

UDC 811.135.1'373.611

[https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2014\(2\).05](https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2014(2).05) | [Research Paper Citations](#)

AN ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTIC OF THE DERIVATION SYSTEM FROM THE LANGUAGE OF METROPOLITAN DOSOFTEI'S TEXTS: THE CONSEQUENCE OF THE SPIRITUAL BASIS OF THE MOLDAVAN SCHOLAR

Mioara DRAGOMIR

Senior Researcher, Ph.D.

("Al. Philippide" Institute of Romanian Philology,
The Romanian Academy, Iasi Branch, Romania)

mioaradragomir_2006@yahoo.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-7102-494X>

Abstract

Derivatives with affixes from a Latin or a Greek neologism (typical of the old period of Romanian) are one of the features of the literary language of Metropolitan Dosoftei's work that can be rarely found in this period, however, they can be found, to some extent, in D. Cantemir's work, according to the "Thesaurus Dictionary of the Romanian Language". Adopting and applying a useful concept from A. Philippide-G. Iovanescu's doctrine in philology and linguistics, we believe that Dosoftei's characteristic literary language is determined by features of his psychological/spiritual basis.

Keywords: *derivation, neologism, literary language, lexical creativity, psychological/spiritual basis*

Rezumat

Derivatele cu afixe dintr-un neologism latin sau grecesc (tipice perioadei vechi a limbii române) reprezintă una dintre trăsăturile limbii literare din opera mitropolitului Dosoftei. Unitățile date sunt rar întâlnite în această perioadă, însă, într-o oarecare măsură, se regăsesc și în opera lui D. Cantemir, conform „Dicționarului Tezaur al Limbii Române”. Preluând și aplicând un concept util din doctrina filologică și lingvistică a lui A. Philippide-G. Iovanescu, considerăm că limba literară caracteristică lui Dosoftei este determinată de trăsături ale conturului lui psihologic/spiritual.

Cuvinte-cheie: *derivare, neologism, limbaj literar, creativitate lexicală, bază psihologică/spirituală*

1. All the experts who have dealt with the language of Metropolitan Dosoftei's texts noted that derivatives were a distinct note of his lexical creativity. So important is the element of derivation in his work, that in "Istoria limbii române literare" (Rosetti *et alii*, 1971, p. 151), for example, they tried dividing the words by the absence or presence of the prefix into two categories, "prefixed groups" and "non-prefixed groups", while derivatives with suffixes were grouped in various subcategories, all types being supported in this work by a series of examples. In a monographic study like that of D. Puschila (1912-1913), derivatives are grouped into grammatical classes: nominal derivatives, noun derivatives, verbal derivatives. The author says in a

brief introduction that “regarding the words formation Dosoftei’s *Molitovenicul* has a great number of derivatives [in which he includes, however, the change of the grammatical value], some existing in language, but many of them formed ad hoc with the help of suffixes and prefixes” (Pușchilă, 1912-1913, p. 57).

2. G. Ivanescu states that besides the phonetic reforms performed in the old literary language, this great scholar “aimed to perform a lexical revolution of language” (Ivănescu, 1989, p. 54). By making this statement, the scientist from Iasi referred, inter alia, to the taking over of the neologistic Latin and Greek element by Dosoftei, and in this sense, he expresses an important conclusion, which we shall quote in full, as it refers to the old period, on the whole: “He is a new type of Romanian theologian, different from the one common to those times, who was inspired especially by the church Slavonic language; Dosoftei knew Greek and Latin and sought to enrich the language with Greek and Latin elements. Only Simion Stefan had tried this before, but not to the same extent as Dosoftei. It is therefore not surprising that Dosoftei’s translations present a large number of neologisms of Greek and Latin origin, as it will be the case with D. Cantemir. It is true that, in his time, other activated who were inspired by the Greek and Latin languages and who borrowed neologisms from these languages: some Wallachian clergy, brothers Greceanu, N. Milescu. But the work of Dosoftei is, in this aspect, the most impressive” (Ivănescu, 1989, p. 57).

