

ETHOS AND EXPRESSIVENESS IN ANTIM IVIREANUS'S *DIDAHII*²

Abstract: Didahii represents a complex work having a didactic, documentary, linguistic and even literary value. The present paper approaches the educative function of the sermons, analyzing fragments significant with this respect, as well as their moving function. The metropolitan bishop was aware that not only the information transfer from speaker to his audience was important, but also the audience's assumption of the received message. The persuasion is achieved not only by logos, but also by pathos and the rhetorical figures have an important role in producing emotion.

Key words: ethos, expressiveness, rhetorical figures, persuasion, argumentation.

1. The originality of Antim Ivireanu's oratorical work

An analysis of Antim Ivireanu's oratorical work should take into account the cultural, literary, social and political background on which it has been created and which has been researched and reflected by the author with a keen eye. The orator-writer should be imagined in the scholar environment of Brancoveanu's period, which was fairly prosperous and possessed the instruments and the institutions (such as printing offices, cultural centers) that made it modern.

In a culture of religious type the artistic originality does not have the precedence, as art is rather a means of educating the communities than an expression of a creative individuality. Up to the 19th century, Romanian culture produced few artistic works in the modern conception, but it manifested itself by religious texts (sermons, dogmatic speeches) and religious architecture and painting (churches, icons).

The originality of Antim Ivireanu's oratorical work and his creative effort should be judged in the terms of that period and, especially, of the "code" which established the rules of constructing a text in that period. A scholar in the 17th and 18th centuries did not ignore the "invention", but, to him, that concept meant, most of the times, to range and to connect some fragments which he compiled from various sources. In this respect, Ivireanu's work is as personal as possible, because it is characterized by a well-marked local feature, and it represents an image of the Romanian society. Antim does no longer write homilies that are generally acceptable, lacking space, time, social or national determinations, but he writes sermons which are inspired by the reality, life and traditions of a certain community. By their meaning, as well as by their level of expression and figures of speech, by the (social, moral) functions with which the author endowed them, "they go beyond the limits established by the tradition of sacred oratory, even beyond the limits of that heterogeneous complex called «religious literature»" (Mazilu 195).

The theological demonstrations, which are sometimes complicated because they are related to day-to-day life, facilitate the audience's assumption of the discussed abstract notions, so the message becomes easier to understand. However, the creative imagination with which the author was certainly endowed is free up to a certain point and the rules of the homiletic discourse do not allow it to go further.

There can be noticed a series of sources that Ivireanu used in order to create his *Didahii*, such as biblical writings, vernacular literature, moralizing discourses, anthologies of philosophical maxims,

¹ PhD candidate, University of Pitesti

² Acknowledgement: This work was partially supported by the strategy 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.

etc. "Due to the familiarity with the Scriptures texts (a topic of daily meditation), from which he almost always quoted from memory, he developed an imagination of biblical type, with a tendency to integrality" (Negrici 63).

So, Antim also makes use of his vast theological knowledge. He includes a series of biblical quotations in his sermons, but he treats them in a personal manner as he has the talent of posing problems and, this way, he manages to arouse the hearers' interest. Thus, his creation combines with his erudition.

It is certain that "Antim's sermons, the rhetoric of his work, in general, prove his mastering an oratorical experience which has many aspects in common with the theoretical and practical works of European Baroque orators and preachers" (Mazilu 183). The Baroque art is characterized by an over-decorated background, by an exaggerated concern for expression, polymorphism and imagistic refinement, it is sentimental and touching and Ivireanu's sermons present all these features in a certain degree.

By the polymorphism of the sermon, proved by the number of types which it presents (prayer, ode, hymn) and by its polytonality, Antim "half opens the gates of Romanian modern literature" (Negrici 45).

