

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS IN THE *LITURGIKON* OF 1815

MARIA-LUCREȚIA CAZAC*

Abstract After the annexation of Bessarabia to the Russian Empire in 1813, the Exarchate Press of the newly created metropolis is established in Chișinău, at the numerous insistences of Metropolitan Gavriil Bănulescu-Bodoni. The press produced many books in Romanian and in Cyrillic script, which respect the compositional structure and formal organization of Russian books. The first book produced is Chișinău, *Liturgikon* (1815), meant to support the liturgical ministry of priests. This print is also an important document of the Romanian language at the beginning of the nineteenth century. The present article offers an exhaustive linguistic analysis of the 1815 *Liturgikon*.

Keywords Romanian language, Bessarabia, 19th century, morphosyntax, linguistic peculiarities.

Preliminary considerations

The Liturgikon of 1815 is the first book printed in Romanian using the Cyrillic alphabet in Bessarabia after the annexation of the area between the Prut and Nistru rivers by representatives of the Russian Empire. In addition to the importance of the *Liturgikon* among religious books, alongside the *Evangelion* and the *Euchologion*, which together constitute the “three books absolutely necessary for the priest,”¹ the value of this text lies in its reflection of the defining aspects of the Romanian language at the beginning of the 19th century.

The *liturgikon*, in Romanian, refers to the book that contains the text of the Holy Liturgy, as well as the ritual guidelines for the conduct of services by Orthodox bishops and priests, especially for Sundays and holidays.

* Grigore T. Popa University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Iași. cazacmarialucretia@gmail.com.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8846-3810>.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26424/philobib.2025.30.2.01>.

¹ Lucian Petroaia, *The Liturgikon, a treasure trove of Orthodox culture and spirituality. Study of the Romanian language editions* (Galați: Publishing House of the Archdiocese of the Lower Danube, 2014), 18.

Officially, both in manuscript and in printed editions, the book is known in the Romanian space under the name of *The Divine and Holy or Holy and Divine Liturgies of Our Holy Fathers John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and Gregory the Dialogist*,² recalling the three authors of the liturgies frequently used in the Orthodox Church. Following the Slavonic model, this text has also been called *Slujebnic* or *Slujelnic*.³ In addition, when the work included the order of the Liturgy with a bishop, integrating prayers for ordinations, consecrations, blessings, etc., it bore the title *Arhieraticon*.

Beyond the four names that have been attributed to it, from a compositional point of view, the work encompasses more than what a title succinctly indicates or anticipates. In this sense, in addition to the Liturgy itself, the book also includes other prayers and religious services. Generally, a *Liturgikon* also includes the services of Matins and Vespers, and sometimes the order of Midnight Office. At the same time, it also includes teachings on certain passages that are used in the Matins and Vespers services, namely variable structures through which the service is adapted to the calendar and to different moments in the liturgical year.⁴ This includes the ekphosis or *vozglas*⁵ from the *ektenias*, *apolises* or *dismissals* from Sundays, holidays, weekdays, and imperial feasts. The *Liturgikon* also contains the canon and the prayers before and after the Eucharistic act, as well as the *synaxarion*, a list of the names of the saints who are remembered at the moment of the Liturgy of Preparation (*Proskomedie*), before the actual celebration of the Liturgy.

Along with the Bible of Saint Petersburg (1818), the Chişinau *Liturgikon* represents two important scholarly achievements in the pastoral and cultural activity of Metropolitan Gavriil Bănulescu-Bodoni, both reflecting the particularities of the Romanian language at the beginning of the 19th century as reflected in church texts, on the one hand involving biblical variety, and on the other hand, the liturgical variety.

Morphosyntactic features

In this text, we will focus on linguistic aspects of a morphosyntactic nature, as these reflect the language used in the 1815 *Liturgikon*.

In the case of nouns, we have recorded nouns belonging to other declensions. The noun *mână* (*hand*), now belonging to declension I, has four occurrences which, in the plural, highlight its descent from the fourth declension specific to Latin, Lat. *manu* + the article *-le*: *în mânule preotului* (*in the priest's hands*) (103^r/ III 37^r), *luând cadelnița din mânule diaconului* (*taking the censer from the deacon's hands*) (116^v/ III 43^v), *din mânule noastre* (*from our hands*) (122^v/ III 46^v), *având mânule strânsă la piept* (*with hands clasped to the chest*) (138^v/ III 54^v). Apart from this form, we have identified sequences with the plural form *mâini* / *măine*: *iară rucavițele puindu-le*

² Petre Vintilescu, *The Liturgikon explained* (Bucharest: Publishing House of the Biblical and Orthodox Mission Institute, 1972) 9.

³ Eugen Pavel, *The Liturgikon in Romanian (a synthetic view)*, *Romanian Language*, LX, no 1 (Bucharest, 2011): 127.

⁴ Petre Vintilescu, *The Liturgikon explained*, 10.

⁵ A part of a prayer that is uttered aloud and clearly, borrowed from Old Church Slavonic.

