Vladislav Knoll (Prague)
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5112-2903

Written Languages in Wallachia during the Reign of Neagoe Basarab (1512–1521)

Abstract. The reign of Neagoe Basarab (1512–1521) represented one of the cultural peaks of Wallachian history. Using the written sources preserved from this period, we tried to present the written Slavonic varieties and other languages (Romanian and Latin) that were used in that period. The Slavonic varieties are examined according to three criteria: spelling, morphosyntax and vocabulary. The standard variety (Church Slavonic) and the specific local written variety we may call Wallachian Slavonic, most purely represented by the epistolography, are opposed in morphosyntax and vocabulary. Both types of varieties are competing in acts and some colophons, eventually other original texts. The spelling criterion permits us to distinguish up to four Church Slavonic varieties, whence two are international ones (Moldavian Trinovitan (Tărnovo) variety and Resavian variety) and two comprise local adaptations – the Trinovitan variety influenced by the Wallachian liturgical pronunciation and the administrative Church Slavonic representing a simplified combination of both Trinovitan and Resavian norms. The Romanian language (written in Cyrillic) is not represented just by its oldest dated coherent text (Neacşu's letter), but also by frequent penetrations mainly in the documents. The main common feature of the Latin documents with other Wallachian varieties is the presence of the proper names.

Keywords: Neagoe Basarab, Romanian Slavonic, Wallachia, Church Slavonic, Old Serbian, Old Romanian, Middle Bulgarian

The traditional functional stratification of the written varieties of the Church Slavonic Cultural Area[1] significantly differed from that of the Latin or Greek Europe[2]. The reason was a different method of written language acquisition, which lacked, for a long time, a grammatical approach[3]. The most curious part

---

[1] Let us remind us that the *Church Slavonic Cultural Area* is not equivalent to *Slavia Orthodoxa* as it also includes the Croatian (Catholic) and Medieval Bosnian (with its own church) environments.

[2] Cf. В.М. Живов, *История языка русской письменности*, vol. I, Москва 2017, p. 97–109.

[3] Cf. the description of the traditional method from the time it was being replaced by the modern (Latin-inspired) one, e.g. in the Râmnic edition of Smotryc'kyj's Church Slavonic Grammar from 1755. *Грамматíка*, ed. иждевéнїемъ Пáѵла Ненáдовича, в҃ єпⷭ҇копїй Ры́мническои ҂а҃ѱн҃е, р. г҃ or in D. Cantemirii, *Descriptio antiqui et hodierni status Moldaviae*, Bucuresci 1872 (originally writ-

of the Church Slavonic Cultural Area was the territory where the Romanian language was spoken[4]. As an example of the mutual relationship among the written lects in this zone, we have chosen Wallachia of the second decade of the 16th century, a rare time of a political and social stability and extraordinary cultural flourishment[5].

A probe to the period of the reign of Neagoe Basarab shows us already stabilized written Slavonic varieties, whose functions were not yet really challenged by written Romanian or other languages. The original writing in Slavonic of that period had not lost yet its vivacity and did not fall completely into a petrified formalism. Moreover, the main protagonist of the period provided one of the most remarkable works of the Romanian Slavonic literature in general – the *Teachings of Neagoe Basarab to his son Teodosie* – that likewise reflect the characteristics and structure of the language situation in Wallachia. Another prominent text of this period is Neacşu's letter, the first extant dated text in Romanian that had remained the only known similar text for several consecutive decades[6].

Spoken languages

Before we discuss the character of the written varieties and languages used in Wallachia of voivode Neagoe Basarab, let us stop shortly by the question of the spoken languages of that period. The dominant spoken language was apparently Romanian. This was manifested in the Slavonic texts mainly by onomastics and morphosyntactic impact (including the insensibility to the main Slavonic grammatical categories). Less frequently, the Romanian language background came up on the phonological and lexical levels.

In Câmpulung, there was a German speaking community, which is attested e.g. by an Early New High German (with new diphthongs) letter issued by the mayors

---

ten as manuscript in St Petersburg ca 1714), p. 153, where the use of Slavonic in Moldavia until the 2nd half of the 17th century is described. It may be supposed the method was not different in Wallachia of the early 16th century. V.M. Živov describes the full method in detail. He considered it had been used from the beginning of the Church Slavonic culture. В.М. Живов, *История*…, p. 150–204.

[4] We will not discuss here the complex question of the adoption of Church Slavonic as the cultural language by the Romance population of the Balkan Peninsula. At this place, let us just mention that many authors, from very different reasons, may agree about a very early adoption (i.e. already the 10th century). Cf. e.g. D.P. Bogdan, *Paleografia romano-slavă. Tratat şi album*, Bucureşti 1978, p. 176; G. Schramm, *Ein Damm bricht. Die römische Donaugrenze und die Invasionen des 5.–7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern*, München 1997, p. 337–338.

[5] St. Ştefănescu, *Ţara Românească*, [in:] *Istoria românilor*, vol. IV, *De la universalitatea creştină către Europa „patriilor"*, Bucureşti 2001, p. 414.

[6] Another candidate for the oldest extant Romanian text is the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* (Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. Rom. 3077, maybe even the first decade of the 16th century), cf. the introduction to its edition: *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki I. Studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic şi ediţie*, ed. I. Gheţie, M. Teodorescu, Bucureşti 2005, p. 19.

and burghers of the town on the 11ᵗʰ February 1524[7]. A more challenging question is the existence of a Slavonic speaking population in Wallachia. It is mostly accepted that the autochthonous Slavonic population had already been assimilated long ago[8]. From the other side, a new colonization from the South likely began already in the 15ᵗʰ century. Nevertheless, its intensity and impact remain questionable[9]. The presence of such Slavs in the Wallachian society might be reflected in the presence of toponyms and anthroponyms derived from the stem сръб-[10], which served as a general denomination of the South Slavs in that time[11]. In the early 16ᵗʰ century, we may count also with the business, cultural and family relations with the South Slavs. Neagoe Basarab himself was married to Despina (Деспина) a Serbian noble, daughter of Serbian despot John Branković. Among the cultural

---

[7] Cf. the edition in *Documentele privitoare la Istoria Românilor culese de Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki*, vol. XV, *Acte și scrisori din arhivele orașelor ardelene (Bistrița, Brașov, Sibiu)*, partea I, *1358–1600*, ed. N. Iorga, București 1911 (cetera: Iorga), p. 277–278.

[8] According to the generally accepted idea in the Romanian scholarship, the assimilation of the previous Slavonic population was completed before the establishment of the Wallachian state. The most spread opinion refers to the 12ᵗʰ century. Cf. G. Mihăilă, *Dicționar al limbii române vechi (sfârșitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI)*, București 1974, p. 14; A. Rosetti, *Istoria limbii române*, București 1968, p. 292. Panaitescu spoke about the period before the 14ᵗʰ century. Cf. P.P. Panaitescu, *Contribuții la istoria culturii românești*, București 1971, p. 15. A later datation of the assimilation was proposed by L. Miletič (14ᵗʰ–15ᵗʰ centuries) and especially by S.B. Bernštejn, who dated the end of the assimilation process to the 16ᵗʰ century. Cf. Л. Милетичъ, *Дако-ромъните и тъхната славянска писменость II. Нови влахо-български грамоти отъ Брашов*, [in:] *Сборникъ за народни умотворения, наука и книжнина*, vol. XIII, 1896, p. 4; С.Б. Бернштейн, *Разыскания в области болгарской исторической диалектологии*, vol. I, *Язык валашских грамот XIV–XV веков*, Москва–Ленинград 1948, p. 363.

[9] М.С. Младенов, *Българските говори в Румъния*, София 1993, p. 7. Early attestations of the settlement of the population north of the Danube are linked with the military actions on the Ottoman frontier, e.g. the settlement after the battle of Varna in 1444. Cf. Ц. Георгиева, Н. Генчев, *История на България 15–19 век*, София 1999, p. 63.

[10] Such toponyms appearing in the documents until the reign of Neagoe Basarab comprise e.g. the villages Сръбїи (27ᵗʰ January 1499, *Documenta Romaniae Historica B. Țara Românească*, vol. I, *(1247–1500)*, ed. P.P. Panaitescu, D. Mioc, București 1966 (cetera: DRH I), p. 475), Сръбшори (1ˢᵗ June 1483, DRH I, p. 301), Сръбещи (4ᵗʰ June 1521, *Documenta Romaniae Historica B. Țara Românească*, vol. II, *(1501–1525)*, ed. Ș. Ștefănescu, O. Diaconescu, București 1972 (cetera: DRH II), p. 404). Some persons mentioned in the administrative documents bear the *lastname* Сръб(ŝ), especially the members of the voivodal council (съвѣ́) Станчо Сръбоу̂ (mentioned 1418, DRH I, p. 87), Татŝ Сръбь (mentioned between 1428–1441, DRH I, p. 578). In the chrysobull to the monastery of Koutloumousiou by Neagoe Basarab, there are two persons called Сръбŝ mentioned (DRH II, p. 209, 210) serving as witnesses to the delimitation of a domain.

[11] The older denomination for (South) Slavs, *Șchei*, was later attested in Câmpulung, where it might have been related to the Bulgarian population of Transylvania. Т. Балкански, *Трансилванските (седмиградските) българи. Етнос. Език. Етнонимия. Ономастика. Просопографии*, Велико Търново 1996, p. 47. In the Wallachian documents until the early 16ᵗʰ century, this name (Шкъи) is related (as today) to the quarter Șchei of Brașov. See the document from the reign of Radu the Great, 1495–1508, cf. *534 Documente istorice slavo-române din Țara-Românească și Moldova privitoare la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346–1603*, ed. G.G. Tocilescu, București 1931 (cetera: Tocilescu), p. 206.

contacts, we must mention the Serbian Slavonic cultural background of the foundation of the monastery of Bistriţa (Бистрица)[12] in West Wallachia (Oltenia) as well as the support provided to the monastery of Hilandar (Хиландⷣа)[13].

Types of texts

Which types of texts are datable to the nine years of Neagoe's reign? Among the books including the basic liturgical and biblical literature, there are just four manuscripts and one printed book possessing a colophon. The ruler himself ordered the composition of the *Tetraevangelion* (Четвⷬорⷪбл҃говѣстїе), printed by hieromonk Macarie in 1512, and the *Menaion for November* (First Romanian School in Braşov, 3, 1517)[14] written for the metropolia of Târgovişte, whose new main temple was built by Neagoe[15]. The composition of two manuscripts, *Apostolos* (Пракⷭь, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 202, 1519)[16] and *Menaion for January* (Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 262, 1521)[17] was ordered by Preda of Craiova (жоуⷫпаⷩ Преда)[18], Neagoe's cousin. Both these manuscripts were written by the most famous Wallachian scribe of the turn of the 16th century: dean Dragomir of Bistriţa (читⷮѡⷫпиⷰь дїⸯакь Драⸯгомⷤ), the second one with the participation of his colleague Dieniş (Дⷣⷦ́єни҇). The most precious manuscript of Neagoe's time was *Marcea's Tetraevangelion* (National Museum of Art of Romania, 7, 1518–1519)[19] written on the command of Neagoe's brother-in-law, great postelnic Marcea (жⷦупаⷩ Марⷱе постелⷩи҇)[20]. Independently, the colophons of these manuscripts should be considered. A specific manuscript written by Neagoe himself is the manuscript of the National Library St. St. Cyril and Methodius in Sofia, 748 (from 1520–1521)[21] containing about one third[22] of the Slavonic original of the already mentioned text *Teachings of Neagoe Basarab*.

[12] R. Flora, *Relaţiile iugoslavo-române. Sinteză*, Lum 22.6, 1968, p. 294.

[13] Cf. DRH II, p. 304–305.

[14] E. Linţa, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române din Braşov*, Bucureşti 1985, p. 42–44.

[15] *Viaţa Sfântului Nifon patriarhul Constantinopolului*, ed. T. Simedrea, BOR 55, 1937, p. 5–6, 295.

[16] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія и русскія рукописи румынскихъ библіотекъ*, С. Петербургъ 1905, p. 330–331; P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. I, Bucureşti 1959, p. 379–383.

[17] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія…*, p. 402–403; P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele…*, p. 357–358.

[18] Cf. N. Stoicescu, *Dicţionar al marilor dregători din Ţara românească şi Moldova. Sec. XIV–XVII*, Bucureşti 1971, p. 46.

[19] E. Linţa, L. Djamo-Diaconiţă, O. Stoicovici, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române din Bucureşti*, Bucureşti 1981, p. 22–24; L. Tugearu et al., *Miniatura şi ornamentul manuscriselor din colecţia de artă medievală românească a Muzeului naţional de artă al României*, vol. II, *Manuscrise slavone, un manuscris latin şi unul românesc*, Bucureşti 2006, p. 99–111, pictures p. 221–223.

[20] N. Stoicescu, *Dicţionar…*, p. 70.

[21] Edited by *Învăţăturile lui Neagoe Basarab către fiul său Theodosie. Versiunea originală*, ed. G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti 1996. Further cited according to the folio of the facsimile.

[22] *Învăţăturile…*, p. LXIII.

Besides these manuscripts, Vasiljev, Grozdanović and Jovanović[23] dated approximately to this period further four manuscripts that might have been written in Wallachia:

- *Typikon* (**Типикъ**, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 212, ca 1505/1515)[24],
- *Nomocanon* (**Изложенїє правиломъ апостольскꙑ́**, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 285, ca 1505–1515)[25],
- *Syntagma* by Matthew Blastares (**Съчинюнїє по съставѣхъ объьтїихъ въсѣхъ винь, сщенⷩный и бж҃тъвный правиль**, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 286, 1st quarter of the 16th century, ca 1521)[26],
- *Bee* (**Пчєла**, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 310, ca 1515/1525)[27].

There are, of course, further manuscripts, currently dated to the 1st quarter of the 16th century that shall be dated more exactly in the future[28].

The second group of texts from this period includes the inscriptions. These may be divided into two corpora linked to two monasteries. The most famed inscriptions of this period are two long ktetor inscriptions in the Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God of the Argeş monastery that were written around 1517[29] and were signed by Neagoe himself. These inscriptions were related to the consecration of the monastery held on the 15th August 1517 with the participation of patriarch Theoleptos I of Constantinople[30]. In the same monastery, there are further two short tombstone inscriptions from ca 1518 relating the death of Neagoe's children Angelina and Ion[31] and the tombstone inscription of Neagoe Basarab himself from the 15th September 1521[32]. The second set of inscriptions is linked with Church of the Dormition of the Mother of God of the monastery of Bistriţa. The longest inscription[33] is signed by Dobromir (**Добромиръ**), Dumitru (**Дꙋмитрꙋ**) and Chirtop

---

[23] Љ. Васиљев, М. Грозданвиħ, Б. Јовановиħ, *Ново датирање српских рукописа у Библиотеци Румунске академије наука*, АПри 2, 1980, p. 41–69.

[24] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія…*, p. 355; P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele…*, p. 307–308.

[25] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія…*, p. 431–433; P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele…*, p. 379–383.