2. The expressiveness of the sermons

Antim Ivireanu is certainly an artisan, a master of word, like Cantemir. The difference between them consists in the fact that "the Moldavian prince often invented forms of expression meant to impress especially the reader, sometimes a refined reader", while the metropolitan bishop's sermons were meant to the hearer, "a refined hearer, if we consider the well-educated boyards in the Brancoveanu's period" (Rotaru 125).

In a period when the influence of Greek was dominant, Antim managed to shed a light upon the qualities of national language and especially to contribute to establishing the use of Romanian in Church and to the development of standard Romanian. He confessed that he always tried to "angle" his parishioners with "the angling line of the words" (Ivireanu 166).

The preacher proves that he masters the oratory art learned from the Antiquity masters, represented by Demosthenes, and from the Church orators, such as Ioan Hrisostomos or Ilie Miniat.

Antim's oratorical work may be considered to be the first main artistic achievement in Muntenia. Still, the author's main concern is making the message accessible so the rhetoric figures and devices occur only as arguments in the demonstrations, as they are meant to move the audience, to generate emotion to the public. The excessive rational characteristic of a sermon, the attempt to excessively explain in order to eliminate confusion or ambiguity, are often prejudicial to art, as they diminish or even cancel the connotation, the expressiveness: "Each added explanation diminishes the expressiveness of the original comparison. This is a phenomenon of self-suppression by consolidation" (Negrici 67).

A research on the rhetorical figures in Ivireanu's work should take into account the specificity of a sermon to be simultaneously a religious text, an oratorical and a literary one. The researchers noticed some homiletic works among the books that Antim had read.

The figures which usually belong to the oratorical structure are particularly interesting, as well as those which have not got a certain special use. The figures that the orators prefer are frequently the figures of thought and some of the most frequent in Ivireanu's sermons are the interrogation, the antithesis, the prolepsis; the device of parallelism or the parable could be added to them. The epanalepsis and the anaphor are frequently used as figures of the compositional harmony. The figures of sacred eloquence, such as epanorthosis, prosopoiia, hyperbole, aposiopesis, apostrophe, exclamation, invocation, epiphoneme also occur. The hyperbaton and the inversion are considered to be figures of words.

Like the chroniclers in that period, Antim achieves an artistic work, although he did not intend so and he created sermons with a powerful didactic characteristic.

3. The didactic characteristic of the sermons

The didactic genre is frequent in European culture and in the 17th century the didactic works represented an important aspect.

In Romanian historiography some of the chroniclers acknowledged the educative goal of the annals which accompanies the main informative goal. Thus, Grigore Ureche wanted that his work “*To be inherited by my sons and grandsons, to teach them to avoid the evil, to think it through, but to follow the good deeds, to learn and to become right.*” (Ureche 63).

The metropolitan bishop Antim is also firmly convinced of the educative effects of the ecclesiastic oratory. In most of his sermons he criticizes the vices and bad habits and his attitude is sometimes allusively expressed, sometimes vehement, with a peerless power. He denounces a series of human defects, which allows us to identify some “moral characters” in *Didahii*, still vaguely presented: the hypocrite, the greedy, the intriguer, the envious, the naïve, the braggart, etc. The technique of the significant detail is seldom used when he illustrates these human types.

Ivireanu deals with four types of sermons: the synthetic sermon (the proper sermon), the homily (the analytical sermon), the aphorism and the panegyric. Regarding the semantic field of passion, they include a various series of vibrating nuances, such as enthusiasm, ardour, passion, vehemence, frenzy, zeal etc. “The metropolitan bishop’s spirit has caprices according to the calendar: he is incisive and threatening during the Advent and the Lent, peaceful and elevated on Virgin Mary’s day and on Good Friday, well-balanced and impartial on Christmas and Easter” (Negrici 48).

4. Ethos and pathos in *Didahii*

The present paper aims to shed light on the various, but complementary functions which the sermons cumulate (the didactic, moralizing and educative, moving functions) and on the methods by which the expressiveness is achieved (especially the rhetoric figures), by analyzing significant fragments in the *Didahii*. The purpose of the sermon is to facilitate the information transfer from the preacher to the parishioners, but also to make the hearer want to assimilate that teaching and to react according to the recommended norms. So, the sermon should be conceived, structured and uttered in such a way that it allows and facilitates its receiving according to the preacher’s intention of communication.

