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Abstract
Moldavian Slavonic texts represent a point of contact between various Slavic and non-Slavic languages. However, due to the increasing influence of Church Slavonic in most types of texts, this fact is often not so obvious. The crucial indicator of the linguistic source of the text and the dynamics of the development of the Moldavian Slavonic written culture are the function words. In our paper, we have chosen two examples of the temporal and genre variability of Moldavian function words: the conjunctions introducing object and purpose clauses. The development of these conjunctions takes place in two, partly parallel ways: the use in chancery formulae and the use in free text. In general, we can distinguish four main layers of function words, three of which appear progressively in internal chancery documents, while the last is specific to external correspondence. The oldest layer is represented by Ruthenian function words, which dominate in the oldest internal and external documents. Soon the early repertoire is challenged by the Middle Church Slavonic set, followed by South Slavonic vernacular elements mediated by the Wallachian chancery. In the late documents, used for communication with the Polish-administered territory, the new, polonising Ruthenian function words are used, probably borrowed from the Polish and Lithuanian Ruthenian chanceries.
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1. Slavonic varieties of Moldavia

The Principality of Moldavia, one of the historical countries with a predominantly Romanian population, belonged to the Church Slavic cultural area from its establishment in the 14th century until the early 18th century (Knoll 2022, 270–271). The consequence was a Slavic character of liturgy, culture and administration, and a strong Slavic influence on the Romanian language, which was written in Cyrillic,
modelled on the spelling of local Slavonic texts. The most prestigious Slavic variety was the local variety of Church Slavonic (hereafter CS), which dominated the texts contained in manuscript books. The language of these texts contrasted with the chancery texts, which were written in two types of language: Ruthenian, a written language of predominantly East Slavic character with increasing West Slavic influence, and Hybrid (Moldavian) Slavonic.

The hybridity of Moldavian Slavonic texts consisted in the blending of four groups of linguistic elements, the combination of which produced the observed variation. These elements may have included phonology, orthography, morphosyntax and vocabulary. We can distinguish the following elements and their sources:

| (Middle) CS (dominantly its Trinovitan/Tărnovo variety) | • Standard (biblical-liturgical corpus)  
|                                                      | • Substandard (elements from the non-liturgical texts of the 14th century Bulgaria) |
| Ruthenian                                            | • Local tradition (with local – Bucovinian – dialectal background)  
|                                                      | • Polish Crown and Lithuanian Chanceries (with Polish, eventually Czech influence) |
| Wallachian Slavonic                                   | • South Slavic elements borrowed in Wallachia drawing from the Serbian chancery tradition  
|                                                      | • Specific Wallachian terminology, expressions and formulae |
| Specific Romanian Slavonic                            | • Common Moldavian-Wallachian Slavonic terminology  
|                                                      | • Specific Moldavian terminology  
|                                                      | • Grecisms and Hungarisms  
|                                                      | • Romanian substrate |

1 In this article, we refer to the standard collections of Moldavian chancery texts: the internal ones, published in Romania (DRH A) and the Republic of Moldova (MEF 1), whose gaps are filled with older collections (Costăchescu 1973). The external documents have been published in the collections linked to specific archives. We refer here to the Polish (Bogdan 1893, 1895; Costăchescu 1932) and Transylvanian (Tocilescu 1931) documents. We also refer to collections of documents from other Cyrillic chanceries.

2 The Moldavian manuscripts are mostly written in a language based on the Church Slavonic variety used in the late period of the Second Bulgarian Empire (cf. Miltenova 2008, 683). In Ukrainian studies, the chancery language is considered part of the Old Ukrainian heritage (cf. Nimčuk 2010, Tymočko 2010). The result of this approach is the inclusion of the vocabulary of Moldavian chancery documents in Old Ukrainian dictionaries (e.g., SSUM). Romanian authors in particular (e.g., Djamo-Djaconiţă 1975, 264) are aware of the connections between the Slavonic written varieties within the Romanian-speaking area. For details on this issue, the comparison of different opinions, and the varieties coexisting in the Moldavian environment, see Knoll (2022b, 525).
2. Function words in Moldavian Slavonic

