

NOTES ON THE IMPERATIVE IN OLD ROMANIAN

MIHAELA GHEORGHE¹

Abstract. The paper analyzes imperative patterns with causal and purpose subordinates adjunct or included in coordinated series in some early Old Romanian texts—16th and early 17th century—to highlight how these extensions contribute to the realization of the directive speech act expressed by the imperative. The communicative situations in the texts that I analyzed here are not very varied. In religious texts, the speaker is often the psalmist and the addressee is usually God (or the enemy), in sermons and moralistic texts the speaker addresses the masses he is instructing, in popular novels the directive utterances usually appear in direct speech sequences, which do not actually reproduce dialogues but lines of a character, and in the few non-fictional texts they appear only in prescriptive sequences. Nevertheless, the analysis highlights some preferred syntactic means for expressing pragmatic values that will later evolve in modern Romanian.

Keywords: imperative, injunctive constructions, old Romanian, syntax-pragmatics interface.

1. INTRODUCTION

Expressions with imperative meaning (which are not necessarily forms in the imperative mood per se) show great diversity in languages of the world². They are associated with the prototypical function of performing a directive act (Jary and Kissine, 2012). Accounts of the semantics and pragmatics of the imperative show a great degree of universality. Generally, the directive meaning (which is a communicative universal) is cross-linguistically identified to the linguistic form of the imperative and/or its surrogates in languages that do not have the complete imperative paradigm or in languages that do not employ imperatives at all (van der Awera and Lejeune, 2005).

Much work has been done on the pragmatic analysis of imperatives, mainly relying on the imperative's illocutionary force of a directive. All imperatives share an element of "fitting the world to the word" in Searle's (1976) terms, and they are generally considered to express prototypical commands. However, the meanings conveyed by sentences containing an imperative verb are varied; the different grounds for issuing an imperative, the context in which they appear, and the precise nature of the verb, may all play a role in determining its status as (i) a command, (ii) a suggestion or advice, (iii) an invitation, (iv) a request, or (v) grant of permission, (vi) a cohortative, (vii) an optative hope, or (viii) an instruction (Fox 2015: 315).

¹ Transilvania University of Braşov and "Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti" Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest, m.gheorghe@unitbv.ro.

² For an overview of the variation of the imperative/its surrogates (for languages that do not have a complete imperative paradigm or no imperative at all), see van der Awera et al. 2005, Aikenvald 2010.

This article briefly overviews the linguistic expressions of directive acts in Old Romanian (OR), aiming to describe the syntactic patterns employed to convey different illocutionary forces of directive speech acts. I will review the recurrent configurations of complex imperative clauses³, and try to correlate them with their pragmatic function. I'm analyzing only constructions with imperatives amplified by coordination and adjunction and do not consider imperative complement clauses.

The data is extracted from texts written in the early period of the Old Romanian language, between the early 16th and 17th centuries. The corpus comprises mainly translations from Slavonic and are predominantly canonical religious texts. However, the corpus also includes other works such as a historical piece, a novel, and several moralistic writings, all of which were also translated from Slavonic (see the list of sources).

2. IMPERATIVE CLAUSES IN ROMANIAN

In Modern Romanian (MR), imperative clauses are structured around an overt imperative or a surrogate form (Vasilescu 2013: 546–7). True/overt imperatives display only singular and plural forms for the 2nd person, as in (1a, b), and have distinct forms for marking the affirmative/negative opposition (1c, d). Surrogate imperatives (especially subjunctives⁴) are used either to supplant the incomplete imperative paradigm (2a) (Zafiu 2013: 36, Isac 2015: 14) or in cohortative (2b) and exhortative contexts (2c) (Zafiu 2013: 45, Isac 2015: 27).

- (1) a. *Vino!*
come.IMP.2SG
'Come!'
- b. *Veniți!*
come.IMP.2PL
'Come!'
- c. *Du astea afară!*
take.IMP.2SG these out
'Take these out!'
- d. *Nu duce astea afară!*
not take.IMP.2SG these out
'Don't take these out!'
- (2) a. *Să placi tuturor!*
SĂ_{SUBJ} please.2SG everyone
'Do please everyone!'
- b. *Să mergem!*
SĂ_{SUBJ} go.1PL
'Let's go!'

³ I will employ the expression *imperative clause* to designate the syntactic structure associated with imperatives (true/overt or surrogate).

⁴ In addition to the surrogate subjunctive, Romanian also uses present and future forms; in specific contexts, infinitive and supine forms may also appear, see Vasilescu (2013: 547), Frâncu (2010: 167), Pîrvulescu and Roberge (2000).

- c. *Să nu plece nimeni!*
 SĂ_{SUBJ} not leave.SUBJ.3SG anyone
 ‘Let nobody leave!’

Old Romanian used the same morphosyntactic means but had an additional negative imperative form in the second person plural (Zafiu 2016: 30), which employed the long infinitive (3).

- (3) Nu vă **bucurareți** (CT.1560–1: 140^v)
 not CL.REFL.ACC.2PL rejoice.IMP.2PL
 ‘Do not rejoice!’

