

Journal of Humanistic *and* Social Studies



J  SS

Editor-in-chief

FLORICA BODIȘTEAN

Editorial board

ADRIANA VIZENTAL
ADELA DRĂUCEAN
ALINA-PAULA NEMȚUȚ
BIANCA MIUȚA
NICOLAE SELAGE

Graphic design

CĂLIN LUCACI

Advisory board

Acad. Prof. LIZICA MIHUȚ, PhD, "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad
Acad. Prof. MARIUS SALA, PhD, "Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti" Linguistic Institute
Prof. LARISA AVRAM, PhD, University of Bucharest
Prof. TRAIAN DINOREL STANCIULESCU, PhD, "Al. I. Cuza" University of Iași
Prof. IOAN BOLOVAN, PhD, "Babeș-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca
Assoc. Prof. SANDU FRUNZĂ, PhD, "Babeș-Bolyai" University of Cluj-Napoca
Prof. IONEL FUNERIU, PhD, "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad
Prof. FLOREA LUCACI, PhD, "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad
Prof. MONICA PONTA, PhD, "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad
Prof. CORNELIU PĂDUREAN, PhD, "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad

Address

Str. Elena Drăgoi, nr. 2, Arad
Tel. +40-0257-219336
e-mail: bodisteanf@yahoo.com, adeladraucean@yahoo.com

ISSN 2067 - 6557

Faculty of Humanistic and Social Sciences of "Aurel Vlaicu" University, Arad

Journal of Humanistic *and* Social Studies



J  S S

Year I, No. 2/2010

CONTENTS

Research Articles

THEORY, HISTORY AND LITERARY CRITICISM / 7

I. L. Caragiale. Theme and Variations, Adela Drăucean / 9

The Angry Young Men, Odetta Manuela Belei / 17

Defining Aspects of the Character in Grammars of Story Telling,
Maria Laura Rus / 31

*The Fictional Woman vs. the Real-World Woman in
Cervantes' **Don Quixote***, Florica Bodiştean / 39

LINGUISTICS, STYLISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES / 53

Present-Day Tendencies in the Romanian Language, Rodica Zafiu / 55

*Actul comunicativ din perspectivă discursiv-pragmatică. Modalizarea
în limba română contemporană*, Lizica Mihuţ, Bianca Miuţa / 69

Meaning, Image and Attitude (I), Adriana Vizental / 77

*Modalităţi expresive de redare a gradării superlative prin supin în
limba română*, Alina-Paula Nemţuţ / 89

A Theoretical Approach to Telicity, Claudia Leah / 99

*The Functional Principle in **Gramatica Limbii Române (Grammar of
the Romanian Language – GALR)***, Simona Redeş / 109

SEMIOTICS, HERMENEUTICS, AESTHETICS / 121

Logical Principles and Logos, Florea Lucaci / 123

The Phenomenology of Critical Thinking in Literature,
Dumitru Mărcuș / 139

REVIEW ARTICLES / 149

Basarab Nicolesco: le quotidien comme un miracle,
Radu Ciobotea / 151

*Cel de-al treilea om și etica responsabilității: Sandu Frunză, Dumne-
zeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel*, Florea Lucaci / 155

JESS

THEORY, HISTORY AND LITERARY CRITICISM

JESS

I. L. Caragiale. Theme and Variations

Adela Drăucean

Abstract:

Analyzing Caragiale's work, a so called "unity in variety" can be noticed and his entire creation may be named after one of his sketches, *Plot and variations*. Since the fire on Dealul Spirii, a real story, had been given five different interpretations by the local media, so must we understand Caragiale's literary pieces: they have a "plot", i.e. the society, and several "variants" (forms), i.e. the events or happenings of all kinds.

As an urban writer, Caragiale was preoccupied with the town and its very life, but also with folk themes and motifs. He also described the countryside with its scenery, inns and innkeepers, the places where people used to meet and talk. Trades and their professions were presented in his sketches and stories, too.

Keywords: plot, variation, realism, customs, trades, satire

An analysis of Caragiale's work, from comedies to sketches and from short stories to fairy tales, allows us to talk about the unity in the variety of his writing and name it according to the author's creation: *Temă și variațiuni (Plot and variations)*. Just like the fire, a real story, was given five different interpretations by the media, so must we understand Caragiale's work, i.e. it has a "plot" – the society, which is presented in different "variations" – forms:

Aseară, pe la 6 ore, un foc a izbucnit la o casă peste drum de cazarma Cuza în Dealul Spirii. Mulțumită activității pompierilor și soldaților, focul, deși bătea un vânt puternic, a fost năbușit în câteva minute. Pagubele nu prea sunt însemnate.¹

Foremost, Caragiale's fairy tales and short stories and his drama called

1 Last night at 6:00 o'clock, a fire broke out at a house across the street from the barracks on the Cuza Spirii Hill. Although a strong wind was blowing, thanks to the firefighters and soldiers, they succeeded to extinguish the fire. Damages are not very important. [*All translations are my own*]

Năpasta (The Bane) as well show a large interest in folk themes and motifs. Being an urban writer par excellence, Caragiale used to evoke the town life, with its carriages torn off, officials late for lunch, people coming from the railway station, streets, hot afternoon hours, fashionable guest halls, breweries where politics was discussed, aligning thus to ironical realist novelists. But his realism, as Garabet Ibrăileanu states, is a culmination of critical spirit in Wallachia (Ibrăileanu, 1984: 343), by depicting some prototypes and social hypostases such as the lust for power.

We are tempted to say that this critical realism can be found in dramas and sketches, but we can also find it in the world of fairy tales and short stories, which are based on folkloric prototypes. A good example is the emperor from the tale *Mamă (The Mother)*, who is preoccupied with politics: “În sfârșit, așa a hotărât politica măriei-sale împăratului, așa am hotărât eu – așa trebuie să se facă!”². The king’s politics refers to the alliance with other neighboring courts through Florea the waivode’s marriage. Even the dark realm is governed by a policy: “politica împărăției noastre cere ca să știm tot, fără greșală, îndoială”³ (*Kir Ianulea*), for which he sends a representative on earth. Both the earthling king and the king of darkness, like most of Caragiale’s heroes, are concerned about politics. It is a less appreciated field in Caragiale’s work.

In the stories and tales of the last two decades we can find a certain atmosphere, certain typologies and happenings. If the city had been his favorite place for a long period of time, the writer is now attracted by the countryside scenery. The latter is not an enclosed space as it is with Creangă, it opens to the city. This accounts for his preferences: inns – *La conac (At the Mansion)*, *La hanul lui Mânjoală (At Mânjoală’s Inn)* or crossroads – *Calul dracului (Devil’s Horse)*, i.e. places where people from different regions can meet and “chat”.

We can notice the characters have the urge to be in the crowd, as do those in sketches, considering Sunday “the ugliest day”: “[...] I’ve been walking for an hour to meet a friend but it seems as if everyone had vanished” – *Repausul duminical (A Sunday’s Rest)*. The fabulous land of the fairy tale introduces the trades. If those occupations are not presented, they are introduced by words peculiar to some crafts or professions. In stories like *Norocul culegătorului (Fieldhand’s Luck)*, *La Hanul lui Mânjoală (At Mânjoală’s Inn)*, *Partea poetului (The Poet’s Share)*, *Kir Ianulea*, *O invenție mare (A Big Invention)*, the romance templates are

2 At last, I choose as His Highness the King wishes, this is how I decide – this must be done.

3 Our policy requires that the kingdom has to know everything, without error or doubt.

almost absorbed by the realistic narration of events.

The inn being a meeting place, the innkeeper or the hostess has an important role in the plot. The innkeepers know all the news, so through their spread they can change destinies. Merchants are another well represented category in Caragiale's work. In *Poveste. Imitație (Story. Imitation)*, they gather at a fair to bring "all the rich goods from the four parts of the world, the relish and cures". And Ianulea creates himself a mercantile image in front of the mortals:

Nu-ți mai spui câte și mai câte am pățimit, prin atâtea depărtări, pe mări și pân țări, cu fiarele, și, încă mai grozave, cu oamenii!... Destul să-ți spui că, încet-încet, m-am chivernisit cumsecade, ajungând să am o stare destul de bună pe potriva mea... Am învățat, cât am colindat pân lume, purtările cele frumoase; știu destule limbi străine – încai despre a rumânească, pot zice, fără să mă laud, că o știu cu temei; măcar că de viță sunt arvanit și nu prea am învățat buche, dar, drept să-ți spun, la asta nu mă dau pe nici un rumân, fie cât de pricopsit cărturar. Îmi plac cu deosebire limba și lumea de-aici, și, așa, fiindcă m-am săturat de atâtea primejdii ale călătoriilor, de atâta bătaie de cap și de inimă ale negoțului, am venit să m-așez aici, în Valahia, la București; să mă bucur în isihie de rodul îndelungatei mele trude...⁴ (*Kir Ianulea*)

Caragiale deeply understands the realism of the Romanian folklore, in which the dreamlike and mysterious atmosphere alternates with segments of reality and psychological insights. Following the essential features of the folklore, the author insists on humor and irony hidden between the lines, but also on the realistic substratum of facts. The writer always vacillates between reality and fantasy, which makes his fairy tales and stories turn into real novellas.

Borrowing some folk episodes, combining reality with fantasy, the author of *Kir Ianulea* gives life to typical characters. The devil's incident is just that fantastic element, having a secondary role, meant to mystify the real world of mortals. Although it has a foreign model as starting point, it is adapted. Niccolo Machiavelli's characters from *Belfagor*, not found in the Romanian folk mentality, become the devils in *Kir Ianulea* who build up "from the smallest to the biggest" at the Dardarot's command and the imposing "arcidiavolo Belfagor" becomes the deuced *Aghiuiță*.

4 I won't tell you how much I suffered through many journeys, by sea and land, against the beasts, and even greater against men!... Enough to tell you that, little by little, I became well endowed with riches and status... As I wandered I learned the ways of the world, I know many languages – the Romanian language, I can say without boast, that I know it well, though my roots are Albanian and I'm not much of a scholarly person, but if I think about it, no Romanian scholar can beat me. I love the language and the people here, and so, because I've had many dangers on the road, many problems because of the trade, I've come to sit here in Wallachia, in Bucharest, to taste the fruit of my work...

The “deuced Aghiuță” being embodied in the honorable Kir Ianulea the merchant, we get into Bucharest and taste the life of late 18th and early 19th century, in an oriental atmosphere, given by costumes, picturesque naming, Fanariot customs and habits. Assuming the role of a famous merchant who travelled to Thessaloniki, Constantinople and Iafa, the devil turns into “a smart, gentle, mannered rich man, a great connoisseur of the world”: “levent și galanton, pătruns de filotimie și de hristoitie”, a true man of honor.

