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INTRODUCTION

The history and status of Old Church Slavonic (hereafter OCS) as a literary, liturgical, and chancery language in the medieval Romanian provinces remains murky and disputed. Unfortunately, there exists no well documented account of its introduction to the Romanian lands. The consensus view among historians is that the adoption of OCS as a liturgical language of the Romanian church had nothing to do with the Christianization of the Vlachs, as this happened in the 4th century, long before Slavic Orthodoxy expanded outward from Bulgaria--then the center of Slavic Christianity--in the 9th century.¹ At the same time, Slavicizing the Romanian church as much as possible would ensure its closer adherence to the Byzantine East rather than the Latin West, thus resulting in a realignment of the existing church--via a Slavic intermediary--along Byzantine lines.² Thus the OCS language as it was received by the Romanians would have been in one of its earliest forms, i.e., shortly after its codification by SS Cyril and Methodius.


This study, however, will not be concerned with the early use of OCS in Romania. Rather, the late 15th century edicts to be examined here were written at a time when the chancery language of Romania was undergoing changes which differentiated it significantly from its early Bulgarian origins.

In her study "Syntactic Differentiation in the Bulgarian Documents of Fourteenth- and Fifteenth-Century Wallachia" MacRobert notes the increase of Serbian and Romanian influence in Wallachian texts from the second half of the 15th century, which coincides with a decline in Bulgarian features. As her study concerns itself with Bulgarian features only,

the [upper] limit of 1462 was set in order to exclude documents in which Serbian elements are pervasive or in which there are instances of ungrammaticality which could be due to an imperfect knowledge of the language in use.

Such Serbian--as well as Romanian--influence, and ungrammaticality in the Church Slavonic used, are indeed found in the late 15th century Wallachian edicts contained in the collection of Hilandar Monastery. This is linguistically significant, because

... the Wallachian documents fall into two stylistically and linguistically distinct groups: on the one hand, charters which deal with gifts of land and exemption from taxes and duties--these are formal in style, conservative in language; and on the other hand, trading charters and letters--these, though not devoid of formal elements, reveal a more spontaneous use of language, less firmly governed by long-established norms.

The edicts with which the present study is concerned are of the former type, formulaic edicts granting annual endowments to Hilandar monastery

---


4MacRobert, 13.

5MacRobert, 11.
and confirming ownership of property. MacRobert notes that the language of such documents is largely inhibited from showing contemporary developments, because many of the charters addressed to monasteries form series, "in which one prince after another confirms his predecessors' grants, reproducing exactly, or with minor alterations, the words of the preceding charters." This phenomenon too is present in the Wallachian texts used in this study.

MacRobert supports Djamo-Diaconită's suggestion that

... one may discover, not only in the letters but also in the non-formulaic sections of the charters and indirectly through errors in the traditional formulae, as least two distinct layers of language, one of which may be characterized as a variety of Bulgarian Church Slavonic while the other may be more appropriately described as a transitional stage from Middle to Modern Bulgarian.

Through the examination of the five late 15th century Wallachian edicts housed in the Hilandar Monastery Library, this study will show that the Wallachian chancery language—under pressure from the popular spoken language—was in a state of transition from its former Bulgarian based recension to a recension which exhibits a great many Serbian features. Additionally, an examination of the mistakes and innovations in the formal chancery language in both the conservative, formulaic portions of the text, as well as in the less formulaic portions, will demonstrate the degree to which the

---

6MacRobert, 11.


8MacRobert, 12.

9This study made use of microfilm copies of these edicts which are part of the Hilandar Slavic Manuscript Collection of the Hilandar Research Library located at the Ohio State University.
popular language was penetrating the written language. Finally, these mistakes in the chancery language, as well as instances of Romanian language influence, lead to the conclusion that the scribes of these texts were Romanians with an imperfect knowledge of the chancery language.
Wallachia and Moldavia as protectors of Christian Orthodoxy

Scholars often point to three significant events which sealed the fate of the Byzantine Empire and the Balkan states in the 14th and 15th centuries: the Turkish victory over the Serbs at the Marica River (1371) and again at the Battle of Kosovo (1389), and the sacking of Constantinople by Mehmed II (1453). It was this entrance of the Turks into the Balkans which marked not only the twilight of Byzantium and the Balkan states of Bulgaria and Serbia, but also the emergence of the Romanian provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia as the last bastion of Orthodox Christianity not under infidel suzerainty.

Moldavia and Wallachia managed to maintain a state of semi-autonomy throughout the Turkish occupation of the Balkans by paying tribute to the Turks.¹⁰ Their ability to remain more or less independent meant that the Moldavian and Wallachian rulers became the legitimate successors of the protectors of Orthodoxy. As one by one, Russian, Byzantine, Bulgarian, Georgian, and Serbian patrons became unable to continue their patronage of the monasteries on the Holy Mount, the Romanian Voivods were called upon to ensure the maintenance and prosperity of the Athonite Orthodox tradition.

The reasons for and importance of this patronage cannot be fully appreciated without considering its broader historical context.

The establishment of Romanian patronage of Mount Athos

Romanian patronage of Mt. Athos was begun by Voivod Nicolae Alexandru (1352-64). His donation to Kutlumus Monastery marked the beginning of a long and important tradition of patronage of the monasteries on the Holy Mount by the Voivods of Moldavia and Wallachia. By the year 1500 Romanian patronage was well established on the Holy Mount and reached its zenith in 1517, when the Wallachian Voivod Neagoe Basarab (r. 1512-21) extended his patronage to all the monasteries on Mount Athos. This feat has been duplicated by several rulers since, and serves as a testament to the piety and devotion of the Romanian Voivods to their Orthodox brethren.

Endowments to monasteries were made annually, usually on a day significant to the monastery, such as the feast day of its patron saint or the Resurrection of Christ. The amount of the donation, as well as an extra sum for travel expenses of the monks coming from the Holy Mount to receive the donation, were indicated in the text of the *chrysoboul*.\(^\text{11}\)

In exchange for their patronage, the Voivods "asked of God the forgiveness of their sins and eternal life, for them and their relatives. On occasion, some Voivod would confer his treasures to Mount Athos in

\(^{11}\)This word in its original Greek form was used by the Greek Chancery as a generic term for at least four types of *diplomas*. The Romanian Voivods used it in a generic sense as well, designating any edict in which they donated money to a monastery as a *chrysoboul*. For a more detailed explanation of the different types of *chrysoboulis*, see Petar Milich Jr.. "Beyond Mimesis: A Study in Byzantine-Serbian Acculturation in the Light of Two Hilandar Chrysoboulis," MA thesis, The Ohio State University, 1987, 8.
expectation of bad days and in the hope of recouping his throne."  

Furthermore, Voivods would request that the monks say prayers for them and their families, and inscribe their names in the pomjanik, along with the names of other benefactors who came before them. In many cases these previous benefactors were the Voivod's own father, as in the edict of Radu Cel Mare (Radu the Great) dated April 19, 1498:

Năsturel notes with curiosity and sadness that not once in all the edicts issued by Romanian Voivods is there the specific request for a prayer for the Moldavian or Wallachian people. But he also points out that it is implied that what is for the good of the Voivod is for the good of all. On this note it should also be pointed out that none of the texts I studied contained a sanctio, a curse included in the closing of many edicts, threatening all those who dare to transgress the decree(s) made within with all manner of retribution. Thus it seems that the Romanian Voivods did not go to extremes, neither in their requests for favors nor in their desire to insure against the possible transgression of their edicts.

---

12 Năsturel, Le Mont Athos, 35. Translation mine.

13 English "beadroll": a book containing categories of names of people for whom prayers are offered by the monks of the monastery.

14 Năsturel, Le Mont Athos, 35.

15 See Milich, "Beyond Mimesis" 13.
CHAPTER II
WALLACHIA AND HILANDAR MONASTERY

The establishment of ties between Wallachia and Hilandar Monastery

Romanian patronage of the Serbian monastery of Hilandar began in November 1492. The Wallachian Voivod Vlad Călugărul (Vlad the Monk) issued an edict granting Hilandar an annual donation of 5,000 aspri, plus an additional 500 to cover the expenses of the monks who traveled to receive the money. This began a tradition of Wallachian patronage which lasted several centuries. 16

This patronage was brought about at the specific request of Mara Branković, widow of Sultan Mourad II and daughter of Despot George Branković. Mara and her sister Catherine (also known as Cantacuzina) feared that upon their deaths their family's long tradition of patronage to Hilandar Monastery would end, as there were no more Brankovići to carry on this patronage. Mara turned to her adopted son, the Wallachian Voivod Vlad the Monk, and asked him to assume the duties of benefactor of Hilandar. 17

This request is poignantly related in Vlad's edict of November 1492, in which

16 Romanian patronage of Hilandar monastery seems to have been exclusively Wallachian. The only evidence of Moldavian patronage is an unnumbered, undated edict bearing the wax seal of Voivod Petr and signed in Jassy. The text is too badly faded to read.

17 It is unclear whether or not Vlad was truly adopted by Mara, or the adoption was merely symbolic, as Nasturel suggests in "Aperçu critique des rapports de la Valachie et du Mont Athos des origines au début du XVIe siècle." Revue des études sud-est européennes 2 (1964): 93-126. Vlad's reference to Hilandar's recent "orphaning" from its Serbian rulers and references to Mara as "Our mother" leads one to believe it was an actual adoption. But one could certainly argue that such phrases were merely an expression of Vlad's empathy for the monks of Hilandar who, like Vlad before them, now found themselves without a benefactor and protector.
he recalls his mother's request and agrees to continue the Branković patronage of Hilandar. Thus, as the once powerful Serbian kingdom shattered under the weight of Turkish occupation and princely in-fighting, the torch of Athonite patronage was passed from Serb to Vlach.

**Wallachian Voivods who patronized Hilandar Monastery**

It is much easier to provide historical background surrounding the patronage of Hilandar monastery on this larger, international scale, than it is to trace the succession of those Wallachian Voivods who served as its benefactors. Vlad Călugărul was placed on the throne of Wallachia by Stephan the Great of Moldavia, who favored the Monk over his infamous brother Vlad Țepeș (Vlad the Impaler). Both Vlads were sons of Vlad Dracul (r. 1435-46), who gave the family its surname after receiving the Order of the Dragon from the Holy Roman Emperor. It is usually Țepeș, though, that is associated with this name, thanks to Bram Stoker's *Dracula*.

Moldavian rulers were less disposed toward Turkish influence in their politics than were some of their Wallachian counterparts. They tried to keep Voivods willing to bow to Turkish demands off the Wallachian throne, in an

---

18In his *Historie des Roumains de la Dacie Trajane* Xenopol incorrectly identifies Vlad the Monk as Vlad Țepeș' son (*fils*).  

19As an example of how difficult a reconstruction of medieval Wallachian family trees and lines of succession is, three different sets of dates are given for the reign of Vlad Dracul: Jeromonah Hilandarac cites 1436-42 and 1443-6; Giurescu and Giurescu cite December 1436-Autumn 1442 and Spring 1443-after November 23 but before December 4, 1447; Iorga cites 1435-December 1446.  

effort to unite the Romanian lands and better fend off the Turks. This is how Vlad the Monk ascended the Wallachian throne in his waning years.