[26] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія…*, p. 355, 433–435; P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele…*, p. 383–385.

[27] А.И. Яцимирскій, *Славянскія…*, p. 485–488; P.P. Panaitescu, *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol. II, Bucureşti 2003, p. 55–58.

[28] E.g. *Typikon* (Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 23), *Paraenesis by Ephrem the Syrian* (Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 290) and *Synaxarion* (Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 274) that are all datable to the 1st quarter of the 16th century. P.P. Panaitescu, *Manuscrisele…*, p. 36–37, 369, 389.

[29] Edition: C. Bălan, *Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României*, vol. II, *Judeţul istoric Argeş (sec. XIV – 1848)*, Bucureşti 1994, p. 203–212.

[30] The consecration was described in detail by one of the participants, protos Gavriil, dwelling at the court of voivode Neagoe, in his Life of St Nephon. Cf. *Viaţa Sfântului Nifon…*, p. 296–297.

[31] Ed. C. Bălan, *Inscripţiile… Argeş…*, p. 217–221.

[32] Ed. C. Bălan, *Inscripţiile… Argeş…*, p. 222–224.

[33] Ed. C. Bălan [coord.]: *Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României*, vol. III, *Judeţul istoric Vâlcea (sec. XIV – 1848)*, Bucureşti 2005, p. 212–213.

(Кирьтопь). It is dated to the 1st October 1519 and it mentions the ruler as well as the ktetors of the monastery, the brother of Craiova, starting with great ban Barbul (Барбѣль великїи бань)[34]. His tombstone inscription from 1520 is also placed in the church together with the mention that he died as a monk in the monastery with the name Pahomie (Пахомїе)[35]. Two small inscriptions from this period are placed on liturgical objects: a silver goblet (чаша, ca 1519)[36] and a cover with a golden ring (единь покров и един прьстен злат, 1514)[37].

The largest group of the texts surely originating in the reign of Neagoe are the letters (or correspondence) and acts. The great majority of them were issued by the ruler. Seventy-six of them are the simple acts, or *horismoi* (traditional name: ѡризмо, a newer name: повелѣнїе)[38]. The simple acts are well distinguishable by the incipit Млтїю бжїю 'By Grace of God' and the *promulgatio* formula дава̂ гꙋ̂ ми сїе повелѣнїе[39] 'my lordship gives this horismos/command'. The second largest group are the letters (fourty-one pieces, traditional name книга)[40]. They mostly have the same incipit, but the *promulgatio* formula sounds пише̂ гꙋ̂ ми 'my lordship writes' or пишемо 'we write'. Neagoe Basarab left us also thirteen chrysobulls (хрисовꙋ̂)[41], from which just two lack the full arenga. The chrysobull is simply recognizable by an arenga, made up usually of commented biblical citations or, in case of a simple chrysobull, by the archaic incipit Въ х҃а б҃а влговѣрни 'Well-believing in Christ the God'. Neagoe uses six of the existing ten Wallachian arengas, one chrysobull starts untypically with an *inscriptio*[42]. All these documents were issued by the voivodal chancellery mostly in the capital Târgovişte or in Piteşti, Bucharest and Argeş, eventually in another place. Except in the correspondence, the scribe may be mentioned. All chrysobulls are addressed to monasteries, while the *horismoi* may be addressed to both monasteries and laymen (mostly Wallachian boyars). The letters are mostly addressed to the mayor of Braşov. The head of the chancellery was great logofăt Ivan Călinescu (Ива̂ велики логѡфе̂) since 1512[43].

---

[34] Uncle of the voivode. Cf. N. Stoicescu, *Dicţionar…*, p. 17.

[35] Ed. C. Bălan, *Inscripţiile…Vâlcea…*, p. 214–215, 229. In his office of great ban of Craiova, he was succeeded by his already mentioned nephew Preda.

[36] Ed. C. Bălan, *Inscripţiile…Vâlcea…*, p. 534.

[37] Currently placed in the Romanian National Museum of Art, inv. 837. Ed. A. Elian, *Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României*, vol. I, *Oraşul Bucureşti (1395–1800)*, Bucureşti 1965, p. 735.

[38] Cf. D.P. Bogdan, *Diplomatica slavo-romînă*, [in:] *Documente privind istoria Romîniei. Introducere*, vol. II, Bucureşti 1956, p. 24/22.

[39] Both formulas have spelling and morphologic variants.

[40] The letters issued by Neagoe Basarab were published by Tocilescu, p. 223–269.

[41] The *horismoi* and the chrysobulls were published in DRH II, p. 193–405. We cite them per number in the edition.

[42] DRH II, p. 223–224.

[43] Cf. N. Stoicescu, *Dicţionar…*, p. 66.

After he became a monk of the monastery of Snagov in 1514, the responsibility was given to his brother Harvat of Grozeşti (Хрьвað вєлики логоѳє̂)[44]. Only three different scribes of chrysobulls are known: grămătic Stoica (Стоикà граматѝ), grămătic Florea (Флорѣ̂ граматѝ) and grămătic Vâlsan Furcovici (Вльсà̂ Ѳȣрко-викю синь граматѝ).

From these traditional document types, two documents structurally differ. These are the homage act (заклинáние на вѣ́рȣ) to king Louis of Hungary and Bohemia (Лаȇ крà̂) from the 17th March 1517[45] and the agreement (тькмєжєнїю) with voivode John Szapolyai of Transylvania (Ià̂нȏ кралю ардєлскїи) about the borders (ради хотарове) between Wallachia and Transylvania from the 9th June 1520[46]. This document was written by grămătic Bogdan.

Few letters in Slavonic were issued by other personalities. Six letters were sent by Neagoe's great dvornic Calotă of Stoeneşti and Slăveni (Калотж̂ вєлѝ дворнѝ)[47], one of them together with great logofăt Harvat. One letter was issued by spătar Lazăr (Лазà̂ спатà̂, *1520*)[48]. A unique document is the act by Toma, mayor of Târgovişte (Тома сȣ̂дцȣ), who issued an act confirming a purchase of a house in the capital[49]. All the documents mentioned so far are in Slavonic, while the letter by Neacşu of Câmpulung (Нѣ́кшȣ̂ ѿ Дльгополѣ́, 29./30.6.1521)[50] is written, except the *inscriptio* and salutations, in Romanian (in Cyrillic). Besides these documents, there are also ten Latin letters issued by Neagoe Basarab to the Transylvanian towns, one of them to Braşov (*Brassov*), the remaining one to Sibiu (*Civitas Cibiniensis*), the capital of the Saxon autonomy. The Latin letters were issued in the same towns as the Slavonic ones, their scribes are not mentioned.

Varieties in the Church Slavonic cultural area

According to the current sociolinguistic models[51], there were three types of written Slavonic varieties employed in the Church Slavonic Cultural Area:

---

[44] Cf. *Ibidem*, p. 63.

[45] Ed. Tocilescu, p. 261–264.

[46] DRH II, p. 375–379.

[47] Ed. Tocilescu, p. 416–421. On the issuer, cf. N. Stoicescu, *Dicţionar*…, p. 39–40.

[48] Ed. Tocilescu, p. 421–422.

[49] DRH II, p. 192.

[50] Ed. Tocilescu, p. 456–458.

[51] Generally, this system is explained in R. Mathiesen, *The Church Slavonic Language Question: an Overview (IX–XX Centuries)*, [in:] *Aspects of the Slavonic Language Question I*, ed. R. Picchio, H. Goldblatt, New Haven 1984, p. 45–55. For the East Slavonic area cf. В.М. Живов, *История*…, p. 231; М.Л. Ремнева, *Пути развития русского литературного языка XI–XVII вв.*, Москва 2003, p. 29–31. Since the 15th century, the system of varieties of the East Slavs within the Moscow State and Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had been subjected to significant divergent changes.

- Bookish or standard variety (local variety of the Church Slavonic language), patterned on the biblical-liturgical corpus.

- Vernacular-based variety manifested mostly in the administration, eventually local law.

- Hybrid variety (eventually called lower style/norm, amalgam) representing a mix of both preceding varieties that was mostly manifested in the non-liturgical sphere and particularly in the original narrative literature. The proportion of the bookish or vernacular elements may be different in various text genres or single texts depending on the theme, supposed readers and prestige of the text.

The basic contrast at the spelling, morphosyntactic and lexical level is supposed to have been provided between the bookish and vernacular-based variety.

It is evident that in Wallachia, where the vernacular was a non-Slavonic language, the system was more complicated. In order to understand it, we will first discuss each of the main language elements (spelling, morphosyntax, vocabulary) found in the Wallachian texts and then divide the texts in accordance with the occurrence of different types of these language elements.

Spelling systems

In the Slavonic texts of Wallachia, we can find the traits of four interrelated spelling systems. Two of them are represented by two coexisting[52] Middle[53] Church Slavonic (CS) norms: the Trinovitan (Tărnovo) and the Resavian ones. The Trinovitan CS was based on the norm of the Late Second Bulgarian Empire and its actual epicentre was Moldavia. The Resavian CS was mainly based on the Serbian CS tradition. At the beginning of the 16th century, it was used mainly by Orthodox South Slavs. The third spelling system was the one prevailing in the Wallachian

---

For the Croatian Glagolitic area cf. K. Lozić Knezović, G. Galić Kakkonen, *Odnos crkvenoslavenskoga jezika i govornoga jezika u hrvatskome srednjovjekovlju*, *ČHS* 6, 2010, p. 211; for the Serbian area J. Грковић-Мејџор, *Списи из историјске лингвистике*, Нови Сад 2007, p. 444. A similar situation existed apparently in the Bosnian area, which is clearly distinguishable from both the Croatian and Serbian ones (V. Knoll, *Církevní slovanština v pozdním středověku*, Praha 2019, p. 288). In the Bulgarian area, we can actually not speak about such trichotomy (V. Knoll, *Církevní…*, p. 187). Except for the East Slavonic area, this system was mainly functioning in the Late Middle Ages.

[52] This situation is comparable to the area of current North Macedonia and Western Bulgaria, where also two varieties were coexisting during the 14th century.

[53] The Middle CS norms originated in the 14th – early 15th centuries through the approximation and mutual impact of the CS norms used by Orthodox Slavs. Based on R. Mathiesen, *The Church Slavonic Language…*, p. 58–61.

correspondence. This system was patterned on the spelling of the Serbian chancellery language, which became one of the models for the international diplomatic language of the Balkans in the 15th and 16th centuries[54]. The specifics of the spelling system of the Wallachian correspondence in contrast with other Štokavian-based systems are linked to the traces of the older, Trinovitan-based chancellery language used in Wallachia. The new Wallachian chancellery language stabilized approximately since the 1470s.

Besides these three main spelling systems, we can already distinguish the fourth one, used for recording of the Romanian language in Cyrillic. This spelling system was developing from the very beginning of the Wallachian chancellery writing for Romanian onomastics. It apparently stabilized ca 1500[55]. It was based on the spelling of Trinovitan CS and it kept its character even after the deep language changes happening in the Wallachian chancellery language mainly during the 2nd and 3rd quarter of the 15th century. In the last quarter of the 15th century, it was enriched by specific letters used only in Romanian words. One can count with the mutual influence of the Romanian spelling in different lands.

Let us characterize the most visible features of these spelling systems, without going into details. The model manuscripts of the Trinovitan CS of this period are the printed *Macarie's Tetraevangelion* and the handwritten *Marcea's Tetraevangelion*. Their spelling is near to the ideal standard, patterned on the Moldavian manuscripts. These may be contrasted with the Resavian manuscripts represented by the *Typikon* and *Syntagma*, both found in the monastery of Bistriţa. The spelling represented by the language of the correspondence will be further called the Administrative one.

The most visible difference between all the spelling systems is the use of juses[56]. This we may call a primary trait:

---

[54] The letters, the language of which was patterned on the traditional Serbian chancellery language, were being issued by Ottoman sultans and officials, Hungarian kings, Albanian leaders and of course the local South Slavonic chancelleries – cf. editions Љ. Стојановић, *Старе српске повеље и писма*, vol. I, *Дубровник и суседи његови. Други део*, Београд 1934; DRH I. Some of these letters contain elements originating from the Bosnian or Dubrovnik chancellery. Likely, through the Wallachian mediation, it had some impact on the Moldavian administrative and especially the epistolary writing.

[55] Cf. I. Gheţie, A. Mareş, *Originele scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti 1985, p. 137–141.

[56] Letters that originally denoted Common Slavonic nasal vowels.

	Trinovitan CS	**Romanian**	**Administrative**	**Resavian CS**
ѫ	Used for *ǫ, eventually *ę in specific cases[57]. Characteristic spelling нѫ 'but'. Pronounced /ə/[58].	/ə/ Interchangeable with ъ/ь[59], being more frequent in Wallachia.	ȣ/ю on place of *ǫ[60]. Rarely used as /ə/[61], interchangeable with ъ/ь.	Not used. There is оу/ю on place of *ǫ.
ѧ	Used for *ę, eventually *ǫ in specific cases. In Wallachia apparently it was pronounced /e/.	Corresponding to /ja/[62], thus interchangeable with ꙗ, it appears rarely.	Not used, it corresponds to є.	Not used, it corresponds to є/ю.

The secondary traits comprise the distribution of further letters, spelling strategies, eventually the existence of specific letters:

	Trinovitan CS	**Romanian**	**Administrative**	**Resavian CS**
ѣ	It may denote both *ě and *ja (behind consonants)[63].	Mostly /ęa/[64].	Mostly denoting *ja behind consonants[65], the position *ě is mostly replaced by є.	Used only as *ě being interchangeable with e, *ja behind consonants is denoted ꙗ[66], respectively ѧ behind є, ρ[67].

---

[57] We will not go into detail of the ѧ/ѫ distribution rules, which significantly differ from the Old Church Slavonic ones, but refer to V. Knoll, *Církevní…*, p. 273, where the Moldavian Trinovitan standard is described in detail.

[58] E.g. *Marcea's Tetraevangelion* 11r (Matthew pericope 6) грѧ́дѫщь vs. Macarie грѧджѫщь 'walking'.

[59] E.g. DRH II, p. 312: Дрѫкȣлъ (*Drăculea*) 'Dracula', no. 165: дъмбȣ̂ (*dâmbul*) 'the hillock'; Tocilescu, p. 457: цѣра ρȣмѫнѣскъ (*Țara Rumânească*) 'Wallachia'.

[60] The letters ѫ/ъ in place of *ǫ do appear randomly, e.g. Tocilescu, p. 225: поρѫганїє 'derision, offence', p. 228: съсѣдȣ̂ 'to neighbours'.

[61] Tocilescu, p. 248: да сє ȣтѫꙗмїˮ 'he shall make an agreement', p. 258: сѫ̑ послаˮ 'I sent'; DRH II, Глѫвѣчȣ̂ – Главачȣ̂ 'monastery of Glavacioc', no. 122: Вльдїслаˮ 'Vladislav'.

[62] Tocilescu, p. 427: воѧ (*voia*) 'the will', аȣ дѧ̂ (*i-au dat*) 'he gave him'; DRH II, no. 196: фиѧстрȣ (*fiastru*) 'stepson'; Dobromir's inscription: Стоѧнь 'Stoian (name)'.