Kir Ianulea, living in Wallachia, puts in at the inn, as other travelers do, the place where he could hear the news. Soon he will settle in good houses “with many rooms for masters and servants, fresh air, with a garden and a fountain in the courtyard [...] finally, everything a merchant needs” in the “merchants’ slum”. The local color is given not only by the house architecture, but also by the characters’ nature. The former devil manages to spread rumors about his wealth through Kera Marghioala “an old and ugly harridan” who recalls the old women from *Gura satului* (*The Gossipmongers*), one of Slavici’s short stories. Thanks to her, he will be accepted into the merchants’ gang and soon he will find a wife, Acrivița, the daughter of Hagi Cănuță Toptangiul.

Once married, Ianulea’s life changes, the ordeal of cohabitation begins, as his wife organizes “jamborees and feasts” where they play “otusbir, ghiordum, and stos”. Such indulgences will quickly drain his chest full of treasures and soon Ianulea, the usurer, borrows from others. Remaining “penniless”, the merchant runs away from the creditors, sneaking “by the mitropoly on the left” to the “Filaret field” and then climbing “to the Silver Knife”. By their names and location, the places where the fugitive finds escape offer us an image of the quarters in which Kera and Kir lived.

A series of figures, jobs and names characteristic for this era are meant to complete the fresco of the social and historical atmosphere. “The cupbearer Iordache from Dudești”, “the squire Tarsița”, “Agop, the tobacconist from the saints”, “Avedic, the sexton from the Armenian Church”, “Ilie, the mercer from Bărăție”, “Ristache, the pan-piper from Ploiești”, “Zamfirache, the oilman from Colentina” or “Tacor, the coffee seller from Caimata”, who sells “rouge and hair mug” etc.

Following Kir Ianulea’s savior, a man called Negoită, we reach the authorities of the time. The devil, which is in human flesh, rewards his benefactor by giving him the power to heal the possessed, which is in fact an agreement between the devil and Negoită. And so, the chubby, fat gyp heals the surrogate’s wife from Craiova, who had called in vain the doctors from Sibiu, paid a lot of money for many prayers and saint ceremonies

read by the prelate and the bishops. As a reward, Negoiață receives an estate “with a record” and the ruler turns him eventually into a boyar by giving him a lot of money. The morals of the court are typically Fanariot. Greeting the healer right on top of the stairs, the ruler welcomes him in Greek, as the squires used to be greeted, takes him into the waiting room where the ill mistress sits down on a carpet. At the royal dinner, Negoiață sits by the rank and fashion, while the band is singing for the craftsmen and the rabble by the window.

Unlike *Kir Ianulea*, in *Abu-Hasan* the environment isn't vernacular anymore; it remains a prototypical one, Baghdad during the time of Caliph Harun al Rashid. The oriental atmosphere is provided by the details of the costumes and the descriptions of the house, but they are summarized as in folklore. These details bring you into a world of silk and decorations, making you think of *The Arabian Nights*, of a continuing story. Caliph's palace is adorned “with large pots of gold, silk curtains and woven carpets”, with “scarlet velvet woven in gold and pearls” and lit by “seven heavy gold chandeliers with seven candlesticks”. However, the main character is a “gossiper” from Bucharest, cleared out of Caragiale's sketches, best known by his verbal tics: “I'll learn them all, you know, that there is no place to disrupt the slumdogs' life, you know!”.

Moreover, the author didn't lose any opportunity to satirize certain social issues, both common and characteristic of Romanian realities of that time: the coalition of clergy and district authorities in order to intrigue and sow discord between citizens. Such a piece of work made Nicolae Manolescu say “this eastern fantasy” is “a real art jewel of the story” (Manolescu, 2008: 434).

In Caragiale's work we don't come across extensive ethnographic scenes as in Slavici's creations, but we do find references about certain traditions and customs. In *Cănuță, om sucit* (*Cănuță, the Loony*) there are some images of three important moments in human life, but also details about the practice of unearthing and re-inhuming somebody after seven years:

A trebuie vreme până s-o deștepte, până să se îmbrace femeia, până să se urce-n brișcă. Copilul a așteptat cât a așteptat și, până să-și piarză răbdarea mă-sa care se văita cumplit, și-a pierdut-o el p-a lui și s-a repezit așa fără socoteală în lume, tocmai când s-auzeau clopoțeii de la brișca lui tată-său la scară.

Peste vreo patru săptămâni, a venit vremea să-l boteze: Radu, Răducanu, Cănuță – fără praznic la călindar. După ce s-a lăpădat de trei ori de Satana nașu-său pentru el, popa satului a luat copilul în mâni și l-a vârât odată în cristelniță: *În numele Tatălui!*... copilul a răbdut; pe urmă înc-odată: ... *ș-al Fiului!*... copilul a-nceput să urle de apă rece parcă-l băga în foc; iar când l-a vârât a treia oară: ...*ș-al sfântului Duh!*... copilul

s-a smucit dintre degetele popii ca o vârlugă, și a scăpat în fundul cristelniței. Popa a scos mâinile goale din apă, iar nașa a început să țipe”, „Ducând viață destul de grea, i-a venit și lui ceasul, și s-a însurat ca toată lumea. L-a înșelat la început soacră-sa, nu i-a dat zestrea făgăduită – el a zis și n-a prea zis ceva. L-a înșelat nevasta întâia oară – el a zis prea puține”, „L-au îngropat a doua zi ca pe toți morții. La șapte ani, i-au făcut după obicei parastas ca să-i scoată oasele și să i le spele. Era de față la slujbă nevasta și câteva rude. Când au dat groparii de coșciugul lui și i-au ridicat binișor capul putred, ce să vezi! În loc să stea oasele lui Cănuță de-a lungul și cu fața-n sus, hârca sta-n sus cu ceafa și țurloaiile erau pornite către grătarul coastelor.

– Țsta n-a fost mort bine când l-au îngropat, a zis popa.

– Aș! a răspuns femeia. M-aș fi mirat, Dumnezeu să-l ierte, să-l găsească la loc... Sfinția ta nu l-ai cunoscut pe răposatul Cănuță... om sucit!⁵

These references to baptism, weddings and the seven years of commemoration are made to demonstrate the extravagance of the character from the very birth, but also beyond death. In the story *Păcat (Shame)*, for highlighting the priest and his wife's turmoil when the child Mitu is taken ill, allusions to two customs are made – the burial and the incantation:

Femeia sta tot deșteaptă lângă bolnav, care dormea de o zi și mai bine. Ea puse mâna pe obrazul copilului – rece; aplecă urechia la gura lui deschisă – nimic!

– Scoal', părinte! țipă ea îngrozită... Nu mai suflă!

Omul sări în picioare, luă băiatul în brațe și fugi în curte strigând:

– Săriți, oameni buni! săriți!

Se arată peste culmea dealului soarele... O mulțime de bărbați și mai ales de femei se strânse. Preotul pusese copilul țepăn pe prispă și-l bocea în genunchi... O femeie

5 We needed time for her to wake up, to get dressed, to climb up in the chaise. The child waited for a while and waited until he lost his patience before his mother, who was whining, and so he rushed without thinking just when they heard the bells on his father's chaise.

In four weeks time, it was time to baptize him: Radu, Răducanu, and Canuță – without the ordinary feast. After his godfather let go of the power of Satan three times, the village priest took the child in anger and pushed him into the water, *In the name of the Father!*... the child endured. Then he was pushed once again, *the Son!*... because of the cold water the child started to scream as if it was fire and when the priest submerged the child the third time, ... *and the Holy Spirit!*... the child jerked between the priest's fingers and escaped to the bottom of the bucket. The priest had nothing in his hands and the god-mother began to scream". "Having a life quite difficult, he got married just like everyone else, when his time came. At the begging, his mother-in-law deceived him by not giving him his promised dowry, of course he did not say anything. After that, his wife cheated on him, but he remained untouched. They buried him the next day like an ordinary man. After seven years, they did the requiem to remove the bones and wash them. At the ceremony came his wife and a few relatives. When the gravediggers reached the coffin and got up his rotten head, they had a great surprise! The bones were in a different order than they had to be, mixed in an awkward position, upside down!

– He wasn't dead when he was buried, the priest said.

Oh! She said. I would be surprised, God forgive him, to find him in the same place... Your Holiness never met Cănuță... the crazy man!

ținea lumânarea.

Dar nu-i mort încă... Un descântec cu apă neîncepută... Copilul pare că mișcă... îl ridică de mijloc încetinel...⁶

In the story *La hanul lui Mânjoală (At Mânjoală's Inn)* more aspects about beliefs in magical spells occur. Once stepped in the inn, the young man “notices a smell of apples and quince”, and in addition it was warm “as if under the wing of a hen”. Wanting to bow, he can’t spot any icon and when he traces the sign of the cross with his right hand upon his forehead and chest, as customs require, he hears a strange noise, thinking he stepped on an old tomcat, which was under the table. Madame Marghioala lets the cat seep through the door and the wind puts out the light. During these events, a storm breaks out and the innkeeper begs her guest to stay. The image of bewitching the hat is subtly introduced: “the woman, lost in her thoughts, sat on the bed with my hat in her hands, swinging it up and down”. This act proves to have taken effect when the young man was travelling: “the hat was squeezing my head like a jaw”, “a throbbing pain roared through my chest”.

These definitions foretell the preparation for the confrontation with dark forces, when they take the shape of a goat and stop his horse: “the steed was trembling and shivering as if overwhelmed by the chills of death”. After this encounter, he will get back to the inn. Caragiale, inspired by folk beliefs, reminds us that malefic things can be dispelled by prayer and fasting. The bridegroom will escape from the inn with the help of his father-in-law, and will be taken to an abbey for “40 days of fast, worship and benediction”. Calling up superstitions, I. L. Caragiale states that, by repentance and Christian life, one is saved from temptation.

Through these late works Caragiale meant to offer his readers “simple explanations about strictly literary relations between the local, apparently fortuitous, the transient and the commonly human, generally valid; just like he represented them in his whole artistic creation” (Munteanu, 1980: 546).

6 The woman sits next to the sick boy, though he was sleeping for more than a day. She touched his cheek – cold, she bent over to hear his breathing coming from the opened mouth – nothing!

– Wake up, Father! She shouted... He is not breathing anymore!

The man jumped up, took the boy in his arms and ran into the yard screaming:

– Help, folks! Help!

The sun appeared over the hill... A crowd of men and many women got close. The priest put the stiff child on the porch and began to pray... A woman was holding a candle. However, he is not dead yet... Maybe an incantation and some holly water would do... The child seems to move... He gently raises the boy...