4.1. As it results from the various attitudes reflected in *Didahii*, Antim is aware of the importance of his assigned missions. He fully understands his role and he often expresses it deliberately from the pulpit in order to motivate his critical actions with moralizing purposes. Like Christ’s disciples, he has the role to spread the faith in the world and, especially, to help those who strayed from the right way to come back. As he was a priest and a shepherd of souls, he understands that he should be a link between heavens and earth, divine and human or sacred and profane, as Eliade would call them. Being situated between these two coordinates, he will try hard to unite them, to bring God back among people and this wish is constantly expressed in his speeches.

He does not hesitate to use the authority of the institution he ruled in order to make the audience adopt his opinions, but, when needed, he also made use of the secular power, as it happens in *Cuvânt de învățătură la Dumineca vameşului*:

Și nimeni să nu socotească, din voi, și să zică în inima lui: dară ce treabă are vlădica cu noi, nu-ș caută vlădicia lui, ci să amestecă întru ale noastre? De n-aș știut până acum și de n-au fost nimeni să vă învețe, iată că acum veți ști că am treabă cu toți oamenii câți sânt în Țara Rumânească, de la mic până la mare și până la un copil de țâță afară din păgâni și din ceia ce nu sânt de o lege cu noi; căci în seama mea v-au dat stăpânul Hristos să vă pasc sufletește, ca pre niște oi cuvântătoare și de la mine va să vă ceară pre toți, iar nu de la alții, până când vă voi fi păstoriu. [...] Și încăș, pre carii să vor arăta semeți și tari de cap și nu să vor supune dreptății și poruncii bisericesti, îi vom pedepsi și cu domniia. (Ivireanu 27-28)

The preacher tries to put an end to the possible hidden thoughts of his hearers by preventively struggling against them in a prolepsis. While in the classical oratory the prolepsis attested the real opinions of a real enemy, with Ivireanu it is mostly a literary device, a pretext for the orator to show

his vast theological erudition. In the previous example, this rhetorical figure offers him the opportunity to assert his duty as a churchman, as well as the parishioners' duties.

Thus, the prolepsis supports the force of the discourse, makes it alive and the enemy is often invented for the sake of the polemic. It is combined with the interrogation, formulated in such a way as if it came from the audience; this interrogation draws the attention to the answer formulated by the orator and particularly to the reasons determining such an answer.

The presence of polyptoton with noun is also noticeable, as the word *vădică* is repeated in various inflectional forms. The antithesis (*n-ați știut/ veți ști, mic/ mare*), combined with the alternation past/future in the first example, emphasizes two different states, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the idea that everybody should assimilate this advice, disregarding age or social position. The metaphoric expression (*să vă pasc sufletește, de gățul mieu spânzură sufletele voastre*) has a moving role and the nominal comparison (*ca pre niște oi*) with an adverbial of manner places the preacher on the position of a shepherd of souls.

4.2. The metropolitan bishop never considered himself apart from the community which he was assigned to take care of, but he always placed himself among his conational fellows who accepted him willingly and he shared their sorrow and sufferance. He manifested solidarity especially to the oppressed people, as he thoroughly knew the difficulties that his country underwent:

Încăș poate să zică fieștecine din voi, în gândul său: dară noi avem nevoi grele asupra noastră și nu putem să facem aceste ce zici; ci eu încă zic că iaste așa, și crez. Numai la greul acela sânt și eu părtaș și într-acel jug ce trageț voi, trag și eu; dară n-am putere să zic nici să gândesc așa, căci că precum cere împăratul dăjdi de la noi, așa ne cere și Dumnezeu credință și fapte bune. (Ivireanu 28)

To get the people's goodwill, even their liking, because he needed his message to be not only understood, but also assumed, the orator presents a similitude and compares his destiny with the others', pointing out that they share the same fate. Similarly, the comparison-paradigm „*că precum cere împăratul dăjdi de la noi, așa ne cere și Dumnezeu credință și fapte bune*” has a persuasive role and it is structured by means of correlative conjunctive phrases; one of the clauses is an adverbial clause of comparison and it represents an example with a descriptive function. Therefore, people's obedience to Church was absolutely necessary as the times were harsh.