în mîini (and putting the epimanikia on the hands) (78^v/ III 24^v), Toate neamurile plesniți cu mâinele! (All ye nations, clap your hands!) (320^v/ III 145^v). The noun *latură* (side) (< Lat. *latura*, cf. Romanian language dictionary (DLR)⁶) is marked in the text as belonging to the third declension, one occurrence presenting a definite article: *sărută laturea cea de-a dreapta a dverii* (kisses the right side of the iconostasis door) (20^v/ II 4^v), and the other sequence with an indefinite article: *să dă diaconul întru o lature de oltariu* (let the deacon stand on one side of the altar) (78^v/ III 24^v), being mentioned in the grammars of the time as representing “singular forms preserved from the previous period, with the ending -e.”⁷ Plural forms were not recorded in the text. Similar to the previous situation, the noun *marmură* (marble) (< Lat. *marmor*, -oris, cf. DLR) is present in the text in the third declension *marmure*: *stâlpul cel de marmure* (the marble pillar) (369^r/ III 170^r). Regarding the form *marmură*, it was mentioned that it “is recorded in the first decades of the 17th century, in a text representing the southeastern Transylvanian literary variant.”⁸ The noun *pântece* (womb) (< Lat. *pantex*, -icis, cf. DLR) is used in the third declension, with no record of its transition to the second declension: *Fă și mie milostiv pre cel din pântecele* (Be merciful to me, O thou who art in my womb) (233^r/ III 102^r), *Din pântece mai înainte de luceafăr te-am născut* (From the womb before the morning star I brought you forth) (286^v/ III 128^v). In the latest edition of the *Liturgikon* published under the patronage of the Patriarchate of the Romanian Orthodox Church, we observe a mixture of the third declension forms, still preserved, and the second declension forms, thus noting the transition: *Cel ce știi pe fiecare din pântecele maicii lui* (He who knows each one from his mother's womb) (liturgikon 2012, 259⁹), *lăcomie a pântecului* (greed of the womb) (liturgikon 2012, 354).

Gender fluctuations are recorded in the case of the masculine noun *veac* (ages) (< Old Church Slavonic (OCS) *вѣкъ*, cf. DLR), noting both the plural form *vêci*: *spre viață de vîci* (towards eternal life) (7^r/ I 3^r), *vîcilor: acum și pururea și în vîcii vîcilor* (now and forever and to the ages of ages) (15^r/ II 2^r), as well as the form *veacuri* in literary Romanian: *Împăratul veacurilor* (The King of the Ages) (258^v/ III 114^v). We observe a mixture with regard to the noun *genunchi* (knee) (< Lat.

⁶ DLR = Romanian Academy, *Romanian language dictionary* (DLR). New series, volumes V, *Letter L: Li-Luzulă*, editors-in-chief: Marius Sala, Gheorghe Mihailă (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2008); volume VI, *Letter M*, editors-in-chief: Iorgu Iordan, Ion Coteanu (Bucharest: Academy Publishing House R.P.R., 1965); volume VII, part I, *Letter N*, editors-in-chief: Iorgu Iordan, Alexandru Graur, Ion Coteanu (Bucharest: Academy Publishing House R.P.R., 1971); volume VII, *Letter P*, part I: *P-Păzui*, part III: *Pînă-Pogribanie*, part IV: *Pogrienie-Presimțire*, part V: *Presin-Puzzolană*, editors-in-chief: Iorgu Iordan, Alexandru Graur, Ion Coteanu (Bucharest: Academy Publishing House R. P. R., 1972, 1977, 1980, 1984); volume X, *Letter S*, part a 4-a: *Slab-Spongghios*, part V: *Spongiar-Swing*, editor-in-chief: Ion Coteanu (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1992, 1994); volume XII, part II: *Letter U*, volume XIII, *Letter V: Venial-Vizurină*, editors-in-chief: Marius Sala, Gheorghe Mihailă (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2002).

⁷ Gh. Chivu et. al. *Studies in the history of the Romanian language. Morphosyntax of the literary language in the 19th and 20th centuries* (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2022), 39.

⁸ Constantin Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)* (Iași: Demiurg Publishing House, 2009), 18.

⁹ *Liturgikon* (Bucharest: Publishing House of the Biblical and Orthodox Mission Institute, 2012).

vulg. *genunc(u)lum*, cf. Academy Dictionary (DA¹⁰). We record four occurrences in which it retains its neuter form,¹¹ with *-e* being used in the plural: *singur cade în genunchi* (*alone falls to his knees*) (192v/ III 81v), one of them presenting the definite article *-le*: *închinăciune cu genunchile la pământ* (*kneeling worship*) (26v/ II 7v). We also note a sequence of the singular form: *ție să pleacă tot genunchiul* (*your whole knee is bending*) (61r/ III 16r). The same preservation of the neuter gender in the plural form is found in the text with regard to the noun *obraz* (*cheek*) (< OCS *образъ*, cf. DLR), a phenomenon specific to the Romanian language until 1780¹², therefore prior to the era of the *Liturgikon* we are dealing with: *obraze mari* (*big cheeks*) (371r/ III 171r).

We identify the old plural form¹³ for the noun *rană* (< OCS *рана*, cf. DLR): *Tămăduiaște ranele sufletului meu* (*Heal the wounds of my soul*) (233r/ III 102r), *ranele mîne le vezi* (*you see my wounds*) (251r/ III 111r), *cu multe rane* (*with many wounds*) (369r/ III 170r). In this text, we can observe the stages of the process of replacing the plural ending *[-e]* with the ending *[-i]* in a series of feminine nouns. From a diachronic point of view, this process “began in the pre-literary period and continues to this day,”¹⁴ with the following nouns with a root ending in *b-* being included in this category: only the form *limbi* (*tongues*): *în limbi de foc preste Apostolii* (*in tongues of fire over the Apostles*) (369r/ III 170r), genitive-dative: *limbilor*: *în chipul limbilor de foc* (*in the form of tongues of fire*) (226v/ III 98v), with the definite article *limbile*: *Toate limbile, bateți cu mîinele* (*All tongues, clap your hands*) (348v/ III 159v); with the root ending in *c-*: the noun *biserică* – *biserice* (*church* – *churches*): *înștiințându-ne că bisericile într-această oblaștie* (*informing us that the churches in this dominated region*) (3r/ I 1r), genitive case, plural number: *bisericilor*: *după starea bisericilor să fie* (*according to the state of the churches*) (389r/ III 180r), in the singular, genitive *bisericei*: *iconomul bisericei cei mari* (*the steward of the great church*) (293r/ III 132r) and *bisericii*:

