

MOXA' S LITURGICAL LANGUAGE

Iuliana-Valentina BOBOACĂ*University of Pitești*

Abstract: This study, dedicated to Orthodox liturgical language, is based on the manuscript of Mihail Moxa: St. Gregory – The Signification of Divine Liturgy. The research analyzes the morphological and lexical features of Romanian language belonging to the seventeenth century.

Keywords: cult, old language, liturgy, theonym, prayer.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper analyzes the liturgical language used by the erudite monk Mihail Moxa in his religious writings. The Romanian literature was enriched in the seventeenth century through the efforts of this monk who, at the urge of Bishop Theophilus, wrote The Universal Chronicle (1620), the first writing of this kind in Romanian. Convinced that a nation can advance only through self-awareness of its historical place, Theophilus of Râmnic asked Moxa to translate two religious works: *St. Gregory – The Signification of Divine Liturgy* – and of *St. Basil – Teachings for Priests*, both kept in a manuscript that is currently located at the British Library, London.

In a time when the cult language in Romania was Slavonic, two papers written in Romanian were more than necessary. The writings' language is concise, having many metaphors that convey the sense of divine, without being overbearing.

The word *liturgy* comes from the contraction of two Greek words: *lakos* – common and *ergos* – work, thus one can define liturgy as: *the work of common people worshipping God*. The liturgical language is full of metaphors, because a human language that summons Divinity needs metaphors to express tension and to bend reality into new perspectives upon old facts¹.

2. MORPHOLOGY

Being the most conservative sector of the language, inherited from Latin, morphology has few dialectal variants in Romanian. The defining features observed in the studied text are oscillations occurred in forming the literary norm and some morphological archaisms. For example:

- the swinging **e-i** desinence in formation of the feminine plural for *vamă* – *vame* (131v); *piatră* – *pietri* (136v);
- the conservation of **-ure** desinence for the plurals of neutres: *colțure* (136v), *duhure* (130f), *steagure* (122v);

¹ Najim, Michel and Frasier, T.L., 1995: 5-12.

- the Genitive-Dative analytical forms are less frequent than the synthetic ones, which means that the specific procedure of Romance languages has not caught on Romanian land, where the forms ending in **-ei** are competing with those ended in **-ii**: *morției* (135v);
- the verb *a grăi* occurs as *grăește* with the variants: *grăiește* (only one-time occurrent in the text: 123v) and *grăiaște* (used four times: 125v, 128f, 131v, 132f);
- the form of the verb *erta* (127f, 128f,) is found without the initial *i*, as it is written nowadays;
- the archaic form of *sub* – *supt* is present twice (121f, 132v);
- the use of etymological verbal forms without the prothesis *în-* is frequent: *cerca* (136v); *chipuiaște* (129v; the form *închipuiaște* is also occurrent – 128f); *junghie* (123f); *tinde* (134f); *tâmplă* (122f);
- the prohibitive is only once met: *nu fireți* (136f);
- the time adverb *atunci* is very often found in the form of *atunce* (36 times);
- the post-position of particles: *avea-va* (126f), *va pleca-se* (occurent next to *se va închina* – 126v), *închipuiaște-se* (128v), *arde-i* (128v), *arde-l* (128v), *cade-i-se* (132f); *tăia-se-va* (133f);
- the present tense of some verbs is formed with the particle *-ează*, no longer used today: *umbrează* (125f), *împreunează* (126v), *îndireptează* (135v);
- very frequent are the adverbial phrases (today – archaic or regional) *iară* (used 57 times in the text); *înălăuntru* (123f); *în veci* (133v); *întru veci* (133v);
- the strengthening pronoun *însuși* is found mainly next to divinity names (9 times): *Însuși pieptul lu Hs* (121f); *Însuși Hs* (121v, 125v); *Însuși lu Hs* (122v); *Însuși Hs Dumnezeu* (125f); *Însuși trupul Fiului* (126f), *însuși pre sine* (128v); *Însuși Dumnezeu* (135v); *pre sine însuși* (136v);
- the repetition of pronominal forms: *ia-ți crucea ta* (135f); *i s-a arătat lui* (123v);
- the occurrence of the reflexive pronoun *sine* (4 times): *sine-ș face* (128v); *sine de toate fărădelegile* (129f); *pre sine de toate cealea* (135v); *iubitor pre sine* (136v).

