’ — A marg. gloss: не хоци бы^т сице^б ‘Do not wish
 to be like this!’

ТТ7.16.8 хто же ростропєнь в седєнїи свое^м, и слово его исполно, подвизаєть
 рѣкою своею, говорячи в ча^с подобныи, се е^с полонъ в раздѣме своемъ. и верєнь
 в дєлѣ^х свои^х ‘He who is calm when sitting, whose speech is rounded and who
 moves his hand at the appropriate time when speaking, is accomplished in his
 intellect and loyal in his deeds’ — A marg. gloss: знаи такихъ ‘Get to know such
 people!’

ТТ7.19.4 мышки долгїа алижъ досагнєть дланїю до колена, оуказоуєть на
 щєдрость и оучитвость. и добродѣшїє ‘Arms long enough for the palms to reach
 the knees betoken generosity and virtue and good nature’ — A marg. gloss: зри о
 се^м, се самъ, ты єси, вѣн^чє побѣди^с | стєлєкоровичю ‘See about that. This is you
 yourself (i.e. the very picture of you), о Crown, son of the Victory-bearer(?)’.

ТТ7.19.5 длань долгаа с палцами долгими оуказъ на чистое мастерство
 рѣкоделное. и смышленїа цр^скаа ‘A long palm with long fingers is an indication
 of neat craftsmanship and understanding of royal affairs.’ — A marg. gloss: зри са^м
 ты єси вє^с тако^б ‘Look, you yourself are completely like this’.

ТТ7.20.9 се^н во истинноу нараздмнѣишии что сотвори^т бг^гь ‘This (sc. the ideal
 man of moderate character and of good nature) is indeed the wisest (man) that God
 created.’ — A marg. gloss: спи и возудивися тво^рцѣ ‘Look and marvel at the
 Creator!’

RM7.35.8 а всакїи иже не имать мл^стивога зренїа. и хорошєства в лицы своемъ.
 и вчє^х свои^х. не е^с возможно. дабы вбычаи его добрыа ‘And for anyone who
 does not have a pleasant look, and beauty in his face and eyes,³⁴ it is impossible that
 his qualities be good.’ — A marg. gloss: вє^нми познава^ни таковы^х, и храни^с о^т си^х
 ‘Try hard to recognize such (men), and beware of them!’

RM7.38.2 не за чєсть ємъ всако роукоделїє чл^чє ‘and all human deeds are of
 little account to him’ — A marg. gloss: по^мни чє^сть дѣя^ти рємє^ственикомъ сво-
 имъ всѣ^м ‘Remember to pay respect to all your craftsmen!’

RM7.39.1 Хо^д тихїи, знаменуєть леность. а борзы знаменуєть мѣжа борза во
 вси^х дєлє^х свои^х ‘A slow walk signifies laziness, while a fast (walk) signifies a man
 who is quick in all his deeds.’ — A marg. gloss: зри и внемли, се єсть твоє по-
 до^бство ‘Look and take heed, this is your likeness!’

RM7.49.3 рѣки его гла^нки и сыры ‘his hands are smooth and moist’ — A marg. gloss:
 зри на^с. ‘Look at us!’

RM7.49.5 позрєнїє его весєло ꙗкобы засмєшно. ‘He has a merry gaze as if
 amused.’ — A marg. gloss: аз є^смь ‘That’s me!’

³⁴ Hebrew (=Arabic): ‘one with an ugly face’. Latin: ‘Cuius facies est deformis’.

МКЗ.5.8 сарковѣ же праженицѣ и постарнаком вареным и праженым ‘an omelet of this kind with boiled or fried parsnips’ — A marg. gloss: кие^бляне ядят сию тра^{ву} в¹ стола^х ‘The Kievans eat this herb at their tables.’

ТТ7.35.1 и чтение^м во книга^х иже в¹ ни^х речи сладкїи дшїи ‘and reading books in which there are things/words sweet to the soul’ — A marg. gloss: и любї читанї^е кни^г м^дры^х ‘and love reading learned books.’