¹⁰ DA = Romanian Academy, Dictionary of the Romanian Language, volume I, part I: A-B, coord. Sextil Pușcariu, prepared and published at the instigation and expense of His Majesty King Carol I (Bucharest: Socer et Comp. and C. Sfetea, 1913); Volume I, Part II: C, coord. Sextil Pușcariu, prepared and published at the instigation and expense of His Majesty King Carol I (Bucharest: Printing House of the “Universul” Newspaper, 1940); Volume I, Part III, fascicle I: D, coord. Sextil Pușcariu (Bucharest: State Industrial Enterprise Universul, 1940); volume II, part I: F-I, coord. Sextil Pușcariu, prepared and published at the instigation and expense of His Majesty King Carol I (Bucharest: Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Națională, 1934); volume II, part II, fascicle I: J-Lacustru, fascicle II: Ladă-Lepăda, coord. Sextil Pușcariu, prepared and published at the instigation and expense of His Majesty King Carol I (Bucharest: Printing House of the “Universul” Newspaper, S.A., 1934, 1937); volume II, part II, fascicle III: Lepăda-Lojniță, coord. Sextil Pușcariu (Bucharest: Printing House of the “Universul” Newspaper S.A., 1948).

¹¹ Al. Rosetti, *History of the Romanian Language. From its Origins to the Beginning of the 17th Century*, vol. I (Bucharest: Scientific and Encyclopaedic Publishing House, 1986), 487.

¹² Constantin Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 251.

¹³ Claudia Cemârțan, “The Literary Norm in Religious Texts Edited in Chișinău at the Beginning of the 20th Century,” *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae*, Series “Humanities” 4, 114 (2018): 13. Although the texts discussed by the author date from a different historical period, some of the analysed linguistic facts coincide, which is why we mentioned this study in our analysis.

¹⁴ Constantin Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 30.

luminată dovadă a bisericii lui Dumnezeu (enlightened proof of the church of God) (8^v/ I 3^v); the noun *poruncă* – *poruncele* (*commandment – commandments*): *Fericit bărbatul carele să tème de Domnul, întru poruncele lui va voi foarte (Blessed is the man who fears the Lord, in his commandments he will delight greatly)* (357^r/ III 164^r) and *porunci* (*commandments*): *frica fericitelor tale porunci (fear your blessed commandments)* (60^v/ III 15^v), with definite article: *poruncile: lumină sînt poruncile tale pre pămînt (your commandments are light upon the earth)* (55^r/ III 13^r), in the genitive: *poruncilor: cu gândirea poruncilor Tale fiind luminați (enlightened by the thought of Your commandments)* (35^r/ III 3^r); with the root ending in m-: the noun *inimă* – *inimele* (*heart – hearts*): *lăudând pre Domnul Dumnezeu întru inimele sale neîncetat (praising the Lord God in their hearts without ceasing)* (396^v/ III 183^v) and *inimi* (*hearts*): *Veselêște inimile noastre (Rejoice our hearts)* (32^v/ III 1^v); with the root ending in p-: the noun *aripă* – *aripelor* (*wing – to the wings*): *Ascunde-mă-voi întru acoperămîntul aripelor tale (Hide me in the shelter of your wings)* (331^r/ III 151^r) and *aripi, aripilor: șase aripi (six wings)* (167^r/ III 68^r), *Dar și acoperi-ne pre noi cu acoperemîntul aripilor Tale (But also cover us with the shelter of your wings)* (88^v/ III 29^v); with the root ending in r-: the noun *prescură* (*prospchora*) – *prescurele*: *dacă nu-s curate prescurele (if the prospchorai are not clean)* (361^r/ III 166^r) and *prescuri, prescurile: mucedu prescuri (moldy prospchorai)* (361^r/ III 166^r), *proscurarii să facă prescurile de făină (to make the prospchorai from flour)* (378^v/ III 174^v); with the root ending in t- – only the form *bucate*: *poți să-l mănânci și în bucate (you can eat it in bucate)* (51^r/ III 11^r), *alte bucate* (51^r/ III 11^r) and only the form *judecăți* (*judgments*): *cei ce sînt în judecăți (those who are in judgment)* (177^r/ III 74^r); with the root ending in ț- – only the form *rămășiilor*: *la potribirea rămășiilor Sfintelor Taine la jărtvennic (the fitting of the remains of the Holy Mysteries to the altar)* (388^v/ III 179^v). With some exceptions where we have identified only plural forms with the ending -e, in most cases there is a higher frequency of forms with -i, because, being a text from the northern dialect area, the closing of -e occurs.

Among the endings used in the formation of the plural of neuter nouns, there are sporadic occurrences of the preserved form -ure, closer to the Latin etymon -ora – *lucrure* (*things*) (254^v/ III 112^v), *toate neamurile* (*all nations*) (333^r/ III 152^r). However, the most frequent forms are those with the ending -uri: *aceste sfințite lucruri (these holy things)* (10^v/ I 4^v), *mă vor ferici toate neamurile (all nations will call me blessed)* (287^r/ III 129^r).

With regard to the consonant alternations observed in plural forms, we note that “the old alternation h/ș still appears (...) at the beginning of the period”¹⁵ of the 19th century: *pravoslavnicii patriarși* (*Orthodox patriarchs*) (85^r/ III 28^r), *la toate patrierșiile* (*at all the patriarchates*) (230^v/ III 100^v), *încă ne rugăm pentru frații, preoții, ieromonașii* (*we still pray for our brothers, priests, and hieromonks*) (105^r/ III 38^r), *cei de nou călugăriți monași* (*newly ordained monks*) (401^r/ III 186^r), *Sfinții Trei Ierarși Mari Arhieri Vasilie cel Mare, Grigorie Bogoslovul și Ioann Zlatoușt* (*The Three Great Hierarchs Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and John Chrysostom*) (296^v/ III 133^v), but also *ierarhi* (*hierarchs*): *ale celor dintru sfinți părinților noștri și marilor dascăli ai lumii și ierarhi, Vasilie cel Mare, Grigorie Bogoslov și a lui Ioann Zlatoușt* (*those of our holy fathers and great*

¹⁵ Chivu et al., *Morphosyntax of literary language in the 19th and 20th centuries*, 49.

teachers of the world and hierarchs, Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and John Chrysostom) (45^r/ III 8^r).