There also occurs a prolepsis in this fragment, but the thoughts which might arise in Christians' minds are not rejected, but understood.

4.3. In Christian religion sinning means a spiritual illness. The moral defects, the bad habits or the disregard for the Church are severely punished, as the orator-preacher skillfully handles a terrible weapon, the severe word. Here is an example:

[...] că ce neam înjură ca noi, de lege, de cruce, de cuminecătură, de morți, de comandare, de lumânare, de suflet, de mormânt, de colivă, de prescuri, de ispovedanie, de botez, de cununie și de toate tainele sfintei biserici și ne ocărăș și ne batjocorim înșine legia? Cine din păgâni face aceasta, sau cine-ș măscărește legia ca noi? [...] Încăș, pe lângă acestia toate, mai adaogem cu răutatea că pre părinții noștri îi ocărăș și-i batem; pre bătrâni îi necinstim, pre domni și pre boieri îi blestemăm, pre arhierii nu-i ținem într-o nimica, pre călugări îi clevetim, pre preoț îi ocărăș, besericile le ținem ca niște grajduri și când mergem la dâșele, în loc de a asculta slujbele și a ne ruga lui Dumnezeu, să ne iarte păcatele, iară noi vorbim și râdem și facem cu ochiul, unul altuia, mai rău decât pe la cărciume. Sărbătorile și praznicele nu le ținem, ca o nimica, ci atuncea facem cele mai rele, de bucurăm pe dracul și atuncea vindem și cumpărăm. (Ivireanu 26)

The orator-preacher reveals his discontent by means of an apostrophe; he leaves the main thread of the story to address to the audience by an interrogation followed by accusing allegations as a powerful feeling animates him. With Antim, the apostrophe often combines with the rhetoric interrogation which is a figure of passion in the traditional classification and it aims to get the

audience's attention and to produce emotion. In *Didahii* the interrogation is frequent and it expresses various nuances. Like in other sermons, here it is a support of the moralizing fragment and it represents a form of the ecclesiastic critic.

The noun comparison *ca niște grajduri* suggests a world lacking the sacred component and, by means of accumulation, the long enumeration or the anaphor (*pre*) emphasizes the seriousness of the blamable facts. The recurrent inversion in the order of the words (object-verb: *pre părinții noștri îi ocărâm*) leads to a pulsating rhythm. The inversion is specific to Romanian religious style where the sentence is characterized by an order of words different in many ways from the one in the spoken Romanian so this is not always determined by stylistic intentions. The great number of verbs renders the sentences a fast rhythm.

The accusations are powerful, the tone of the sermon reveals irritation, but the orator's rage is "ineffective" because "the attack lacks a direction and the speaker includes himself in the parishioners' flock that is full of sins, as he considers himself a humble Christian. [...] Thus, there can be delimited a type of lampoon which rarely occurs later and remains a type of pulpit literature" (Negrici 118).

However, the moralizing teachings keep being decent, as the theological norms require, so the words addressed to the sinners are not extremely tough, but rather well-balanced.