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Caragiale, Ion Luca, *Opere*, vol. I–IV (I. *Proză literară*, II. *Teatru. Scrieri despre teatru. Versuri*, III. *Publicistică*, IV. *Correspondență*), ediție îngrijită și cronologie de Stancu Ilin, Nicolae Bârna, Constantin Hîrlav, prefață de Eugen Simion, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2000, 2001, 2002.
- Călinescu, G., *Caragiale sau vârsta modernă a literaturii*, București, Editura Albatros, 1976.
- Cioculescu, Șerban, *Caragialiana*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1987.
- Derșidan, Ioan, *Nordul caragialian*, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2003.
- Ibrăileanu, Garabet, *Spiritul critic în cultura românească*, București, Editura Minerva, 1984.
- Iorgulescu, Mircea, *Eseu despre lumea lui Caragiale*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1988.
- Iosifescu, Silvian, *Dimensiuni caragialiene*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1972.
- Iosifescu, Silvian, *Momentul Caragiale*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963.
- Manolescu, Florin, *Caragiale și Caragiale. Jocuri cu mai multe strategii*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1983.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Istoria critică a literaturii române. 5 secole de literatură*, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2008.
- Munteanu, George, *Istoria literaturii române. Epoca marilor clasici*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1980.
- Negrea, Gelu, *Dicționar subiectiv al personajelor lui I. L. Caragiale (A–Z)*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 2005.
- Oprea, Ștefan, *Caragiale, orator politic sau Caragiale, personaj caragialean*, în „Dacia literară”, nr. 72 (3/2007), mai 2007, p. 23–24.
- Pârvulescu, Ioana, *În Țara Miticilor*, București, Editura Humanitas, 2007.
- Petreu, Marta, *Filosofia lui Caragiale*, București, Editura Albatros, 2003.
- Vodă Căpușan, Maria, *Despre Caragiale*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1982.
- Zalis, Henri, *I. L. Caragiale*, București, Editura Recif, 1995.

Adela Drăucean is lecturer at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad, tenured for the courses on Literary Folklore and Romanian Literature. She has published in the collective volume *Iceni ai modernității* (2008), and in specialised journals from Arad, Timișoara, Oradea and Craiova.

The Angry Young Men

Odetta Manuela Belei

Abstract:

The “angry young men” were a group of mostly working and middle class British playwrights and novelists who became prominent in the 1950s. The group’s leading members included John Osborne and Kingsley Amis. The phrase was originally coined by the Royal Court Theatre’s press officer to promote John Osborne’s *Look Back in Anger*. It is thought to be derived from the autobiography of Leslie Paul, founder of the *Woodcraft Folk*, whose *Angry Young Men* was published in 1951. Following the success of the Osborne play, the label was later applied by British newspapers to describe young British writers who were characterized by disillusionment with traditional English society. The term was always imprecise, began to have less meaning over the years as the writers to whom it was originally applied became more divergent, and many of them dismissed the label as useless.

Keywords: Movement, 1950s

The 1950’s in Britain saw the emergence of two literary movements, the so called “Movement” and the “Angry Young Men” movement. Controversies regarding whether or not these two rightly deserve such a label or not persist until today, with some arguing that the “Movement” and the “Angry Young Men” in particular possessed none of the traits of what is traditionally viewed as an artistic or literary grouping, and that in fact both were artificial creations, the products of publicity and external factors, lacking a manifesto or a proper literary programme. Certainly most of the “angries” would agree with such a statement. On the other hand, there are those who claim that although the movements did not have a clear program, there existed nevertheless a common view with respect to writing, to what the material for a novel should be and also an anti-modernist attitude and a return to more traditional approaches to writing fiction. Having taken this into consideration, it must also be stated that the “Movement” came

closer to what one might call a literary movement, basically because of the fact that its main protagonists, Kingsley Amis, Philip Larkin and John Wain, John Osborne were bound by friendship and the dynamics of the relationship between them facilitated influences and proved benefic for their careers and their development as writers.

John Wain, Man of Letters

Another notable appearance at Oxford was John Wain. Three years younger than Larkin and Amis, he came from an upper-class family and was determined to assert himself both academically and as a writer. He first met Larkin and, given his own aspirations, was impressed by his self-determination and effort put in edifying his literary reputation: “he was important to me... His literary self-training had already begun and had already borne some fruit; and this, combined with his quietness, his slight stammer, and [perhaps] the impression of giant intelligence produced by the fact of his having a large dome-like head and wearing very thick glasses, all helped to make him ‘the college writer’” (Carpenter, 2002: 42).

Larkin’s image as a “Flaubertian saint of letters” persisted even after his departure from Oxford and created around him a tight group that would meet whenever he reappeared at the university during the weekends. Amis naturally participated in these meetings and on such occasion he and Wain met. He wrote: “My first casual meeting with him came about because we were both, so to speak, swimming in the thin fluid that solidified only when Philip Larkin arrived” (Carpenter, 2002: 42). Amis resented Wain for his notable academic achievements such as receiving a junior fellowship at St John’s and co-editing the literary periodical *Mandrake*, often taking satisfaction in Wain’s occasional misfortunes. In a letter to Larkin, Amis wrote: “John Wain was in a minor car smash recently and was cut rather badly about the forehead. I am glad”. Al Alvarez, a friend and protégé of Wain’s, recounts that being Wain’s friend “was a tricky business” and that he was “a man without much modesty who sincerely believed he was a great genius and would tolerate no one he couldn’t patronize” (Leader, 2007: 361). Nevertheless, he played a crucial role in Amis’s rise to literary notoriety and substantially promoted his work. Also Wain’s efforts towards building a literary and academic career influenced and determined Amis to take conclusive steps in the same directions. He recalled that it was Wain who “pushed me in the academic direction myself, inciting me to go for my First, pointing me towards a provincial college lectureship and away from the suburban schoolmaster’s job I had vaguely envisaged” (Carpenter, 2002: 43). Conversely, Wain recalls that he “caught the virus” of writing

novels after having read samples of Amis's work in progress, *The Legacy*: "When a few years later I sat down... to 'see if' I could write a novel, Amis's example was certainly one of my motives. He had made it seem... simple and natural to be trying to shape one's day-to-day reactions to life into fiction. I'm quite certain that I would never have written *Hurry on Down* without the example of that first, undergraduate novel of Amis's" (Carpenter, 2002: 42).

The year 1953 marked a turning point for Wain's career both as a writer and as an intellectual. After three years of work on his first novel, he finally finished it and also managed to find a publisher. However the most important event was the offer he received from the BBC third programme to edit and introduce a revamped version of the New Soundings radio programme. Disappointed by John Lehmann for his failure to discover new writers and present them on his show, the third programme decided to replace him with Wain. He immediately accepted seeing this as "a chance to move a few of the established reputations gently to one side and allow new people their turn, people whose view of what should be attempted was roughly the same as my own" (Carpenter, 2002: 45) and decided to call the programme *First Reading*. At the beginning of the first programme of *First Reading*, Wain included a reading of an excerpt from Amis's novel *Lucky Jim*. This initiative immediately attracted criticism and, in a way, kindled a sort of awareness that a new generation of young writers is slowly but surely emerging and with them a new literary hero is ready to take centre stage. Hugh Massingham, radio and television critic of the "New Statement", greeted the first programme with a sort of uneasy anticipation of what the consequences of change brought about by the new writers might be, without realizing that their intentions were far less radical and that they lacked any real focus in such a direction: "Mr. Wain's implication, I think, is fairly clear. Our brave new world is over at last and the old fogies can be led off to the slaughterhouse... Mr. Wain and his fledglings can move in and establish the new dispensation" (Carpenter, 2002: 15).

With the publication of *Hurry on Down* and *Lucky Jim*, this awareness of an impending change that was going to be implemented on the literary scene and perhaps beyond it by the new young writers grew more acute. The members, willing or not, of this new generation that was now threatening to become a movement, had to be identified and described. Their goals, views and the substance of the literary hero they proposed had to be carefully studied and discerned.

Parallels were drawn between the central characters of Amis's novel *Lucky Jim* and Wain's *Hurry on Down*. Beside the more obvious common

traits and similar themes in the two novels, such as the characters' preoccupation with jobs and earning a living, as well as their resentment towards social classes and their efforts towards freeing themselves from the constraints of such a system, some critics noted that the new hero, as characterized in these two novels, signals an emerging *Zeitgeist*:

A new hero has risen among us... He is consciously, even conscientiously, graceless. His face, when not dead-pan, is set in a snarl of exasperation. He has one skin too few, but his is not the sensitiveness of the young man in earlier twentieth-century fiction: it is the phoney to which his nerve-ends are tremblingly exposed, and at the least suspicion of the phoney he goes tough. He is at odds with his conventional university education, though he comes generally from a famous university: he has seen through the academic racket as he sees through all the others (Carpenter, 2002: 75).

“The New Statesman” critic, Walter Allen, who wrote these lines, was referring to Jim Dixon, but also added: “In fiction I think he first arrived last year as the central character of Mr. Wain’s *Hurry on Down*” (Carpenter, 2002: 75). In his book *The Angry Years*, Colin Wilson also notes about Wain’s novel that: “...it seems to embody the ideas that would later be regarded as typical of the Angry Young Men. Lumley’s explosion in the first chapter about his girlfriend’s petit bourgeois parents might have been put into the mouth of Osborne’s Jimmy Porter. This also applies to his tirade against the standards and values of a crowd of right-wing ex-rugby types he encounters at a party thrown by one of the junior doctors, from which he is forcibly ejected” (Wilson, 2007: 49). Of course much of the parallels drawn between the two protagonists were superficial and strained but nevertheless they contributed to establishing the new literary hero who was supposed to reflect a certain social reality specific to that period and also embody the complexities, angst and aspirations of the younger generation. What most reviewers overlooked in their haste to point to the symptoms of a new state of affairs was the substantial reliance of the fictional characters’ eccentricities and attitudes on the author’s own subjective experiences and options. And this had far less to do with the creator’s sensitivity to the changes in society, changes far less radical than one might think, than with their own peculiarities and traits. This is something that later reviews would highlight.

Slowly but consistently, the feeling that a new group of writers was emerging started to spread through the London literary community, as reflected in a review by Anthony Hartley, who had been a student at Oxford and was slightly acquainted with Amis, Wain and Larkin. The review appeared in January 1954, a month after *Lucky Jim*’s publication and in it Amis was identified as one of a group of young poets called the “University

Wits". A few weeks later Amis remarked to Larkin that he had been "flanked by you and Alvarez" in an edition of a BBC Third Programme series called *New Poetry*, and he added: "There's no doubt, you know, we are getting to be a movement, even if the only people in it we like apart from ourselves are each other" (Wilson, 2007: 49). Hartley further attempted to more exactly identify this movement in another article published in the "Spectator" on 27 August 1954. The article was called "Poets of the Fifties" and in it Hartley named Amis, Larkin and Wain among those he considered to be developing a new poetic voice that he described as being "'dissenting' and non-conformist, cool, scientific and analytical". He also characterized their style as being an "elimination of richness, of dryness pushed to the point of aridity", and although he warned of the dangers inherent to such a style he nevertheless concluded that they amounted to "the only considerable movement in English poetry since the thirties".

