

Slavic Lexical Elements in Antim Ivireanu's *Evangelhia* (1697)

Roxana VIERU

El Evangelio de 1697, que lleva la firma de Antim Ivireanul, no se ha beneficiado hasta la fecha de una edición comparable a la de otros textos rumanos antiguos. Por el momento, hemos realizado la transcripción del texto, pero estamos preparando también un estudio en dos partes: filológico y lingüístico. En el presente artículo haremos hincapié en un aspecto del componente léxico, más concretamente en los lexemas de origen eslavo o con base de derivación eslava ocurrientes en el texto estudiado (vocablos que han desaparecido de la lengua rumana literaria o que se registran con un significado diferente del que tienen hoy en día).

Palabras clave: léxico, origen eslavo, base de derivación eslava, términos griegos incorporados al rumano mediante un intermediario eslavo

Antim Ivireanu's text, *Evangelhia*, has not been brought to public attention in detail until now. The text, written in the Cyrillic alphabet, does not have a transcription in the Latin alphabet like most of the texts of its time. One of my latest projects is to reveal the text in the Latin alphabet and to create a complete study of this late seventeenth century text, with both a philological and a linguistic component.

My article follows the well-known pattern of extended linguistic studies as it is accepted by linguists (especially language historians). Thus, I have in mind two different aspects of this topic, namely the analysis of those words that are no longer in use nowadays and then the analysis of those words whose meaning was different from the one used by the common speaker of contemporary Romanian language.

In the lines above, I have referred to the archaisms found in Ivireanu's *Evangelhia* and I think that, at this point, a distinction between the common literary Romanian and the religious style of literary Romanian should be drawn to public attention. The religious style of any language (Romanian is no exception in this respect) is very conservative, preserving linguistic facts (phonetic, lexical, semantic and grammatical) from older stages in the development of a language. For priests, linguists and for regular church-goers, the above mentioned linguistic facts are or might be common knowledge. But for the largest part of the community (and the dissociation is valid for communities speaking any language), the same linguistic facts might make no sense at all. That is the reason why by common literary language I mean the language understood by all the speakers of a certain

community sharing that language as it is spoken correctly (or, at least, as these speakers aspire to use it correctly).

In this respect, the first part of the present article is a linguistic commentary on those words that are no longer used in the common literary Romanian, even though they might be used by some of the speakers (as I mentioned before, those persons who are familiar with the religious style). If any of the words are still heard today in some parts of the country – not as part of any specialized vocabulary, but as common words – references will be made.

In the second part of the article, I analyze those lexemes that can still be heard today, but with a different signification from the one used in the text.

Words which are not in use in common literary Romanian

Words of Slavic origin

An impressive number of compound Slavic elements belonging to the religious register are formed with the word *blago*, which conveys the true meaning of the Greek word *euv* „well”. *Blagočistivî* counts among these elements. The Slavic word *blagočistivî* generated the adjective *blagocestiv*¹ in Romanian, a word which means “compassionate”. In the text that has been subjected to our examination, the word is registered in the introductory fragment: [1^v] „...Asupra stemei prea luminatului, slăvitului și *bl[a]gocestivului* Io[an] Constandin B. Basarab Voevod”.

Cirtă (< Sl. *črŭta*) was used in Romanian with extremely diverse meanings: 1. “feature”, 2. “small amount”, 3. “moment, second”. The dictionaries of contemporary Romanian language indicate that the noun is still used today, but only in the vernacular (and never in the literary language) and only with one of the two last meanings. In Ivireanu’s text, the word occurs in the following fragment with the second of the three meanings mentioned above: [143^v / 2] „...Că adevăr zic voao: până ce va trece ceriul și pământul o iotă sau o *cirtă* nu va trece din leage până ce vor fi toate”.

Sl. *dažda* “donation”, derived from the verb *dati* “to give” had generated in Old Romanian the noun *dajde*, whose signification is “contribution, tribute, tax”. Romanian derived new words from this noun and among them one can observe two other nouns: *dajnic*, designating the person who makes a donation or the tax-payer, and *dăjdier*, designating the person who collects the taxes. Both terms can be found in texts written during the same period as the text analyzed here. The lexeme *dajde* occurs in the following fragment: [39^v / 2] „...Ce ți [40^r / 1] să pare, Simone, împărații pămîntești de la carii iau *dăjdi* sau bir: dela slugile sale au dela striini?”, where a synonym was also given, probably in order to make the meaning of this word more explicit (*bir*). A more precise signification is attributed to the word in a number of other contexts, from which one can infer that the donation referred to money and not to different kinds of products, for instance. Immediately after the above-mentioned paragraph there is another one, even more obvious: [40^r / 1]

¹ G. Ivănescu presents this lexeme as a Slavic element used exclusively in literary (written) texts (see G. Ivănescu, *Istoria limbii române*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 2000, p. 591).

