

TWO CONVERGENT EFFECTS OF LANGUAGE CONTACT IN ROMANIAN: THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *CINE* ‘WHO’

ADNANA BOIOC APINTEI, ADINA DRAGOMIRESCU,
ALEXANDRU NICOLAE¹

Abstract. This paper focuses on a construction attested in Old Romanian and Lipovan Romanian, but unavailable in standard Modern Romanian: the use of *cine* ‘who’ as a relative pronoun in headed relative clauses. We put forth the hypothesis that this structure occurred as an effect of language contact. In particular, the interrogative *cine* ‘who’ acquired its relative value and the possibility to be used in headed relative clauses by grammatical replication of the Old Church Slavonic equivalent, respectively of the Russian equivalent. Although the two scenarios appear to be similar, the two varieties followed two distinct diachronic paths.

Keywords: language contact, grammatical replication, relative pronoun, Old Romanian, Lipovan Romanian.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this article, we analyse a construction which is attested in Old Romanian (ORom)² and in the Modern Romanian variety spoken by the Lipovan community in Dobrodja (LRom): the headed relative clause introduced by *cine* ‘who’. In Modern Romanian (MRom), *cine* (< Latin QUI(S)+NE ‘who’) is used as an interrogative pronoun, (1a), and as a relative-interrogative pronoun in free relative clauses, (1b). Moreover, *cine* can only refer to [+ human] entities and it is a default 3rd person singular form, as seen by the agreement with the verb when *cine* occupies the subject position (1) (see GR 2013: 491–492).

- (1) a. *Cine* a venit?
who AUX.PERF.3SG come.PTCP
‘Who came?’

¹ “Iorgu Jordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy/University of Bucharest; adnanaboio@gmail.com, adina.dragomirescu@unibuc.ro, alexandru.nicolae@unibuc.ro.

This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian Ministry of Education and Research, CNCS - UEFISCDI, project number PN-III-P4-ID-PCE-2020-1097, within PNCDI III.

² The earliest Romanian texts are from the 16th century; therefore, ORom roughly covers the period between the 16th century to 1780.

- b. Nu știu cine a venit.
 NEG know.1SG who AUX.PERF.3SG come.PTCP
 ‘I don’t know who came.’
- c. *Cine au venit?
 who AUX.PERF.3PL come.PTCP
- d. *Cine ați venit?
 who AUX.PERF.2PL come.PTCP

In contrast to MRom, in ORom and LRom *cine* can function as a relative pronoun, in headed relative clauses (2); importantly, unlike MRom *cine*, ORom and LRom *cine* carries the morphological feature specification of the antecedent, visible, for example, in the plural agreement with the verb when *cine* is a subject. In similar constructions, in MRom, the relative *care* ‘which’ is used.

- (2) a. Toți *cinre* me vădzu
 all.M.PL who CL.ACC.1SG see.PS.3PL
 bătură-și joc (PH.1500-10:17^r)
 hit.PS.3PL=CL.REFL.3PL game
 ‘All the ones who have seen me bemocked me’
- b. Se umblau femei *cine* știu
 CL.REFL walk.around.IMPF.3PL women who know.IMPF.3PL
 să cânte.
 SUBJ sing.SUBJ.3PL
 ‘Women who knew how to sing were walking around.’
 (LRom, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)

The goal of this paper is to describe these constructions in the two Romanian varieties (ORom and LRom) and to investigate their sources. Our working hypothesis is that, given that the two varieties under scrutiny have been strongly influenced by Slavonic languages, differing contact settings (i.e. literacy contact with Old Church Slavonic (OCS) for ORom and Russian-Romanian direct contact for LRom) had a convergent effect.

Therefore, in section 2 we present the state of the art and the data in ORom, in section 3 we focus on LRom, while in section 4 we introduce the two contact scenarios and the OCS and Russian structures that could have influenced the relative use of *cine*; in section 5 we offer explanations for the occurrence of the construction with *cine* as a relative pronoun in headed relative clauses in the two varieties under consideration.

2. OLD ROMANIAN

The construction with *cine* ‘who’ as a relative pronoun introducing headed relative clauses is attested in Old Romanian. We first present the previous literature on the topic, then introduce our data collected from Old Romanian texts.

2.1. The state of the art

Two aspects have been previously highlighted in the literature: (i) the fact that *cine* ‘who’ was used in headed relative clauses instead of *care* ‘which’ or *ce* ‘what’, therefore *cine* also covered some values of *care* and *ce*; (ii) *cine* could only refer to [+ human] entities, could carry the morphological features of the antecedent and could trigger plural agreement on the verb (Densusianu 1961 II: 122, Bidu 1965: 65–67, Rosetti 1968: 543, Dimitrescu (coord.) 1978: 284, Frâncu 2009: 68, SOR 2016: 361, 483).

