PRESCRIPTIVE DOMINANTS OF THE PRESENT OCCASIONAL THEOLOGICAL DISCOURSE. PARAENESIS.

Anamaria Gheorghiu,
Ph. D. Student,
(Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iaşi, Romania)

Abstract: *The religious discourse is theorized and analyzed in this article as a way of particular expression, as an occasional sermon, circumstantial discourse, which involves numerous influencing forces by its own construction: through the enunciation device, through the materials used (types of arguments) and the architecture of the construction (the way the arguments are organized), through the other verbal, nonverbal and paraverbal means which mobilize the argumentation. Dressing "the mode of organization"[1] of the argumentative speech, we try to capture exactly how the religious occasional discourse builds the dominant prescriptive-incentive tonality and how the argumentative process, which influences the audience behavior, would "melt" certain "instruction acts" in its construction. The present work has, at a structural level, a theoretical and an applicative part. The latter is based on a small corpus of paraenesis, which were personally recorded, transcribed from audio-video format, according to the conventions of transcription of pieces of spoken language, indicated in Hoarță Cărăuşu Luminița (coord.). "Corpus de limbă română vorbită actuală nedialectală". Iaşi: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza", 2013, p. 60-70.*

Keywords: *religious discourse, construction, enunciation, argument, mean, speech, dominant.*

The paraenesis, more than the other homiletic genres, wants to be a speech with a profound moral content, but with a special formative character which engages the audience cognitively, affectively and from an action point of view (must be „moving", „persuasive", the emphasis being on promoting values or praising certain acts which become examples) thereby becoming deeply persuasive: "...scopul special al parenezei este să extindă binefacerile propovăduirii şi la alte momente liturgice, în afară de Sfânta Liturghie cum ar fi Săvârşirea Sfintelor Taine şi a Ierurgiilor, în Biserică, la casele credincioşilor, în țarine sau alte locuri. Parenezele pot produce uneori efecte mai mari decât în cazul celorlalte forme ale predicii din cauza scurtimii şi al zborului înalt retoric care le este propriu" [9, p. 182]. Although we use the term "paraenesis" according to Vasile Gordon's study, for the discourses we are considering for analysis, it is necessary to mention that for the secular language, terms such as "allocution" and "exhortation" become synonyms for what is defined in the homiletic literature as paraenetic discourse. Some important clarifications are required regarding the studies which have defined the paraenesis with a view to establish it as a literary category in the biblical studies on early Christianity. Philip L. Tite opens certain prospects to a full understanding of the genre highlighting the

reductionist vision of previous studies. What we want to point out as being relevant for this study are several features of the paraenesis as the author characterizes it, a dynamic genre, in which both the protreptic and the paraenetic function coexist; it is a moral discourse with a general definition which reads like this in his study: "Moral discourse intended to persuade or dissuade a course of action or direction in life" [26, p. 132] through various procedures (in the study mentioned, "literary features") such as the use of imperative and of a certain hortative devices, which ensures the dominant hortative tonality (as reprimand or exhortation); by prescriptive indicators ("... the hortative or prescriptive nature of paraenesis is the defining element, when placed within moral context of discourse" [idem, p. 126]) backed by specific strategies: as quote, rhetorical interrogation, example, eulogies, but also other surrogates of the imperative "...the hortative and moral dimensions of such features is determinative of the presence of paraenesis" [idem, p. 121]. As homiletic genre of Orthodox worship, "pareneza adeseori produce efecte mai mari decât celelalte feluri de cuvântări bisericeşti, fiindcă în împrejurări ocazionale, de regulă oamenii sunt mişcaţi şi dispuşi a primi învăţături şi îndemnuri salutare, şi cuvântarea fiind scurtă şi mişcătoare, e ascultată cu luare aminte şi plăcere şi ţinută minte mai lesne" [3, p. 152]. It targets "prefacerea morală a vieţii ascultătorilor, de unde vine şi dificultatea sporită în abordarea sa, în comparaţie cu predica obişnuită" [4, p. 161]. Exhortative or counseling, consoling or comforting the paraenetic sermons, that we will analyze, almost always take on missionary garb, persuasive through permanent adaptation, according to the event, to the spiritual state of those present: "…în context actual, discursul teologic trebuie… să nu mai fie doar un instrument pastoral, ci şi unul misionar. Se simte o acută nevoie de limbaj teologic capabil să cuprindă răspunsuri la multe întrebări care au început să se nască" [30, p. 130].

Around the moral ideas proposed are grouped practical exhortations, which represent the subject of the present paper, because, through sequences of this type, this homiletic genre becomes particular by comparison with other homiletic genres: "În general, pareneza are acelaşi scop cu al celorlalte genuri omiletice, formulat astfel: luminarea minţii, încălzirea inimii şi înduplecarea voinţei (potrivit celor trei mari funcţiuni ale sufletului). Toate acestea în vederea unei tot mai mari apropieri a credinciosului de Biserică, spre mântuire. Prin specificul lor, parenezele ţin, mai mult însă, de latura voliţională a persoanei. Îndemnurile, caracteristice acestui gen omiletic urmăresc influenţarea voinţei ascultătorului spre săvârşirea faptelor virtuoase" [10, p. 42].

All "mijloace ale înduplecării voei" [3, p. 88] and of "combatere a pasiunilor omeneşti, a pretextelor, a desvinuirilor morale" [idem, p. 97] make

up the architecture of the discourse which has as its foundation the conditions for both producing and receiving the discourse.

