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Although the Glagolitic script is usually associated with Bulgaria and Croatia, graffiti, inscriptions and single letters in otherwise Cyrillic writing areas have been found on East Slavic territory, too – mostly prominently in Kiev and in Novgorod, its first capitals.

In this short note, we would like to draw the readers’ attention to two lines of Glagolitic text, which are to be found in the Epilogue to Pamvo Berynda’s Triodion or Triod Cvetnaya, printed in Kiev in 1631 (russ. Тріодь Цветная 1631 г., ukr. Тріодь Цвітна 1631 р.). No full facsimile or a pdf of this rare book seems to be available online. However, a copy is currently being offered for sale for roughly 10,000 Euros.


He reproduces the full text of the Prologue to the Triodion written by the corrector Tarasij Zemka, and then the full Epilogue by the same author which makes up the last two pages of the 1631 edition. The Epilogue ends with a sample of the alphabet used for printing the Triodion and then features a Glagolitic ornament, before ending with four more lines of text and the obligatory “Amen”. See Addendum I (below) for a picture of the full page.

---

See http://chernovtsy.chv.slando.ua/obyavlenie/1631-g-triod-tsvetnaya-petra-mogily-raritet-ID86wlh.html (accessed July 24, 2014). This page also has two pictures of the volume.

---

1
In his comments about the edition, the Prologue and the Epilogue, Titov restricts himself to a simple note about the presence of this unusual element: “An original ornament of the book, by the way, are two lines set in Glagolitic type”.\(^2\)

In his Tipografija, published two year earlier, he had also shown the same ornament (p. 16) in the chapter about Old Russian printing, as a rare example of using this script among Russian scribes. Its function, according to Titov, usually was a cryptographic one, hiding, for example, the scribe’s or printer’s names. After Titov, Speranskij seems to have been the next author to reproduce the ornament in his “Tajnopis’ v jugoslavjanskix i russkix pamjatnikax pis’ma” (In: Enciklopedija slavjanskoj filologii, vyp. 4.3, Leningrad 1929, p. 67), although in bad quality. He cites it as a remarkably recent example of using Glagolica in a cryptographic function and transliterates it into Russian.\(^3\)

So, first, we would like to transliterate the Glagolitic text using Latin letters – see the following figure.

![Fig. 2: Glagolitic ornament with transliteration](image)

Translated, the two lines say: “Pamvo, also called Pavel, Berynda, protosingel and prototypograph”. That Pamvo Berynda (russ. Pamva Berinda) was called Pavel is not as widely known as his unusually sounding first and last names, by which he is almost always referred to. The designations ‘protosingel’ and ‘prototypograph’ attest to his high rank and role in the Lavra and are known from other sources, too. With nearly the same words, Pamvo Berynda himself had

\(^2\) “Оригинальное украшение книги составляют, между прочим, двѣ строки, набранные шрифтом глаголицы (см. выше, стр. сг [= 253])” (Титов op. cit., p. сг [255]).

\(^3\) See also “1631 р. вийшла ‘Тріодь цвітна’ з криптонімічним записом Беринд” (http://sofiynist.donntu.edu.ua/kalendar/2012/july/pamva.html; accessed July 29, 2014; no author given). – By the way, Berynda and his legacy would normally be seen today as part of the Ukrainian (and Byelorussian) history – see, for example, the corresponding article in the Ukrainian Wikipedia (https://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/Беринд_Памво), while the Russian version avoids a precise statement, simply saying that he was one of the first printers „in Rus“ („на Руси“) (https://ru.wikipedia.org/wiki/БериндаПамво; accessed Sept 12, 2014), thereby hiding the fact that Kiev definitely wasn’t part of the Russian state at the time. Speranskij, of course, simply subsumes Berynda under the „Russian“ sources he investigates, as was customary at the time. Other versions of the Wikipedia article also call Berynda „Rutenian/Rysin“ (de.) or „East Slavic“ (be.).

Памво Беры́нда, Правосу́гелъ и Архитипогра́фъ цérке Руссии.
Памво Беры́нда, Правосу́гелъ и Архитипогра́фъ цérке Руссии.

Fig. 3: Pamvo Berynda’s self-description (1627)

In the second line, we have reproduced the same sentence in our “Method” font. By the way: in the Epilogue to the *Triod’ Postnaja* (1627), Pamvo Berynda had still simply called himself “protosingel and tipograf”. Both Pamvo Berynda and Tarasij Zemka died in the year after the publication of the *Triodion* (i.e. in 1632), and on Berynda’s tombstone we find those words repeated: “Here lies the blessed father Pamvo Berynda, protosingel of the Jerusalem Patriarchal throne and prototypograph of the Russian Church/of the Kievan Lavra.”"4

What follows are the two lines from the ornament (omitting the moon and the star) as searchable text in Unicode Glagolitic, with word separators added:

ПАМВО ИЖЕ И ПАВЕЛ’ БЕРИНДА ПРОТОСИНГЕЛ’ И АРКИТИПОГРАФ’