- (3) a. oamenii *cine*-s rumâni creștini
 people.PL.DEF who=be.3PL Romanian.PL Christians.PL
 ‘the people who are Romanian Christians’
 (ICr: 2, in Densusianu 1961 II: 122, Dimitrescu (coord.) 1978: 285)
- b. *cine* mă văzură
 who CL.ACC.1SG see.PS.3PL
 ‘who saw me’
 (CP.XXX: 12, in Dimitrescu (coord.) 1978: 284)

Some scholars have underlined the fact that *cine* as a relative pronoun introducing headed relative clauses is specific to translations (SOR 2016: 361), but others considered it a general feature of ORom, since it was also employed in non-translated (“original”) texts (Frâncu 2009: 68). It is also worth mentioning that *cine*-constructions sometimes correspond to a participial clause in the Slavonic original text; this is the case of example (4), the only occurrence in CV.1563–83 (Costinescu 1981: 164, Stan 2013: 65).

- (4) și alalți *cinre* avea langedzi
 and others who have.IMPF.3PL disease.PL
 întru ostrovu (CV.1563–83: 49^v)
 in island
 ‘and the other ones on the island who had diseases’
 cf. *imeștei* (OCS original, 24^v, in Costinescu 1981: 164)

2.2. Other data from ORom

In this section, we present the data extracted from the ORom corpus set up by Emanuela Timotin for SOR (2016: 1–7). We aim to offer a brief description of the headed relative clause introduced by with *cine*, as well as an overview of the frequency of this structure and of its distribution relative to the type of text (translation vs original texts³). A significant number of texts (mainly religious and legal) dating from the ORom period are translations from OCS.

³ The phrase “original texts” is taken from Romanian traditional scholarship, and refers to texts written directly in Romanian (not translated). As most of the ORom translations are religious translations (and follow more closely the features of the source texts), original texts have been generally considered as being a more faithful reflection of older stages of language.

First of all, we should mention the variety of antecedents of these relative structures. The most frequent is the indefinite pronoun *tot* (all), especially in the masculine plural form *toți* ‘all’ (5a). Other antecedents are: personal pronouns (5b), demonstrative pronouns (5c), negative pronouns (5d), nominal phrases headed by [+ human] nouns (5e,f), and proper names (5g).

- (5) a. Ferice de **toți** *cinre* se teame
 happy of all who CL.REFL fear.3PL
 de Domnul (PH.1500-10: 112’)
 of God
 ‘Happy are all those who fear God’
- b. cum iaste **el** *cine* poate dereage
 how be.3SG he who can reclaim.INF
 păcatul (CC¹.1567: 225’)
 sin.DEF
 ‘how he is the one who can reclaim the sin’
- c. avutul iaste **acela** *cine*-au luat oarece dar
 rich.DEF be.3SG that.one who=AUX.PERF.3SG take.PTCP some gift
 de la Dumnezeu (CC¹.1567: 110’)
 from God
 ‘the rich one is the one who took a certain gift from God’
- d. nu-i **nime** *cine* să-l
 NEG=be.3SG no.one who SUBJ=CL.ACC.M.3SG
 dezleage (PO.1582: 140)
 interpret.SUBJ.3SG
 ‘there is no one who can interpret it (the dream)’
- e. să înțeleagă **toți oamenii**
 SUBJ understand.SUBJ.3PL all people.PL.DEF
cine-s rumâni creștini (CCat.1560: 1’)
 who=be.3PL Romanian.PL Christians.PL
 ‘in order for all the people who are Romanian Christians to understand’
- f. iară **alalte rude** *cine* am (DÎ.1591-1600: VIII)
 and other relatives who have.1SG
 ‘and the other relatives I have’
- g. sămânța lu **Dan**, *cine* era măiestru
 seed.DEF GEN Dan who be.IMPF.3SG master
 la cioplit (PO.1582: 309)
 at carve.SUP
 ‘the successor of Dan, who was a carver master’

Secondly, although in most of the headed relative clauses *cine* occupies the subject position (see (5)), it is also attested in other syntactic positions, such as the direct object (6):

- (6) Iisus Hristos, pre **cine** jidovii ținură
 Jesus Christ DOM who Jews.PL keep.PS.3PL
 ca un procler și blăstemat (CC¹.1567:136’)
 as a damned and cursed
 ‘Jesus Christ, whom the Jews people considered damned and cursed’

Thirdly, in Table 1 below, we present the quantitative data extracted from the ORom corpus.