3. PATTERNS OF DIRECTIVE STRUCTURES IN OR

Warren (1998: 146), among others, argues that directives are subordinate to the deontic modality and are considered a subtype, along with volitives, voluntatives, and desideratives. Volitives have expressive illocutionary force, voluntatives have cohortative illocutionary force (they also imply the speaker’s participation in the performance of the speech act), desideratives are considered a subclass of volitives, and directives have illocutionary force corresponding to obligation. According to Palmer (2001: 70), directives are at the core of the deontic system: “The most common types of deontic modality are directives, ‘where we try to get others to do things’ (Searle 1983: 166)”.

Cross-linguistically, imperatives are the preferred expression of directives. They may take other forms (interrogative or declarative) that I am not dealing with here; I will only discuss imperatives and injunctive subjunctives.

Some authors draw a distinction between acts expressed by imperatives and those expressed by surrogate forms, correlating this distinction to the competence of the protagonists. Prototypically, directive (*commands*) and precative (*requests*) utterances have imperative forms. In terms of the actant’s competence, directives are utterances in which the speaker is competent, whereas in precative utterances, the addressee is competent. Obligative utterances (*demands* and *permissions*) are either speaker-oriented or hearer-oriented. In demands, the hearer’s volition is disregarded, while in permissions, the hearer is the one who takes the decision. Prohibitive utterances are the negative form of permissions and are speaker-oriented.

From the point of view of the protagonists’ competence, the examples in my corpus fall into two main categories: (i) in religious texts (psalms and moralistic writings) the speaker is the psalmist or the preacher, and the addressee is either God (in psalms and sermons) or the receiver(s) of the sermon; (ii) in popular novels, imperatives are used to render in direct speech the lines of the interactants in a narrative sequence.

Imperative clauses have a high frequency in both religious and secular texts but are extremely frequent in canonical religious ones. In the *Hurmuzaki Psalter* (32.000 words), I inventoried 571 imperatives and 19 surrogate forms (18 subjunctives with injunctive value and one future).

Regarding their syntactic organization, imperative clauses are either simple or amplified by coordination (3.1) or complex (3.2).

3.1. Imperative clauses in coordinated structures

3.1.1. *Genuine coordination*

Structures with an independent imperative clause are sporadic. Examples (4a, b) have a 2nd person singular/plural imperative; in (4c), the imperative is a surrogate form (1st person plural). In pragmatic terms, (4a) is a precative utterance, with the illocutionary force of a request, (4b) is a command, and (4c) is a cohortative.

- (4) a. *Învii, Dumnedzeul mieu!* (PH.1500–1510, 6^v)
 ressurect.IMP.2SG Lord my
 ‘Come, my Lord!’
- b. *Aduceți-m pre Ducipal.* (A.1620: 224, 73^r)
 bring.IMP.2PL=cl.1SG.DAT DOM Ducipal
 ‘Bring Ducipal!’
- c. *Să ne rugăm Domnului!* (CC¹.1567: 233^v)
 ‘Let us pray to God!’

The amplification by coordination is very well represented in the corpus. Most of the injunctive series are coordinated using copulative conjunctions or are juxtaposed. The coordination string has two (5a) up to five terms (5c). The clustering of imperatives or subjunctives with injunctive value correlates with the rhetorical features of canonical texts; see the affirmative/negative alternation in (5a) or the repetition in (5b). In (5c) the mass of imperatives increases the illocutionary force of the request.

- (5) a. *Ci îndrăznește, priiatene și nu*
 but dare.IMP.2SG friend.VOC and not
te infricoșă. (BVI.1764: 297)
 CL.REFL.ACC.2SG scare.IMP.2SG
 ‘Dare, my friend, and fear not’
- b. *Chemați lui Dumnedzeu tot pământul,*
 call.IMP.2PL LUI.DAT God all earth.DEF
cântați și vă
 sing.IMP.2PL and CL.REFL.ACC.2PL
bucurați-vă⁵ și cântați.
 rejoice.IMP.2PL=CL.REFL.ACC.2PL and sing.IMP.2PL
 (PH.1500–1510, 81^r)
 ‘Call unto God all the earth, sing and rejoice’
- c. *Scoală întâmpinratulu mieu și vedzi*
 raise.IMP.2SG meeting.DAT my and see.IMP.2SG
și tu, Doamne, Dumnedzeu cel tare,
 too you Lord.VOC Lord CEL strong
Dzeu Israililor, caută și

⁵ The phenomenon of the reflexive clitic repetition in OR will not be discussed here. For the syntactic account of the phenomenon, see Croitor 2016; Hill and Alboiu 2016; Croitor 2013.