1. Theoretical Preliminaries of Pragmatic Analysis of the Corpus

Attempts at semiotic analysis of the discourse have established theoretical premises which have revealed the functionality and manifestation of dynamic discursive units towards the formation of the discourse as a whole. In this regard, Charles Morris's [17] contribution is clearly significant and is even today regarded as a first step in clarifying the role of discursiveness: the priority of the analysis of discursive acts through the prism of efficiency in action. Based on the tendency of diversification of various language specializations, Charles Morris reaches the forms in which it is concretized: *types of discourse* [18, p. 125][1]. Charles Morris proposes a typology of discourse in which the performative dimension is well represented, and the types of discourse are delimited according to two criteria which concern the sphere of the practical act: the mode of signifying and the mode of use. The mode of signifying refers to the ability of signs to make available to the receiver a description of the object or the given situation (thus the prescriptive indicates to the receiver a desirable mode of behavior). The mode of use refers to the relationship between sequence of discourse and the attainment of the goal of the action (the way in which the message affects the receiver in the sense of the intention of the sender of the communication). At the intersection of these two criteria, the religious discourse appears as a kind of discourse bounded by prescriptive mode of signification and incitive mode of use.

For the occasional religious discourse analysis that we propose in the present paper we begin with two other essential clarifications made by the same author, namely:

A. The categories of signs that the author enumerates do not divide into equal proportions in the concrete discursive acts. In addition, the proportion of these types of signs is not the essential aspect of the analysis of the discourse, but must be informed by what is emphasized in the communication relationship; every type of discourse noted by the author is defined by the mode in which one of the dimensions (prescriptive, appreciative, designative) becomes "semn dominant" [*idem*, p. 73][2] (this gives the tone of discourse). For example, in the occasional religious discourse the emphasis falls on the prescriptive aspect, therefore, according to the table, the dominant tone is prescriptive-incentive.

We are committed, in this paper, to analyze the mechanisms by which the dominant prescriptive-incentive is realized in the occasional religious discourse, theorizing that "langage en acte" as action and interaction equally, as "dire" (to transmit to the other specific information) and "faire" (to act on the other party, on the world in general) [13, p. 1] framed by a specific organization: the argument with persuasive finality. Depending on

the purposes of the discourses, signs must also be appropriately used: (1) 'informative' adequacy may be described as 'convincingness'; (2) 'valuative' adequacy may be described as 'effectiveness'; (3) 'incitive' adequacy may be described as 'persuasiveness'; and (4) 'systemic' adequacy may be described as 'correctness' [16, p. 147]. Thus in the occasional religious discourse the prescriptive-incentive dimension is associated with the performative aspect.

B. Hence the criterion of usage, *primary usage* and *secondary usage*: in their primary use prescriptives have incentive functions, but we will emphasize in the present paper, by considering the argument that an integral part of discourse analysis, that a *sequence of appreciative discourse (evaluative)* can receive the same primary use through *indirect strategy* of the specific objective of the perlocutionary argumentative act: "In giving positive approval to one kind of personality rather than to others, it involves appraisors which signify the ultimate commitments (the supreme valuata) of the religion in question, but since it signifies the personality as something to be attained, its mode of signifying is prescriptive. And since its aim is to cause persons to become personalities of the kind prescribed, its aim is not merely informative or valuative but incitive" [*ibidem*]. Prescribing a recommended behavior above all others, with the aim of inciting it in his interpreters, represents one of the most relevant examples of prescriptive-incentive priority discourse, particularly through sequences of laudative type.

I made these clarifications on the morrisian typology, as a preamble for our analysis regarding the dominance of prescriptive-incentive on religious discourse in general and of the occasional in particular, in order to be able to ease the transition to what we in current pragmatics call *discursive acts*. The notion of *discursive acts* constitutes one of the most important aspects of pragmatics. Through this one makes a gradual transition to the linguistics of the text, the notion proven to be, according to how we have underlined, extremely effective and which is increasingly exploited in tackling the discourse; the latter is itself considered a discursive macro-act, composed of discursive micro-acts or dominant acts: "une séquence d'actes de discours peut être considérée en elle-même comme un acte de discours unifié" [1, p. 103].

Moreover, the above clarifications help us to ease the connection between what Ch. Morris [18, p. 66] in his work calls *primary* and *secondary use* or rather *dominant* and *secondary tonality* and that which Searle [*idem*, p. 35] later calls *primary* and *secondary intention of the speech acts*: "En d'autres termes: le locuteur s'exprime indirectement ou *quand dire, c'est faire plusieurs choses à la fois* (informer d'un fait et susciter une conduite); et plus précisément... *quand dire, c'est faire une chose sous les apparences d'une autre*. En d'autres termes encore: en matière d'actes de langage, il n'y a pas de correspondance biunivoque entre tel signifiant (forme déclarative, interrogative ou

impérative de la phrase) et tel signifié (valeur d'assertion, de question ou d'autre)" [14, p. 33].

The real values, prescriptive-incentive, in the paraenetic discourse transpire predominantly by means of a secondary illocutionary act which fulfills the primary intention of the primary illocutionary act. We will also see that even performative acts lend themselves, sometimes, a litotic use, likewise, as an integral part of the *indirection strategy* although they make a discordant note among the other acts because the interpretive freedom of the expressed performative values is much more limited, close to the zero bound. Thus, in the case of indirect acts, the preacher communicates to the audience more than he expresses literally, relying on the inference ability of the latter. All the mentioned elements have established the vision of argumentation as *macro-act of speech* which will lead us to the extensive analysis of utterances. "În acest cadru... putem vorbi de o micro-pragmatică (teoria actelor de limbaj) şi de o macro-pragmatică; sub incidenţa acesteia din urmă se situează orientarea argumentativă a discursului, ca şi tipurile discursive, în genere asociate unor macro-acte de limbaj [...]; o argumentaţie este cu atât mai reuşită cu cât pare mai indirectă, cu cât lasă impresia unei alegeri libere din partea interlocutorului" [21, p. 110].