[63] E.g. Matthew pericope 16: *Marcea's Tetraevangelion* 15r волѣ (nominative singular) vs. Matthew pericope 49: 26r волѧ (accusative singular).

[64] DRH II, Лѣwтѫ 'Laiotă (name)'; Tocilescu, p. 457: єль съ трѣкъ (*el să treacă*) 'he may pass'; DRH II, no. 156: валѣ (*valea*) 'the valley'.

[65] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 227: погȣбѣкȇ 'they (!) kill', p. 247: ваша волѣ 'your will'.

[66] E.g. *Syntagma*: 3v w̑ставлꙗють 'they leave', 47r нн҃ꙗ 'now'; *Typikon*: 11v постáвлꙗє̂ 'set'.

[67] E.g. *Syntagma*: 2v вьсѧ̀ко 'each', 4r ρастварѧю̀щий 'of blending'.

	Trinovitan CS	Romanian	Administrative	Resavian CS
*ĭ > є, *-ŭkŭ > -окъ	Yes[68].	(Yes in Slavonic loanwords in Romanian)[69].	Optional[70].	Mostly no[71].
Specific letters	ѕ	ц /dʒ/, ѫ /in /or /im/	It can marginally include any specific letter from other spelling systems.	ѥ, most regularly behind л, н, optionally in other positions[72].
ы	Used even if homophonous with и.	Missing.	Missing[73].	Used even if homophonous with и.
ъ/ь distribution	The letter ъ is used in monosyllabs and in the words interior[74], otherwise ь.	Neacșu's letter mostly distinguishes ъ /ə/ and ь (mute), in other documents this is not fully respected.	Random distribution, ъ is most frequent in prepositions and prefixes.	Random distribution, ъ is most frequent in prepositions and prefixes.

Besides the above mentioned spelling differences, there are further typical forms of the administrative spelling that were partly inherited from the Serbian chancellery and they are opposed to the CS spelling (both Trinovitan and Resavian). We will call them tertiary traits. The frequency of these traits depends on the type of the document or they can be randomly replaced by the CS elements:

---

[68] *Marcea's Tetraevangelion*, Gospel of Matthew, pericope 3, 9v шⷣе́ше, percope 43, 24r кро́токь.

[69] E.g. *temniță* 'jail', *stareț* 'elder', *dobitoc* 'cattle'.

[70] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 227: добитокⷪ҇, p. 236: добитⷦ҇, p. 247: добитⷪ҇, p. 249: добитъ҃ – добитокⷯ҃ 'property'; DRH II, no. 160: старⷮъ 'elder'.

[71] E.g. *Typikon*: 8r съшъⷣ҇ 'having come down', 12r чл҃колюбⷱцъ 'lover of men', but 41r вⷭе́сь 'whole'.

[72] E.g. *Typikon*: 8v оуготовлꙗєⷮ '(it) prepares', 11v єⷭ '(it) is'; *Syntagma*: 2 ѡ҆ нюⷨжꙗ 'about whom', 3v ро́дителюꙗмь 'to parents'.

[73] Exception: Tocilescu, p. 236: мы ꙋчиниⷨ 'we will do' (such spelling is rather typical for Moldavian chancellery documents).

[74] Most frequent exceptions comprise the position behind ч that we find in the *Marcea's Tetraevangelion*. Nevertheless, Macarie's Tetraevangelion prefers ъ at this place, being stricter in following the jer distribution rule. This is the ideal as represented in the Moldavian manuscripts, actually not thus typical for Wallachia.

	CS	Administrative	Romanian
*vjsja 'all' (nominative plural neuter)	въсѣ (Trinovitan), въса (Resavian)	сва[75]	(тоте)
*tj/*dj	щ/жд	к (хокю) / г (мегю)[76]	The Slavonic loan-words in Romanian have mostly /ʃt/ and /ʒd/[77].
*vŭ(-)	въ(-)	ȣ(-)[78]	(ꙟ 'in')
*xv	хв	хв or ф[79]	Slavonic loanwords in Romanian have older /xv/ and younger /f/[80].

Less frequent tertiary administrative features comprise further South Slavonic vernacular traits: the Serbian (*Štokavian*) traits, as the shift *ŭl > ȣ[81], the spelling of the type съ̑ ними 'with them'[82], the switch of final *-l > -ѡ[83], and the switch of the Common Slavonic reduced vowels to а[84]. A reflex of a widespread feature of different Balkan languages can be revealed in the traces of the variation of the unstressed *e/i* and *o/u*[85].

---

[75] TOCILESCU, p. 247: съ свѣ ȣзети 'to take with all things', p. 262: съ сва землѣ 'with the whole land'.

[76] TOCILESCU, p. 223: такогере 'also', хокю 'I want', ке бити '(he) will be', хокѐ '(he) wants', p. 225: пръкге 'before', p. 227: мегю ва̑ 'among you', p. 251: мегю нами 'between us'.

[77] E.g. *peşteră* 'cave', *primejdie* 'danger'.

[78] TOCILESCU, p. 223 ȣзимаше 'he took', p. 225 и не ѿтавите ȣ ми 'do not let them in peace', p. 225 ȣзети 'to take', p. 248 кои не ке ȣлѣти ȣ горщинȣ 'who will not submit himself to the tax for small animals'.

[79] TOCILESCU, p. 228: ȣфатили 'they captured' vs. захвалѣти 'to thank'. These traits can be found also in the (almost) contemporary letters from 1507 and 1511 by Firuz Bey (Феризь Бегь), the sanjak-bey of Bosnia: Љ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Старе српске…*, p. 384–385 зафалисмо 'we thanked', фале 'of praise'.

[80] E.g. Moxa's Chronicle (*Russian National Library* f. 87, no. 64, 1620), 147r хвалж 'praise'.

[81] TOCILESCU, p. 230: дȣжни 'due', p. 246: кю послати све по̑ пȣнȣ 'I will send everything fully', p. 254: Дȣгополе 'Câmpulung (a town in Wallachia)'. Cf. the letter by sultan Selim the Strong from 1513, Љ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Старе српске…*, p. 390 дȣге 'debts'.

[82] TOCILESCU, p. 225.

[83] TOCILESCU, p. 247: ѿтавиѡ съ̑ 'I left', p. 249: ѐ съвраѡ 'he gathered', p. 244: съ̑ разȣмѡ 'I understood', p. 238: ми си порȣчаѡ 'you ordered me'. This trait can be found, e.g. in a contemporary letter by future sultan Süleyman the Magnificent (Сȣлеимень шахь) from 1517: Љ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Старе српске…*, p. 397: е ȣзео 'he took', самь извадаѡ 'I brought'.

[84] *Horismos*: DRH II, no. 184: съ дащери 'with daughter', border agreement: ȣтакмихо̑ 'we agreed'. While in the Wallachian texts of this period it is a very rare feature, in the contemporary Štokavian correspondence out of Wallachia, it is widespread, see e.g. the correspondence by sultan Selim the Strong, Љ. СТОЈАНОВИЋ, *Старе српске…*, p. 389–392.

[85] TOCILESCU, p. 227: ѐдно дрȣгȣ 'various things', p. 240: ȣслобозити 'to free', пишемȣ 'we write', вашемо 'to your', p. 242: кнйгѡ 'book' (object), p. 256: не можимо 'we cannot', p. 258: чети ȣзети 'you will

From these spelling systems the most prestigious one was apparently the Trinovitan CS. This was the variety that dominated in the printed books and it was the one, which was used in the most precious manuscripts with colophons including the *Marcea's Tetraevangelion* and *Menaion for November* dedicated to the metropolia. It was also chosen by Neagoe for his own work.

Now let us see how these four *ideal* spelling systems are realized in the concrete texts. In the CS texts modelled on Trinovitan CS, the most frequent deviation is the replacement of ѫ by є, which can be caused by both the pronunciation and the impact of the administrative spelling. Such replacement is rare in the above mentioned Tetraevangelia[86], but very frequent in the *Teachings* of Neagoe Basarab. The inscriptions of Argeş almost lack ѫ. Neagoe's *Teachings* show marginally further Resavisms: the use of the letter ѥ[87], once the spelling въса (40r) and very few cases of оу/ю on the place of *ѫ[88]. The latter phenomenon can occur in the second inscription of Argeş[89]. Dieniş's part of the Menaion for January is using practically just ь, while otherwise it follows quite attentive Trinovitan spelling (with random switch ѫ > є).

Resavian manuscripts comprise all the above-mentioned features except those already marked as Trinovitan. Dragomir's Apostolos from 1519 is an example of a text containing the primary traits of Resavian, but secondary traits of Trinovitan. Thus, the text does not use neither juses, nor ѥ behind consonants[90]. It also shows ѣ behind consonants in the positions corresponding to the Resavian ꙗ/ѧ[91] and the e-vocalization[92]. This spelling resembles the administrative spelling without tertiary traits.

The administrative spelling is typical for the documents. The tertiary features (reflecting South Slavonic vernacular) are prevailing in the correspondence. Nevertheless, also there, they may be interchangeable with the CS ones[93]. In the

---

take'. The same phenomenon in the formula ѿ сложенїа мирѹ in an arenga of a chrysobull (DRH II, no. 116) actually causes a change of meaning ('from the serving to the world' instead of ѿ сложенїа мирѹ 'from the creation of the world').

[86] E.g. *Marcea's Tetraevangelion*, Gospel of Matthew, pericope 4, 10r оумѣршоу 'when he died'; pericope 6, 11r градыць 'going'.

[87] This is lexicalized in the words ѥ '(it) is' (18v, 20r, 30v) and ѥще 'yet' (18v, 19r, 30v), in few cases in other places, e.g. in the typical Resavian spelling 80r понѥже 'while'.

[88] Found twice in the 1st singular of the present tense (73v понеже ви хоцѹ познати, 68v даю вѫ) and more frequently in the instrumental singular of the nominal flexion: e.g. 61v съ силож моею 'with my force', 61v своею млтїю 'with his grace', 92v съ многож скръбїю 'with much sorrow'.

[89] E.g. тьцѹ во се 'I make effort', сѹт 'they are', variation рѹка/ржка 'hand'.

[90] E.g. 3r глеть '(he) says', оставленїе 'remission'.

[91] E.g. 2r дивлѣхоу же се 'they were surprised', 4r въсѣка дша 'each soul', but 5r въса 'all'.

[92] E.g. 1r съшєше се 'having met'.

[93] E.g. TOCILESCU, p. 223: просѣцши 'asking', p. 227: надеждѹ 'hope' (object), p. 229: да плаца 'they shall pay', p. 234: въсѹ мархѹ 'all merchandise', p. 235: такождере 'also', p. 247: хоцѣ 'I/we want' vs. p. 248: хокю 'I want', p. 248: еви си плаца горцинѹ 'all pay the tax for small animals', p. 262: гпрѣ прежде на вїши 'lords being before us' (subject of the sentence).

chrysobulls and *horismoi*, such features can be found in the segment of *dispositio*, which contains lowest frequency of formulas and often includes the description of the domain and rights confirmed to the addressee. The preposition ꙋ 'in' appears typically in the *datatio* and generally before toponyms. All documents and in particular *horismoi* may contain also the words using the Romanian spelling – this concerns mainly the onomastics, eventually ad hoc borrowings from Romanian[94]. In the chrysobulls and *horismoi*, these are concentrated in the *dispositio* and *corroboratio* (list of the members of the voivodal council). The chrysobulls contain larger parts written in CS (the segments of arenga and sanctio) that may contain unsystematic traces of the strictly Trinovitan spelling[95]. In a lesser extent this may happen in the fixed forms of *horismoi*, especially those addressed to the monasteries (description of the monastery). The tertiary administrative features are widespread in the act of homage and the border agreement as they represent rather non-formulaic texts. In addition, Neagoe's tombstone in Argeş and the Bistriţa inscriptions actually represent the administrative spelling without tertiary traits. This is also caused by the fact they are too short. Dobromir's inscription shows also the Romanian spellings Пръвꙋль (Pârvul) and especially Стоꙗнь (Stoian). Both Dragomir's colophons use the administrative spelling, while the colophon of the printed Tetraevangelion and the Menaion for November is patterned on Trinovitan CS (with variation ѧ/є). The colophon of Marcea's Tetraevangelion is too short to state anything.

Likewise, the Latin documents have to deal with the spelling of Romanian onomastics, but using, of course, the Latin script. Moreover, the names can be submitted to a certain Latinization[96]. In the few recorded names, we see the variation i/y, o/u, the phoneme /ʃ/ is marked as *s*[97], the cluster /ər/ or perhaps already /ɨr/ may be written in two manners[98]. There is a visible uncertainty of representing the diphthong /e̯a/[99]. Curious spellings are Pwrwul (*Pârvul*)[100] and Neagoe's signature Bozorab[101].

[94] Tocilescu, p. 246: пѡⷧⷶ нашега чл҃га Гъцж 'I sent our man Gheaţă', ѡ хелꙋи 'of stoaȶ', p. 256: жꙋпⷶ҃ Ханж҃ и жупⷶ҃ Џюрⷢ҇ию 'Sir Hanăş and Sir Giurgiu'.
[95] Particularly the chrysobull to the monastery of Glavacioc by grămătic Stoica (DRH II, no. 108), where the Trinovitan forms prevail (except the low frequency of ъ). In some other chrysobulls, the appearance of the Trinovitan forms is random or they reflect the Trinovitan pronunciation, e.g. DRH II, no. 153: воⷣнѧё 'of water', no. 131: въ славъ 'for the glory', no. 189: съ славоє 'with glory'.
[96] Iorga, p. 235 (1517) ex oppido arghensi 'from Curtea de Argeş', p. 240 (13th October 1519) Tergovistia 'Târgovişte', p. 240–241 (20th October 1519) Mylus 'Miloş (name)', Tergovysta 'Târgovişte'.
[97] Iorga, p. 220 (21st April 1512) Bocoresth 'Bucharest', p. 238 (18th December 1518) Pytest 'Piteşti'.
[98] Iorga, p. 216 (1st February 1512): Targovistie, p. 240 (13th October 1519) Tergovistia.
[99] Iorga, p. 220 (21st April 1512) Oppre vs. p. 238 (18th December 1518) Opra (Rom. *Oprea*), p. 240–241 (20th October) filius Woyvode Myhnye 'son of voivode Mihnea' (can be considered also as genitive singular).
[100] Iorga, p. 221 (4th December 1512).
[101] Iorga, p. 216 (1st February 1512).

Morphosyntax

The Middle Church Slavonic morphosyntax differed minimally from the one we know from Old Church Slavonic as the model texts did not change radically. The most important differences consisted in the use of concrete flexional endings – newer ones might have coexisted with the archaic ones, some of the newer ones prevailed[102]. The morphosyntax of the biblical text contrasted with the morphosyntax prevailing in the Wallachian letters. Their grammar was highly balkanized and clearly showed the Romanian background of the writers. Thus, the language represented by the letters can be denominated as Wallachian Slavonic (WS). The typical morphosyntactic features of this variety can be divided into two groups:

- systematic morphosyntactic features,
- neglected morphosyntactic features.