Lord Israel.DEF.PL.GEN seek.IMP.2SG and
socoteaști în toate limbile, nu cruța
 count.IMP.2SG in all tongues not spare.IMP.2SG
toți carii facu fărădelege. (PH.1500–1510, 49^v)
 all who did outlawry⁶
 ‘Arise up to meet me, and see for yourself, O Lord, God all mighty, Lord
 of the children of Israel, and be minded to search out all peoples, that thou
 have not mercy on the wicked’

According to Frâncu 2010: 167, the imperative’s competition with the subjunctive is relatively late in Romanian; the frequency of the injunctive subjunctive forms increases in 17th and 18th-century texts, and it became stronger after the fixation of the subjunctive’s mark *să*. However, subjunctives with injunctive value occur relatively frequently in 16th-century texts. The partial equivalence of the two forms is preserved in MR, and the difference between them is generally explained in pragmatic terms (Zafiu 2016: 31; Zafiu 2013: 45). It correlates with a distinction between the immediate realization of the action and the prescriptive subjunctive, which indicates (like the future imperative in Latin) a subsequent and conditioned accomplishment (Zafiu 2016: 31). In OR, when coordinated with the imperative, the subjunctive is usually in the second position.

- (6) *Măriți Domnul cu menre și se înrălțăm*
 praise.IMP.2SG Lord with me and SĂ_{SUBJ} raise.SUBJ.1PL
numele lui depreunră. (PH.1500–1510: 27^v)
 name his.D together
 ‘Praise the Lord and exhalt his name together’

The two forms also compete with the future tense of the indicative, a feature present in late Latin (Frâncu 2010:168). In (7a), the future is the last in a series of four injunctive subjunctives, so the proximity of a series of forms with pronounced injunctive value favors the injunctive reading. In pragmatic terms, the utterance with the verb in the future has a stronger directive force than the subjunctives, it is more speaker-oriented. On the other hand, example (7b) is more opaque due to the reversed ordering of the two verbs (future + imperative). In this example, the directive force of the utterance with the verb in the future is almost invisible. The imperative form that follows is the one that requires the reading of the future form as having (an attenuated) directive force.

- (7) a. *Și voi să nu mâncați, ce să o băgați în păharul lu Alexandru și să i-l dați*
să-l be, iar voi să nu beți. Și veți vini la mine. (A.1620: 218, 69^v)
 ‘And you shall not eat, but put it into Alexander’s cup and give it to him to
 drink, and you shall not drink. And you will come to me’
 b. *veți priimi tăria venitului Duhului Sfînt spre voi și fiți mărturie nu*
numai întru Ierusalim (CC¹.1567: 37^v)
 ‘You will receive the strength of the coming of the Holy Spirit to you and
 be a witness not only for Jerusalem’

⁶ For space reasons, I will not provide the full gloss of the following examples because the morphosyntactic indications are irrelevant to the data analysis in this paper.

3.1.2. Imperatives coordinated with declaratives (pseudo-imperatives)

Imperatives are also associated with future forms in other configurations than in (7a, b). In many languages⁷, [imperative + declarative] coordinated structures⁸ (in conjunction or disjunction) are interpreted as conditional constructions/pseudo-imperatives⁹, see Bolinger (1977), Davies (1986), Clark (1993), Han (2000), Russel (2007), Corminboeuf (2009), Kaufman (2012), Jary and Kissine (2014). The conditional reading of the [imperative + declarative] structure is supported by the fact that both configurations – conjunction (8a) or disjunction (9a) – can be paraphrased by true conditionals, see (8b) and (9b).

- (8) a. *Be on time, and you'll get a seat.* (< Kaufman 2012: 221)
 b. *If you are on time, you will get a seat.*
- (9) a. *Be on time, or you will miss the first slot.* (< Kaufman 2012: 221)
 b. *If you are not on time, you will miss the first slot.*

Semantic accounts of the conditional reading of such constructions rely on the fact that the imperative in the first clause is associated with a particular directive force which creates a fictive world (Corminboeuf 2009: 206-208); in the framework of Kaufman (2012), conditionals are modal sentences that express quantification over possible worlds individuated by a modal base and an ordering source. The modal base is further restricted by the apodosis of the conditional, which is the imperative clause. Among the authors who deal with the [imperative + declarative] coordinated structures, Davies (1986) is the first to point out that other features differentiate them apart from the type of coordination. According to Davies (1986: 177), [imperative + declarative] conjunctions are *imperative-like conditionals* (ILCs), while [imperative + declarative] disjunctions are *imperative-like ultimatums* (ILUs). In terms of the illocutionary force of the imperative in the first clause, ILCs can be both directive (10a, b) and non-directive (10c):

- (10) a. *Finish by noon, and I'll pay you double.* (directive ILC)
 b. *Come closer, and I will shoot.* (inverse directive ILC)
 c. *Catch a cold, and you will end up with pneumonia.* (non-directive ILC)

⁷ [Imperative + declarative] constructions are attested in English, German, Dutch, Spanish, Modern Greek, Russian, Polish, and Georgian (Kaufman 2012: 221). For a brief recording of this syntactic configuration in Romanian, see Vasilescu (2013: 476), Alexe (2015: 193–4).