Table 1

The occurrences of cine ‘who’ in headed relative clauses in the ORom corpus

| The text | Original/Translation | Cine-constructions |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| PH.1500-10 | Translation – Slavonic | 11 |
| DĪ.1521–1600 | Mainly original | 7 |
| CCat.1560 | Original | 5 |
| CT.1560–1 | Translation – Slavonic | 27 |
| CC ¹ .1567 | Translation – Slavonic | 23 |
| CM.1567 | Translation – Slavonic | 3 |
| FT.1570–5 | Original | 1 |
| CV.1563–83 | Translation – Slavonic | 1 |
| CC ² .1581 | Translation – Slavonic | 4 |
| PO.1582 | Translation – Hungarian | 48 |
| FD.1572–1604 | Translation – Slavonic | 3 |
| DRH.A.1636–46 | Original | 2 |
| DRH.B.1628–46 | Original | 2 |
| PI.~1650 | Translation – Slavonic | 2 |
| SVI.~1670 | Translation – Slavonic | 2 |
| DDL.1679 | Translation – Slavonic | 1 |
| DPar.1683 | Translation – Slavonic | 1 |
| ULM.~1725 | Original | 2 |
| CLM.1700–50 | Original | 2 |
| NL.~1750-66 | Original | 5 |

What Table 1 shows is that the construction under scrutiny was far from being accidental in ORom: it is attested in a large number of texts, and these are both translations and original texts. It is interesting to notice that a translation from Hungarian (PO.1582) contains the highest number of attestations.

However, there are certain texts belonging to the same period in which this usage of *cine* is not attested at all: CPrav.1560-2, CP¹.1577, Prav.1581, A.1620, CD.1698, AA.1708, AAM.1713, ACP.1714, CBuc.1749, Bert.1774, etc.). In the fourth section we will try to offer an account of this situation.

3. LIPOVAN ROMANIAN

Lipovan Romanian headed relative clauses introduced by *cine* ‘who’ have been largely analysed in Boioc Apintei (2021b). Lipovan Romanian is a conservative variety of Romanian, spoken by Russian communities, mainly in the Dobrudja region, in South-Eastern Romania, therefore in a bilingual Russian-Romanian setting (with Romanian being the official language and Russian, the language of the community). The Lipovan communities migrated from Russia approximately 300 years ago, where they were being prosecuted for religious reasons; these communities have been separated from the Russian-speaking areas ever since. The data used in this section was collected by Adnana Boioc Apintei in several fieldwork sessions, between 2018 and 2021.

Similarly to ORom, headed relative clauses with *cine* are also attested in LRom. In these structures, *cine* refers to [+ human] entities and can trigger plural agreement on the verb, as in (7a,b,c,e). As for the nature of the antecedent, in contrast to ORom, LRom does not have a clear preference for *tot* ('all'); therefore, *cine* allows as antecedents nominal phrases, (7a, b, c), proper names, (7d), or the indefinite *tot*, (7e).

- (7) a. Se umblau femeii *cine* ştiu
 CL.REFL walk.around.IMPF.3PL women who know.IMPF.3PL
 să cânte.
 SUBJ sing.SUBJ.3PL
 'Women who knew how to sing were walking around.'
 (LRO, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)
- b. Copiii *cine* sunt mai mici
 children.DEF who be.3PL younger
 se duc după douăzeci şi două
 CL.REFL.3PL go.3PL after 12 pm
 'The children who are younger go (carolling) after 12 pm.'
 (LRO, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)
- c. Femeile *cine* vor vin
 women.DEF who want.3PL come.3PL
 şi se roagă.
 and CL.REFL pray.3PL
 'Women who want come and pray.'
 (LRO, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)
- d. Dacă o trimitem la doamna Voluvia,
 if CL.ACC.F.3SG send.1PL to madam.DEF Voluvia
cine este bibliotecară, o să afle mai multe.
 who be.3SG librarian FUT find more
 'If we send her to Mrs. Voluvia, who is a librarian, she will find out more.'
 (LRO, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)
- e. Ei cântă cântece de Masleniţa,
 they sing.3PL song.PL on Masleniţa
toţi *cine* sunt lipoveni asta fac.
 all who be.3PL Lipovans this do
 'They sing songs on the occasion of Masleniţa (= pre-Christian holiday), all who are Lipovans do this.'
 (LRO, spontaneous conversation, 20.02.2018)

When comparing ORom to LRom, it is clear that the construction under scrutiny is common to the two varieties. What seems to be different is the fact that while ORom clearly prefers the indefinite *tot* ('all') as antecedent for the *cine*-clause, LRom does not exhibit such a tendency, allowing different types of antecedents.