Argumentative analysis today claims its place beside communication science and linguistics in the broadest sense as constituting a construction beam for disciplines that aims to analyze how language is used in concrete situations because it has become a branch of discourse analysis: "...partie intégrante de l'analyse du discours" [*idem*, p. 9]. Thus, the applicable part of the present work crystallizes on two premises:

(1) In general, religious discourse is a discourse with "argumentative orientation" [*idem*, p. 34][3]. Its mode of organization represents the ordering of linguistic categories in order to have a perlocutionary effect (i.e. a change in belief, perceptions and implicitly in future orientation of acts of its audience). The ultimate aim of any argument is the action, i.e. taking positions, i.e. inducing a disposition of action ("acts of faith") thus fulfilling a concrete action: "On cherche à convaincre autrui pour obtenir son concours, sa coopération dans le procès de transformation du monde. On vise donc *in fine* le comportement d'autrui" [27, p. 70]. Moreover, religious discourse builds the argument such that it convinces to join, i.e. it produces in turn pro-discourses "...le locuteur doit amener son partenaire à accepter ce que lui est proposé... en lui faisant produire un pro-discours" [2, p. 18].

(2) In particular, the occasional religious speech is a complex one and, moreover, it is a *performance speech*, in which the argument is legitimate under certain conditions and specific frameworks which offers *prescriptive-incentive* dominance, supported at a discursive level through the interactivity of discursive acts (verbal or nonverbal) and through prosody. We borrow from conversational analyses, which have prevailed in the majority of

studies which have considered the conversation as a more *natural* manifestation of the language system, certain concepts and classifications which can help us in analyzing the functioning of speech acts within the argumentative oriented discourse whose dominant argumentation is prescriptive-incentive, precisely transpires from their interactive use. Van Eemeren et Grootendorst [*apud* 14, p. 158] described the argumentation itself as an act of *composed illocution (illocution composée),* an act of complex language formed by a sequence of statements, many of them we add, as speech acts which incite *le faire* and *le dire* of the audience (grouped in the searlian taxonomy into the category of *directive acts*). At the same time, we must take into consideration that we may have both macro-acts of speech as well as micro-acts and most often in forms in which we dress up the occasional sermon, expressive or assertive acts represent an illocutionary force of the argumentative macro-act, but hide the other illocutionary forces found in interactivity, offering a dominant tone of the discourse. All these *indirect speech acts* that define the primary intent of the argumentative act *(tropes illocutoires* [*idem*, p. 55]): *the rhetorical interrogation, the eulogy, the quote* help to achieve the perlocutionary objective of the argumentative act, supporting the dominant tone of the discourse, becoming *strategies*. If we were to "call" this perlocutionary objective of the argumentative act (which drives various illocutionary forces) for the two paraeneses which we have selected we consider that the adherence through "accountability" of the audience is the goal pursued (either to the sacred object mentioned in paraenesis at *Epiphany*, or to future actions in which you see the professional and personal evolution of young graduates in the paerenesis on the *Day of the graduate*).

To describe and determine the *functioning of discursive acts* within the occasional discourse, we naturally need to appeal to all the elements which the pragmatic offers us. What is certain and which we said from the outset is the fact that it is very difficult to identify, inventory and label all the speech acts and that we are aware of the lack of an integrated theory of acts, be they linguistic or not. In summary, we base our analysis and approach on theory, stating the following:

- We take from Charles Morris the idea that the specificity of each type of speech is given by the tonality of the discursive intervention, tonality extracted from the manifestation of a "dominant sign" in one of the dimensions: *designative, prescriptive or evaluative*;
- For the occasional religious discourse, as discourse with *argumentative orientation*, the prescriptive-incentive dimension corresponds especially to the imperative tonality prevalent in the genre: "As prescriptive (or percept-giving) discourse, paraenesis will always carry a hortative aspect, even when using non-imperatival verbal forms that are specifically or essentially prescriptive verbs [...] However, even when there is no imperatival verbal construction, there will still be an

imperatival sense within supporting material (...). In other words, although the imperative will be a central element within a paraenesis, it is the prescriptive and proscriptive aspect of paraenesis that dominates all aspects of paraenetic text" [26, p. 139].

- The performative aspect of the argument in the religious discourse does however not depend on percentages of such utterances and neither is it realized only through them. The occasional religious discourse "...se angajează atât pe linia unei performanţe cognitive (orice spor în componenta cognitivă a receptorului sau chiar a locutorului), cât şi pe cea a unei performanţe acţionale (orice decizie de a acţiona sau de a nu acţiona provocată prin receptarea discursului)" [24, p. 57].

- The inventory of speech acts never enjoyed unity or stability as each theorist proposes their inventory in wider or narrower categories, this occurs because the system of speech acts is a hierarchical system (a taxonomy). Speech acts are elements too complex to be restricted or constrained by a single theoretical vision. It remains to be seen at what times of the sermon such directly expressed acts are placed and which the conditions of fulfillment of a prescriptive act in the religious text are and of course which other categories of acts fulfill this prescriptive role but which are used as *indirect acts* and how in this case the face of the audience is protected.

- We now adopt in our work the searlean taxonomy which distinguishes six main classes of speech acts: *assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, declarative, representative*. Regardless of their type these acts can cause a change in the interlocutor or in the immediate reality. In the searlean *taxonomy*, the class of directive acts is characterized by its aim at determining the interlocutor to do something. However this may simply be suggested or may be expressed through verbs with a much greater force. The verbs that characterize this class are: *to order, to command, to ask, to plead, to solicit, to invite, to allow, to pray, to advise*. The prescriptive act in discourse exceeds the values associated with the imperative phrase and integrates through their melting together in the larger context of the discourse wider and milder concepts such as: *request, advice, suggestion, and exhortation*. On a pragmatic level, the *prescriptive act* is oriented towards the recipient, but it involves a number of other relations which we have already mentioned, relationships governed and regulated by politeness; they determine certain different modal nuances. The classes of modalities are expressed by different linguistic means: most often through verbs (the verbal mode). The close relationship of pragmatics with modalities is justified by the modal importance of the modalizers, the

Speech and Context, 1(VII)2015

understanding of which depends on all parameters of the situation of the communication. *The modality* is defined as a speaker's attitude towards its own transmitted message which at the same time drives the receiver towards a given area of interpretation [19, p. 77].

