Knoll, Vladislav

The layers of function words in Moldavian Slavonic texts (15th – 16th centuries)

Vladislav Knoll

THE LAYERS OF FUNCTION WORDS IN MOLDAVIAN SLAVONIC TEXTS (15th – 16th CENTURIES)

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.

KEYWORDS

Moldavian Slavonic; Ruthenian; function words; Romanian Slavonic; subordinate clause

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,[1] 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.[2]

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[3]:

	Church Slavonic	Ruthenian (older)	Ruthenian (younger)	South Slavisms via Wallachian Slavonic
Future auxiliary (3ʳᵈ singular)	*хощет, имат*	*имет, буде(т)*	*буде(т)*	*щет, кет*
Direct object complementizer	*iако*	*вж(е), аж(е)*	*иж*	*ере, како*
Purpose conjunction	*да, да iако*	*щобы, аби*	*аби, жеби*	*како да, да*
Time conjunction (simultaneity overlap)	*егда, когда*	*коли*	*кди*	*къда*
Conditional conjunction	*аще (ли), ли*	*коли (би)*	*ес(т)ли*	*ако (ли)*
Adversative conjunction	*нж, wбаче*	*але, али*	*але*	*али*
Additive particle 'also'	*такожде*	*також(е), тиж*	*теж*	*такождере*
Temporal adverb 'now'	*ннѣ*	*тепер*	*тепер, терас*	*съда*

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 *wж(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[4]. The oldest attestation in a letter sent from Moldavia dates from 1393.[5] 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 *wж(e)* remained fixed in this formula until the end of administrative Slavonic in Moldavia.[6]

The free text (out of formulae) equivalent of the complementizer *wж(e)* was the lexeme *aж(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[7] and later used in older Lithuanian documents.[8] In a few documents addressed to Poland, *aж(e)* appeared in the

---

4   Coстăснеscu (1932, 605): *Чинимо то свѣдом оусѣмъ, которъи 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 оуслышить чтучи, wже…* '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 чтꙋчи оуслишит, wж…* 'With this letter of ours, we inform everyone who will see or hear this letter when read that…' DRH A (28, 173–174; 1645): *Wж прїиде прѣд нами…наш болѣрин Тꙋтꙋл* 'That (our boyar Tăutul) came before us…' (beginning of the sentence). This expression was then translated into (Old) Romanian as *aдекъ* (*adecă*) 'namely, and so.'

7   SDRJa (1, 77; 1281–1297). Otherwise, the lexeme *aже* is used in a conditional sense ('if') in Smolensk documents.

8   Leontovič (1896, 80; 1495): … *давно о томъ памятаютъ, ажъ то есть отчина и дѣдина наша…*

promulgatio formula.[9] Otherwise, the range of use of this complementizer was very wide in internal, and some external (early letters to Poland and Transylvania) documents, being used in any object clause after the verbs of saying, promising, complaining, testifying, seeing, knowing, understanding and others.[10]

The series of complementizers shared with West Slavic appears especially in the letters sent to Poland. In the oldest documents, the lexemes *иже, же* appear in the not yet stabilised *promulgatio* formula.[11] Later, in Ruthenian-based letters sent to Poland, the conjunction *иж* was used.[12] This corresponded to its spread in the Lithuanian chancery.[13]

The Church Slavonic function word *iako* traditionally has complex semantics[14] including the introduction of the object clauses (DURIDANOV et al. 1991, 481). It appears in the texts of manuscript books such as Annals and Chronicles.[15] As a random replacement of a conjunction of Ruthenian origin, it can be found especially in documents related to the monastic environment. Rarely we find the lexeme *како*, which is known in this sense from the Serbian chancery language and Wallachian Slavonic. This complementizer appears especially in external letters, which also contain other South Slavisms.[16]

The classic Wallachian Slavonic object complementizer, also inherited from the Serbian chancery is *ere*.[17] In the 2ⁿᵈ half of the 15ᵗʰ century and in the 1ˢᵗ half of the 16ᵗʰ century, *ere* may appear accidentally in the documents sent to Brașov (Brașov chancery communicated in Wallachian Slavonic).[18] In the second half of the 16ᵗʰ

