GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES IN ANTIM IVIREANU'S "DIDAHII"[1]

***Abstract**: The present study represents an approach to the grammatical expressiveness in Antim Ivireanu's "Didahii" which consists in the empathic feeling of making the message come closer by means of language, because the preacher was convinced that as he was getting closer to the people, they were getting closer to God. The forms of expressiveness range two important aspects of speech acts functionality: their intentionality and their rationality. Due to the complexity and flexibility of the grammatical structure, it may become a source of expressiveness both at morphological and syntactic level.*

***Key words**: grammatical structures, empathy, morphological, syntactic.*

1. Expressiveness is a concept often identified with affectivity as a result of some devices by means of which certain emotional moods become evident in language (DSL, 2001: 31), aiming to affect the hearers' perception background. According to Ch. Bally, this was the domain of stylistics for the literary text. However, the artistic effect, the emotional knowledge, does not perfectly fit in the figurative area, as many researchers considered.

Antim Ivireanu's *Didahii* is not an artistic work in the sense of the pure art gratuitousness and all the three fundamental types of speech acts are to be found in it: illocutionary, locutionary and perlocutionary acts.

At the pragmatic level, illocutionary acts reveal the position of the preacher who uses language "as a basic form of social behavior, characterized by intentionality" (Ionescu Ruxandoiu, 1991: 10). In Ivireanu's texts three cognitive areas are aimed at: making the passive hearers aware of some basic elements of Christian behavior; prevention from the permanent threat of devil's aggression; sinners' redemption by confession. None of these is considered less important, although the first and the second seem intermediary elements. The awareness should not result from an individual act, but it is institutionalized: *Şi am apelat la el mai ales ca la un renumit dascăl al şcolii de aici, pe care preacuvioasa-ţi înălţime a înfiinţat-o cu cheltuieli larg acordate întru iubire de Dumnezeu* (AI, 1972: 401).

The role of salvation by redemption is essential, as the Bible says that nobody is perfect, so it is often evoked by the author: *Pentru ca să ridicăm din mijlocul norodului nişte vătămări sufleteşti, ce vedem totdeauna că se lucrează şi la cei mici şi la cei mari... pentru ca să nu piară sufletele în deşărt...*(AI, 1972: 390).

All these aspects of *Didahii* may be approached as argumentative strategies with a great complexity. In each of them a well mastered technique of persuasion is obvious.

2. At locutionary level the use of persuasive techniques implies the tendency of permanent close relation between speaker and hearer. Ivireanu addresses to a variety of people, with pretty different levels of understanding, but his ambition is to project his message at the simplest man's level. Expressiveness with Antim Ivireanu means the very empathic feeling of making the message come closer by means of language, because the *Didahii* shows that the preacher was convinced that as he was getting closer to the people, they were getting closer to God.

[1] Sorinela Olteanu (Gheorghe), University of Piteşti olteanu_georgel@yahoo.com

3. The forms of this expressiveness range two important aspects of speech acts use: their intentionality and their rationality.

3.1. With Ivireanu, the illocutionary component, the deliberate manipulation by impressing functions in a simple way: people understand you better if you speak like them, as they consider you one of them. So, the text should be written "in an accessible language, so that it should become easy to understand the solving of such issues which are questionable" (AI, 1972: 400). The preacher does not always make the language accessible (it is not totally popular), but he combines the spoken language elements with standard language, sometimes in adjoining contexts, to get a greater accessibility. He pointed out that *Gramatica slavoneasca* "was written in spoken language and easier to understand" (AI, 1972: 405). He sometimes used old etymological forms which were later to be found only in the Northern dialects. That was a translator's habitude: the translated texts, which were meant to be spread all over the Romanian territory, used such a combination. It is known that the same method was used in translating the *Bible from Bucharest*, as the planned spreading power imposed the use of a greater number of Northern dialects elements than in other usual translations in Muntenia.