4. TWO CONTACT SCENARIOS, ONE CONVERGENT EFFECT

4.1. Two contact scenarios

Although there are approaches in which direct contact and written contact (via translations) are considered to be two possible manifestations of *bilingualism* (Adams 2004, i.a.), in this section we focus on briefly describing *literacy contact* (relevant for the relation between ORom and OCS) and *contact in a direct bilingual setting* (relevant for the relation between LRom and Russian) as two separate phenomena.

4.1.1. Literacy contact

While direct contact has been widely discussed in the literature, contact via translations has only been more recently taken into account as a source for language change (Verkholantsev 2008, Rabus 2013, Lavidas 2021, Mendoza and Birzer (eds.) 2022).

Written language contact is related to ancient languages, where *cultural borrowing* represents a type of contact induced change (Lavidas 2021: 11). In many situations, including translations from OCS to ORom, this type of contact takes place between a standardized language and a non-standardized language, a fact which facilitates translation induced changes (Heine and Kuteva 2005: 250; Lavidas 2021: 15). As noticed by Lavidas (2021: 7), the influence of the written learned language can trigger semi-natural grammatical change, i.e. changes that are in line with the typological feature of the target-language.

For this type of contact we adopt the label *literacy contact* first introduced in Slavonic historical linguistics by Verkholantsev (2008: 136–137) and discussed by Rabus (2013); more recently, *literacy contact* appears in relation to (biblical) translations in Greek, Latin, OCS (Mendoza and Birzer (ed.) 2022) and we suggest that the situation of the massive translation from OCS in ORom fits the same framework. It is important to note that old translations, mainly focused on being faithful to the original, differ from modern translations, where the focus is on the content. The cultural prestige and the standardized character of the source-language are also important factors in favouring potential translation induced changes to spreading from high registers to low registers and – depending on the diffusion of the texts – even to the spoken language. In this respect, let us take stock of Heine and Kuteva’s (2005: 250) observations:

“In some contact situations, the model language is accessible primarily as a written medium only while the replica language has no, or no commonly accepted, written norm. Now, in an attempt to translate texts from the former into the latter language, translators tend to conform to the structure provided by the model language, in particular if the latter is considered to represent a more attractive religion and/or a more powerful civilization.

Such situations may have the effect that, at least in the initial stages, the replication of grammatical categories starts out with written discourse before it extends to spoken discourse, and it may result in a situation where the written register of a replica language is characterized by more transfers than the spoken registers.”

4.1.2. Contact in a direct bilingual setting

As seen at the beginning of section 3, LRom is a variety of Romanian that has been spoken by Russian communities in a bilingual setting for approximately 300 years now. Some of the speakers show a *symmetric* bilingualism, while other are *dominant* in Russian. These communities are characterized by conservatism in both languages: they have been separated from the Russian-speaking area, therefore they speak an old version of Russian and they are closed communities, therefore they also preserve conservative features of Romanian (for details, see Boioc Apintei 2021a).

4.2. Old Church Slavonic

In order to account for the possible influence of OCS on the use of *cine* as a relative pronoun, it is incumbent on us to have a general idea on the system of *wh*-words in OCS.

First of all, the OCS had an ‘universal’ relative pronoun (m. *иже*, f. *иже*, n. *же*), with the meaning ‘who, which, that’, referring either to persons or things (Vaillant 1948: 141, Olteanu 1974: 60, Olteanu (ed.) 1975: 86, Gamanovich 2001: 89, Lunt 2001: 162):

- (8) **отче нашъ, иже еси на небесѣхъ**
 father our who be.2SG in heaven
 ‘Our Father, who art in heaven’ (*Mar*, Mt., VI, 9, in Olteanu (ed.) 1975: 208)

The relative *иже* frequently occurred as an equivalent of the Greek definite article (Vaillant 1948: 341, Gardiner 1984: 139, Fuchsbauer 2022), a pattern introduced in the Greek-Slavonic translations made by Constantine the Philosopher and his collaborators, which extended to original Slavonic texts (Fuchsbauer 2022: 166).