3. LEXIC

By introducing the Slavonic liturgy to the Romanians, in the second half of the tenth century, the Romanian religious terminology has been established and refined, especially the one related to organizing the cult, the church hierarchy, the christian calendar, and the holidays. The Slavonic – as spoken language of Eastern Europe – helped the pervasion of Greek-Byzantine religious terms in Romanian language. The ecclesiastical terminology research reveals the existence of two layers of religious words. The first has a secular origin and the second, which was shaped in the process of development and organization of Christian cult, enriched with semantic and lexical neologisms².

The religious terminology used by Moxa in *St. Gregory* can be distributed in the following semantic fields:

- sermons: *evanghelie* (123v, 124f); *leturghie* (127v – *leturghii* 121f); *pildă* (133f), *urariu* (129v, 130v); *molitva* (123v, 124f); *văhocu* (123v);

² Frențiu-Ivăniș, 2013: 311-315.

- used objects and materials: *aerul* (121v); *antimisul* (121v); *blid* (122v, 123f, 125f, 130v); *cadelniță* (123v); *cădi* (123v), *crucea* (132f; *crucii* – 135f); *discosul* (121v); *mir/-ul* (124f, 136v); *potir* (121v); *prescure* (122v; *prescuri* – 123f); *priceaștenie* (128v); *pocroave* (121v); *sfintele daruri* (124v, 126v, 128f);

- buildings and furniture: *biseareca* (121f, 127v); *catapetazma* (121v); *mănăstire* (133v); *oltariu* (123v, 124v); *preastolul oltariului* (121v); *sfânta masă* (124v; *sfintei mease* – 125f);

- hierarchy: *arhiereul* (129f, 129v); *vl(ădi)ca* (129f); *preot* (129f); *popa* (129f); *diacon* (129f, 129v); *cetețul* (129f, 129v); *călugărul* (132v, 134v) – *caloger* (129f, 129v);

- ritualic clothing: *analav* (135f, **gr. analevos**, *analab*, clothes belonging to monks, covering the chest and back, decorated with many crosses); *brâu* (134v, **alb. bres** – belt, girdle); *cuculiu* (135v); *călțuni* (136v) *felon* (122v, **sl. felonŭ**, a short cape, also called *șfită*, which is dressed over the priests clothes), *mantie* (134f, **sl. mantija** - cape), *petrahiriu* (130v), *pomisălnic* (122f, an ornament for the head), *procoave* (121v, **sl. pokrovŭ**, cloth), *scumă* (135f); *stihariul* (130v, **ngr. stihári**, **sl. stihárŭ**, **rus. stihári**, a cloth with sleeves worn by the deacon at the sermon; is also worn by the priest under the *felon*).

The introduction of Slavonic Liturgy to the Romanian Orthodox people was understood by many linguists (including A. Lupul-Antonescu³) as a cultural dependence on the Slavonic world, even though just few of the terms have become popular in our language: *călugăr*, *evanghelie*, *icoană*, *liturghie*, *pildă*, *prescure* etc.

The Christianization of the Slavs meant also that they borrowed the Byzantine Orthodox terminology. But they did not just borrow the terminology, they had also enriched it with local terms, that would penetrate later on into the Romanian language.

In the technical text of sermons some lexical units appeared, many of these being terms attested in the first Romanian texts (the XVI-th century): *altar* (next to its variants: *oltar*, *oltareu*, *oltariu*), *duh*, *jertfă*, *post*, *taină*, *moaște*, *prooroc*, *sfânt*, *ceteț* (*citeț*), *sobor*, *jertfelnic*, *pocrovăț*, *șfită*, *cădelniță*, *pomeni*, *sfînți*, *praznic*, *mir* etc.

