

## **SPECIFIC LANGUAGE TYPES OF RELIGIOUS STYLE<sup>1</sup>**

**Abstract:** *The purpose of this article is to investigate the specific languages of religious style, including the common and the newer ones. The religious style is the first special manifestation of the Romanian literary language; and the beginning of the written Romanian language is directly associated with the writing of religious texts. Being ignored for a long time, in the last decades, the religious style assumed new forms generated by the practices of religious rites, which are sometimes very diversified. The article describes the main language types, and we mention the following: the biblical language, the liturgical language, religious oratorical, religious technical, religious dramatical, theological or the ecclesiastic magazine language. The biblical language predominates in Romanian culture through its primary and most conservative version, the biblical text, as opposed to the theological language, which underwent modification during the modernization of the Romanian literary language. The religious oratorical language of the sermons distinguish itself being more mobile, using frequently means that are characteristic to the fictional style languages. The language of the theological magazines derives from the theological language and it points only to the theological version of religious style and not the style on the whole. Therefore, the language of the contemporary ecclesiastical texts carries forward our old literary language that was used in the first decades of the 19th century. The ecclesiastical literature had a major role in the development of the Romanian literary language, a role that was emphasized in number of studies. The multitude of language types of religious style proves that this stylistic version has been existing since back in the old Romanian language period.*

**Keywords:** *religious style, types of languages, the biblical language, the religious oratorical language, the theological language.*

### **Chapter I. The orthodox discourse - between tradition and innovation**

The religious style is the first specialized manifestation of the Romanian literary language, and the beginning of the written Romanian language is directly linked to the attainment of religious texts. Though it is specific to a professional group (especially priests), the religious path is a lifestyle, that gives a religious dimension to human existence and characterizes groups / communities of people, causing behavioral changes and new attitudes towards others and it plays an important role in the society.

The religious ritual practices generates more of religious languages, sometimes with big differences between them:

- 1) The biblical language;
- 2) The liturgical or ecclesiastic language;
- 3) The oratorical religious language;
- 4) The technical religious language;
- 5) The dramatically religious language;
- 6) The theological language;
- 7) The religious teaching language.

To these types of languages can be added others, such as the language of the church's magazines, missionary language and the language of the religious sites. Individual styles could be mentioned: N. Steinhardt's religious vocabulary, providing an effective and

---

<sup>1</sup> Adina Elena Coclici (Telescu), Ștefan cel Mare University, Suceava, Romania, adinacoclici@yahoo.com.

\*This paper was supported by the project "Knowledge provocation and development through doctoral research PRO-DOCT - Contract no. POSDRU/88/1.5/S/52946 ", project co-funded from European Social Fund through Sectoral Operational Program Human Resources 2007-2013.

individual solution to combine the neologism and archaism with familiar expression. With a constant tradition since the late XVI century, Biblical language version prevails in the Romanian culture through its most fundamental and conservative, biblical text, although suffering revisions and rectifications, still has many archaic features, unpreserved in other types of writings. Specific lexical items can be observed: *ardere-de-tot* "jertfă prin ardere", *capiște* "templu", *fur* "hoț", *pîrîș* "reclamant" (Oprea, Nagy, 2002: 321).

The first Romanian translation of the full Bible was printed in Bucharest, in 1688, and many lettered people, from all Romanian provinces, have worked on. Bucharest's edition (1688) was followed by Samuil Micu's in 1795, of Blaj, and several minor changes appeared: *spirit* instead of *duh*, *Doamne îndură-te!* Instead of *Doamne miluiește!* Regardless of denomination, the Bible has preserved the basic features, which were also extended to other languages of the religious style, especially the liturgical language. The theological speech suffered a number of changes during the modernization of Romanian literature, being characterized by similar features from the philosophical speech. The oratorical preaching speech gained distinction with a greater mobility, often using methods specific to the belletristic style: rhetorical procedures and figures of speech.

Religious style of Romanian literature testifies in the formative process of Romanian as the national language and culture. As important and as spreading, religious texts have long dominated secular writings, because the process of secularization of Romanian culture has been slow, and the religious writings had the support of the press, while secular writings were spreading as manuscripts.

In the modern era, the religious style was simply ignored because it was aimed only the stylistic diversification of the secular style of Romanian, but the religious speech / biblical represents an important issue in the evolution of the Romanian literary language, regardless of the period in which we relate and target levels. Part of the ethnogenesis of the Romanian people, orthodoxy and autochtonism are the main coordinates in the Romanian culture. Every language in the world, more or less, portrays a specific view of life and constitutes the specific nature of a civilization. It is also the case of Romanian language. In-depth knowledge of the Romanian soul can be achieved by studying the language, which prates the spiritual image of the Romanians.