In this respect the most extended phenomenon which occurs in Ivireanu's sermons consists in producing fortis consonants so the following sound, non-syllabic *–i*, disappears. The phenomenon occurs with the nouns in the plural: *cetăț* (AI: 4, 6), *bunătăț* (AI: 23, 129), *iubiț fraț* (AI: 8). The adjectives involved in this phenomenon are usually participles: *văzuț şi nevăzuț* (AI: 22), *aleş şi despărțiț* (AI: 25), *nedechisiț* (AI: 5). The pronouns are the most numerous: *toț* (AI: 13, 24), *bătându-ş* (AI: 24), *să-ş răpue* (AI: 111), *nu-ş aducea aminte* (AI: 14), *ca să-m dea putere, că-m voiu fi eşit, să-m dăruiți* (AI: 23, 27, 203), *îț va da, îț voi arăta* (AI: 103). The fortis consonants occur also with verbs: *trimiteț, întindeț, vânaț* (AI: 5), *primiț, faceț, înveț* (AI: 7), *să nu ne laş* (AI: 119). There occurs a generalized popular form of the possessive pronoun in the masculine/neuter singular and masculine plural: *iubiții miei* (AI: 6), *cuvântul mieu şi înțelepciunea mea* (AI: 15). In the adverb category the popular feature does not include a fortis consonant, in most situations: *nu numa* (AI: 108, 203, 205); nimica (AI: 16, 26), *acuma* (AI: 103), *acolea* (AI: 113, 115), *întocma* (AI: 129). Still, the fortis consonants are not absent: *încăş* (AI: 16), *astăz* (AI: 103, 120).

Due to the fact that the verb is the center of the verbal group, an important component of the sentence, it had popular features well marked in spoken language. Ivireanu frequently uses the most important ones as a method to come closer to hearers. The first important feature is the iotacism with the most usual verbs: *nu poci cunoaşte* (AI: 27); *rămâiu fără de graiu* (AI: 131), *ca să rămâie* (AI: 127); *au vrut să vază şi să auză* (AI: 110). It seems that in the extra-linguistic context of Ivireanu's texts, the reverse verb forms which were rather frequent in translations were considered literary, so they little occur and are usually accompanied by common forms : *greşit-am şi am încălcat* (AI: 100). Some etymological verb forms preserved in spoken language occur in Ivireanu's texts, too: *şi dede lor putere* (AI: 125); *le dede plata* (AI: 128). Besides these spoken language forms used by the author to place him in the hearers' linguistic code, in communication there occur speech acts which seem to have this very role, to establish a relation between preacher and hearer. These are interjections, especially ostensive, considered "one of the means by which the speaker is related to the hearer" (ROVA, 2011: 310). The context of strengthening the deictic meaning is larger, involving use of imperative and nouns in the vocative. The interjections, especially the ostensive ones, seem to be required by the discursive nature of the *Didahii*: *Iată nor*

luminat (AI: 14); *Iată dară că n-avem credinţă* (AI: 25); *Ci iată ce vă zic, iubiţilor miei* (AI: 27); *carele sânt iată ce şi iată ce* (AI: 392).

With conjunctions, the accumulation or use of certain elements, usually correlative, preserved from Latin, are rather archaic: *căci că de am avea credinţă* (AI: 25); *au de la vrun sat, au să le hirotonească* (AI: 390); *sânt neertate, deaca nu să va face* (AI: 123). Expressions such as *nu care cumva să*, used to introduce the negative Clause of Purpose are folkloric, but the connector is still used in the contemporary standard language as the only form of expressing that relation: *carea cumva că nu-l fac* (AI: 388). The most relevant example of adopting spoken language occurs with conjunctions: *scriu pe cei ce să postesc, pen'ca să ştie cei ce nu-ş fac datoriia* (AI: 204).