The most conspicuous non-CS elements in the hybrid texts were function words. This may be due to the fact that most of the formulae were changed to Church Slavonic, and in other places words common to more varieties were preferred. In other words, there are many texts that appear to be CS at first sight, but use non-CS conjunctions, prepositions, adverbs and forms of compound tenses. Below are some examples of function words (possibly basic adverbs) that appear in four different forms. There are others that have only Church Slavonic and Ruthenian variants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Church Slavonic</th>
<th>Ruthenian (older)</th>
<th>Ruthenian (younger)</th>
<th>South Slavisms via Wallachian Slavonic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future auxiliary (3rd singular)</td>
<td>хотел, имат</td>
<td>мет, бде(m)</td>
<td>щет, кет</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct object complementizer</td>
<td>иако</td>
<td>жк(e), аж(e)</td>
<td>иж</td>
<td>ере, како</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose conjunction</td>
<td>да, да иако</td>
<td>щобы, аби</td>
<td>аби, жеби</td>
<td>како да, да</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time conjunction (simultaneity overlap)</td>
<td>егда, когда</td>
<td>коли</td>
<td>кди</td>
<td>къда</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional conjunction</td>
<td>аще (пи), ли</td>
<td>коли (би)</td>
<td>ес(m)пи</td>
<td>ако (пи)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative conjunction</td>
<td>жк, вбаче</td>
<td>але, али</td>
<td>але</td>
<td>али</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additive particle ‘also’</td>
<td>такожде</td>
<td>також(e), тиж</td>
<td>теж</td>
<td>такождере</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal adverb ‘now’</td>
<td>йньъ</td>
<td>тепер</td>
<td>тепер, терас</td>
<td>съда</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the reasons given above, each group of function words is typical for a certain group of texts in which it occurs most frequently. Church Slavic function words dominate non-diplomatic texts and, to a lesser extent, monastic charters. Older (lo-

---

3 The classification of the conjunctions is partly taken from KORTMANN (2001, 845–846).
cal) Ruthenian function words are mostly found in internal chancery texts and correspondence with Poland, and younger (Polonising) Ruthenian ones in communication with the Orthodox Brotherhood of Lviv. South Slavic words are concentrated in the correspondence with Transylvania. Nevertheless, the actual use of concrete function words may have been influenced by various aspects and spread in texts of different types. An important variable was the evolutionary dynamics of Moldavian Slavonic varieties and the fixation of concrete lexemes in formulae.

We will illustrate this with two examples: the equivalents of the direct object complementizer and the purpose conjunction, the latter sometimes used as an optative/imperative particle.

### 3. Direct object complementizer

The complementizer that introduces an object clause (‘that’) is usually found in our texts after verbs that express giving information, swearing, saying, promising and others.

One of the few words used in an unchanged form from the very beginning of the Moldavian chancery writing until the 17th century is the complementizer вж(e) (cf. SSUM II, 76–77). In the Moldavian context, we find it for the first time in 1388 in the promulgatio formula of a Polish Ruthenian letter sent to Moldavia. The oldest attestation in a letter sent from Moldavia dates from 1393. Despite the variation of the verbal construction (which was completely lost at the end of the 16th century) and the transposition of the formula into the Church Slavonic form, the complementizer вж(e) remained fixed in this formula until the end of administrative Slavonic in Moldavia.

The free text (out of formulae) equivalent of the complementizer вж(e) was the lexeme аж(e) (cf. SSUM I, 67). In this sense, it was already attested in a charter sent by Archbishop of Riga to the Duke of Smolensk and later used in older Lithuanian documents. In a few documents addressed to Poland, аж(e) appeared in the

---

4 COSTĂNESCU (1932, 605): Чинимо то свѣдом оуємь, которъіи на тот листь посмотрить, оже... ‘We inform everyone, who will see this letter that...’

5 DRH A (1, 5): Чинимъ то вѣдомо оусѣмъ добрымъ паном, ктожь на сеї листъ оузритъ или его оуслышитъ чтучи, вже... ‘We inform all good gentlemen who will see or hear this letter when read they it that...’

6 DRH A (9, 13; 1593): Знаменито чиним с сим листом нашим, въсѣм кто на нем възрит или его чтѣчи оуслышит, вж... ‘With this letter of ours, we inform everyone who will see or hear this letter when read them that...’

7 DRH A (28, 173–174; 1645): Що ж прийде прьд нами...наш боярин Тютуля ‘That (our boyar Tăutul) came before us...’ (beginning of the sentence). This expression was then translated into (Old) Romanian as адвэ (adică) ‘namely, and so.’