‘It has been a long time since they remembered that it is our domain and inherited property.’ In the Lithuanian documents, the conjunction *аж(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’. TOCILESCU (1931; 1435): *жалуютъ намъ Брашевлъне, аже...* ‘the burghers of Brașov complain to us that...’. MEF (1, 153; 1597/1611): *тако есми поразумел, аж бил сътворил соби нъких исписоче хитлени...* ‘I understood it to mean that he had drawn up some false documents for himself...’ DRH A (8, 612; 1591): *Гаврил рекл аж била викȣпленїе...* ‘Gavril said that (the domain) was a purchased property...’

11   COSTĂCHESCU (1932, 603; 1388): *чиним свѣдомо велебноі твоеі млсти, же...* ‘We inform Your Reverend Grace... that...’ COSTĂCHESCU (1932, 607; 1393): *знаменитосто чинимъі..., иже...* ‘We inform... that...’

12   E.g., BOGDAN (1893, 206–207; 1558): *знати вам даємо ижь...* ‘We inform you... 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 слышашѧ iако падошѧ добрїи и храбрїи витѧжи...* ‘when they heard that good and brave nobles had fallen...’

16   TOCILESCU (1931, 497; 1453): *знаменито чиним... како* ‘We inform ... that...’

17   In the Serbian Chancery language, the semantics of *ere* (spelled *ѥре*) 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... ѡн дал...* ‘We inform you that... he gave...’

century, *epe* also appears in internal letters (i.e., not in charters) together with traditional forms of Ruthenian origin.[19] I also found it in one document sent to Lviv.[20]

4. Purpose conjunction

Our second example concerns the means of introducing a purpose clause or optative (modal)/imperative constructions.[21] 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*).[22] *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),[23] but also in the introductory formula of the *dispositio* of internal documents.[24] At the beginning of the 15ᵗʰ century, *щобы* appears as an imperative particle in the *sanctio*[25] and in a trade privilege to Braşov.[26] In the second half of the 15ᵗʰ century (or later), its appearance is rather accidental and not very frequent.[27]

The conjunction *аби (абы)*, which spread in the Lithuanian chancery[28] (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): *сице рекли прѣд нами ере вълазили въ их хотар* 'they said so in front of us that they had entered their domain.'

20   Bogdan (1893, 242; 1564): *тоє даємъ вашой милости знати, ере 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 бы 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, штобы ходили у нашои земли* 'We agreed with them that they should walk on our land.'

24   DRH A (1, 81; 1424): *дали есмъі ему, оу нашеи земли, едно село..., што бъі ему оурикъ* '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): *дали есми ему два села..., що бы емоу были оурик* 'We gave him two villages..., to be his property.'

25   DRH A (1, 33; 1408): *таковъіи што бъі бъіл проклѧтъ* 'such a person should be cursed.'

26   Tocilescu (1931, 491; 1448): *а нигде по нашеи 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 бих не загиблъ* 'do it in such a way that I do not perish.'

28   Leontovič (1896, 84; 1495): *и мы ему приказали, абы далей на честь его не сягалъ 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.[29] In the communication with Poland, it was dominant until the late 16ᵗʰ century. Its use in an imperative construction (command) is rare.[30] Together with *щобы* it appeared in a formula in the Braşov trade privileges.[31] Rarely it appears in the First Moldavian Annals (until 1507), combined with other function words.[32]

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 проклѧт* 'he shall be cursed' of the *sanctio*, a segment taken from the Wallachian-South Slavic diplomatic.[33] Around 1415, we find it in a *dispositio* formula, which establishes the right of settlement.[34] In the monastery charters in the 1420s, *да* is introduced in the *dispositio*.[35] Until the middle of the 15ᵗʰ century, this formula replaced the older one (including *щобы*)[36] even in secular documents. However, in Moldavian internal documents, Transylvanian correspondence and historiography, the simple *да* tended to be used in imperative/optative constructions,[37] while the purpose meaning was usually reserved for other means. An exception is Eftimie's Chronicle (1554).[38] In the 15ᵗʰ century trade privileges the imperative construction of the type *да не платѫтъ* ('they shall not pay', Romanian *să nu plătească*), competed with the modal expression *имаютъ платити* ('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 стн̃ъ ти аби сѧ еси велми силовал* 'we therefore ask Your Holiness to do your best.' TOCILESCU (1931, 530; 1603): *а ти рьц̃і им аби дали покои мѣсто им* 'and you, tell them to leave their place in peace.'