ТТ8.13.8а прото^ж оуставно ходи на полатѣ м^дрцовѣ свои^х. и потешаиса с ними м^дростїю а не глжповѣство^м. ‘and therefore go regularly to the chamber of your wise men and take pleasure with them in wisdom and not in foolishness’ — A marg. gloss: сри ї вне^мли сего ра^зума и любї му^дры^х ‘Look and heed this sensible (piece of advice) and love learned men.’

At the end of the concluding (added) section (ТТ8.14.7) of the *TT*, just before the the *Account of the Hellenic philosopher, the most-wise Aristotle*, MS A has here an ornamental drawing into which the name *Θεодор* is integrated (its significance is not clear), continued on the next folio with an afterword by the copyist and glossator:

тебе ради, чадо намъ любес^нѣйшее, о сихъ любопрем^дрыхъ книгахъ многу потр^дих^ся, и удо^бнѣшаго ради поз^нания, понуди^ся, и^з бѣлоро^сїйскаго диалекта, сирѣчь, гла : преложисася во словес^кую рѣчь : елико по во^змо^жном^д, наше^му, малумию, кромѣ стран^ныхъ речей : и^хже не по^ложих^х моему, ра^зсуж^дению. По си^х, с^дра^вствѣй;

‘For you, our most dear child, I have laboured much over these most philosophical books and for the sake of more convenient comprehension I have translated them from the Belorussian dialect [*dialekta*], that is idiom [*glagola*], into the Slavonic [*slovenskij*, here = Russian Church Slavonic] language [*rěč*], insofar as this was possible for my poor understanding, except for strange terms which it was not proper for me to discuss. And now, farewell.’

A’s personal remarks in the appended *Account of the Hellenic philosopher, the most-wise Aristotle* (A biography of Aristotle abridged from Diogenes Laertius, *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*, book 5):

ТТ8.15.2 оученикъ же бѣ Платона филосооа еллин^скаго иже всѣ^х превзыде в наученїи платонски^х оучн^ковъ прем^дростїю и раз^дмо^м и всакими философ^скими и риторьскими оученїи и наказанїи.

‘and he (sc. Aristotle) was the pupil of Plato the Hellenic philosopher and he excelled in learning all the other students of Plato in wisdom and intellect and in all the philosophical and rhetorical arts and sciences.’ — платона A marg. gloss: сри ‘See!'; всѣ^х превзыде A marg. gloss: в^си^х ты рѣ^вну^и. ‘You should emulate them all’; наказанїи A marg. gloss: сри w сри и жел^аи са^м сице^в во любомудрїи быти нео^тступно ‘See, observe and desire always to be the same in philosophy.’

ТТ8.16.2 Неоусышно естество бжїе бытїе не имѣши начала. ‘Immortal is the nature of God, existence having no beginning.’ A marg. gloss: сри ї вне^мли ‘See and take heed.’

ТТ8.16.5 а какъ ложилса на одрѣ постѣла своѣа спати, и онъ держалъ въ рѣцѣ своѣи яблоко медѣное. ‘And when he lay down on his bed to sleep, he would hold in his hand a copper apple’ A marg. gloss: зри се^т прм^тра^т ‘See this wise man.’

ТТ8.17.2 могъ живѣщи то здѣлати бѣ^з повелѣнїа, что иныи толь не сотвори^т по законѣ и с понѣжденїемъ ‘living I can do unbidden what another will not do by law and under compulsion’; могъ A marg. gloss: зри расу^м его ‘See his wisdom’; с понѣжденїемъ A marg. gloss: зри зри и смотри ‘Look, look and take note.’

ТТ8.17.4 и паки вопроси^м бысть ѿ любом^тры^х ‘And again he was asked by some philosophers.’ A marg. gloss: зри како вопрошаю^т і ищутъ ‘Look how they (sc. the philosophers) ask and seek.’