8 SDRJa (1, 77; 1281–1297). Otherwise, the lexeme аже is used in a conditional sense (‘if’) in Smolensk documents.

---
'It has been a long time since they remembered that it is our domain and inherited property.' In the Lithuanian documents, the conjunction акъ(ъ) mostly appears in the sense of 'up to', as in West Slavic.  
9  Costăchescu (1932, 728; 1445): Чинимъ знаменито…, аже… 'We inform… that…'
10  Costăchescu (1932, 651; 1433): слюбуемъ и слюбили есми…, аже… 'We promise and we have promised… that…'
11  Costăchescu (1932, 603; 1388): знати вам даємо ижь… 'We inform you… that…'
12  E.g., Bogdan (1893, 206–207; 1558): знанитосто чиним… како… 'We inform… that…'
13  Leontovič (1896, 18; 1482): повѣдали, ижъ пани Монковая имъ была сестра 'they said that Lady Monkovaja was their sister.' Another complementizer with this meaning, absent in the Moldavian context, was штожъ.
14  See SJS: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/?recordId=37156.
15  E.g., First Moldavian Chronicle 242r вънегда слышаш иако падошѧ добрїи и храбрїи витыжи… 'when they heard that good and brave nobles had fallen…'
16  Tocilescu (1931, 497; 1453): знаменитосто чинимъ… како 'We inform… that…'
17  In the Serbian Chancery language, the semantics of ере (spelled ере) was quite broad, including the original use as a relative particle and conjunctions of different meanings (also as a cause conjunction, see Daničić 1863–1864, 3, 523–526).
18  Tocilescu (1931, 520; 1527/1546): даем вам знати ере… ви дал… 'We inform you that… he gave…'
4. Purpose conjunction

Our second example concerns the means of introducing a purpose clause or optative (modal)/imperative constructions. Their natural milieu is the dispositio of documents, most often expressing the purpose of issuing the document or explaining the purpose of a decision, action or request. In some specific documents (e.g., trade or monastic privileges) the same means may be used to express the command or prohibition. A formally similar use can be found in sanctio.

The oldest Moldavian Slavonic expression used with these semantics was щобы (older spelling штобы, 3rd person), which appears in an internal letter from 1392 (in corroboratio). Щобы is an East Slavic expression used in both the Muscovite and Lithuanian chanceries. During the reign of Alexander the Good (early 15th century), щобы appeared in the dispositio formula of the trade privileges to Lviv merchants (from 1408), but also in the introductory formula of the dispositio of internal documents. At the beginning of the 15th century, щобы appears as an imperative particle in the sanctio and in a trade privilege to Brașov. In the second half of the 15th century (or later), its appearance is rather accidental and not very frequent.

The conjunction аби (абы), which spread in the Lithuanian chancery (replacing щобы) and shared with West Slavic, is the typical free text purpose conjunction of the Moldavian chancery texts. From the 1430s, it replaced щобы in non-formu-

---

19 DRH A (8, 515; 1590): сие рекли прьд нами ере вълазили въ их хотар ‘they said so in front of us that they had entered their domain.’
20 BOGDAN (1893, 242; 1564): тое даємъ вашой милости знати, ерє послали єсте листъ до нас ‘We inform Your Grace that you have sent us a letter.’
21 Cf. the use of щоб (и), аби in this sense in modern Ukrainian (Šul’žuk 2004, 45 and 289–290).
22 DRH A (1, 2): велѣлъ есмо нашю печатъ великую привѣсити, што бъі непорушено то николиже, до вѣка ‘We have commanded that our Great Seal be affixed so that (the privilege) shall be irrevocable forever.’
23 COSTĂCHESCU (1932, 632; 1408): доконали есмы съ ними, щобы ходили у нашои земли ‘We agreed with them that they should walk on our land.’
24 DRH A (1, 81; 1424): далъ есмъі ему, оу нашеи земли, едно село..., що бы емоу би были оурик ‘We gave him a village... in our country, so that it becomes his property’ (i.e., without a finite verb in the subordinate clause). DRH A (1, 252; 1438): далъ есмъі ему два села..., що бъі ему оурик ‘We gave him two villages... to be his property.’
25 DRH A (1, 33; 1408): таковъіи што бѣі бѣі проклѧтъ ‘such a person should be cursed.’
26 TOCILESCU (1931, 491; 1448): а нигдѣ по нашей земли щобы не платили сочав’ское мыто ‘and in no part of our country should they pay the Suceava toll.’
27 DRH A (2, 354; ca 1481): так оучините, що бѣі не загиблъ ‘do it in such a way that I do not perish.’
28 LEONTOVIĆ (1896, 84; 1495): и мы ему приказали, абѣі далъ на честь его не сказалъ и далъ ему въ томъ покой ‘and we commanded him not to offend his honour anymore and to leave him in peace.’
laic constructions and it survived until the 17th century. In the communication with Poland, it was dominant until the late 16th century. Its use in an imperative construction (command) is rare. Together with щобы it appeared in a formula in the Brașov trade privileges. Rarely it appears in the First Moldavian Annals (until 1507), combined with other function words.