2. Argumentative Rhetoric Strategies and Surrogates of the Imperative which Support the Prescriptive-Incentive Dominants of the Occasional Religious Discourse

The paraenesis from the Epiphany Day held in front of a public (-heterogeneity), the majority of which being regulars, the sequences with a didactic tint, explanatory, prevail. The prescriptive-incentive dominants transpire especially in *question-answer* type of sequences. We are referring here to a well-knit structure around some key *rhetorical questions*, the answers of which substantiates reasons for which certain actions are prescribed (regarding the indicated object: *holy water*). If E. Benveniste [*apud* 14, p. 83] reunited assertion, the question and the order under the umbrella of *arch-acts*, the Searle theory, as I have mentioned, groups *the order* and *the question* in the family of directive acts and *the question* is to some extent considered a form of an order. Reconciling the two points of view, the linguistic one with the pragmatic one, C. Kerbrat-Orecchioni [*idem*, p. 84] offers a special scheme: the first that opposes *the question* (demande d'un dire) to the *requirement to do something* (demande d'un faire); the order being also a requirement type, including both of them in the same category: the second of *requests* (demandes).

In most cases, in the discourses we are dealing with, as I have already said, they manifest as indirect acts. For example *rhetorical interrogations* are, of course, used as *trope illocutoire* [*idem*, p. 96] which do not involve receiving a genuine answer from an interlocutor, but can mediate the expression of a content with prescriptive-incentive dominant through a direct directive act or as an assertive act: ″În cazul întrebărilor retorice, informarea este doar instrumentul prin care se împlineşte un scop, iar scopul este acțiunea, comportamentul, atitudinea, etc. Prin urmare, întrebările retorice îndeplinesc acelaşi scop ca şi comenzile, promisiunile, imperativele. Valoarea lor performativă este mult mai evidentă″ [22, p. 317]. The rhetorical interrogations and the terminal ascending melodic contour accompanying their utterance, segment the discourse, transmitting not just value expressed in dialogue, but especially a certain rhythm that tightens up to a certain point the rate of argumentation.

The interrogative iteration amplifies and offers dramatism but certain elements with an imperative hint are faded through the usage of the verb in first person, plural form: ″cum îl putem primi:↑(repetând acelaşi gest al mâinilor orientându-se către auditoriul din dreapta sa)pe hris-tos_domnul în viața noastră?(orientându-se către centru şi revenind)″ (A1, p. 3) or the pronoun in first person, plural form, that generic "we", which is inferring an identification of the preacher with his audience, especially if we

take into account the parameters of the context: "cum putem avea noi binecuvântarea_cerului în acest AN?". The rhetorical interrogations in the paraenesis delivered on the day of *Blessing of the Water (on Epiphany Day)* are organized as a fabric which gives rise to answers formulated either as:

- findings which are reinforcing the feeling of belonging to a group, through the use of some acts with modal values from the field of epistemic modalities, as „certainty" for the compact, homogenous group which belongs to the permanent audience: "...SUN:TEM BOTEZAŢI↑(marcând emfaza prin mişcări ale aceleiaşi mâini pe axa verticală sus-jos)şi ne botezăm copiii noştri↑sau pe cei adulţi care se_ntorc la credinţă(continuând gestul mişcându-şi trupul şi privirea pe axa orizontală centru-dreapta-stânga-centru)îi botează:m↓(continuând gestul şi mişcarea trupului şi privirii)în biserica_ortodoxă↑în numele sfintei treimi↑în numele tatălui(ţinând cu mâna moale latura stângă a crucii de lemn aflată în mâna dreaptă) "...." (A1, p. 3). We note that, this verbal act, generates an answer (nonverbal act) which validates the audience's adherence to what was said and especially, the entry through it in the discourse, in that validating this premise, it will validate others, but will act accordingly in the direction of the final conclusion: "Auditoriul(făcând gestul crucii)"(A1, p. 3). We add that this *ritual act* of utterance is recognized immediately by the audience, even before its final utterance, the audience is making the sign of the cross, as a way of belonging to the group, as a gesture of recognition of the values proposed, but mostly of the authority invoked, hence of the *requirement* of fulfilling the indicated action, if this has not yet been achieved.
- either in the form of *quotation* as argumentative strategy, especially as directive act expressed directly and supported prosodically and nonverbally, whereby certain contents belonging to the supreme authority become responses and starting points in indicating the adoption of certain conduct or operating in a particular direction.

In the occasional religious speech, the quotes used are mostly the sources of so-called *common places* that become, through their imperative utterance, direct *directive acts* which guide the audience towards a particular behavior. Of the two paraeneses which we have analyzed, the paraenesis uttered at the *Blessing of the Water* on *Epiphany* Day offers an authentic image of how it is organized around the quote and rhetorical interrogation, as "chain of logic" [9, p. 286], genuine prescriptive-incentive sequences. The *chain of logic* aims to rebuild the event that will take place, its justification and usefulness, the beneficial effect on those who truly understand and know its importance; if we were to draw schematically the logical order of these sequences, we get a chain in which each act implies the other and depends on it at the same time, and together, by amplification and gradation infer the message and the desired content by the preacher towards his audience, qualified as I have

already mentioned as *ratified overhearers* and not just as target audience. This is how the sequences of these type can be represented:

1. quote + interrogation + force indicator which introduces the macro argument („în primul rând↑ (revenind către centru, priveşte auditoriul din faţa sa, facând un gest de ridicare a degetului mare al mâinii stângi, marcând forma metalingvistică; în mâna dreaptă ţine crucea de lemn)") + *alethic modality value*: „necessary" (A1, p. 3).

2. Force indicator which introduces the macro argument („în al doilea rând↑ (orientând palma mâinii stângi în sus marchează construcţia metalingvistică prin mişcări sacadate, scurte, pe axa verticală sus-jos)") + interrogation + quote (deontic modality value: „obligativity") + explanation („adică↑") + quote (which sustains the authority of the quoted text before, of the source text: deontic modality value: "obligatory") + explanation („meaning") + *alethic modalities* of the „necessity" of taking the source text as only authority (A1, p. 3).