By analyzing the derivates from the work of the Moldavian scholar, we extracted several features of the derivation system, of which we present here *the formation of derivatives with affixes from a Latin or Greek neologistic word (for this period)*. In a relatively recent paper, Eugen Munteanu finds in the language of Dosoftei’s texts a category of “derivative lexical creations, in which the Romanian suffixes are attached to foreign-tongued roots” (Oprea, 1988, p. 183), “foreign-tongued” also include the derivatives from a Slavonic radical. Distinguishing this category of products on the basis of the analysis, we have in view, as closer to the specificity of Dosoftei’s derivatives, only the derivates with a Latin and Greek radical, because we think that the Slavonic language, as it was most widely known then and many words were inherited from the previous century, the Slavonic radical - maybe not with the same frequency as in Dosoftei - was widely used at the time⁶. In addition to this argument we must consider, especially in case of the Slavonic words, an idea advanced by Ivanescu which is an own vision and comes from a deep observation of the dynamics of ancient literary Romanian: “It is possible that

⁶ See also (Rosetti *et alii*, 1971, p. 149), which states: “The words of Slavonic origin, great in number [in Dosoftei’s language] were somewhat in fashion in old Romanian literary language, especially in ecclesiastical and administrative language”.

a large number of neological terms were present in the language of the clergy and nobles in the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century; but they never had the opportunity to be recorded in writing and, therefore, they can only be presumed" (Ivănescu, 1989, p. 53)⁷.

3. From the category of derivatives discussed in relation to Dosoftei's work⁸, we have distinguished two sets:

- (a) the one which consist of derived words: *aposcorachință*, *aschitac*, *aselghi-ciune*, *demonesc* (with the form *dimonesc*), *despuitoaresc*, *a disputui*, *a dogmatici*, *dogmaticit*, *formuire*, *formuit* (and with the form *furmuit*), *înformui*, *neînformuit*, *НЕМАТЕРИАЛИК*⁹, *necompozit* (and with the form *necompozuit*), *nefigurat*, *nemăculat*, *plăzmătareț*, *plăzmător*, *a plăzmui*, *plăzmuire*, *politicie*, *a preformui*, *a preplăzmui* (and with the form *prăplăzmui*), *a ritori-ci* etc. We must point out that some derivatives of this type appear in the era in other scholars' work, and a number are considered as creations of Dosoftei, original both in terms of form as well as in terms of meaning;
- (b) words with the suffix *-icesc*, such as: *aselghicesc* și *mirtopsicesc*, created by analogy with a number of loans that Dosoftei tended to take over with this termination.

One of the most special creations by derivation from the work of this scholar is noun *aposcorachință*:

"Ce-m trimite, Doamne, a ta socotință,
Să nu duc delungul *aposcorachință*"
(Dosoftei, *Psaltirea în versuri* 1673, p. 179).

The etymology is *aposcorachință* < ἀποσκορ ακιζω + suffix *-ință*¹⁰ (Oprea, 1988, p. 172), and ἀποσκορ ακιζω < ἀπο- + σκορακιζω < ες κορακας 'la corbi; la dracu', according to Babiniotis (s.v.).

Given the context, which refers to God, and its meanings ἀποσκορ ακιζω (Munteanu, 1998; Dragomir, 2008, Bailly, 1997) we believe that by *aposcorachință*

⁷ We must mention here that once finished the first edition of the *Romanian Language Dictionary* of Academy – even if it has the imperfections inherent to a work of this importance and extension – has already opened the way towards the study of ancient vocabulary, which G. Ivanescu thought about.

⁸ We extracted the material for analysis from (DLR, 1965-2010; Ursu, 1980; Dosoftei, 1689, Dosoftei, 2012; Ursu, 1984; Pușchilă, 1913-1914).

⁹ We kept the transcription system used by D. Puschila (1913-1914) to extract the words from that he analyzed.

¹⁰ See the *Romanian Language Dictionary* accomplished by A. Philippide and his team, where the definition of the word is 'chasing out with disdain' and the following is stated for the first time: "Dosoftei issued the word, which was not used before him nor after him, from the Greek word ἀποσκορακίζω 'chasser avec mépris'"; also see the complete etymology and the discussions from Munteanu, 2008, p. 172.

Dosoftei wanted to express the state of the one who feels abandoned by God, as if he had a curse on him, therefore the meaning would be “curse, anathema; repudiation”. The Metropolitan must have found this meaning in his many readings of sacred texts, primarily in the *Bible* (ἄποσκορ ακιζω in *Isaiah* 17: 13 and in the *Psalms* 26: 15, and ἄποσκορακιζω in *Isaiah* 66: 15)¹¹.