ТТ8.18.5 вели емѣ и бити мѣна ‘tell him to beat me as well’ A adds: Аминъ and marg. gloss: и ты тая^жде говори ‘You, too, say the same!’

* * *

From consideration of the scribal interventions listed above we can suggest a small amplification of what is known about Timofej Kamenevič-Rvovskii and his writing.

To deal first with his name. The family name Kamenevič is not normal in Russia, and is not the only family name Timofej used in inscriptions on manuscripts. On occasion in written works he signed himself as ‘Petrov’ or ‘Kifič’, which are imprecise calques of ‘Kamenevič’ via the Greek and Aramaic forms of the New Testament names Peter and Cephas, both also meaning ‘rock’. Kifič is an entirely fictitious name but Petrov is widely found in Russia. ‘Kamenevič’ is less suggestive of Muscovy than of West Russia, Ukraine, and Poland where variants of ‘Kamenets’ meaning ‘rocky place’ are common toponyms.

‘Rvovskii’, the second part of Kamenevič’s hyphenated surname (perhaps intended to give it an aristocratic colouring), appears to be no more than an invention by Kamenevič based on his service as a young cleric in the St Basil’s Cathedral in Moscow, the official name of which is ‘The Cathedral of the Intercession of the Most Holy Theotokos on the Moat’ (‘Sobor Pokrova Presvjatoj Bogorodicy, čto na Rvu’, *rvovskii* being a confected adjective from the last word *rov*).

As has been well described by Bulanin and Matveeva, and more recently by Novikova, Timofej had a penchant for grandiloquent and fantastical language. He was the author of several unpublished historical and homiletic works³⁵ and the copyist of several other works and documents, including the *TT*, all signed with various Greek-based etymological puns on his own name, with a similar pun on the name of the dedicatee of his manuscript of the *TT*. He also liked using Greek words, invented compound words, copious marginal notes and *nota bene* signs (usually the word *zri*

³⁵ “Сказание о холопъей войне” (1699).

История о начале Русской земли и о создании Новгорода Новгорода // Сказания Новгорода Великого (IX–XIV вв.). Составление, перевод, комментарии и вступительная статья Ю. К. Бегунова. СПб.: Политехника, 2004.

О древностях Российского государства (1699),

История государства Российского,

Послание к Кариону Истоминому (1680–81),

Повесть о семи мудрецах.

‘see’), and had a fondness for the pretentious if imprecise title of *kantselir* (chancellor) which in fact described him only in the historical Latin sense of ‘scribe’ (*cancellarius*).

It seems highly probable then that in fact Kamenevič’s real name was Petrov, as Novikova has stated [Novikova 2018: 132], and not Kamenevič-Rvovskij, which was a pretentious Ruthenian-sounding pen-name probably invented to suggest to readers that he was one of the learned Ukrainians and Belorussians brought to Moscow by Patriarch Nikon to assist with his church reforms. This fantasy is entirely consonant with Kamenevič’s elaborate word games, use of Greek, use of Polish sources in Russian translation, marginal notes, and mendacious claims to scholarship in his dedication to the *TT*. The milieu to which Kamenevič apparently aspired was indeed familiar with, and even enthusiastic about this mirror of princes thought to be authored by Aristotle for Alexander the Great — Nikon himself wrote a copy in his own hand (MS S2) and placed it in the library of the New Jerusalem monastery (it has a Biblical curse in the margins on anyone defacing or stealing it); another copy of the same period (MS S) belonged to Nikifor Semeonov, a learned cleric and ‘corrector’ at the Moscow Printing House, the official publisher which may even have considered printing it as a genuine work of Aristotle — a full list of the chapter heads of the *TT* appears in the *Оглавление книг, кто их сложил* (‘Titles of Books and Who Wrote Them’), a list of works available in translation and suitable for publication which was compiled for the Printing House and printed there in 1665–6.