3. Force indicator which introduces the macro argument („în al trei:lea râ:nd↑ (continuând gestul îndreaptă cele trei degete către auditoriu, mişcând trupul pe axa de adâncime faţă-spate)") + quote (deontic modality: „obligatory") + rhetorical interrogation („de_ce să_le_lărgim?+") + alethic modalities of the necessary („ca să intre: (orientându-se către auditoriul din dreapta sa, face gesturi largi cu palma deschisă a mâinii stângi. cu degetele depărtate, pe axa verticală sus-jos şi orizontală faţă-spate simultan cu mişcări ale trupului pe axa de adâncime faţă-spate, marcând cuvintele) în inima_noastră <R> <F> dum-nezeu↑şi tot omul↑şi tot veacul↑ (orientându-se prin mişcări pe axa orizontală dreapta-centru-stânga-centru, continuând aceleaşi gesturi ale mâinii) cel trecut_cel prezent↓şi viito:r.") (A1, p.4).

We notice that their utterances are often supported by mimic gestures and are prosodic as imperative, but their *interpretation* in discourse, by the preacher, most times, reduces certain deontic modalities of the compulsive ("compulsory") to the alethic modality "necessary" or even at the axiological modality "favorable/unfavorable". It is actually a *strategy of indirection* through which, *the explanation* introduced even through "meaning" or "that" immediately after the quote uttered on an "injunctive" tone will reestablish the initial equilibrium of the discourse. We also note permanent oscillations of the tonality, a discourse with a strong prescriptive-incentive dimension sustained by all three levels of communication: verbal, nonverbal, paraverbal.

Even in the case of paraphrases, the authority of whom is uttering the paraphrased words is always supported and remembered. We note, in the context of occasional sermons utterance that the permanent source remains the sacred, founder text, l'*archétexte* [15, p. 32]: the Gospel. Reporting to the source is made continuously and the discourse of the *institutionalized authority* [8, p. 216] is not just:

1) "Referred discourse" [15, p. 48]: "...această apă duhovnicească spune sfântul_pavel↑+„iz-vorăşte↑din PIAtra cea duhovnicească↑ (marcând emfaza cu mişcări ale mâinii stângi în care ţine crucea de lemn, în timp ce mâna dreaptă este strânsă în pumn) iar piatra cea duhovnicească este hristos."+ (repetând gestul, priveşte către auditoriul din faţa sa, iar pumnul mâinii drepte este aşezat la nivelul pieptului) sau „lărgiţi↑fraţilor şi surorilor_i:nimile voastre↑" (gest ilustrativ prin răsfirarea degetelor mâinii stângi, cu deschiderea palmei şi orietarea sa în sus; mişcând trupul sacadat pe axa de adâncime faţă-

^{spate)}<u>spune sfântul apostol pavel.</u>^(reuneşte degetele în pumn şi revine cu palma deschisă privind către auditoriul din dreapta sa)" (A1, p. 4-5).

2) but, certain sequences manifest as *modalization*, as secondary discourse, in relation to another discourse vested with authority (here we also place the authority of popular wisdom, the authority of the proverb):

"...<u>o rugăciune a unui ma:re părinte↑al bisericii↑din vremea noastră↑+care se ruga nfiecare zi cu următorul cuvânt arată că↑</u>^(repetă gestul orientându-se către auditoriul din stânga sa; mişcări ale palmei pe axa verticală sus-jos)<u>dă mi doamne↑ca poruncile tale↑să fie SINGURA+lege↓</u>^(repetând gestul marchează emfaza cu mişcări scurte pe axa verticală sus-jos)<u>a fiinţei↓şi a vieţii mele</u>"" (A1, p. 4).

The two phenomena are most of the time noted by explicitly using specific formulas. This is also the case of the *proverb* usage in the paraenesis from the Graduation Day where we have the following sequence: "<u>I.P.S Teofan</u> ^(înaintează în partea faţă-centru a dispozitivului 1, ţinând microfonul în mâna dreaptă şi cârja în mâna stângă; pe fundal se aud zgomote şi glasuri specifice evenimentului, în spatele arhiereului se află ceilalţi preoţi) <u><L> <Î> <F> zice o bo⊥o vorbă din popo:r</u>^{↑(privind către grupul de studenţi din dreapta)} <u>că n „totdeauna lucrul tă:u să-l începi cu dumnezeu".</u>"

In the paraenesis held at the Graduation Day, the proverb plays the role of modalizer, that is an argument for a *direct act of requesting attention*: „să-l rugă:m pe dumnezeu^(lăsând privirea în jos) în linişte.^(scurtă reverenţă, întorcându-se către dreapta, se poziţionează în faţa mesei pe care se află obiectele liturgice pentru a începe slujba de mulţumire) (A1, p. 2, first part).

It is actually a request of the most simple and artistic form possible: by proverb. Its pragmatic function results just from its summary character, from the fact that it serves as frame and guarantor of the following discursive acts: „Les proverbes, marqueurs de leur propre provenance, ne sont en fait pas destinés à fournir de l'information par eux-mêmes, mais à servir de cadre et de garant à un raisonnement, développé dans d'autres énoncés" [28, p. 271-289].

The proverb is most often used in discourses of this type as an argument of authority, especially when its illocutionary power is directed towards a heterogeneous audience, as is the case here: the proverb is "...expresie impersonală şi de mare vechime (din bătrâni) înzestrată cu autoritate şi purtătoare de înţelepciune" [20, p. 231] and thereby belongs to those formulae which Philippe Breton calls *common opinions* (opinions communs) framed by common values and places, the broader scope of what the author calls „présupposés communs" producing exactly as in this case an „effet de communauté" [5, p. 54]. These *common places* facilitate the construction of a *univers de referinţă* [*idem*, p. 59]. Through the use of such stereotypic construction in a discourse, unlike the prototypical structures of acts in the language system, one attains several values simultaneously. Thus, besides

the illocutionary value of prescriptives, the proverb here has the value of an „adoucisseur d'incursion" [14, p. 150]; from the relational point of view its use becomes a process of *captation benevolentiae*, but especially a process through which *the agreement* of the audience is obtained. This *agreement* is established through the use of the proverb as a common point of view of the linguistic community to which the preacher belongs and which the latter shares with his audience: the proverbs have a coded meaning and a standardized interpretation. This verbal act will correspond to a nonverbal one, actually with a correction of the posture, an act which the audience will feel as *necessary*, thus the preacher receives an immediate and positive feedback especially from those who recognize the authority of the one making the request, but also the specific ritual of interaction: „Auditoriul (unii studenți participanți fac gestul crucii plecând capetele)".