To the same category, of the derivatives with a Greek or Latin radical, belong a number of other derivatives. For example *aschitac*, from Gr. Ecl. and Ngr. ασκητικός (< ασκητης - ‘hermit, recluse’) (Dragomir, 2008)¹², accommodated by suffix -ac: “(Părinții noștri, blagonosnicii săhastrii) aschitacii, (carii acea mai zăbavnică și mai trudnică măcenicie a științii luptară) (Ursu, 1974, p. 12); aselghiciune < aselghie, by abstract suffix -iciune (cf DLR, 1913-1914, of the formations which occur only in Dosoftei¹³: (pîngărite) aselghiciuni (idem, p. 274); despuitor < a despui (present indicative first person from despune (Chesarie, 1776) s.v. despuietor < Lat. *disponere*) + suffix -tor: (Acestea le păzîm noi pînă la dzua giudețului, cînd va veni) despuitorul (Dumnădzău); despuitoresc from despuitor (based on the neological Latin root *disponere*) + suffix -esc: (O și prăznuim, făcîndu-ă și sărbătoare și) despuitoareasă (dzî pentru Domnul) (Ursu, 1974, p. 217); dimonesc, from demon (< Lat. *daemon*, Gr. Δαίμονιο¹⁴) + suffix -esc: (S-au luptat cu multe supărări și, mai vîrtos, cu dimonești (Ursu, 1974, p. 126); a dispotui ‘to explain, to debate’ (< Lat. *disputo*, -are) + suffix -ui¹⁵: (Iaste ș-altă a lui carte asupra păgînilor, întru carea pentru fireadimonilor) disputuiaște (Ursu, 1974, p. 401); a dogmătici¹⁶ we believe that it was formed by analogy from adjective *dogmatic(esc)*¹⁷ (< Lat. *dogmaticus*, -a, -um (according to Chesarie, 1776; without attestations in the old age), but we also believe that Gr. Ecl., Mgr., Ngr. δογματικός) + verbal suffix -i; adjective *dogmătit* < a *dogmătici*. These derivatives can be found in Dosoftei, *Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la faptul lumii...*: (Daturile [...] de sinții părinți) dogmătici (aședzate) (Ursu,

¹¹ We prepare a broader communication about this creation of Dosoftei, which we intend to present at the fifth edition of the international symposium “Explorations in Romanian and European Biblical Tradition” held in Iasi, and whose works are to be published in Volume *Receptarea Sfintei Scripturi între filologie, hermeneutică și traductologie* (*Reception of Holy Scripture between Philology, Hermeneutics and Translation Studies*) which reached the fourth volume, in preparation for printing.

¹² The *Romanian Language Dictionary* states that this is „a word Romanized by from Neo-Greek. This process was produced by derivation.

¹³ Also see Manea, 2006, pp. 450, 470, and 472.

¹⁴ According to Dragomir, 2008, in Eccl. Gr. it means “unclean, crafty soul”.

¹⁵ The word was not recorded in Chesarie, 1776. Instead they recorded *disputație*, without attestations in Dosoftei’s texts.

¹⁶ In Chesarie, 1776, the verb is recorded with the form α δογματισι (s.v.) < δογματί-σα, aor. Of δογματίζω, without attestations in the old period.

¹⁷ For *dogmaticesc* see: (cuvintele) *dogmăticești* (Dosoftei, *Vieța și petreacerea svinților*, p. 199); (Șese săboară, pentru credință, cercare s-au făcut și socoteală, adevă hotariu) *dogmaticesc* (s-au scos) (Dosoftei, *Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la faptul lumii...*, f. 342^v).

1980, f. 229^r); verb *do<g>măticiră* appears in the marginal gloss in relation to the context *Tocmiră și pentru sintele icoane și a sintei cruci, să fie de închinat* (idem, f. 344^r).