The transition from a circumscribed group of young writers who seemed to share certain aesthetic preferences to a full-grown literary movement with well-defined principles was the work of J. D. Scott. In 1954 he was editing the "Spectator's" literary pages and according to his own account it was the paper's disappointing sales that determined him to begin looking for something that could become sensational, given that a proper strategy was applied to it: "The circulation was not behaving as it should and one day in the autumn, the editor, Walter Taplin, gave the staff a pep-talk. What could we do to liven things up...? Sensational journalism: not an easy product for a literary editor, whose main job is to arrange for reviews; you can review sensational books in a sensational way, but what can you do if people are not producing sensational books? Well, you can look again to see whether those already in your hands are not capable of generating a deeper or more widespread interest" (Leader, 2000: 375). He also remembers that after reading Anthony Hartley's article on "Poets of the Fifties", he decided to take this supposed literary movement and "see how far it extended beyond poetry, and specifically into the novel, and to consider the extent to which it represented some historic change in society. Two of the poets named in 'Poets of the Fifties' had then recently published first novels; Kingsley Amis's *Lucky Jim* and John Wain's *Hurry on Down*. Not very much, but I used it as the basis for my attempt" (Leader, 2000: 375).

The result of this attempt was an article entitled "In the Movement" and published unsigned in "Spectator" on 1 October 1954. According to Scott, it was "designed to grab the attention of any casual reader... on his way from the political pages ["The end of Bevanism?"] to the financial column

[“Sterling Convertibility Deferred”]” and was consequently “written in a tone brisk, challenging and dismissive” (Carpenter, 2002: 79). In the article Scott points to three novels as representative of the Movement: John Wain’s *Hurry on Down*, Kingsley Amis’s *Lucky Jim*, and Irish Murdoch’s *Under the Net* and further attempts to highlight its basic characteristics as evident from the three literary works mentioned: “It is bored by the despair of the Forties, not much interested in suffering, and extremely impatient of poetic sensibility, especially poetic sensibility, about the writer and society. So it’s goodbye to all those rather sad little discussions about ‘how the writer ought to live’”, and its goodbye to the Little Magazine and “experimental writing”. The Movement, “as well as being anti-phoney, is anti-wet; skeptical, robust, ironic, prepared to be as comfortable as possible in a wicked, commercial, threatened world which doesn’t look, anyway, as if it’s going to be changed much by a couple of handfuls of young English writers” (Carpenter, 2002: 80). The impact of the article was powerful and it immediately triggered reactions. Nevertheless, Amis was not very enthusiastic about the whole “Movement” idea. Two weeks after the publication of Scott’s article he wrote to Larkin: “Well, what a lot of bullshit all that was in the Spr about the new movt. Etc. Useful up to a point, but the point is nearly here, I feel...” (Carpenter, 2002: 80).

In a further attempt to emphasize the historical validity of the Movement and also to capitalize on the publicity stir created by Scott’s article, two anthologies of poetry were published in 1955 and 1956 respectively. The first was D. J. Enright’s collection entitled *Poets of the 1950s* which included poems by Amis, Larkin, Wain, Davie, Elizabeth Jennings, Enright himself, John Holloway and Robert Conquest. The second was an anthology edited by Robert Conquest called *New Lines* which published the same writers with the addition of Thomas Gunn.

During the early and mid fifties the London stage was faced with an acute lack of originality and freshness in its plays. In a round up of the plays of 1954, Anthony Hartley wrote in the “Spectator”: “appalled by the lack of standards among those fabricating material for actors and actresses to perform. It is not easy to recall one English play in this last year which even suggested that there might be a new playwright behind it ... The [lading playwrights] of 1954 were, of course, Charles Morgan and Christopher Fry... It seems to be the fact that the best writers... are... not concerning themselves with the theatre... The English stage is passing through a singularly barren period. Shaw must be turning in his grave” (Carpenter, 2002: 81–82).

The reason for this situation was the British theatre’s heavy reliance on

the canonical writers on the one hand and on the other hand the predominant lack of real value of the works of most young aspiring playwrights. In his cultural history of the period Robert Hewison writes: “Shakespeare, Sheridan, Maugham and Wilde were keeping the new playwrights out” and the young Peter Ustinov complained that “there is very little reason for the dramatist to be confident these days. Like Ibsen’s Mrs. Alving he is haunted before he begins to work by ghosts-ghosts of the past” (Leader, 2000: 405). One of those who were sensitive to the crippling situation that was dominating British theatre was George Devine, a man who was not satisfied with passively observing what was going on but envisioned a practical solution to this problem. He told a potential patron: “I want to have a contemporary theatre. I have been all my life in the classical theatre. I want to try to make the theatre have a different position and have something to say and be a part of the intellectual life of the community” (Carpenter, 2002: 89). This resulted in the creation of the English Stage Company, a theatre company devoted to the promotion of young playwrights and their work and in the publication of an advertisement in the “Stage” requesting new plays by new writers. Devine received more than 600 scripts in response to the “Stage” advertisement but they all lacked any real merit from a literary point of view.

John Osborne

One notable exception among these was a play called *Look Back in Anger*. Its author was a 25 years old struggling actor and playwright named John Osborne. Devine agreed to produce Osborne’s play and on the night of May 8th 1956 *Look Back in Anger* opened at the Royal Court Theatre. At first, it failed to draw in audiences and the critics were mostly unimpressed. The hero of the play was generally viewed as a sort of spokesperson for the younger post-war generation, one that is frustrated by the lack of meaning and purpose around him. One reviewer, T. C. Worsley of the “New Statesmen” made a link with *Lucky Jim*, describing the play as “set on the seamy side of the Kingsley Amis world” (Carpenter, 2002: 118).

A very different review came from the 27 years old drama critic for the “Observer” Kenneth Tynan. In it Tynan discusses not only the play’s merits and shortcomings but also what had already been written about it and the condition of the British drama in general. It had an important impact and eventually led to a reconsideration of the play and its relevance. One excerpt from this review is particularly interesting for the emphasis it places on the plays supposed accurate depiction of the post war youth:

Look Back in Anger presents post war youth as it really is, with special emphasis on the non-U intelligentsia who live in bedsitters... To have done this at all would have been a signal achievement; to have done it in a first play is a minor miracle. All the qualities are there, qualities one had despaired of ever seeing on the stage – the drift towards anarchy, the instinctive selfishness, the automatic rejection of ‘official’ attitudes, and the surrealist sense of humour... the casual promiscuity, the sense of lacking a crusade worth fighting... The Porters of our time... are classless, and they are also leaderless. Mr. Osborne is their first spokesman in the London theatre... (Carpenter, 2002: 118).

Financially the play became successful only after the BBC presented a 25 minute extract on television. After that broadcast, *Look Back in Anger* played to packed houses. Three weeks after *Look Back in Anger* had opened at the Royal Court a book called “The Outsider” was published receiving enthusiastic reviews and becoming a media phenomenon. It transformed its author, Colin Wilson, a 24 years old man coming from a working class family with no academic training into an intellectual celebrity. Wilson was usually associated with two other writers; one was Stuart Holroyd and Bill Hopkins. Holroyd says that what the three of them had in common was “a shared conception of man as a creature with spiritual hunger... We held that mystical experiences, visionary states of consciousness, moments of ecstasy... should be the chief object of man’s endeavour. ‘Religious Existentialists’ we called ourselves. ‘Spiritual Fascists’ we were called by our critics” (Carpenter, 2002: 131). They played the role of disciples to Wilson’s genius. And indeed his exacerbated self-confidence plus his vast readings must have made a powerful impression on the two. In his diary, Wilson’s description of himself even before his leap to literary stardom was flattering to say the least: “The day must come when I’m hailed as a major prophet”; “I am the major literary genius of our century... the most serious man of our age” (Carpenter, 2002: 133).

The person who apparently coined the term angry young man was George Fearon, the English Stage Company’s part time press officer. According to Osborne’s recollection, Fearon invited him for a drink in a pub, told him how much he disliked the play, and added: “I suppose you’re really – an angry young man” (Carpenter, 2002: 103). The first indication of the fact that Fearon’s phrase was catching on was an article published in the “Daily Mirror” and signed by Robert Tee in which *Look Back in Anger* is described as being “an angry play by an angry young author” (Carpenter, 2002: 169–170). Still, the first person to make public use of Fearon’s description of Osborne seems to have been a journalist called Thomas Wiseman, in the Evening Standard’s ‘Show Talk’ column on 7 July 1956, two months after the opening of *Look Back in Anger*. Osborne himself

seems to have found the phrase silly and unhelpful, at least according to his memoirs. And yet he used it two days after the Standard article, while being interviewed by Malcom Muggeridge on BBC television's Panorama. "You see", he told Muggeridge, "if one recognizes problems and one states them, people say – oh, this is an angry young man" (Carpenter, 2002: 130). Daniel Farson picked up the phrase in a pair of articles he wrote for the "Daily Mail" a few days after Wiseman's piece had appeared in the "Standard". "The post-war generation has suddenly arrived", he told readers of the "Daily Mail" on 12 July 1956. "A number of remarkable young men have appeared on the scene. I have met them". The first one on the list was Amis, whom he described as "the only literary movement since the war"; then Osborne, who's "angry young man Jimmy Porter" typified "the lack of any real belief" among his generation (Carpenter, 2002: 134).

From the point of view of fashion, the Angry Young Men were also beginning to be associated with a specific style of dress best exemplified by Colin Wilson. Harry Ritchie writes:

Beaton photographed Wilson for his 1957 collection the face of the World, and parodists and cartoonists latched on to the distinctive look with glee. Soon the horn-rimmed glasses, lank hair and inevitable polo-neck sweater were adorning caricatures of the celebrity philosopher. Wilson provided the essential components for a new literary type, as the cover illustration for the November 1957 issue of Twentieth Century demonstrates; three generations of writers are represented, the youngest by an author wearing the mandatory costume of Wilsonian spectacles and sweater and holding an [Amis inspired] glass of beer. He was offering a new literary image at a time when one was badly needed (Carpenter, 2002: 139).

John Braine: The Man at the Top

A later, but very valuable addition to the group of Angry Young Men was the thirty-four-year-old Yorkshire librarian John Braine. The London literary press greeted his first novel *Room at the Top* published in 1957 with much praise. He was also immediately labelled as a new recruit to the AYM movement. John Davenport in the "Observer" described *Room at the Top's* protagonist, Joe Lampton as "a callous, ambitious, sexy L-cky J-m... Joe inhabits the same sort of world... as Mr Amis's hero. L-cky J-m [is] saved by [his] amiability: Joe Lampton reveals the obverse side of the medal; he is a beast, and his story is the autobiography of a cad... He is ruthless rather than an angry young man: any anger he has is the driving force of his ambition" (Carpenter, 2002: 139).

"R. G." in *Punch* drew a comparison to Osborne's Jimmy Porter: "Joe Lampton looks back more in sorrow than in anger". David Holloway wrote in the "News Chronicle": "If I were given to movement-hailing, I would

welcome Mr. John Braine as the leader of a new school, ‘The Lecherous Young Men’. But... the love making is handled with directness that is totally void of offence and the book crackles with life” (Carpenter, 2002: 142). The “Daily Express” described Braine as one of “three youngish men” who had “geysered into the writing world”, the other two being Amis and Osborne (Carpenter, 2002: 142).