He was quickly succeeded three years later by his son, Radu Cel Mare (Radu the Great), so called by the clergy due to his willingness to protect "des gens d'église." Radu the Great ruled from 1495-1508, and was succeeded by Mihnea Cel Rău (Mihnea the Bad), one of the sons of Vlad Țepeș. Mihnea, installed on the Wallachian throne by the Turks, founded and enriched monasteries, but proved to be cruel and dissipated, and was thus expelled, ruling only from 1508-09. His son Mircea succeeded him and held the throne all of 3 months, ruling from October 1509-January 1510. His successor was a brother of Radu the Great, Vlad Cel Tînăr (Vlad the Young or Vlăduț). His brief reign (1510-12) was marked only by his death at the order of Mohammed, chief of the begs.

The present study will not be concerned with all of these short-lived rulers or their constant palace revolutions. Of the above mentioned Voivods, Vlad the Monk and his sons Radu the Great and Vlad the Young were the only Voivods to make donations to Hilandar Monastery. It is the five edicts they issued respectively between 1492 and 1498 that will be the subject of this study.

---


23 Nicolae Iorga, *A History of Roumania*, 95. The begs were high ranking Turkish officials who had some say in the appointing and "dismissing" of the rulers of their vassal states.
Philology and Paleography

There are no less than thirty edicts issued by Wallachian Voivods in the Hilandar Monastery Library. This study makes use of the five earliest of these documents. Three of these edicts are annual endowment edicts issued to the monastery by the respective Voivod, and two of the documents are land charters, confirming the ownership of patrimony. These edicts are examined in more detail below.

Vlad the Monk's edict of November 1492 is numbered #13 in the Hilandar Monastery Library's Wallachian Edict Collection. Like all of the edicts examined in this study, it is written on parchment using semi-uncial script with elements of cursive. Unlike most of the edicts in the Wallachian edict collection, however, the writing in this edict is oriented like a modern sheet of paper, with the writing going across the short width of the parchment, rather than being oriented horizontally with the writing oriented lengthwise. Because of this the writing is about half the size of that in the other edicts. The seal is no longer present, but the holes where the thread was attached are still visible. The text begins with a large, decorative initial and has a large, decorative signature ligature.
As mentioned above, this edict established the first ties between Wallachia and Hilandar Monastery. Despite its intended function as an endowment edict, this text could arguably stand on its own among other works of medieval Slavic literature.

The author of this text—presumably Vlad Călugărul himself—possessed a high degree of education and literacy. The text begins with a series of quotes—or more accurately paraphrases—from the Bible. He draws heavily from Matthew, specifically chapter 25:14-30, the parable of the master who gave talents to his three servants to invest while he was away. Vlad draws a parallel between himself and these servants who are given the opportunity to make an investment, portraying himself as "the good and faithful servant" mentioned throughout Matthew 21, 23, and 25 who makes wise investments and is loved by his master. The underlying theme in these comparisons is that earthly wisdom and goodness will be matched by heavenly rewards, i.e., a transformation of the earthly into the heavenly.

This high-style portion of the edict is followed by Vlad's recounting of his adoptive mother's request that he assume the duties of benefactor of Hilandar monastery in the absence of any male Branković to carry on this long tradition. He confirms his willingness to take on this responsibility for himself and pass it on to his sons Mircea and Radu after his death. He promises a yearly endowment to the monastery of 5,000 aspri, as long as he and his sons are able to do so.

The edict of March 1497, issued by Radu Cel Mare, son of Vlad the Monk, is numbered #4 in the Hilandar Monastery Library's Wallachian Edict Collection. The seal is no longer present, but the holes where the thread was
attached are still visible. The text begins with a large, very decorative ligature, and has a large, very decorative signature ligature.

In the text of this edict, Radu the Great titles himself not only Voivod of the entire Ugro-Wallachian land, but also Baron of Transylvania and of Amlaș and Făgăraș. He recounts how monks came from Hilandar, bringing with them the November 1492 edict of his father Vlad the Monk, in which Vlad initiated a yearly endowment of 5,000 aspri to the monastery. Radu receives the monks and confirms his father's edict, promising that he will become in his turn the new benefactor of Hilandar monastery and renew his father's endowment. After confirming his endowment, he calls upon those who succeed him on the Wallachian throne, be they from his own family or foreigners, to match—or if the Holy Spirit compels them—or enlarge this yearly endowment to the monastery.

The edict of April 19, 1498, also issued by Radu Cel Mare, is numbered #6 in the Hilandar Monastery Library's Wallachian Edict Collection. The wax seal, which was affixed directly to the document, is no longer present. The text does not conclude with a decorative signature ligature, but with the usual signature ligature rendered in the same hand as the text, only larger.

In the text of this edict, Radu sends his reverence to Abbott Euthemius of Hilandar, whom he refers to as his "visitor and father in the Holy Spirit."

24 Amlaș and Făgăraș were semi-autonomous provinces created by Vlad Dracul on the Transylvanian side of the Carpathians. They were intended to serve as look-out and buffer zone against invaders from the north, but were not always under Wallachian control.

The phrase воивода въся земли оуттроаважском и подоувкуйю is used by some Voivods in the 16th century. It is likely that political considerations and audience determined how Voivods titled themselves in their edicts. See Iorga, "Le Mont Athos et les Pays roumains" p.164-5.

25 Such wording implies that Euthemius is Radu's spiritual advisor, and this may very well be the case, though I was unable to find any references to such a relationship in any of the secondary literature consulted.
and "to the acting abbots, priests, elders, and all the remaining brothers in Christ." In thanks, perhaps, to the brethren, he acknowledges their prayers--in addition to the expected "by the grace of God"--as granting authority to his sovereignty. He recounts Deacon Visarion's arrival, bringing with him "the usual blessing from the holy monastery, as is the custom of the holy monastery." After being informed as to the needs of the monastery, Radu reconfirms his position as benefactor of Hilandar, and grants his annual endowment of 5,000 aspri.

In exchange for his endowment, however, he asks in return that the monks pray for him and his father, and that they record his name in the holy pomjanik26 along with the names of previous benefactors who are now deceased. Furthermore, he asks that the monks bring this edict27 with them the next time they come, so that he can see for himself the endowment he has promised.

The remaining two Wallachian edicts with which this study is concerned are land charters. It is unclear exactly why these are in the Hilandar Monastery Library, as no mention of Hilandar is made in the charters, nor of any persons that can be connected with the monastery. Most likely, the land with which the edicts are concerned was at one point donated to or came under the control of Hilandar and the edicts were retained as proof of ownership.

It is also interesting to note that none of the secondary literature consulted made mention of these documents. It seems Romanian historians

---

26See 11n13.

27The Slavic word used is кнъігоу. Venelin states that this was the usual term for edicts and letters. See Юрий Веленин Влахо-болгарская или дако-славянская граматы (С. Петербургъ: типографія імператорскому російскій академій, 1840): 297.
are interested only in the endowment edicts and ignore land charters such as these. This could be due to the ambiguity of the persons and places named in the charters, the commonness of such charters, and the relative insignificance of the transactions concerned.

The edict of June 7, 1494 was issued by Radu Cel Mare and is unnumbered in the Hilandar Monastery Library's Wallachian Edict Collection. The parchment on which the edict is written is small, about half the size of that usually used for an edict. The parchment was of poor quality when chosen, as evidenced by a hole around which the scribe wrote. The impression given by the handwriting is of a hastily written text. The wax seal, which was affixed directly to the document, is no longer present. There is no decorative initial at the beginning of the text, nor is there a decorative signature ligature, but rather the usual signature ligature rendered in the same hand as the text.

This charter presents some problems with its dating. It is clearly dated 1494 and signed by Radu the Great, yet his reign did not begin until the following year, 1495. He titles himself "Voivod and Sovereign of the entire Ugro-Wallachian land," thus implying that he was on the throne when this charter was issued.

The text of the charter confirms that the Voivod's "servant" Stojan and his brother Vlksan and their sons own a certain plot of land in Soxodol and all the land of Faca Floreau, because they purchased the later from Stančul of Varna for 300 aspri. Before confirming their patrimony, the brothers gave Radu proof of their ownership. The members of the Voivod's court are listed as witnesses.

The land charter of September 15, 1497 was issued by Vlad Cel Tinăr (or Vlăduț "the Young") and is unnumbered in the Hilandar Monastery
Library's Wallachian Edict Collection. The wax seal is no longer present, but the holes where the thread was attached are visible. There is a stain on the right side of the document from the parchment being folded over the seal when stored.

The text of the charter confirms that Vlad's nobleman Master Krstijan, along with his sons and step-sons Stepan and Tepša and their sons own a certain plot of land in Xerča. Due to damage and illegibility, the context of much of the text is lost, thus making translation and comprehension difficult. He further confirms the patrimony of Runkul and lists the properties concerned, which were received from Vlad's uncle, Vlad Voivod. Further clarifications of patrimony ownership are mentioned, as well as the proof of ownership asked by the Voivod before confirming these patrimonies. The members of the Voivod's court are listed as witnesses.

Orthography

All five texts in this study are written in semi-uncial script with elements of cursive. These later features include, among others, the cursive forms of the letters κ, Α, and χ.

The Greek breathing and accent marks `, ˊ, ˋ, ˊ, ˋ, ˊ, are used by the scribes to denote vowels in monosyllabic words and word-initial vowels: ᾦ, ω, σω, αι, ει, οικελει, ηι, ει, δεο. Not all monosyllabic words and word-initial vowels are marked as such, however, and the determining factor in their placement seems to be merely the whim of the scribe. When used within a word, they are usually placed over vowels: πρεξεγολοσενθεν, κυσμαγο, εξεις, ἀγρωλαχισκον, εκτιτορι. The mark ˊ is often placed over the i in the abbreviation ιω (ιοανν).
Mid-linear dots are used by the scribes much like periods. They often appear when the text shifts from one topic to another, after biblical quotes, before contrastive conjunctions, between clauses, etc. They are sometimes helpful in providing context when translating from the Church Slavonic, determining with which clause a nominal pronoun goes, and determining if a conjunction makes a dependent clause of the present clause, or the beginning of a new "sentence."

Titlos appear in two forms: those placed above the linear characters to denote the omission of one or more letters, and those placed above supralinear characters, which may or may not denote omitted characters. Some common occurrences are ͕, ͞, ͔, ͖, ͔, ͞, ͕, ͞, ͗, ͘, and ͙. Most suprascpted characters appear with titlos, but not all: ͕, ͞, ͗, ͘, ͙, ͚, ͛, and ͜. When the last consonant of a word is superscripted, the inflectional ending is often omitted. In some cases, the vowel below (i.e. preceding) the superscripted consonant serves as the inflectional ending as well, and is read before and after the consonant, as the adjectives in instrumental plural in the following example show: ͑, ͒, ͓, ͔, ͕, and ͖. When it is felt necessary to indicate from which edict a particular example is taken, the year of the edict will be given in parentheses following the excerpted example. Since there are two edicts from 1497, their citations will include the month as well.
Pojeroks—supralinear marks used to denote omitted jers—appear mainly between double ι: πρέπεις:μοσμοβέρην, ἔξεχεον, ἡκέν:ναιν, ἡκέν:νοινε, ἡκέν:νοινο. Pojeroks also appear over other consonant clusters as well, sometimes appearing over them in one instance and not in another: μνοξεκτα, δ'γρολακαι, κτισκρι.