3.2. Like Dosoftei, Ivireanu knew spoken folk language very well, as it may be proved by all types of examples above. The circumstances of this experience have not been explained by the researchers, because he had been brought in our country for his typographer knowledge, then he became an isolated monk. But Ivireanu knew also standard Romanian at that period and these language elements represent the majority in the text structure. He could not use only them, because of the variety of cultural levels in his audience. Adaptation of language to the communication context results from a certain realism of the preacher, as well as from his wish to render everyone the opinion that the Bible message addresses directly, in everyone's language.

Not only that he adopted spoken language forms, but he practiced the theological tolerance and used the standard forms to make hearers become familiar to them. There are numerous examples of structures combining the two registers: *văzuţi şi nevăzuţ* (AI: 8), *slujiţ şi vă bucuraţi* (AI: 15), *astăz, astăzi* (AI: 110); *toţi câţi s-au supus* (AI: 153); *îm înfruntez şi-mi ticăloşesc* (AI: 16); *încetaţi, mutaţi, vânaţ, veniţ* (AI: 5); *greşit-am şi am încălcat* (AI: 100); (eu) *văz* (AI: 200); *văd lumină* (AI: 110); *să nu să lipsească, ca să se ducă* (AI: 14); *nu să odihniia* (AI: 4); *să se mântuiască* (AI: 24), *i să cuveniia* (AI: 30), *să ducea* (AI: 43), *să tem* (AI: 44), *ţi să cuvine* (AI: 45), *să se facă el însuş; să se facă zidire, să se facă văzut* (AI: 130); *ca să se lupte* (AI: 131). It is clear that these structures are adequate to the communication context, as when Ivireanu addresses to priests, not to common people, he avoids the spoken folk features of language (*Învăţătură pentru taina pocăinţii; Învăţătură bisericească, Capete de poruncă*).

The frequency of fortis consonants is reduced in these texts: *să-m iarte; îm vor fi greşit* (AI: 392); with verbs and participle adjectives the fortis consonants are almost absent *să faceţi, lăcuiţi, să cercetaţi, toţi anii, să faceţi* (AI: 388); the etymological form *mâni* (AI: 111) is replaced by the standard one: *mâini* (AI: 401). However, a few spoken language features seem to be completely adopted by Ivireanu, for example the form of possesive pronoun: *gândul mieu; moştenitorii miei* (AI: 392); *al mieu de bine făcătoriu* (AI: 398). Ivireanu shapes the text acording to the speaker, so in the model text of a will there occur some iotacism marks, as this is not his own text and its language should be accesible to common people: *să şază; să le vânză* (AI: 389); *puind; să-şi pue* (AI: 391). Another distribution of language elements can be found in *Prefeţe, Dedicaţii, Postfeţe*, where fortis consonants in verb inflection are absent: *veţi avea credinţă; nu vă veţi îndoi, veţi zice* (AI: 397); *luaţi, veţi vedea, fiţi sănătoşi* (AI: 409). Fortis consonants is excluded with other categories, too: *alţii luminaţi, alţii lăudaţi, alţii vestiţi* (AI: 410); *îndată-şi* (AI: 409). But the phenomenon occurs with the reflexive pronoun: *i să cuvine* (AI: 399); *i se cuvin* (AI: 400).

4. The grammatical structure may represent the start point for language expressiveness, due to its complexity and flexibility, both at morphological and syntactic level, including sentence and complex sentence level. The morphological level includes the forms of each part of speech.