„...Iată că sînt slobozi fiii. Ce, ca să nu-i scîrbim pre dînșii, mergi la mare și aruncă undița, și peaștele carele vei prinde întîi, ia-l. Și, deșchizînd gura lui, vei găsi un *statir*. Luînd acela, dă pentru mine și pentru tine” (the word *statir* designates a coin used by the old Greeks and the old Macedonians). And a few pages after that: [77^r / 1] „... <Învățătoriuile, știm că drept zici și în- [77^r / 2] veți și nu cauți în față, ce întru adevăr calea lui D[u]mnezău înveți. Cade-să noao a da *dajde* împăratului au ba?> Iară el, înțelegînd hicleșugul lor, au zis cătră ei: <Ce mă ispitii? Arătați-mi un *dinariu*! Al cui chip are și scriptură?>” (*dinar* designates an old coin used in the Arab world). No other reference is made to monetary units, but instead two generic terms are used further on, *bani* and *galbeni*: [45^v / 2] „...<Cade-să a da *dajde* Chesariului au ba?> Iară Is., înțelegînd ficleșugul lor, au zis: <Ce mă ispitii, fățarnicilor? Arătați-mi *galbenul* cel de *dajde*!> Iară ei au adus lui un *ban*.”, [85^r / 2] „... <Învățătoriuile, știm că adevărat ești și nu ții grijă de nimenea, că nu cauți în față oa- [85^v / 1] menilor, ce cu adevărat calea lui D[u]mnezău înveți. Cade-se a da *dajde* împăratului au ba? Da-vom au nu vom da?> Iară el, știind fățarnicia lor, au zis lor: <Ce mă ispitii? Aduceți-mi un *ban* să văz.>”

The noun *jitniță*, existent in Romanian since the century preceding the one in which this text was written (it was attested in some of Coresi's texts and in *Palia de la Orăștie*), has been buried in oblivion. The word is very rarely used and only as a regionalism². Its etymon is Slavic (< Sl. *žitnica*) and its meaning is “barn”. The word can be found in a number of contexts, such as: [27^v / 1] „...Căutați spre pasările ceriului, că nice nu samănă, nice nu seaceră, nice adună în *jitniță*”, [31^v / 2] „...grîul îl strîngeți în *jitnița* mea”, [70^v / 1] „...carii n-au visterii, nice *jitnițe*”.

The verb *a năimi* (which has a number of phonetic alternatives in old Romanian texts, such as *nă(ie)mi*, (*i*)*nă(i)mi*) means “to employ, to hire”. Its etymology is also Slavic (< Sl. *najmati*), as it happens with most of the words here discussed. By articulating the participle form of this verb, the speakers of old Romanian language created the noun *năimitul*. The verb occurs in the context [37^r / 2] „...Aseamene iaste împărăția ceriului omului casnic carele au eșit de dimineață să *năimească* lucrători la via sa”. The noun can be found in: [144^r / 2] „...Iară *năimitul* și care nu iaste păstoriu, căruia nu sînt oile ale lui, veade lupul viind și lasă oile și fuge; și lupul răpește pre dînsele și răsipește oile. Iară *năimitul* fuge, că *năimit* iaste și nu-i iaste lui grije de oi”. The only element from this family of words that is still in use today is the noun *năimitor*, which was derived in Romanian from the verb *a năimi* with the agentive suffix of Latin origin *-tor*. The mentioned noun has, though, a very restricted usage. It is not a component of the contemporary literary Romanian vocabulary, it is a regionalism. In the sixteenth century texts (to be more specific, only in Coresi's texts), the verb was the only element of this family that can be found.