As regards the vocative case, for the masculine gender, singular number, the Latin vocative ending -e was inherited, both for common nouns and proper nouns: *aceasta să-ți fie în știință, o, preote* (let this be known to you, O priest) (51^r/ III 11^r), *Blagoslovêște, stăpîne* (Bless, master) (75^r/ III 23^r), *să slujască ție, împărate al slavii* (to serve you, emperor of glory) (160^v/ III 65^v), *Ioânne Zlatoúste, preafericite cuvioase* (John Chrysostom, most blessed and pious one) (144^v/ III 57^v), *lisuse* (Jesus) (22^v/ II 5^v), *Hristoase* (Christ) (15^r/ II 2^r), *pomenêște, Doamne* (remember us, Lord) (6^v/ I 2^v), the last example being considered an etymological vocative preserved to this day. The vocative ending in -(u)le also has a consistent presence: *fă cu noi după mila ta, Vindecătoriuile și Tămăduitoriule* (do with us according to your mercy, Healer and Physician) (197^r/ III 84^r), *lubitoriule de oameni* (Lover of mankind) (198^v/ III 84^v), *Atotstăpînitoriule* (Almighty) (199^r/ III 85^r), *Miluiaste-ne pre noi, Dumnezeule* (Have mercy on us, God) (199^r/ III 85^r), *Ziditoriule și Făcătoriule a toate* (Creator and Maker of all things) (202^v/ III 86^v). There are also contexts of competition between the two case endings *sufletul* – *suflete* (soul – souls): *Mărește, sufletul meu, pre Domnul* (Magnify, my soul, the Lord) (353^r/ III 162^r), *Binecuvintează, sufletul meu, pre Domnul* (Bless, my soul, the Lord) (349^r/ III 160^r) – *Mărește, suflete al meu, pre Domnul* (Magnify, my soul, the Lord) (352^v/ III 161^v), *Laudă, suflete al meu, pre Domnul* (Praise, my soul, the Lord) (347^r/ III 159^r), *Binecuvintează, suflete al meu, pre Domnul* (Bless, my soul, the Lord) (351^r/ III 161^r).

We identify the use of the enclitic article in the case of nouns, “which generally designate names of deities, but also well-known characters from the Old Testament, and especially from the New Testament,”¹⁶ preceded by prepositions but lacking a determiner: *Pentru aceasta, mă priimêște și pre mine, lubitoriule de oameni, Doamne, ca pre curva, ca pre tâlhariul* (For this, receive me, the Lover of all men, as You received the prostitute, the thief) (241^r/ III 106^r - 242^v/ III 106^v), *priimêște-mă precum ai priimit pre curvariul* (accept me as you accepted the fornicator) (247^r/ III 109^r), *carele ai îndreptat pre vameșul* (whom you corrected the tax collector) (255^r/ III 113^r), *în groapă cu trupul și în iad cu sufletul ca un Dumnezeu, iară în raiu cu tâlhariul și pre scaun ai fost, Hristoase, cu Tatăl și cu Duhul* (In the tomb with the body, in hell with the soul as God, in paradise with the thief and on the throne with the Father and the Spirit) (115^r/ III 43^r).

We note the “articulation of both terms of the noun phrase,” the situation being similar to the old language. In this regard, we mention “numerous structures in which the genitive-dative cases are articulated to all constituents of the nominal group;”¹⁷ *Adormirea Sfintei Annei, maicei a Preasfintei de Dumnezeu Născătoarei* (The Dormition of Saint Anne, mother of the Most Holy Mother of God) (321^r/ III 146^r), *Slujba Preasfintei Născătoare de Dumnezeu* (The Service of the Most Holy Mother of God) (353^r/ III 162^r), *cu mijlocirea întru tot lăudatei Precuratei Fecioarei*

¹⁶ Daniela-Luminița Teleoacă, “Morphosyntactic features of contemporary prayer texts (I),” *Romanian Language* XXI, 11-12 (Chișinău, 2011): 53.

¹⁷ Claudia Cemărtan, “The language of religious texts published at the Exarchate Printing House in Chișinău: syntactic features,” *Studia Universitatis Moldaviae*, Series “Humanities” 10, 100 (2016): 14.

Născătoarei de Dumnezeu Marii (with the intercession of the all-praised Virgin Mother of God the Great) (397^r/ III 184^r).

With regard to the genitive possessive article, we note the presence of invariable forms in the following contexts: *numărul drept a celor cinci simțiri (the right number of the five senses)* (259^r/ III 115^r), *frumsețea cea nespusă a fetei tale (the unspeakable beauty of your face)* (258^v/ III 114^v), *stăpâne a toate (master of all)* (184^v/ III 77^v), *Mitropoliții (...) a toarei Róssii (Metropolitans (...) of all Russia)* (271^r/ III 121^r), *Rânduiala Dumnezeieștii Liturghii a lui Zlatoust (The Order of the Divine Liturgy of Chrysostom)* (10^v/ I 4^v), *salmii cei aleși a lui David (the chosen psalms of David)* (30^v/ II 9^v), *să-l roage ca și a lui toate greșalile (to ask him for all his mistakes)* (368^v/ III 169^v), *face închinăciune preotului a căruia este rândul (to bow down to the priest whose turn it is)* (15^r/ II 2^r). Beyond these sequences, in the present text, the possessive-genitive article takes on variable forms: *înfricoșatul județ al lui Hristós (the fearful judgement of Christ)* (43^r/ III 7^r), *Fiiule al lui Dumnezeu (Son of God)* (162^v/ III 66^v), *sfinților și dreptilor ai lui Dumnezău părinți Ioachim și Annei (the saints and righteous ones of God, parents Joachim and Anne)* (46^v/ III 8^v), *cu trei degete ale mâinii drepte (with three fingers of the right hand)* (19^r/ II 4^r), *cu bărbații sîngiurilor(...) întru ale cărora mâini sînt fărădelegile (with the men of blood (...) in whose hands are the transgressions)* (80^v/ III 25^v). Therefore, this mixture of invariable and variable forms of the possessive article reveals, on the one hand, that the text belongs to the northern dialectal area, where invariable forms¹⁸ are specific, and, on the other hand, reflects the beginning of the modernization of the Romanian language, as the print dates from the early 19th century.