4.1. In Ivireanu's texts the noun is usually used according to standard Romanian norms which correspond to the contemporary ones. At the level of formal classification, the compound nouns are frequently used, some of them being part of idiomatic phrases: *faceri de bine* (AI: 3), *buna-credinţă* (AI: 4); *bunavestire* (AI: 5); *fărădelegile* (AI: 6, 13); *fărlegile* (AI: 13); *făcătoriul legii* (AI: 25); *purtători de grijă* (AI: 7); *blagoveştenia* (AI: 18), *blagocestia* (AI: 24); *a facerilor de bine* (AI: 107, 109, 113); *fărdelege* (AI: 390); *al mieu bine făcătoriu* (AI: 398). The noun conversions frequently come from adverb: *binele cel mare* (AI: 109); *binele ce am luat* (AI: 113). A very interesting conversion which originates in spoken language comes from the possessive pronoun *al său: alsăuri fireşti* (AI: 129); *alsăuri* (AI: 64). The plural, especially with feminine and neuter nouns, is common: *valurile, vicleşugurile, ceriurile* (AI: 21), *glasuri, mirosuri, duhuri, vânturi, văzduhuri, feliuri* (AI: 19), *lucruri* (AI: 26), *vaetele, rosturile, plânsurile* (AI: 110). Some plural inflections are preserved with an intermediary form: *hotarăle* (AI: 6), *carăle* (AI: 106), *săboară* (AI: 117). The inflections resulted from turning *–e* into *–i* seem to belong to another dialect: *picioarilor* (AI: 8), *suspinile* (AI: 110).

At the level of the standard norms at that period, the inflections did not often corresponded to the dominant norm: *ostenele, patime, colibi* (AI: 14); *cârciume* (AI: 26); *pietri* (AI: 117); *sânurile* (AI: 20); *obiceele* (AI: 28). The genitive (Dative) forms, both those required by government and those with prepositions, usually correspond to the dominant norm: *izvorul preaînţelepciunii* (AI: 8), *dintru ocara patimilor; sânt ale sfintei Evanghelii* (AI: 9), *a facerilor de bine* (AI: 107); *înaintea dragostei voastre, prin mijlocul vorbelor mele* (AI: 16), *şăderia de-a dreapta lui Dumnezeu* (AI: 18), *înaintea lui sânt scrise* (AI: 100); *noianul Fecioarii* (AI: 131); *i-au fost lipsă lui Dumnezeu* (AI: 106).

The atomistic declension (marking the inflection with both elements of a phrase) is generalized with the demonstrative pronominal adjective: *şarpelui celui de demult* (AI: 15), *bucuriei ceii adevărate* (AI: 17), *lucrurile întunericului veacului acestuia* (AI; 26). This declension also occurs with common and proper nouns and it will persist as a Latin morphology feature: *lauda preasfintei născătoarei de Dumnezeu şi pururea fecioarei Mariei* (AI: 16), *iară Sfintei Fecioarei* (AI: 17). Similarly, the adnominal dative would persist, especially as a poetic device, up to the 19th century: *păzitor sunt eu fratelui mieu* (AI: 100); *părtaş împărăţiei ceriului* (AI: 101), *părtaş stricăciunii* (AI: 30). The direct object in the accusative is usually accompanied by the preposition *pre* when it is expressed by a person noun and it is not preceeded by this preposition when it is expressed by a name of a thing: *cel ce ascultă pre voi, pre mine ascultă* (AI: 22); *ne arată nouă vaetele, plânsurile, suspinile şi dorirea păriunţilor* (AI: 110). The masculine nouns in the vocative preserve the Latin inflections and the atomistic declension, but the feminine inflections of Slavonic origin also occur: *Doamne* (AI: 14, 100); *Adame, unde eşti* (AI: 100), *ce zici, prorocule* (AI: 111); *o, blagocestive împărate* (AI: 119); *iubite, cu adevărat i-au fost lipsă* (AI: 106); *Du-te denapoia mea, satano* (AI: 9).