- (9)
- | | | | | | |
|----|--|---------------|--------------|------------|------------|
| a. | τὸ | φῶς | τὸ | ἐν | σοί |
| | to | fō-s | to | en | soi |
| | the.NOM.SG.N | light-NOM.SG | the.NOM.SG.N | in | you.DAT.SG |
| b. | svět-ъ | ize | vъ | tebě. | |
| | light-NOM.SG. | REL.NOM.SG.M. | in | you.LOC.SG | |
| | ‘the light that is in thee’ (Mt. 6.23) | | | | |

(in Fuchsbauer 2022: 165)

Secondly, OCS had two specialized interrogative forms, *кѣто* ‘who’ and *чѣто* ‘what’, and a semantically unspecialized interrogative, i.e., *къи* ‘what, which one, who’ (Gardiner 1984: 48-49, Gasparov 2001: 95); the last item could also be used as a relative pronoun (Olteanu (ed.) 1975: 88, Gorazd, s.v. *къи*).

Interestingly, *иже* was progressively replaced by the interrogative *къи* ‘what, which one, who’ (Olteanu (ed.) 1975: 88) in the spoken language (Vaillant 1948: 142). Therefore, the interrogative *къи* ‘what, which one, who’ specialises as a relative form that is also used with the forms *кии* and *ции*, the latter involving palatalisation, (10). In OCS, this palatalisation (i.e. “Slavonic second palatalisation”) takes places when a velar consonant (like *к*) is followed by a soft vowel, written *и* or *ь*, originating in a diphthong (M. Hâncu, *p.c.*).

- (10) **цин** **слоузьбѣж** **тѣлесънѣж** **прѣимъше...**
 which serving.ACC.SG.F body.ACC.SG.F accept.PTCP.PRES
 ‘which (having) accepted to serve the bodily service’
 (*Codex Suprasliensis*, 88, 14, in Gorazd, s.v. **кѣин**)

Another OCS pronoun which is important for our discussion is **кѣто** ‘who’. According to the grammars of OCS, **кѣто** ‘who’ is an interrogative pronoun (Vaillant 1948 I: 139, Gardiner 1984: 49, Gazparov 2001: 95, Lunt 2001: 63), but the dictionaries based on texts also mention its use with a relative value (Gorazd, s.v. **кѣто**) (11):

- (11) **приведи** **кто** **слъша** **кто**
 lead.IMP.2SG who.NOM listen.IND.AORIST.3SG who.NOM
ли **тоу** **стои**
 PRT.INTERROG there sit.IND.AORIST.3SG
 ‘you shall lead the one who had listed and the one who had sat there’
 (*Codex Suprasliensis*, 241, 22, in Gorazd, s.v. **кѣто**)

4.3. Russian

In order to account for the existence of the *cine* relative construction in LRom, we first briefly describe the situation of relative pronouns in Russian. What is relevant for our discussion is the fact that a set of pronouns – *кто* ‘who’, *что* ‘what’, *какой* ‘what’ (adjective), *какой* ‘which’ and *чей* ‘whose’ – function as both interrogative and relative pronouns (Wade 2011: 143). Moreover, Russian consistently uses *кто* (originating in the OCS **кѣто**) for people (12a) (Wade 2011: 145) and this item can trigger either singular, (12a), or plural, (12b), agreement on the verb; interestingly, *кто* can only have pronouns as antecedents, as in (12b), and not nouns (Wade 2011: 147).

- (12) a. **Кто** у вас **родился?** **Мальчик**
 who to you be.born.PAST.3SG=REFL boy
или **девушка?** (in Wade 2011: 145)
 or girl
 ‘What is it, a boy or a girl?’
- b. **Те** из нас, **кто** читали **стихотворения,**
 those of us who read.PAST.3PL poem
были в восторге. (in Wade 2011: 147)
 were.delighted
 ‘Those of us who read the poem were delighted.’

5. EXPLANATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The data presented in this paper so far can be summarized as follows: in two Romanian varieties, ORom and LRom, which have been in contact with two Slavonic varieties, i.e. OCS and Russian, respectively, we find attestations of a structure which is

unavailable in MRom. In particular, the respective varieties allow for a structure in which *cine* ‘who’ (an interrogative pronoun in MRom) introduces headed relative clauses; in MRom, this is only possible with *care* ‘which, who’ or *ce* ‘which, (nonstandard) who’. In both varieties, the relative *cine* can only have [+ human] antecedents. However, there is a significant difference between the two varieties: relative *cine* was lost in the passage from ORom to MRom, but it was preserved in present-day LRom.