Obroc (< Sl. *obrokū* “wages”) designated the following notions in old Romanian: “portion, ratio”, “present, donation” (with religious references). This

² See point number 75 on the map number 338 in *NALR (Banat)*.

word merged with another one, its homonym, whose etymon is the Slavic *uborŭkŭ*. The last of the above mentioned lexemes³ comprises these meanings: 1. “measure for cereals”; 2. “basket”; 3. “weir, sluice gate”. *Obroc* is found in a fragment excerpted from the studied text as part of the phrase *a pune sub obroc* “to keep something hidden”: [68^v / 1] „...Nime aprinzînd lumina o pune într-ascuns, nici supt *obroc*, ce în sfeășnic, ca ceia ce întră să vază lumina”. The word can still be heard nowadays, but only as part of this idiom (which is almost a fixed phrase). Very rarely, the term alone is used with just one of its former meanings, namely that of “basket”, and not any kind of basket, but the one used to catch fish. In one village (in Vaslui county), the word designates a kind of basket made of wood or iron used to measure maize or wheat⁴. During the sixteenth century, the Romanians used the verb *a obroci* (with its alternative form *a obrăci*) – as one can easily realize by reading texts dating back to that time. But the verb had nothing to do semantically with the noun.

Oțapoc is a term with Ruthenian (< Ruth. *otcupok*) and Russian etymology (< Rus. *oščepok*); these words, in turn, came from a term of old Slavic origin, *čepati*. Its meaning is “splinter, chip”. The word occurs in this large fragment (for more than one time): [25^f / 2] „...Dară ce vezi *oțapocul* în ochiul fratelui tău, iară bîrna carea iaste în ochiul tău nu o simți? Sau cum zici fratelui tău: <Lasă să iau *oțapocul* den ochiul tău> și iată, bîrna iaste în ochiul tău. Fățarnice, ia înfii bîrna den ochiul tău și atuncea vei vedea să iai *oțapocul* din ochiul fratelui tău”.

The word *pritiča* of Slavic origin had generated the Romanian noun *price*, a word with four related meanings: 1. “cause, reason, pretext”; 2. “litigation, trial”, 3. “quarrel, argument, discord”, 4. “opposition, contradiction”. Al. Ciorănescu (*DER*) mentions that a natural reduction occurred in the phonetic structure of the Romanian word, in much the same way it happened with some other words in similar cases. The noun *price* is registered in the following fragment excerpted from Ivireanu’s *Evanghelia*: [94^f / 1] “Iară ei au început a să întreba întru eiș cine ar fi dintru dînșii cel ce va să facă aceasta. Și au fost și *price* întru ei carele s-ar părea a fi mai mare între ei”. The word is used here with the third of the four above mentioned meanings. Even though the lexeme is still sometimes used today in vernacular, speakers of contemporary Romanian language never use it with this meaning. The only significance known (and used) today for this word is that of “accusation, blaming”. As authors of contemporary Romanian language dictionaries point out, the word might come into structures with the verb *a face*; in these structures the meaning of the noun is “sorrow”. In some of the sixteenth century texts, the same noun was recorded with another meaning, which is “parable”.

³ I found the word *oboroc* in *ALRR (Banat)*, map 493, point 13, designating the brim of a hat. I also found the lexeme *oborog* in *ALRR (Maramureș)*, map 866, points number 227, 240; its meaning is “a covered place used to store the hay”.

⁴ See point 616 on the map number 279 in *NALR (Moldova și Bucovina)*.

Specific to the religious texts only, the term *soroacă* is of Slavic origin and its etymon is, as H. Tiktin shows, the word *sroka*. In old Romanian, this word was used with two meanings: 1. “point”, 2. “verse (in the Bible)”. The latter is used in the following fragment excerpted from Ivireanu’s text: [III^r] „...Și pre unde iaste steaoa aceasta să nu gîndească neștine că s-au pus în toate locuri pentru *soroacă* de săvîrșit, ce pentru unirea stihurilor den Tetravanghel”. In this fragment, the discussed lexeme is related to its synonym, *stih*, a lexical element with Medieval Greek etymology (< MGr. *stivco*) which did not come into Romanian directly, but by means of Slavic religious texts (< Sl. *stihŭ*). The noun *soroacă* can also be found in a text dating from the sixteenth century (Coresi’s *Praxiu*), where it occurs with the former of the above mentioned meanings.

Umivanie is a word that was last used during the eighteenth century. In what concerns the sixteenth century, I presume it was known, though I could not find it in the texts written in those times; my motivation for this hypothesis is based on the fact that another word from the same family of words, *umivalniță*, is present in *Cuvente den bătrîni*. In Ivireanu’s text, the noun *umivanie* occurs in the titles of two (divine) services that must be held by priests during the Passion Week: [112^r / 2] „...E[va]ng[he]lia la *Umivanie* dintîi”, [112^v / 1] „...E[va]ng[he]lia a dooa după *Umivanie*”. The two services refer to the fragment in the Bible in which the apostles’ feet are (symbolically) washed by Jesus. Tiktin indicates the Slavic word *umyvanije* as the etymon of the Romanian lexeme; the meaning of the etymon itself is “washing” and so is the meaning of the Romanian word.