The grapheme ω appears in place of ο in word initial position: ὡρή, ω, ὡσιφτρεσα, ὡμης. It also appears in the declensional endings of words with religious significance: μητιωμ, μηπιωμ, άξιωμ, ἀξιελέξιωμ, νικάριω. It appears only rarely in a word-internal position, and then at a morpheme boundary: μηκογκ, δ'κταρσος. The one exception to this is the word ἀφωκτευμ, a word of religious significance. ω is also used exclusively in the proper name ἰαομμ, which appears only in its abbreviated form: ἰῴο.

The grapheme η appears consistently in these edicts in preference to the digraph ωγ: ἐξκρπεθυμ, καλτε, κάνη, κάνα. The digraph ωγ appears only once: ὡγκ (3/1497).

The grapheme γ is used in the Greek word κτρ (1498). It also appears exclusively in place of the graphemes η and ωγ in the proper name παδυλ, (usually written as παδ), with the a appearing as a small circle attached to the left-most vertical line of the γ, as one digraph.

The grapheme Φ appears exclusively in the word ἀφωκτευμ, and as the numeral 9. In all other instances Φ is used: φαγαραψ (3/1497), φαγοψ (1494, 9/1497), φαγα φαρωτά (1494), and ζΔΦ (9/1497).

The grapheme ε sometimes appears in place of ε in word initial position: εζικ, εμθ, εζ, ειν, ειν, ειν, ειν. The only occurrence of ε in non-word initial position is μιλε (1492).
The nasal vowel graphemes appear infrequently, and then only as a spelling convention. Sometimes they appear in their etymological position, and other times they appear as the result of a spelling rule, i.e. where the scribe uses either nasal vowel character regardless of etymology, as seen in many Middle Bulgarian texts. The grapheme `<` appears in the following instances: `μιτίξ`, `εξτ`, `ομαδαξψ`, `Γεδώξψ`, `πρισερτώξ`, `πριλᾶπιψ`, `νενοτχνορένννν`, `εξαξψιπν`, and `Δένξα`. All but the first two examples are found in the edict of 3/1497. The last example especially shows this particular scribe's knowledge of Euthemian spelling rules, as he puts the nasal vowel characters in the order prescribed for two nasals occurring side-by-side.

The grapheme `α` occurs only twice within the text of the edicts: `εα`, and `Δένξα` (3/1497). It is also found in the signature ligature at the bottom of each text in the phrase `ΜΑΤίων ΕΞίων ΓΝύλ`. This is of course a frozen spelling form preserved in a stock phrase used in such documents, but it is interesting to note that when this phrase occurs within the text of the edicts it appears in its later form: `ΜΤίων ΕΞίων`.29

_Jers_ are still written in their etymological positions in some words, no doubt frozen forms which have resulted from spelling rules. Such spelling rules maintain that only back _jers_ be written in a word, regardless of whether or not the etymological vowel was a front _jer_.

Back _jers_ fall into two main groups: those spelled in prepositions and prefixes, and those spelled after liquids.30 Examples of the former include `εζικ`, `κζ`, `ρζ`, `ζικ`, `ρζινδιεν`, `ρζισταλδιγχ`, `ρζισονενινι`, `ρζεδετιξει`, `εζργεννιει`, and `εζρεδενια`. Examples of _jers_ spelled after

---

29 See the section on Morphology below.

the liquids /r/ and /l/ include ἀράγκεσθαι, σεραγκεῖν, σεραγκεῖνοι, 
στεράδετε, σεράδετε, καλάζετε, and καλάζωσανος among others.

Other spellings with jers worth noting include μνοζάτστα, τράζαζεν, 
and насторзк.

Front jers are spelled only in word final position: ἀλ ἀλ, ἄλ ἄλ, ἄλ ἄλ, 
ἀλ ἀλ, and σῆ. If this spelling of ἀ was in accordance with a spelling rule, it 
was not always observed, as the following pairs are found in the texts: 
σῆ- 
σῆ, ραδῦλ-ραδῦλ, and ἀζ-ἀζ.

In what appears to be adherence to another spelling rule, the 
grapheme ἀ appears in place of η, ά, and ἀ (tense jers) when preceding 
another vowel: εἰνζί, εἰνζί, τία, εἰνζίο, ποκλονεῑε, 
εἰνζίε, εἰνζίε, ὑειζίαε, πίζαία, πίζαία. Instances of ἀ appearing before a 
consonant or in word final position are limited to a few common words: 
ροδίτε, ραδί, μοναστί, ἡδοῑνε, and αἴἱ. The scribe of the edict of 3/1497 
uses ἀ in the verb ἡζώδαντι twice: ἡζαῖε and ἡζαί. The scribe of the 
edict of 1498 is somewhat freer with his use of ἀ, as in the following examples: 
ἰζε (2x), ἰ (conjunction), and ἀπρίδα. Conversely, the scribe of the edict of 
1494 uses ἀ only twice (ροδίτε, and ραδί), and is either unaware of the 
spelling rule or ignores it, and uses ἀ in front of other vowels: 
ἐρατίκα, 
ἐζσίε, σις, κεδέςειε. The only other instances of -ἱε occurring are found 
in two occurrences of the form ἀζσρεῖεξοι in the edict of 1492. There is one 
ocurrence of -ἱι: 
κλαδίκι (1492).

As is obvious from some of the above cited examples, jotation of a 
vowel preceded by another vowel is not strictly observed. In fact, jotation of a 
vowel in postvocalic position seems the exception rather than the rule.
Almost all the edicts examined here contain instances of the same word occurring once with a jotated vowel and another time without jotation, i.e., писанію—писаніа (1492), and ератію—ератіа (9/1497).
CHAPTER IV
LINGUISTIC EXAMINATION OF THE WALLACHIAN CHANCERY LANGUAGE

Phonology

The merger of the phoneme /y/ with /i/ is indicative of the South Slavic recension of these edicts. The grapheme ω appears in only a few frozen forms: πακυ, σαμίσμακυ (several tenses of this verb appear), ναβύκνιςτες, κυ, χυσμαγος, κυ, and κλαδκυς appear in the edict of 1492; τρεμυ enters the edict of 1494, and εγούτνις and χριτολομενις in the edict of 3/1497. The edicts of 1498 and 9/1497 contain no instances of ω. It is noteworthy that in half the occurrences of ω it is written with one or another of the Greek breathing marks over it. This is probably the scribes' way of marking this letter as being somehow "different" or of showing their uncertainty in its use. There are a few instances of scribes writing η for ω:

εισιτις appears once in each edict except for 1498, and the form σαμεσεω appears in 3/1497.

The reflex d+j>α also points to the South Slavic recension used in these edicts. Examples include πρατζάς, κανάζας, and γούναζας.

The reflexes of the nasal vowels are x>8 and ά>ε. As noted above, the nasal vowel characters are preserved only in spelling rules and even then they appear rarely. Examples of x>8 include μάθε, ράθε, καθαμάθε, καθαμάθε (μ>α), κεκίσε μάτιος, καθαμάθε, and δεκσίου. Examples of ά>ε include εζίκκ, κανέλα, καμίσες, πρινδώσε and εε (reflexive particle).
Many jats still appear in their etymological positions: ἔρως, ἀκτό, ἀστίττικε, γράμμα, ἐννοοε, ἑκάστηπτ, ἑορτάνυς, πρεκτετίχ. In other instances the reflex η>ε is found: παραλείπε, πρέανη, ητήνο, ποτεέα. The spellings δοερή and δοερε are found in different edicts, and the pair εξεψανείς-εξεψανο is found in the edict of 3/1497. Such variations in spelling, and especially the existence of the above mentioned pairs, indicates that jat is no longer pronounced as it once was, but has shifted and merged with /ε/. Thus, those words where jat is still spelled η have to be considered the results of the conservative nature of the written language. Those words where jat is spelled ε reflect the incursion of the spoken language into the written language.

The confusion of the vowel pair -οε and -οη occurs in the word ΡΟΕΡΟΔ. This is no doubt another incursion of the spoken language into the written language. The most likely explanation is je>j, as seen in modern Serbo-Croatian vojvoda. But since there was no letter at that time to represent jot, the scribes simply used η, which was the closest their orthography came to a jot. When pronounced quickly, ΡΟΕΡΟΔ no doubt came out as [vojvod] rather than [vojevod], thus leading the scribes to spell it as they spoke it: ΡΟΗΡΟΔ. There are three occurrences of this misspelling, two in 9/1497 and one in 3/1497, though the scribe of 3/1497 also spells it correctly once. In the signature ligature of all the documents ΡΟΕΡΟΔ is spelled correctly.

The confusion of ε and η occurs twice in 1498, both times in the word ἱρυσκεν, which the scribe spells ΕΡΥΣΚΕΝ. These are the only occurrence of this word in any of the edicts, so it cannot be determined whether it was also sometimes spelled correctly or not.
There is one occurrence of a confusion of ѣ for о. The scribe of the edict of 1498 misspells ὡροδαβες as ὡρδαβες.

The word сіονομεσіі occurs in three of the edicts and is spelled differently in each one of them. The scribe of 1492 spells it correctly as сіονομεσіі, the scribe of 1498 gives сіονομεςіі and the scribe of 3/1497 gives сіонемесіі. Such variance in spelling is surprising, given the obvious use of прєждпіі сіономесяшіи ὡο as a stock phrase in edicts of endowment. A survey of 16th century Wallachian edicts shows the correct spelling to be predominant, though there are occasional spellings as сіономесяшіі, which may be a result of influence of the verb ποσειςіі. This dichotomy in spelling indicates a confusion of е and η in this particular word. The spelling of сіонемесіі given by the scribe of 3/1497 is then either a confusion of both е and η as well as е and о, or more likely, simply a case of scribal inattentiveness.

**Morphology**

Herein comment will be made not on the entire declension system and all the inflections encountered, but rather, only those forms which are unexpected, problematic, or linguistically interesting.

A dichotomy exists in adjectival and possessive pronoun endings of feminine locative/dative singular. The expected ending of -ᵗθη is encountered, as well as the ending -οη: сіоθη-сіοη. The -οη ending is no doubt a generalization from the demonstrative pronoun τοη to the adjective and possessive pronoun endings. The expected ending is preserved only in

---

31 See Djamno-Diaconă p.130.
formulaic parts of the text, and only in words of religious significance: στής, αφοντίς, πρέστις, πρέττις, and πρέειςολοκενδής.

But even these formulaic, stock phrases are not free of the influence of the new endings, as seen in this passage from 1498: το ἀλατί εἷοςιν, and in this passage from 1492, where both endings are used: ἕνε ρξα στόις γορτ αφοντίς. In a later, less formulaic portion of the text of 1492 the scribe makes free use of the -oH ending: το ἐλκέλεντε πρεσταλεύσιν εξεύτνον ἤ ἐλκέλενοσ ανείς ἐκεύνον γῆςιν καὶ γῆςιν καὶ ἔςαις νᾶςος μάρης. These examples demonstrate the degree to which the new ending has pervaded the spoken as well as the written language. Its widespread use is indicative of its popularity with the scribes, due probably to the fact that velars do not undergo the second palatalization before back vowels, thus saving the scribes the trouble of having to do so.