The agreement, this condition *sine qua non* of addressing a speech of formative role in a context whose parameters are so different from one circumstance to another, becomes equivalent in discourse to the image which the preacher makes about his audience. This image transpiring thus and through discourse is called „representation" [11, p. 64] (because this image represents the image which he makes about his audience, knowing his: preferences, values). Behold in this regard in the paraenesis at the Graduation Day, the adaptation and reporting of the audience is including *intertext* elements with certain *common places* from the Romanian culture in general: "veți ajunge uneori↑+(mișcare scurtă a capului pe axa verticală cu direcția de execuție sus-jos, în sens aprobator)să spuneți precum marele gânditor român_NOIca a spus↑ „SÎNT ceea ce a mai rămas din mine:(îndreptând trupul și privirea către centru-față)după ce m-au desființat cu totul(revenind către dreapta)prietenii și dușmanii mei."(gest al capului, înclinare ușoară către dreapta) <zâmbet> <F> și CHIAR și în aceste situații(mișcare scurtă a capului pe axa verticală cu direcția de execuție sus-jos)să_aveți curaj↑pentru că veți învinge.+(îndreptându-și trupul și privirea către centru-față)"." (A2, p. 3,4).

In the festive context in which the speech is addressed to the audience gathered on the Day of the Graduate, the selection process of the arguments and strategies of their ordering is, of course, made in function of all contextual parameters: the preacher faces an audience (+heterogeneous). It extends to a degree of being amorphous, a crowd. However, both preachers' speeches are from a thematic point of view, in order: focused on students (*targeted overhearers*), on the co-preacher (in turn, *authorized speaker*), on the officials present which will in turn speak and in general on others who are part of the audience (*ratified overhearers*) or not. I mentioned this to emphasize the importance of *communicative and dialogic competence* which the preacher must keep in mind issuing such messages to a wide audience.

If we were to reduce the whole speech to a single *material* supporting the content transmitted towards an audience which approaches by various degrees the proposed topic, in the case of the paraenesis held at Graduation

Day, this would be *the quote*. The dominating prescriptive-incitive of this discursive event transpires in an argumentative complex which crystallizes around a quote initially delivered as the principal axis which frames the other content. The quote, especially as a basis, is manifested as modalization and especially as the object of the agreement of the two planes: with the representative of The Catholic Church (in turn *authorized speaker*, *audience* and also *addressee*) and with the rest of the audience in all its complexity: "pentru a_ntrebuinţa lucrurile: ^(mişcare a trupului şi a privirii pe axa orizontală centru-stânga)învăţate BINE_şi_CORECT^(înclinare uşoară a capului către dreapta)după spusele:unui prelat↑^(mişcare a trupului pe axa orizontală cu direcţia de execuţie stânga-centru, îndepărtând din proximitatea sa către dreapta, cârja arhierească)al bisericii_apusene în timpul bisericii nedespărţite:↑^(mişcări scurte, sacadate ale capului pe axa de execuţie sus-jos, marcând cuvintele, privirea fiind îndreptată către dispozitivul 2)este:necesar să_mpliniţi TREI lucruri↓+^(trupul şi privirea orientate către auditoriul, predominant format din studenţi, din stânga sa)" (A2, p. 3). We have, therefore, as a premise of exhortative sequences that follows, a direct statement of need, a conjunctive which depends on this modalizer: the emphatic expression which is framed in the category of a*lethic* modality, just with modal value "necessary".

Once past the stage of establishing relations and connections between instances of discursive communications through "ritual" acts and expressive acts, to the premises upon which one logically base the discourse, are initiated by indicators which introduce the macro-argument as three large central points, which will be oriented towards the production of a new cognitive equilibrium in the audience held especially towards the actional purpose: to produce changes in their behavior (to train them in action). In this case, the one who issues the message is in a position of authority, and the elements which define the position through the connection with the context of the future actions of the target audience, are expressed just through directive acts, through prescriptions, through promptings, through recommendations. Among the most common modal values, the majority belongs to the conjunctive. This is a particularly valuable mode: when it appears alone the conjunctive has a highly accentuated value (a form very close to what we might call *hortative subjunctive*), in discourse on the other hand, the connection with the other elements leads to an attenuation of that value: in specialty literature one speaks in this way about a *weak conjunctive modalizer* (in dependent syntactic conditions) and a *strong modalizer* (in independent syntactic conditions). Without dwelling on the concerned theory we mention again that: modal meanings are not meanings of the conjunctive, but modal values at which indication, the conjunctive participates in varying degrees [29, p. 87]. We summarize for the time being to identify these two interrelated levels, in the framework of this short discourse but with expressed prescriptive-incitive valences we say, more directly, than in the other cases:

1) ″...s<u>înte</u>ţi chema:ţi^(mişcare scurtă a capului şi privirii pe axa dreapta-centru-dreapta)s<u>ă ntrebuinŢAŢI</u>↑bine^(mişcări scurte ale capului pe axa sus-jos, marcând silabele)şi corect lucrurile_nvăţate↓+^(plecând privirea)″ (A2, p. 3).

2) ″...pe de_o-parte <u>să aveţi CURAJ în faţa greutăţilor vieţii</u>↑<u>care nu vor lipsi</u>↓în faţa voastră...″ (A2, p. 3).