The systematic morphosyntactic features comprise the adaptation of Romanian morphosyntax on the predominantly Serbian-like grammatical shape[103]. Its tendency towards systematization does not mean the Grammar was regular as it was facing various levels of Church Slavonic impact and included rests of older Bulgarian traits.

Let us make a basic description of the WS morphosyntactic system. At the beginning, it should be said that the forms might be influenced by the habit to shorten the words by the above-writing of the last consonant omitting thus an eventual final vowel[104]. The noun system mostly distinguishes two main cases – the common case and the dative. The common case serves as subject, object and it dominates behind prepositions. In a-stem feminines and animate o-stem masculines, either original nominative or accusative singular may be used as both subject and object of the sentence[105]. In plural, it is the nominative of the masculine o-stem that is mostly used as a common case[106]. The common case of the plural

---

[102] The most typical new ending is -їє in the nominative plural of masculine jo-stems, e.g. *Marcea's Tetraevangelion*, Gospel of Matthew, pericope 36, 21v голѹбїє.

[103] This combination reminds us the current Timok-Prizren dialects.

[104] This tendency is most evident in a-stems: e.g. Tocilescu, p. 223: на глȃ 'on the head', p. 225: на потрѣ̈ 'for need'. It contributed to the confusion of the 1st singular and plural in voivodal letters, cf. e.g. the self-addressing of the voivode in the same letter: Tocilescu, p. 242: пишемо нашиȋ 'we write to our' – давȃ 'I/we give' – що ми сте нарѹчали 'what you ordered me' – сȃ разѹмею 'I understood' – захвалкȇ 'we/I thank' – зарадї нашою потребѹ 'for our need' – сȃ допȗтй 'I sent' – кемо пѹстити 'we will sent' – кю пѹстити 'I will send'.

[105] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 225: послȃмо нашега слѹга 'we sent our servant' – vs. p. 231: ке доити слѹга 'our servant will come', p. 225: да ми бѹде пагѹбѹ 'I shall get the damage' vs. p. 234: не кȇ ȗтавити наши сиромаси ѹ пагѹбѹ 'we/I will not leave my subjects in danger', p. 227: прииде ȗвогаи наше чл̄ка 'this our man came' vs. p. 244: по вашога чл̄ка 'through your man'.

[106] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 227: допȗстȋмо наше чл̄вци 'we sent our men' vs. нȃ чл̄вци, а ни сѹ дошлȋ 'our men and they came' – p. 230: ȗ ваше чȋци 'from your men', p. 247: пȃтирїє посѣчи 'to execute

feminine a-stems prefers the Štokavian ending -ε[107]. A specific, Romanian-inspired ending -ȣ/ю may optionally appear in the common case of masculine o-stems and neuter jo-stems[108]. The inspiration of the first case is the older Romanian -ŭ ending of masculines, the second case is surely provoked by the regular transfer of Slavonic neuter jo-stems to the feminine declension in Romanian. The latter form we found more frequently in *horismoi*. The -ȣ/ю ending of the common case in neuter jo-stems is a feature more frequently found in the acts and it is linked to the fact that such nouns are borrowed to Romanian as feminines[109]. The same may also concerns the neuter o-stems in case they represent the shared Slavonic-Romanian vocabulary[110].

The dative case expresses both the indirect object and the possessiveness[111]. As it appears just in few, mostly fixed phrases, there are few different forms attested in the correspondence, mostly o-stems and jo-stems. As the singular dative form of these declensions has the ending -ȣ/ю, it may be homophonous to the Romanian-inspired common case[112]. In dative plural, both the CS ending and the nominative enriched with an above written м can be found[113]. In exceptional cases, the dative can be replaced by a common case in a simple apposition (mainly if the dative is expressed e.g. by the pronoun or adjective)[114], once the preposition на is used[115]. Sometimes, the appositional common case appears by the jjo-stems in the acts and colophons, specifically in the description of a religious establishment[116]. Behind the preposition съ/съ̏ 'with', the CS or *Štokavian* form of instrumental

---

the shepherds', but p. 227: ·н̇· аспрε […] сте ȣзели 'you took 50 silver coins' vs. p. 237: за с̅ апри 'for 200 silver coins'.

[107] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223: книгε 'books', p. 223: на главε 'on the heads', p. 225: рȣкε 'hands', p. 262: преко планине 'over the mountains'.

[108] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 227: ѿ̑ се подиже еди̑ лотрȣ 'a bandit raised', p. 238: све до еди̑ аспрȣ 'everything up to the last silver coin', and even p. 245: ради̑ нашега правителю 'regarding our official'. An analogic form can be found in the tombstone inscription of voivode's son Ion (прѣстави се рабȣ бж̑їю 'God's serf died').

[109] Tocilescu, p. 258: ȣ ꙗ̑тию 'for eating'; DRH II, no. 107: на̇ полю 'on the field', no. 112: ѡни имали съпрениȣ 'they had a quarrel', no. 191: сїю повелѣнїю 'this *horismos*', no. 178: въ покрѣпленїю 'for the support'.

[110] DRH II, no. 106: блатȣ нѣккою 'a lake' (Rom. *vreo baltă*), no. 203: на Чернȣ блатȣ 'in Baltă Neagră (Black Lake)', no. 188: ѿ грълȣ 'of rivulet'.

[111] The possessive genitive is generally absent in the letters excerpt for the fixed phrase гб̑а ми 'of my lordship'.

[112] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 251: заради̑ еди̑ ациганȣ болѣр100ȣ гб̑а ми 'regarding a Gypsy of the boyar of my lordship'. The first noun represents the common case, while the second one the possessive dative.

[113] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223, 225: приꙗтели – p. 224, 228: приꙗтело̑ – p. 231: прїꙗтелε 'to the friends'; e.g. Tocilescu, p. 224: сȣседȣ̑ – p. 231: сȣседи̑ 'to the neighbours'.

[114] 250 заради̑ работȣ ѡвѣзи сиромаси 'regarding those subjects', 223 за работȣ ѡномȣ чл̑кь 'regarding that man', p. 253 добри̑ приꙗтели 'to good friends'.

[115] Tocilescu, p. 230: аспри̑ длъжни на една жена 'silver coins owed to a women'.

[116] Colophon of the Menaion for January: хрȃ̑ оу̇спѣнїε 'temple of Dormition'.

can be found along with the prevailing common case[117]. In few cases, there is the locative behind the preposition по[118]. Other appearance of case endings in the letters is mostly limited to random fixed phrases[119]. A specific feature of the *horismoi* (mainly in the fixed formulas) is the use of locative plural behind the preposition ѿ 'of, from' inspired by the confusion of adjective and noun paradigm[120]. The declension of adjectives and personal pronouns in letters uses the *Štokavian* ending, but they mostly do not agree with the noun.

The paradigm of personal pronouns is very regular and generally corresponds to the one known in fully balkanized Slavonic languages. The personal pronouns distinguish nominative, accusative and dative short forms that all precede the verb[121]. The dative form may be used as the postpositive possessive form[122]. In the 3rd person, a special form is preferred[123]. A different long form of the pronoun is used behind prepositions[124]. The characteristic form of the 3rd person of the singular masculine is the *Štokavian* га found also in the masculine adjective paradigm – in Wallachian documents it should be considered common case singular animate. Sometimes, the double object is expressed[125]. There is a typical WS set of indefinite pronouns introduced by варе (Romanian *oare*)[126]. Less frequently, further types of pronouns appear[127].

The WS verb flexion has the following characteristics. Its most visible feature is the analytical creation of the future tense using the short form of the verb *velle* (preferring the Serbian chancellery spelling) and the infinitive[128]. The use of the preterite with l-participle and simple tenses is equivalent. The typical 1st plural

---

[117] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 228: съ любовию 'with love', p. 232: съ нашими потребними ръчи 'with our needed things', p. 234: сѣ Радꙋлѡ 'with Radul', p. 247: съ ѿцами и съ свиꙗми 'with sheep and pigs', p. 262: съ правѡ слꙋжбѡ 'by just service', p. 259: съ печатю 'with a seal'.

[118] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 256: по сваке тръгове и по варошѣ 'in all markets and towns', p. 223: по сй 'after that'.

[119] Tocilescu, p. 247: Бжїе хотѣнїе 'by God's will', p. 247: ме е помиловꙋ Бъ влꙗкѡ землꙗ 'God donated me the Wallachian land', p. 254: ꙋ Дꙋгополі 'in Câmpulung', p. 251: мегю нами 'between us'.

[120] DRH II, no. 98: слободни […] ѿ въсех слꙋжбꙋ и даждꙋ 'exempted from all services and taxes', никто ѿ слꙋгꙋ 'nobody from the servants', no. 125: ѿ горꙋ и ѿ полй 'of woods and fields'.

[121] DRH II, no. 125: ю им даде 'he gave her to them'; Tocilescu, p. 255: ви чекꙋ 'I am/we are waiting for you', p. 255: ѡни га сꙋ ꙋбили 'they killed him', p. 235: що й сте ꙋзели 'what did you take him', p. 228: да й пꙋстите 'you shall release them', p. 223: лꙋ съ послꙋ 'I sent him'.

[122] 230 къ гꙋꙋ ви 'to your lordship', 229 ѿ мꙋжа си 'from her husband'.

[123] DRH II, no. 122: нихно колено 'their family'; Tocilescu, p. 240: неговꙋ товꙋ 'his merchandise', p. 239: зарадї негове работꙋ 'regarding his issue'.

[124] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 227: мегю вꙋ 'between you', p. 260: за нега 'for him'.

[125] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 224: ако га наидѣ прꙋ члкъ 'If I will find the right man'.

[126] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 230: варе що 'whatever', p. 225: варе кога 'whomever'.

[127] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 225: ница 'nothing', p. 227: тко 'who', p. 235: нитко 'nobody', p. 257: посвꙋде 'everywhere'.

[128] Eg. Tocilescu, p. 231: ке доити – p. 238: че доити 'he will come', a unique form is p. 258: ꙋложикете 'you will provide'.

ending is -мо (both in present and aorist) that can be reduced to the above-written final м, which can be interpreted as both plural and singular. There are examples of an analytical comparison of adverbs (no example for adjectives)[129]. A rare, but remarkable feature is the use of calqued composed prepositions[130].

In the interpretation of the texts impacted by WS, one must take into consideration the morphosyntactic features that are caused by the negligence of the writers to these phenomena. We already mentioned the neglecting of the difference between nominative and accusative and the use of the common case, whose outcome is the non-distinction of expression of the position and direction. We also mentioned the frequent lack of distinguishing the 1st person singular and plural of verbs, rarely found also in the 3rd person. In some cases, we see the confusion of aorist, present and infinitive. This is supported by the above-writing of the final т in the 3rd person present and infinitive or its simple omission[131]. However, the most frequently neglected morphosyntactic feature is the agreement in case and gender between adjective, numeral or pronoun and noun[132]. Otherwise, the endings of the adjectives and personal pronouns are *Štokavian*-based. Just in a few cases both endings are totally random.

The WS morphosyntax is the typical feature of the correspondence and actually also of *horismoi*, which might, however, suffer some CS impact in the fixed formulas. The chrysobulls follow the CS morphosyntax, the impact of the WS can be noted in the *dispositio*. An important impact of the WS morphosyntax can be traced in Dragomir's colophons, Argeş and Dobromir's inscriptions, even if these texts are patterned on CS. These texts show a frequent use of common case including the appositional possessive with variations shown above besides the correct Middle CS endings. The colophon in Dragomir's Apostolos contains the pronoun forms моєга (as accusative singular animate), га 'him', що 'what', l-preterite (съмь гледа̂ 'I was looking'), analytical future and the replacement of the infinitive by the да-construction[133]. The colophon in the Menaion for January contains the feminine a-stem treatment of the word for 'monastery'[134].

---

[129] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 225: повекє 'more', p. 238: поболє 'better'; DRH II, no. 116: наидолѕ 'to the lowest place', повише 'upper'.

[130] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 239: ѿ къ странѕ 'from the side' (Rom. *de către*); DRH II, no. 205: ѿ пре̏ гѡ ми 'from my lordship' (Rom. *dinainte*), no. 140: ѿ меги изводръ 'between sources' (Rom. *dintre*).

[131] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 225: не кю ѿтави 'I will not leave' (expected ѡставити), p. 253: ва̂ ма̂ти вкр̏ѕети емѕ 'your Grace believes him' (expected вкр̏ѕе(т)), p. 244: хтȅ доити нашега чл̂ка 'our man will come' (this auxiliary form is otherwise used as 3rd plural), p. 238: кю платите 'I will pay' (2nd plural instead of infinitive), p. 230: да мѕ се плати̂ аспри 'silver coins should be paid to him' (singular instead of plural).

[132] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 224: къ воєво̂а ерд̂ескомъ 'to the voivode of Transylvania', p. 225: за наше работѕ 'for our affair', p. 228: дрѕго винѕ 'another guilt', p. 225: еди̂ гръло 'a necklace', p. 234: ни́єдно метехѕ 'no discord', p. 237: вашемъ ма̂ти 'to your Grace', p. 242: зарадї нашою потркѕ 'for our need', p. 249: въсе добитъ̂ 'the whole property'.

[133] ко га кȅ покоусй да га прине̏ 'who will try to bring it'.

[134] въ ст̂оую монастироу 'to the holy monastery'. Masculine o-stem in CS, but feminine in Romanian. This is actually the most frequently found word in Slavonic written by Romanians with a switched gender.

The second Argeş inscription contains the pronouns нєгово 'his' and ницⷶ 'nothing' and the use of common case[135]. The *Teachings of Neagoe Basarab* do not contain the common case except for unique cases[136], few cases of confusion of position and direction[137], and variation in agreement of the noun слоуга[138]. There are, however, few forms of analytical comparative[139]. In a-stems, there are few *Štokavian* forms[140].

   Specifically in *horismoi* (and of course in Neacşu's letter), we may find the Romanian or mixed flexional forms. These are linked to the landscape appellatives or proper names of places or persons. Most frequently, we see the Romanian article of the common case in the Romanian words[141]. The genitive-dative ending appears rarely[142]. Otherwise, mixed endings (лꙋ̂ for *-lui* and лꙋ̂ for *-lor*) may be applied in the toponyms[143]. The Romanian common case endings without articles resemble the Slavonic ones, even if sometimes the clearly Romanian ending is applied[144]. A curious expression is волнꙛ̂ used in the adjective sense 'free; allowed'[145], which can be considered a Romanian adaptation, as the Slavonic adjective suffix -*nyj is regularly borrowed as *-nic*.

Vocabulary

There are many ways to deal with the vocabulary. For our needs, we will divide it according to the part of speech, thematic group, origin and their attestation in Romanian[146]. We will present here a short overview of some typical terms found in the original Slavonic texts.

---

[135] 2ⁿᵈ inscription: ѿ властєлє своихь 'from own officials', ѿ гсⷩпво ти 'from your lordship'.