In 1957 Tom Maschler, then an editor at MacGibbon and Kee, invited several Angries to contribute to a book entitled *Declaration* by writing essays in which to explain their views on a wide range of topics such as literature, the role of the writer, contemporary society and of course the angry young men label. The writers invited were: Amis, Osborne, Wilson, Kenneth Tynan, Lindsay Anderson, Bill Hopkins, Stuart Holroyd, John Wain and Doris Lessing, with the notable exception of John Braine because Maschler simply did not find any interest in *Room at the Top*. Amis turned down Tom Maschler’s invitation telling him: “I hate all this pharisaical twittering about the ‘state of our civilization’ and I suspect anyone who wants to buttonhole me about my ‘role in society’” (Carpenter, 2002: 153). The presentation for the book claimed that these were writers who “together... will help to mould our tomorrow”; yet, it admitted that they did not “form part of a united movement”. Similarly, in his brief introduction, Maschler dismissed the AYM label as a piece of low journalism, and complained that “the writers who have set themselves the task of waking us up have been rendered harmless in the AYM cage”. He also added: “It is important to note that although most of the contributors to this volume have at sometime or other been labelled Angry Young Men they do not belong to a united movement... Declaration is a collection of separate positions” (Carpenter, 2002: 154). And indeed any reader of the essays comprised in this collection would have to agree to that last sentence.

On the issue of whether or not there is any validity to the assertion that Angry Young Men movement had indeed existed, Wain and Osborne expressed the view that it was something created by the press and that in order to support such a claim actual facts were necessary, which in their opinion were missing. Doris Lessing on the other hand concluded that such a group existed and that “the work of the angry young men was like an injection of vitality into the withered arm of British literature” (Carpenter, 2002: 154). Wilson forecast “the evolution of a higher type of man... hardly less than superman” (Carpenter, 2002: 154), and Hopkins and Holroyd prophesied the end of pure rationalism as the foundation of western thinking and an imminent change in traditional forms of government. Tynan and Lindsay Anderson took a conventional left-wing stance in their

essays. Tynan wrote: “I want drama to be vocal in protest and I frankly do not see whence the voices will come if not from the Left” (Carpenter, 2002: 156). Jason Osborne’s essay was perhaps the most striking do to his attack against the Royal family, the nation’s worshipful attitude towards it and also his criticism of the Church of England.

In sales terms the *Declaration* was a success but most of the critics found no justification for its publication. In fact, by 1957 the general impression was that the Angry Young Men had run its course and the critics’ hostility towards its alleged protagonists was growing. Daniel Farson, the same Daniel Farson who played a pivotal role in the popularizations of the “Angry Young Men” phrase and of its association with a literary movement, published a scathing review of *Declaration* in the “Books and Bookmen” magazine:

The really heartening thing is its complete failure. Not its commercial failure, for I believe the first edition has sold out, but its failure as a statement of any real significance or permanence. It would have been too awful if this conceited and remote little document had been acclaimed as the voice of a generation, but the opposite has happened. For the first time we see the “angry young men” in their proper perspective. They not only disagree, they actively dislike each other and they are not nearly angry enough; there is instead a note of sullen petulance. *Declaration* marks the death of the “angry epoch”...

The only attempt at a movement comes from Colin Wilson who is trailed by Stuart Holroyd and, inevitably, by his literary dog, Mr. Bill Hopkins, whose inclusion in the book is one of its mysteries (Carpenter, 2002: 178).

It is interesting to note how only after the AYM movement had served its purpose its striking lack of consistency and coherence became highlighted – ironically by one of its former architects. A careful reader of Amis’s review of the “Outsider” published in 1956 would have become aware of this situation long before the publication of Farson’s critique of *Declaration*. In it Amis states his antipathy to the qualities attributed to the outsider type, qualities that soon after its publication became incorporated into the angry young man figure. The “most untenable and annoying” of these was a supposed “larger share, if not a monopoly, of depth and honesty and sensitivity and intensity and acuity and insight and courage and adulthood – especially that”. Another quality that was sure to irritate Amis was the outsider type’s intellectual superiority and consequently his isolation from most people. Considering Amis’s anti intellectual leanings and his highly active social life it becomes transparent why such traits

were unlikely to impress him: “He has no strong affections, and his lack of ordinary warmth makes him divide the human race into himself on one side, plus the odd hero-figure or two, and the mob on the other”. Another side to the outsider is his irrationalism, his reliance on extreme states of consciousness to deliver him from the limitations of ordinary life and what others perceive as being reality: “He does not accept the conditions of human life, and finds release from its prison only in moments of terror and ecstasy”. Amis also rejected this attitude and expressed his adherence to a rationalistic view on life: “feeling as I do that one is better off with too much reason than with none at all” (Carpenter, 2002: 178).

Collin Wilson: The Man behind *The Outsider*

There is undoubtedly a fundamental difference between Amis’s and Wilson’s [and by extension Hopkins’s and Holroyd’s] views on “man” and consequently on the manner in which the writer relates to this specific image of humanity, both as a source of inspiration for his fiction and also as a potential consumer of his literary products. For Wilson and his acolytes the primary appeal of humanity resided not in its present configuration but in its supposed potential for a spiritual transformation. They all prophesied the imminent arrival of a spiritual revolution that would result in a new type of man, in Wilson’s words a veritable “superman”.

Amis perceived man in a totally different manner. For him man was a concrete being, something that can be perceived in its manifestations, its contradictions, and its commonality, something that exists in the real world and exhibits recognizable traits. In an interview when asked what was there to write about in contemporary England, Amis retorted: “he [the writer] is not distracted from his proper task, which is to write about human nature, the permanent things in human nature. I could reel you off a list as long as your arm, beginning with ambition, sexual desire, vainglory, foolishness – there’s quite enough there to keep people writing” (Carpenter, 2002: 180). So it is man that Amis is talking about, not how he would like him to be but how he in fact it is in all his complexity and contradiction. This also explains Amis’s attitude towards his potential reader, trying never to bore him with ideological or philosophical nonsense, but concerned with satisfying his need for entertainment and not disappointing his expectations (although not at the cost of superficiality and commerciality). It can be said that Amis wrote with the public constantly in mind. For Wilson, Hopkins and Holroyd literature should serve the purpose of elevating man’s spirit to a higher level, to facilitate a spiritual transformation and reveal all his potentialities. This is not literature written for the sake of entertaining the

reader. At one point asked about his image of the ideal reader Hopkins answered: “I think I only write for people of my own imagination. And of course one or two very close friends, but certainly not with the public in mind. I think that literature of the sort that we’re thinking of will be very difficult to absorb, and will require a different attitude on the part of the public” (Carpenter, 2002: 180).

At the end of these considerations, it seems rather clear that the AYM was nothing more than a media stunt. Due to the fundamental lack of a unified and coherent perspective on art and writing of its alleged members, there simply was no ground for such a movement to be “created”. Any attempt to group together Wilson and Amis, for example, under the same label seems rather ludicrous now. The group had an important function which Doris Lessing remarked in her *Declaration*’s essay, it was partly to revitalize the London literary scene in a moment when it desperately needed such an effort.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Alvarez, Al., *Where Did it All Go Right?* Bloomsbury, 2002.
 Amis, Kingsley, *Memoirs*, London: Mackays of Chatam PLC, 1991.
 Amis, Martin, *Experience*, Jonathan Cape, 2000.
Books and Bookmen, December, 1957.
 Carpenter, Humphrey, *The Angry Young Men*, London: Penguin Books, 2002.
 “Daily Express”, 13.4.57.
 Hewison, Robert, *In Anger: Culture in the Cold War 1945–60*, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1981.
 Holroyd, Stuart, *Contraries: A Personal Progression*, Bodley Head, 1975.
 Taylor, John Russell (ed.), Osborne, John, *Look Back in Anger: a Casebook*, Macmillan 1968.
 Larkin, Philip, *Required Writing, Miscellaneous Pieces 1955–1982*, London: Faber & Faber, 1983.
 Leader, Zachary, *The Letters of Kingsley Amis*, Harper Collins, 2000.
Literary Voices, no. 2, Borgo Press, California, San Bernardino, 1984.
 Maschler, Tom, *Declaration*, MacGibbon and Kee, 1957.
 “New Statesman”, 18.7.53.
 “New Statesman”, 30.1.54.
 “News Chronicle”, 14.3.57.
 “Observer”, 13.5.56.
 “Observer”, 17.3.57.
 Osborne, John, *Looking Back: Never Explain, Never Apologise*, Faber and Faber, 1999.

“Punch”, 17.4.57.

Ritchie, Harry, *Success Stories: Literature and the Media in England, 1950–1959*, Faber and Faber, 1988.

Roberts, Philip, *The Royal Court Theatre and the Modern Stage*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1999.

“Spectator”, 1.10.54.

“Spectator”, 7.1.55.

“Spectator”, 16.4.77.

“The Daily Mail”, 12.7.56.

The Legion of the Lost, “Spectator”, 15 June, 1956.

The originals of Amis’s letters to Larkin, Bodleian Library, Oxford, MSS Eng. C. 6044-54.

Wain, John, *Sprightly Running: Part of an Autobiography*, Macmillan, 1965.

Wilson, Colin, *The Angry Years*, London, Robson Books, 2007.

Odetta Beleï is Assistant Lecturer with a Doctoral degree in Philology; her doctoral thesis, entitled *Kingsley Amis’s Protean Growth*, was presented at Sibiu in 2010. She is presently working at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad. Her domains of competence are English Language and Literature. She published different studies about Kingsley Amis, F. Scott Fitzgerald and Stephen Crane.

Defining Aspects of the Character in Grammars of Story Telling

Maria Laura Rus

Résumé:

Notre article présente quelques aspects définitoires du personnage dans les grammaires du récit. De cette manière, nous avons parlé sur les théories de V. I. Propp, A. J. Greimas, Tzvetan Todorov et Claude Bremond. Pour Propp, les actions du personnage sont plus importantes que le personnage lui-même. Greimas a construit un modèle actantiel qui inclut six actants ayant chacun une fonction spécifique durant le parcours narratif. Todorov parle sur le personnage en termes syntactiques tandis que Bremond a une théorie plus complexe, avec les émotions du personnage, ses différentes facultés et son lieu dans la narration.

Mots clés: actant, personnage, agent, rôle narratif, parcours narratif

Grammars of story telling assume a series of assertions and formulas connected by an ordinate set of rules and giving account to a set of stories or to their structure. They individualize the “natural” components of a set of stories and characterize their relations. Grammars of story telling consider a story to be a series of episodes which bring a character either closer to or further from a purpose, through achieving or not a secondary purpose. As a matter of fact, any narrative system must have a subject. The examination of the human subject proposed by a speech can always lead to surprising conclusions, not only from the point of view of what is said about this subject, but from the perspective of what is supposed. Despite some affirmations based on which the formalists and structuralists reject the concept of *character* (Popovici, 1997: 12), this can be indisputably found in their works, being studied under various aspects.