4.2. The definite article present the redundant determination, as a characteristic of the previous century: *cuvântătoarea turma lui cea aleasă* (AI: 7), *preaslăvita schimbarea feţii a Domnului* (AI: 9), *nemincinoasa gura lui* (AI: 15); *după marea mila*

sa (AI: 15). The demonstrative or adjectival article has been ranged in the subcategory of semi-independent pronoun in the normative grammar (GALR, I, 2008:245), except those contexts where it is used as a morpheme of the relative superlative and a morpheme of the genitive and dative forms, when it precedes ordinal numerals (GALR, I, 2008: 247). The prototypical form (Noun+*cel*+adjective) is very frequent: *mării cei neînsufleţite; meşterşugul cel păsăresc* (AI: 5); *adâncimea cea nehotărâtă, mâna cea tare şi puternică* (AI: 8), *fiiul lui Dumnezeu celui viu* (AI: 9); *mila sa cea veche* (AI: 13); *pohta cea nespusă, bunătatea cea negrăită; mila cea bogată şi dragostea cea desăvârşită* (AI: 14); *sărbătorile cele mari, sfinţii cei numiţi* (AI: 27); *năravurile cele rele şi obiceele cele necuvioase* (AI: 28).

In such contexts they are considered to be demonstrative pronominal adjectives, with an independent syntactic function: "If the noun-center on the left side of the structure including *cel* (*vinul cel vechi*) is lexicalized – not every structure above admit the noun lexicalization-, *cel* loses its pronoun meaning (becomes adjective) and functions (like other demonstrative adjectives placed after) as an emphatic determiner, which has the role to increase the degree of definiteness/ identification of the structure" (GALR, I, 2008: 140). As it has been pointed out above, there are contexts where the noun is absent and the role of semi-independent pronoun becomes obvious: *va păsa cuiva la cele sufleteşti* (AI: 28); *au trecut cele vechi şi au înflorit cele noao* (AI: 30). The problem of noun lexicalization on the left of the pronoun is raised also with the so-called possessive article, when this is considered a possessive genitive mark: "The structure [semi-independent pronoun + possessive adjective] must not be identified to those contexts where the possessive adjective is preceded by the possessive genitive mark *al*, as a result of the strict non-adjoining the possessive adjective to a governor with a definite article: *o carte a mea; această carte a mea; cartea aceasta a mea e veche; al meu suflet e pătruns de fiori*" (GALR,I, 2008: 128). Such contexts, especially with the genitive, are frequent. The agreement rules are not strictly established, as it may be noticed in many situations: *adâncimea cea nehotărâtă a bunii îndurări* (AI: 8); *cu toţi ai dumneavoastră* (AI: 8); *zile a vieţii lui* (AI: 117); *păcatul a neştiinţii mele* (AI: 122); *cu rugăciunile cuvioşilor egumeni şi a cuciarnicilor preoţ* (AI: 202); *Sărbătorile cele mari, şi ale Maicăi Precistii şi a unora din sfinţii cei numiţi* (AI: 27); *postul iaste pace de suflet al sufletului* (AI: 101).

When functioning as a predicative, the group formed by *al* and a possessive or a genitive is considered differently: "The constituent functioning as a predicative is analyzed rather as a nominal group consisting of [semi-independent pronoun + nominal group in the genitive/ possessive adjective] than as a nominal group in the genitive/ possessive adjective preceded by the possessive genitive mark *al*" (GALR, I, 2008:130). There are many such contexts: *cuvintele acestea sânt ale sfintei* (AI: 9); *de vă ţineţi ai lui Hristos* (AI: 28); *Şi această vină tot o dau să fie mai mult a preoţilor* (AI: 104). The semi-independent pronoun occurs when the noun with the same reference is absent: *Daţ ale Chesarului Chesarului şi ale lui Dumnezeu lui Dumnezeu* (AI: 28).

4.3. With respect to formal classification, the adjective presents a great number of phrases: *făr'de răotate, făr'de arme* (AI: 5), *făr'de putere* (AI: 119), *făr'de lene, făr'de prihană* (AI: 7), *fără de prihană* (AI: 12), *făr'de socoteală* (AI: 26). The absolute superlative is often expressed by prefixes: *lumi preaslăvite* (AI: 4); *preascump sângele său* (AI: 7), *preaslăvită mărire* (AI: 12); the relative superlative presents the so-called construction of Hebraic superlative: *împăratul împăraţilor* (AI: 3). The degree number comparison is not clearly differentiated from the qualitative comparison: *mai mult decât trei apostoli* (AI: 12).