⁸ The conjunction of an imperative clause to a declarative is often considered a case of *pseudo-coordination*. See Culicover and Jackendoff (1997) for analyzing *LSand* (left subordinating conjunction) constructions. See also Croitor 2013: 516, for other types of constructions involving pseudo-coordination.

According to Montolio (1999), *apud* Alexe (2015:193), [imperative + declarative] configurations are *pseudo-coordinates*. In her analysis devoted to this structure in Spanish, Montolio shows that, besides the modal-temporal correlation involved in the conjunction of the two clauses (which is employed for expressing a cause–consequence relationship), besides the need for a specific intonation (usually associated with a pause), they also display ordering restrictions. The imperative clause is always the antecedent of the consequence expressed by the declarative, and it can never occur in the second position: (i) Come any closer and I'll shoot; (ii) *I'll shoot and come any closer.

⁹ Kaufman (2012) and Jary and Kissine (2014) provide excellent overviews of the various approaches to conditional imperatives and imperatives in constructions with conditional value.

MR records all three possible structural patterns for conditional imperatives (Gheorghe 2018). However, in the OR corpus, I only found examples of the directive ILC type and no instances of disjunctive coordination of the ILU type.

According to Kaufman (2012: 225), directive ILCs behave like true conditionals. For Clark (1993: 114), these are the only *genuine pseudo-imperatives*. The imperatives are conditional antecedents (apodosis), followed by information about the future situation, which is the consequence of compliance/non-compliance with the request/order.

As far as the organization of the structures in (11) is concerned, they are more elaborate than the examples of this type in MR. They are amplified by coordinating two imperatives (11b,c) or two future forms (11e). They are also different in terms of the illocutionary force of the directive act and in terms of the orientation towards one of the protagonists; in examples (11a-c), the directive act expressed by the imperative is the condition for the promise of a benefit to the receiver; in examples (11d,e), the directive act is the condition for commitment, so the orientation is towards the speaker.

- (11) a. **Întoarceți-vă** către mine **și fi-veți** miluiți. (CC¹.1567-1568: 149^v)
 ‘turn to me and you will be blessed’ [IMP + FUT]
- b. **Descoperi** către Domnulu calea ta **și nedejdește** pri-ns **și acel face-va**. (PH.1500–1510: 31^r)
 ‘Discover unto the Lord thy way, and trust in him, and he shall do good’
 [IMP + IMP + FUT]
- c. *E tu, Doamne, miluiaște-me și învii-me și plăti-voiu* lor (PH.1500–1510: 35^r)
 ‘and you, Lord, have mercy on me and save me and I will repay them’
 [IMP + IMP + FUT]
- d. **Mântuiaște-me** de clevețele oamenrilor **și voiu ținrea** porâncitele tale. (PH.1500–1510: 108^r)
 ‘keep me from the people’s gossips, and I will keep thy commandments’
 [IMP + FUT]
- e. **Agiută-mi și me voiu ispăsi și me voiu învăța** în dereptațile tale pururea. (PH.1500–1510: 107^r)
 ‘help me and I will repent and I will learn in your righteousness forever’
 [IMP + FUT + FUT]

3.1.3. Pseudo-coordination

Pseudo-coordination is recorded in OR (Croitor, 2016: 460) and preserved in MR (Croitor, 2013: 450). The sequences involving an imperative clause have an ambiguous reading between (i) copulative coordination of two imperatives (usually a verb of motion) and (ii) subordination of the second imperative as a clausal adjunct (usually a purpose adjunct).

- (12) a. **Păsați** la Erusalim **și loați** oasele Eremiei **și le duceți** la Alexandria **și le îngropați** în cetate (A.1620: 67^r)
 ‘Go to Jerusalem and bury the bones of Hermia and take them to Alexandria and bury them in the city’
- b. **să te duci** la Machidonie ta **și să-m tremeți** haraciu de pre la toate țările ce-i luat (A.1620: 25^v)
 ‘Go to your Machidonia and send me tribute from all the countries you’ve taken it from’

Constructions with the conjunction *de* pose a similar problem of interpretation – marking an ambiguous syntactic relationship between coordination and subordination (Zafiu, 2013: 63). In this kind of structure, frequently, the first imperative is also a verb of motion or an interjection equivalent to the imperative of a verb of movement. The form *blăm*¹⁰ in (13c) (< lat. *ambulemus* ‘walk’) used to be employed as a cohortative before it was grammaticalized as an interjection.

- (13) a. *Aveți peceți, duceți-vă de întăriți cum știți.* (CC¹.1567: 211^v)
 ‘You have seals, go harden yourselves however you know’
 b. *Veniți de vedeți locul unde-au zăcut Domnul și curînd păsați* (CC¹.1567: 211^v)
 ‘Come and see the place where the Lord has lain, and shortly walk away’
 c. *Rogu-te, frate, blăm de-m arată acea peștere* (A.1620: 48^v)
 ‘Please, brother, let’s go and/to show me that cave’

The sequences in (14) may also be considered examples of pseudo-coordination. The verb(s) in the future tense following the imperative is/are linked to it by the copula *și*; however, there is more than copulative coordination here; the events that follow the conjunction will take place after the order expressed by the imperative is accomplished, like a purpose deriving from the satisfaction of the directive act.