We found in Dosoftei's writings several derivatives from the verb *formo*, *-are*, and under the influence of noun *forma*, *-ae*¹⁸, such as: noun *formuire* < *a formui* < Lat. *formo*, *-are* + suffix *-ui*: (*fericita*) *formuire* (Ursu, 1974, p. 164); participle *formuite* (*cu ceara*) (idem, p. 162) and in (*trii păhară*) *furmuite* (Ursu, 1980, f. 59^v); verb *a înformui*, formed by parasynthetic derivation from prefix *în-* + *a forma* (< Lat. *formo*, *-are*) + suffix *-ui*, used in DLR (1965-2010) in the same context as in Pușchilă, 1913-1914: (*Ai făcut pre omul din țărână și pre aces-ta*) *l-ai înformuit (în fai și-n bunătate)* (Pușchilă, 1913-1914, p. 198); *L-ai înfur-muit (în fai și-n bunătate)* 'to give shape, to create' (Pușchilă, 1913-1914, f. 81^v); (*De iznoavă*) *ai înformuit (acea strică de păcat firea noastră)* (DLR, 1965-2010, p. 293); the participle from this verb, with prefix *ne-* appears in (Pușchilă, 1913-1914), in the context (*Cum să fie trup acee ce-i nesămuită și nehotărâtă și*) *neînformuită, (nehizmută și nepipăită)* (Pușchilă, 1913-1914, 8, f. 361^v). Another verb created from Lat. *formo*, *-are* is *a preformui* < prefix *pre-* + *a forma* + suffix *-ui* 'to adorn' (Pușchilă, 1913-1914, f. 141^v). This can be found, according to (Chesarie, 1776) (s.v.) in (Cantemir, 1901), with the meanings "to compose, arrange, to plan" and "take someone's shape to turn to". In Μπαμπινιώτης, 1998, another derivative from the same radical and with the same prefix can be found, but with a different suffix, *informălui* with the sense "to polish, to arrange", used by this scholar as participle and the noun, *informăluire*, meaning "information, explanation". In DLR, 1913-1914, it is supposed that these words are either scholarly formations from medieval Latin *informo*-, *-are*, or form *formo*, *-are* with prefix *în-* and the attestation in Pușchilă, 1913-1914, is not given. In Μπαμπινιώτης, 1998, *informăluire* may be based on *informo*-, *-are*, but we believe that the Metropolitan scholar created the words analyzed in this section rather by derivation from *formo*-, *-are* "to create, to shape" because, on the one hand, this is the meaning with which he uses it again and, on the other hand, the same radical lies at the basis of the other derivatives dis-closed herein.

Another derivative from the series discussed here is the adjective *нематири* *АЛНИКЪ*, from Pușchilă, 1913-1914, present in the context: (*pentru făgăde și ru-gi*) *А нематири АЛНИКИЛОРЪ* (*tăi slujitori*) (f. 95^r). By analyzing this word, D. Pușchilă gives the hypothesis, which we consider true, that this could be a typo, and that in fact, the word created by Dosoftei is *нематири* *АЛНИКЪ*, from Lat. *măteră*-, *-ae*¹⁹, and the sense of the derivative would be 'spiritual'²⁰.

¹⁸ This Latin neologism appears in Dosoftei's writings, see Pușchilă, 1913-1914, p. 93; DLR, 1965-2010, p. 124; Ursu, 1974, pp. 12, 164, and 376.

¹⁹ The neologism *materie* is used several times in Ursu, 1980 (f. 348^v, f. 351^r, f. 352^v, f. 356^r).

²⁰ See Pușchilă, 1913-1914. D. Pușchilă states that the word is a "derivative of Dosoftei" and he considers it analogous to *înfurmui* derived from *formă*. Therefore,

Other derivatives of this type are: *necompozit*, with the form *necompozuit*, from Latin neologism *compono*, -ere “to put together, to reunite; to compile”, with the glossed sense: (*Esti Dumnădzău [...] necompozit, (adecă netocmit din bucăți)* (Ursu, 1980, f. 327^v) and (*Așe-i și la dumnădzăiasca*), *necompozuita* (*fire în cumeniciune dumnădzăirii, unirea*) (Ursu, 1980, f. 351^r).

Dosoței creates from Latin *figuro*, -are “to form, to shape” derivative *nefigurat*, present in the context: (*Unul Dumnădzău, ună tuturoră începătură ne-ncepută și nezidită [...], nefigurată, (o ună din sus de ființă supradumnădzăiască, dumnădzăire în trei staturi)* (Ursu, 1980, f. 355^v).

In Pușchilă, 1913–1914, the derivative adjective *nemăculată*, was used along with Latin neologism *macula*, -ae, from which it was formed: (*fără prihană, fără oc<ar>ă, fără maculă*), *nemăculată* (f. 155^r).