This last example cited above also demonstrates the generalization of the -oH ending to the possessive pronouns as well, where νᾶςον has replaced the expected νᾶςει. This expected form is not encountered at all in any of the five edicts examined here. Thus the form νᾶςον occurs in the formulaic parts of the text, alongside adjectives in -τίς: πρέστις καὶ πρέττις καὶ πρέειςολοκενδής ἐκανεύσες νᾶςον θείς καὶ προδατινός μαρίν.32 This stock phrase appears--with slight variation in the wording--in all three endowment edicts, and all three contain the form νᾶςον. This form also occurs in the phrase τὸ νᾶςον σαυρλίς (1492); ἰς ἐλάκων ζεμίς (3/1497); and νᾶςον ποταυνεις νᾶςον στοτί (1498). The only exception to this form occurs in the edict of 1498, in the phrase ἰς νᾶςίς ἐλᾶα.33

32Djam-Diakonić cites νᾶςει here (p.138), though the form in the text is clearly νᾶςον.
The masculine dative singular adjective endings also exhibit a generalized ending from the demonstrative pronoun ὑμεῖς. Instead of the expected ending of -ος or -οςκοιμος, only the generalized ending -ος is found. Examples include ἐξεκτομ, ἐξηνομ, ἡτημ, ἡτηςωμος. As with the feminine dative/locative, these new, generalized endings are seen even in the most conservative portions of the texts.

The feminine i-stem instrumental singular exhibits a generalized ending from the masculine o-stems of -ομ. This is most often seen in the phrase ματιε ἔξιο. The edicts of 3/1497, 4/1497, and 1494 all exhibit this form. Only the edict of 1492 contains the expected ending of ἔξιο ματιε, accounting of course for ι > ιο as noted above.

The masculine u-stem noun σουζ exhibits an extended stem in all examples found except for the nominative singular, where both σουζ and σουι are written. The instrumental plural form σζ σουωσ is found in the edicts of 1492 and 1494, in place of the expected σουωσ or σουζζ. The edict of 1497 gives three variants of the instrumental plural: σζ σουωσ, σζ σουωσ, and σζ σουωσ. The edict of 1494 also contains the form σζ σουωσ. The expected σουωσ is not found. The only "correct" declension of σουζ is the nominative plural σουοιε in the edict of 1492. The appearance of this last form is rather unexpected, as Venelin notes that in almost all Wallachian edicts, σουωσ is found in place of σουοιε. Clearly all the examples herein show that the extended stem with the suffix -οσ has been generalized to all forms of the plural, regardless of case.

33See Djamo-Diaconită pp.117-21.
34Venelin, p.136.
As for the variance in inflectional endings in the instrumental plural, the ending -HW may be a hybrid form of H from the H/Ω of o-stem nouns and -HW of other declensional classes. Since at this time the Serbian instrumental, dative, and locative plurals were in the process of being generalized into one common ending for all, this state of flux in the language may explain the plethora of endings. The absence of the Serbian instrumental plural -HW in these texts indicates that the endings have not yet been fully generalized, and are yet in a continued state of transition.

The masculine noun ᵃאוגוסט is consistently declined with an ε in the genitive singular in place of the expected ᵃ postpone. Djamo-Diaconita attributes this to the influence of the Serbian feminine genitive.35 Note also that the genitive singular of ᵃ postpone is given as ᵃ postpone (1492).

There is a dichotomy found in the forms of the first person plural aorist ending. Along with the expected -xομε (spelled herein without the jεr), there is also -xοπ. Djamo-Diaconita attributes this later form to Serbian influence, considering it a "contamination" of the endings -xοε and -εο36 (see the section on Serbian influence below). Only the three endowment charters contain second person plural aorists, all the result of the use of the "royal we" in the text.

The three edicts display a varying usage of these two forms. The edict of 1498 has only the form with -xοπ, while the edict of 1492 contains only the expected Church Slavonic form with -xομε. The edict of 3/1497 makes use of the Church Slavonic form in the more formal, opening portion of the edict, and then switches over to the -xοπ form in the less formal portion. The

---

35Djamo-Diaconita, 120.
36Djamo-Diaconita, 209.
appearance of these two forms of the aorist ending in the distribution described indicates that the new -$\chi$w ending has most likely already pervaded the written language. The continued use of the Church Slavonic form of the aorist ending is indicative of the scribes' conscious efforts to use the "proper" form in passages they consider to be formal or of a high style.

Lexicon

There are several lexical items which appear in the texts which are either specific to Wallachian recension or merit special comment.

The first of these words is $\omega$ax$\xi$ (1494). Hasdeu gives the following account of this word:

In Paleoslavic Lexicon, in which all the Slavo-Romanian terms are recorded, Miklosich and Venelin forgot or didn't want to include ohabâ "oxaâx" in their dictionaries; uric though appears (Lex., 1063) as being identified with the paleoslavic uroku "ouroko," which means "sententia" and with Hungarian órôk "aeternus"; and following Miklosich, Cihac (II, 441) repeated the same etymology which is totally wrong and he also leaves out ohabâ like Miklosich.

Wallachian ohabâ means "food" from the Bulgarian ohap - uhap "to bite," the action of "biting" and that of "food" which was confused exactly like in the paleoslavic $\chi$xc "to bite, to eat" (Mikl., Lex., 329). In the old Wallacho-Slavic texts, starting for example with those of Mircea Cel Mare from 1387 and 1399 (Venelin, Влахо-болгарска граматы, p. 19, 26), the expression да ест на охабâ or да имите въ охабâ has no other meaning but "to be for food," "so have it for food," "to subsist." Only through giving this means of sustenance as a hereditary right could the word ohabâ get the meaning of "inheritance." 37

It is interesting that neither Miklosich nor Venelin include $\omega$ax$\xi$ in their works--especially given its Slavic etymology--and that the only source that treats this word is a Romanian etymological dictionary. Even

contemporary Romanian-Romanian dictionaries include the term ohabă. The following entry is taken from DEX:

**Ohabă**, ohabe, fem., (not used) 1. Estate (hereditary) inalienable, exempt from taxes or other financial obligations. 2. Term for boyars' and monasteries' immunity in medieval Wallachia. From Old Church Slavic.38

The omission of ωxas:8 by Miklosich and Venelin may be due to the limited geographic range of the use of this word. As Hasdeu points out, ωxas:8 was only used in Slavo-Romanian texts written in Wallachia, just as the word ωyrozk was specific to Slavo-Romanian texts written in Moldavia. In the above cited entry by Hasdeu, the etymology of this later word is given. Its etymology and semantic generalization over time is just as interesting as that of ωxas:8, but beyond the focus of this study.

Thus we see that the phrase Δα ἦ ζΥΗΗΙ οδόνας:8 η (1494) means that the patrimonies being confirmed by the Voivod are to be hereditary and exempt from taxes (versus the patrimony confirmed in the edict of 9/1497 which is not said to be ωxas:8, i.e. hereditary and exempt from taxes).39

The phrase запланинський страмауз is not specific to Wallachian OCS texts per se, but is so specific in its meaning that one must know the origin of the text in order to understand the term. This phrase appears in the edict of 3/1497 in the sentence ζεπланинський страмауз η φαγαρашь xερψε. Venelin explains the term as follows:

запланинський страмауз. In mountainous Slavic countries планина (полонина in Carpatho-Russia) means that which the Latin peoples call the Alps. Запланинський страмауз or Запланинськь, 38Dictionarul Explicativ Al Limbii române, s.v. "ohabă." Translation by Boțoman and me.

39Note the double use of the dative pronoun in showing possession.
here in the Bessarabian sense, means Transylvania. Thus even in Hungary, on the other hand, they call Wallachia (in Latin, in the historical sense) Dacia Trans-Alpina. But here our work is concerned with the meaning of the name in the sense of the inhabitants of Bessarabia and Moldavia. Trans-Sylvania (it can be Залесье in Russian) means firstly the large western part of Wallachia; Transylvania proper is Sylvania, i.e. forested country: therefore the Hungarians and Magyars correctly call it Erdely (Эрдэйль "forested country") from erdő "forest." For that reason even the Transylvanian Wallachians call it thus (Ардякъ). Conversely, the Hungarian Slavs call it Седми-городскою землею, or Седмиградами (Sedmihrady, Semihrady). Even the Germans took Siebenbürger from the Slavs. Thus Transylvania, though an unnatural word, was accepted out of necessity, as the Latin equivalent of its name. Inhabitants of Moldavia and Wallachia for their part called it Запланенскимъ: in all of the following edicts Transylvania--and even the eastern part of Hungary--is referred to by this name. Thus still today Bucharest Bulgarians often say: "We fled from the Turks across the Alps" (преко Планину), or "to the Alps" (за Планину), i.e. "to Transylvania" (въ Трансильванию), or if from Little Wallachia, then "to Hungary" (въ Венгрию).

These names of Transylvania and Hungary, necessitated by location, were in use not only from the side of Bessarabia and Wallachia, but also from the side of Moldavia and Rus' (Подолья), thus, to both one and the other side the trans-Carpathian country was Запланиньемъ, just as once Romania in Bulgarian became the same as Загорьемъ.40

While the etymology and historical use of this term are obviously interesting from a linguistic perspective, the historical significance of these names for countries (cited above) and their use must not be overlooked. Such names as Седми-городскою землею and Запланиньемъ reflect an as yet simple world view on the part of the inhabitants of Central Europe. If for the Wallachians their nearest neighbor to the north was known simply as "the country across the mountains," one wonders if their world view in the late 15th century allowed them to understand the significance of their stand against the Ottomans which spared Western Europe "500 years under the Turks."

---

40 Venelin, pp.20-1. Translation mine.
While not specific to Wallachian texts, the titles of the members of the Voivod's court merit comment. These titles appear in the edicts of 1494 and 9/1497 (see Appendices B and D below). Most of these titles are of foreign origin, which the Wallachians took from the Bulgarians who previously adopted them from the Byzantine court. While Miklosich gives the Latin equivalents of the titles, Venelin gives a more detailed history of the word, sometimes including its etymology, as well as a description of the duties of the particular nobleman, and an overview of the history of the adoption of court customs from Byzantium. Djamo-Diaconită too gives a description of the duties of the courtier, but not in as much detail as Venelin. In some cases Venelin notes alternative forms of the word which appear in Moldavian edicts.

The word *kon* appears twice: ο γεω μη δαςοσε κο (1494) and ο γεω μη κο ν μη κο (9/1497). Djamo-Diaconită translated the former sentence as "and to me they gave a horse." At first this translation seemed acceptable, assuming the existence of a barter system by which Voivods asked the price of a horse in return for granting tax free, hereditary patrimony.