In his well-known work, *Morfologia basmului (The Morphology of the Folk Tale)*, Vladimir Propp takes up Aristotle’s distinction (*Poetics*) between characters and actions, reversing the hierarchical relation of these two constitutive instances of the story. If in the discourse of cultured

literature the characters are essential according to the essentialist-humanist postulate of this type of speech, with Propp the situation is different: for him actions are fundamental, not the characters. “The functions are few, but the characters are many. A fact that explains why the story can be on one hand amazingly diverse, picturesque and colourful and on the other hand it can be so astonishing through its stereotypes, through its repeatability. Thus, the functions of the characters represent the fundamental elements of the story” (Propp, 1970: 26).

By presenting the functions in connection with one another in an ideal syntagmatic, Propp talks about various types of characters: the hero, the malefactor, the benefactor, the help, the emperor’s daughter and her father, the sender, the false hero (Propp, 1970: 80–81). They are all engaged in more areas of actions. So, the hero’s area of actions consists of: his departure for the quest, the reaction to the benefactor’s demands, the marriage; the false hero is engaged in the same actions, less the marriage; the malefactor commits the following actions: the prejudice, the fight with the hero, the pursuance; the benefactor is involved in: the preparation for transmitting the magic tool and in the endowment of the hero with this tool; the actions of the help suppose: the spatial shifting of the hero, the dissolution of the misfortune or of the deficiency, saving the pursued hero, solving the difficult tasks the hero is subject of and his transfiguration; the actions of the emperor’s daughter and of her father are: the commandment of the difficult tasks, the note, the recognition, the punishment of the second malefactor, the marriage; finally, the sender has a single role, that of sending the hero in his quest.

Propp also mentions other categories of characters: “besides these, there are special characters from passages” (the ones who complain, the denouncers, the scandalmongers), as well as traitors specific to the E function (the mirror, the chisel, the broomstick)”. Propp insists on the idea of the actions’ relevance of these characters: “important is not what they wish to do, not even the feelings they have, but their actions, appreciated and defined exclusively from the point of view of their meaning for the hero and in the perspective of the action’s evolution”. For Propp, each category of characters is included in the story through specific processes, this being actually one of the stories’ norms. In this way, for example, the malefactor appears during the action and at its second appearance he is considered “the searched-for character”, as the emperor’s daughter is considered, at her second appearance, “the found character” or the uncanny help is introduced in the narrative course as a gift.

One last aspect regarding the characters refers to their attributes,

understood by the Russian folklorist as “variable measures of the story”, “the ensemble of the exterior qualities of the characters”: age, sex, condition, looks, different traits etc.

A. J. Greimas talks about the character inside the story using a term taken from linguist L. Tesnière, for whom *actant* meant a type of syntactical unit. In an “effort of a generative approach”, he notes: “In order to maximize our knowledge about models of construction and junction of the characters in the narrative course, we propose to see if, starting from a unique basic structure, the creation of the actants of a story can be explained, as well as the number of possible stories, depending on the different distribution of these actants” (Greimas, 1975: 262).

By processing the role taxonomy proposed by Souriau and Propp, A.J. Greimas reached an acting model that originally consists of six actants: The Subject (Lion for Souriau, Hero for Propp), Object (Sun for Souriau, The searched-for character for Propp), Sender (Balance for Souriau, Sender for Propp), Recipient (Earth for Souriau), Adjuvant (Moon for Souriau, Help and Benefactor for Propp) and Opponent (Mars for Souriau, Malefactor and False hero for Propp)¹.

The “subject/object” category is a syntactical one, but a semantic investment in the “agent/patient” couple is given to it, things that bring together or, better said, unite the concept of desire and the volitional modality (“vouloir”). Claude Bremond will follow this line: “we will reduce the study of the character to considering the attributes through which he suffers or causes an evolution; in other words, we shall reduce the notion of character to that person who intervenes in the deployment of the events that are told in order to play the role of a patient or a role of an agent” (Bremond, 1981: 173).

For Greimas, the hero, when searching for a palpable object or an abstract one, is supported in his search by an “adjuvant”, being at the same time detained by an “opponent”. The force that galvanizes the search of the hero is either the community that he represents, with its norms and values, or the divinity, in one word the “sender”, and the result of the search will be offered to the “receiver”.

The “sender/receiver” axis is one of value control and of their repartition among the characters; it is, with other words, the axis of knowledge and strength (“savoir” and “pouvoir”).

Going further in explaining the axis, the one represented by the “adjuvant/opponent” either facilitates or detains the action and the

¹ In a more recent version of Greimas’ acting model, the Adjuvant and the Opponent are considered Auxiliaries, not actants.

communication. It produces the action's circumstances and modalities. Greimas talks about this axis as being represented by the characters, but he also says that there are situations in which we can talk about projections of the will of action and the imaginary resistance of the subject.

As noted by Tzvetan Todorov, Greimas' actants highlight a difference between the way that they conceive Souriau's and Propp's roles. In this way, the latter identifies each role with a series of predicates; Souriau and Greimas, on the contrary, define the role without reporting it to a certain predicate. Regarding Greimas, we find ourselves in the situation of opposing the roles (in the sense thought and used by Propp) and the actants, who are nothing more than simple syntactical functions.

An actant can occupy a well defined number of positions or acting roles along the narrative course. The subject, for example, can establish himself as the Sender, qualified (gifted with competence) along the axis of capacity, acknowledged as a successful performer and rewarded for his performance.

"The narrative game" – states Greimas – is played not at two, but at three different levels: the roles, elementary acting units that correspond with the palpable functional fields, enter the composition of two larger units: the actors, units of the speech, and the actants, units of the story" (Greimas, 1975: 269).

At the level of the story's surface structure, a single actant can be represented by more different actors, and more actants can be represented by one and the same actor. In this way, in an adventure story the Subject can have more enemies, they all function as Opponents; in a simple love story, the young man can be both the Subject, and the Receiver, while the young mistress can be both the Object, and the Remitter. Finally, not only human actors, but also animals, things and concepts can fulfil the fundamental roles that constitute the actantial model: a diamond can represent the Object of the Subject's Search, and an ideological imperative can function as a Remittent.

Tzvetan Todorov operates with terms like "proper name", "agent", "person", in *Poetica. Gramatica Decameronului (The Poetics. The Grammar of the Decameron)*. He does not make appeal to a typology, as his predecessors have done, and he motivates his choice in the following way: "It won't be necessary to talk about 'hero', 'malefactor' and 'reparatory' as Propp, Souriau and Greimas do; these characteristics are connected to the predicate and not to the subject of the sentence [...] Talking about the reparatory means expressing in an elliptic way a full sentence that is *X is making justice (iterative)*. Thus, the agent is not the one who can fulfil

an action or another, but he is the one who can become the subject of a predicate” (Todorov, 1975: 130).

Another interesting thing is the distinction made by Todorov between the proper name (or the person) and the agent. From the point of view of narrative syntax, the person represents an empty form, it ensures the synthesis of the actions and of the ego’s passions, it ensures its maintenance in the multiplicity of the events that take place at the same time or successively, in which it is engaged by the story.

A single agent can be formed of more persons (in the situation in which, for example, he is represented by a group of individuals that act together in order to fulfil a purpose). Claude Bremond opposes, in a certain way, this distinction: “it is impossible to say about two persons that carry out different actions in different moments, that they are «one and the same agent». They are two persons assuming identical formal roles, two agents of the same species” (Bremond, 1981: 141), but he agrees with it to the extent that the agent is understood as a qualification of the person: “it is an agent the person that takes action”. Moreover, Bremond considers that the observed resemblance between the roles of two rivals (Todorov’s example) comes from the fact that they both are “agents-*authors* [s.a.] of an action” and they are “the *authors* [s.a.] of the same type of actions”. Bremond’s conclusion upon the mentioned distinction is that the agent “either does not mean anything, or it designates a predicate of the person” (Bremond, 1981: 141).

In a manner similar to that of Greimas, for Todorov the same person can be, one after another, the agent that sins and then the one who punishes. The characters are considered by Tzvetan Todorov agents of the mechanism of the event determinations and not characters gifted with the sap of psychology.

In Claude Bremond’s *Logica povestirii* (*The Logic of the Short Story*), the novelty regarding to the character and the subject is the fact that it appears to be gifted with various faculties. The first of these, the faculty of interfering in the process, decomposes into three: the action (the faculty of being an agent), the passion (the faculty of being the target of someone else’s action) and the will (the faculty of setting a result as a target of the action that we attempt or suffer).

Made of successive events, as well as of simultaneous ones, the story presumes the ego’s permanence in these events, action assigned to the person, the one ensuring both the synthesis of the ego’s passions, and its undertakings.

Starting from Propp’s legacy, Claude Bremond aims to apply this

formalization “to other narrative genres, or, even better, to any kind of story” (Bremond, 1981: 23). But, in his analysis, he starts from the character when he defines the main narrative roles in “agents” and “patients”: “In the following discussion we shall reduce the character’s study to the consideration of the attributes through which he suffers or causes an evolution; in other words, we shall reduce the notion of character to the one of person that intervenes in the deployment of the events told in order to play either the role of a patient or the role of an agent” (Bremond, 1981: 173).

In the definition given by Bremond to the narrative role, the notion of character-subject is essential, namely its association with a process-predicate: “... the function of an action can only be defined in the perspective of the interests and initiatives of a character, patient or the agent of that certain action” (Bremond, 1981: 168). The agent of a frustration can be the same person as its patient, the same person as the agent or the patient of amelioration or degradation, or a person different to the ones mentioned. An agent can attempt at the same time a voluntary action and an involuntary one, and thus he can become at the same time the patient of someone else’s action, who uses him as a tool in fulfilling its own purposes.

What deserves to be highlighted is the fact that the Bremondian subject has the perception of the state in which he finds himself², and so, he is capable of receiving information. As well, he shows affectivity, moral, forasmuch he judges his own actions as being satisfying, unsatisfying or indifferent. He is capable of fear and hope, having the ability to persuade the other actants. As such, he is responsible for his actions, achieving either the merit for it or the blame.

Bremond’s merit in this aspect is underlying the fact that in the story’s essence as an abstract series of event symbols the subject can be found, the story is impossible to be described in its absence.

In as much as the narrative text cannot be conceived as a simple product, “a closed receptacle with a rigid contour”, it has been imagined as a galactic structure, “capable of fulfilling the sense, welled from the text and progressively amplified by the alchemy of all the signals, verbal or non-verbal, osmotically relational in the game of the speech act, every time a particular one” (Vlad, 2000: IV).