30   DRH A (2, 52; 1453): *а такиж, коли медѵ привезȣт ѿ своих пасик, абы не платили мыта* 'and if they bring honey from their clearings, they shall pay no toll.'

31   TOCILESCU (1931, 491; 1448): *дали есми сес лист нашъ... на то, абы имали оу нашеи земли тотъ закон, що имали въ дн̃и родителъ 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   244v *съмири их, нѧ аби сѧ вратили...* 'he made them reconcile and return.'

33   DRH A (1, 10; 1398/1399): *кто бы емȣ ѿнѧлъ, таковїи да е проклѧтъ* 'anyone who tries to take it from him, will be coursed.'

34   DRH A (1, 56; 1414/1419): *а на томь хотаръ... аще мочи имȣ ѡсадити села, да ѡсадѧтъ* 'and in this domain, if they are able to settle villages, they shall settle them.'

35   DRH A (1, 85; 1424): *дали есми имъ едно ⟨мѣсто⟩... да поставетъ и да ѡсадетъ себѣ монастиръ* 'we have given them a place to build and populate a monastery.'

36   DRH A (2, 111; 1458): *дали есми и потвердили слȣгамъ нашим ... да соут имъ оурикъ* '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 повелѣ емоу скоро прїити оу Црїиградъ да желаемыи емоу законь моусоулманскыи полоучьтъ.* '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,[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.[40]

Other combinations containing *да* are very common. The combination *iако да* is already known, though not frequently, from the OCS period,[41] but it is widespread in the 14ᵗʰ century Bulgarian literature,[42] the secondary source of the model texts for the Romanian Slavonic environment. This expression appears early in the Wallachian chancery documents.[43] In the Moldavian Slavonic context, it occurs already in Gârd's Letter of 1407,[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 *iако да* in the letters sent to Braşov and in monastery charters.[45] In the latter type of documents, *iако да* was fixed in the Wallachian-inspired *dispositio* formula in the second third of the 15ᵗʰ century and the first half of the 16ᵗʰ century.[46] Later, this formula was simplified to a paratactic clause (*дадох и потврьдих* 'I gave and confirmed', 1586, DRH A 8, 121). In Macarie's Chronicle (1529–1551) *iако да* is the quintessential means of introducing purpose clauses.[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 *iако да*.[48] In Moldavia, this expression appeared at the very end of the 15ᵗʰ century in the introductory formula of the *dispositio* as a variant of *iако да*.[49] During

---

39 See SJS: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/?recordId=2959, Večerka (1989, 54).

40 Tocilescu (1931, 516; 1517/1527): *а гсво ми бꙋдемо неволисати, да би било по вашеи воли* 'And our lordship, we will do our best to make the matter go according to your will.'

41 See SJS: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/?recordId=37156, cf. Večerka (2002, 395).

42 See HistDict: https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/dictionary/show/d_10926.

43 Tocilescu (1931, 5; 1413): *просихꙗ гсво ми iако да поновим и ꙋтврьдим закони* 'they asked my lordship to renew and confirm the laws.'

44 DRH A (1, 29; 1407): *дадохом... iако да сѫт тïези монастире неразлѫчени* 'we have given... that these monasteries are indivisible.'

45 Tocilescu (1931, 489; 1437): *даемъ сес лист гсва ми трьговцем ѿ Брашова iако да давают мыто* 'we give this document to the merchants of Braşov to pay the toll.'

46 DRH A (1, 298; 1448): *бл҃гопроизволи гство ми... iако да оутврьдимъ и оукрѣпимъ монастирь* 'our lordship has made a kind decision... to confirm and strengthen the monastery.'

