

Knoll, Vladislav

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

Linguistica Brunensia. 2023, vol. 71, iss. 1, pp. 75-86

ISSN 1803-7410 (print); ISSN 2336-4440 (online)

Stable URL (DOI): <https://doi.org/10.5817/LB2023-1-4>

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/digilib.78613>

License: [CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

Access Date: 29. 11. 2024

Version: 20231009

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

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/ Târnovo variety)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard (biblical-liturgical corpus) • Substandard (elements from the non-liturgical texts of the 14th century Bulgaria)
Ruthenian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local tradition (with local – Bucovinian – dialectal background) • Polish Crown and Lithuanian Chanceries (with Polish, eventually Czech influence)
Wallachian Slavonic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • South Slavic elements borrowed in Wallachia drawing from the Serbian chancery tradition • Specific Wallachian terminology, expressions and formulae
Specific Romani- an Slavonic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, ТУМОЧКО 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-DJACONIȚĂ 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 variants³:

	Church Slavonic	Ruthenian (older)	Ruthenian (younger)	South Slavisms via Wallachian Slavonic
Future auxiliary (3 rd singular)	<i>хочет, имат</i>	<i>имет, бѣдет</i>	<i>бѣде(т)</i>	<i>цет, кет</i>
Direct object complementizer	<i>іако</i>	<i>ѡж(е), аж(е)</i>	<i>иж</i>	<i>ере, како</i>
Purpose conjunction	<i>да, да іако</i>	<i>щобы, аби</i>	<i>аби, жеби</i>	<i>како да, да</i>
Time conjunction (simultaneity overlap)	<i>егда, когда</i>	<i>коли</i>	<i>кди</i>	<i>къда</i>
Conditional conjunction	<i>аще (ли), ли</i>	<i>коли (би)</i>	<i>ес(т)ли</i>	<i>ако (ли)</i>
Adversative conjunction	<i>нѡ, ѡбаче</i>	<i>але, али</i>	<i>але</i>	<i>али</i>
Additive particle 'also'	<i>такожде</i>	<i>також(е), тиж</i>	<i>теж</i>	<i>такождере</i>
Temporal adverb 'now'	<i>нѣнь</i>	<i>тепер</i>	<i>тепер, терас</i>	<i>съда</i>

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 Slavonic 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(е)* (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 Moldavia⁴. 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 *вж(е)* remained fixed in this formula until the end of administrative Slavonic in Moldavia.⁶

The free text (out of formulae) equivalent of the complementizer *вж(е)* was the lexeme *аж(е)* (cf. SSUM I, 67). In this sense, it was already attested in a charter sent by Archbishop of Riga to the Duke of Smolensk⁷ and later used in older Lithuanian documents.⁸ In a few documents addressed to Poland, *аж(е)* appeared in the

4 COSTĂNESCU (1932, 605): Чинимо то свѣдом оустьмъ, которъиу на тот листъ посмотритъ, аже... 'We inform everyone, who will see this letter that...'

5 DRH A (1, 5): Чинимъ то въдомо оустьмъ добрымъ паномъ, ктожь на сеі 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, въсьм 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 that...'. DRH A (28, 173–174; 1645): Сѣж прѣиде прѣд нами...наш больрин Тѣвнтѣл 'That (our boyar Tăutul) came before us...' (beginning of the sentence). This expression was then translated into (Old) Romanian as *адекъ* (*adecă*) 'namely, and so.'

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

8 ЛЕОНТОВИЧ (1896, 80; 1495): ... давно о томъ памятають, 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 semantics¹⁴ 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 *epe*.¹⁷ In the 2nd half of the 15th century and in the 1st half of the 16th century, *epe* may appear accidentally in the documents sent to Braşov (Braşov chancery communicated in Wallachian Slavonic).¹⁸ In the second half of the 16th

⁹ '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 Брашевльне, аже... 'the burghers of Braşov complain to us that...'. MEF (1, 153; 1597/1611): тако есми поразумел, аж бил сътворил соби ньких исписочехитленни... 'I understood it to mean that he had drawn up some false documents for himself...'. DRH A (8, 612; 1591): Гаврил рекл аж била викъпление... 'Gavril said that (the domain) was a purchased property...'

¹¹ COSTĂCHESCU (1932, 603; 1388): чинимъ свѣдомо велебної твоєї млсти, же... 'We inform Your Reverend Grace... that...'. COSTĂCHESCU (1932, 607; 1393): знаменитосто чинимъї..., иже... 'We inform... that...'

¹² E.g., BOGDAN (1893, 206–207; 1558): знати вам даємо ижь... 'We inform you... that...'