In fact Kamenevič had not produced a new, clarified, Russified version of the *TT* as he claimed — some of his explanations of Ruthenian words are entirely wrong, as are some of his glosses on obscure Russian words, and many more remain untranslated. Many of the Russified corrections in his manuscript can be found in other Muscovite manuscripts, in particular MS O, which was written in Moscow in the previous century and is the earliest extant Russified copy. Like A it has marginal notes (indicating Ruthenisms which have been replaced, also *zri* ‘see’ and manicules). The manuscript from which MS O was copied is not known, but is probably part of the chain of provenance of MSA. Only about fifteen of the Russified words in Kamenevič’s manuscript are not found in other copies, and even those could have come from the exemplar from which he copied, and which is so far unidentified and seemingly not extant. It is clear that the process of Russification of the *TT* began in the sixteenth century, long before Kamenevič’s *предложение*.

Following his time in Moscow, in 1683 Kamenevič became a hiero-deacon and *уставщик* (master of ceremonies) in the small Afanasievskij monastery on the river Mologa, near the provincial market town of Mologa in the Jaroslavl’ guberniia, close to its confluence with the Volga and some 400 km north of Moscow. This monastery had been subordinated in 1680 to the much larger New Jerusalem Monastery, founded in 1656 by Patriarch Nikon, which was quite close to Moscow and furnished with a large library of manuscripts taken from other monastic libraries. Kamenevič’s own monastery library possessed only thirty-three manuscripts, mostly liturgical [Sinicyna 2005].

Was Kamenevič’s manuscript of the *TT* written in the monastery at Mologa, so far from Moscow, three years after Timofej arrived there? Who was the encoded dedicatee of the *TT*, so extravagantly flattered in the dedication and marginal notes? What

manuscript was Timofej copying from, since no copy is listed as having been in the very small library at Mologa? Did he read Nikon's manuscript of the *TT* (MS S2) in the New Jerusalem Monastery library (comparison of the few variants from Speranskij's edition suggests that this was not in fact his source)?

These questions may never be answered, but whatever we may think of the pretensions, fantasies, and ambitions of Kamenevič, his *преложение* of the *Тайная Тайных* does at least give us an insight into the methods and mistakes of a seventeenth-century Russian writer, scribe, and editor, and adds to the number of words in the Russian lexicon hitherto recorded only for later dates.

ABBREVIATIONS

TT — *Tajnaja Tajnyh*

DICTIONARIES

Hobson-Jobson — Henry Yule & Arthur Coke Burnell, *Hobson-Jobson: A Glossary of Colloquial Anglo-Indian Words and Phrases, and of Kindred Terms, Etymological, Historical, Geographical and Discursive*, London, 1903.

HSBM = ГСБМ — Гістарычны слоўнік беларускай мовы, Вып. 1–37. Мінск 1982–2017.

OED — Oxford English Dictionary online at <https://www.oed.com/>

SRJaXI–XVIIvv — Словарь русского языка XI–XVII вв. Вып. 1–31. Москва, 1975–2019.

Sreznevskij I. I. (Срезневский И.И.) Материалы для словаря древнерусского языка по письменным памятникам. СПб.: Типография Имп. Академии наук, 1893–1912.

Vasmer – Trubačev 1964–73 — Фасмер М. Этимологический словарь русского языка. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения О. Н. Трубачева. Москва: Прогресс, 1964–1973.