[136] E.g. 67v скровищє вашѫ 'your treasury', 80r ѡбрѣтаєт сѧ водѫ жива 'there is the water of life', 76v съ двѣ пагꙋбы голѣми 'with two great damages', 97r ѿ црⷠїє 'from the emperors', 104v ѿ гласовє 'from voices'.

[137] E.g. 13v на зємли падєши 'you fall on earth', 31v поидѣмь ꙋжє нⷩѣ оу нєдⷪбинаго гⷩпна ѡного 'let us go to that unworthy lord', 32v сѣдиши на трапєзѫ 'you are sitting at the table'.

[138] 42v слоугꙛ моⷶ слⷶкаа 'my sweet servant', 43v любимаа слоуго моⷶ 'my beloved servant'.

[139] 44r по вышє 'higher', 48r по долѣ 'lower', 94r по вєщьшє 'more'.

[140] Acc. pl. 27v слоугє, 27v правꙛ слоужбꙛ 'with right service', but also Šumadija-Vojvodina forms 29r на трапєзы 'at the table', 89v къ Єввы 'to Eve', otherwise absent in WS.

[141] DRH II, no. 156: връхꙋ̂ 'the peak', плаюꙛ̂ 'the plateau', лакꙋ̂ 'the lake', стꙋлпꙋ̂ 'the border sign', no. 184: дѣлꙋ̂ 'the hill', no. 156: валѣ 'the valley', no. 142: сⷮ силищилє 'with the villages', no. 132: плаюрєлє и лꙋнчєлє 'the plateaux and the meadows'.

[142] DRH II, no. 135: манастиⷬ Радꙋ̂ постєлникꙋлꙋи 'monastery of postelnic Radu'.

[143] E.g. DRH II, no. 156: пискꙋ̂ глⷪдолꙋ̂ 'mud peak' (piscul glodului), връхꙋ̂ рꙋдєлꙋ̂ 'mine peak' (piscul minelor), no. 208: лꙋнка глⷪдꙋлꙋ̂ 'mud meadow' (lunca glodului), no. 146: Станчюлꙋ лⷪгѡфєтꙋлꙋ̂ 'of Stanciu logofăt', no. 208: прєдѣлꙋ̂ корвꙋлꙋ̂ 'rook hillock' (predealul corbului).

[144] DRH II, no. 161: ливєзи 'meadows'.

[145] Tocilescu, p. 257: сꙋ̂ вⷪници продавати 'they are free to sell'.

[146] We are aware this criterion is very tricky as all fully Romanian texts were created after the period we are evaluating, but still we consider such consideration is valid. As the reference point for the attestation, we choose the database https://dexonline.ro/.

The first group of terms will concern the titles and functions[147]. Here we may distinguish the following types:

- Old terms attested already in Old Church Slavonic[148]: гн҃ь (господинь) 'lord, head of a country'[149], болꙗрй 'boyar, nobleman'[150], жупа҇ 'boyar's title'[151], цр҃ь '(Ottoman) sultan'[152], воивода 'voivode'[153], краль 'king (of Hungary)'[154], сꙁд҇е 'judge, mayor'[155], граматй҇ 'secretary of the chancellery, grămătic'[156].

- Terms of Byzantine origin borrowed at least partly through the mediation of the Bulgarian and Serbian state organization: комй҇ 'court official in charge of the provisioning'[157], спата҇ 'commander of cavalry'[158], вистіа҇ 'head of finance'[159],

---

[147] As the lexemes denoting titles and functions are very frequent especially in the documents, we note just one attestation.

[148] Here and further, if the term is attested in OCS, it means it can be found in the database *Old Church Slavonic Dictionary*, [in:] *GORAZD. The Old Church Slavonic Digital Hub*, ed. Š. Pilát, Prague 2016–2020. Online: http://gorazd.org/gulliver/ [28 IV 2021]. The spelling corresponds to the usual form attested in the documents.

[149] Tocilescu, p. 223. In Latin corresponding to *dominus* (Iorga, p. 243). The typical form of address related to this title is гв҃о (господство) 'lordship', translated into Latin as *Dominacio* (Iorga, p. 221), eventually *dominium* 'dignity of being lord' (Iorga p. 243). The self-addressing in the Latin letters is just *nos* 'we'. In Romanian corresponding to *domn*.

[150] Tocilescu, p. 251, in a Latin document as *boyero* (Iorga, p. 243). Romanian *boier*.

[151] DRH II, no. 94.

[152] Tocilescu, p. 261. In Latin *imperator Turcorum* (Iorga, p. 240) or even *Imperator Cesar Turcorum* (Iorga, p. 243). In Neacșu's letter ѧпъратꙋ҇.

[153] Tocilescu, p. 261, in Latin *waywoda* (Iorga, p. 218), there is also a neologism *Waywodatum* 'function of the voivode' (Iorga, p. 246), Romanian *voevod*, *voivod*, *voivodă*, etc.

[154] Tocilescu, p. 262. Corresponding to Latin *rex* (Iorga, p. 243). 'His majesty' is denoted, on the same place as ст҃а корꙋна 'holy crown'.

[155] DRH II, no. 116; Tocilescu, p. 223, in Latin *iudex* (Iorga, p. 222). Romanian *jude*, cf. *Dicționarul elementelor românești din documente slavo-române 1374–1600*, ed. G. Bolocan, București 1981, p. 117 жꙋде since 1409 in Moldavia, 1510 in Wallachia.

[156] DRH II, no. 103, in no. 114 translated as словоꙋстроите҇, in no. 161 as словоположителю.

[157] Tocilescu, p. 236. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 52 (Moldavia and Wallachia) *comis*; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти на българските царе*, София 2005, p. 205–206 (Bulgaria); *Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität*, vol. IV, ed. E. Trapp et al., Wien 1994–2017 (cetera: LBG), p. 852 κόμης 'Graf'.

[158] DRH II, no. 100; *Teachings* 28v, in Latin *spatarius* (Iorga, p. 218) or *zpatayr* (Iorga, p. 221). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 219 *spătar* (Moldavia and Wallachia); *Исторически речник*, [in:] *Cyrillomethodiana*, https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/dictionary/show/d_08826 [28 IV 2021]; LBG, vol. VII, p. 1588: σπαθάριος.

[159] DRH II, no. 100; *Teachings* 59r, less вйтиꙗрнй҇ (Tocilescu, p. 262), in a Latin document *vizter* (Iorga, p. 238). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 261–262 *vistiar* (Wallachia), *vistiarnic* (Moldavia); LBG, vol. II, p. 275 βεστιάριος 'ein Hofbeamter'.

логофе̑ 'head or official of the chancellery'[160], страторни̑ 'master of court ceremonies'[161], поклиса̑ 'envoy'[162], порта̑ 'court official in charge of the court protocol'[163].

- Terms attested in the Bulgarian or Serbian context: вата̑ 'head of a group of courtiers'[164], стопанъ 'lord, owner'[165], ключа̑ 'court official in charge of the food storage'[166].

- Terms taken or adapted from the Hungarian (respectively Transylvanian) administration: ба̑ 'administrator of Oltenia'[167], мецни̑ 'owner of the neighbouring domain'[168], пꙋга̑меще̑ 'mayor'[169], пръкъла̑ 'head of an administrative district'[170], пꙋрга̑ 'town councillor'[171].

---

[160] Tocilescu, p. 262. In a Latin document, the 2nd logofăt is denoted as *vicecancellarius*. Also in OCS, as Serbian official cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник из књижевних старина српских*, vol. II, Биоград 1863, p. 18. Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 126–127 *logofăt* (Wallachia and Moldavia); LBG, vol. V, p. 945 λογοθέτης 'Vorsteher einer Kanzlei'.

[161] DRH II, no. 118. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник из књижевних старина српских*, vol. III, Биоград 1864, p. 184; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 359 страторь; LBG, vol. VII, p. 1621 στράτωρ 'Stallmeister'.

[162] Tocilescu, p. 261; *Teachings* 37r, also 18v поклїсарство 'delegation'. Both terms also in Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 345–346 (Serbian and Ottoman chancellery). The term поклисарь is attested also in Moldavia, cf. *Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст.*, vol. I–II, ed. Л.Л. Гумецька, Київ 1977–1978, p. 178. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 61 апокрисиарь (Bulgaria), 2, 178; LBG, vol. I, p. 169 ἀποκρισιάριος 'Gesandter'.

[163] DRH II, no. 132, also spelled 232 пꙋта̑ (Tocilescu, p. 232). Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 190 *portar* (Wallachia and Moldavia); LBG, vol. VI, p. 1354 πορτάρης 'Pförtner'.

[164] Tocilescu, p. 243; *Teachings* 28v. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 90 (Bulgaria); *Dicţionarul…*, p. 257 *vătah* (Wallachia and Moldavia).

[165] *Teachings* 71r 85v, comp. Romanian *stăpân*, Bulgarian стопан(ин), cf. *Български етимологичен речник*, vol. VII, София 2013, p. 477–478.

[166] DRH II, no. 116. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник из књижевних старина српских*, vol. I, Биоград 1863, p. 450 'claviger'; *Исторически речник*, https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/dictionary/show/d_03725; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 48 *clucer* (Wallachia only), in Moldavia ключникъ, cf. *Словник…*, vol. I, p. 477.

[167] Tocilescu, p. 262, also in Dobromir's inscription. Cf. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*, ed. L. Benkő, Budapest 1992–1995, p. 77 'Ban'. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 11 (Wallachia only); Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 25 for lord of Bosnia, Croatia and a Dubravnik official.

[168] DRH II, no. 114, also spelled мегиаши (DRH II, no. 116). Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 140 *megiaş*; *Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár a legrégibb nyelvemlékektől a nyelvújításig*, vol. II, ed. G. Szarvas, Z. Simonyi, Budapest 1891, p. 720 *megyés* 'habens districtum, circuitum'.

[169] Tocilescu, p. 261. Cf. *Magyar nyelvtörténeti…*, vol. II, p. 791 *polgármester* 'consul'.

[170] Tocilescu, p. 261. Cf. *Etymologisches…*, p. 1189 *porkoláb* 'Burgvogt'; *Magyar nyelvtörténeti…*, vol. II, p. 1315 'castellanus'; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 179–180 *pârcălab* (Moldavia and Wallachia).

[171] Tocilescu, p. 223, in Latin *consul* (Iorga, p. 221). Cf. *Etymologisches…*, p. 1182 *polgár*; *Magyar nyelvtörténeti…*, vol. II, p. 1307 'civis'; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 181 *pârgar* (Wallachia, exceptionally Moldavia).

- Specific terms used in Wallachia and Moldavia: дв͠рнй̈ 'head of state administration'[172], постелнй̈ 'master of court ceremonies'[173], с͠лцъвⷢ 'court official responsible for the provisioning of meat'[174], шетрⷶ̈ 'military official in charge of the provisioning of military campaigns with the tents and weapons'[175], столнй̈ 'court official in charge of the provisioning of voivode's table'[176], исправнй̈ 'any official in charge of the execution of voivode's will'[177], хотарнй̈ 'border surveyor'[178], пехарнй̈/пахарнй̈ 'court official in charge of the wine cellars'[179], питⷶ̈ 'court official in charge of the provisioning with bread'[180].

- Terms specifically used in the *Teachings*: коуртанⸯ 'courtier'[181], крединчѣрⸯ 'confidant'[182].

This type of terms appears in all acts, always in the *corroboratio* containing the list of the members of the voivodal council. Less regularly, but still frequently, they can be found in the letters (both Slavonic and Latin ones) and other original texts, where an official is involved: the inscriptions (ktetor or defuncted person), colophons (orderer) and the *Teachings of Neagoe Basarab*.

The terms related to the war are much less frequent. They mostly appear in the letters, the border agreement, eventually in the corresponding parts of the *Teachings*. The most typical terms found in the texts in question are размирица 'conflict'[183] and вражмⷶ̈ 'enemy'[184]. Very specific terms can be found in the *Teachings*: 54v глота 'simple soldiers'[185], 56r стража 'core of the army'[186], 74v скѵптро

---

[172] Tocilescu, p. 262, also in Dobromir's inscription. In a Latin document spelled *dwornick* (Iorga, p. 221). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 72–73.

[173] DRH II, no. 99. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 191–192. A more recent term for страторнй̈.

[174] DRH II, no. 135, also spelled слѹⷢ (no. 165). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 225–226 *sulger* (Wallachia and Moldavia).

[175] DRH II, no. 99. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 230 *șetrar*.

[176] DRH II, no. 99. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 223 *stolnic*.

[177] DRH II, no. 99. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 112 *ispravnic*.

[178] DRH II, no. 208. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 107–108 *hotarnic*.

[179] DRH II, no. 100. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 167–168 *păharnic*.

[180] DRH II, no. 139, in a Latin document *pytar/pyttar* (Iorga, p. 238). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 177 *pitar*.

[181] *Teachings* 57v. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 62 *curtean*.

[182] *Teachings* 28v. Romanian *credincer*.

[183] Tocilescu, p. 255, in the border agreement (DRH II, no. 194) with the morphological variants размирїе (Tocilescu, p. 255; *Teachings* 53r) and размиренїе (*Teachings* 50v). Cf. размирица/размирїе in Moldavian (*Словник*…, vol. II, p. 287), Serbian and Ottoman documents (Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник*…, vol. II, p. 27). Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 200 *răzmiriță*.

[184] Tocilescu, p. 223. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 265 *vrăjmaş*.

[185] Cf. *Български*…, vol. I, p. 251 'crowd, group', Romanian *gloată*.

[186] OCS 'guard, watch', Romanian *strajă*.

'battalion'[187], 28v лафачїє 'mercenaries'[188], 60r трєсковы 'fire weapons'[189]. A curious lexeme is пистр͠ѣ 'distance covered by a shot of an arrow'[190]. A specific lexeme, denoting a person provoking a conflict is лотрȣ 'bandit'[191].

The largest terminological group concerns the administration, law, trade and finance, which are hardly dividable. From the perspective of the origin of the term, we can distinguish the following types:

- Terms attested in the Old Church Slavonic corpus or found in various Slavonic varieties: ѡчина 'inherited property'[192], даждⱭ 'tax'[193], печ͠а 'seal'[194], слȣжба 'service, attendance'[195], д͠ѣдїна 'inherited domain'[196], добитт͠ѣ 'property'[197], пивница 'cellar'[198], тов͠а 'load, property'[199], ѡбр͠о 'tax in kind'[200].