In Church Slavonic, this semantics is reserved for the function word да, whose use in South Slavic languages is similar to the Romanian să. The Moldavian chancery language inherited this function word from the Wallachian chancery formulae in the process of the transposing of Ruthenian formulae into Church Slavonic in the internal chancery language. It seems that the original щобы was first replaced by да in the imperative construction such as да ест проклът ‘he shall be cursed’ of the sanctio, a segment taken from the Wallachian-South Slavic diplomatic. Around 1415, we find it in a dispositio formula, which establishes the right of settlement. In the monastery charters in the 1420s, да is introduced in the dispositio. Until the middle of the 15th century, this formula replaced the older one (including щобы) even in secular documents. However, in Moldavian internal documents, Transylvania correspondence and historiography, the simple да tended to be used in imperative/optative constructions, while the purpose meaning was usually reserved for other means. An exception is Eftimie’s Chronicle (1554). In the 15th century trade privileges the imperative construction of the type да не платътъ (‘they shall not pay’, Romanian să nu plătească), competed with the modal expression имають платить (‘they shall pay’, both Tocilescu 1931, 492; 1449).

---

29 DRH A (2, 4; 1449): перепросил пана Костю абы его простил ‘he asked Sir Costea to pardon him.’
Tocilescu (1931, 521; 1538/1540): протож молимо стнѣ ти абѣ съ еси велими силовал ‘we therefore ask Your Holiness to do your best.’
Tocilescu (1931, 530; 1603): а ти рѣцѣ им абѣ да покои мѣсто имъ ‘and you, tell them to leave their place in peace.’

30 DRH A (2, 52; 1453): а також, коли меду привезъ свих пасик, абѣ не платилиь мыыта ‘and if they bring honey from their clearings, they shall pay no toll.’

31 Tocilescu (1931, 491; 1448): дали есмѣ сес лист нашъ… на то, абы имали оу наши земли тотъ закон, що имали въ днѣ родителей нашего ‘we have given this our document so that that they may have the same rights in our land as they had in the days of our father.’

32 244у съмири ихъ, нѣ абѣ са вратили… ‘he made them reconcile and return.’

33 DRH A (1, 10; 1398/1399): кто бы емѣ вѣнчалъ, таковий да е проклѣтъ ‘anyone who tries to take it from him, will be cursed.’

34 DRH A (1, 56; 1414/1419): а на томъ хотарѣ… аще имѣ вѣдѣ ли вѣдѣли село, да вѣдѣ ли ‘and in this domain, if they are able to settle villages, they shall settle them.’

35 DRH A (1, 85; 1424): дали есмѣ имѣли не мѣсто… да поставимт и да вѣдѣ ли се популя ть монастыръ ‘we have given them a place to build and populate a monastery.’

36 DRH A (2, 111; 1458): да имѣли и потвердили слугамъ нашимъ… да соумъ имѣли ‘we have given and confirmed to our servants…. that they will receive the property.’