These analyses dedicated to the story grammar, to the logic of the story etc., despite the differences that separate them, have a common purpose, that of identifying the story’s universals and their structure. Even more,

2 This can be correct, false or null.

Todorov stated in one of his articles: “The universal grammar is thus the source of all universals and it gives us the very definition of the human being. Not only all languages, but also all significant systems submit to the same grammar. It is universal not only because it is spread all around the world, but because it concurs with the structure of the universe itself” (*apud* Bremond, 1981: 162), and “the story’s universe submits, as well, the universal grammar”.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Adam, Jean-Michel, Revaz, Françoise, *Analiza povestirii*, traducere de Sorin Pârvu, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 1999.
- Bremond, Claude, *Logica povestirii*, traducere de Micaela Slăvescu, București, Editura Univers, 1981.
- Carpov, Maria, *Introducere în semiologia literaturii*, București, Editura Univers, 1998.
- Codoban, Aurel, *Semn și interpretare: o introducere postmodernă în semiologie și hermeneutică*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 2001.
- Eco, Umberto, *Tratat de semiotică generală*, traducere de Anca Giurescu și Cezar Radu, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1982.
- Greimas, A. J., *Despre sens. Eseuri semiotice*, text tradus și prefațat de Maria Carпов, București, Editura Univers, 1975.
- Greimas, A. J., *Elemente pentru o gramatică narativă*, București, Editura Univers, 1975.
- Popovici, Vasile, *Lumea personajului*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Echinoc, 1997.
- Propp, V. I., *Morfologia basmului*, în românește de Radu Nicolau, București, Editura Univers, 1970.
- Todorov, Tzvetan, *Poetica. Gramatica Decameronului*, traducere și studiu introductiv de Paul Miclău, București, Editura Univers, 1975.
- Vlad, Carmen, *Sensul, dimensiune esențială a textului*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Dacia, 1994.
- Vlad, Carmen, *Textul-aisberg*, Cluj-Napoca, Casa Cărții de Știință, 2000.

Maria Laura Rus is Assistant Lecturer at the Faculty of Sciences and Letters of “Petru Maior” University, Tg.-Mureș. Doctor in Philology, with a thesis entitled *Ion Creangă. Semantic Approach of the Narrative Art*. Her fields of interest are Applied Semantics, Lexicology, Morphology, Syntax, and Dialectology. She published a considerable number of articles on various linguistic themes, in journals of linguistic such as “Studia Universitatis Petru Maior (Tg.-Mureș)”, “Philologica Jassyensia” (Iași), “Analele Universității din Oradea”, “Studii și

cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie” (Craiova), “Limba română” (Chișinău), Proceedings of the International Conference “European Integration between Tradition and Modernity” (1st, 2nd and 3rd edition, Târgu-Mureș).

The Fictional Woman vs. the Real-World Woman in Cervantes' *Don Quixote*

Florica Bodiștean

“... for the same may be said of knight-errantry as of love, that it levels all”

Abstract:

Our study presents the role that the vision of love has in the anti-chivalrous novel of Cervantes, *Don Quixote*. The most complex character of the entire work, Dulcinea is a great absence. By her, the novel denounces in a Renaissance style a great void of the chivalrous literature, the disability to experience love, but, at the same time, it illustrates the force of the female ideal in constructing the hero's inner self.

Keywords: chivalrous novel, parody, Eros/ love, imaginary woman

What's the Use of “Make-believes”?

Along with Renaissance literature fall the last rampart of the heroic and the epic solemnity influenced by the manifestations of the burlesque spirit, inducing a skeptical attitude expressed in ironic, comic, caricature, parody forms. All these are the signals of a vision subjected to a process of secularization, a value system that seeks the transcendence into the immanence, founding a religion of man. A spirit that animates the intellectuals of the epoch, universally appreciated as a consequence of the feeling of “secure human superiority over all manifestations of life which prevails as a master” (Dumitrescu-Bușulenga, 1975: 85). Epicureanism is the underground philosophy of this generic hoax, replacing sobriety by the healthy laughter, affirming life's values, and *l'uomo piacevole*, which Dante would have intended for the Inferno, is the greatest sage in the

science of emotion, a violently sensual one.

Pulci, Boiardo and Ariosto, through their mock-heroic poems terribly shock the world image established by the *Song of Roland*, so that along with Don Quixote the heroism and medieval heroic literature would exhibit its operating mechanism, its machinery, and technicality, as an anatomical sketch with an open body and skin hanging nearby. Cervantes's novel reveals a dead end and asks the epic after him for other pathways. Accordingly, the super-theme will be the literary convention or about its dangers and advantages, and how such a convention can drive you mad, but also about how ordinary life can be given a high sense. Surely, we think that the chivalrous novel is controlled in forms, not in substance, that too widely spread forms lapse and become patterns, but the spirit which animated them is not dead. "Don Quixote – says one of the most profound connoisseurs of Cervantes's works, Martin de Riquer – satirizes the books of knights, not cavalry; the improbable heroism from fabulous novels, not real heroism as that shown by Cervantes in Lepanto" (2007: LXX). Under these circumstances, it would be expected that the woman's image should swing somewhere between these forms and a superhuman, super-temporal essence, that can influence human events in an ascendant sense.

Don Quixote offers a vision of a life constructed through imitation, but only the outer aspects are imitated; their content is obviously true, as any substance. He does what he knows he has to do, what all wandering knights used to do, among whom Amadis of Gaula is the invincible model, but this "what has to be" paradoxically overlaps "what he feels" that the distinction between form and substance is cancelled in his head and remains only to remove for the narrator/reader as theory of inadequacy to reality. For the very forms are to be changed, that is the perception of the phenomenal, not the overall vision projected upon him. In this character, the illusion and the conscience of convention paradoxically coexist, but lucidity deliberately feeds fantasies. Don Quixote's madness was regarded as an accepted game to make existence bearable. In his *Cartea întâlnirilor admirabile* (*The Book of Admirable Encounters*) Anton Dumitriu brilliantly comments on the conversion of wisdom into madness, as a pan cultural expression of a carnivalesque spirit. Cervantes owes much to Erasmus as well, who used to praise folly, i.e. the exalted passion which espouses you to loftier goals than the present moment, as he also owes to the recurrent idea in the Spain of "golden century" about dream lived as life and life taken as a dream. Don Quixote's play was said to be outside the antithesis madness – wisdom and it was argued that it reproduced all parts discovered by Huizinga in the behavior of his *homo ludens*: free, disinterested, limited as

duration, having a preset order (Bloom, 1998: 108). Nuanced distinctions, as the one made by Nicolae Manolescu, reveal that the term *play* would be more appropriate in the case of this character than the one of *game*. Because playing at the knight, in fact at the literary character, like playing at literature by real writers is “for real”, full-blown life, otherwise how would we explain the play of these “big children” who risk everything on their stake? (Manolescu, 1999)

The secret of the Quixotic attitude lies in mediation, it is René Girard’s theory from his book *Minciună romantică și adevăr românesc (Romantic Lie and Novelistic Truth)*, i.e. in the existence of a third court sitting between the subject and the object of his desire, in this case the chivalrous model, which is necessarily imitable, in order that he, the subject, Don Quixote, could gain access to the transcendent target, the ideal unequivocally affirmed so many times: “I was born to eliminate injustice in the world”. The effect of this triangular desire, a desire according to “Another”, is that once the mediation model gathers way, “real meaning is lost, justice is paralyzed” (Girard, 1972: 25). We have here a case of external mediation, which will be later found with Flaubert, *Madame Bovary* being the constant association, the female Don Quixote. It is, in both cases, about a mediator who remains outside the hero’s universe, a bookish mediator placed at a considerable distance from the subject so that the two spheres of *possibles* should not get in contact, but conversely than with Stendhal, Dostoyevsky, and Proust, where imitation follows proximate models. In such a mediation which acknowledges its model, the subject keeps an observant admiration of it, declaring himself as his loyal vassal. Resentment, hatred, rivalry do not fit into this non-competitive relationship. In both cases, the effect of mediation is that it gives the object an illusory value, prompting the desire to possess it. Differences between Quixotism and bovarism are a much harder argument to fundamentally dismantle such a greatly circulated contiguity and the opposition between an individualistic phenomenon and a completely disinterested one has to be primarily appealed at here, as that between weakness and inner strength.

Does Don Quixote need this mediator? Yes, he, the mediator, is more than just a simple impulse; it is the engine of his own life. In the absence of Amadis, inner springs collapse and the ex-knight dies of... melancholy. Not of an outer cause. Because his benevolent friends wanted to eradicate Quixotism rather than to correct its errors and make it better in order to become efficient and useful to life. Girard’s statement according to which the mediator, the Knight, an epic figure of the imagination, exclusively present inside the character’s consciousness, indirectly confesses that

the metaphysical autonomy of the human being is impossible, dull, insignificant, is confirmed in this case, without allowing the generalizations made by the author of the study. It proves out because we are in front of a life exclusively built on imitation. The chivalrous life itself, Huizinga said in *Amurgul Evului Mediu (The Twilight of the Middle Ages)*, is set up on imitation, an imitation of the heroes from Arthur's cycle or of ancient heroes, but it goes to the fair copy here. When the picture of the knight staggers under the unbreakable blow of another knight, the bachelor Sansón Carrasco, life returns to the horizon and falls into decay. It is a fable about conditioning between life and aspirations.

A Lady is Required

Here it is Dulcinea, the leading female character in the scenario, now that you cannot be a true wandering knight without a Lady, without being in love. Thus, says Don Quixote, he would solely be a bastard who entered the fort of the cavalry not through the gate, but on the crest walls. Her social rank does not exist in the chivalry list, the peasant being merely the object of licentious jokes and instinctual manifestations, as among other things, Boccaccio's and Chaucer's short stories tell us. She cannot write or read either, her relationship with Sad Figure Knight consists in decent glances from him during the four maximum dates they had in twelve years. This is because Aldonza Lorenzo, her real name, deserves such a reverent attitude, she is worthy of being called a "mistress of the whole universe", being raised by her mother and her father as a greenhouse flower, with a large "care and isolation". So Don Quixote recommends her to Sancho, who replies with a specific unhidden admiration:

I know her well, said Sancho, and let me tell you she can fling a crowbar as well as the lustiest lad in the entire town. Giver of all good! But she is a brave lass, and a right and stout one, and fit to be helpmate to any knight-errant that is or is to be, who may make her his lady: the whoreson wench, what sting she has and what a voice! I can tell you one day she posted herself on the top of the belfry of the village to call some laborers of theirs that were in a ploughed field of her father's, and though they were better than half a league off they heard her as well as if they were at the foot of the tower; and the best of her is that she is not a bit prudish, for she has plenty of affability, and jokes with everybody, and has a grin and a jest for everything. [...] and I wish I were on my road already, simply to see her, for it is many a day since I saw her, and she must be altered by this time, for going about the fields always, and the sun and the air spoil women's looks greatly.

She is robust, too tall ("and so lofty she is, said Sancho, that she overtops me by more than a hand's-breadth"), having a male's physical strength, rudeness, airiness. She is a functional being, a good working

woman, efficient, not decorative or graceful at all, just purely natural and too specific to be able to inspire even the least demanding suitor.