In the case of adjectives, the absolute superlative is formed with the adverb *prea* (most/too), which is specific to Nordic texts:¹⁹ *prea înțelepții coconi (most wise boys)* (235^r/ III 103^r), *prea mare lipsă (too great a lack)* (3^r/ I 1^r), *împărăteasa (...) prea înfrumsețată (the empress (...) most beautiful)* (83^r/ III 27^r), *prea curatele (...) mâni (most clean (...) hands)* (123^r/ III 47^r). From here, we have the superlatives welded and substantivized: *preablagocestiva* (176^v/ III 73^v), *pentru rugăciunile Preacuratei Maicii sale (for the prayers of his Most Holy Mother)* (186^v/ III 78^v), *Părinte Preacuvioase Vasilie (Most Reverend Father Basil)* (186^v/ III 78^v), *Preasfîntă Troiță (Most Holy Trinity)* (220^v/ III 95^v), *rugăciunile Preacuratei Maicii sale (the prayers of his Most Holy Mother)* (215^r/ III 93^r).

Regarding the personal pronoun, unaccented form, of the third person, the feminine gender is, as a rule, prefixed to the auxiliary: *lumea ta așa o ai iubit (your world as you loved it)* (123^r/ III 47^r), *cătră zidirea ta carea o ai făcut (to your creation as you made it)* (168^v/ III 69^v), *Piatra carea nu o au socotit ziditorii (the Stone that the builders did not consider)* (65^r/ III 18^r), *cei ce o au adus (those who brought it)* (89^r/ III 30^r), *au luat toată firea noastră și o au îndumnezeit (they took our whole nature and deified it)* (227^r/ III 99^r).

¹⁸ Ion Gheție et. al., *The History of Literary Romanian. The Early Period (1532–1780)* (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 1997), 327.

¹⁹ Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 275.

A peculiarity of the old language is the use of the adjective *singur* (*alone*) instead of the strengthening pronoun, a phenomenon recorded in the case of the following situation: *fiind îmblânzit de singură milostivirea* (being tamed by your mercy alone) (57^r/ III 14^r).

In the Chişinau *Liturgikon*, we have pointed out the omission of the reflexive pronoun, the unaccented form, of the second person, in the case of the verb *a odihni* (*to rest*), a sequence used several times in the chapters that include the text and the order of the Liturgy of Saint John Chrysostom and Saint Basil the Great, “a phenomenon due to the influence of foreign sources”²⁰: *Dumnezeul cel sfânt, carele întru sfinţi odihneşti* (*Holy God, who rests among the saints*) (67^r/ III 19^r). In the current edition of the *Liturgikon*, the verb appears in the reflexive form: *Dumnezeule Cel Sfânt, Care întru Sfinţi Te odihneşti* (*Holy God, who rests among the saints*) (LITURGIKON 2012, 143).

A phenomenon specific to Old Romanian that can be found in the text is the competition between the use of pronouns and possessive adjectives and the use of third-person personal pronouns.²¹ In the singular, we observe competition between the possessives *său, sa* (*his/hers*) and the personal pronouns *lui, ei* (*his/hers*): *să duce la locul său* (*he goes to his place*) (20^v/ II 4^v) – *să duce la locul lui* (*he goes to his place*) (65^r/ III 18^r), *gura sa* (*his mouth*) (371^r/ III 171^r) – *gura lui* (*his mouth*) (366^v/ III 168^v), *soţul ei* (*her husband*) (42^v/ III 6^v). For the plural, we note the same competition: *ş-au plecat ţie capetele sale* (*they bowed their heads to you*) (182^v/ III 76^v), *rugăciunile lor* (*their prayers*) (58^v/ III 14^v), *robii tăi cei chemaţi carii ş-au plecat cătră tine grumazii lor* (*your servants, the ones who are called, who have bowed their necks to you*) (108^v/ III 39^v).

As can be seen, the reconstructed form for the genitive-dative, singular number, feminine gender of *acestei(a)* (*this*) is not recorded, instead the etymological form *aceştii*, specific to Old Romanian, is used exclusively: *însemnarea lucrării şi a cuvintelor aceştii Sfinte Cărţi* (*the significance of the work and words of this Holy Book*) (5^r/ I 2^r), *cele mai însemnate vremi a slujbei aceştii* (*the most significant times of this service*) (5^r/ I 2^r), *pentru acoperirea sfintei casii aceştii* (*for the covering of this holy house*) (47^r/ III 9^r).

We note a single occurrence of the demonstrative considered to be Muntenian²²: *în seara asta* (*tonight*) (52^v/ III 11^v).

We also identify the situation of using the deictic particle *-a* in the case of prefixing the demonstrative pronominal adjective to the noun: *întru acesta chip* (*in this way*) (240^v/ III 105^v).

We identify a form of demonstrative pronoun specific to Old Romanian, resulting from the combination of the demonstrative pronouns of proximity + *şi*²³ – *acestaşi: întru acestaşi chip* (*in this way*) (394^v/ III 182^v), *aceastaşi: întru aceastaşi zi* (*in this day*) (278^v/ III 124^v, 282^v/ III 126^v, 346^v/

²⁰ Veronica Olariu, *Linguistic study of the Saint Petersburg Bible (1819)* (Iaşi: Doxologia, 2019), 136.

²¹ Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 282.

²² Ion Gheţie, *The dialectal basis of literary Romanian* (Bucharest: Publishing House of the Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1975), 458.