3) ″...s<u>ă aveţi curaj</u>↑*pentru că* <u>veţi învinge</u>.+^(îndreptându-şi trupul şi privirea către centru-faţă)în al doilea râ:nd SĂ NU VĂ LIPSEASCĂ NICIODATĂ DIN VIAŢĂ BUCURIA LUCRURILO:R LĂUNTRICE+^(mişcare a trupului şi privire panoptică pe axa orizontală, cu direcţia de execuţie dreapta-centru-stânga)*căci* <u>fără a avea viaţă interioară</u>↑<u>nu veţi ave:a lumină:şi SENS adevărat în existenţa voastră</u>.^(trupul şi privirea orientate către auditoriul din stânga sa, executând mişcări ale capului pe axa verticală sus-jos)″ (A2, p. 4).

4) ″...şi_n_al_treilea rând↑<u>foarte important</u> în contextul în care ne af⌐găsim↓<u>să fugiţi</u>↑+<u>să evitaţi</u>↑+<u>să dis-preţuiţi</u>↑+PARVENIREA: cu toate manifestările ei↑<u>legate de minciună:</u>↓^(mişcare scurtă a capului pe axa verticală sus-jos, marcând cuvintele)de jurăminte false↓de CUVINTE nerespectate↓şi_aşa mai departe″ (A2, p. 4).

However, the epistemic authority of the preacher is tested here as well through the way in which he knows how to express a content which could attack *the face* of his audience. Therefore *the amplification* plays a very important role. Every decision of the audience to act or not depends, as I have already mentioned, on the reception of the discourse. The amplification and theatricality of the organization of these acts is done verbally, but especially by rhythm and the way they are segmented, all supporting the *spectacular dimension* of the discourse as a whole. The ultimate sequence intentionally segments the conjunctive as a deontic modalizer, with the modal value "forbidden": this is a strong conjunctive modalizer used in the end position, directive and conclusive at the same time. The *climax* is as you can see prepared by the other values which are part of the category of *alethic* modalities (with modal value „necessary") and *axiological* (with modal value "favorable"/"unfavorable"). The axiological values are connected also to the presence of indicators of justifying force "for" and "because", an internal organization of the discourse which favors orientation towards a conclusion which cognitively and emotionally trains the audience: „<L> <J> <S> şi împlinind_aceste TREI lucruri.+^(mişcare scurtă pe axa orizontală cu direcţia de execuţie stânga-centru-dreapta şi revenire)cu:raj_în greutăţi↓bucuria lucrurilor lăuntrice↓+şi fuga de parvenire↓<u>veţi fi biruitori</u>.+^(mişcare scurtă a capului pe axa verticală, sus-jos)înzestraţi_cu_aceste arme:↑<u>veţi avea capacitatea:să nu fiţi ÎNVINŞII acestei vieţi</u>″ (A2, p. 4). On all levels of communication this conclusion restores the initial equilibrium by way of tone and it really builds axiological value, but by organization conditions the future actions of the target audience that outside of the context may take the simple form: "must... because (+positive result)"; future indicative: as a

temporal rift between the production of the text, its decoding and its transformation into action, invests through using its audience, with the responsibility of future decisions.

Conclusions

As the occasional religious discourse targets cognitive and actional modifications of the audience we observe that the dominant tonality, prescriptive-incitive on which I have insisted, transpires and depends on the *semiolinguistic competency* [*idem*, p. 82] of the preacher. It is precisely in this capacity he manipulates the *linguistic matter* which he has available in the circumstances of the discourse. We refer here to the *linguistic competency*: different ways of organizing the linguistic material; to the *situational competency*: which considers the capacity of the social practices of a given community, codified socio-linguistic practices which determine the speech contract and to the *discursive competency* which refers to the number and nature of the activities realized during the communication: discursive strategies with multiple effects. These strategies are ordered and systematized by various logical discursive operators which give order and purpose to the discourse with prescriptive-incitive dominant, to which we add the elements with metadiscursive functions. This framework offers the preacher the possibility to realize through discourse, by various logical, rhetorical and linguistic procedures, certain cognitive and affective modifications in the audience which, through actual manifestation establishes an image over the theme, which Grize calls, "schematizare discursivă" [11, p. 195-199].

Thus in addition to mastering the theme, which represents the central element in the occasional sermon, the preacher can not only urge, instruct, recommend, prescribe a certain behavior, not because it would not enjoy the deontic authority to do so, but because, especially facing a heterogeneous audience, the performance of the act of speaking increases with increasing epistemic authority or its confirmation through discourse. This is because its prescriptive-incitive tonality and even certain directive acts are woven into other niches which sustain the argumentation by "illocution composée" [*apud* 14, p. 158]. Paul W. Taylor, opposes injunctivity to the prescriptivity (although there are studies which have tried to establish textual typologies, this prescriptive text is also called injunctive, called in this way after the macro-act of utterance [19, p. 42]) motivating the following: "To prescribe an act to someone is not to force or compel him to do it. Indeed, prescribing can occur only if the person is free to choose not to do the act prescribed. This condition derives from the fact that prescribing is one way of giving advice, making a recommendation... I contrasted these activities with commanding, ordering and issuing directives... I argued that it is of the essence of giving advice... that the person who receives the advice or guidance be free to

choose not to follow it... a person does not *obey* a prescription. He decides to follow it or carry it out; he adopts it as a guide to his conduct" [31, p. 209].

In the same book, the author describes the act of „prescribing" as a rational act justified by the very reasons by which it is enunciated. Thus, *the pure act of emitting a prescription does not involve the explanation for which the prescribed act must be fulfilled*, but comes more as an advice, a recommendation: „prescribing, like all advising, is a rational act. It presupposes its own justifiability" [*ibidem*]. The author differentiates inside every prescription: the act of prescription (*uttering the sentence*: the act of saying) from the prescribed act (what the sentence is about: *what is said*) [*idem*, p. 212].

The prescriptive-incitive dominant tonality of the occasional religious speech we can, therefore, in the term of textual linguistics, thus justify: the content of a prescriptive text (i.e. *the prescribed act*) is expressed through different means of accomplishment specific of another type of text: the argumentative one.