What we witness in these two varieties is the fact that an interrogative pronoun becomes a relative pronoun, with certain grammatical and semantic restrictions. This type of syntactic change is not unusual, being attested in many European languages (i.e. Romance, Slavonic, some Germanic, Latin, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Georgian etc., see Kuteva et al. 2019: 356–357). This type of change probably modelled on written Latin (Giacalone Ramat 2008: 161) was considered a property of Standard Average European by Haspelmath (1998: 281–282), and its distribution in Europe was considered to be an effect of contact-induced grammaticalization (Heine and Kuteva 2006: 205–243). Moreover, this path extended to non-European languages, probably also via contact (Kuteva et al. 2019: 357).

Although we seem to face a general process of (contact induced) grammaticalization, we still need to explain the means/situation which determined this syntactic change. Therefore, we adopt Heine and Kuteva’s (2010: 86) concept of *grammatical replication*, defined as a process whereby speakers create a new grammatical meaning or structure in the replica language following the model language, by using the linguistic resources available in the replica language. In particular, the interrogative *cine* ‘grammatically replicated’ the relative value of OCS *къи/кни/ции* ‘what, which one, who’ in ORom, and respectively the value of Russian *кто* in LRom. But while in ORom the structure with *cine* preserves the same grammatical and semantic constraints (nominal and pronominal singular and plural antecedents, with the [+ human] feature), in LRom the antecedent constraint of Russian was lost (i.e. in (Modern) Russian (12b), the structure is possible only with pronominal antecedents, while in LRom (7), both pronominal and nominal antecedents are possible).

For ORom, two other factors have probably favoured the process: firstly, the form *иже* from OCS was a general complementizer and relative marker (as seen in section 4.2); although it was replaced in later texts by *къи/кни/ции*, it was probably preserved in the translators’ passive knowledge as a universal relative marker; secondly, the equivalence between Romanian *cine* [ʃine] and the OCS palatalised form *ции* [tsiɨ] was also favoured by their phonological resemblance.

The spread of the structure in ORom needs a supplementary explanation. As we mentioned in section 2, the relative *cine* was also used in translations from other languages (such as PO.1582) and in original texts and documents. Therefore, although the translations from OCS offered the input for this syntactic change, this is not enough to explain the spread of the phenomenon. This is a point where the general European *interrogative-to-relative* path of grammaticalization comes into play: the original replica grammaticalization was supported by the fact that the transfer interrogative-to-relative follows a universal path of grammaticalization (Heine and Kuteva 2005, ch. 3), a fact which allowed for the spread of the structure to texts which are not translated from OCS. Moreover, although grammatical induced changes via translations have been considered ephemeral for a long time, as Lavidas (2021: 114) mentions, the new elements that appear in translations can really diffuse in a population because of their *prestigious character* and the fact that *translations can be influential and trigger semi-natural changes*.

Finally, we need to account for the different evolution of the structure in LRom and ORom, i.e. preservations vs disappearance. In order to do so, we adopt Lavidas' (2021) *Hypothesis of Internalized Diglossia*, based on Kroch's (1989, 2001) model of grammars in competition, according to which multiple grammatical systems coexist in a "peaceful" way within a synchronic period. Applying this hypothesis to our contact situations we can notice that in LRom the coexistence of *cine* and *care* as relative pronouns has really been "peaceful", being preserved to the present-day, while in ORom the two grammars were indeed in competition (as mentioned in section 2, there were texts in which *cine* was not attested at all as a relative pronoun), and the effect of this competition was that *care* was preserved as a relative pronoun, while *cine* was jettisoned and restricted to its primary interrogative value, at which point it also lost the ability to trigger plural subject-verb agreement.