Dosoței uses the verb *a plăzmu* with the meaning “to create”, adapted by suffix -ui after Gr. *πλάσσω* and Lat. *plasma*, -ātis: (*Mînule Tale mă făcură și mă*) *plăzmuiră* (DLR, 1965–2010, p. 19, cf. and 16), also used in Ursu, 1974: *Au plăzmuit (omeneasca fire)* (p. 182), and in Ursu, 1980 (*Pre sine au deșertat singur Născutul Fiu și Dumnădzău, om de s-au făcut din fetescul singe cu alt ustav decît a firii obicei) de s-au plăzmuit* (f. 359^v) and also, several times in Dosoftei, 1689: *Plăzmu* (*Dumnădzău pre omul, țărna luînd din pămînt*) (p. 112); *Te-am plăzmuit (și te-am dat și te-am pus în testament veacinic)* (p. 163, cf. and 113, 146, 157, 184, 190). The noun from this verb is also used, *plăzmuire*, with the meaning of “God’s creation”, in Pușchilă, 1913–1914, f. 81^v and in the context (*Să nu treci cu căutatul a Ta*) *plăzmuire* from DLR, 1965–2010, p. 199, cf. and 293, 295. The derivatives in this category include the verbal derivative *a preplăzmu*, with the form *a prăplăzmu* with the meaning “to prefigure” < prefix *pre-* + *plăzmu* (< Gr. *πλάσσω*, Lat. *plasma*, -ātis), from the context: *prăplăzmuind (a ceriurilor împărăție)* from Ursu, 1974, p. 221. Other derivatives created by Dosoftei based on the neologicistic radicals mentioned here are: noun derivatives *plăzmătareț* “creator” (Pușchilă, 1913–1914, f. 146^r) and *plăzmător*: (*Tu -) Plăzmătorul (nostru și lucruri mînului tale, toț noi)* (Dosoftei, 1689, p. 305). In the era, the verb *a plăzmu* is also used in Cantemir, 1901, meaning “to imagine, to invent”. In Cantemir, 1901 we can also find noun *plăzmuire*, with the meaning “creation”, and noun derivative *plăzmuitor* “creator, maker”. The latter with the meaning of “person who imagines, invents” appears in a writing from 1798, according to Cherasie, 1776 (s.v.).

A derivative created from Greek *πολιτική*, formed by adapting this noun to suffix -ie, is *politicie* from Ursu, 1980, in the context (*Așe s-au înfrîmășat Rîmul de Romul cu cele de războiu, iară de-acesta, cu cele de cetățenie*), *politicie (și de pace)* (f. 75^v).

this linguist believes that the verb *înfurmui* is derived from the Latin noun *forma*, not from the verb *formo*, -are. He reaches this conclusion because in Pușchilă, 1913–1914, f. 12^v, the noun *formă* (*deșerb*) appears as well.

A derivative based on a neologistic radical is the verb *a ritorici*²¹, formed by analogy, like *dogmatici*, from adjective *ritoric(esc)*²² (< Gr., Ngr. ρητορικός, Lat. *rhetoricus* + verbal suffix *-i*: (Ceale dumnădzăiești) *ritoriciia* (Dosoftei, 1689, p. 255); (Bunmăiestru și bine grăitori rost) *a ritorici* (nu poate să te cînte) (Dosoftei, 1689, p. 280, cf. and 271). This verb also appears in Cantemir, 1965.

We also noticed in the language of Dosoftei's texts the frequency of words with termination *-icesc*, adapted in general, in the old literary Romanian after Gr. *-ικος* and Lat. *-icus*²³ such as: *astronomicesc*, *canonicesc*, *dogmățicesc*, *icumenicesc*, *iroicesc*, *loghicesc*, *politicesc*, *practicesc*, *silloghiticesc* etc. The recent study on the suffix *-icesc* conducted by Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil and Elena Danilă Tamba, which examines the history of this issue and the etymological solving from *Thesaurus Dictionary of the Academy* offers solutions to the different eras of literary Romanian regarding the etymology of words terminated as such and for the etymological paragraph of this dictionary, solutions that we consider reasonable and fair. Thus, in agreement with other opinions (Pamfil & Dănilă-Tamba, 2013, pp. 259-272) according to which suffix *-icesc* could be formed "toward the end of the eighteenth century and especially in the nineteenth century" (Pamfil, 2008, p. 200), the authors conclude in a nuanced way with which we agree, that "adjectives borrowed from Greek and Latin, ending in *-ικος* and *-icus* in old literary Romanian as in the case of loans from other languages, entered in the phase of transition to modern literary Romanian" (*idem*, p. 201), the conclusion is that they should be considered loans adapted to the Romanian language system, and not derived words.