Although they have a similar organization [IMP + FUT], these examples differ from those in (11) because the conditioning of the directive act is much attenuated. In addition, the second term of the coordination – the declarations with a future tense verb – has the verb in the first person singular, so if there were a promised benefit for fulfilling the command expressed by the imperative, it would be for the speaker and not the receiver.

- (14) a. *Deșchideți-mi ușa dreptăției și venri-voiu în ea, ispovedi-me-voiu Domnului* (PH.1500–1510: 101^v)
 ‘Open the door of righteousness for me and I will come in, I will plead with the Lord’
 b. *Deșchide ochii miei și voiu înțeleage ciudele den leagea ta* (PH.1500–1510: 101^v)
 ‘Open my eyes and I will understand the miracles of your doings’

To a lesser extent, disjunctive, adversative, or negative coordinated imperatives are also represented in the corpus:

- (15) a. *... iară acmu sau te închină mie sau ieși să ne lovim ..* (A.1620: 36^v)
 ‘but now either worship me or come out and hit me’
 b. *Și nu ne duce pre noi în ispită, ce ne izbăveaște pre noi de hicleanul.* (CC¹.1567-1568: 234^v)
 ‘and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil’

¹⁰ For details, see Gheție 1965; Maiden 2006; Manu Magda 2017.

- c. *Doamnele, nu bășăul tău afla menre, nece cu mânia ta căzni menre.*
(PH.1500–1510: 4^r)
'Lord, do not meet me with your vengeance, nor with your anger do you afflict me'

3.2. Subordination

Like in spoken MR and in other varieties of Daco-Romanian, the imperative is often included in complex constructions with clausal or purpose adjuncts, which justify the communicative act expressed by the imperative and contribute to the addressee's understanding of the illocutionary force. The significant patterns considered here are those of the form: [(true/surrogate) Imperative + clausal/purpose adjunct].

3.2.1. Imperatives followed by causal adjuncts

In spoken MR, complex injunctive structures with causal adjuncts are frequently¹¹ organized as metadiscursive structures of the type (16a). Their interpretation requires the reconstruction of a reduced conditional adjunct clause. The predicate of the conditional is the negative form of the predicate in the imperative clause (16a'). The pattern is similar to conditional imperatives of the type ILU (*imperative-like ultimatums*); see the English translation in which a disjunctive conjunction is employed instead of the subordinator in the Romanian version.

- (16) a. *Scoală-te, că te pușc pe fereastă* (GT: 130)
'Get up or I'll throw you out the window'
a'. *Scoală-te, că [dacă nu te scoli] te pușc pe fereastă*
'Get up, because if you don't, I'll throw you out the window'

Pragmatically, the imperative in examples of type (16) expresses an act of threat, an ultimatum, and the verb in the subordinate clause renders the undesirable event that will be triggered if the speaker does not obey the command in the imperative clause. The consequence directly affects the addressee.

The imperative in (17a) is an act of warning. Although there is no direct threat for the addressee (but for the speaker), he/she is supposed to comply, based on empathy towards the speaker or simply for reasons of civil behavior.

- (17) a. *Ai de grijă că mă răstorni* (GT: 15)
'Watch out or you'll take me down'
a'. *Ai de grijă că [dacă nu ai grijă] mă răstorni*
'Watch out, because if you don't, you'll take me down'

Both these patterns are almost absent in the texts from the first period of the OR. I only found four examples. Example (18a) is of type (16a), while (18b) is similar to (17a) in

¹¹ For the analysis of a larger number of examples extracted from a spoken corpus of Romanian, see Gheorghe 2019.

the indirectness of the consequence for the addressee, which is God's disapproval. Regarding the illocutionary force of the utterance, the warning is not as strong as in (17); instead, it may be interpreted as a piece of advice. The pattern in (18c) is identical to that in (18a), except that the imperative sentence contains an exhortative subjunctive. In (18d), reconstruction of the explanatory conditional sequence is no longer necessary because the explanation of the directive act is already present in the structure. It contains a relative clause with a quantificational reading – *cine va căuta* ('whoever will search') – which performs the same inference-expanding role as the reduced conditional clause.

- (18) a. *Alexandre, să nu mai mergi de ice nainte, că vei peri* (A.1620: 51')
 'Alexander, do not go any further, or you will perish'
- a'. ... *să nu mai mergi de ice nainte, că [dacă mergi] vei peri*
 'don't go any further because if you do, you will perish'
- b. *Cându vedzi că cade ceva de la soful tău, nu te bucura de paguba lui, că lui Dumnezău nu-i place.* (FD.1592-1604: 478")
 'When you see something fall from your neighbor, do not rejoice in his loss, for you will upset God'
- b'. ... *nu te bucura de paguba lui, că [dacă te bucuri] lui Dumnezău nu-i place.*
 'do not rejoice in his loss, because if you do, you will upset God'
- c. ... *până aice să vină, mai nainte să nu margă, că va peri de focul raiului* (A.1620: 19')
 'Let him come this far, let him go no farther, for he will burn in heaven's fire'
- c'. ... *până aice să vină, mai nainte să nu margă, că [dacă merge] va peri de focul raiului*
 'Let him come this far, let him go no farther, because if he does, he will burn in heaven's fire'
- d. *iar în cetate să nu cauți, că cine va căuta muri-va* (A.1620: 15')
 'and seek not in the city, for he that seeketh shall die'