---

41 I do not provide a listing of these titles here, as the reader can find them in the transcriptions of the texts provided, as well as find their corresponding English equivalent in the translation provided. Translating these titles proved somewhat problematic, as many of the courtiers' duties were wide and various, making it difficult to encompass all these duties in an equivalent English title. Additionally, different scholars sometimes gave different descriptions of the duties of a particular courtier, further complicating the translation process. I based my translations primarily on the Russian translations of the titles given by Venelin and the Romanian translation given by Djamo-Diaconită. In one instance I consulted the *Glossarium ad Scriptores Mediae & Infimae Graecitatis*. I am grateful to Dr. Bopman and Dr. Collins for their help in translating these titles.

42 See Venelin, pp. 191-201.

43 See Djamo-Diaconită, pp. 337-350. Note that she includes these titles in the section "Serbo-Croatian Influence."

44 Djamo-Diaconită, p.98. Translation by Boțoman.
Venelin, however, offers a much better interpretation. Citing two sentences which match the above two almost verbatim, he explains that "конц here means an authentic, true, or legal act or document of transaction."45 This then changes the meaning of the first cited sentence from "and to Us they gave a horse" to "and they gave Us legal proof [that this is indeed their patrimonial land]." Similarly, the second sentence cited above would read "and We asked of them legal proof [that this is indeed their patrimonial land]." Venelin explains the use of nominative рrпм in the first sentence in place of the expected dative рrпм as scribal carelessness.46

This explanation of конц fits perfectly with the context of the land charters and does not require us to assume a barter system necessary to explain Djamo-Diaconitā's translation of конц as "horse."47 The application of Ockham's razor shows that Venelin offers the better explanation of the use of конц.

The word српнза is used in all three of the endowment edicts in the phrase н е ратил крое ъ роке српнза по ы п рпм. This word--like окас8 above--proved to be problematic. Даниц included this word in his dictionary and cites examples of its use, but only gives the Latin expensa by way of definition.48 Venelin offered the following definition: "Expenses, support, from Latin expensa. It is remarkable that even the Poles often use the word

45Venelin, p.112. Translation mine. Venelin goes on to give a detailed etymological examination of this word and its use in this context cited above.

46Venelin, p.143.

47I feel it is necessary to state that Djamo-Diaconitā can hardly be faulted for her rendering of the cited passage, given the unusual and highly specialized use of the term конц in this context.

48Djuro Dančić, Рječnik iz književnih starina srpskih, s.v. "српнза."
His explanation seems acceptable if one assumes the Voivods were willing to cover the cost of the monks' travel from Mount Athos to Wallachia. Additionally, it is interesting that 

\( \text{cn\v{c}na} \) appears in the accusative case without the expected prepositions \( n\text{a} \) or \( z\text{a} \).\(^{50}\) Nevertheless, Venelin's explanation fits the given context and is acceptable.

---

\(^{49}\)Venelin, p.157. Translation mine.

\(^{50}\)Danci\v{c}, however, does cite one example with the use of \( z\text{a} \).
CHAPTER V
SERBIAN, BULGARIAN, AND ROMANIAN INFLUENCE IN THE WALLACHIAN CHANCERY LANGUAGE

Serbian Influence

Up to this point in the present study the South Slavic recension of the Wallachian OCS chancery language has been noted, including the emergence of $i$ with $u$, the reflexes of the nasal vowels $x > 8$ and $a > e$, and the reflex $d + j > x a$. While several instances of Serbian influence have been pointed out above, additional examples of Serbian influence are examined in more detail below.

The Serbian substitution of the preposition/prefix $8$ for $a z$ is encountered several times. The scribes of all three endowment edicts use $8 z h w a t$ rather than $a z z h w a t$. The scribe of 1492 also uses the form $8 z a r a k x i$ rather than $a z z a r a k x i$. The scribe of 1498 uses $8$ in place of $a z$ both as a preposition and a prefix: $8 n i s h e t e m i a z p r e z h a m i a x e x i o r h a i 8 s t i$ $p o m z h i$. Finally, the scribe of 3/1497 writes $a o k a e c i o s a z h i e n 8 g e g a r a t i$.

---

51 It should be pointed out that some of the features which I have labeled as Serbian may also be features of western Bulgarian dialects. In my use of the term "Serbian" I have in mind not only the eastern Serbian dialects, but the Serbian literary language as well.

52 This has been pointed out in part to emphasize that there are no East Slavic features found in the Wallachian chancery language, whereas the Moldavian chancery language—-from the 10th century on and especially after the 14th century—-used a variety of Russo-Ukrainian-Slavonic. See G. Mihăilă, "Istoricul studierii limbii ruse în România," Romanoslavica 18 (1972): 321.
This last example also exhibits the use of the Serbian first person plural present form of the verb вити: смо. Other instances of its use include 

\[ \text{напос касмо} \] (1492); \[ \text{ко живе касмо} \] и \[ \text{гозо касмо} \] (1492); and \[ \text{и џо се симо касела сима ностиро не потворемо симо држати.} \]

The later example exhibits the use of the Serbian future tense. This is formed by using the short form of the first person plural of the auxiliary verb \[ \text{хтати} \] plus an infinitive: \[ \text{смо држати.} \] The expected Church Slavonic form \[ \text{хостева} \] is not found in any of the documents.

Other examples of Serbian first person plural verb forms include \[ \text{да донесо} \] и \[ \text{сино кинйо} \] \[ \text{да ваньо џо касо касела} \] (1498); \[ \text{касело се еико ен по сим} \] \[ \text{едемо} \] (1498); and \[ \text{дасе назовемо хтитори сима ностиро} \] (3/1497).

The second person plural aorist ending \[ \text{-хмо} \] was commented upon briefly above. Djamo-Diaconită--citing Bernštejn\(^{53}\)--attributed this to Serbian influence. Bernštejn notes the parallel use of this form in the edicts with present tense forms in \[ \text{-мо}. \] He attributes the appearance of this later form to the Serbian literary language, via a contamination of the forms \[ \text{-хме} \] and \[ \text{-смо} \] (as noted above). As to the spoken use of \[ \text{-хмо} \] in the dialects, Bernštejn points out that

The form \[ \text{-хмо} \] was, undoubtedly, literary. The Wallachian Slavic dialects, of course, did not know it. But we would have difficulty in defining it as only a written form. Edicts testify that in the course of the greater part of the 15th century it was almost the only form.

---

\(^{53}\) В. Бернштейн Разыскания в области болгарской исторической диалектологии. Том I, (москва: издательство академии наук СССР, 1948) 209.
The form \( -\text{XMO} \) appeared in several north-western dialects (see Todorov, p. 361). The form is of later origin. We have no basis for attributing it to the 14th century.\(^{54}\)

Bernštejn's explanation may be somewhat overgeneralized. If such forms were both written as well as spoken—as he admits—how can we be so sure that these forms were unknown to the Slavic dialects of Wallachia? The large influx of Serbian forms into the Wallachian chancery language suggests that this influence was most likely motivated by both literary as well as vernacular forces.

If only literary influence were involved, we would expect to see a return to the previous Church Slavonic forms, much like Russian texts show a return of Russian forms once the second South Slavic influence was no longer active. This, however, is not the case with the Wallachian texts, and a chronological examination of them shows the adoption of more and more Serbian features into the chancery language at the expense of the previous Church Slavonic forms. The permanence of these new forms suggests the reinforcement of their adoption by the spoken language, i.e. the Wallachian Slavic dialects, which were most likely undergoing a "Serbianization" much like the written language. The consistency of this Serbianization—as evidenced by the appearance of Serbian verb forms in the past, present, and future tenses—also points toward influence from the spoken language.\(^{55}\)

\(^{54}\)Bernštejn, p. 209. Translation mine.

\(^{55}\)That is, we would expect the newly adopted \(-\text{MO}\) ending to become generalized throughout the verbal paradigm in the spoken language much more quickly than in the chancery language. As Bernštejn himself points out, the aorist in \(-\text{XMO}\) appears at the same time as does the present tense ending \(-\text{MO}\). This suggests that it had probably already been generalized throughout the verbal paradigm in the spoken language and its appearance in the texts is a reflection of this. Otherwise, given a purely literary influence, we would not necessarily expect the new ending to appear in all the tenses at once.
Attempting to determine the amount of influence exerted respectively by the literary and vernacular languages on the chancery language would be unnecessarily splitting hairs, and most likely unproductive. Clearly, however, there is more at work here than a mere adoption of written or "literary" forms.

The Serbian term for "uncle on one's mother's side" (i.e., mother's brother)—gkla—is found in the edict of 1497: тiмa вzё &д e читам г вика га. The edict of 3/1497 contains possessive pronouns inflected with the Serbian ending -єга in place of the expected -єгo. They are found in the passages в кашегa срiпiцa пiдa, and 3 вешанiє ёогa рiтец. It is likely that this ending was only newly introduced into the written language in the late 15th century, as these two occurrences are the only two found, and there is no appearance of the accusative/genitive masculine singular personal pronoun єгa from which this ending could have been generalized.

The expected ending -єгo occurs twice in the edict of 1492: вжиди вd раdо в єго своегo, and да своєм єго вже в деснiю своегo престоiжна. The Serbian metathesized form of вzє—cba—appears in the edict of 1494: дa в е 8 сoхoдo в петm дe поповиiг кoлiкo в е в дe стaвiло в фaца форiцo cва. It is also used twice in the edict of 1498: в нa рoгi в вb понеж є стaра н пpaва wинiв и в пa дiпoницa cва н кoторiм cва. Interestingly enough, it appears in the same sentence with the expected form, вzє. This is yet another example of newer, Serbian forms entering the chancery language.
Bulgarian Influence

Obvious Bulgarian influence is far less frequent than Serbian influence. The Bulgarian relative pronoun *контъ* appears in the edicts of 1492 and 1497 in the same phrase each time: `и спея ератъ контъ` досходъ да 8имаш оро. This is the only occurrences of the pronoun *контъ*, as normally the relative pronoun *еъе* or *иъе* is used.

The edict of 1492 also makes use of the adverb *наноситъ* in its Bulgarian meaning of "recently," rather than the Church Slavonic meaning of "finally": `вестива и еготини гръчъ сръбски и еженинъ хито` наноситъ.

Finally, in the edict of 1494, the Bulgarian preposition *съ* appears: `съм съ ератъ си вакся съ съвъиъ`. This example also shows the use of the Bulgarian dative reflexive pronoun *съ* used to show possession.

Romanian Influence

Romanian influence is seen in adjectival endings, where the scribe modifies a Slavic noun of masculine or neuter gender with a feminine adjectival inflection. This is due to the scribe forgetting that while *манастиръ* is feminine in Romanian, *монастиръ* in Slavic is masculine. The following example is from the edict of 1492: `еъ въ стаа стиъ монастира зовомаго хианда`. This is the only instance of this in the text, and the scribe modifies *монастиръ* with masculine adjectives in all other occurrences.

56Those features I term as Bulgarian here are understood to be Middle Bulgarian. Obviously, the majority of the language used in the edicts could be called Old Bulgarian or Bulgarian Church Slavonic instead of simply "Church Slavonic".

57See Djamo-Diaconită p. 183.