4.4. In the sermon given on the Palm Sunday, the speaker vehemently accuses the hypocrisy of those who choose two father confessors, a naïve one in the country, to whom they confess their severe mortal sins, another in town, to whom they confess their superficial sins:

Și, în scurte cuvinte, nici unul din noi nu vom să ne ispovedim de bună voie, pentru evlavie și cu gând desăvârșit, ca să ne părăsim de păcate, ci numai în vederia oamenilor, pentru pricinile ce am zis, până ne vom cumâneca, apoi iară ne întoarcem, să mă ertaț, ca cânele la borăturile sale și ca scroafa la tăvăliturile de împuciune. [...] Și când mergem să ne ispovedim nu spunem duhovnicului că mâncăm carnea și munca fratelui nostru, creștinului, și-i bem sângele și sudoarea feței lui cu lăcomiile și sațul ce avem, ci spunem cum am mâncat la masa domnească, miercurea și vinerea, pește și în post raci și untdelemn, și am băut vin. Nu spunem că ținem balaurul cel cu 7 capete, zavistiia, încuibat în inimile noastre, de ne roade totdeauna ficații, ca rugina pre fier și ca cariul pre lemn, ce zicem că n-am făcut nimănui nici un rău. Nu spunem strâmbătățile ce facem totdeauna, clevetirile, voile veghiate, fățăriile, mozaviriile, vânzările și pârăle ce facem [...], ce zicem: am face milă, ce nu ne dă îndemână, că avem nevoi multe și dări și avem casă grea și copilaș c-an gloată [...]. (Ivireanu 95-96)

The ironic tone can be noticed in the comparisons with a pejorative effect (*ca cânele la borăturile sale și ca scroafa la tăvăliturile de împuciune*). The polysyntheton occurs in the second paragraph by means of the excessive use of the coordinating conjunction *și* with an emotional value, as this expresses the insistence; by obsessively repeating this conjunction, it emphasizes the terms that are introduced by it, which may make the sinners shiver.

The recurrent sentences that begin with a negation and end with an affirmative assertion which is introduced by the adversative connector *ci* (*ce*) follow after and they are symmetrically structured, while the pauses for breathing determine their rhythm. The symmetries combined with antithesis are very frequent in the pre-modern literature, especially the oratorical literature.

The anaphor *nu spunem* lays emphasis on a moral feature, duplicity which is grotesquely illustrated. In *Didahii* the repetitions often create an effect of opposition, of parallelism or give a lyrical tone, while they are seldom the expression of "a vision or an obsessive thought" (Negrici 139).

In *Cazanie la Sfântul Nicolae* the orator denounces dissimulation and bragging:

Cu fapte bune să face omul lăudat și sfânt, iară nu cu fapte rele. Nici nume vestit va putea să lase neștine, după moarte, cu răutăț. Iară noi acum, de facem vreodată cuiva vreun bine sau vreo îndemână, cât de puțin, o facem mai mult cu fățarie, pentru ca să ne laude oamenii și de nu să va supune întru toate, după pohta noastră, vom să-i scoatem binele acela pe nas,

împutându-i totdeauna și blestemându-l, îi zicem să-l osândească bine ce i-am făcut și ne lăudăm cătră unii și cătră alții. (Ivireanu 53)

The moralizing message gets more powerful by means of antithetic constructions (*fapte bune / fapte rele*) or the expressive order of words. The collective (*noi*) places the orator in the middle of his audience; it makes the hearer feel closer to the speaker, so the critical tone is diminished. This strategy, otherwise specific to the theological discourse, shows that the accusations are not mean, but they come from love and from the belief that evil may be turned into good.

But the metropolitan bishop's discourse never limits to critical hints; these are always followed by a piece of advice, by an impulse. Sometimes, his moral authority is supported by the biblical example, which increases the persuasive power:

Dară dascălul nostru Hristos nu ne învață așa, ci zice: când facem milostenie sau alt bine, să nu știe stânga ce face dreapta. Deci, cine va vrea să isprăvească desăvârșit și precum să cade aceste ce zic, aibă în loc de pământ dragostea, că acolo să va înrădăcina credința, ca un copaci și-ș va da roada sa la vremea sa, după cum zice David: că toț copacii și toate erburile, răzimând în pământ cresc și să măresc și-ș dau roada, iar deaca nu razimă în pământ să usucă și per. Așa și credința, răzimând în dragoste crește și să mărește și face toate rodirile bunătăților, căci pământul credinții iaste dragostea. (Ivireanu 53)

Like in the folklore, the human level relates to the nature one: as the tree with deep roots in the fertile soil will grow gorgeous, the faith based on love will be strong and true. The comparison is suggestive, based on the relation between real and abstract.