¹³ ЛЕОНТОВИЧ (1896, 18; 1482): повѣдали, ижь пани Монковая имъ была сестра 'they said that Lady Monkovaja was their sister.' Another complementizer with this meaning, absent in the Moldavian context, was *штожь*.

¹⁴ See SJS: <http://gorazd.org/gulliver/?recordId=37156>.

¹⁵ E.g., *First Moldavian Chronicle* 242г вънегда слышаша иако падоша добрии и храбрии витажии... '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 *epe* (spelled *юпе*) 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): даемъ вамъ знати ере... ии 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 *абу* (*абы*), which spread in the Lithuanian chancery²⁸ (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 вашей милости знати, ере послали есте листъ до нас* ‘We inform Your Grace that you have sent us a letter.’

21 Cf. the use of *щоб(у)*, *абу* in this sense in modern Ukrainian (ŠUL’ŽUK 2004, 45 and 289–290).

22 DRH A (1, 2): *велѣлъ есмо нашу печать великую привѣсити, што бѣи непорушено то николиже, до вѣка* ‘We have commanded that our Great Seal be affixed so that (the privilege) shall be irrevocable forever.’

23 COSTĂNESCU (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 есмѣи ему, оу нашої земли, едно село..., што бѣи 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): *таковѣи што бѣи бѣи проклатъ* ‘such a person should be cursed.’

26 TOCILESCU (1931, 491; 1448): *а ниде по нашої земли щобы не платили сочавское мыто* ‘and in no part of our country should they pay the Suceava toll.’

27 DRH A (2, 354; са 1481): *так оучините, що бих не загиблѣ* ‘do it in such a way that I do not perish.’

28 ЛЕОНТОВИЧ (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 *цобы* 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 *цобы* was first replaced by *да* in the imperative construction such as *да ест проклят* ‘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 *цобы*)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 платятъ* (‘they shall not pay’, Romanian *să nu plătească*), competed with the modal expression *имають нламуму* (‘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 стїнь ти аби съ еси велми силовал* ‘we therefore ask Your Holiness to do your best.’ TOCILESCU (1931, 530; 1603): *а ти рѣци 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 медв привезѣт 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 нашѣ... на то, абы имали оу нашеи земли тотъ закон, що имали въ дни родитель нашезо* ‘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, нѣ аби съ вратили...* ‘he made them reconcile and return.’

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

34 DRH A (1, 56; 1414/1419): *а на томъ хотарѣ... аще мочи имѣ всадити села, да всадятъ* ‘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 всадетъ себѣ монастырь* ‘we have given them a place to build and populate a monastery.’

36 DRH A (2, 111; 1458): *дали есми и потвердили слугамъ 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 повель емоу скоро прити оу Призградъ да желаемыи емоу законъ моусулманскыи положуть*. ‘The Sultan ordered him to come to Istanbul quickly, so that he could obtain gets the desired Muslim faith.’

The combination of *da* with the conditional auxiliary *бу* (*дабу*) 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 *дабу* is marginal, I found it only in two letters addressed to the Hungarian milieu.⁴⁰

Other combinations containing *da* are very common. The combination *иако 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 *иако да* in the letters sent to Braşov and in monastery charters.⁴⁵ In the latter type of documents, *иако 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 потвърдих* 'I gave and confirmed', 1586, DRH A 8, 121). In Macarie's Chronicle (1529–1551) *иако да* is the quintessential means of introducing purpose clauses.⁴⁷ In Eftimie's Chronicle, it varies with simple *da*.

The Serbian (DANIČIĆ 1863, 1, 430–431) and Vidin chanceries (DASKALOVA – RAJKOVA 2005, 195) knew another combination with *da* specialised for the introduction of the purpose clause, which was *како да*. In the 1430s, it entered Wallachia as a variant of *иако 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 *иако да*.⁴⁹ During

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

40 TOCILESCU (1931, 516; 1517/1527): *а гсво ми бѣдемо неволицати, 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): *просиѣх гсво ми іако да поновим и ѡтвѣрдим закони* 'they asked my lordship to renew and confirm the laws.'

44 DRH A (1, 29; 1407): *дадохом... іако да сѣт тїези монастире неразлчени* 'we have given... that these monasteries are indivisible.'

45 TOCILESCU (1931, 489; 1437): *даемъ сес лист гсва ми трѣговцем ѿ Брашова іако да давають мѣто* 'we give this document to the merchants of Braşov to pay the toll.'

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

47 Macarie III, 246v *Оумоли господина Богдана воеводи съ многым оумоленіемъ, іако да сѣ съмири съ Радоулом воеводом* 'he implored Voivode Bogdan to make peace with Voivode Radul.'