37 E.g., First Moldavian Annals 241v да живет царь ‘long life to voivode.’
38 488rv Црь же повелъ емуо скоро прийти оу Дтѣрѣ и да желаемыи емуо законъ мусульманскии полуучытъ ‘The Sultan ordered him to come to Istanbul quickly, so that he could obtain gets the desired Muslim faith.’
The combination of да with the conditional auxiliary би (даби) is a form that was rare in the OCS,\textsuperscript{39} but it was widespread in the Church Slavonic texts written by East Slavs (cf. SDRJa 2, 414). Not surprisingly, this construction appears several times in the Moscow version of the Moldavian Chronicle. In the strictly Moldavian context, the appearance of даби is marginal, I found it only in two letters addressed to the Hungarian milieu.\textsuperscript{40}

Other combinations containing да are very common. The combination іако да is already known, though not frequently, from the OCS period,\textsuperscript{41} but it is widespread in the 14\textsuperscript{th} century Bulgarian literature,\textsuperscript{42} the secondary source of the model texts for the Romanian Slavonic environment. This expression appears early in the Wallachian chancery documents.\textsuperscript{43} In the Moldavian Slavonic context, it occurs already in Gârd’s Letter of 1407,\textsuperscript{44} the oldest dated Church Slavonic text from Moldavia, where it is placed in the dispositio formula explaining the purpose of the donation. In a similar expression, we find іако да in the letters sent to Brașov and in monastery charters.\textsuperscript{45} In the latter type of documents, іако да was fixed in the Wallachian-inspired dispositio formula in the second third of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century and the first half of the 16\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{46} Later, this formula was simplified to a paratactic clause (дадох и потвърдих ‘I gave and confirmed’, 1586, DRH A 8, 121). In Macarie’s Chronicle (1529–1551) іако да is the quintessential means of introducing purpose clauses.\textsuperscript{47} In Eftimie’s Chronicle, it varies with simple да.

The Serbian (Daničić 1863, 1, 430–431) and Vidin chanceries (Daskalova – Rajkova 2005, 195) knew another combination with да specialised for the introduction of the purpose clause, which was како да. In the 1430s, it entered Wallachia as a variant of іако да.\textsuperscript{48} In Moldavia, this expression appeared at the very end of the 15\textsuperscript{th} century in the introductory formula of the dispositio as a variant of иако да.\textsuperscript{49} During

\textsuperscript{40} Tocilescu (1931, 516; 1517/1527): а гсво ми бёмеме неволисати, да би било по вашеи воли ‘And our lordship, we will do our best to make the matter go according to your will.’
\textsuperscript{42} See HistDict: https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/dictionary/show/d_10926.
\textsuperscript{43} Tocilescu (1931, 5; 1413): просих гсво ми іако да поновим и твърдим закони ‘they asked my lordship to renew and confirm the laws.’
\textsuperscript{44} DRH A (1, 29; 1407): дадохом... іако да схт мшци монастыре неразличему ‘we have given... that these monasteries are indivisible.’
\textsuperscript{45} Tocilescu (1931, 489; 1437): даеме сес лист гсва ми тръговем и Брашова іако да даваме мъсто ‘we give this document to the merchants of Brașov to pay the toll.’
\textsuperscript{46} DRH A (1, 298; 1448): благопразови гство ми... іако да оутвърдимъ и оукръпимъ монастыр ‘our lordship has made a kind decision... to confirm and strengthen the monastery.’
\textsuperscript{47} Macarie III, 246v Оумоли господина Богдана воевода съ многым оумоленїемь, іако да ест старїи закон, како да купчю се въсѣк по вьсеи земи ‘he implored Voivode Bogdan to make peace with Voivode Radul.’
\textsuperscript{48} Tocilescu (1931, 23; 1431): дровах ски хрисова... іако да им ест старїи закон, како да купчю въськъ копія по вьсьеи земи ‘I have given this chrysobull ... that he may have the ancient right to trade in all goods throughout land.’
\textsuperscript{49} DRH A (3, 199; 1491): та есмо дали томо стопомо нашеи мистирио..., како да ест... и како да уе имамь въсейе мистиро... that it may have the possession of us.’ Costâchescu (1943,
the 16th century it entered the same formula of secular documents replacing the simple да. From the formula, it appeared in the free text of the letters addressed to Transylvania.50 In the Moldavian historiography, I found како да only once in the last record of the First Annals,51 which also contains other South Slavisms.

Rarely we can find other combined function words, used to introduce purpose clauses. The combination како би was borrowed from the Wallachian milieu.52 In the Ruthenian-based Lviv correspondence, there is the form ажби53 and from the turn of the 17th century also the Polonisms жеби and ижби.54 The most curious, even if only marginally, are combinations of South Slavisms and Ruthenisms such as како аби, да аби, аби да.55

5. Layers of Moldavian function words

The dynamics of the use of function words of different origins in Moldavian Slavonic texts follows the general dynamics of the development of Slavonic writing in Moldavia.