In the studied religious text the following semantic subclasses were found:

- basic knowledge of the Christian religion: *duh*, *taină* (*taina*), *trup*, *jertfă*;
- names that aim at holiness: *apostol* (*apl.*), *sfânt*, *moaște*, *măcenic*;
- church hierarchy: *cetețul*;
- the church, the monastery: priestly clothes (*felon* or *șfită*) and cult objects, religious gestures: *cădelniță*, (*a*) *cădi*;
- the religious service (sequences of sermons, church hymns, rituals): *ceas*, *mirui*, *pomeni*, *sfînți*, *slujbă*, *sluji*, *taină*, *vohod* (the priest walking through the church during the service, when he goes out – *văhocu*).

Most of the religious terms mentioned above have entered our language after the old Slavic phase (after the XI-th century). The name of Slavonic (proposed by Gh. Mihăilă and repeated by other researchers) is most suitable. Some Slavonic elements occurent in the

³ Lupul-Antonescu, in his study published in 1890, *Veacul XVI – Limba și literatura românilor*, at the page 26 noted that the Slavic prevalence kept shackled the Romanian thinking...: *Această predominare slavonă, ține cugetarea românească încătușată, presară țara cu mănăstiri în care se adăpostesc Bulgari, pună în mână Domnilor limba slavonă și le deprindă condeiful să reprezinte cu slove cugetarea formulată în slavonește.*

religious texts possess features of the Medio-Bulgarian or Serbian nature and many researchers agreed on the idea that the Medio-Bulgarian version is the fundamental variant of Slavonic. Being the direct successor of old Slavic, it was the dominant cult language in our country during the centuries XIV – XVI. Therefore, by elements of Slavic origin one should understand the Medio-Bulgarian Slavonic terms. The only old Slavic term that Romanian language kept is *sfânt*.

The Slavonic influence on the Romanian language had not manifested itself in one period or uniformly. Old Slavic words have been preserved or have been replaced with new, Medio-Bulgarian, then Serbian or Russian, given that in our country many works belonging to Medio-Bulgarian, Serbian, and Russian-Ukrainian editions were drafted and printed.

4. THE PRAYER AS TEXT

The prayer can be analyzed as part of religious orations genre (in terms of textual linguistics) as well as part of discursive universe (from the perspective of Eugen Coșeriu). The Romanian scholar classified the universe of discourse into four classes, taking into consideration there are four fundamental modes of human knowledge: current experience, science and technology, fantasy and art, and faith. The latter is perhaps the most strict of them all, as it possesses a founding value, being absolute. This system does not allow any hypothesis that can be verified, making the prayer a text more or less fixed, which must recognize the omnipotence of God.

The liturgy can be considered a sum of codes (gestic, proxemic, iconic, clothing) and a language that can be investigated accordingly. From a function perspective, the language of prayers is dominated by its liturgic function. Its secondary functions are: emotive, conative, and referential.

The language of prayers is dominated by sitagms as: *Dumnezeu* (God), *ceruri* (Heaven), *sfânt* (sacred, holy), *voe* (divine will) etc. The texts of prayers have not changed dramatically, as Saint Basil the Great was advising the priests to read all the time from the holy books, not to recite, in order to avoid altering the holy texts. Up until today, the religious language held its ground, its archaic character, but nevertheless it is a poetic language, adorned with beautiful metaphors.