The noun of Slavic origin *vadră* (< Sl. *vědro*) is registered in etymologic dictionaries with three different meanings: 1. “measure for volume or capacity (that equals ten ‘oca’ or 12.88 l. in Muntenia / Wallachia and 15.2 l. in Moldavia)”, 2. “bucket”, 3. “a certain folk dance”. The word occurs in the text I have studied with the first of the meanings listed above (a meaning with which the speakers of contemporary Romanian are not familiar): [180^r / 1] „...Și era acolo șase vase de piatră puse după curățeniia jidovilor, carele lua cîte doao sau trei *veadre*”. The word occurs in the text in some other place with the second meaning, in a fragment that narrates the episode in which Jesus talks to the Samaritan woman: [11^v / 1] „...Iară muiarea ș-au lăsat *vadra* sa și au mers în cetate și au grăit oamenilor: <Veniți și vedeți[i] pre omul carele mi-au zis mie toate cîte am făcut, au doară acela iaste Hs.! >” The noun is still used today with this meaning but only as a regionalism, since it can be heard in a number of villages in Oltenia, Muntenia and Dobrogea⁵, Banat⁶ and also in two villages in Bucovina (in Suceava county)⁷.

⁵ See sketch number 142 in *ALRR (Muntenia și Dobrogea)*. The word refers to a recipient used to place the milk in order to coagulate. See also sketch number 83 indicating points 671, 675, 681 – the word refers to a tub, a kind of vessel with ears made of (wooden) staves and used for wine.

⁶ See 230/15; 265/68; 269/43; 284/31, 34, 35, 41, 77, 80, 81; 300/9, 92 in *NALR (Banat)*.

⁷ See points 462 and 469 on the map number 219 in *NALR (Moldova și Bucovina)*. Here, the word is used with some changes in the phonetic structure (since it is registered as *vidră*) and it designates a specific type of bucket, made of (wooden) staves and used when someone milks the sheep or the cows.

As part of the religious terminology, but out of use nowadays, the word *zaceală* (< Sl. *začalo*) must also be included here. It designates the chapter in the Gospel which is read at every service. In the studied text, it occurs in: [III^r] „Cade-se a ști că la E[va]ng[he]lia aceasta nu s-au pus *zacealele* precum au fost înfii, ce capetele”.

Zapis (< Sl. *zapisŭ*⁸), meaning “act, document, written record”, has only one occurrence in the analyzed text: [73^v / 1] „...Ia-ți *zapisul* tău și șezi curînd de scrie cincizeci”. In the same context, on the same page, one of its synonyms is used, *scrisoarea* (a noun derived in Romanian from a verb of Latin origin): [73^v / 1] „...Ia-ți *scrisoarea* ta și scrie optzeci”.

Words of Greek origin which came into Romanian through Slavic

The noun *finic* has drawn my attention in the following phrase: [105^r / 1] „...stîlpări de *finic*”. Its origin must be sought in Medieval Greek (< MGr. *foivnix*). The Romanian language did not get it directly from Greek; the term had its way to Romanian through Slavic (< Sl. *finiku*). Since the meaning of the lexeme is “palm tree”, its referent was familiar, at that time, in Europe, only to those populations living close to the Mediterranean Sea. The concept itself and thus the word must have been presented to populations living in different other areas by means of descriptions made in written wide spread texts. The noun *finic* had been used previously, for example in some of Coresi’s texts (sixteenth century).

Another word of Medieval Greek origin is *pizmă* (< MGr. *pei’sma*) meaning “envy”. It is not recommended today as an element of literary Romanian, but it is still heard sometimes in vernacular. As in the case of the word mentioned above, it also came into Romanian by means of a Slavic term, namely *pizma*. In Ivireanu’s text, it occurs in: [127^v / 1] „...Deci adunîndu-se ei, le-au zis lor Pilat: <Pre carele veți să vă sloboz voao: pre Varavva au pre Is., ce să zice Hs.? > Că știia că pentru *pizma* l-au dat pre dînsul”.