- Terms of Byzantine origin mediated via Bulgarian and/or Serbian administration: мет͠о 'monastery property out of the monastery complex'[201], аспрȣ

---

[187] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 115 'agmen'; *Евтимиев речник*, [in:] *Cyrillomethodiana*, https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/evtdict/evt_show/d_04684; LBG, vol. VII, p. 1566 σκῆπρον 'Schwadron'.
[188] Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 124 *lefegiu*.
[189] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 320 тр͠ѣскове 'fragores'.
[190] DRH II, no. 161. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 177 *pistreală*.
[191] Tocilescu, p. 227, also in Neacşu's letter as an insult. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 127–128 *lotru*.
[192] DRH II, no. 184. In this meaning used in the East Slavonic milieu, cf. *Словарь русского языка (XI–XVII вв.)*, выпуск 14, p. 64–65 *отчина*, but almost absent in Moldavia, cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 161 *ocină*.
[193] Tocilescu, p. 257. Not used in Moldavia. Cf. OCS 'contributing; bribe'. Romanian *dajdie*, *dajde*. Not used in Moldavia.
[194] Tocilescu, p. 260. Also in OCS. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 172 *pecete*.
[195] DRH II, no. 116. Also in OCS, Romanian *slujbă*.
[196] DRH II, no. 122. Romanian *dedină*. Cf. *Словник…*, vol. I, p. 335 (Moldavia); Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 325 (Serbia); *Словарь…*, 14, p. 64 (East Slavonic milieu).
[197] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 285 'facultates'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p.138 'gain, profit'; *Словник…*, vol. I, p. 305; Romanian *dobitoc* 'cattle'.
[198] DRH II, no. 94. Romanian *pivniță*. Attested in Ruthenian since 1489 (*Словник…*, vol. II, p. 144–145).
[199] DRH II, no. 160. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 294 'onus'; *Словник…*, vol. II, p. 433 'merchandise; cattle; property' (in Moldavia and Wallachia), Romanian (Banat) *tovar* 'load'.
[200] DRH II, no. 109. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 160 *obroc* (Moldavia and Wallachia); Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 191 'stipendium; viaticum'.
[201] DRH II, no. 185. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 185; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 59 'terra monasterio subjecta'; *Dicționarul…*, p. 141 *metoh*; LBG, vol. V, p. 1017 μετόχιον 'Dependance eines Klosters'.

'silver coin'[202], перпери 'golden coins'[203], прекию 'dowry'[204], ѡризѣ̂[205], хора 'rural area'[206], комⷶ 'pieces'[207],

- Other terms attested in the Bulgarian or Serbian context: десетⷪ̂ 'tithe'[208], прѣ-далика 'escheat'[209], дворба 'service'[210], глоба 'fine'[211], би̂ 'tax'[212], сиромⷶ̂ 'simple subject of a ruler'[213], сѫдство 'administrative unit'[214], доходкь 'income'[215], воденица 'water mill'[216], спенза 'expense'[217], сⷮѣ дигнⷪ̂ 'with increase, as a wholesale'[218], правина 'justice; just amount'[219].

---

[202] Tocilescu, p. 238. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 19 аспра; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 7 *aspru*; LBG, vol. II, p. 217 ἄσπρον 'Sibermünze'.

[203] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 285 перьпера; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 173 *perper* 'ancienne monnaie utilisée dans la Valachie'; LBG, vol. VIII, p. 1867 ὑπέρπερον 'Goldmünze'.

[204] DRH II, no. 129. Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865, p. 668 прикиѩ; *Български…*, vol. V, p. 714 прикия, прикие; LBG, vol. VIII, p. 6, 1395 προί-κιον 'Mitgift'.

[205] DRH II, no. 94. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 266; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 229 оризмо 'decretum' (in a Bulgarian document); G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, p. 973 ὁρισμός 'decree'.

[206] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 397 'Bulgarian administrative unit'; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 419 'regio'; LBG, vol. VIII, p. 2031 χώρα 'Ortschaft, Dorf'. In the *Teachings*, there is the expression 67r ѿ хорѣнь 'of peasants', cf. Romanian regionally *horean* 'big boy; healthy boy', https://dexonline.ro/definitie/horean.

[207] DRH II, no. 22 and the 2nd Argeş inscription. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 466 'pars, frustum, aliquantum'; LBG, vol. IV, p. 853 κομμάτιν 'Stück, Teil'.

[208] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 133.

[209] DRH II, no. 94. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 318; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 195 *prădalică*.

[210] *Teachings* 33v, 37r, 69r. Cf. F. Miklosich, *Lexicon…*, p. 156 'servitium'; *Cyrillomethodiana* (Trojan Story).

[211] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 118; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 209 'mulcta'.

[212] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 40–41 'census clero praebendus'; А. Даска-лова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 68 бирокъ; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 16–17 *bir*.

[213] Tocilescu, p. 234, *Teachings* 28v. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 113 'pauper'.

[214] DRH II, no. 108. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 199 'conventus, terra judicis', whence the current Romanian *judeţ* 'county'.

[215] *Teachings* 41r. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 143; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 296–297 'reditus, tributum'.

[216] DRH II, no. 122. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 98; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 144 'mola aquaria'.

[217] DRH II, no. 109. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 142 'expensa'.

[218] Tocilescu, p. 257, 262 (homage act). The form may have been created both from an o-stem or a-stem. Cf. Štokavian *dignuti*, Bulgarian *дигна* 'to raise', *Български…*, p. 386.

[219] Tocilescu, p. 262. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 409–410 'jus, justitia; justa'.

- Terms taken from the Hungarian administration: вама 'toll'[220], дижма 'tithe'[221], мѣр҆тикь 'payment in kind'[222], хота҃ 'border'[223], варо҃ 'town'[224], газда 'owner'[225], кѐчй 'expense'[226], мархѫ 'merchandise'[227], флорини ȣгрѫски 'Hungarian *floreni*'[228],

- Specific Wallachian and Moldavian terms: тькъмѐ 'agreement'[229], 249 горшинȣ 'tax from sheep and pigs'[230],

- Specific Wallachian terms: ѡхаба 'inalienable heritable property'[231], вѣчй 'serf'[232], поводникари 'collectors of a specific tax'[233], винарй 'wine tax'[234].

A linguistically very specific group of terms comprises the professions and merchandise. A specific Wallachian term, integrated into the local Slavonic, is скȣлищє 'jewellery, treasury'[235]. Another typical term, this time of the Bulgarian origin, comprises рȣтищє 'clothing'[236].

[220] Tocilescu, p. 262, 2nd Argeş inscription. *Etymologisches…*, p. 1603 *vám* 'Zollstelle; Abgabe für Waren'; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 253–254 *vamă*. A linked substantive is DRH II, no. 108 вамишириа 'income of a customs point', cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 257 *vămeşerie*.

[221] DRH II, no. 98. *Etymologisches…*, p. 259 *dézsma*; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 68 *dijmă*. From this lexeme, the term дижмари 'collectors of taxes' on the same place is derived. Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 68.

[222] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. *Magyar nyelvtörténeti…*, vol. II, p. 776 *mérték* 'mensura, metrum; modius; pondus'; Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 105 мѣрьтикь 'demensum'; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 140 'ration; don annuel en nature ou en espèces; messure de capacité pour les grains'.

[223] DRH II, 140. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 105–107 *hotar* (both Wallachia and Moldavia); *Etymologisches…*, p. 537 *határ*.

[224] Tocilescu, p. 251; DRH II, no. 140, 161. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 102; *Etymologisches…*, p. 1609 *város*. On DRH II, no. 175, there is also the derivation варошани 'burghers'.

[225] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. *Etymologisches…*, p. 450–451 *gazda* 'Hauswirt; 1544 Verwalter; 1570 Besitzer'; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 89 *hôte*.

[226] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 40 *chelciug*; *Etymologisches…*, p. 815 *költség*.

[227] Tocilescu, p. 234. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 51 мархѫ 'merx'; *Etymologisches…*, p. 938 *marha* 'Vermögen; bewegliches Gut'.

[228] DRH II, no. 108. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 82 *florin*.

[229] DRH II, no. 196. Cf. *Словник…*, vol. II, p. 435 тꙋкмеж(а).

[230] Tocilescu, p. 249. Cf. *Словник…*, vol. I, p. 253; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 95.

[231] DRH II, no. 184. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 163–164. In most documents replaced by дѣдина.

[232] DRH II, no. 98. Cf. *Dicţionarul…*, p. 258 *vecin*.

[233] DRH II, no. 98; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 192 *povodnicar*.

[234] DRH II, no. 98; *Dicţionarul…*, p. 260 *vinarici*.

[235] *Teachings* 48v and the 2nd Argeş inscription.

[236] Tocilescu, p. 246. *Български…*, vol. VI, p. 353.

Further terms are rather occasionalisms:

- professions: ма̃гана̃ 'jeweller'[237] кроиторю̃ 'tailor'[238], маисто̃ 'craftsman'[239],

- merchandise: роате[240] ѿ кола 'wheels of vehicle', фалче 'old units of measurement'[241], гръло́[242] ѿ бисѣ 'pearl necklace', ѿ хелци 'of stoat'[243], типаре 'casting forms'[244], хамꙋре 'armours'[245], щꙋк̃ꙋре 'horse harness'[246], тарнице 'saddles'[247], касито̃/косито̃ 'lead'[248].

One must mention the very curious phonological adaptation of the lexeme свиꙗ 'pig'[249]. All these terms appear mostly in the letters, rarely in other texts.

A very specific semantic group are the lexemes describing the landscape. Such words can be divided into the following types:

- General Slavonic (or OCS) terms: връ̃ 'top of a hill'[250], пꙋстынѣ 'desert'[251], пеще-ра 'cave'[252], лꙋ̃ 'riparian forest'[253], дꙋбрава 'oak forest'[254], долина 'valley'[255], пото̃ 'brook'[256], стлъ̃ 'border sign'[257], ꙗзꙋ 'little lake; pond'[258], ꙋстїе 'river mouth'[259], блатꙋ/блато 'little lake'[260], виногра̃ 'vineyard'[261].

---

[237] Tocilescu, p. 225. Linked to the Greek μαγγανεία 'trickery', while μαγγανάρις is used for 'mechanical engineer'. Cf. G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic…*, p. 818.

[238] DRH II, no. 146. *Dicționarul…*, p. 59 *croitor*.

[239] Tocilescu, p. 224. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 43 'opifex'; *Български…*, vol. III, p. 617.

[240] Tocilescu, p. 243. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 202 *roată* 'wheel'.

[241] Tocilescu, p. 207. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 76 *falce*.

[242] Tocilescu, p. 225. Homophonous to гръло 'brook', metonymy linked to гръло 'throat'. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 241 'guttur'.

[243] Tocilescu, p. 246. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 104 *helge*.

[244] Tocilescu, p. 225. *Dicționarul…*, p. 236 *tipar* 'moule, matrice'.

[245] Tocilescu, p. 243. *Dicționarul…*, p. 102 *ham* 'harnais'.

[246] Tocilescu, p. 243. *Dicționarul…*, p. 233 *ștreang* 'courroie d'attelage'.

[247] Tocilescu, p. 243. *Dicționarul…*, p. 235 *tarniță*.

[248] Tocilescu, p. 238, 242. *Dicționarul…*, p. 55 *cositor*.

[249] Tocilescu, p. 252.

[250] DRH II, no. 140. Romanian *vârf*.

[251] *Teachings* 110v. An OCS lexeme. Romanian *pustie*.

[252] *Teachings* 110v. An OCS lexeme. Romanian *peșteră*.

[253] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 21 лоугь 'nemus'.

[254] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul…*, p. 71–72 *dumbravă*.

[255] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 289 'vallis'. Romanian *dolină* 'a hollow or basin in a karstic region'.

[256] DRH II, no. 105. Romanian of Banat *potoc*.

[257] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 22 *stâlp*.

[258] DRH II, no. 141. *Dicționarul…*, p. 110 *iaz*.

[259] DRH II, no. 143. An OCS lexeme.

[260] DRH II, no. 106 and 183. In OCS 'swamp, mud'. Romanian *baltă*.

[261] DRH II, no. 161. Already in OCS.

- Lexemes of South Slavonic origin attested in Romanian: гръло/гръла 'brook'[262], ѡбрежїе 'slope'[263], гомила 'small bank'[264], слеме 'top of the hill'[265], бранище/браница 'forest or place forbidden for hunting or fishing'[266], ѡбръшїе 'upper part of a watercourse'[267], изво̑ 'source'[268], хрꙋ̂ 'ridge'[269], припо̑ 'slope'[270], въртѫжъ 'whirlpool'[271].

- Greek terms mediated through South Slavonic: ливези 'meadows'[272], периволие 'garden'[273].

- Slavonic terms not attested in Romanian: бара 'small river'[274], планина 'moutain'[275], бро̑ 'ford'[276], шꙋма 'forest'[277], поле 'field'[278], крꙋшка 'pear tree'[279], бръдо 'mountain'[280], липа

---

[262] Tocilescu, p. 256. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 92 *gârlă*. Речник на българския език, https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/гърло/ *гърло* 'place where the groundwater flows up on the surface'.

[263] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 160 *obrejie* 'colline, taules, pente, flanc de coteau'. *Български…*, vol. IV, p. 754 *обреш* 'path to the steep top, highlands'.

[264] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 217 'collis'. Romanian in Banat *gomilă* 'small uplift of earth or stones, made to serve as a boundary between two places'.

[265] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Български…*, vol. VI, p. 867 'beam'; *Dicționarul…*, p. 216 'sommet d'une montagne, crête'.

[266] DRH II, no. 144. Cf. *Български…*, p. 74; *Dicționarul…*, p. 21–22.

[267] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 192 обрьш(ина) 'collis'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 262 'highlands'.

[268] DRH II, no. 120. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 395 'fons'.

[269] DRH II, no. 143. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 429 'rupes'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 398 'ridge'.

[270] DRH II, no. 156. *Dicționarul…*, p. 194 *pripor* 'pente, versant raide, talus'. Cf. *Български…*, vol. V, p. 760 'steep place'.

[271] DRH II, no. 156. *Dicționarul…*, p. 264 *vârtej*. Cf. *Речник на българския език*, https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/въртеж/ 'going around'.

[272] DRH II, no. 161. *Dicționarul…* p. 125 *livadă* 'verger; prairie'. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 11 'pratum'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 219; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic…*, p. 801 λιβάδιον 'marshy place, damp meadow'.

[273] DRH II, no. 161. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 284 периволь 'hortus'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 279 периволь 'garden; court'; LBG, vol. VI, p. 1267 περιβόλης 'Garten'.

[274] DRH II, no. 105 and 106. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 27 'palus'; *Български…*, vol. I, p. 32 'small river, waterlogged place'.

[275] Tocilescu, p. 244. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 309–310 'mons'; *Словник…*, vol. II, p. 150 (Moldavia).

[276] DRH II, no. 122. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 79 'vadum'.

[277] DRH II, no. 105, 107, 120. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 492 'silva'.

[278] DRH II, no. 105. In OCS.

[279] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 497 'pirus'.

[280] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 80 'mons'; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 83.

'linden'[281], ръто̂ 'to the top'[282], ꙗсе̂ 'ash'[283], кладене̂ 'well'[284], гꙋмно 'threshing floor'[285], дꙋ̂ 'oak'[286].

- Slavonic lexemes adapted to Romanian: лꙋнка 'river meadow'[287], поꙗна 'clearing'[288], на ꙗзере̂ 'on the lake'[289], плаюреле 'plateaux'[290], садꙋреле 'orchards'[291], дѣлꙋ̂ 'the hill'[292], кривина 'marshy place'[293], пажище 'pasturage'[294],

- Specific Romanian lexemes: бра̂ 'fir'[295], фа̂ 'beech'[296], дъмбꙋ̂ (*dâmbul*) 'the hillock'[297], кꙋрмътꙋрꙋ 'depression on the top of a hill'[298], пискꙋ̂ 'the top of the mountain'[299], стꙋпинꙋ 'apiary'[300], рꙋптꙋра 'trench'[301], магꙋрк 'the hillock'[302], валѣ 'the valley'[303].