Every prayer begins with theonymes, as follows:

- *Tatăl nostru, care ne ești în ceruri/ Sfîntească-se numele Tău/Vie împărăția Ta/ Facă-se voia Ta...*

- *Cuvine-se cu adevărat să Te fericim pe tine Născătoare de Dumnezeu, cea pururea fericită și prea nevinovată și Maica Dumnezeului nostru. Ceea ce ești mai cinstită decât Heruvimii și mai mărită fără de asemănare decât Serafimii, care fără stricăciune pe Dumnezeu Cuvântul ai născut, pe Tine cea cu adevărat Născătoare de Dumnezeu Te mărim;*

- *Împărate ceresc, Mângâietorul, Duhul adevărului, Care pretutindenea ești și toate le împlinești, Vistierul bunătăților și dăătorule de viață, vino și Te sălășluiește întru noi, și ne curățește pe noi de toată întinăciunea și mântuiește, Bunule, sufletele noastre;*

- *Iubi-Te-voi Doamne, vârtutea mea. Domnul este întărirea mea și scăparea mea și izbăvitorul meu*⁴.

The first part of a prayer focuses on God, with all of His attributes, which is considered to be a reminiscence of the Hebrew practice of prayer (scholars call this: *the Hebrew respect*), and only after respects are being payed, the believer starts to ask Divinity for food, sanity, forgiveness, and protection from Evil.

The Divine Liturgy is an act of faith including many people, it cannot be performed by the priest alone, given its *communal nature*: the priest prays for the believers, while the believers pray in return for the priest, offering sacred hymns to God.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The presentation of linguistic features of Byzantine-Slavic terminology highlights the conservatism and the archaic character of the technical language of worship. A diachronic perspective on the text confirms the perpetuation of archaic facts of language. It has been said that the Byzantine-Slavic terminology represents a common feature of Eastern spirituality, and rightly so. The Slavic influence on technical vocabulary in the studied text was stronger than the Greek influence. Many of Byzantine Greek lexemes penetrated Romanian through the Slavonic languages, and their presence in the first Romanian texts of the seventeenth century constitutes an argument of their age in the language. At the same time, it confirms the stability of Romanian religious vocabulary. The linguistic analysis of the studied text aims to be a step in approaching the complex issues of religious language.

References

1. Coșeriu, E., 2010 – *Orationis Fundamenta. Rugăciunea ca text*, trad. Andreea Grinea, în Transilvania (7-8), pp. 1-12.
2. Graur, Al., 1963 – *Etimologii românești*, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romîne.
3. Hasdeu, B.P., 1983 – *Cuvente den bătrâni, I*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
4. ILRL1, 1983 – *Istoria limbii române literare* (St. Munteanu, V. Țăra), București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
5. ILRL2, 1997 – *Istoria limbii române literare, Epoca veche (1532-1780)* – coord. I. Gheție, București, Editura Academiei Române.
6. Iorga, N., 1925 – *Istoria literaturii românești*, Ediția a II-a revăzută și larg întregită, București, Editura Librăriei Pavel Suru, Calea Victoriei 73.
7. Ivănuș-Frențiu, Maria, 2013 – *Aspecte ale limbajului liturgic românesc*, Cluj, Casa Cărții de Știință.
8. Lupul-Antonescul, 1890 – *Veaculă XVI – Limba și literatura românilor*, Bucuresci, Tipografia Carol Gobl, Strada Doamnei, 16.

⁴ Prayers currently sung in the Ortodox Church: *Sfaturi ortodoxe* [Online], Available at: <http://www.sfaturiortodoxe.ro/rs.htm>, [Accessed at 25/07/15].

9. Mihăescu, D., 2006 – *Cronografele românești*, București, Editura Academiei Române.
10. Moxa, Mihail, 1989 – *Cronica universală*, ediție G. Mihăilă, Editura Minerva, București.
11. Moxa, Mihail, 1620-1630 – *Sfântul Grigorie Bgslov*, British Library, London.
12. Najim, Michel and Frasier, T.L., 1995 – *Understanding Orthodox Liturgy*, Antiochian Orthodox Christian Church Archdiocese, New Jersey.
13. *Sfaturi ortodoxe* [Online], Available at: <http://www.sfaturiortodoxe.ro/rs.htm>, [Accessed at 25/07/15].

NOTE:

This research has been partially supported by the Project POSDRU/159/1.5/S/138963 – "Sustainable Performance in Doctoral and Post-doctoral Research – PERFORM", co-financed by the European Social Fund.