The Greek word *smuvrna* (“resin of the *Styrax benzoï* tree”) had generated in Slavic *smirna*, *zmirŭna*, which, in turn, generated in Romanian the word *zmirnă*. In contemporary Romanian, the phonetic form is slightly altered (the voiced consonant *z* changed to its mute pair, *s*), so that it is pronounced *smirnă*. Currently, the lexeme only occurs in the religious vocabulary. In the analyzed text, it occurs in a number of contexts, such as: [121^v / 2] „...Și i-au dat lui să bea vin amestecat cu *zmirnă*”, [123^v / 1] „...aducînd amestecătură de *zmirnă* și de aloi ca la o sută de litre”, [149^v / 2] „...Și întrînd în casă, au aflat pruncul cu Mariia, muma lui; și căzînd, s-au închinat lui. Și deșchizîndu-ș vistieriile sale, adus-au lui daruri: aur și tămîe și *zmirnă*”.

Romanian words which are derived from roots of Slavic origin

⁸ G. Ivănescu considers that the etymology of this word should be considered Medieval Bulgarian and not Old Slavic (see G. Ivănescu, *Istoria limbii române*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 2000, p. 500).

The masculine noun *oblăduitoriu*, meaning “governor, administrator, leader” is a word derived from the verb *a oblădui* of Slavic origin (< Sl. *obladovati*, which comes from *oblasti*, *oblada*, these two forms coming, in turn, from *vlasti*, *vlada*) with the suffix of Latin origin *-tor* (< Lat. *-torius*). It occurs only once in Ivireanu’s *Evangelhia*, in the introductory fragment: [1^r] „Sfînta și d[u]mnezeiasca Evanghelie cu voia prea luminatului și înălțatului D[o]mn și *oblăduitoriu* a toată Țara Rumânească, Io[an] Constandin B. Voevod”.

The noun *pizmaș* (designating an envious wicked person) and the adjective *pizmaș* (designating the characteristic of such a person) are both derived from the noun *pizma* (see *supra*) with the suffix *-aș*. The noun is found in: [32^r / 2] „...Iară *pizmașul* carele le-au sămănat pre dînsele iaste diiavolul.” The adjective is found in the following context: [31^v / 2] „...<D[oa]mne, au n-ai sămănat sămînță bună în holda ta? De unde are neghină?> Iară el le-au zis lor: <Om *pizmaș* au făcut aceasta>.” Both the noun and the adjective are sometimes heard today, but they are elements of the colloquial speech.

The verb *a prici* “to quarrel” and the noun *pricire* “quarrel”, derived from the word *price* (see above), can be found in a number of contexts in the analyzed text, such as: [8^r / 1] „...Deci *să priciia* întru dînșii jidovii”, [80^v / 2] „...Iară ei au tăcut că *să pricise* pre cale unul cu altul cine ar fi mai mare dentru dînșii, [111^v / 2] „...*să făcuse și pricire* între dînșii, carele dentru ei se-ar părea a fi mai mare”.

Words which occur in the text with another meaning than the one(s) accepted today

Words like *harnic*, *a hrăni* and *scîrbă* fall into this category. By looking up the first of the three mentioned words in etymological dictionaries, everyone interested can notice two ‘unusual’ meanings of the lexeme, besides the one well known and quite often used today. One of these two meanings is “grateful”, no longer in use today; the other one is “capable”, used only in vernacular. *Harnic* was derived in Romanian from the noun *har* by suffixation (with the suffix of Slavic origin *-nic*). On the one hand, the noun is indicated to have Greek origins⁹ (< MGr. *cavri*”), as Ciorănescu states; but the linguist also specifies that the Greek word made its way to Romanian through Slavic (Sl. *chari*). On the other hand, Scriban supports another theory, according to which the Romanian word has Slavic origin exclusively; to prove his point of view, he indicates the Slavic etymon *charinŭ* and he offers two Bulgarian terms for comparison: *haren* “beautiful” and *neharen* “lazy” (so, no connection with the meanings of the Romanian lexeme). In the following excerpt from Ivireanu’s text, the word *harnic* means “capable”: [89^r / 2] „...nu mai sînt *harnic* a mă chiema fiul tău”.

In the old period of literary Romanian, the verb *a hrăni* was used with two meanings; besides the current one, another one was accepted at that time and now forgotten: “to protect”. The word was older, but it gained the second meanings

⁹ See Ciorănescu, *DER*.

afterwards (after its ‘birth’ as a Romanian word), by means of written religious texts. The etymon of the verb, the Slavic *chraniti*, is a word derived from the noun *chrana*. In texts from the sixteenth century, both the verb and the noun in this family of words are recorded. And both these words occurred with their old meanings, the ones that are no longer in use now, namely: “protection, vigil” and “to protect” respectively. In the analyzed text, written at the end of the seventeenth century, the verb is recorded in the preface with the meaning that has been forgotten, as one can easily see from this fragment: [I^v] „...Veade-se că Corbul proroc *au hrănit* și dumnezeiască poruncă au plinit, pren care și stema aceasta să arată cu darul cel de sus înfrumusețată aducându-i arma cea de biruință de încoronează pre cel de bună viță”.