4.5. The preacher's voice sometimes becomes more peremptory and he explicitly establishes the moral behavior recommended to a good Christian who should worship the divinity and honor the religious feasts:

Și vă poruncesc tuturor, cât sânteț cu meștersug și cu neguțătorii, veri de ce breaslă, ca de acum înainte, duminecile și sărbătorile cele mari ce să numesc domnești și ale Maicăi Precistii și a unora din sfinții cei numiț, să vă închideț prăvăliile și nici să vindeț, nici să cumpăraț nu numai de la creștini, ce nici de la turci, nici de la alții, nici să lucaț și precum zic să faceț, că nefăcând să știț bine că vă voi pedepsi bisericește, cu pravila și pre dreptate, nefăcându-vă nici o năpaste. (Ivireanu 27-28)

The enumeration, a figure of insistence, has an amplifying role in this example, as well as in others; its terms are mostly introduced by the adverb of negation *nici* (*nici să vindeț, nici să cumpăraț [...] nici să lucaț*) which has the same effect of reinforcing the idea, of emphasizing some restriction in this particular situation when repeated anaphoric.

The antithesis (*să faceț/ nefăcând*) based on the relation affirmative/negative points out two different types of behavior: a positive Christian one, another negative, unwise, which entails the punishment. The gerund cumulates the meaning of direct object in concise constructions where the expression is elliptic like in vernacular Romanian: „că nefăcând (*acest lucru*) să știț bine că vă voi pedepsi bisericește”. The ellipsis determines a certain intonation and, particularly in the final prayers, it shows its artistic potential and generates a discreet, jerky rhythm.

4.6. The severe word is addressed especially to the noblemen whom Antim knew well; they were “persistent in evil [...], mean and envious schemers, sly informers, in short full of old and carefully cultivated sins which he as a metropolitan bishop, as well as a person, could not accept.” (Ștrempel LIII): ”Nu spunem că pre carele îl vedem că jăfuiaste și pradă și căznește pre săraci, îl lăudăm și-i zicem că iaste om înțelept, îi ajunge mintea la toate și iaste vrednic și face dreptăți [...]” (Ivireanu 96).

However, he shows compassion and sympathy to the humble exploited people, whom he presents in opposition to the rich, trouble free people:

Nu să cuvine cinstea și lauda numai oamenilor celor mari și bogăț că sânt vrednici acestui dar și cei mici și smeriț. Că măcar că cei mari strălucesc cu hainele cele de mult preț și cei mici n-au cu ce să-ș acopere trupul; cei mari să odihnesc pe așternuturi moi și frumoase și cei mici să culcă pe pământul gol și pe pae; aceia însoiț de mulțime de slugi, iar aceștia lipsiț, pustii și de ajutoriu și de priatenu; aceia între răsfățari și între bogății și aceștia între primejdii și între întristăciuni. Însă, cu toate aceștia măriri despărțite, nu să cuvine celor mici mai puținică cinste și dragoste decât aceia ce să cuvine celor mari și bogăț, nici iaste cu dreptate celor mari să li să închine lumea și pre cei mici să-i batjocorească. (Ivireanu 164)

The descriptive antithesis used in this fragment points out the different status of two social classes. The developed reasoning creates a series of antinomies. The antitheses, which represent some features, are symmetrically ordered by coordinating conjunctions (*și*), by adversative connectors (*nici*, *decât*), by demonstrative pronouns (*aceia/ aceștia*), so there results an expressive rhythm of the long rhetoric complex sentence. With respect to the grammar, the notions that form the oppositions are not only adjectives and nouns, but also verbs. “The symmetries will be substantially used in the endless range of antithetic structures, because the antithesis, the oratorical repetition and the interrogative sentences are the main pillars of the rhetoric of Antim’s discourse” (Mazilu 184). With Antim, the antithesis often has a characterizing function and it bases on well known oppositions, such as heaven/earth, perishable/eternal, physical/ spiritual etc.