4.4. The pronoun is very diverse and Ivireanu's texts preserve forms which belonged to the norms of that period. As he used to be a translator, he often uses the personal pronouns, although the person was included in the verb inflection: *eu, nevrednicul* (AI: 21), *Acela şi eu ...îl voiu zice* (AI: 17); *dară noi acum* (AI: 25); *sânt şi eu părtaş şi într-acel jug în care trageți voi trag şi eu* (AI: 28). The pronouns followed by the deictic morpheme–*şi* are very rare: *cel ce luiş era; luiş stăpâneşte* (AI: 200). The system of personal pronouns of reverence is fully established, even if *dânsul* rarely has a personal reference: *Adam o trage spre dânsul* (AI: 3); *marea de pre dânsa* (AI: 4). There also occur other forms: *m-au pus la dumneavoastră* (AI: 6); *dumneavoastră încă aveți datorie* (AI: 7); *măria-sa, măriei-tale* (AI: 226).

The reflexive pronouns with a short form in the dative (*îşi*) and in the accusative (*se*) present fortis consonants in many situations, leading either to cancelling the non-syllabic front vowel or to turning it into a central vowel: *să asămâneză* (AI: 10); *i să cuveniia* (AI: 30); *nu gândiia a să părăsi* (AI: 37); *carele să văd* (AI: 51); *cei ce să cunosc* (AI: 83). There also occur common forms, but they are less frequent: *să se zideascâ beserici, să se rădice case* (AI: 117); *să se părăsească* (AI: 123). The dative forms present fortis consonants much more frequently: *ş-au prepus* (AI: 5), *nu-ş aducea aminte* (AI: 14), *ca să-m dea putere* (AI: 23), *şi-ş goliia capul* (AI: 117), *îț voiu arăta* (AI: 153), *cei ce-m zic* (AI: 27), *nu-ş caută vlădiciia* (AI: 28). Sometimes, the forms in the dominant norm occur in the same sentence: *îm înfruntez şi-mi ticăloşesc* (AI: 16).

The demonstrative pronoun presents more subcategories than in contemporary Romanian. Firstly, there is a pronoun of close identity, which is very frequent and would persist up to the 19th century: *pre acestaş domn* (AI: 11); *acestaşi Dumnezeu* (AI: 106, 131), *într-acestaşi chip* (AI: 116), *acestaşi prooroc zice* (AI: 120), *întru acestaş* (AI: 202). The semi-independent demonstrative has a form for proximity: *trupurile noastre ceste de carne; inimile cele de piatră* (AI: 16). The demonstrative of differentiated distance presents various forms including the standard ones: *celelalte limbi* (AI: 4), *toate celialalte* (AI: 19, 102,152), *ceilalți* (AI: 115), *cialialalte* (AI: 151).

The relative pronoun varies according to gender and number in the nominative and the accusative: *carii*, *carele* The feminine form is the most variable, depending on the topic and on the context: *dragostea cu carea* (AI: 111), *făgăduința carea* (AI: 126). There also occur common forms: *dintru care arătare* (AI: 114); *lărgime care* (AI: 117). The uncertain forms are written with a stress mark: *firea caré era* (AI: 121), *lumea caré* (AI: 124). In contemporary Romanian the feminine equivalent of the structure *cel ce* does not occur any longer, except the constructions with a neuter meaning, but in Ivireanu's texts the formal opposition was still present: *cel ce Dumnezeu* (AI: 8); *pacea lui cea ce covârşaşte toată mintea* (AI: 8).