58Djamo-Diaconita p. 314.
Another such example occurs in the edict of 1494. The scribe, influenced by the Romanian feminine noun *parte*, modifies Slavic *де а* with a feminine adjective in one instance, but then uses a masculine past participle in the second: 

\[
\text{де } \text{н } \text{е } \text{т } \text{а } \text{в } \text{о } \text{х } \text{о } \text{д } \text{о } \text{o } \text{п } \text{е } \text{т } \text{n} \text{е } \text{п } \text{o } \text{л } \text{о } \text{в } \text{n } \text{в } \text{ь} \text{ы } \text{k} \text{o } \text{l } \text{i } \text{k } \text{o } \text{е } \text{т} \text{ь}
\]

In the edict of 1498, the scribe is influenced by Romanian *vreme* and modifies Slavic *рёме* with a feminine pronoun: 

\[
\text{н } \text{п } \text{а } \text{д } \text{е } \text{в } \text{е } \text{н } \text{е} \text{м} \text{ь } \text{д } \text{а}
\]

The Romanian preposition *пд*, meaning "on," is confused with Slavic *но* in the edict of 9/1497: 

\[
\text{н } \text{п } \text{д } \text{в } \text{л } \text{д } \text{е } \text{в } \text{е } \text{н } \text{ь } \text{ь } \text{п } \text{о } \text{д } \text{т } \text{р } \text{ь}
\]

"and half of Vlădeșești on the Motra River".

It is evident from these examples that one cannot ignore the role of the scribe and his mastery (or lack thereof) of the chancery language when looking for explanations to linguistic anomalies in Romano-Slavic medieval texts. Based on the infiltration of Romanian elements in medieval Romano-Slavic texts, Djamo-Diaconită concludes that the authors must have been bilingual Romanians and not Slavs, since they thought in Romanian and translated into Slavonic. Similarly, Bârsănescu believes that scribes and copyists of the 14th and 15th centuries were Romanian because they sometimes supplied a Romanian word in place of a Slavic or Greek one.

59Djamo-Diaconită p.316.

60Djamo-Diaconită p.320.

61Djamo-Diaconită p.306

Additionally, as noted above, MacRobert cites such texts for "instances of ungrammaticality which could be due to an imperfect knowledge of the language in use."64 This would be consistent with the proposed scenario of Romanian scribes writing in a chancery language of which they are most likely not native speakers. Most of the grammatical mistakes found in the edicts used in this study were instances of inexplicable case usage inconsistent with the grammar. Some of these include the use of the dative when the genitive is expected:65 ἡ ἀκούσαμο ἐε ἐλακό ἐν ἁπ ιατ εδαμο ἦημηχ ἁτο ἀρτεὶδα ᾐτῆς ῶ (1498); use of nominative when instrumental is expected: στόμ σε ἐπατής ει (1494); use of the accusative when the genitive is expected: ά ι να αροδο κα. ἑκας (9/1497); and use of the genitive when nominative is expected: άν ἀ ντ φατ σ一字 ἀτ ητί ἁ ε ἁνορίπι (1494 and 9/1497).

Concerning this last example, it is worth noting that Venelin attributes such misuses of the letter Ơ (as in ἁνορίπι) to Bulgarian influence. He has in mind the difference between spelling and pronunciation caused by devoicing of unstressed vowels.66 At the same time, though, he points out that -u is a common noun ending in Romanian, and this too may account for some inexplicable uses of the letter Ơ.

Another mistake consistently made appears in all three of the endowment edicts in the stock phrase ἁ πρὸκε ἐπατία ἂ στρο ὑματηρα 63Stefan Bărsănescu, Pagini nescrise din istoria culturii românești (București: 1971) 24-27, quoted in Irina Livezeanu, "Slavonism: The High Culture of a Non-Slavic People," unpublished seminar paper, the University of Michigan, 1979.

64C. M. MacRobert, 13.

65See Schmalstieg, p.188 for occurrences of dative for expected genitive.

66Venelin, pp.139-41.
дадо 83наго оцеро срм8 монастырь. In the edicts of 1492 and 3/1497 his phrase has the first verb in third person singular and the second in third person plural. Obviously the scribes had trouble in deciding whether a collective noun like кративид should take a singular or a plural verb form. The scribe of the edict of 1498 chooses to use the singular and remains consistent in doing so: дадо приходим кративид послана о церко монастырь. дадо 83наго оцеро срм8 монастырь.

All but one of the edicts shows an inconsistent use of a first person singular pronoun or verb form when the second person plural "royal we" is expected. These include и по си оцни срм дадо 83нагие вашон срм (1498)⁶⁷; и го оцн и проти ко (9/1497); сего рао и дадо го го оцн иако до ин оцни оцакеви и (1494 and 9/1497); and и приимоше писаний о цакеви и 83нагие воеро роител (3/1497).

While on occasion the philologist must simply ascribe a linguistic anomaly to scribal error, there are too many mistakes and too many patterns in these edicts to do so here. What has not been done in this study is the careful analysis of all mistakes, unexpected forms, etc., for each text individually. Such a study of each single text would no doubt lend insight into each scribe's relationship with the chancery language, i.e., his tendencies to use Serbianisms, Romanianisms, non-agreement of gender, number, case, and so on. Such a survey might then provide more details, reveal more patterns, providing answers to and lend greater insight into the general overview presented here. By better understanding the authors of medieval Romano-Slavic texts, the texts themselves can be better understood.

⁶⁷It should be pointed out that this example could be the first person plural form of the verb with the final vowel omitted due to suprascripting of the final consonant.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This study has had as its central theme the presentation and description of five late 15th century Wallachian edicts housed in the Hilandar Monastery Library. Emphasis has been placed on linguistic anomalies found in these texts and the explanation thereof. The conclusions which can be made are enumerated below.

1. The Wallachian chancery language--under pressure from the popular spoken language--was in a state of transition in the late 15th century from its former Bulgarian based recension to a recension which exhibits many Serbian features. This is seen in a) the second person plural form of the present, aorist, and nonpast tense (-\(\omega\)); b) the inflection ending -\(ɛ\,r\,a\) of some possessive pronouns; c) the use of the relative pronoun \(ɛ\,r\,a\); and d) the substitution of the preposition/prefix \(ɛ\) for \(\alpha\).

2. The mistakes and innovations found in the formal chancery language in both the conservative, formulaic portions of the text as well as the less formulaic portions are indicative of changes taking place or having taken place in the spoken language which are now in the late 15th century making their appearance in the written language. This includes the generalization of endings from the demonstrative pronouns to adjectives and possessive pronouns, resulting in a generalized masculine dative singular ending in -\(\omega\), and a dichotomy of -\(ɛ\,h\) and -\(ο\,h\) in the feminine locative/dative singular.
3. The influence of Romanian language is present in the text in the form of a) Romanian gender attributed to Slavic words of a different gender, and b) the ungrammaticality found in number, gender, and case agreement. These phenomena lead to the conclusion that the scribes of these texts were Romanians with an imperfect knowledge of the chancery language.
APPENDIX A

The text and English translation of the Hilandar Monastery Wallachian Edict
dated November 1492 (document unnumbered)
въздвѣшьтась елгвонъвь послѣдѣвше писанію рѣшшовъ: мѣті хошъ а не 
жрѣте: і пакѣ ио мѣтинами оуѣщаоосе гръсі і пакѣ вѣжѣнній 
мѣтівъ ібо тѣ пойображені вѣтъ іко и прроукаа дѣланіеівънага оца 
глѣ елже мѣ щилѣ и вѣдѣ нѣ релѣ і се ген.: сціа 86 о ежѣвнаого 
писаніа вѣдѣве: пакѣ слышахъ пррока мѣлопуна дѣи стѣ іко 860 
слышите урѣ і разыбѣтіе: навѣкътѣ сѣдѣ концу земли вѣзнѣтіе 
дрѣженъ мноожѣства: і срѣдѣвше сѣ нардоѣ ѣзъ іко дана елѣ о 86 
дрѣжа вѣ и сила о вѣшнаго разыбѣвше 860 ико вѣцѣ вѣ рѣка вѣжѣн 
сѣ і елико хошѣ 860 конѣко о на подавае мѣ 860 елже і трѣлѣже: 
10 иже егосаніе етво добрѣ 88 растагае: і дѣлает вѣ танкѣ его 
вѣрвушѣнніѣмѣает талан іко 860 вѣлунъ ейъ 860 і слѣкин о 86 
радованія ейъ рать вѣрнѣ вѣндѣ вѣ радѣ 89 86 ого. сціа 860 
слышавше подовѣ нѣ вѣзнѣтіі и вѣдѣннѣ іко мало вѣрмѣнна и 
прѣхова сѣ 86 какоже і гла іко вѣсака слава до вѣрна ельѣ 87 0 подовѣ 
15 на поревновать прѣховѣ егосанѣвѣ и стопопушенѣ гло. иже земныа 
добрѣ острѣвъ е сціа добрѣ прѣпроводише 71 сины земнынмѣ нѣнаа 
приобрѣвѣ ейѣ и сѣ маслѣдовше а земныа земны: 87 оставише: сѣ 860 і 
азѣ иже вѣ зѣ ейѣ стѣновѣрѣвѣ и егосанѣвѣ 87 іо вѣ вѣсова 
ѣжѣю мѣтію мѣ бѣ вѣсѣнѣ 87прѣволахѣ и сѣ. .74 уедан іо раула 
20 вѣсова і мирта желаніе вѣздѣлѣвъ вѣ вѣсѣвѣнѣ вѣжѣмѣ нѣ 

68 73 74 damaged and illegible.
пророческой славы, как бы вразжек желае, еле на истохни вонис ветвьше своему, како раи, 
чаще 75 наши греческое число, во веку, греческое число, все и 
вздымах, стоях, 77 всшестях, и вкрашавах, и чилоах, 
наипае же вже, стоят горе, афонстя, създа, стааго же, и цркаго храма 
и святых престоли и престолу и престоль словеснаго владычнаго наших 
из и приходах царину утнаго и славаго, еже вшедений вже, стояа 
стая, монастыря сторонаго, хильандра, греческое число, 78 всшестях, ое 
греческаго и еженинаго хито, напоследок же изъставуем, 
еягоустоимо гради и урщи царе, и, старости, еже достигуешь, и 
еяженаго коня, ждающо, на всшесто свое, еже, всшесто и еке, вчестях, 
ее више ревенинаго монастыря, изъставитись и еяженаго словеснаго, еже, еко, уеда 
поощренинаго, еко ве стая монастыря ое, всшесто граи, 
смотренный не оставить ни назирать и чиловати и послованhallа хитори прарячатисе, сего 
раи, е я, всшесто всшесто всшесто всшесто, монастыря от еяженаго преставленнаго 
всшесто, еяженаго више ревенинаго гради и урщи и маине наших царе: и сестре ег гради, катакынье, всшесто назиратисе хитори стоях 
монастыря, и чиловати елко есмо ныши сего раи, е я, всшесто и еки на 
христа всшесто, еко да е непотворено стоях монастыря: елко, 
речен всшесто, да е бишь ве, еко на всшесто, ет, стоях монастыря да е 