In the Romanian provinces the Romanian language was adopted gradually as an instrument of written expression, and the Slavonic language, used as the language of the church and the Chancery was replaced by Romanian language during a long transition process. Thus, those who should receive the appreciation are the priests and monks because they supported and have developed rich urban centers and monastic printing.

In the sixteenth century, most of the literary texts belonged to the religious literature: reading texts Church (*Apostolul, Tetraevanghelul, Psaltirea, Palia*), texts of the ministry (*Liturghierul, Molitvelnicul, Octoiul, Cartea de cîntece*), exegesis texts and moral edification (sermons, education in patristic literature). But most religious texts from this period are translations or processing of texts from Slavonic, Greek and Hungarian. In this century, the deacon Coresi expressed in the preface of *Întrebarea creștinească* (1559), the need of Romanian language in church. Religious texts were translated into Romanian and were the most read and most popular books in old age. Through them, the Romanian language has become the definitive culture of the Romanians and won the first uniform expression of the denominations. Religious literature is materialized in a more conventional matter than the secular language and it is often marked by the consistent influence of the original words from Slavonic, Greek and Hungarian, and because of the tradition respect for church's writings are archaic and homogeneous language.

We further propose a contrastive analysis of religious texts from various periods in the history of Romanian language that illustrates the specific features of the Orthodox discourse. Thus, for the old Romanian language we chose literary references to *Biblia de la Blaj* (1795) compared with the Gala Galaction's and Dumitru Radu's Bible 1968, and for oratorical religious language we have selected a sermon (*Pastorala la Învierea Domnului* din 2010).

## Chapter II. Specific types of religious language style

**II.1 The Biblical language** is the most conservative, as evidenced by keeping many facts of language which have characterized the earlier stages of development of the Romanian literary language. Some facts like these have remained continuously in the biblical texts, others have been reintroduced in the texts, but not for expressive aesthetic purposes, as in belletristic texts, but because of the need of respect for the sanctity of the religious texts.

We believe that the Bible is a basic text, which was, by translation, the most important part of the primary intellectual vocabulary of Romanian literature. The first full translation of the Bible in Romanian, *Biblia de la București* (1688), was the point of departure for the birth of a new language of culture, replacing the old language, Slavonic liturgical "ecumenică" not only in its primary functions, but also the rest of the cultural functions.

The opened attitude toward religious movements which promoted religious services held in the local's mother tongue, in Transylvania, rushed the process of translation of religious literature. In the mid-seventeenth century, the basic printing works for the religious ceremony in Romanian, took place in Balgrad: *Noul Testament* (1648) și *Psaltirea* (1651). The version published in Bucharest in 1688 was clarified by the discovery of two manuscripts (45 and 4389) the translation of the Old Testament. The prefaces of these two manuscripts actually stated that the translator of the Old Testament is Milescu Nicolae, who used as the basic text of the *Septuaginta* Greek version, and as auxiliary versions, the Slavonic translation of the Bible printed at Ostrog in 1581, the Latin *Vulgate*.

In the early age of the Romanian literary language, because the Romanian culture was part of the Orthodox-Byzantine culture of south-east, Greek was the mainly language model and Slavonic was subordinated to the Greek model, at least in the specialized vocabulary of the superior intellectual operations. Bible translators of 1688 had to face major problems due to the fact that the Romanian language was not sufficiently prepared, at that time to translate flawless in Romanian the most read text in all languages and cultural spaces, of all time. It also emerges the idea of „strâmtarea limbii românești”(Iacob N., 2000: 48), something that could make it impossible for the translators to use appropriate terms for the new concepts, which were inserted with translated text. Romanian erudits have often solved the transposing of Greek words, combining the structural and semantic calchieria with rare adoptions.

In addition to the actual adoptions or semantic and structural calculations, we can observe the manifestation of another type of phenomenon of linguistic interference, amplifying and refining the semantic fields of the Romanian cultural vocabulary, the creation of many synonyms and antonyms series. The pressure of the Greek language for Romanian vocabulary has not been exercised only upon the "terminological vocabulary" and the special terminology (names of objects, priestly functions, ecclesiastical terminology), but also upon the basic vocabulary of the Romanian language. The translator, facing the inadequacies of the Romanian language as a higher communication tool and systemic incompatibilities according to the original languages, is often forced to opt for

adoptions of context. The full translation of the Bible brought plenty of difficulties, and the printed text of 1688 represents the traditional version of the Bible.