²³ *Romanian language grammar*, Volume I. *The Word* (Bucharest: Romanian Academy Publishing House, 2005), 248.

III 158^v). This form belongs to the sphere of proximity of the opposition of identity,²⁴ without, however, the form *cestălalt* (*the other one*) being used.²⁵

We have identified numerous cases in which the relative pronoun is not accompanied by a preposition in the accusative case: *trupul carele l-ai luat* (*the body you took*) (245^r/ III 108^r), *Pâinea carea o voiu da* (*The bread I will give*) (12^v/ I 5^v), *Piatra carea nu o au socotit ziditorii* (*The stone which the builders did not consider*) (65^r/ III 18^r), *lujba aceasta carea ai voit din mânule noastre a o priimi* (*this service which you wanted to receive from our hands*) (122^v/ III 46^v), *ne dăruiaște somn carele l-ai dat spre odihna neputinții noastre* (*grant us the sleep which you gave for the rest of our weakness*) (35^r/ III 3^r). However, there are numerous contexts in which the preposition *pre* is recorded alongside the pronoun, in accordance with the current norm: *untul de lemn acesta pre carele l-ai blagoslovit* (*this oil which you have blessed*) (51^r/ III 11^r), *psalmul 50 pre carele cetindu-l* (*Psalm 50 which we read*) (90^v/ III 30^v), *Fericiți pre carii i-ai ales și i-ai priimit* (*Blessed are those whom you have chosen and received*) (329^r/ III 150^r).

In the case of indefinite pronouns and pronominal adjectives *orice* (*any/ whatever*), these are accompanied by the prepositions *în* (*in*), *de* (*by*), and *la* (*to*), which are inserted between the two components of the pronoun. This aspect actually captures “forms from the first phase of grammaticalization:”²⁶ *ori în ce zi te vom chema* (*any day we will call you*) (348^v/ III 159^v), *or de ce feliu* (*any kind*) (397^r/ III 184^r), *or de ce necinste* (*any dishonesty*) (397^r/ III 184^r), *or de ce vârstă* (*any age*) (403^r/ III 187^r), *or la ce loc ar fi fost cineva* (*any place someone would have been*) (402^v/ III 186^v). In addition to these, we also record the form *orice*: *orice am greșit* (*whatever I did wrong*) (58^v/ III 14^v, 72^v/ III 21^v), *toate musturile stoarse din orice poame* (*all juices squeezed from any fruit*) (375^r/ III 173^r), *orice vei lucra în altariu* (*whatever you will work on the altar*) (394^v/ III 182^v).

Another phenomenon noted is the use of *niște* (*some*) “before the names of subjects, some of them singularia tantum,”²⁷ one example being the noun *mir*: *niște mir de mult preț* (*some precious holy oil*) (250^v/ III 110^v).

We note numerous instances in which the cardinal number is placed after the noun: *are zile 31* (*it has 31 days*) (322^v/ III 146^v), *molitve o sută* (*a hundred prayers*) (402^v/ III 186^v), *molitve doao sute* (*two hundred prayers*) (402^v/ III 186^v), *molitve trei sute* (*three hundred prayers*) (402^v/ III 186^v), but we also have sequences in which the numeral precedes the noun, according to the current norm: *trei sute de molitve* (*three hundred prayers*) (403^r/ III 187^r). The phenomenon is “attributed to the original Greek, from which the translation into Romanian was made,” this idea being emphasized when Veronica Olariu presents similar forms found in the Bible of St. Petersburg.²⁸

²⁴ Ana-Maria Minuț, “Elements of Romanian historical morphology, based on the first Romanian translation of the Septuagint (ms. 45, BAR Cluj),” *Diachrony*, no. 5 (mars 2017): 3.

²⁵ *Romanian language grammar* (2005), 242.

²⁶ Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 286.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 289.

²⁸ Olariu, *Linguistic study of the Saint Petersburg Bible (1819)*, 149.

In the case of verbs, we identify numerous situations where they are classified in conjugations other than the current one. The verb *a curăța* (to clean) (< *curat* (clean), cf. to Dictionary of the Modern Romanian Language; DA also records the variant *a curăți*) has forms specific to the fourth conjugation: *curățește* (cleans) (61^f/ III 16^f), *să curățești* (to clean) (110^v/ III 40^v), *va curăți* (will clean) (137^f/ III 54^f), *curățindu-ne* (cleaning ourselves) (169^f/ III 70^f), *să se curățească* (to clean oneself) (205^f/ III 88^f), *curățit* (cleaned) (233^f/ III 102^f), *să va curăța* (will clean oneself) (363^f/ III 167^f). We identify a single occurrence in which the form of the verb belongs to first conjugation: *a (...) curăța* (395^f/ III 183^f). The verb *a adăuga* (to add) (< Lat. *adaugere* (*adaugere*, cf. DA)), classified in the modern literary language as belonging to first conjugation, belongs to the third conjugation: *să (mai) adaoge* (to add) (6^v/ I 2^v), *adaoge* (66^v/ III 18^v), *va (mai) adaoge* (363^f/ III 167^f). We have noted the oscillation of the verb *a rămâne* (to stay) (< Lat. *remanere*, cf. DLR) between the second conjugation: *va rămânea* (will stay) (384^v/ III 177^v) and the third conjugation: *vor rămâne* (will stay) (386^v/ III 178^v). We note that the verb *a ține* (to hold) (< Lat. *tenere*, cf. DLR), now in the third conjugation, appears in the text in the second conjugation: *nu era puțință a să ținea supt stricăciune* (it was impossible to keep it from spoiling) (170^v/ III 70^v), *a le ținea* (to hold them) (250^v/ III 110^v).