Metadiscursive can also be considered constructions such as those in (19a,b), in which the causal adjunct is subordinated to a performative prefix such as "I command you to/advise you to... for the reason that...":

- (19) a. *Deșchideți-mi, că eu sânt, Ipolit* (FD.1592-1604: 487")
 'Open the door, for I am Ipolit'
- b. *Veni-m veaste că au murit arhanghel Mihail. Ei ziseră: Nu creade, că nu mor îngerii* (MC.1620: 67")
 'I've just heard that the archangel Michael died. They said: Don't believe, because angels don't die'

There are frequent instances in which the causal adjunct provides additional information to justify the addressee's decision to obey an order, exhortation, or answer a prayer (20 a-e). In the case of orders (20 a-c), the justification is deontic/prescriptive, but can also be subjective, as in prayers (20 d,e).

- (20) a. *Spre mine căutaț, că eu-s împărat spre toți împărații...* (Ev.1642: 231)
‘To me, you seek, for I am emperor to all emperors’
- b. *Voi iară, muierile, supt ținutul bărbaților să fiți și să-i ascultați ca și lu Dumnezeu; că bărbatul iaste cap muieriei, cum Hristos iaste capul besereciei* (CC¹.1567-1568: 261^v)
‘But you also, wives, be subject to men and obey them as you obey God; for the man is the master of the wife, as Christ is the master of the church’
- c. *... acela nice să ia anaforă, nice să sărute svintele icoane, că așa dzice Svânta Scriptură...* (ȘT.1644: 19)
‘that he takes no wafer, neither he kisses the holy icons, for thus saith the Holy Scripture’
- d. *Miluiaste-me, Doamne, că cătră tinre chemu în toate dzile* (PH.1500–1510: 72^v)
‘Lord, have mercy on me, for I have called to you every day’
- e. *Pleacă-ț, Doamne, urechea cea svântă și să mi-ascuț la vreme de smântă, că-s în lipsă și în ticăință.* (DPV.1673: 188)
‘Turn to me, O Lord, thy holy ear, and hear me in the time of my sorrow, for I am in need and in pain’

The causal adjunct embedded in the injunctive structure may have functions other than justifying the exhortation/command. The causal adjunct contributes to the meaning of the whole construction because it motivates the addressee to carry out the directive act, as it has positive effects and represents their *implicit goal*¹². In this way, in (21a) we are not dealing with a directive act, but with encouragement, and in (21b, c) with a promise.

- (21) a. *Nu vă teameți, că veți vedea ce lucru mare va face Dumnezeu cu noi astăzi* (CC¹.1567-1568: 163^v)
‘Do not be afraid, for you will see what great things God will do for us today.’
- b. *Mâncați zise, că veți fi ca Dumnezeu, de veți ști binele și răul!* (MC.1620: 9^v)
‘Eat, he said, that you may be like God, and you will know good and evil.’
- c. (...) zise Domnul: *Crede-mă, muiare, că va veni vreme a venirii mele* (...) (Ev.1642: 479)
‘(...) said the Lord: Believe me, O woman, that the day of my coming will come (...)’

3.2.2. Imperatives followed by purpose clausal adjuncts

When an imperative clause is associated with a clausal adjunct of purpose, the intended outcome is explicitly expressed. The purpose clause can strengthen the directive force of the imperative by describing an undesired event or it can hedge it by adding an explicit goal that should motivate the addressee’s compliance with the directive. In the former case (as in 22 a, b), the verb in the adjunct clause is expressed in the negative form. In the latter case (examples 22 c, d), the verb is in the affirmative form.

¹² For this concept see Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 730.

- (22) a. *Așa, fugiți și vă feriți, creștinilor, - mai tare voi, preuților -, să nu periți ca și Iuda.* (CC¹.1567-1568: 202^v)
 ‘Therefore flee and take heed, O Christians - much more you priests - so that you may not be like Judas’
- b. *Prevegheați și vă rugați, să nu meargeți în năpaste* (CC¹.1567-1568: 205^v)
 ‘Watch and pray, so that you don’t get into trouble’
- c. *Spunre-mi, Doamne, cumplitul meu și numărulu dzilelor mele, se înțelegu de ce me voi părăsi eu.* (PH.1500–1510: 33^r)
 ‘Tell me, Lord, my fear and the number of my days, so that I may understand why I will leave’
- d. *Scutește-ne Doamne, Domnulu nostru și adură-ne den păgânri, ca se ni ispovedim numelui tău sfântului* (PH.1500–1510: 92^r)
 ‘Save us, O Lord our God, and save us from the unbelievers, that we may be saved by your holy name’

The attenuation of the illocutionary force conveyed through the imperative reaches its maximum degree in the case of imperative clauses with motion verbs followed by subjunctives. Sometimes, these complex imperative clauses have an ambiguous reading between subordination (imperative + purpose clause) and coordination (imperative + surrogate imperative), see (23a). The same is true for the *de*-constructions discussed above (3.1.1.), see (23b). The imperative verbs of motion that appear in this type of construction can be considered a kind of light verbs.