In the second half of the eighteenth century, when Samuil Micu realised the full translation of the Bible into Romanian, the translation of religious texts became a habitual task for more than two centuries, and the Romanian culture was eagerly involved in an accentuated process of secularization. In a time when works were made, translations to support the development of different areas of secular culture, religious culture was not neglected because our culture still retained a predominantly religious character. Representative of the Transylvanian School, Micu Samuil takes the initiative to publish again the Bible understandable to all Romanians, regardless of whether they were Catholic or Greek Orthodox. Micu's 1795 printed text is not simply a reprint of the Bible from 1688, but a considerable effort of an expression of renewal and straightening of the old translations, in order to achieve a version that reflects changes from the first translation. *Biblia de la Blaj* wanted to be like a transposition of the biblical text that would provide a common language and style. Micu's desire was that his interpretation to be according to Greek version, but for readers to understanding, and for that he resorts to annotations, most of philological nature. The annotations were synonyms, written at the bottom, with sources as a means of explaining the variations.

We will present some of the phonetic, morphosyntactic and lexical features that characterizes the second full translation of the sacred text of 1795, extracts from the book *Limbajul biblic românesc* (Niculina Iacob).

Although Micu adapts the text to the phonetic rules of the modern literary language, however, inconsistencies are not permanently removed, archaic phonetisms were motivated by considerations etymology. Here are some of the phonetisms presented in the text, which are rejected by the modern literary standard: *blăstăm, blăstăma, năcaz*; etymological form of the preposition *cătră*; phonetism *năsip*; etymologically phonetism of the *răsiți, rădica, lăcui*; *jertvă* form; *pre, preste* preposition etc. In most cases, Micu opted for phonetisms that Romanian literary language has preserved in a unique way: noun *norod* is used only with this form, with *o* assimilation; words as: *a nimeri, nimic, dimineața, inima* have only the *e* medial form became atonic *i*, exception is the verb *a citi* which appears with *e*, *din* and *prin* prepositions that appears with *e* closed to *i*, *î* becomes *u* in *a umple, a umbla*; *a pofti* verb and its derivatives on the Romanian field, know new phonetism and not etymological phonetism. In conclusion, it is not difficult to notice that similar phonetic text from 1795 is still unitary.

At the morphological level, there is in the text of 1795 noun declension, which varies from one to another. It is the case of *soră* noun in I declension, *ușă, cenușă, grijă; strugur* noun, in II declension, and *pîntece* knows only the third declension. It is kept the worth genitive structures consisting of *a + tot + noun*; and the absolute superlative structure of the morpheme-adverb *foarte* is placed after the adjective. Some verbs maintains Latin conjugation: *a adaoge, a plăcea, a rămînea, a tăcea, a ținea, a umplea*, and some verbs were different framed in active voice and reflexive. Perfect auxiliary structure *au* shaped the person singular the same with plural, and the rule is the conjugated auxiliary verb + participle. The future in Micu's text presents a paradigm very homogeneous and ancillary topics (you will, will, you will) + conjugated verb is cvasigenerală. Currently connective forms of verbs *a bea, a sta, a da, a lua, a vrea* are etymological and are not the newest and conjunctival perfect auxiliary structure is still given in person and number with the subject.

Using prepositions and prepositional phrases with a causal regime which is still

kept in today's Romanian language, also appears in our biblical text analysis. Disjunctive conjunction *au* is the element of relationship in the phrase, and *ori* is disjunctive element coordinator in sentence.

At the syntactical level, we can notice the defaulting apposition in regent, when the case is different from the nominative, the direct and indirect complement are constructed generally as in the current literary Romanian language, the predicate is sometimes, as in texts from the previous period, the affirmative aspect of the negative sentences.