REFERENCES

- Adrianova V. P.* (Адрианова В. П.). К истории текста «Аристотелевых врат» // Русский филологический вестник. 1911. № 66. С. 1–14.
- Badawi A.* *Fontes graecae doctrinarum politicarum Islamicarum*. Pt. 1. *Testamenta graeca* (pseudo-) *Platonis*, et 2. *Secretum secretorum* (pseudo-) *Aristotelis*, ed. Abdurrahman Badawi. Cairo, 1954 (in Arabic).
- Bos G.* (ed.). *Maimonides, On Poisons and the Protection against Lethal Drugs*. Provo, Utah: Brigham Young University Press, 2009. 436 pp.
- Bos G.* (ed.). *Maimonides, Medical Aphorisms*, Hebrew Translation by Nathan ha-Meati. Leiden: Brill, 2020. 292 pp.
- Bos G. et al.* *Maimonides On Coitus. A New Parallel Arabic-English Edition and Translation*, with editions of medieval Hebrew translations by Gerrit Bos, medieval Latin translations by Charles Burnett and a Slavonic translation by W. F. Ryan and Moshe Taube. Leiden: Brill, 2019. 241 pp.
- Bulanin D. M., Matveeva E. N.* (Буланин Д. М., Матвеева Е. Н.). Тимофей Камeneвич-Рвовский // Словарь книжников и книжности Древней Руси. Вып. 3, ч. 4. СПб.: Наука, 2004. С. 17.
- Černyh P. Ya.* (Черных П. Я.). Историко-этимологический словарь современного русского языка. М.: Русский язык, 1993.
- Gaster M.* 'The Hebrew Version of the *Secretum Secretorum*: A Medieval Treatise ascribed to Aristotle' // *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. 1907 (October), pp. 879–912; 1908 (January), pp. 111–62; 1908 (October), pp. 1065–84.
- Johnstone P.* 'Aconite and its Antidotes in Arabic Writings' // *Journal for the History of Arabic Science*. 1977, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 65–71.
- Krymskij A. E.* (Крымский А. Е.). [Рец. на] Сперанский М. Н. Из истории отреченных книг IV: Аристотелевы врата или Тайная тайных, Санкт-Петербург, 1908 // Этнографическое обозрение. Год 22-й (1910). № 3–4. Кн. LXXXVI–LXXXVII. Варшава, 1911, С. 226–31.
- Lestvicyn V.* (Лествицын В.). Камeneвич-Рвовский, мOLOGский проповедник конца XVII в. // Ярославские епархиальные ведомости. 1875. № 9. Часть неофиц. С. 65–68.

- Novikova O. L. (Новикова О. Л.).* Пометы Петровского времени в трех известных рукописях XV–XVI веков и труды Тимофея Камневича-Рвовского // Вестник «Альянс-Архео». 2018. Вып. 24. С. 116–142.
- Novikova O. L. (Новикова О. Л.).* Духовная монаха Феодосия Нелидова из сборника Тимофея Камневича-Рвовского и новые сведения о рукописях книжника. // Вестник «Альянс-Архео». 2019. Вып. 28. С. 45–76.
- Reczek St.* Podręczny słownik dawnej polszczyzny. Wrocław–Warszawa–Kraków: Ossolineum, 1968.
- Ruska J.* Tabula Smaragdina, Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung, 1926. 176 p.
- Ryan W. F. and Taube M.* The Secret of Secrets: The East Slavic Version. Warburg Institute Studies and Texts 7. London, 2019. 528 pp.
- Sazonova L. I. (Сазонова Л. И.).* Литературная культура России. Раннее Новое время. М.: Языки славянских культур, 2006. 894 с.
- Sinicyna E. V. (Синицына Е. В.).* Книжные собрания небольших монастырей Ярославской епархии до начала XX века // Сообщения Ростовского Музея. Вып. XV. Ростов: [б. и.], 2005. С. 147–157.
- Speranskij M. N. (Сперанский М. Н.).* Из истории отреченных книг IV: Аристотелевы врата или Тайная тайных. Санкт-Петербург: Тип. М. А. Александрова, 1908. 319 с. [= Памятники древней письменности и искусства 17].
- Steele, R. et al.* Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi, fasc. 5, Secretum secretorum. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920. 317 pp.
- Taube M.* The Logika of the Judaizers: a Fifteenth-Century Ruthenian Translation from Hebrew. Critical edition of the Slavic texts presented alongside their Hebrew sources, with Introduction, English translation, and commentary. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 2016. 720 pp.