75 Supralinear 1; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
76 Difficult to read; this is most likely the proper form.
77 Supralinear 1 appears lying on its side.
78 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.
79 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.
80 Supralinear 1; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
81 Supralinear 1; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
14 целех и спеша братья конте доходи да бътхърао форо а Ф. сие елко резно име по силе възмогочно да се дава: оставихо и наши съмвое више рекеяхъм ио раулъв във върхе и ширие. додееже и ши живъм що и
15 Еписьънао еънае нътът на Епосъръвъмъвъната на такоже и наши съмвое по нашон съмърти да творе донде и Елъларъсъ олъ жище и вър
Еподарабанон и власть свои роите. и пръъръто въ. а...83 синъ синъе
а сътъръе икошъ и резко84 и испакъ и понъше и отъръзъе съм
кръсовъ и онъ и въсъдъ кого85 елъ изволи бити намъкстънъ си вище рекеяхъм такъ86 и олъ да понъще и съмъртъ и шумъре. ...87 испакъ88
да шъ да олъ олъ зъде диъна добъръ и ширъа пръъръдовши нена
50 Епъгъа поляути и да сподоби его же о десъдъ своего пръъстъмънъ;
егоше Елъларъсъ90 и на пръъшънъ поляути и съръъвъмънъ91 и Епъоуътииитъ
хънитъ и евътахъ пръътъе владъмъуе наше Ешъ и пръъсъ дъвънъ църе. и
53 съмъ и Епъсъмънъъъъ и въсъ съмъ иже о Елъка Еписьънао въмъ и шъмъ ино
иже въ съмъ монастиръ8

82 Supralinear "i`; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.

83 Illegible.

84 Difficult to read; this is most likely the proper form.

85 Preceding two words difficult to read; these are most likely the proper forms.

86 Difficult to read; this is most likely the proper form.

87 Illegible.

88 Difficult to read; this is most likely the proper form.

89 Supralinear \( \tau \) missing?

90 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.
ω κακοῦ ἑδο διὰ τᾶς ηττῆς καθεὶρος αἰῶνος καὶ νῦν προσφερόμενος καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐν τῷ ἔσθεν ἐκ τῆς ἐντόκες ἐν καὶ στη ὡς ἡμέρα ἐν ἐκ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ ἐκ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ (sic) ἐκ τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ ἐν τῇ ἀλήθειᾳ.
In accordance with the most Holy Scriptures which say "I desire mercy and not a sacrifice," and another, "through mercies sins are cleansed," and again "blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy" and just as the prophetic, spiritually imbued mouth speaks "Blessed is the man who is merciful and all the day finds pleasure in his Lord": these things have thus been learned from the Holy Scriptures. And again, We heard the prophet saying through the Holy Spirit: "Hear ye kings and understand! And all ye judges of the earth! Hearken to those holding the multitudes, and caring for the peoples of the nations, for to you was given power by the Lord and understanding that strength came from on high, and that everything is in the hands of God, Who gives to us as much as He wills." But therefore blessed and thrice blessed is he who invests his God-given wealth well and does so in secret with the talent given to him by God. And thus hearing good things and the sweet voice of rapture, "the good and faithful servant will enter into the joy of his master." Therefore, having heard all this, it is fitting for Us to be concerned with things here, as time is short and transient. Just as it is

---

91Hos. 6:6.


93Matt. 5:7.

94This appears not to be a direct quote, but a paraphrase. Possible sources include Prov. 8:34; Ps. 35:27-8; Matt. 24:45-6; Luke 12:37-8.

95Paraphrase from Ps. 8.


said that there is a time for every glory, it was fitting for Us to take the example of the previous, pious sovereigns now asleep in the Lord who arranged earthly things well, and having managed these things well, by these earthly means obtained heavenly rewards and thus left earthly things behind. Thus even I, who in Christ the Lord am the faithful and pious Ioann Vlad Voivod, by the grace of God sovereign of the entire Ugro-Wallachian land, and with Our children Ioann Radu Voivod and Mircea, felt a zealous desire toward the all-pious, blessed church. In accordance with the glory of the prophets, "like the hart longs for the water brooks," so too because of Our sins the mind of man longs after those pious sovereigns who built and adorned the divine and holy churches and, most of all, who showed mercy toward those which were on Holy Mount Athos. We thus saw—the holy and divine cathedral and monastery of the most holy and most pure and most blessed Lady, our Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary, dedicated to Her honored and glorious feast day, the holiest of holies—that monastery called Hilandar recently orphaned from its pious Serbian sovereigns and blessed benefactors. Recently, the remaining pious sovereign and empress Mara—reaching old age and awaiting the blessed end, and having begun to love Us like her own children, and also having informed Us about this holy monastery mentioned above, and having spoken sweet words as if to her own children about this monastery—expressed a desire that this holy monastery orphaned from its pious sovereigns should not be forgotten, but rather be looked after

---

99 Eccles. 3:1.

100 Ps. 42:1.
and shown mercy and for Us to be declared its next\textsuperscript{101} benefactors. Because of this, We wholeheartedly received the holy monastery upon the blessed death of the above mentioned pious and blessed sovereign and empress and Our mother, Mara, and her sister, the sovereign Cantacuzina, and undertook to name Ourselves benefactors of the holy monastery and show mercy to it in as much as We are able. Therefore, We promised and thus created this Our chrysoboull, to remain unchanged regarding the holy monastery to the extent as We stated, it is possible. Let there be an endowment every year to the holy monastery of an entire 5,000 aspri and a sum of 500 aspri to the brethren who come to take the endowment. This much We declared, in as much as was possible by Our power, and thus let it be so. We leave to Our sons mentioned above, Ioann Radu Voivod and Mircea, as long as we are alive and it will be pleasing to God, those things which God has given Us. Let Our sons act in the same manner after Our death, as long as they receive life from the Lord God and are in their God-given power as were their father and grandfather [before them].\textsuperscript{102} Thus they will do as We have told them and fulfill and honor and confirm this chrysoboull. And let the Lord God honor and preserve and strengthen [all of us]\textsuperscript{103} and fulfill them and all those whom God allows to be successors to those conditions mentioned above. May the Lord God endow such a ruler well with earthly things here, and having spent his time peacefully, may he receive heavenly blessings, and be enabled to stand on

\textsuperscript{101} The word in the text is Последний, but is meant in the sense of "next" or "subsequent."

\textsuperscript{102} Illegible. I have filled in the omitted words based on context for the sake of translation.

\textsuperscript{103} Illegible. I have filled in the omitted words based on context for the sake of translation.
His right side. May this also be received by Us sinners, and may We be numbered among the joyful and honorable other benefactors, through the prayers of the most holy Mother of God, our Lady and Ever-Virgin Mary, and the holy and God-bearing fathers and other holy people who since the age of God-pleasing and honorable hermits have labored and served in the holy monastery since the beginning and to this time in peace of the past and of the future. And may it be thus according to these conditions for as long as the holy monastery shall stand. Amen. Written in November in the year 7001 in the city of Bucharest.

†JOANN RADU VOIVOD BY THE GRACE OF GOD SOVEREIGN
APPENDIX B

The text and English translation of the Hilandar Monastery Wallachian Edict
dated June 7, 1494 (document unnumbered)
† Матиа, в 104 воевода и гна власне земли 8гревлянский
съ влѧ великаго воевода: дава гedo ни сье повеление гeda ни слабе
съ влѧ кратны си влѧкса сь си влѧмъ пако да н е съсходо сь пети де половинъ колико сь еь дя стаюло и фаца флорѣо сь влѧ понѣ
покѣпше сь стаю влѧ варма за сь апрѣ та к с правя она и гedo ни
dарошь кь сего радо хь даходо и гedo ни иако да н оть одинъ хь 106 и
свѣтъ и н вѣстительно и прѣндѣтело и никого не потхорое гeda ни.
свѣтелъ 107 хь па драги дворны хь па крѣнъ виши дяони хь па стиоко
dоготѣ 108. хь па тѣдя витика даю ль дяони строкъ 109 спата бъдя стонѣ
дѣвнитѣ 110 пехарны и палага и драгони стратедини 111 и ась писа въ
зѣфрь въ настонѣ гра евхреци ниа въ аны вѣтѣ.

† Матиа воевода Матиа Ехія Га

---

104 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in
the text.

105 Supralinear І: unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.

106 For an explanation of ωχαβ see the section on Lexicon.

107 тъ appear as one ligature.

108 Supralinear τ probably missing due to damage.

109 тъ appear as one ligature.

110 тъ appear as one ligature.

111 тъ appear as one ligature.
† By the grace of God Ioann Radu Voivod and sovereign of the entire Ugro-Wallachian land, son of Vlad, great Voivod. We the sovereign issue this Our edict to Our servant, Stojan, along with his brother Viksan, and their sons, as they own one half the land from the fifth portion in Soxodol, as much as was the portion of Stančulov, and all the Faca Floreau\textsuperscript{112} land, because they purchased it from Stančul of Vama for 300 aspri. In this they have the rights of patrimony and gave Us legal proof of this. Because of this We gave them their patrimony, to be hereditary and free from taxes, and to their sons and grandsons and great-grandsons. And let no one speak against Us.

Witnesses: Master Dragić the Minister of the Imperial Court, Master Krstijan the former Minister of the Imperial Court, Master Staiko the Scribe, Master Tudor the Treasurer, Dančul the Operations Chief, Stroe the Chief of Military Affairs, Alba the Stolnik, Dumitru the Viticulturist and Radu and Dragomir the Equerries. And I wrote this in the capitol city of Bucharest, the month of June, the 7th day, in the year 7002.

†IOANN RADU VOIVOD BY THE GRACE OF GOD SOVEREIGN

\textsuperscript{112}This may be the name of a village. The exact use here of the Romanian word \textit{făță} ("face") is unclear.

\textsuperscript{113}Tainopis, as yet indecipherable.
APPENDIX C

The text and English translation of Hilandar Monastery Wallachian Edict #4

dated March 1497
вестори стыс монастырь сх предними стопетеши (sic) га и буниньо оро стыс монастырь. да приходи братия та стого монастырь. ката гейне124 на викрию веб да буниньо оро стыс монастырь.125 по га апри и братия кропа. грецка спз8 по га апри тон се дебешао дражати непоткновенно. да е оро стыс монастырь. и ежтвави мников (sic) на потребе. елико е нежда стыс монастырь да се покрепе. на же да е ве втное вжемичание сие се дебешао докле сио жили и гави давати. а по на кого избере га би ети гиб илакон земли. или о нашега срнаго плода. или о нашей србни. или о нероплемени коме да ели етгоеетиви. кто помох и отржди сии хрисов и отржди оро стыс монастырь. иако е зде буниньо или же. настави его ач стин и еще и о више приложити. то таковаго да поняние га би и вкрени ва га е его и ва едации втже. да да емди га би пользовати би гала да же егота мовешив его. е о дениж престола га да споки его апи пи иса мартва ва настани гр. траговнца126 в ак ги.

126

124Supralinear "i"; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.

125p8 appears as one ligature.

126Note that this text says the capitol is Tigoviste, while the texts of 9/1497 and 1494 say that Bucharest is the capitol.