The number of forms of indefinite pronouns is greater than in contemporary Romanian: *fieştecarele din noi* (AI: 8), *a fieştecăriia firea* (AI: 130), *oarece întreba, oarece şi frumos lucru* (AI: 12), *neştine* (AI: 113), *verice altă cerere* (p. 23), *ver de ce boală ar fi fost* (AI: 24), *niscai bunătăț* (AI: 129). The negative pronouns occur in their spoken forms: *n-am putut afla nimica* (AI: 16), *nu s-au dat din veci nimănui* (AI: 17), *nimeni* (AI: 24), *nimica* (AI: 26), *nimeni, nimenea* (AI: 205). The nominative and the accusative form of the emphatic pronoun (*însuşi*) presents a fortis production of the consonant *ş*. It is interesting that the forms of the emphatic pronoun are as frequent as those of the emphatic pronominal adjective, which represent the direction of evolution for standard Romanian: *însuş era ca un stăpân* (AI: 8), *însuş Domnul* (AI: 10), *noi înşine* (AI: 124), *ca un smerit ce era însuş* (AI: 117), *să se facă el însuş* (AI: 130); *însuş Dumnezeu* (AI: 151). Similarly, the possessive pronoun and the possessive adjective in

the masculine singular and plural are constantly used in spoken language: *iubiții miei* (AI: 6), *cuvântul mieu şi înțelepciunea mea* (AI: 15).

Regarding the inflection, the whole range of instruments which achieve the syntactic relations can be noticed. The dative meaning is expressed both by inflections and by the prepositions with the genitive and even with the preposition *la* in the accusative: *nu s-au dat nimănui* (AI: 17), *vărsă asupră-i mila* (AI: 17). The genitive meaning is also expressed by the prepositional form of accusative: *har înaintea mea* (AI: 17), *sfârşitul a tot cuvântul* (AI: 104).

4.5. The numeral is well established in the basic categories (cardinal and ordinal), the ordinal morpheme corresponding to the dominant usage: *al treilea lucru* (AI: 103), *al unsprăzecilea* (AI: 7), *la al doilea psalom* (AI: 15), *la al patrulea cap* (AI: 17). In enumerations, the agreement is preserved in appositions: *Şi sânt păcate de moarte 7: păcatul cel dintâi iaste trufia, al doilea iaste zavistia, al treilea, al patrulea, al cincilea, al şaselea, al şaptelea* (AI: 123). Still, there are contexts where the agreement disappears: *cuprinde în sine trei lucruri: una, a dooa, a treia* (AI: 18). There also occur collective numerals: *amândoao sânt adevărate* (AI: 112); *voința a amândurori obrazelor* (p. 393), distributive numeral adjectives*: câte un ban* (AI: 128) and fractionary numeral phrases*: a treia parte* (AI: 393).

4.6. With the verb, there occur many idiomatic phrases: *nu-ş aducea aminte* (AI: 14), *luând seama vorbei* (AI: 14), *luând trup* (AI: 109). Grouping the verbs into conjugations does not always correspond to the contemporary situation: *adeverează* (AI: 7), *să asămănează* (AI: 10), *a le ținea* (AI: 23), *a şeda* (AI: 117). Certain verbs have an argument structure different from the one required by the dominant usage: *vă cuceriți lor* (AI: 7), *de care foarte doriia; atâta doriia de păharul acesta* (AI: 113); *luând seama vorbei* (AI: 14), *să fugim deşertăciunile* (AI: 206), *nu să va erta oamenilor* (AI: 123), *să se părăsească de dânsul* (AI: 123).