CORPUS

- A. 1620 = *Alexandria*. Ed. F. Zgraon, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2005 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 11).
- AA.1708 = *Archirie și Anadan*. Ed. Magdalena Georgescu, București, Minerva, 1997 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 2), 157–168.
- AAM.1713 = Antim Ivireanul, *Așezământul Mănăstirii Antim*. Ed.: Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ștrempel, București, Minerva, 1972, 324–346.
- ACP.1714 = Antim Ivireanul, *Capete de poruncă*. Ed.: Antim Ivireanul, *Opere*, ed. G. Ștrempel, București, Minerva, 1972, 386–394.
- Bert.1774 = *Bertoldo*. Ed. Magdalena Georgescu, București, Minerva, 1999 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 3), 157–239.
- CBuc.1749 = *Carte întru carea să scriu mâncările*. Ed.: *O lume într-o carte de bucate. Manuscris din epoca brâncovenească*, ed. I. Constantinescu, 1997, București, Editura Fundației Culturale Române.
- CC¹.1567 = Coresi, *Tâlcul Evangheliilor*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1998, 31–187.
- CC².1581 = Coresi, *Evanghelie cu învățătură*. Ed. S. Pușcariu, Al. Procopovici: *Diaconul Coresi, Carte cu învățătură (1581)*, vol. I, *Textul*, București, Socec, 1914.
- CCat.1560 = Coresi, *Catehism*. Ed. Al. Roman-Moraru, in I. Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. I. Catehismul lui Coresi; II. Pravila lui Coresi; III. Fragmentul Todorescu; IV. Glosele Bogdan; V. Prefețe și Epiloguri, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1982, 101–105.
- CD.1698 = Dimitrie Cantemir, *Divanul*. Ed.: D. Cantemir, *Opere complete*, I, *Divanul*, ed. V. Câdea, București, Editura Academiei, 1974, 103–405.
- CLM.1700-50 = Miron Costin, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Ed.: M. Costin, *Opere*, ed. P. P. Panaitescu, București, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1958, 41–201.
- CM.1567 = Coresi, *Molitvenic*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, București, Editura Academiei, 1998, 189–211.
- CP¹.1577 = Coresi, *Psaltire slavo-română*. Ed.: Coresi, *Psaltirea slavo-română (1577) în comparație cu psaltirile coresiene din 1570 și din 1589*, ed. S. Toma, București, Editura Academiei, 1976, 35–662.
- CPrav.1560–2 Coresi, *Pravila*. Ed. Gh. Chivu, in I. Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, I. Catehismul lui Coresi; II. Pravila lui Coresi; III. Fragmentul Todorescu; IV. Glosele Bogdan; V. Prefețe și Epiloguri, București, Editura Academiei, 1982, 218–231.
- CT.1560-1 = Coresi, *Tetraevanghel*. Ed.: *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi. Brașov 1560 – 1561*, comparat cu *Evangheliarullui Radu de la Mănăcești. 1574*, ed. F. Dimitrescu, București, Editura Academiei, 1963.

- CV.1563-83 = *Codicele Voronețean*. Ed. M. Costinescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1981, 229–400.
- DDL.1679 = Dosoftei, *Dumnezăiasca liturghie*. Ed. N. A. Ursu, Iași, Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, 1980, 3–313.
- DÎ = *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, text stabilit și indice de Gh. Chivu, M. Georgescu, M. Ioniță, Al. Mareș, Al. Roman-Moraru, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.
- DPar.1683 = Dosoftei, *Parimiile preste an*, 1683, ed. M. Ungureanu, Iași, Editura Universității „Al. I. Cuza”, 2012, 95–356.
- DRH.A = *Documenta Romaniae Historica. A. Moldova*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1996: vol. XXIII (1635–1636); 2003: XXV (1639–1640); 2006: XXVIII (1645–1646).
- DRH.B = *Documenta Romaniae Historica. B. Țara Românească*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1969: XXII (1628–1629); vol. XXIII (1630–2); 1974: vol. XXIV (1633–1644); 1985: vol. XXV (1635–1636); 1998: vol. XXX (1645); 2003: vol. XXXI (1646).
- FD.1572-1604 = *Floarea darurilor*. Ed. Alexandra Roman Moraru, București, Minerva, 1996 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 1), 119–82.
- FT.1570-5 = *Fragmentul Todorescu (Carte de cântece)*. Ed. I. Gheție, in I. Gheție (coord.), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*. I. Catehismul lui Coresi; II. Pravila lui Coresi; III. Fragmentul Todorescu; IV. Glosele Bogdan; V. Prefețe și Epiloguri, București, Editura Academiei, 1982, 336–343.
- NL.~1750-66 = Ion Neculce, *Letopisețul*. Ed.: Ion Neculce, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei și O samă de cuvinte*, ed. I. Iordan, București, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, ed. a II-a, 1959, 31–388.
- PH.1500-10 = *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, ed. I. Gheție, M. Teodorescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.
- PI.~1650 = *Palia istorică*. Ed. A. Roman Moraru, M. Moraru, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2001, 101–243 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 4).
- PO.1582 = *Palia de la Orăștie*. Ed. V. Pamfil, București, Editura Academiei, 1968.
- Prav.1581 = *Pravila ritorului Lucaci*. Ed. I. Rizescu, București, Editura Academiei, 1971, 161–183.
- SVI.~1670 = *Varlaam și Ioasaf*. Ed.: M. Stanciu Istrate, *Reflexe ale medievalității europene în cultura română veche: Varlaam și Ioasaf în cea mai veche versiune a traducerii lui Udriște Năsturel*, București, Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române, 2013, 82–325
- ULM.~1725 = Grigore Ureche, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*. Ed. P. P. Panaitescu, București, Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă, 1955, 57–210.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J.N., 2004, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Bidu, A., 1965, “Observații asupra sistemului de pronume relative”, in *Omagiu lui Alexandru Rosetti la 70 de ani*, București, Editura Academiei, 65–68.
- Boioc Apintei, A., 2021a, *Limba română vorbită de rușii lipoveni. O perspectivă sociolingvistică și gramaticală*, PhD Thesis, University of Bucharest.
- Boioc Apintei, A., 2021b, “Linguistic interference in a Romanian-Russian bilingual context. Issues in the grammar of relative clauses”, *Linguistic Analysis*, 43, 1-2.
- Costinescu, M., 1981, „Studiu lingvistic”, in *Codicele voronețean*, Ediție critică, studiu filologic și studiu lingvistic de M. Costinescu, București, Editura Minerva, 89–213.
- Densusianu, O., 1961, *Istoria limbii române*, II, București, Editura Științifică.
- Dimitrescu, F. (coord.), 1978, *Istoria limbii române. Fonetica, morfosintaxă, lexic*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Frâncu, C., 2009, *Gramatica limbii române vechi (1521-1780)*, Iași, Casa Editorială Demiurg.