The vocabulary in the text from 1795 reflects the fact that the Romanian language became a modern tool of communication, the natural consequence of a long period of practice of our language as the language of culture. The large number of synonyms which are emerging in the text from of the late eighteenth century confirms the existence of various possibilities of expression in Romanian. A first principle in the selection of lexical material is to replace words considered archaic or regional with literary terms: *lance* and *arc de aramă* has replaced *fuște*; *a rămînea* and *a lăcui* replaced by the verb *a mînea*; *a pîngari* has been replaced by *a spurca*. It was also considered the replacement of the terms of Slavic origin with words of Latin origin: *adînc* instead of *beznă*, *a blagoslovi* replaced by *a binecuvînta*, *chică* replaced by the *părul copilului* etc. Sometimes the same terms are preserved in Romanian because these realities were known only by the term adopt, or to remain as closely as the Greek text: *chiparos*, *drahmă*, *gripsor*, *onih*, *topazion*, *safir* etc. It was also appealed to phraseological calculations after Greek language, despite the fact that it was very easy to employ a single word, semantically equivalent to the expression used: *cei cu mulți ani*, *cinstitoriu de Dumnezeu*, *fără de lege*, *a naște crud*, *sărac de părinți* etc.

In conclusion, in 1640-1800 Romanian biblical language senses a clear evolution which also certifies the progress of the Romanian literary language. There were published mainly religious translations texts and the literary Romanian language was originally a language of religious books. Original Greek language had a great impact on language translations and on the syntax. Only the religious style can be related to the acceptance of modern functional style, on this period of time.

In linguistics' research it is ignored the religious speech, they just used the secular version of our language. Gh Chivu drew attention to the need to recompose the picture of the Romanian literary language variants, since the specific religious speech is not restricted to a lexical stock, as it might be suggested by religious terminology dictionaries. Rodica Zafiu states that a linguistic research must follow the stylistic position of forms, the competition of archaisms and neologisms, semantic derivation or specialization within religious vocabulary, syntactic and textual phenomena of features. As for the Christian church language, the cultural history of the Romanian language raises some specific issues in the relationship between slavonisms, hellenism and roman neologisms, in the competition between the lexical choices made by various denominations.

To support the existence of religious variant of Romanian literature, Chivu notes that the Bible is different from contemporary secular texts through a series of orthographic, morphological, syntactic and lexical features, which identifies the "așa-numitul limbaj bisericesc" (Chivu, 1995: 446).

As we stated earlier, using the comparative method, we'll consider the biblical speech from a new version of the sacred text of the Bible 1968, revised by Dumitru Radu (Orthodox version) and Galaction Gala. In the spelling matter, the words that define the divinity, according to symbolic principle, some nouns and pronouns in the accentuated form or not, are written with uppercase: "Precum Mă cunoaște Tatăl și Eu cunosc pe Tatăl.

Și viața Mea o pun pentru oi” (Ioan 10:15), ”Mulțumim Ție, Doamne Dumnezeule, Atotțitorule, Cel ce ești și Cel ce erai și Cel ce vii, că ai luat puterea Ta cea mare și ai început să împărățești” (Apocalipsa 11:17).

At the morphological level, the etymological form *pustie* appears, instead of the actual noun *pustiie*: ”il va trimite cu un om anumit în pustie”(Levitic 16:21), linguistic fact that also appears in the Bible from 1795, which proves the conservation of some old forms. Common nouns that refer to God are articulated with the definite article and when there are no subjects or attributive determinations, they behave like proper nouns: ”robul tău era om cu temere de *Domnul*”, ”Astfel este cu oricine e născut din *duhul*” (Ioan 3:8). The vocative noun for gentleman does not have any article when it is been used for the name of God: ”În ajutorul tău nădăjduiesc, o, *Doamne!*”(Facerea 49:18).

Absolute superiority superlative frequently forms with the adverb *mult*: ”Domnul este îndelung răbdător și *mult milostiv*” or with the morphem of the adverb *foarte*: ”Domnul este înțelept, *înfricoșat foarte*”. In some cases there are used adjectives with the prefix *prea-*: ”Striga-voi către Dumnezeul cel *preainalt*”, ”Binecuvântat este numele cel sfânt al slavei tale și *prealăudat* și *preainălțat* întru toți vecii”. The verbs *a veni* and *a crede* are used in the *Tatal nostru* prayer in this form: *va să vie* and *crez*: ”*Vie împărăția ta*” (Matei 6:10). Conjunctival imperative value is often used without *să*: ”*Vie împărăția ta!*” (Luca 11:2), ”*Facă-se voia ta!*”(Luca 11:2).

The *au* adverb with frequency appears at the beginning of interrogative sentences, single or with *doară*: ”*Au* cerut-am eu fiu de la domnul meu?”, ”*Au doară* rob sau fiu de rob e Israel?” (Ieremia 2:14). *Întru* and *dintru* are the only prepositions used without the final vowel: ”*Dintru* adâncuri am strigat către Tine, Doamne ”(Psalmi 19:1).