We have attested several verbs used in the reflexive form, although they generally function actively *a posti* (to fast): *Cuviosul Părintele nostru Lázár, cel ce s-au postit în Muntele Gallisii* (Our reverend Father Lazar, who fasted on Mount Gallisii) (277^f/ III 124^f), *a munci* (to labor): *Sfântul Marele Mucenic Ioánn cel Nou, care s-au muncit la Cetatea Albă* (Saint John the New, the Great Martyr, who labored at Cetatea Albă) (312^v/ III 141^v), *a zăbovi* (to linger): *de să va zăbovi acolo pentru vreo întâmplare* (to linger there for some reason) (381^f/ III 176^f). Moreover, the Romanian Language Dictionary mentions the reflexive use of these verbs, considering it obsolete.

We encounter in the third person plural the old, etymological forms²⁹ without the ending [-u], because “between 1780 and 1828, the norm of the time in all provinces was for the third person plural to end, like the third person singular, in [-a],” the form with [-u] being recommended by Heliade-Rădulescu to eliminate the annoying homonymy, in the years 1836-1839 – *era* (was): *cei ce era hrăniți cu multe desfătări* (those who was fed with many delights) (219^f/ III 95^f), *a tuturor dreptilor ce era acolo* (of all the righteous who was there) (367^f/ III 169^f), *cetea* (was reading): *lară alții (...) cetea câte 3 cathisme* (And others (...) was reading three cathisms) (401^f/ III 186^f), *făcea* (was doing): *lară alții (...) făcea câte o sută de metanii* (And others (...) was doing a hundred prostrations) (401^f/ III 186^f), *avea* (had): *creștinii cei de demult (...) avea voie* (the Christians of old (...) had permission) (5^f/ I 2^f).

We identified structures with periphrastic imperfect, constructions made up of the imperfect of the auxiliary *a fi* (to be) and the gerund form of the conjugated verb:³⁰ *acea era rugându-să* (those were praying) (368^v/ III 169^v), *mârge la locul de era stând* (goes to the place where he was sitting) (173^f/ III 72^f), *la locul unde era el stând* (at the place where he was sitting) (125^f/ III 48^f). In the case of these structures, opinions are diverse. First of all, it was

²⁹ Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 304.

³⁰ Ibid., 306.

observed that the forms made up of *a fi* (to be) + gerund in the translated texts “correspond to similar constructions in the Slavic original, which in turn reflect the Greek original.”³¹ Beyond the fact that equivalent periphrastic structures are found in the original Greek text, which could explain the existence of these sequences in the Romanian translations, constructions of this type were also recorded in untranslated texts or texts were mentioned in which such sequences are found only in the Romanian ones, and not in the Slavic or Greek ones.³² In addition, the idea was emphasized that “the number of attestations of these periphrastic constructions is continuously increasing throughout the 17th and 18th centuries and falls into disuse in the 19th century,”³³ the period from which this text dates.

We note in the text the homonymy of the auxiliary forms for the third person in both the singular and plural, which was in fact the norm in the previous era, which “only allowed the form *au* (were):”³⁴ *fost-au Iudéa* (were Judea) (267^r/ III 119^r), *cei ce au fost episcopi* (those who were bishops) (301^r/ III 136^r), *Domnul (...) di la Ánna la Caiáfa au fost dus* (The Lord (...) from Annas to Caiaphas were led) (368^v/ III 169^v), *Mântuitorul nostru (...) au strigat* (Our Savior (...) they cried) (369^r/ III 170^r), *el n-au fost la ascultarea Liturghiei* (he were not at the Mass) (381^r/ III 176^r). The form *au* (were) of the auxiliary verb for the third person singular was explained either by the influence of the third person plural (*au* < **habunt*)³⁵ or by the form *habuit*.³⁶

We do not identify synthetic constructions with pluperfect verb forms. We record sequences with analytical forms of the pluperfect, constructions formed from the compound perfect of the verb *a fi* (to be) and the past participle of the verb to be conjugated, structures specific to texts belonging to the northern dialects,³⁷ being even a “Moldavian peculiarity:”³⁸ *s-au fost tipărit* (were printed) (401^r/ III 186^r).

We record future forms consisting of an auxiliary verb + subjunctive, particularly in the third person singular and less frequently in the second person singular and third person plural.

³¹ Maria Rădulescu, “The periphrastic verb forms ‘to be’ + gerund in translated Romanian texts from the 16th century,” *Linguistic studies and research* XI, 3 (1960): 697.

³² Constantin Frâncu, “The origin and evolution of supercompound verbal forms in Romanian,” *Yearbook of Linguistics and Literary History* XXIX (Iași: Academy Publishing House, 1983-1984): 29

³³ Claudia Cemârtan, “The language of religious texts published at the Exarchate Printing House in Chișinău: syntactic features” (2016): 13. Beyond the different historical periods from which the texts date, the linguistic phenomena encountered are similar, emphasizing their archaic character.

³⁴ Chivu et al., *Studies in the history of the Romanian language. Morphosyntax of the literary language in the 19th and 20th centuries*, 204.

³⁵ Constantin Frâncu, “Third person forms of the auxiliary verb in the present perfect tense. Historical overview,” *Linguistic studies and research* XX, no. 3 (1969): 303.

³⁶ Ion Gheție, “The origin of the auxiliary *a* from the 3rd person singular of the present perfect,” *Linguistic studies and research*, XXIV, no. 4 (1973): 421-30.

³⁷ Frâncu, *Grammar of the Old Romanian Language (1521-1780)*, 311.

³⁸ Vasile Arvinte, “Linguistic study of the first book (Genesis) of the Bucharest Bible (1688), compared to Ms. 45 and Ms. 4389,” in Paul Miron et alii (coord.), *Monumenta Linguae Dacoromanorum – Biblia 1688*, part I, *Genesis* (Iași: Alexandru Ioan Cuza University Press, 1988), 79.

a) a) in the third person singular: *carele va să săvârșască* (who will be done (75'/ III 23'), *viața veacului ce va să fie* (the life of the age that is to come) (120'/ III 45'), *când va să blagoslovească agnețele* (when he will bless the Lambs) (188'/ III 79'), *cela ce va să se cuminece* (the one who will take the Holy Communion) (237'/ III 104'), *va să să puie înainte pre această masă de taină* (will place before this table of mystery) (206'/ III 88');

b) in the second person singular: *vei să pui* (you will put) (247'/ III 109');

c) in the third person, plural: *să fie de ajuns celor ce vor să să pricestuiască* (let it be enough for those who want to take the Holy Communion) (134'/ III 52'), *darurile care vor să se puie înaintea* (the gifts that are to be placed before) (160'/ III 65').