We said that Dosoftei tends to adapt by means of this termination the type of neologisms in question, but we must emphasize that, more than that, he had linguistic intuition and felt this termination as a suffix. We also found in his texts formations such as *aselghicesc*²⁴, *mirtopsicesc* and with the Slavonic radical *vrăcebnicesc*, *mironosicesc*²⁵ and also *tăinuicesc*, that have no equivalent in any foreign language, so that in these cases, we can say that we are deal-

²¹ In Chesarie, 1776 s.v. *ritorici* the etymology *ritor* + suffix *-ici* is suggested.

²² For *ritoricesc* see Ursu, 1974: *Era învățat în toată filosofia și deprins la cuvintele ritoricești* VS (184).

²³ For explanations about this category of words and this process valid for old age, see Pamfil, 2008, pp. 191-202.

²⁴ DLR (1913-1914) suggests the etymology: „Derived from *aselghie*, by adjectival suffix *-esc*”.

²⁵ With Slavonic radical, by closeness to *врачевѣн*, adj. *ижат роуѣ медики, врачевѣсч*, adj. *ижат ричовѣ* *ижат роуѣ медики, врачевѣсчы* adv. *ижат ричовѣ* *артѣ медики* (Miklosich, 1682-1685) is *vrăcebnicesc* 'healing; medical': *Aceștiia [...], de meștersugul vrăcebnicesc foarte fiind iscusiți, îmbla la tot orașul și cetatea, tămăduind fără plată* (Ursu, 1974, p. 89); by closeness to *мироносица мирофобро зингентъм ференс* (Miklosich, 1682-1685): (*Acea [...] femeie, a ta simțind dumnădzăire*) *mironosicească*, (*luînd rînd tînguind miruri ție* [.] *aduce*) [8, f. 251^v].

ing with derivatives that Dosoftei created by analogy: *aselghicesc*²⁶ < *aselghie* (< ἀσέλ γεια 'dissipation') + suffix *-icesc*; *mirtopsicesc* (we have not found in the Greek dictionaries forms corresponding as loans) < *mirt* < μύρτο, which by closeness to the verb μυρεψώ "to prepare something like ointment" could give for euphony the consonant group *-ps-* + suffix *-icesc*; *tăinuicesc* < *tănu* + suffix *-icesc*. These derivatives appear in contexts such as: (*spurcăciuni*) *aselghicești* (Pușchilă, 1913–1914, f. 96^r); (*curvii spurcate*) *asîlghicești* (Ursu, 1980, f. 230^r); (*spurcări*) *aselghicești* (Ursu, 1980, f. 230^v); (*petrecînd în necurății*) *aselghicești* (Dosoftei, 1689, p. 314); (*Svîntul măcenic [...] împlînd văzduhul de miros scump*) *mirtopsicesc*, (*să sui ca o stea luminoasă la Dumnăzău*) (Ursu, 1974, p. 304); *tăinuicesc* (Pușchilă, 1913–1914, f. 101^v).

4. Therefore, when they discuss a philological problem such as the authorship of a text or language problems such as the literary language of Dosoftei's works or the evolution of the Romanian literary language (in the old period), they should consider this aspect of derivation, which characterizes the language of the Metropolitan scholar's texts: *the formation of derivatives with affixes from a Latin or Greek neologistic word* (for this period). This is a characteristic determined by features of his spiritual basis – we adapt and apply this concept of A. Philippide–G. Ivanescu doctrine²⁷, which is very useful and entirely appropriate – such as: the knowledge of the classical language, and the tendency to assimilate neologisms and to integrate them in the Romanian literary language – with a special vision on the ones coming from Latin (Dosoftei, 2002) – and, of course the sense of language, the linguistic intuition, too, combined with linguistic creativity, the latter being a feature of the creators of language, especially rare in the old period.