47 Macarie III, 246v *Оумоли господина Богдана воеводы съ многым оумоленïемь, iако да сѧ съмири съ Радоулом воеводом* 'he implored Voivode Bogdan to make peace with Voivode Radul.'

48 Tocilescu (1931, 23; 1431): *даровах сꙗи хрисовоул..., iако да им ест старïи закон, како да коупчюꙗт вьсꙗкꙗ кꙋпïꙗ по вьсеи земи* 'I have given this chrysobull ... that he may have the ancient right to trade in all goods throughout land.'

49 DRH A (3, 199; 1491): *та есмо дали томо ст҃омо нашемꙋ мнстирю..., како да ест... ѿ нас ꙋрик* 'and we have given to this our holy monastery.... that it may have the possession of us.' Costăchescu (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 *ажби*⁵³ 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 (*иж, щобы*) appeared in the early formulae of the chancery documents and, except for *иж*, 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*

15; 1517): *а мы такождере и ѿ нас дали и потврѣдили есмо нашемȣ вѣрномȣ панȣ..., како да ест емȣ ѿ нас ȣрик* 'and we have also given and confirmed to our loyal nobleman... that he has a property from us.'
50   Tocilescu (1931, 522; 1538/1540): *и тиж мѓимо сѣ гсв ти и въсемȣ сватȣ како да есте нам еще маи добрїи прїиател ѿ тоти стран* '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 ним единого своего поклисарѣ до Радоула воевода съ въсѣми своими болѣры. на стѣм евгѓїи како да дрѣжит миръ вѣчнїи. и хотар по старим хотарем.* '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, 23; ca 1430): *оуправете их како би право и мирно ходиле* 'teach them to walk (trade) legally and peacefully.'
53   Bogdan (1893, 205; 1558): *абы милостивый богъ васъ ȣкрѣпилъ и ȣтвердилъ, ажбы есте и ȣпередо не вслабили и полнили законъ хрестиѧнский* 'may the merciful God strengthen and confirm you, so that in the future you will not weaken and fulfil the Christian (Orthodox) law.'
54   Bogdan (1895, 27; 1601): *бȣдемо се старати, жебисми въ короткимъ часе до того есче изколкостъ послали* 'we will do our best to send some money within a short time.' Bogdan (1895, 343; 1605): *прето жадаємо вашихъ милостей, ижебысте емȣ ваша милостъ были помочни* 'therefore we ask Your Grace to assist him.'
55   First Annals 244v *и тако Бирток посла свои сли до кралѣ лѧдског како аби ѡн и сам ихал до кралѣ* 'and so Birtok sent his envoys to the king of Poland that he himself might go to the king'. Tocilescu (1931, 538; 1530s/1540s): *понеж мѓим гсвȣ те, iако прїиателю моему мѓм како аби тѧ наȣчил бȣ да испрѣчите тотї людї да аби єсми вратил ми пинѣзи* '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, 539; 1530s/1540s): *протож просим и молим гсвȣ ти... аби да тѣ наставил бȣ... да ми дрѣжиш на тебе ȣ Бистрицȣ* '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, iако 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 Braşov). 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 (*аж, аби*) 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.

REFERENCES

Bogdan, Ioan, ed. 1893. *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor: Urmare la colecțiunea lui Euxodiu de Hurmuzachi Supliment 2 vol. 1: 1510–1600: documente din arhive și biblioteci polone.* Bucureşti: Academia Română.

Bogdan, Ioan, ed. 1895. *Documente privitoare la istoria românilor: Urmare la colecțiunea lui Euxodiu de Hurmuzachi Supliment 2 vol. 2: 1601–1640: documente din arhive și biblioteci polone.* Bucureşti: Academia Română.

Bogdan, Ion – Panaitescu, Petre P., eds. 1959. *Cronicile slavo-române din sec. XV–XVI.* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei RPR.

Costăchescu, Mihai. 1932. *Documente moldoveneşti înainte de Ştefan cel Mare.* Vol. II. Iaşi: Viaţa românească.

Costăchescu, Mihai. 1943. *Documentele moldoveneşti dela Ştefăniţă Voevod: 1517–1527.* Iaşi: Brawo.