Among the abstract terms, we can mention those that are not limited to the religious sphere, but also appear in the documents or in other original works. Among such, we will mention:

---

[281] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник*…, vol. II, p. 13 'tilia'.

[282] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 66–67 'apex'.

[283] DRH II, no. 105. *Речник на българския език*, https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/ясен/.

[284] DRH II, no. 208. In no. 112 and 156, there is the form кладеница. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник*…, vol. I, p. 444 кладеньць 'puteus'.

[285] DRH II, no. 178. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник*…, vol. I, p. 244 'area'; *Български*…, vol. I, p. 294 'threshing floor, stackyard'.

[286] DRH II, no. 184. OCS дѫбъ.

[287] DRH II, no. 107. In the no. 132, there is the Romanian plural лꙋнчеле. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 128 *luncă*.

[288] DRH II, no. 118. On DRH II, no. 184, there is a spelling variant пꙗꙗ̂, on DRH II, no. 119, the Romanian plural поꙗнниле. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 186 *poiană*.

[289] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul*…, p. 111 *iezer*, OCS ѥзеро, ѥзеръ.

[290] DRH II, no. 132. *Dicționarul*…, p. 182 *plai* 'plateau d'une haute montagne'.

[291] DRH II, no. 132. *Dicționarul*…, p. 206 *sad* 'jeune vigne, verger'.

[292] DRH II, no. 184. *Dicționarul*…, p. 65 *deal*.

[293] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul*…, p. 58 *crivină*.

[294] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul*…, p. 168 *pajiște*. Cf. OCS пажить 'grass, pasture, lawn', also А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти*…, p. 274.

[295] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul*…, p. 21 *brad*.

[296] DRH II, no. 208. *Dicționarul*…, p. 76 *fag*.

[297] DRH II, no. 165. *Dicționarul*…, p. 69 *dâmb*; *Etymologisches*…, p. 272 *domb* 'Hügel; Erdaufschüttung'.

[298] DRH II, no. 156. *Dicționarul*…, p. 62 *curmătură*.

[299] DRH II, no. 156. *Dicționarul*…, p. 175–176 *pisc(ul)*.

[300] DRH II, no. 178. *Dicționarul*…, p. 225 *stupină*.

[301] DRH II, no. 184. *Dicționarul*…, p. 205 *ruptură* 'rupture; fondrière'.

[302] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Dicționarul*…, p. 136 *măgură*.

[303] DRH II, no. 105. *Dicționarul*…, p. 251–253 *vale(a)*.

- Words attested in Old Church Slavonic: пагꙋба 'damage'[304], хоула 'insult'[305], по ѡбꙑчꙗю 'following the habit'[306], надежда 'hope'[307], врѣме 'time'[308], вѣк̂ 'age'[309], слава 'glory'[310], похвалꙋ 'praise'[311], неволю 'need'[312], прю 'dispute, accusation'[313],

- Words of Greek origin: ѡргїа 'anger'[314], ѳемелїе 'base'[315], харь имѣти 'to thank'[316], скандалꙋ 'disturbance'[317], метехꙋ[318],

- South Slavonic lexemes: ꙋсил̂ 'violence'[319], разл̂ 'reason'[320], трꙗ̂ 'trace'[321], бел̂ 'sign'[322],

- Church Slavonic lexemes absent in Romanian: съпрѣнїе 'dispute'[323],

- Specific Romanian words: прилежь 'occasion'[324].

---

[304] Tocilescu, p. 260. Romanian *pagubă*.

[305] *Teachings* 58r. Romanian *hulă*.

[306] DRH II, no. 97. Romanian *obicei*.

[307] *Teachings* 50v. Romanian *nădejde*.

[308] DRH II, no. 109. Romanian *vreme*.

[309] DRH II, no. 109. Romanian *veac*.

[310] DRH II, no. 109. Romanian *slavă*.

[311] DRH II, no. 131. Romanian *pohfală*.

[312] Tocilescu, p. 258, Romanian *nevoie*. *Teachings* 59r имѣти неволѧ. Romanian *a avea nevoie* 'to need'.

[313] DRH II, no. 143. Romanian *pâră*.

[314] DRH II, no. 98, *Teachings* 32r. Cf. А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти*…, p. 266; Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. I, p. 230 (in a Bulgarian document); G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic*…, p. 970 ὀργή.

[315] *Teachings* 25r. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 286 'fundamentum'; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic*…, p. 623 θεμέλιον 'foundation'.

[316] *Teachings* 72r. Cf. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 408 'gratia', Romanian *har*.

[317] Tocilescu, p. 225; DRH II, no. 143. Cf. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 114 сканьдаль 'scandalum'; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic*…, p. 1235 σκάνδαλον 'obstacle; difficulty; offence', Romanian *scandal*.

[318] Tocilescu, p. 234; DRH II, no. 161. Cf. *Български*…, vol. III, p. 768 метехам 'I make a mistake; I hinder' from Greek μετέχω 'I participate'.

[319] Tocilescu, p. 229. Cf. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 381 'violentia'. There is a variant сил̂ at the same place.

[320] Tocilescu, p. 246. Cf. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. III, p. 25–26 'ratio; argumentum'. Romanian archaic *răzlog* 'advice'.

[321] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика*, https://www.srpskirecnik.com/stranica/6/248.

[322] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. Ђ. Даничиħ, *Рјечник*…, vol. I, p. 100 бѣлѣгь 'signum'. Romanian archaic *beleag* 'watchword'.

[323] DRH II, no. 143. With the spelling variant of no. 112 съпрѣнїꙋ and no. 132 сꙋпрение. Cf. *Словарь*…, 26, p. 126 *сопрьние/съпьрьние*.

[324] *Teachings* 28v. Romanian *prilej*.

To this group, we could also order the names of months.

Separately, we must evaluate the verbs that may be divided into the following types:

- Verbs attested both in Church Slavonic and Romanian: порѹчити 'to order, to command'[325], съвѣтовати 'to advice'[326], съвръшити 'to finish'[327], трѣбѹе 'it is needed'[328], свадити сє[329].

- Verbs of Greek origin mediated via South Slavonic: пєдєпсати 'to instruct'[330], мартѹрїсати 'to witness'[331].

- Verbs attested both South Slavonic and Romanian: пазити 'to care; to guard'[332], исправити 'to execute, to arrange'[333], слобѡ̈ти 'to free, to liberate'[334], хранити 'to support materially'[335], тръговати 'to trade'[336].

- Verbs differing from the form attested in Romanian by a prefix: оѹтъкмити 'to arrange; to agree'[337], извѣсєдити 'to utter'[338], нарѹчити 'to command'[339], замѹчити

---

[325] Tocilescu, p. 223, 238. OCS порѹчити. Romanian *a porunci*.

[326] Tocilescu, p. 257. Attested in OCS. Romanian *a sfătui*.

[327] Tocilescu, p. 258. Attested in OCS. Romanian *a sfârşi/săvârşi*.

[328] Tocilescu, p. 243; *Teachings* трѣбоѹєтъ e.g. 37v, 41v, 52v. Thus is OCS. Romanian *trebuie*.

[329] Tocilescu, p. 255. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 218 сквадити сє 'inimicitias suscipere', Romanian *a se sfădi*.

[330] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 283–284 'punire' Romanian *a pedepsi* 'to teach, to educate, to instruct, to convict'; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic…*, p. 996 παίδευω 'to instruct, to educate; to train, ro discipline; to chastise'.

[331] DRH II, no. 101. Cf. *Български…*, vol. III, p. 364 мартоѹрисати (17th century); *Dicţionarul…*, p. 139 *a mărturisi* 'avouer, déclarer, affirmer'; LBG, vol. V, p. 976 μαρτυρίζω 'zum Zeugen anrufen'.

[332] Tocilescu, p. 255. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 268 'custodire'.

[333] Tocilescu, p. 237. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 420–421 'perficere; absolvere, componere; solvere', Romanian *a isprăvi*.

[334] Tocilescu, p. 257. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 126 слободити 'liberare'. Romanian *a slobozi*.

[335] Cf. OCS 'to protect; to guard; to hide; to keep; to take care'; Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 425 'custodire', Romanian *hrăni* 'to sustain, to nourish, to feed'.

[336] Tocilescu, p. 23, 262. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 310–311 'mercaturam facere'. Romanian *a târgui* 'to buy'.

[337] Tocilescu, p. 227. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 394 'constituere; convenire'; *Словник…*, vol. II, p. 491 оѹтокмити. Romanian *a întocmi*. In the *Teachings* (55r), there is the deverbative оѹтъкмѥнїє 'arrangement, agreement'. Romanian *întocmire*.

[338] Tocilescu, p. 244. Romanian *a besedui*. Cf. *Словарь…*, 6, p. 96–97 извєсѣдовати 'to express; to explain'.

[339] Tocilescu, p. 242. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 123 'mandare'. Romanian *a porunci*.

'to make suffer'[340], ѡслободити 'to liberate'[341], захвалю̈ 'I thank'[342], щѹрьбити 'to get impoverished'[343].

- Verbs borrowed or adapted from Hungarian: бантовати 'to bother'[344], келтовати 'to spend'[345], хотарити 'to border'[346].

- Specific Romanian Slavonisms: грабити се 'to hurry'[347], дворбити 'to serve, to discuss'[348].

- CS-lexemes with a different vernacular meaning not attested in Romanian: чекати 'to wait'[349], говорити 'to speak'[350], ѹчинити 'to do'[351], казати 'to say'[352], знати 'to know'[353].

- Non-CS lexemes not attested in Romanian: хѹсовати 'to rob'[354], тѹжити 'to litigate'[355], хаꙗти 'to care'[356], ѹлѣти 'to reach'[357], се диже 'he made an action'[358],

---

[340] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. *Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика*, https://www.srpskirecnik.com/stranica/2/164 *замучити* 'to expose to torment'. Romanian *a munci*.

[341] Tocilescu, p. 229 with spelling variant on p. 240: ѹслововзити. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 235 'liberare'. Romanian *a slobozi*.

[342] Tocilescu, p. 223. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 369 захвалꙗти 'gratias agere'. Old Romanian *făli* 'to praise'.

[343] *Teachings* 41r. Linked to cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 492 щрьбь 'mancus'. Romanian *a știrbi*.

[344] Tocilescu, p. 240. Cf. *Etymologisches…*, p. 78 *bánt* 'mißhandeln; hindern', Romanian *bântui/băntui*.

[345] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. *Etymologisches…*, p. 815 *költ* 'verbringen (Zeit); ausgeben (Geld)', Romanian *a cheltui*.

[346] DRH II, no. 105. Cf. *Словник…*, vol. II, p. 513.

[347] Tocilescu, p. 223.

[348] *Dicționarul…*, p. 72.

[349] Tocilescu, p. 239. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 459 'exspectare'.

[350] Tocilescu, p. 241. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 212 'loqui'.

[351] Cf. in OCS 'to arrange; to appoint; to turn something into something'; Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 398–399 'facere'.

[352] Tocilescu, p. 227. OCS 'to show; to instruct; to order; to preach'. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 429 'dicere; ostendere; monere; punire'.

[353] Tocilescu, p. 261. Already in OCS attested as 'to know'. In the letters, it fully replaces the verb вѣдѣти as in most South and East Slavonic languages.

[354] DRH II, no. 194. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 438 'latrocinari'.

[355] Tocilescu, p. 234. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 324 'lamentari; conqueri'.

[356] Tocilescu, p. 225. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 409 'curare'.

[357] Tocilescu, p. 224. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 178 'ingredi'.

[358] DRH II, no. 146. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 269 дигноути 'surgere'. In Tocilescu, p. 227 with a prefix ѡ се подиже 'he raised'. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 332 подигноути 'tollere'.

спензивати 'to spend'[359], метехати 'to hinder'[360], ра́збрати 'to understand'[361], рас-хабена 'spoiled'[362], уцѣнити 'to put a value'[363], и̂вадити 'to take out'[364], теглити 'to burden'[365], раскинути 'to break'[366], ѿкинути (съвѣ̑) 'to reject (an advice)'[367].

Some of the above mentioned verbs create a stylistical opposition with the stricly CS ones, e.g. наити vs. обрѣсти, сътворити vs. оучинити[368].

The correspondence and the *dispositiones* of other documents contain a typical set of function words, the biggest part of which comprise the conjunctions attested in the Serbian chancellery tradition: ако 'if'[369], тере 'and'[370], ере 'that; while'[371], али 'but'[372], докле 'until'[373], како 'that'[374] the adverbs къда 'when'[375] and съда 'now'[376], ѡ̈в'де 'here'[377], заедно 'together'[378], дори 'even'[379], вѣ̑ма 'very'[380], the prepositions зарадӥ 'regarding'[381], ко̑ 'by, near, at'[382], the particle нека 'let it'[383] and the invariable relative pronoun що 'which'[384]. In other original texts, such words appear randomly.

---

[359] Tocilescu, p. 223. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 141 спеньза 'expensa'.

[360] DRH II, no. 123. Cf. *Български…*, vol. III, p. 768 метехам 'I make a mistake; I hinder'.

[361] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 20 'comperire'.

[362] Tocilescu, p. 258. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 406 хабити 'damnum inferre'; *Речник на българския език*, https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/хабя/ 'I spend in vain; I spoil, I make something unusable'.

[363] Tocilescu, p. 246. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 397 'pretium stature'.

[364] Tocilescu, p. 241. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 391 'eximere'.

[365] Tocilescu, p. 227. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 284 'pondo valere'.

[366] Tocilescu, p. 260. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 35 'conscindere, abolere; diruere'.

[367] Tocilescu, p. 257. Cf. *Словарь…*, 13, p. 247 'to reject'.

[368] See the occurrence in the CS correspondences in the *homage act*.

[369] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 6; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 58.

[370] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223; *Teachings* 28v. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 283–284 те, терь, тере 'et'.

[371] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223; *Teachings* 108r. In the meaning 'because' cf. Tocilescu, p. 229. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 523–526 'quod'.

[372] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 255; *Teachings* 28r 49r. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 8 'sed'.

[373] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 238; DRH II, no. 122. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 288 'quousque'.

[374] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 430–431 in this meaning. As the same place also combined with да as the conjunction 'in order to'.

[375] Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 516 'quando'.

[376] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 241. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 232 'nunc'.

[377] Tocilescu, p. 254. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 203 'hic'.

[378] DRH II, no. 175. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 370–371 'una'.

[379] DRH II, no. 140. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 292 'usque'.

[380] Tocilescu, p. 228. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 109 'valde'.

[381] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 229. It may be combined with да as the conjunction 'in order to' (Tocilescu, p. 230). Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 364 'propter'.

[382] DRH II, no. 146. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 461.

[383] *Teachings* 71r. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 140–141.