---

4 This translation combines the information from two sources: a Polish version (“Tu leży czczigodny ojciec Pamwo Berynda, protosingel tronu jeruzalimskiego, architipograf Ławry Pieczerskiej”) by Elżbieta Dziwisz in her section *Rzeka czasu* in the monthly journal *Alma Mater* published by Kraków University (http://www2.almamater.uj.edu.pl/95/11.pdf, p. 35) and the shorter version cited by V. R. Vavrik in his *Kratkij očerk Galicko-Russkoj pis’-mennosti* (published in Louvain 1973, p. 27) (full text available at http://www.ukrstor.com/ukrstor/vavrik-galruspismennost-vse.html): “…скончался в Киеве, как «протосингел от Иерусалимского патриаршего престола и архитипограф Россия церкви» в 1632 году.” In the English excerpts Walter Maksimovich has published in his article about Vavrik at http://lemko.org/rusyn/vavrik.html, he translates the church as “Rusyn” [both sources accessed July 25, 2014]. By the way, it is very interesting to see that Google returns exactly and only 2 results if one searches for “protosingel Berynda 1632”. Both results are cited in this footnote.
For the first representation, we have used the automatic transliteration of Glagolitic using Cyrillic built into the author’s “Method” font where transliterated characters are marked with a little Glagolitic sign. The second representation uses the author’s square Glagolitic font, “Glagol”. The third representation uses a Croatian Glagolitic font named “Glagolica Missal DPG”. As for their underlying Unicode values, all three representations are identical: it is simply a matter of switching fonts to change from one version to the other.

It is time to comment upon the obvious mistake which has been made in assembling the Glagolitic letters for the ornament in the Epilogue of the 1631 edition of the Triodion: the last word indeed reads arkitipograf’, not arxitipograf’, as one would expect. This can be explained when one looks at the actual printing types used for the ornament: Glagolitic K [= k] (Ⱀ, Ⰿ) and Glagolitic X [= kh] (Ⱁ, Ɐ), although clearly different in printing type representing older or standardized letter forms (cf. first samples), can indeed mor be e similar in other designs (cf. second samples), and a K [= k] may thus be mistaken for a X [= kh] by someone who is not very familiar with Glagolitic letters. Speranskij, by the way, seems to have overlooked this typo.

This leads us to the question about the origin of the Glagolitic printing types used in Kiev in the Epilogue of the 1631 Triodion. It is obvious that the letters match the Glagolitic printing types used in Croatia (and in certain printing houses outside Croatia) in the 16th century. This had already been mentioned by Speranskij (op. cit., p. 67) who calls it an “imitation” (подражание) of Croatian Glagolica. Indeed, the letters are similar (but not identical) to the large-size ones used by Primož Trubar in his “Tabla za dicu”, printed in Urach in 1561, see the figure below and Addendum III. (The printing types themselves were created in Nuremberg.)

One similarity worth mentioning is the ‘open’ form of the Glagolitic ‘I’ used for larger type, making it look like a Latin ‘X’ (see below, second line, fourth character). On its page about their collection of Trubar’s book, the British Library features the same alphabet types from 1561 as we do (see right half of fig. 4), and it is interesting to note that in their copy of this edition, someone has added Latin letters to the Glagolitic alphabet, too, making several mistakes before giving up altogether. The ‘I’, for example, is identified as ‘H’.

---

5 For the font and its background see http://nenad.bplaced.net/doku.php/en:glagolmissal. The author, Nenad Hančiće-Matejić, says that he has styled his font after the types in a book called Transit of St. Jerome, which was printed in Senj in 1508 (“Transit sv. Jerolima”)


Trubar’s letters are also very similar to the ones J. VAJS uses in 1909 in his chart of “Literae Initiales” (in his Abecedarium, p. 7, see also Addendum II, below). More samples of printing types similar to the ones used in Kiev can be seen on http://www.croatianhistory.net/glagoljica/runjak.html and elsewhere on that site. See for example the types used in Rome in 1629 for the ‘Azbukividnjak slovinskij’ (and note the Latin transliteration someone has added to the first word, mistaking the ‘U’ for an ‘O’ – also similar letters):

However, when comparing the letters from Kiev with Croatian samples one cannot help but state that the Kievan type looks inferior – decidedly less organic in its design. Some letters have a distinct ‘outline’ look, others have filled-in forms like standard text fonts would have. This only adds to the effect that these two lines serve more as an ornament than text for reading. By the way – who could have read Glagolitic in Kiev in 1631 anyway? Our short hint (above) could have already answered this question: rarely anyone, and on purpose – if it is true that the ornament served as a cryptogramm.

There can be no doubt that the Glagolitic printing types used in the Triodion in 1631 either came from Croatia or from foreign Glagolitic printers in places like Rome or were modelled after 16th century Croatian printing types. In the introduction to their reprint of Titov’s Tipografija..., editors Martin Erdmann and Walter Kroll (Köln etc.: Böhlau 2000) mention that Petro Mohyla himself man-

---

aged to import one set of Latin characters for the Kievan printing house (p. XVIII), so it is entirely possible that the Glagolitic characters were brought to Kiev at the same time which would be after 1627. We think this is more plausible than to assume they were cut as an “imitation” of Croatian printing types on the spot in Kiev.

To sum up, both the Latin and the Glagolitic printing types show a distinct Western influence on Kiev, which belonged to the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth at the time and had been part of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania for centuries. However, the main purpose of this article was to draw attention to the Glagolitic ornament itself, and to make a Unicode representation of the two lines of text available electronically.
Addendum I: *Triodion*, Kiev 1631, Epilogue (from Titov 1918)

Глаголический орнамент в Памво Бернда"s "триод" "Цветная" (1631)
Addendum II: J. VAJS Abecedarium 1909, p. VII

LITERAE INITIALES.
Addendum III: Large-size printing types from Trubar’s *Tabla za dicu* (1561)
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