As for the syntax of the sentence, the predicate is often implied or absent: ”Înalță-te peste ceruri, Dumnezeule și peste tot pământul ... slava ta!” (Psalmi 56:7). Apposition is, in some contexts, in the case of the regent concorded: ”Te slăvesc pe tine, părinte, *doamne* al cerului și al pământului...” (Luca 10:21). The direct object is sometimes expressed by verbs in the infinitive: ”a început Isus *a face* și *a învăța*” (Fapte 1:1), and sometimes in common nouns with the preposition *pe*: ”el a mai învățat *pe popor* cunoștința”(Ecclesiast 12:9). In some contexts the accented and unaccented forms of pronoun with function of a direct complement following eachother in a tautological repetition: ”Vremea este *să-l miluiești pe el*” (Psalmi 101:14).

Instead of a direct complement is used in dative an indirectly complement, after the verb *crede*, *ierta*, *răsplăti*, *urma* și *vesti*: ”Și Avraam a crezut *lui Dumnezeu*” (Romani 4:3), ”de veți ierta oamenilor greșelile lor, ierta-va și *vouă* tatăl vostru” (Matei 6:14), ”și răsplătește la fel *celor ce-l urăsc*” (Deuteronom 7:10).

In the phrase is particularly noteworthy the frequency of the *și* conjunction at the beginning of several successive syntactic units, which supports the idea that most of the books in the Bible have a narrative structure. Specific to the Bible is the emergence of the *ci* conjunction, used as a link between the phrases that have adversely role in some contexts: ”Eu nu găsec în el nici o vină. *Ci* este la voi obiceiul ca la Paști să vă eliberez pe unul” (Ioan 18:39).

The topic of components in some phrases individualized the biblical language. The adverb *foarte* it's used sometimes after the verb: ”și s-a veselit *foarte*”, ”s-a bucurat *foarte*”, ”s-a tulburat *foarte*”. The compound verb forms have frequently the auxiliary after the verb: ”adormit-am”, ”cerut-am”, ”strîns-am”, ”grăit-a”. Between the auxiliary verb and the conjugated one is dithered atonic pronominal form: ”apucatu-l-am”, ”lauda-te-voi”, ”sculamă-voi”.

The most numerous examples of features that individualise the biblical language occur in the vocabulary. This does not regard to the words used to describe the specific realities of the world mentioned in the Old and New Testaments like: *efod*, *meil*, *hiron*, *chidar*, *sicli*, *homer* de orz, and nor terms like *Dumnezeu*, *Isus*, *duh*, *propovădui*. We note however the presence of many words missing from the current use, lexical archaisms. The Bible is still using loans from Slavic or neogreek which are no longer used, old words of Latin origin, derived with suffixes, forms or etymological structure without prefixes. Some examples include: *ardere-de-tot* "jertfă în care animalul sacrificat este ars", *asină* "măgăriță", *dajde* "bir, impozit", *danț* "joc", *necredincioșie* "necredință", *osebi* "a deosebi", *pîrîș* "reclamant", *pogorî* "a coborî", *punere-înainte* "ofrandă", *zămisli* "a procrea" etc. We also find the semantic archaisms: *apăsa* "a asupri", *a da* in verbal phrase *a da morții* "a omorî", *destoinic* "demn", *idol* "statuie a unei divinități păgîne", *îndurat* "îndurător", *înger* "slujitor", *îngreuna* "a însărcina", *lege* "credință", *mreață* "plasă de pescuit", *sămînță* "seminție, neam" etc. These archaisms present in the Bible are not intended to create color and age, but are traces of the old forms of the text preserved to meet the letter and spirit of the sacred text. At the end of this presentation we can conclude that both texts, the Blaj Bible and the 1968 Bible, are identified by various archaic features, preserved in spite of the language and stylistic revisions. The biblical language is the successor of our ancient literary language.

**II.2 The religious oratorical language** is more colloquial than the previous versions and allows the personalization of the message. The religious speaker (priest) holds a religious discourse that takes the form of a sermon. The sermon was the instrument that emerged and made Christianity the dominant religion. The synthetic homilies, analytical and exegetical, expressed on church holidays and Sundays, conferences and other religious events, are sacred or ecclesiastical oratory. The fundamental purpose of preaching is the digestion of truths of faith, therefore dominating the whole system of religious oratory. The explanation of the Gospel in all Sundays and major holidays is the most popular form of religious discourse in the Orthodox Church. The speeches, sermons or homilies had a certain freedom of expression in relation to other religious writings, the language was severely and rigorously criticized by the respect for the doctrine.