References

- *** (1776). Chesarie, Ch., episcopul Rîmnicului. *Mineiul, luna lui octombrie, care s-au tipărit acum întîi rumânește...*
- *** (1913-1914). *Dicționarul limbii române* (tom I-II). Tipografia ziarului „Universul”, Imprimeria Națională (= DLR, 1913-1914).
- *** (1965-2010). *Dicționarul limbii române* (serie nouă, tom VI-XIV). Editura Academiei (= DLR, 1965-2010).
- *** Philippide Al. *ms. of Dicționarul limbii române (Romanian Language Dictionary)*. BAR Iași (= Philippide, DLR).
- Bailly, A. (1997). *Dictionnaire greco-français* (redigé avec le concours de E. Egger,

²⁶ We have not found in the Greek dictionaries a form ἀσελγικός, but the adjective is ἀσελγής, ής, ές.

²⁷ View a summary of A. Philippide–G. Ivănescu doctrine on the issue of *articulatory basis* and *psychological/spiritual basis* in Philippide, DLR.

édition revue par P. Séchan et P. Chantraine). Hachette.

Cantemir, D. (1901). *Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor* (ediție îngrijită de Gr. G. Tocilescu). Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl.

Cantemir, D. (1965). *Istoria ieroglică* (vol. I-II). Editura pentru Literatură.

Dosoftei, mitropolitul. (1689). *Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la fapitul lumii...* (traducere de mitropolitul Dosoftei, în 1689, după cronograful lui Mattheos Kigalas; păstrată în ms. 3456, Biblioteca Academiei Române-BAR) (= Dosoftei, 1689).

Dosoftei, mitropolitul. (1974). *Psaltirea în versuri 1673* (ediție critică de N.A. Ursu, cuvînt înainte de ÎPS Iustin Moisesescu, arhiepiscop al Iașilor și mitropolit al Moldovei și Sucevei). Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei (= Ursu, 1974).

Dosoftei, mitropolitul. (1980). *Dumnezăiasca liturghie 1679* (ediție critică de N.A. Ursu, studiu introductiv de ÎPS Teoctist, arhiepiscop al Iașilor și mitropolit al Moldovei și Sucevei). Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei (= Ursu, 1980).

Dosoftei, mitropolitul. (2002). *Vieța și petreacerea svinților, Iași 1682-1686* (text îngrijit, notă asupra ediției și glosar de Rodica Frențiu). Editura Echinox.

Dosoftei, mitropolitul. (2012). *Parimiile preste an, Iași, 1683* (ediție critică, studiu introductiv, notă asupra ediției, note și glosar de Mădălina Ungureanu). Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” (= Dosoftei, 2012).

Dragomir, M. (2008). Elementul latin în Hronograful den începutul lumii. Noi argumente în sprijinul paternității lui Nicolae Milescu Spătarul. *Analele Universității „Ștefan cel Mare”, Seria Filologie, A. Lingvistică*, XIV(1), 83–10.

Ivănescu, G. (1989). *Studii de istoria limbii române literare* (ediție îngrijită și postfață de Al. Andriescu). Editura Junimea.

Manea, L. (2006). *Dosoftei. Viața și petreacerea svinților. Studiu lingvistic*. Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

Miklosich, Fr. (1682–1685). *Lexikon paleoslovenico–graeco–latinum*. Guilelmus Braumueller.

Μπαμπινιώτης, Γεωργίου Δ. (1998). *Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλ ὡσσας Αθήνα· Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας*.

Munteanu, E. (2008). *Studii de lexicologie biblică*. Editura Humanitas.

Oprea, I. (1988). Originea sufixelor adjectivale compuse din perioada premodernă a limbii române literare. *Limba română*, XXXVII(3), 259–272.

Pamfil, C.-G. (2008). *Alexandru Philippide*. Editura Litera.

Pamfil, C.-G., Dănilă Tamba, E. (2013). Soluții etimologice pentru adjectivele neologice în *-icesc*, propuse de Dicționarul Academiei. In: *Cultură și identitate românească. Tendințe actuale și reflectarea lor în diasporă* (pp. 191–202). Editura Univer-

sitații „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

Pușchilă, D. (1913–1914). Molitvenicul lui Dosoftei. *Analele Academiei Române, seria II, Memoriile secțiunii literare*, XVI, 1-114. Librăriile Socec & Comp. și C. Sfetea, Leipzig Otto Harassowitz, Viena Gerold & Comp.

Rosetti, Al., Cazacu, B., Onu, L. (1971). *Istoria limbii române literare* (vol. I: *De la origini pînă la începutul secolului al XIX-lea*). Editura Minerva.