Daničić, Đuro. 1863-1864. *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih.* Vol. 1–2. Biograd: Državna štamparija.

Daskalova, Angelina – Rajkova, Marija. 2005. *Gramoti na bălgarskite care.* Sofija: Marin Dri-nov.

Djamo-Diaconiţă, Lucia. 1975. Limba textelor slavo-române. In: Olteanu, Pandele et al. *Slava veche şi slavona românească.* Bucureşti: Editura didactică şi pedagogică, pp. 263–301.

DRH A: Berza, Mihai et al., eds. 1975–2019. *Documenta Romaniae Historica. A. Moldova. Vol. 1–4, 8–9, 18–19, 21–28.* Bucureşti: Editura Academiei RSR.

Duridanov, Ivan et al. 1991. *Gramatika na starobălgarskija ezik: fonetika, morfologija, sintak-sis = Grammatika drevnebolgarskogo jazyka.* Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata akademija na naukite.

HistDict [online]: *Cyrillomethodiana. Tekstov korpus.* Sofija: Sofijski universitet „Sv. Kliment Ochridski" 2011–2019. [retrieved 20.12.2022]. Available at: http://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/tex-tcorpus/search.

Knoll, Vladislav. 2022a. Rumunská církevní a administrativní slovanština. *Slavia* 91 (3), 257–282.

Knoll, Vladislav. 2022b. Written Languages in Moldavia during the Reign of Peter Rareş (1527–1538, 1541–1546). *Studia Ceranea* 12, 523–598.

Kortmann, Bernd. 2001. Adverbial conjunctions. In: Haspelmath, Martin, ed. *Language typology and language universals: an international handbook. Volume 1.* Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 2001, pp. 842–854.

Leontovič, Fjodor, ed. 1896. *Akty litovskoj metriky. Tom pervyj. 1413–1498.* Varšava: Varšavskij universitet.

MEF 1: Čerepin, Lev V. et al., eds. 1961. *Moldova în epoca feudalizmului. Vol. I. Documente slavo-moldoveneşti.* Chişinău: Ştiinţă.

Miltenova, Anissava. 2008. Knižnina na bălgarski ezik v Moldova i Vlahija. In: Milte-nova, Anissava, ed. *Istorija na bălgarskata srednovekovna literatura.* Sofija: Iztok-Zapad, pp. 683–686.

Nimčuk, Vasyl'. 2010. Moldavs'ki Hramoty. In: Smolij, Valerij A. Encyklopedija istoriji Ukra-jiny. T. 7. Mi-O. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka. [online] [retrieved 12.5.2023]. Available at: http://www.history.org.ua/?termin=Moldavski_hramoty.

SDRJa: Avanesov, Ruben I. et al., eds. 1986–. *Slovar' drevnerusskogo jazyka (XI-XIV vv.). T. 1–.* Moskva: Russkij jazyk.

SJS [online]: Kurz, Josef – Hauptová, Zoe, eds. 1966-2016. *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského – Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae. I–V.* Praha: Academia. [retrieved 20.12.2022]. Available at: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/.

SSUM I-II: Humec'ka, Lukija L., ed. 1977–1978. *Slovnyk staroukrajins'koji movy XIV-XV st. 1–2.* Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.

Šul'žuk, Kalenyk F. 2004. *Syntaksys ukrajins'koj movy: pidručnyk.* Kyjiv: Akademija.

Tocilescu, Grigore G., ed. 1931. *534 Documente istorice slavo-române din Ţara-Românească şi Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346–1603.* Bucureşti: Cartea românească.

Tymočko, Bohdana. 2010. Ukrajins'ko-moldavs'ki hramoty jak predmet naukovyx studij XIX-XX st. *Naukovi vyklady* 1, pp. 57–61.

Večerka, Radoslav. 1989. *Altkirchenslavische (altbulgarische) Syntax. T. 27,1 Die Lineare Satzor-ganisation.* Freiburg i. Br.: U.W. Weiher.

Vladislav Knoll

Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Valentinská 91/1, Praha 1

Czech Republic

knoll@slu.cas.cz