48 TOCILESCU (1931, 23; 1431): *даровахъ жи хрисовоул..., іако да им ест старіи закон, како да коупчюжт въсьѣжъ кѣпїѣ по въсьеи зєми* '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 стѣомо нашемѣ мнстирю..., како да ест... ѿ нас ѡрик* 'and we have given to this our holy monastery... that it may have the possession of us.' COSTĂNESCU (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 (*уж, щобы*) appeared in the early formulae of the chancery documents and, except for *уж*, 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 такожде ре и ѿ нас дали и потвърдили есмо нашемъ вѣрномъ панѣ..., како да ест емѣ ѿ нас ѡрик* 'and we have also given and confirmed to our loyal nobleman... that he has a property from us.'

50 Тосилеску (1931, 522; 1538/1540): *и тиж мѣмо съ гсв ти и вѣсемъ святѣ како да есте нам еше маи добрии 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 едного своего поклисарь до Радоула воевода съ вѣсьми своими болѣры. на стѣм еуглїи 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 Тосилеску (1931, 23; ca 1430): *оуправете их како би право и мирно ходиле* 'teach them to walk (trade) legally and peacefully.'

53 ВОГДАН (1893, 205; 1558): *абы милостивый богъ васъ ѡкрѣпилъ и ѡтвердилъ, ажбы есте и ѡпередо не ослабили и исполни законъ хрестїанский* 'may the merciful God strengthen and confirm you, so that in the future you will not weaken and fulfil the Christian (Orthodox) law.'

54 ВОГДАН (1895, 27; 1601): *бѣдемо се старати, жебисми въ короткимъ часе до того еше изколкость послали* 'we will do our best to send some money within a short time.' ВОГДАН (1895, 343; 1605): *прето жадаемо вашихъ милостей, ижебысте емѣ ваша милость были помочни* 'therefore we ask Your Grace to assist him.'

55 First Annals 244v *и тако Бирток посла свои сли до краль ладског како аби вн и сам ихал до краль* 'and so Birtok sent his envoys to the king of Poland that he himself might go to the king'. Тосилеску (1931, 538; 1530s/1540s): *понеж мѣим гсвн те, іако прїиателю моему мѣму како аби тѣ навчил бѣ да испрѣчите тотї людї да аби еси вратил ми пинъзи* 'as we ask Your Lordship, as my dear friend, that the God help you to force these people to give me my money back.' Тосилеску (1931, 539; 1530s/1540s): *протож просим и молим гсвн ти... аби да тѣ наставил бѣ... да ми дрѣжиши на тебе ѡ Бистрицн* 'and so I ask your lordship... that God may make you... to keep it for me at your place in Bistrița.'

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 (*ѡа, ѡако ѡа*). 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 ѡа*). 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 ѡа*).

From the formulae, some Ruthenian functional words of the second generation (*аж, 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.

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 Ştefăniţa 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 bälgarskite care*. Sofija: Marin Drinov.
- DJAMO-DIACONIŢĂ, Lucia. 1975. Limba textelor slavo-române. In: OLTEANU, Pandele et al. *Slava veche și slavona românească*. București: Editura didactică și 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. București: Editura Academiei RSR.
- DURIDANOV, Ivan et al. 1991. *Gramatika na starobälgarskija ezik: fonetika, morfologija, sintaksis = Grammatika drevnebolgarskogo jazyka*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bälgarskata 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/textcorpus/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 Rareș (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-moldovenești*. Chișinău: Știință.
- MILTENOVA, Anissava. 2008. Knižnina na bälgarski ezik v Moldova i Vlahija. In: MILTENOVA, Anissava, ed. *Istorija na bälgarskata srednovjekovna literatura*. Sofija: Iztok-Zapad, pp. 683–686.
- NIMČUK, Vasyľ. 2010. Moldavs’ki Hramoty. In: SMOLIJ, Valerij A. *Encyklopedija istoriji Ukrainy*. 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. *Slovník staroukrajins’koj movy XIV–XV st.* 1–2. Kyjiv: Naukova dumka.
- ŠUL’ŽUK, Kalenyk F. 2004. *Syntaksys ukrajins’koj movy: pidručnyk*. Kyjiv: Akademiya.
- TOCILESCU, Grigore G., ed. 1931. 534 *Documente istorice slavo-române din Țara-Românească și Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346–1603*. București: Cartea românească.
- ТУМОЧКО, 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 Satzorganisation*. Freiburg i. Br.: U.W. Weiher.



Vladislav Knoll

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

Vladislav Knoll

Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences

Valentinská 91/1, Praha 1

Czech Republic

knoll@slu.cas.cz

71 / 2023 / 1



STATI - ARTICLES



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as image or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.