Made in order to interpret the meaning of all the teachings of Jesus and intended to be understandable for the readers, and especially at the Sunday Masses and at the utterance at the great feasts of the year, at the baptism, weddings, the erection or installation of bishops in office in the parish priest, homily, it was able to change the composition language, according to the culture and oratorical talent of those who spoke, but also according to those listening. Religious speeches, even if they are based on models and texts that have become classics, from the famous sermons of the apostles or due to the homilies of St. Augustine, speeches were also like folk creations, each of the preachers being able to add or remove something. Yet there had to be a basic text to be followed by the priests in terms of content, even if not literally reproduce it.

The oldest collection of sermons that was translated into Romanian and which preached the Calvinism is *Tîlcul evangheliilor*, published in 1567 by Coresi. The *Evanghelia cu învățătură*, from 1581, printed by the same publisher was accepted by romanian orthodoxs. The basic homiletic orthodox text for the churches of the Romanians is Varlaam's *Cazania*, printed in Iasi in 1643. The best known, most widespread and most read book of our ancient literature and the basic for religious discourse written in Romanian. The old period is marked by the Wallachian Metropolitan Antim Ivireanul's

contribution, that gives a demonstration of Romanian dialect in *Didahiile*, but they were printed by the end of the nineteenth century. The homiletic literature has seven specific oratorical sacred moments, moments that constitute the plan of a sermon: the text, salutation, introduction or the exord, theme announcement, theme and sharing invocation, treat basis (naratio), end (peroratio).

In the following paragraphs, we will analyze the religious speech in a linguistical and rhetorical way, made as a sermon, held by the Higher Eminence Nicholas, Metropolitan of Banat, at Resurrection or *Pastorală la Învierea Domnului* (2010). Being an occasional sermon, it is delivered once a year and is not linked to a central point of the liturgy. The pastoral (lat. *pastoralis*) is an epidictic type of speech, a sermon held by the priest and sent to the audience by referring to an important event in the history of Christianity: the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The text begins with an addressing formula: *Cinstiți credincioși și credincioase*, individual recognition and acceptance within the Christian community is marked by linguistic group identity and is represented by generic expressions. At this level, the specific religious discourse as a speech-oriented in moral-religious training of a person appears from the semantics terms: *iubiți, frați, cinstiți, credincioși, creștini*, specific terms that reveal an attitude of involvement, both verbal as well as emotional of the speaker towards the audience, because the common interest of the group identified by common spiritual origin.

The demonstrable core communication becomes perceptible by marking people, time and space, which is actantial. In addition to specific Christian group marks, at the speech's level, the personal deixis is represented by first-person's plural: *noi*. The motivation of this type of addressing is the equal status of the priest in front of Divinity with the christians: *ni-l prezintă, ce ne înconjoară, să alungăm din noi*. Specifying the exact time is the main form of religious speech re-enactment of the Biblical message. During a religious discourse the time can have two interpretations: first connected with the chronological profane time, and second during the sacred liturgy. If liturgical ritual events presented are timeless, then the profane time and the sacred timen are juxtaposing. The linguistic time, ranked by speech, is included in the deployment of chronological time of events. The speech's liturgical time is marked by the lexical units: *în această primăvară, în aceste momente, sărbătoarea de Paști*, that coincide with the profane time. The speech time becomes: *acum, astăzi, Pământul, pe câmpii, prin livezi* words that marks the speech's space.

The introduction of pastoral poetic images captures the plasticity, wanting to draw the attention of the audience by using Goga's lyricism and the descriptive side of nature. The beauty of the nature, is placed under the sign of the mystery of creation, life and resurrection. Somewhat, the metaphorical expression cancels religious significance of the moment, but the solemnity and resurrection ceremony includes the whole universe. The epithet, metaphor, phrase crowded and the reversal from the beginning, marks a religious discourse-oriented on audience, inviting to meditation and contemplation of God's creation.

The enthusiasm, was considered essential by the rhetoric of the antiquity, and is still present in our days in the pastoral. Emotions can be aroused by the poetic vocabulary evocation of the rebirth of the nature. We can also talk about an emotional scenario because the sermon's main theme is to relive humanity's decisive events: the pain, the anguish, and Jesus's death and sacrifice.