Dictionaries indicate more than one meaning for the word *scîrbă*: 1. “sadness, bitterness”, 2. “misfortune”, 3. “anger, fury” 4. “disgust, boredom”, 5. “disgust, repugnance”). From these five, the third meaning has been forgotten and the first two have become regionalisms. In the analyzed text, the noun *scîrbă* occurs (only with the first of the five meanings) and, along with it, the adjective *scîrbit* “sad”: [18^v / 1] „...Dară de aceasta vă întrebați între voi, că ce am zis întru puțin și nu mă veți vedea pre mine și iară întru puțin și mă veți vedea. Că veți plînge și vă veți tîngui voi. Iară lumea să va bucura. Și voi veți[i] fi *scîrbiți*, ce *scîrba* voastră va fi întru bucurie. Muiarea cînd naște, *scîrbă* are, că au sosit ceasul ei. Iară deaca naște coconul, după aceeaia nu-ș mai aduce aminte de *scîrbă* pentru bucurie, că s-au născut om în lume”. In the texts written in the sixteenth century, another word from the same family of words is recorded, namely *scîrbie*; its meaning is “anger, fury”.

Bibliography

The basic text

Ivireanul, Antim, *Sfînta și dumnezeiasca Evanghelie*, Mănăstirea din Snagov, 1697 (tipăritură)

Atlases and dictionaries

Dicționar explicativ al limbii române, Editura Univers enciclopedic, București, 1998

Arvinte, Vasile, Dumistrăcel, Stelian, Florea, Ion, Nuță, Ion, Turculeț, Adrian, Botoșineanu, Luminița, Hreapcă, Doina, Olariu, Florin-Teodor, *Noul atlas lingvistic român pe regiuni. Moldova și Bucovina* (III), Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași, 2007. [= *NALR. (Moldova și Bucovina)*]

Ciorănescu, Alexandru, *Dicționarul etimologic al limbii române*, Editura Saeculum I. O., București, 2002 [= *DER*]

Neiescu, Petru, Beltechi, Eugen, Faiciuc, Ioan, Mocanu, Nicolae, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Banat* (III), Editura Academiei Române, București, 1998. [= *ALRR (Banat)*]

Neiescu, Petru, Beltechi, Eugen, Faiciuc, Ioan, Mocanu, Nicolae, *Noul atlas lingvistic pe regiuni. Banat* (II), Editura Academiei Române, București, 1997. [= *NALR (Banat)*]

- Neiescu, Petru, Rusu, Grigore, Stan, Ionel, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Maramureș (III)*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1973. [= *ALRR (Maramureș)*]
- Teaha, Teofil (coord.), Marinescu, Bogdan, Saramandru, Nicolae, *Atlasul lingvistic român pe regiuni. Muntenia și Dobrogea (V)*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2007

Theoretical works

- Pascu, G., *Sufixe românești*, Librăria SOCEC & Co., București, 1916
- Densusianu, Ovid, *Istoria limbii române*, Editura Științifică, București, 1961 [vol. II]
- Ivănescu, G., *Istoria limbii române*, Editura Junimea, Iași, 2000

Texts

- Arvinte, Vasile, Caproșu, Ioan, Gafton, Alexandru, Guia, Sorin, *Palia de la Orăștie (1582). Textul*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 2005
- Bianu, I., *Psaltirea Scheiană*, Tipografia Carol Göbl, București, 1889
- Bianu, I., *Texte de limbă din secolul al XVI-lea*, Tiparul „Cultura națională”, București, 1930 [vol. IV *Lucrul apostolesc*]
- Chivu, Gheorghe, *Codex Sturdzanus*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1993
- Costinescu, Mariana, *Codicele Voroneșean*, Editura Minerva, București, 1981
- Gafton, Alexandru, *Codicele Bratul*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, Iași, 2003
- Gheție, Ion, Teodorescu, Mirela, *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 2005
- Gheție, Ion (coordonator), *Texte românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1982
- Mareș, Alexandru (coord.), *Crestomația limbii române vechi*, Editura Academiei Române, București, 1994
- Mareș, Al., *Liturghierul lui Coresi*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1969
- Rizescu, I., *Pravila ritorului Lucaci*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1971