By describing the poor people’s living conditions, the orator addresses to the audience’s emotional state. In another sermon we find out that there are „*doao feliuri de mici [...]: cei dintâi sânt săracii și cei de a dooa sânt preoții.*” (Ivireanu 233). These two categories are defended in a remarkable pleading.

4.7. Ivireanu’s position against the Turks is consistently expressed in his sermons and it can be explained also by the fact that, according to certain researchers, he was a slave in the Turkish Empire in his youth. The unbearable Turkish oppression presents interest to him not only because he himself suffered because of those “pagans”, but, particularly because his foster land has to bear the foreign injustice. The fragments where Antim expresses this worry sometimes get the tone of lamentation, as the metropolitan bishop pities the majority’s destiny:

Norii ce negresc văzduhul, fulgerile ce orbesc ochii, tunetile ce înfricoșază toată inima vitează sânt întâmplările cele de multe feliuri, neașteptate pagube, înfricoșările vrăjmașilor, supărările, necazurile ce ne vin de la cei din afară, jafurile, robiile, dările cele grele și nesuferite carele le lasă Dumnezeu și ne încungiuă, pentru ca să cunoască credința noastră și să ne vază răbdarea. (Ivireanu 158)

The author proves to be a skilled creator of an atmosphere; he cultivates the correspondence, as the dramatic way the nature manifest is according to the oppressed people’s feelings. The visual and auditory images have a symbolic function and the emerged euphony is also suggestive (*norii ce negresc, înfricoșază/ vitează*). At a stylistic level, the structure including an oxymoron (*fulgerile ce orbesc*), the antithesis (*înfricoșază/ vitează*) and the enumeration make the consequences of the Turkish domination seem more evil.

The enumeration of nature phenomena gets alive by means of asyndeton; the deletion of the coordinating conjunction *și* (*Norii (...), fulgerile (...), (și) tunetile*) makes the sentence more forcible and more alert.

4.8. Sometimes, the revolt against injustice has the form of a prayer full of hope. The metropolitan bishop is in the habit of advising his parishioners about the salvation methods and he recommends the collective prayers:

Pentru aceia eu, nevrednicul și mult păcătosul robul tău, fiindu-le tată sufletesc, rânduit de Fiiul tău, prin mijlocul meu să roagă cu toții, cu căldură, dintru adâncul inimii zicând: stăpână de Dumnezeu născătoare, împărăteasa ceriului și a pământului, cinstea și slava creștinilor, ceia ce ești mai naltă decât ceriurile și mai curată decât soarele, Fecioară prealăudată, nădejdia

celor păcătoși și liniștea celor bătuți de valurile păcatelor, caută asupra norodului tău, vezi moștenirea ta, nu ne lăsa pre noi, păcătoșii, ci ne păziaște și ne mântuiaște de vicleșugurile diavolului, că ne-au împresurat scârbele, nevoile, răotățile și necazurile. Dă-ne mână de ajutoriu, Fecioară, că perim [...]. (Ivireanu 21)

This fragment is an imploring speech where the author expresses the attitude of a man who is overwhelmed by powerful feelings, still humble in front of God. In his sermons Antim often tries to get the audience's benevolence by a certain type of faked humble attitude in front of the public, because this humble attitude belongs to the standard behavior of a monk and a churchman. In his imploring prayers he frequently introduces antiphrasis such as *eu, nevrednicul și mult păcătosul robul tău ...*, a conventional expression belonging to religious language. Such an example can be found in *Cuvânt de învățătură la streteniia Domnului nostru Iisus Hristos*:

Drept aceea, cu multă jălanie îmi ticăloșesc nevredniciia și-m caut și făr` de voia mea a tăcea, iar apoi cunoscându-mi datoria ce am și temându-mă ca să nu caz în osânda slugii cei viclene, cu cuviință iaste, după puțină, să povestesc de-a pururea lucrurile Domnului, căruia mă și rog, cu multă umilință, să-m dezlege gângăviia limbii și să-m lumineze mintea, ca să poci zice puține cuvinte întru slava lui cea negrăită. (Ivireanu 29)

The style of Antim's speeches is generally solemn and it rarely becomes colloquial by lack of rigidity and the interruption of the grave tone. His prayer full of solemnity and powerful moving marks outlines the suave portrait of Jesus' mother, but not at an imagistic level. The Holy Virgin is evoked by means of metaphorical structures (*împărăteasa ceriului și a pământului*) or metonymies (*cinstea și slava, nădejdia, liniștea*) that are quite usual in the theological language. The enumeration has an evaluative and amplifying function. The eulogy continues by a series of superlative phrases consisting of adjectives in the comparative (*mai naltă decât ceriurile și mai curată decât soarele*) or the vernacular superlative *prealăudată*.

In *Didahii* a characterizing element usually occurs in combination with another, in pairs of adjectives, adjective phrases or adverbs.

The hyperbole metaphor (*bătuți de*) *valurile păcatelor* is also interesting, as, on the one hand, it points out the people's sufferance; on the other hand, it indicates a possible cause of their sufferance.

The Holy Virgin's panegyric has a lyrical and delicate tone which comes from "the tension, the rapid rhythm and the elevated manner of recitation" (Negrici 20).

5. Conclusions

Therefore, Ivireanu's sermons are animated mainly by a didactic purpose, as the metropolitan bishop has an important, fundamental role in educating and enlightening the people. The critic attitude that arises from almost every Antim's sermon represents the way that could help to improve people's behavior. In this respect, the persuasive force is essential and it is achieved by the technique of argumentation, as well as by the poetic function of language. Surely, the rhetoric figures can make the message more powerful and they can also move the audience, as the present paper has already pointed out.

Since this writer's death many of the social and political aspects evoked in *Didahii* with an extraordinarily keen eye have changed, but, unfortunately, the morals and manners, the moral defects, the sins that represent the main target of Ivireanu's critic have remained almost the same. Thus, Ivireanu's sermons are quite of the hour, like Caragiale's comedies. Nowadays there still are hypocrites, braggarts, greedy men who may shiver when hearing the masterly, thundering or calm speech.

The period when Ivireanu, who had managed to perfectly speak the language of his foster land, "nationalized" the sermon and turned it into a type of the autochthonous oratory represented a period of remarkable development of religious and secular persuasive discourse in Romanian literature and culture. Certainly, Antim was not the first orator in Romanian culture. Before his speeches were given, various speeches (homilies, panegyrics) had been given on burials or other important occasions

in people's lives (weddings, christening parties), coronation feasts, anniversaries or other feasts. But only few of them are known nowadays. Fortunately, the manuscripts of Ivireanu's oratorical work have been preserved, so it enriches the cultural treasure of Romanians.

References

- Ivireanu, Antim. *Opere*. București: Editura Minerva, Ediție Ștrempele, 1972.
- Mazilu, Dan, Horia. *Proza oratorică în literatura română veche*. București: Editura Minerva, 1987.
- Negrici, Eugen. *Antim Ivireanu. Logos și personalitate*. București: Editura Du Style, 1997.
- Piru, Alexandru. *Literatura română veche*. București: Editura pentru literatură, 1962.
- Rotaru, Ion. *Valori expresive în literatura română veche*. București: Editura Minerva, 1983.
- Sasu, Aurel. *Retorica literară românească*. București: Editura Minerva, 1976.