Adverbs of time are frequently used, from the perspective of their intratextual space of use, identifying two categories. On the one hand, we have the class of adverbs used only in the liturgical text of services and prayers, mentioning here – *astăzi* (today): *Pâinea noastră cea de-a pururea dă noao astăzi* (Give us this day our daily bread) (131'/ III 51'), *acum* (now): *Iată acum binecuvîntați pre Domnul toate slugile Domnului* (Behold, now bless the Lord all the servants of the Lord) (39'/ III 5'), *noaptea* (at night): *Doamne, Dumnezeuul mântuirii mele, zioa am strigat și noaptea înaintea ta* (Lord, God of my salvation, I cried out to you day and night) (335'/ III 153'). On the other hand, we can talk about the category of adverbs used only at the level of individual typical indications or within the final chapter devoted to recommendations for priestly service. Some of these adverbs belong to the semantic field of succession – *atuncea* (then): *descoperindu-ți capul, te închină și atunci începe* (uncovering your head, bow down and then begin) (394'/ III 182'), *îndată* (immediately): *de nu este diacon, îndată zice preotul* (if there isn't a deacon, the priest says immediately) (159'/ III 65'), *târziu* (late): *a să începe și mai de dimineață și mai târziu* (let him begin even earlier in the morning and later) (372'/ III 171'); others capture a precise moment – *dimineață* (in the morning): *Iară de va spăla gura și dimineața cu pază* (And if he washes his mouth and in the morning with care) (371'/ III 171' -372'/ III 171').

We record several adverbial phrases of time, which emphasize the order in which liturgical actions are performed – *după aceea* (after that): *după aceea să ștergă și cu burțile marginea* (after that, wipe the edge with the cloths) (385'/ III 178')/ *după acêia* (after that): *după acêia, mergînd, aprinde candelile* (after that, walking, light the candles) (15'/ II 2'), *după aceasta* (after this): *și după aceasta, luînd burêtele antiminsului, să-și ștergă bine palma* (and after this, taking the antimimension cloth, wipe your palm well) (385'/ III 178').

Frequent uses include the forms *mai înainte* (previously) and *mai nainte*, used in both temporal and local senses. For this paragraph, we will note sequences in which the temporal value is emphasized – *mai nainte: a tuturor celor ce mai nainte s-au mutat întru credință* (of all those who have previously moved into faith) (47'/ III 9'), *este sfîntîntă mai nainte* (it is previously holy) (190'/ III 80'), *mai înainte: cêle ce s-au zis mai înainte* (those which were previously said) (364'/ III 167'). We also add here the form *denainte* (earliest), which has both temporal and local value, for the temporal value, excerpting the example: *în cele mai denainte tipărite rumânește Liturghii* (in the earliest printed Romanian Liturgies) (4'/ I 1').

We record the adverb *aici* (here) with a temporal value, without a spatial one: *Aici să închină preotul* (Here the priest worships) (183'/ III 77'). The form *aceia* has both values, the

temporal one being captured in the sequence: *Aicea să deșchid dverile cêlê împărătești la vohodul cel mic* (Here the iconostasis doors open at the small entrance) (98^v/ III 34^v).

The preposition *peste* (< *pre* + *spre*, cf. DLR) was recorded in only four sequences: *Învățătură cum să cade a zice otpusturile la praznice domnești și a Maicii lui Dumnezeu și peste tot anul* (Teaching on how to say the dismissals at royal feasts and those of the Mother of God, and throughout the year Instruction on how to say the dismissals at the feasts of the Lord and of the Mother of God and throughout the year (223^r/ III 97^r), *în otpusturile de peste săptămână* (in the dismissals of the week) (230^v/ III 100^v), *să zică(...) toate celelalte a proscomidiei peste agneț* (to say (...) all the rest of the proscomidia over the Lamb) (376^v/ III 173^v), *așa peste toată săptămâna toată Psaltirea săvârșăsc* (so throughout the whole week the whole Psalter is performed) (401^r/ III 186^r), the form *preste* totaling 69 occurrences: *toate prochimenele trebuincioase preste tot anul* (all the necessary prokeimenons throughout the year) (4^v/ I 1^v), *trimite preste noi milele tale cêlê bogate* (send us your rich mercies) 45^r/ III 8^r), *însemnează cu dânsa cruce preste celêlalte pîini* (mark with it the cross over the other loaves) (50^v/ III 10^v).

Conclusion

The language of the Chișinau *Liturgikon*, printed in 1815 at the Exarchate Printing House, is characterized by a strong archaic aspect. Although produced at the beginning of the 19th century, when specialists speak of the beginnings of the modernization of the Romanian language, from a linguistic point of view, the text presents various elements specific to the previous period. Here we briefly recall the plural form *mânule* of the noun *mână* (*hand*), gender fluctuations in the plural forms *veacuri* (*ages*) and *vêci*, and the preservation of the plural ending *-ure* in forms such as *neamure* and *lucrure*. Also, with regard to the imperfect tense, we observe the homonymy of the third person singular and plural forms. At the same time, also in the case of the auxiliary verb, in the present perfect, we note the homonymy of the third person singular and plural forms: *cei ce au fost episcopi* (those who were bishops) (301^r/ III 136^r), *Domnul (...) di la Ánna la Caiáfa au fost dus* ((The Lord (...) from Annas to Caiaphas were led) (368^v/ III 169^v).