The absolutely superlative archaic in contact with the *prea* adverb, reveals the features of nature, the perfection of creation: *prea luminată, prea minunată*. The speaker builds its message through a combination of styles: artistic style and religious, metaphor of



the resurrection of nature being necessary. The presence of a phonetic archaism is not surprising: skillful song, this language demonstrates the conservative nature of the religious version. The introduction is based on comparison of the outside and the within world resurrection. The text starts from the material world that we submit to the uttermost as a divine creation, gaining spiritual values. Beyond what we see, is God's perfection born of his love for the world, for the man. Thus, the resurrection of Jesus is God's gift to us humans, and the return to life of nature is a mystery, which we take as a natural given, an explanation of the succession of seasons.

The theme's announcement is present even in the introductory or we can say that the discourse's theme is induced from the beginning: the resurrection of the Saviour. Call for Christian love (fraternal love), for others and transforming into a new creature are the coordinates of Christianity. The audience is called with the help of the conjunctive verbs, present at the beginning of the sentences, to choose life, to banish sin, to bury sin and to rise to a new creature. It is a speech with a strong intertextuality, with references to the biblical text involving specific citation ways (Romans 6.4; Matthew 5.16). The sermon speech, which allows more freedom of expression, approaches the current communication and is dominated by the persuasive intent. Oscillating between the solemn and accessible language, the sermon's speech differs from the daily sermon, however, retaining the ability to be understood.

The pastoral message is built on Orthodox liturgical worship symbols: light and resurrection, candle, oil, resurrection, the Holy Easter and life-death antinomy. We could refer to the presence of stereotypes: "Aflându-ne în aceste momente de sfântă prăznuire" or "Ținînd seama de greutățile existente astăzi", "sfintele sărbători", or even some remnants of the totalitarian political speech before 1989: "pentru înfăptuirea acestor năzuințe". At the vocabulary's level it is worth to be mentioned the specialized lexicon of religious style and the archaisms: *sfântă prăznuire, sculare din morți, ajutători zidirii unei lumi noi, vrajbă, îndreptar, dreaptă cinstire a praznicului Învierii*. The transmitter invokes the need of change in the human being, and the need to return to biblical values: goodness, faithfulness, love, justice.

The sermon's ending is preachy, "the guide for Christian party", and the pastor calls his preach "the parents' word" and ends with the words of the Apostle Paul from 2 Corinthians 13:14: "Hristos a înviat!" is the Easter greeting that marks the end but also restores the universal order that was disturbed by the Saviour's death. The "Al vostru ... totdeauna rugător" form, is the high priest's signature, that suggests that he is in the service to God and the people, responsible mediator between God and men. In conclusion, this text illustrates the features of the oratorical religious speech, being a mixture of styles and using old and new speeches' strategies.

### **II.3 Theological language**

According to Ion Coteanu, in 1981: "Obligația principală a limbajului teologico-filozofic este exegeza textului biblic. În modul cel mai simplu care și domină în vechea cultură religioasă românească, ea se face prin predică sau cazanie și prin indicațiile privind desfășurarea serviciului religios, obligațiile clerului și relațiile dintre el și poporeni din liturghiere, molitvenice, ohtoihuri etc"(Coteanu I., 1981: 140). Analyzing this paragraph, we can observe that the investigator had not yet defined the religious style of the Romanian literary and stylistic variation that remains long ignored and makes that Romanian language to be a language of religious books. The **Theological-philosophical language** chapter deals

with Antim Ivireanul's rhetorical sermons and the philosophical writing register in the *Divanul* by D. Cantemir.

As humanities science, theology is between disciplines terminology "weak" but without strong standards and full of ambiguities arising from natural language expressions only. On the other hand, Romanian theology has much older terminology than other disciplines, due to historical and cultural particularities in which it developed, and consisted primarily of borrowings from Greek and Slavonic, a character much more stable and conservatively than other disciplines. Under the linguistical report, it is an interesting study object, which puts a more acute problem of the relationship between conservatism and innovation, or between respect for doctrine and receptivity to modernity than other styles or specialized languages.