The first generation of Ruthenian function words (ѡж, щобы) appeared in the early formulae of the chancery documents and, except forѡж, they were replaced in the process of changing the originally Ruthenian formulae into Church Slavonic, which intensified during the period of the chancery under the leadership of logofăt

---

50 Tocilescu (1931, p. 522; 1538/1540): и ти ж мъмъ мо съ ечмъ ти и въсмъ сватъ како да естемъ назъ добрий приятели и томъ странъ 'and we also ask Your Lordship and the whole Council to be a better friend to us from this side.'

51 246v и тако посла съ нимъ едного своего поклисаръ до Радула воевода съ всмъ своими банами. на съмъ емв шобъ да држит миръ вечнъ. и хотаръ по старимъ хотарамъ. 'And so he sent one of his envoys to Voivode Radul with all his boyars, who swore on the Holy Gospel to perpetual peace and the preservation of the old borders.'

52 Tocilescu (1931, p. 23; ca 1430): оправете ихъ како би право и мирно ходиле 'teach them to walk (trade) legally and peacefully.'

53 Bodan (1893, p. 205; 1558): абъ милостивъ богъ васъ ъкръни и вътвердй, абъ естемъ и въпередь не съпили и полили законъ хрестионскъ 'may the merciful God strengthen and confirm you, so that in the future you will not weaken and fulfill the Christian (Orthodox) law.'

54 Bodan (1895, p. 27; 1601): бдемо се старати, жебисме въ короткъмъ часе до тогъ ечмъ изколкъ послали 'we will do our best to send some money within a short time.' Bodan (1895, p. 343; 1605): прето жадемо вашихъ милостей, жебймъ емв ваша милость были помочни 'therefore we ask Your Grace to assist him.'

55 First Annals 244v и тако Биртокъ посла свои слв до кралъ лъдскъ како аби мнъ и самъ ишалъ до кралъ 'and so Birtok sent his envoys to the king of Poland that he himself might go to the king'. Tocilescu (1931, p. 538; 1530/1540): понеж мъмъ ечмъ те, како приятели моему мъмъ како аби та наций бъ да истрчните томи люди да аби емъ врата ми пинь 'as we ask Your Lordship, as my dear friend, that the God help you to force these people to give me my money back'. Tocilescu (1931, p. 539; 1530/1540): пропож просимъ и молимъ ечмъ ти... аби да ть наставий бъ... да ми држки на тебе въ Бистрицу 'and so I ask your lordship... that God may make you... to keep it for me at your place in Bistriţa.'
Neagoe in the 1430s. From this time on, the older Ruthenian function words in the formulae may have been replaced by Church Slavonic (or similar) ones, starting with the Wallachian-inspired monastic charters (да, iako да). From the middle of the 15th century, with the culmination in the chancery led by logofăt Ion Tăutul, the third generation of function words entered the formulae, this time coming from the Wallachian chancery and thus of Serbian chancery origin (ере, како да). These words were naturally concentrated in the areas of contact with Wallachian Slavonic (communication with Brașov). Some of them, however, made a brilliant career in the internal documents of the chancery (како да).

From the formulae, some Ruthenian functional words of the second generation (ак, абу) were commonly used in the internal and external documents of the whole period in question. A separate development can be seen in the late Ruthenian correspondence, mostly represented by the letters sent to the Lviv Orthodox Brotherhood. In this correspondence, the second-generation Ruthenian function words were replaced around the turn of the 17th century by the third-generation Ruthenian function words adapted from Polish (иж, ижбы, жебы).

Moldavian historiography, having a Church Slavonic basis, used exclusively Church Slavonic means. The reflex of the development of the chancery language can be traced by chance only in the First Moldavian Annals. The Romanian language entered the chancery language of Moldavia at the end of the 16th century in the private correspondence and in the 1610s in the voivodal documents. The reign of voivode Vasile Lupu in the second third of the 17th century accelerated the gradual transfer of all administrative and non-liturgical writing to Romanian, after which this type of text represented only a minority of Moldavian written culture.
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