4.7. With the adverb, as it has been pointed out previously, a great frequency is to be found with those used in spoken Romanian: *mai nainte* (AI: 17), *din ceput* (AI: 130), *acuma* (AI: 103), *nu numa* (AI: 108, 203), *petutindenea* (AI: 203), *amintrilea* (AI: 111), *încailea* (AI: 226). The adverbs of manner and modal adverbs, including the predicative ones, occur frequently: *sufleteşte şi trupeşte* (AI: 204), *sufleteşte, înțelepțeşte* (AI: 28). The predicative adverbs function as a regent of the Subject Clause: *poate doară că am avea şi nădiajde* (AI: 25); *poate că vom fi socotind că numai căci ne numim creştinine vom spăsi* (AI: 27). When they are used in parenthetical structures, they function as adverbials of manner: *iar în cartea bisericii iaste, negreşit, scriş toț, şi cei tineri, şi cei bătrâni* (AI: 204).

4.8. The prepositions are used with all the prepositional cases: genitive, dative and accusative. The prepositions of the genitive may impose, firstly, the genitive: *deasupra mării* (AI: 5), *te milostiveşti asupra lor* (AI: 21), but they may impose also the accusative, when followed by possessives: *înaintea mea* (AI: 17), *du-te denapoia mea* (AI: 1); they may impose even the dative: *vărsă asupră-i mila* (AI: 17). The dative prepositions, whether considered as such or analyzed as adverbs rarely occur: *meşterşuguri asemenea acestora* (AI: 4). In the accusative, the intermediary forms *pre* and *preste* are almost general: *apa mării pre pământ* (AI: 5), *pre calea cea dreaptă* (AI: 7); *preste puțin* (AI: 8). The standard forms rarely occur: *putem lua pildă de pe vameşul* (AI: 24), *peste trupul vostru* (AI: 126).

4.9. At the conjunction level, the accumulation of elements must be pointed out, though this seemed to be the norm of that period: *pentru căci că ar fi putut* (AI: 130). Ivireanu's text preserves the intermediary form of *dacă: iară noi deaca auzim pre*

cineva (AI: 26). The correlative structures are frequent in coordination: *Nu numai singură mărirea lui Hristos, ce şi a lui Moisi* (AI: 11), *Au doară ai băgat vreun sărac în nevoe? Au doară faci năpaste cuiva, au ai făcut?* (AI: 235). The synonymy of the constructions allows their alternation with the form in the dominant usage: *sau ai vărsat ceară sau plumbu? Au doară le faci tu însuți, sau le-ai făcut vreodată?* (AI: 235).

4.10. The most frequent interjections are ostensive and affective, in parenthetetical structures or in related syntactic structures, functioning as regents: *Iată că acum veți şti* (AI: 28); *Că iată, vestesc vouă bucurie mare* (AI: 194); *O, vai de capetele noastre!* (AI: 27).

5. The language expressiveness of the texts in *Didahii* comes from the interference between spoken oratorical style and the literary register, from the frequency of illocutionary speech acts and from the relation between the forms of the standard norm in that period and those in spoken Romanian.

References

Bidu-Vrânceanu A., Călăraşu, C. et alii, *Dicționar de ştiințe ale limbii*, Bucureşti, Editura Nemira, 2001

Bolocan, Carmen-Maria, *Sfîntul Mitropolit Antim Ivireanul, ctitor al predicii originale în limba română*, in *Text si discurs religios*, nr. 1/2009, p. 429-435, www.cntdr.ro/volumul1

Cartojan, N. *Istoria literaturii române vechi*, Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1980

Dascălu Jinga, Laurenția (Ed.), *Româna vorbită actuală* (*ROVA*). *Corpus şi studii*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 2011

Guțu Romalo, V. (Ed.), *Gramatica limbii române, I, Cuvântul*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 2008

Ionescu Ruxăndoiu L., *Narațiune şi dialog în proza românească*, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1991

Antim Ivireanu, *Opere*, (Ed. Gabriel Ştrempel), Bucureşti, Editura Minerva, 1972

Pană Dindelegan, G. (Ed.), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENT: This work was partially supported by the strategic grant POSDRU 107/1.5/S/77265 (2010) of the Ministry of Labor, Family and Social Protection, Romania, co-financed by the European Social Fund – Investing in people.