- (23) a. (...) *iar voi să meargeți să grăiți împăratului să faceți tocmeală pre această pohtă și tocmeală ce-am trimes acum la voi* (DÎ: 23)
 ‘and you shall go and tell the emperor to make a bargain for this desire and bargain which I have now sent unto you’
- b. *Veniți cu toți depreună să ne facem voaie bună, să ne bucurăm cu Domnul și să-i strigăm cu tot omul* (DPV.1673: 210)
 ‘Let us all come together to do good will, to rejoice with the Lord, and to call out to him with all our might’

Some of these motion verbs have been grammaticalized as hortative interjections in OR: *blem/bleți/blemați, pas(ă), va* (Manu Magda 2017):

- (24) a. *Blăm de-m arată* (A.1620: 48^v)
 ‘Let’s go to show me that cave’
- b. *Pasă și tu de fă așijderea* (CC¹.1567-1568: 132^r)
 ‘Go and do your share’
- c. *Pasă să iei 100.000 de oameni calarași aleși* (A.1620: 47^v)
 ‘Go and get 100,000 people who are good riders’
- d. *Vă, derept aceea, și adună întruna bărbații lu Izdrail* (PO.1582: 187)
 ‘Go therefore and gather together the men of Izdrail’

4. CONCLUSIONS

A pragmatic analysis of the imperative clause is difficult to carry on 400-year-old texts since the texts considered are canonical texts and, with very few exceptions, they are texts translated into Romanian in the context of a written tradition that was not very rich at the time, and in the absence of any information on language use. However, some of the patterns identified in the corpus texts are also found in today's spoken Romanian, which may be an indication that they belong to the language in use in the 16th century as well. Of course, there are also universal patterns (see, for example, pseudo-imperatives or constructions associating two or more verbs of motion), but I have also identified several features that are specific to Romanian, which appear as a reflection of the employment of verbal paradigms (true imperatives and subjunctives and sometimes also future indicative).

The brief inventory of complex injunctive structures in OR shows that recurrent patterns of complex imperative structures are of the form [imperative + causal/purpose clausal adjunct]. On the one hand, a higher frequency of structures with a causal adjunct is observed compared to structures with a purpose adjunct; on the other hand, a greater variety of pragmatic functions is conveyed by the imperative in metadiscursive causal structures. Structures in the final propositional adjunct pattern show a great deal of ambiguity in the interpretation of the syntactic relationship between the imperative and the rest of the sequence, ambiguity due both to the connector and to the semantic features of the second verb in the structure.

In terms of the frequency of the imperative clauses in general, I found that imperative clauses (with both true imperatives and hortative subjunctives) are very often used in religious texts, but this is a fact that can be explained in terms of genre. As for the syntactic organization of imperative complex structures, it is rather sparse. Apart from the clausal and purpose adjuncts, other types of propositional adjuncts are absent (at least from my corpus), highlighting a rudimentary, not very elaborate, sentence organization. This can also be attributed to the original model after which the texts were translated or to the insufficient development of the means of expression.

SOURCES

- A.1620 *Alexandria*. Ed.: F. Zgraon, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2005 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare în literatura română, 11).
- BVI.1764 Vlad Boțulescu de Mălăiești, *Varlaam și Ioasaf*. Ed.: Vlad Boțulescu de Mălăiești, *Scrieri II. Canonizarea Sfântului Felice. Varlaam și Ioasaf. Glosar irochez-român. Note astronomice*, ed. C.-I. Dima, București, 2013, 127–88.
- CC¹.1567 Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor*. Ed.: Coresi, *Tâlcul evangheliilor și molitvenic românesc*, ed. V. Drimba, București, Editura Academiei, 1998, 31–187.
- CT.1560–1 Coresi, *Tetraevanghel* (Brașov). Ed.: *Tetraevanghelul tipărit de Coresi. Brașov 1560 – 1561*, comparat cu *Evangheliarul lui Radu de la Mănăcești. 1574*, ediție alcătuită de Florica Dimitrescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1963.
- DÎ: 23 *Documente și însemnări românești din secolul al XVI-lea*, text stabilit și indice de Gh. Chivu, Magdalena Georgescu, Magdalena Ioniță, Al. Mareș, Al. Roman-Moraru, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1979.
- DPV.1673 Dosoftei, *Psaltirea în versuri* (Uniev). Ed.: Dosoftei, *Opere*, 1, *Versuri*, ediție critică de N. A. Ursu, Iași, 1974.