127In the signature ligature there is a decorative character which appears after the words χασα and εασι. The character represents a hand holding a candle, and serves as the a in the former word and the i of the latter.
In Christ the Lord, the faithful, pious, and Christ-loving Ioan Radu Voivod, son of the great Vlad Voivod, by the grace of God and through God's blessed graciousness, possessing and ruling all Ugro-Wallachian land and Baron of Transylvania, Amaśl and Făgăraş: We have deigned for those rewards given to Us from God through an honorable heart to glorify God who glorifies Us. Thus having recalled how many discovered the heavenly through the earthly as the Holy Scriptures attest to, "do your shopping while the market is open." Because of this, We were envious of those who preceded Us, who, having conducted their earthly lives peacefully, thus left earthly things to the earth and attached themselves to heavenly rewards. And We, seeing and hearing this felt the desire to do good for the holy monastery called Hilandar, home to the holy, most pure, and most blessed Lady, our Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary and her honored feast day, the holiest of holies. For there arrived brethren from the holy monastery, and they brought the writing and promise of My father, Vlad Voivod. Because of this, holy fathers, We saw and received the holy monastery with all enthusiasm and promised to declare Ourselves Benefactors to the holy monastery along with the previous benefactors who have gone to sleep in the Lord, and ordered an endowment to the holy monastery. Let the brethren from the holy monastery come every year at the Resurrection of Christ to take the endowment to the holy monastery, in the sum of 5,000 aspri. And to the brethren, besides the endowment, a sum of 500 aspri. This We promised to maintain untouched. Let there be an endowment to the holy monastery and to the blessed hermits for their needs, as much as is necessary for the holy monastery to strengthen

---

128 This is undoubtedly a quote or paraphrase, but I was unable to locate its source. It may also be merely a proverb of folk wisdom, such as "strike while the iron is hot" or some similar phrase.
itself. And let there be unto Us in eternal remembrance that which we promised, as long as we are alive in Our given reign to donate that which we have promised. And after Us, whosoever the Lord God chooses to be sovereign of the Wallachian land, whether from the fruit of Our flesh or from Our neighbors, or from foreigners, whomsoever the righteous God wills to be ruler, whoever renews and confirms this chrysoboull and confirms the endowment to the holy monastery as has been ordered here, or if the Holy Spirit compels him to give even more, let the Lord God bless such a one as this and fortify him in his rulership and in the coming age. And may the Lord God let him receive the blessings which he prepares for those loving Him. Let him be worthy to stand on the right side of God. Amen. Written in the month of March, in the capitol city of Târgoviște in the year 7005.

† IOANN RADU VOIVOD BY THE GRACE OF GOD SOVEREIGN
APPENDIX D

Text and English translation of the Hilandar Monastery Wallachian Edict
dated September 15, 1497 (document unnumbered)
† Мято ико раў 129 воньда и гда 130 везен земли.
8гревлахинско 131. сьвь доброго и великого вда воньдье дать гео ии сие повеление геа ии болвриче геа ии жкпани кртким в и сьвь ви ии пасторъ ии степя 132 и теша ии сьвь ви еголюке на ии половинь иез 133 ирезу посланже е иезвайлъ приды. 134 ротелю 135 геа ии Ыы. болврнъ ии па пре геа ии иезен 136. ви ви болвркако е икпни ойбрсоте доброть о храбрости ыырпфртъ 137. ви ви дьни ротелю геа ии. 138 сьвь правь ськже в ии па роес ви посланге ии е стара ии правь вьнна в ии апополна ии сва ии которы сва ии селиша едьде в ии па ой вьлдешье ии пь вътреть посланге тим ви е и иеккн ойбкака геа ии раля 139 воньде. 138 ии лесникъ ви ви вътреть е е посланге ви ии кпека алы ой вь вьнна оо сь лвше писане. да е жкпани кртким на половинъ ии на дя половинъ. 139 ви ви пасторъ ии степя ви теша ии сьвь ви ии геа ии ии против ко то раи ии дадо ии. 140 вьнна

129Supralinear appears one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.

130Supralinear appears one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.

131Supralinear appears lying on its side.

132Difficult to read, but most likely this form.

133Difficult to read, but most likely this form.

134Illegible.

135First half of word illegible, but most likely this form.

136Supralinear 'и; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.

137Vertical line in 'п' may be an 'р'.

138Scratched out text, half of one text line.

139Supralinear appears one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.

140Next entire text line illegible due to vertical fold in the parchment.
Δα ζ ο ταβοί. α εις αν προδολιη αν δεν ενι... 142πο τέκνηνενο πο
σε γεα αμ: χατελίε χρήμα ἱπεν τε κρατεια. χρήμα κρινία: οφθαλμιν
χρήμα πρυάν νύν διστειν. χρήμα έστασσο λόφε. δαγκο κομί η 8ρής
στροζ σπαραζ. δεμπτός περομίδι έκκοραστε στομάτρα 143 και δραγομή
στρατηρική και αξι χρή ποισιν εις. κατόπιν γρα κεφαλή. ημα ας έλη διή κ
141 Difficult to read. Unsure of proper form.
142 Ilegible.
143 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.
† By the grace of God Ioann Radu Voivod and sovereign of the entire Ugro-Wallachian land, son of the good and great Vlad Voivod: We the sovereign issue this Our edict to Our nobleman Master Krstian and his sons and stepsons Stepan and Tepșa and his sons, confirming that they own a half portion of land in Xerče. Because there was taken out . . . by Our father 24 noblemen, and thus before Us took out 12 of these noblemen, as he had bought from Brother Dobrot from Xraborești 13 in the day(s) of Our father . . . with the right of service. And also all of Runcul because it is their old and rightful patrimony, and also the entire Luponica and the entire Cotoruia and the villages of Vodev and half of the Vlădeșești on the Motra River, because this all has come from Our uncle Radu Voivod. And in Pestriva the fourth portion of land, because it was purchased by them. But from these patrimonies which are written above, more than one half to Master Krstian, and to the others one half. As for his stepsons Stepan and Tepșa and their sons, We asked of them legal proof of ownership. And because of this We gave them . . . patrimony . . . to the others. And in them they sold on the second day . . . according to my order. Witnesses: Master Barbul

---

144 Illegible.
145 Scratched out text, half of one text line.
146 These place names and their proper Romanian forms are taken from Djamo-Diaconiță, p. 179.
147 The proper Romanian form of this place name is taken from Djamo-Diaconiță, p. 304.
148 Next entire text line illegible due to vertical fold in the parchment.
149 Loss of context due to illegibility does not allow for a proper translation.
150 Illegible.
from Craiova, Master Krstijan the former Minister of the Imperial Court, Master Pravul the great Minister of the Imperial Court, Master Staiko the Scribe, Dančul the Operations Chief, Turdvu the Treasurer, Stroe the Chief of Military Affairs, Dumitru the Viticulturist, Izvoranul the Stolnik, Radu and Dragomir the Equerries. And I Xran wrote this in the capitol city of Bucharest, the month of September, the 15th day, in the year 7006.

† IOANN RADU VOIVOD BY THE GRACE OF GOD SOVEREIGN

151 The proper Romanian form of this place name is taken from Djamo-Diaconită, p. 308.
APPENDIX E

Text and English translation of Hilandar Monastery Wallachian Edict #6

dated April 19, 1948
† иже в съ его горе афостен уркис и овиний овнитель, монатир
зовоага хиадара храма же съ приутен 152 и приютен вдье нашон
буки и прио деу царии и утна эна эжкенем съда въ съ н и утнишон 8
оуя 8 самоненъ. иже по дъя сты съъ и постить иже къ еж генерату
куп еутицыю и проприемъ и овникъ и старцы и въсе иже оо жреціе-
и живущи въ сты вмьто тон: смырено прикосно поклоненіе вашон стоти-
ніже по вміт винион и вашим вмценин: ефрейсъ въ влакон землі гн 8
по ралъ 153 вондь и по съ ови сты дарь эхманіе вашон сты поге
прішове дпако висарков: и прикесе оежево дланес: о съго монатир-
яко е оежуан сты монатиръ, елико ен о потрене веше монатирскіе
взвести на въ везе передо добро раздыво сего ралъ 154 ови сты ми
въ везе ерэдіе причаюо сты монатиръ: да се назовемо новін хтитори
св предни и божественній стопучеші фан и съешано ес елико ен по
силѣ ездемо овній: и по заповѣда наші роителю 155. и овиний о ць
восе сты монатиръ на вѣско лете 8 велені по пе апри: и спо за
кратьі ямътек дожида да охманіе орос сты монатиръ по апри сего
ралъ 156 ови сты пріимлъ и езгоарите и вмьт ен и наши роителъ 157
и в на грани 158. аще едьте цъма ваше сты: вишете ни свъ преждніи.

152 ръ: appear as one ligature.
153 Supralinears appear one atop the other; unable to duplicate here as they appear in the text.
154 Supralinear Ʉ; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
155 Supralinear Ʉ; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
156 Supralinear Ʉ; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
157 Supralinear Ʉ; unable to duplicate here as it appears in the text.
158 ръ: one ligature.
Χτίτορι: ἡ τινὶ πόθοι οὐκ ἔχεις καὶ οἱ νασί ῥεῖτελι

159. οὐ δὲ σὺ σὲς ὅπως ὠσπέσαις

160. καὶ πέρα ἔρχεται 

161. ἔτι,
† There is on holy Mount Athos a divine and holy monastery called Hilandar, which is home to the holy and purest and most blessed Lady, our Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary, and her honored feast day, the holiest of holies. And to the honorable Father abbot, Our visitor and father in the Holy Spirit,¹⁶² who desires good, Kir Euthemius, and to the acting-abbots and the priests and the elders and all the remaining brothers in Christ who are living in that holy place: We humbly prostrate Ourselves before your holiness, We, who by the grace of God and through your blessings are found in the Wallachian land, ruler Ioann Radu Voivod. And by this, holy fathers, I let it be known to your holy place, that Deacon Visarion arrived and brought the usual blessing from the holy monastery as is the custom of the holy monastery and informed Us of the things necessary for the monastery. We understood everything well and in order. Because of this, holy fathers, We received the holy monastery with all enthusiasm and declared Ourselves the new Benefactors along with the former, pious benefactors, who are asleep in the Lord. And We promised, as much as it would be possible within Our power and in accordance with the request of Our father, and We too ordered an endowment to be made to the holy monastery every year at Great Lent in the amount of 5,000 aspri, and a sum of 500 aspri to the brethren who come to take the donation to the holy monastery. Therefore, holy fathers, accept and bless and pray God for Our father and for Us sinners. And if it will be possible, ye holy ones, write Us down with the previous benefactors in the holy pomjanik just as Our father. That which We have promised to the holy monastery We will maintain untouched. As long as the Lord God gives Us life

¹⁶²See 13n25.
in Our rulership, then at this time of year let the brethren sent from the holy
monastery arrive to take the endowment to the holy monastery and let them
bring this edict in order that We see that which We have promised to the holy
monastery. And may Christ, who is the source of all goodness and Creator of
the world, not deprive Us sinners also of your holy prayer, but may they also
be for Us. Written in the capital city of Bucharest, the month of April, the 19th
day, in the year 7006.

†IOANN RADU VOIVOD BY THE GRACE OF GOD SOVEREIGN
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