[384] E.g. Tocilescu, p. 223. Cf. Ђ. Даничиђ, *Рјечник…*, vol. III, p. 483–484; А. Даскалова, М. Райкова, *Грамоти…*, p. 403; *Словник…*, p. 564–565.

A typical expression of the *dispositio* of some acts is the Greek preposition ката 'each, per'[385]. Some of these function words are clearly opposed to the CS ones as e.g. ако vs. аще, що vs. иже, ере/како vs. ꙗко, съда vs. н҃нѣ.

The religious terms are, of course, largely present in the biblical and liturgical writings including the *Teachings*, the majority of which comprise moral instructions. The documents addressed to the monasteries, colophons and inscriptions may share a part of the strictly religious vocabulary, which comprises the titles of clerics, religious terms, religious establishments and few, already mentioned abstract terms. Few terms of religious contents are specific for the documents addressed to monasteries or inscriptions, the most particular is the request of the voivode to the monks to do in his favour параклй҃[386] съ прилевко҃[387] и каливо҃[388] 'preaching with the ritual drinking of wine and cooking of wheat'[389]. The family terminology is generally the Slavonic one, with the exception of the frequent Grecism анепсеи 'nephew'[390] and the occasionalism once appearing фиꙗстрꙋ 'stepson'[391] of Romanian origin.

Written varieties in Wallachia

At the very end, it is needed to sum up the system of existing written lects used in Wallachia in the second decade of the 16th century. It can be stated that one can distinguish actually four varieties of Church Slavonic applied in the Wallachian environment. The most prestigious one was the Trinovitan Church Slavonic patterned on the Moldavian norm, which was the variety used in the most prestigious books containing the biblical texts. Another variety exclusive for the manuscripts containing shared texts was the Resavian CS. As the books containing a most characteristic example of this variety are not signed, one cannot definitively say, if they were just used in Wallachia and brought from abroad (Athos, Serbia, Bulgaria) or they were copied exactly according to the Resavian models particularly in the Western Wallachian (Oltenian) monasteries. The traces of some Trinovitan

---

[385] DRH II, no. 97 ката годинѣ, comp. DRH II, no. 108 на сваку годїнꙋ 'every year'. Cf. ката годинꙋ 'quotannis' in Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 441 and *Български…*, vol. II, p. 266.

[386] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 275 'preces'; G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic…*, p. 1018 'consolation'.

[387] Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. II, p. 429 'additamentum vini'.

[388] DRH II, no. 153. For коливо cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 463 'frumentum coctum'; *Български…*, vol. III, p. 556 'boiled wheat in memory of the dead'; LBG, vol. IV, p. 850 κόλλυβα 'gekochter Weizen'.

[389] For more details on this ritual, cf. В. Савић, *Литургијски елементи у повељи деспотице Јелене манастиру Хиландару из 1504. године*, [in:] *Теолонгвистичка проучавања словенских језика*, ed. Ј. Грковић-Мејџор, К. Кончаревић, Београд 2013, p. 483–484.

[390] DRH II, no. 102. Cf. Ђ. Даничић, *Рјечник…*, vol. I, p. 10; LBG, vol. I, p. 106 ἀνεψιός.

[391] DRH II, no. 196. Cf. *Dicționarul…*, p. 79 *fiastru* 'beau-fils'.

features (especially the jer vocalization) could speak in favour of the relationship with an earlier Trinovitan tradition or copying in Wallachia (or Bulgaria).

A little *lower* variety was the Wallachian Trinovitan, i.e. the variety used in both shared and original texts (*Teachings*, some colophons and inscriptions) that was patterned on the Trinovitan norm, but was submitted to a more visible influence of the bookish pronunciation (in particular ѧ > ε, ж/ъ variation, eventually traces of Resavian elements). A compromise variety, representing a combination of primary Resavian traits (no juses) and the secondary Trinovitan features, can be called Wallachian Administrative Church Slavonic. Such variety could be also used in the literature of the basic corpus, but its main field were the Church Slavonic parts of the documents (especially arengas and *sanctions*), colophons and inscriptions. The CS production in such smaller texts is generally less attentive that the copied texts of the basic corpus.

The variety, opposed to the Church Slavonic, i.e. to the bookish variety, is the Wallachian Slavonic. Functionally, the Wallachian Slavonic corresponded to the vernacular-based varieties in Slavonic speech communities including their impact in the various types of acts[392]. Linguistically, the Wallachian Slavonic represented a specific, artificial language of a complicated origin. It was definable by the use of the administrative spelling generally patterned on the Serbian chancellery tradition[393]. The morphology was formally based on the Štokavian and thus showed similarities with the administrative texts issued by other contemporary chancelleries of the Balkans. Nevertheless, the morphosyntax was highly balkanized and generally patterned on Romanian. This was mostly manifested by the two-case system (opposition of the common case and dative) and especially by the spread negligence to agreement of gender and number revealing thus a non-Slavonic speaker behind the text. The main components of the vocabulary were the basic South Slavonic vocabulary, which was enriched with the Wallachian chancellery terminology, comprising the inherited Bulgarian and Serbian chancellery traditions (including the Byzantine terminology absorbed by those traditions), Hungarian loanwords, Romanian Slavonic neologisms and rather rare words taken directly from Romanian. Such Romanian expressions comprised mainly the landscape phenomena (that can be often considered toponyms) and few occasionalisms. In its purest shape, the Wallachian Slavonic appeared in the correspondence.

In the Wallachian context, we would thus define the hybrid variety to be a combination of the Church Slavonic and Wallachian Slavonic features. The most characteristic representant of this variety would be the *horismoi*. In the chrysobulls, the hybrid variety or the Wallachian Slavonic is often recognizable in the *dispositio*. In addition, some colophons can be of hybrid character.

---

[392] Thus, the Wallachian *diplomatic trichotomy* resembles to the linguistically three types of Serbian documents as described by Ј. Грковић-Мејџор, *Списи из историјске…*, p. 448–449.

[393] Thus being opposed to the Wallachian Chancellery Language of the late 14th and early 15th century that was Bulgarian based.

Out of Slavonic, but not fully separated from it yet, is the Romanian written in Cyrillic. In our period, it is represented by Neacşu's letter, but also by the examples of code-switching in the *horismoi* (description of the domain). Actually, also Neacşu's letter represents an example of the code-switching as it contains Slavonic formulas. The Latin documents represent a different chancellery tradition based on the Hungarian one, which shows a minimal penetration of the Wallachian Slavonic features, reduced practically just to onomastics and specific, hardly translatable Wallachian titles.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

534 Documente istorice slavo-române din Ţara-Românească şi Moldava privitóre la legăturile cu Ardealul 1346–1603, ed. G.G. Tocilescu, Bucureşti 1931.

Documenta Romaniae Historica B. Ţara Românească, vol. I, *(1247–1500)*, ed. P.P. Panaitescu, D. Mioc, Bucureşti 1966.

Documenta Romaniae Historica B. Ţara Românească, vol. II, *(1501–1525)*, ed. Ş. Ştefănescu, O. Diaconescu, Bucureşti 1972.

Documentele privitoare la Istoria Românilor culese de Eudoxiu de Hurmuzaki, vol. XV, *Acte şi scrisori din arhivele oraşelor ardelene (Bistriţa, Braşov, Sibiu)*, partea I, *1358–1600*, ed. N. Iorga, Bucureşti 1911.

Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României, vol. I, *Oraşul Bucureşti (1395–1800)*, ed. A. Elian, Bucureşti 1965.

Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României, vol. II, *Judeţul istoric Argeş (sec. XIV – 1848)*, ed. C. Bălan, Bucureşti 1994.

Inscripţiile medievale şi din epoca modernă a României, vol. III, *Judeţul istoric Vâlcea (sec. XIV – 1848)*, ed. C. Bălan, Bucureşti 2005.

Învăţăturile lui Neagoe Basarab către fiul său Theodosie. Versiunea originală, ed. G. Mihăilă, Bucureşti 1996.

Marcea's Tetraevangelion, Romanian National Museum of Art, 7, 1518–1519.

Moxa's Chronicle, Russian National Library coll. 87, no. 64, 1620.

Nomocanon, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 285, ca 1505–1515.

Psaltirea Hurmuzaki I. Studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic şi ediţie, ed. I. Gheţie, M. Teodorescu, Bucureşti 2005.

Stare srpske povelje i pisma, vol. I, *Dubrovnik i susedi njegovi. Drugi deo*, ed. L. Stojanović, Beograd 1934.

Tetraevangheliarul lui Macarie 1512/2012, Târgovişte 2012.

Typikon, Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. sl. 212, ca 1505/1515.

Viaţa Sfântului Nifon patriarhul Constantinopolului, ed. T. Simedrea, "Biserica Ortodoxă Română" 55, 1937, p. 5–6, 257–299.

Dictionaries

Bălgarski etimologičen rečnik, Sofija 1971–.

Cyrillomethodiana, Sofija 2012–, https://histdict.uni-sofia.bg/textcorpus/search

Daničić Đ., *Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih*, vol. I–III, Biograd 1863–1964.

Daskalova A., Rajkova M., *Gramoti na bălgarskite care*, Sofija 2005.

Dexonline. Dicţionare ale limbii române, https://dexonline.ro/

Dicţionarul elementelor româneşti din documente slavo-române 1374–1600, ed. G. Bolocan, Bucureşti 1981.

Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen, ed. L. Benkő, Budapest 1992–1995.

Lampe G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961.

Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität, ed. E. Trapp et al., Wien 1994–2017.

Magyar nyelvtörténeti szótár a legrégibb nyelvemlékektől a nyelvújításig, vol. I–III, ed. G. Szarvas, Z. Simonyi, Budapest 1890–1893.

Mihăilă G., *Dicţionar al limbii române vechi (sfârşitul sec. X – începutul sec. XVI)*, Bucureşti 1974.

Miklosich F., *Lexicon palaeoslovenico-graeco-latinum*, Vindobonae 1862–1865.

Old Church Slavonic Dictionary, [in:] *GORAZD. The Old Church Slavonic Digital Hub*, ed. Š. Pilát, Prague 2016–2020, http://gorazd.org/gulliver/

Rečnik na bălgarskija ezik, https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/

Rečnik sprskohrvatskoga kniževnog jezika, https://www.srpskirecnik.com/

Slovarʼ russkogo jazyka (XI–XVII vv.), Moskva 1975–.

Slovnyk staroukrajinsʼkoï movy XIV–XV st., vol. I–II, ed. L. L. Humecʼka, Kyïv 1977–1978.

Secondary Literature

Balkanski T., *Transilvanskite (sedmigradskite) bălgari. Etnos. Ezik. Etnonimija. Onomastika. Prosopografii*, Veliko Tărnovo 1996.

Bernštejn S.B., *Razyskanija v oblasti bolgarskoj istoričeskoj dialektologii*, vol. I, *Jazyk valašskich gramot XIV–XV vekov*, Moskva–Leningrad 1948.

Bogdan D.P., *Diplomatica slavo-romînă*, [in:] *Documente privind istoria Romîniei. Introducere*, vol. II, Bucureşti 1956, p. 5–227.

Bogdan D.P., *Paleografia romano-slavă. Tratat şi album*, Bucureşti 1978.

Cantemirii D., *Descriptio antiqui et hodierni status Moldaviae*, Bucuresci 1872.

Flora R., *Relaţiile iugoslavo-române. Sinteză*, "Lumina" 22.6, 1968, p. 291–396.

Georgieva C., Genčev N., *Istorija na Bălgarija 15–19. vek*, Sofija 1999.

Gheţie I., Mareş A., *Originele scrisului în limba română*, Bucureşti 1985.

Grammatika, ed. P. Nenadović, Rymnik 1755.

Grković-Mejdžor J., *Spisi iz istorijske lingvistike*, Novi Sad 2007.

Jacimirskij A.I., *Slavjanskija i russkija rukopisi rumynskich "bibliotek"*, S. Peterburg 1905.

Knoll V., *Církevní slovanština v pozdním středověku*, Praha 2019.

Linţa E., *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române din Braşov*, Bucureşti 1985.

Linţa E., Djamo-Diaconiţă L., Stoicovici O., *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române din Bucureşti*, Bucureşti 1981.

Lozić Knezović K., Galić Kakkonen G., *Odnos crkvenoslavenskoga jezika i govornoga jezika u hrvatskome srednjovjekovlju*, "Časopis za hrvatske studije" 6, 2010, p. 211–226.

Mathiesen R., *The Church Slavonic Language Question: an Overview (IX–XX Centuries)*, [in:] *Aspects of the Slavonic Language Question I*, ed. R. Picchio, H. Goldblatt, New Haven 1984, p. 45–65.

Miletič L., *Dako-roměnite i těchnata slavjanska pismenosť II. Novi vlacho-bălgarski gramoti ot Brašov*, [in:] *Sbornik za narodni umotvorenija, nauka i knižnina*, vol. XIII, 1896, p. 3–152.

Mladenov M.S., *Bălgarskite govori v Rumănija*, Sofija 1993.

Panaitescu P.P., *Catalogul manuscriselor slavo-române şi slave din Biblioteca Academiei Române*, vol. II, Bucureşti 2003.

Panaitescu P.P., *Contribuţii la istoria culturii româneşti*, Bucureşti 1971.

Panaitescu P.P., *Manuscrisele slave din Biblioteca Academiei RPR*, vol. I, Bucureşti 1959.

Remnëva M.L., *Puti razvitija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XI–XVII vv.*, Moskva 2003.

Rosetti A., *Istoria limbii române*, Bucureşti 1968.

Savić V., *Liturgijski elementi u povelji despotice Jelene manastiru Hilandaru iz 1504. godine*, [in:] *Teolingvistička proučavanja slovenskih jezika*, ed. J. Grković-Mejdžor, K. Končarević, Beograd 2013, p. 473–491.

Schramm G., *Ein Damm bricht. Die römische Donaugrenze und die Invasionen des 5.–7. Jahrhunderts im Lichte von Namen und Wörtern*, München 1997.

Ştefănescu S., *Ţara Românească*, [in:] *Istoria românilor*, vol. IV, *De la universalitatea creştină către Europa „patriilor"*, Bucureşti 2001, p. 409–426.

Stoicescu N., *Dicţionar al marilor dregători din Ţara românească şi Moldova. Sec. XIV–XVII*, Bucureşti 1971.

Tugearu L. et al., *Miniatura şi ornamentul manuscriselor din colecţia de artă medievală românească a muzeului naţional de artă al României*, vol. II, *Manuscrise slavone, un manuscris latin şi unul românesc*, Bucureşti 2006.

Vasiljev L., Grozdanović M., Jovanović B., *Novo datiranje srpskih rukopisa u Biblioteci Rumunske akademije nauka*, "Археографски прилози" / "Arheografski prilozi" 2, 1980, p. 41–69.

Živov V.M., *Istorija jazyka russkoj pis´mennosti*, vol. I–II, Moskva 2017.

Vladislav Knoll

Institute of Slavonic Studies of the Czech Academy of Sciences
Department of Old Church Slavonic and Byzantine Studies
Valentinská 91/1
110 00 Praha 1, Czech Republic
knoll@slu.cas.cz