- Ev.1642 *Evanghelie învățătoare (Govora, 1642)*. Ediție, studiu introductiv, note și glosar de Alin-Mihai Gherman, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2011.
- FD.1592-1604 *Floarea darurilor*. Ed.: Alexandra Roman Moraru, București, Minerva, 1996 (Cele mai vechi cărți populare, I), p. 119–182.
- GT Frățilă, V., *Graiul de pe Târnavă. Texte și glosar*, Timișoara, Tipografia Universității din Timișoara [new edition: Blaj, Editura Astra, 2005].
- MC.1620 M. Moxa, Cronograf. Mihail Moxa, *Cronica universală*, ediție critică însoțită de izvoare, studiu introductiv, note și indici de G. Mihăilă, București, Minerva, 1989.
- PH.1500–1510 *Psaltirea Hurmuzaki*, studiu filologic, studiu lingvistic și ediție de I. Gheție și Mirela Teodorescu, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2005.
- PO.1582 *Palia de la Orăștie*. Ed. V. Pamfil, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1968.
- ȘT.1644 *Șapte taine ale besearecii, Iași, 1644*. Ediție critică, nota asupra ediției și studiu filologico-lingvistic de Iulia Mazilu, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2012.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. Y., 2010, *Imperatives and Commands*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Alexe, R., 2015, *Construcții condiționale în limba română*, Brașov, Editura Universității Transilvania.
- Bolinger, D., 1977, *Meaning and form*, London-New-York, Longman.
- Clark, B., 1993, “Relevance and ‘pseudo-imperatives’”, *Linguistics and philosophy*, 16, 79–121.
- Corminboeuf, G., 2009, *L’expression de l’hypothèse en français: Entre hypotaxe et parataxe*, Bruxelles, De Boeck Supérieur.
- Croitor, B., 2013, “Coordination”, in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 514–524.
- Croitor, B., 2014, “Asymmetric Coordination in Old Romanian”, *Linguistica Atlantica*, vol. 33, no. 2, 4–24.
- Croitor, B., 2016, “Coordination and coordinating conjunctions”, in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 444–462.
- Culicover, P. W., R. Jackendoff, 1997, “Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination”, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 195–217.
- Davies, E., 1986, *The English Imperative*, Beckenham, Croom Helm.
- Fox, C., 2015, “The Semantics of Imperatives”, in S. Lappin, C. Fox (eds), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory* (second edition), Wiley Blackwell, 314–342.
- Frâncu, C., 2010 *Conjunctivul românesc și raporturile lui cu alte moduri*, Iași, Casa Editorială Demiurg Plus.
- Gheorghe, M., 2019, „Construcții injonctive complexe în româna vorbită (graiuri ale dacoromânei)”, în G. Pană Dindelegan, A. Boioc, B. Croitor (eds), *Variație diacronică și diatopică. Note gramaticale*, București, Editura Universității din București, 289–303.
- Gheorghe, M., 2018, “Pragmatic Effects of the Overt Subject in Romanian Conditional Imperatives”, *Revue roumaine de linguistique*, LXIII, 1–2, 167–182.
- Gheție, I., 1965, „Un vechi text literar românesc din secolul al XVII-lea”, *Limba română*, XIV, 6, 679–705.
- Han, C.-H., 2000, *The Structure and Interpretation of Imperatives: Mood and Force in Universal Grammar*, New York, Garland.
- Hill, V., G. Alboiu, 2016, *Verb Movement and Clause Structure in Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

- Huddleston, R., G. K. Pullum, 2005, *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar* New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Isac, D., 2015, *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Jary, M., M. Kissine, 2014, *Imperatives*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Kaufman, M., 2012, *Interpreting Imperatives*, Dordrecht, Springer.
- Maiden, M., 2006, "On Romanian Imperatives", *Philologica Jassyensia*, II, nr. 1, 47–59.
- Manu Magda, M., 2017, "The interjection in old Romanian texts", *Diacronia*, 6, A93.
- Palmer, F.R., 2001, *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Pîrvulescu, M., Y. Roberge, 2000, "The Syntax and Morphology of Romanian Imperatives", in V. Motapanyane (ed.), *Comparative Studies in Romanian Syntax*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 295–312.
- Russel, 2007, "Imperatives in conditional conjunction", *Natural Language Semantics*, 15, 131–166.
- Searle, J. R., 1976, "A classification of illocutionary acts", *Language in Society*, 5, 1, 1–23.
- Searle, J.R., 1983, *Intentionality, an essay in the philosophy of mind*, Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- von der Auwera, J., L. Lejeune, 2005, "The morphological imperative", in M. Haspelmath (ed.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 286–289.
- Vasilescu, A., 2013, "Sentence types", in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 537–550.
- Warren, A., 1998, *Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in the Psalms*, PhD dissertation, Cambridge University.
- Zafiu, R., 2013, "Mood, tense and aspect", in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 24–64.
- Zafiu, R., 2016, "The Imperative", in G. Pană Dindelegan (ed.), *The Syntax of Old Romanian*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