Romanian theological discourse has undergone an evolution, starting from 89 years until nowadays, it was open to renewing of religious language both in terms of vocabulary, as well as rhetoric, known as its philosophical side. These days we can talk about theological discourse as a necessity for the revival cultural. This type of discourse has not stopped to catch other forms in recent decades. But it never left, remaining in an area of strictly professional, oscillating between the theologian desk and religious affairs office departments. During the communist period Staniloaie Dumitriu's book appeared, the series entitled *Arta creștină în România*, theological manuals and religious books, fragile appearances but important for Romanian theology. In the present context, theological discourse must pass from the state of surviving into that of the fighter, not just a pastoral tool but also a missionary one. It can be felt an acute need for theological language to be able to include answers for many questions that started to arise. Obvious necessities of Romanian culture are the simple, decent, redemptive and elegance Catechesis but also the theologian depth presence in the society. Its power comes from the ecclesial space, monastery, and strictly intellectual. The holy Fathers have set a style, an *ars poetica* meant to recognize God's kingdom. St. John Chrysostom, is not an author, but a witness, he has no works but a testimony, and the authorial ego is replaced by humility of God's chosen one. The theologian confessor empowered as a priest, immediately knows the spirituality pulse, themes and truths, solutions and models. The patristic writer is the earthly hand of the divine message, through entire person and his character.

Theological act and theological discourse, are both claimed in the liturgical act, a relationship between word and sacrament, unseen and seen, the supernatural and natural. Theological act is essentially Hristocentric, ie divine-human. Theological discourse is one of joy, and not a moral grim way. In one way, theological discourse is essentially worn of not so much text, but silently, paying great attention to the use of words seen in their edifying and destructive force, but the theological discourse breathes well in a wide silence. It is a paradoxical urge to silence through word, as Gospel urges us to do those spiritual things and not those of the word. Theological discourse taken as quietly moment assumes the same power and missionary zeal. By it mere, quiet presence, a church's cross, is announcing over roofs and trees, the only news worthy to hear, the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Found between the pastoral and mission, beauty and truth, confession and faith, theological discourse is meant to offer the nowadays world, a world troubled and confusional, an assuming model of sober reality, seen in the interpersonal relationship with the Creator. The theological discourse healing from the "wooden language" could get used to the revealing much silence, a confession language.

**Conclusions.** We have proposed in this article a description of religious language taking into account the characteristics of the literary language, and on the other hand, the structure of the language of contemporary literary style. The incursion in the history of religious discourse was necessary because it captures the evolution of language, language of the contemporary church as the successor of our old literary language, in use until the first decades of the nineteenth century. The major role that church literature has played in shaping Romanian literary language is highlighted in a series of important studies for the development of our literary language. Most of these studies agree that the establishment of the Romanian language has been fixed by using the same translations of religious books, and dialect differences from the areas of language development process. The many types of specific religious languages style demonstrate the existence stylistic variant that made its appearance since the old Romanian language, but it was ignored for a long time by linguists.

**Bibliography**

- Charaudeau, P., 1983, *Langage et discours*, Paris, Hachette.
- Chivu, Gh., 1995, „O variantă ignorată a românei literare moderne limbajul bisericesc”, *LR XLIV*, nr. 9-12, p. 445-453.
- Chivu, Gh., 1997, *Civilizație și cultură. Considerații asupra limbajului bisericesc actual*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Chivu, Gh., 2008, „Didahiile lui Antim Ivireanul și înnoirea limbajului predicii românești”, *Limba română XVIII*, nr. 9-10.
- Coteanu, I., 1981, *Structura și evoluția limbii române (de la origini pînă la 1860)*, București, Editura Academiei.
- Deleanu, M. M., 1997, „Stilul religios al limbii române literare”, în *LL XLII*, nr. 2, p. 28-39.
- Frențiu-Ivăniș, M., 2001, *Limba română și limbajul rugăciunii*, București, Editura Anastasia.
- Iacob, Niculina, 2001: *Limba biblică românească (1640-1800)*, vol.1, 2, Ed. Univ. Suceava.
- Munteanu, E., 2008, *Lexicologie biblică românească*, București, Ed. Humanitas.
- Munteanu, Ș., Țâra, V. D., 1978, *Istoria limbii române literare*, Ed. Didactică și Pedagogică, București.
- Oprea, Ioan, Nagy, Rodica, 2002: *Istoria limbii române literare. Epoca modernă*, Suceava, Ed. Universității.
- Răducănescu Obreja, D., 2010, „Reactualizarea mesajului sacru la nivelul discursului religios actual”, în *Limba română*, XX, nr. 9-10.
- Zafiu, R., 2001, *Diversitate stilistică în româna actuală*, EUB, București.