Notes

[1]The classification of discourse as it is elaborated by the author corresponds with our visions on the opportunity of crossing these two criteria („the mode-use classification") *dominant mode of signifying* (the capacity of signs to offer the receiver a desciption of the object or of the given situation) and the *principal mode of use* (the way in which the message affects the receiver in the sense of the intention of the communication of the issuer). So, according to the first criterion, the discourse may be: *designative* (if it offers a description of the object or of the given situation); *apreciative* (if it offers a description of the subject according to certain values); *prescriptive* (if it indicates to the receiver a desireable mode of behavior). Regarding the second criterion, i.e. in relation to the use, the discourse may be described as: *informative* (if the receiver is informed of the properties of the object); *evaluative* (if the receiver is urged to improve „processing properties" of the object); *incitative* (if it refers to the appreciation of „the properties of satisfaction" of the object); *systemic* (if it concerns the organisation of signs as a means of producing an action).

[2]All the signs classified above complement each other such that the realized combinations succeeds to guide the interpreter's behavior: "...signs in the various modes of signifying complement each other...the prescriptors normally signifying the responses required by something which is identified, designated and appraised". The complex of signs which combine the *identificative mode of signifying* ("identificative mode of signifying") with a sign or signs from which result *other modes of signifying* is in the terminology of the author called *ascriptor* (which corresponds to the sentence). According to the mode of signifying of the dominant signs, the ascriptors may be: *designative ascriptors*; *appraisive ascriptors*; *prescriptive ascriptors*; *formative ascriptors.*

[3]The author delimits conceptually the *argumentative orientation* from the *argumentative dimension*, the latter inherent in many discourses. The category of discourses which have an *argumentative orientation* includes the sermon.

References

Books:

1. Adam J.-M. Linguistique textuelle. Des genres de discours aux textes. Paris: Nathat Université, 1999.

2. Amossy R. L'argumentation dans le discours. 3ᵉ édition. Cursus Lettres. Paris: Armand Colin, 2010.

3. Aramă G. Omiletica. Bucureşti: Editura Imprimeria Independenţei, 1922.

4. Băjău I. L. Omiletică specială. Craiova: Editura Universitaria, 2004.

5. Breton Ph. L'argumentation dans la communication. Paris: La Découverte, 1996.

6. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness, Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

7. Charaudeau P. Langage et discours. Éléments de sémiolinguistique. Paris: Hachette, 1983.

8. Fiske J. Introducere în ştiinţele comunicării (traducere de Monica Mitarcă). Iaşi: Editura Polirom, 2003.

9. Gordon V. Introducere în omiletică. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, 2001.

10. Gordon V. Predica ocazională. Pareneza. Consideraţii teoretice şi exemplificări. Teză de doctorat în teologie. Bucureşti: Editura Institutului Public şi de Misiune al BOR, 2001.

11. Grize J.-Bl. Logique naturelle et communications. Paris: PUF, 1996.

12. Ioan P. Orizonturi logice. Deschideri şi resemnificări în universal actual al formalismelor. Bucureşti: Editura Didactică şi pedagogică, 1995.

13. Kerbrat-Orecchioni C. Les actes de langage dans le discours. Théorie et foctionnement. Cursus (sous la direction de Henri Mitterand). Paris: Armand Colin, 2012.

14. Kerbrat-Orecchioni C. Les actes de langage dans le discours. Théorie et fonctionnement. Cursus (sous la direction de Henri Mittérand). Paris: Armand Colin, 2012.

15. Maingueneau D. Les termes clés de l'analyse du discours. Nouvelle édition revue et augmentée. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2009.

16. Morris Ch. Writings on the General Theory of Signs. Mouton: The Hague, 1971.

17. Morris Ch. Fundamentele teoriei semnelor, traducere din limba engleză şi cuvânt înainte de Delia Marga. Cluj-Napoca: Editura Fundaţiei pentru Studii Europene, 2003.

18. Morris Ch. Signs, Language and Behavior. New York: University of Chicago, Prentice Hall, 1946.

19. Pitar M. Textul injonctiv. Repere teoretice. Timişoara: Excelsior Art, 2007.

20. Pop M., Ruxăndoiu P. Folclor literar românesc. Bucureşti: Editura Didactică şi Pedagogică, 1978.

21. Rovenţa-Frumuşani D. Argumentarea. Modele şi strategii. Bucureşti: Editura BIC ALL, 2000.

22. Sălăvăstru C. Discursul puterii, încercare de retorică aplicată. Iaşi: Institutul European, 1999.

23. Sălăvăstru C. Modele argumentative în discursul educaţional. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 1996.

24. Sălăvăstru C. Raţionalitate şi discurs. Perspective logico-semiotice asupra retoricii. Bucureşti: Editura Didactică şi pedagogică, 1996.

25. Săvulescu S. Retorică şi teoria argumentării. Bucureşti: Editura Comunicare.ro, 2004.

26. Tite Ph. L. Valentinian Ethics and Paraenetic Discourse. Determining the Social Function of Moral Exhortation in Valentinian Christianity. Boston: Brill Leiden, 2009.

27. Vernant D. Du discours à l'action. Études pragmatiques. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1997.

Articles and other studies:

28. Anscombre J.-Cl. Temps linguistique et théorie des topoï. In: Ch. Plantin (éd) Lieux communs, topoï, stéréotypes et clichés. Paris: Kimé, 1994.

29. Borchin M.-I. Valorile modale ale conjunctivului. In: Analele Universităţii de Vest (AUT). Seria „Ştiinţe Filologice", XLV. Timişoara, 2007.

30. Preda R. Patru meditaţii asupra discursului teologic. In: Studii Teologice. XLV. Nr. 3-4, Bucureşti, 1993.

Electronic resources:

31. Taylor P. W. Normative Discourse. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1961. In: Biblioteca virtuală Questia. A part of Gale. Cengage Learning. www.questia.com.

Anexă:

Hoarţă Cărăuşu L. Corpus de limbă română vorbită actuală nedialectală. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza din Iaşi, 2013, p. 60-70: Anexa 1 (A1) Pareneză la Sfinţirea Apei (Bototează).