- Fuchsbauer, J., 2022, “The article-like usage of the relative pronoun *iže* as an indicator of early Slavonic grammatical thinking”, in I. Mendoza, S. Birzer (eds), *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, Mouton, 163–178.
- Gamanovich, 2001, *Grammar of the Church Slavonic Language*, English edition, translated from Russian, Jordanville, Holy Trinity Monastery.
- Gardiner, S.C., 1984, *Old Church Slavonic. An Elementary Grammar*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Gasparov, B., 2001, *Old Church Slavonic*, München, Lincom Europa.
- Giacalone Ramat, A., 2008, “Areal convergence in grammatical processes”, in M. J. López-Couso, E. Seoane (eds), *Rethinking grammaticalization. New Perspectives*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 129–167.
- Gorazd = *Digital Old Church Slavonic Dictionary* (<http://gorazd.org/gulliver/?envLang=en>).
- GR = G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 2013, *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, M., 1998, “How Young in Standard Average European”, *Language Sciences*, 20, 271–287.
- Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2005, *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2006, *The Changing Languages of Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2010, “Contact and Grammaticalization”, in R. Hickey, (ed.), 2010, *The Handbook of language contact*, Wiley-Blackwell, 86–105.
- Kroch, A., 1989, “Reflexes of grammar in patterns of language change”, *Language Variation and Change*, 1, 3, 199–244.
- Kroch, A., 2001, “Syntactic change”, in M. Baltin, C. Collins (eds), *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*, Oxford, Blackwell, 699–729.
- Kuteva, T., B. Heine, B. Hong, G. Long, H. Narrog, S. Rhee, 2019, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Second, extensively revised and updated edition, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Lavidas, N., 2021, *The Diachrony of Written Language Contact*, Leiden/Boston, Brill.
- Lunt, H. G., 2001, *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, 7th revised edition, Berlin/New York, Walter de Gruyter.
- Mendoza, I., S. Birzer, 2022, “Introduction”, in I. Mendoza, S. Birzer (eds), *Diachronic Slavonic Syntax Traces of Latin, Greek and Church Slavonic in Slavonic Syntax*, Berlin/Boston, De Gruyter, Mouton, 1–8.
- Olteanu, P. (coord.), 1975, *Slava veche și slavona românească*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Olteanu, P., 1974, *Sintaxa și stilul paleoslavei și slavonei*, București, Editura Științifică.
- Rabus, A., 2013, *Die Rolle des Sprachkontakts für die slavischen (Standard-)Sprachen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des innerslavischen Kontakts)*. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Freiburg. <https://www.slavistik.uni-freiburg.de/personal/univ-prof-drachim-rabus/RabusHabil.pdf>
- Rosetti, A., 1968, *Istoria limbii române de la origini până în secolul al XVII-lea*, București, Editura pentru Literatură.
- SOR = G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), 2016, *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Stan, C., 2013, *O sintaxă diacronică a limbii române vechi*, București, Editura Universității din București.
- Vaillant, A., 1948, *Manuel du vieux slave*, tome I, Grammaire, Paris, Institut d’Études Slaves.
- Verkholantsev, J., 2008, *Ruthenica Bohemica. Ruthenian Translations from Czech in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and Poland*, Wien, Berlin & Munster: Lit.
- Wade, T., 2011, *A Comprehensive Russian Grammar*, Oxford, Wiley-Blackwell.