To all these, he, the Knight, answers somehow repentant that “for what he wants”, Dulcinea del Toboso is worth “the most exalted princess on earth”, because it is not her he sees in her, but an imaginary being, as imaginary as all the Amaryllises, the Phyllises, the Sylvias, the Dianas, the Galateas who inhabit the books of the time. That it is her or another, it is all the same, because, says he, “I picture her in my imagination as I would have her to be, as well in beauty as in condition; neither does Helen approach her, nor does Lucretia come up to her, nor any other of the famous women of times past, Greek, Barbarian, or Latin”. The imaginary proves to be a limitless one, if it detachedly beats the established models of beauty and virtue. We are in full conscious illusion, in full deliberate substitution between life and fiction. It is such a necessary compensating fiction that it is entitled to write a new mythography. Because Don Quixote’s world is exclusively black and white, or so, or conversely, there is no tolerance but only uplifting things or things to be repudiated and corrected on the spot. The grey ordinary suddenly moves to the winged ideality, as in this description of Dulcinea which the knight made for Vivaldo, the gentleman who came to attend Chrysostom’s funeral. The human being whom Don Quixote will present as the Lady of his heart resembles, by the effervescence of comparisons, no more no less, the description of the bride in the *Song of Songs*: “her hairs are gold, her forehead Elysian fields, her eyebrows rainbows, her eyes suns, her cheeks roses, her lips coral, her teeth pearls, her neck alabaster, her bosom marble, her hands ivory, her fairness snow, and what modesty conceals from sight such, I think and imagine, as rational reflection can only extol, not compare”. So it is a perfect noticeable beauty, practically impossible to find out in reality (“her beauty superhuman, since all the impossible and fanciful attributes of beauty which the poets apply to their ladies are verified in her”), mystery and virtue – a compulsory quality, proclaimed by Don Quixote whenever he has the opportunity.

The requirement of a good family would be also added, debatable in this case, but which our hero serenely “embellishes”: the Toboso family from La Mancha is a modern one that can give generous origins to the most illustrious families from future centuries. It is a perfect portrait, made like Arcimboldo’s paintings from bookish ingredients at the highest price, a standard portrait which goes down to the gauntness and disappearance of the physical into pure allegory. As a matter of fact, it is a process specific to chivalrous literature which, by excluding any individual notes, tends to dematerialize characters and turn them into symbolic characters.

Something about the Lady's function should be added, too, so that her double role could be exactly noticed, not only of chaste ideal, but also of guardian angel in the life of a wandering knight. In the same issue, at Vivaldo's observation, according to which knights entrust themselves too much to their girlfriends before the battle, rather than to God, as if those girlfriends would be their God, Don Quixote has no other reason than habit, he also says that entrusting to his lover does not mean he gives up God, he just postpones it for another moment of the battle. And when Sancho, obsessed by the fantasy of a luxury life, summons him to marry the alleged Princess Moimițomițona – Dorothea, the angered Knight speaks him about Dulcinea's "bravery", who uses his arm for her acts of bravery: "She fights in me and conquers in me, and I live and breathe in her, and owe my life and being to her". It is a total spiritual transfer into a *quid pro quo* of a perfect pair. The character of the chivalrous novel, Don Quixote actually says, is not only one, the knight, but the pair. In the second volume, he will confess to the duchess that he is somehow in love "out of obligation" and it doesn't matter if the "object" of his desire exists or not beyond it. The Lady – a condition derived from the chivalrous madness which "he did not invent", but others before him:

God knows whether there is any Dulcinea or not in the world, or whether she is imaginary or not imaginary; these are things the proof of which must not be pushed to extreme lengths. I have not begotten nor given birth to my lady, though I behold her as she needs must be, a lady who contains in herself all the qualities to make her famous throughout the world, beautiful without blemish, dignified without haughtiness, tender and yet modest, gracious from courtesy and courteous from good breeding, and lastly, of exalted lineage, because beauty shines forth and excels with a higher degree of perfection upon good blood than in the fair of lowly birth.

What does the Lady stand for? It is a compulsory banner, worn with pride. What is love? It is a simple declarative form. The use is all that remains from the old erotic and antagonistic structures of chivalry. Love stagnates at the level of masterful rhetoric, there is no feeling; it is out of the question that Don Quixote is in love. So, the lady could be anyone, she can look anyhow and can be worn anyway. "For the same may be said of knight-errantry as of love, that it levels all", says Don Quixote. It makes him equal to Sancho, whom he invites to his table, otherwise a meatless one, it makes Dulcinea equal to any illustrious antecedence. Not the appearances, not the conjunctures, not the forms matter, but the spirit animating them. The knight wants to believe that appearances are the result of a witchery that someone wanted to arrange to laugh at well-intentioned people. Simple, ignoble avatars of an eternal reality, which are on the edge

in his mind, ready to fall when on one side, while on the other. You just have to see what you want to see and pass rapidly from the profane to the sacred by a simple exercise of imagination. This is what imagination manages; it makes things be equal, and equalizes the reality with fantasy, arbitrarily stretching it, as on a Procrustean bed which reflects the extent of their own dreams. The theme of oscillating reality is the theme of the work's level of depth, the theme in which the appearance and essence light each other according to the time zone of imagination. So the character has "crises of the real", says Călinescu, and obviously, from his point of view, crises of "unreality" as the great drama of his life is, the discovery of Dulcinea, a primitive peasant in person.

We said before that of this game between shapes and content does not get rid the woman's image built somewhere at the intersection between what it is and what it means, between the human and the eternal, between the immanent and the transcendent, between the winged poem and the burlesque prose. And yes, indeed, such a woman is Dulcinea, an idea, a spirit, an image that can get any profane semblance and, since her essence is clarified before, cannot exist in reality, the important thing is that it can exist in his hero's mind and play the role she has to play: The Great Lady of the Heart, that "by which I live". Dulcinea is the great absent character in the novel, no one meets her in the narrative present, and everything we know about her is reported, rumored, invented, and idealized. Or, when the meeting cannot be postponed, as it happens before Don Quixote's third departure, then one appeals to her replacement by a peasant woman encountered by chance. If Don Quixote did not accept Sancho's suggestion, that Dulcinea was bewitched, the rest of the novel would be cancelled, because the very motivation of his actions would be cancelled as well. As Auerbach notes (1967: 372), the terrible disappointment due to the brutal loss of the illusion would be able to make one man go crazy to the pure pathological, which would be a terrible misuse of the meaning invested in the character, or it may finally awake him. It's not one way or the other. The reason of the witchcraft permits to Don Quixote to remain Don Quixote and represents the narrative solution of the novel's continuity. The witchcraft is, in fact, the constant process of the two volumes, but used for different purposes: in the first, it serves to the secular transfiguration of reality into the desired direction, the sacred, in the second, it is a form of defending the sacralized illusion from the invasion of the nude profane (Ivanovici, 1980: 78). The wizards' evils are invoked out of such a defensive reaction so that the character can avoid at least the failure of the ideal, if the failure of the real is a total one.

Is Don Quixote's Chastity a Merit or Helplessness?

Love for Dulcinea is, from all cavalry slogans, the most sounded. Love for Dulcinea or love for love? Because you cannot love something inexistent or what you do not know, especially you cannot love without a reason. Don Quixote thinks he has such a reason, the essence and the incentive of the feeling declared being Dulcinea's excellence in beauty. But beauty which does not have any object cannot be loved, it is like loving concepts. They cannot stir the human being. The character's great limit remains the inability to live his love, which comes from the inability to define its object of love. A spiritual rigidity which has been interpreted as "the clear sign of decadence, a revealing testimony of an era drained of human values [medieval age, *my note*], in which the formalism and conventionalism penetrate even the most intimate human plans" (Mustață, 1991: 45). Sterility and medieval asceticism taught by the church go here to their ultimate consequences, imagining the psychic sublimation of Eros into a metaphysical one by denying one of the partners. But such a situation involves disability, not holiness, as not the absence of the opponent, but only his actual presence can give somebody the certainty of his drive. Don Quixote is not only the emblem of the inability to cherish love, but also the inability to live within human nature itself, to accept the natural home for personal fulfillment. Two times, throughout his adventures, the knight learns something the hard way and wants to establish real bridges between himself and the chosen of his heart. Being in Sierra Morena, he sends a letter to Dulcinea with Sancho's help, by which he tells her how much he suffers for her own sake. He gives clear instructions regarding the place, her family, and promises a reward to Sancho if he gives a good account of this task. The fragment is outside the scope of the fictitious, it hardly seems to illustrate a literary topos, but it is the expression of a highly specified need. Now Don Quixote is obliged to open a parenthesis in his fiction and recognize to Sancho that Dulcinea is actually Aldonza Lorenzo, whom the squire knows too well. The sequence prepares the effective meeting: before leaving on the third trip, Don Quixote likes to see Dulcinea with his own eyes, an amazing initiative for a man who concedes that the Lady may not exist in reality. Its ontological duplication, "an invented man, with his nerves and veins fed by very different cultures, from the medieval chivalry to Renaissance culture", but at the same time "a real and genuine man" with identity, age and physiognomy (Cabas, 1971: 223), generates the duplication Dulcinea – Aldonza Lorenzo, the bookish and the real woman. The big surprise comes when Don Quixote, not Alonso Quijano, goes to

meet his girlfriend, who cannot be but Aldonza Lorenzo, not Dulcinea. The serious insertion of the imaginary into the real, an insane courage bringing disaster if it had been the salutary intervention of Sancho's, who presents an arbitrary peasant as Dulcinea and suggests the idea of the witchcraft. However, the sequence is bizarre in the novel and we ask ourselves which is its role. Why does the hero feel the need of Dulcinea's effective blessing if this blessing anyway existed in an imaginary outline? This is the only thing which matters for him. It seems that Călinescu is right when he talks about the crises of reality which the Knight experiences. His delusion, in order to function, needs a minimum real support; it needs a minimum fuel, after which it develops itself, through successive buddings. We may also ask if his declared love for Dulcinea, whose real prototype is a peasant girl "with whom he had been at one time in love, though, so far as is known, she never knew it nor gave a thought to the matter", is not a compensation product; an extreme advertising of a feeling doomed to remain hidden, ignored. When he searches for the chosen of his heart in Toboso, we remain astonished, as Don Quixote says he has not seen her in his life and that he just fell in love with her "hearsay" because of the great fame she enjoys. The latter is, however, clearly Dulcinea, not Aldonza, she is the product of literature, of the troubadours' poetry.

Don Quixote does not love, because no movement ever comes to disturb the calm waters of his soul. The lover's torment is totally foreign to him, the incandescence does not exist in this theoretical feeling, and, therefore, equal to itself. There is no oscillation, because there is no life in this formal love. He is a complete character deprived of any inner conflict, without a psychology, without dilemmas, without crises of conscience. The dialogue with him is cancelled; the reflection is cancelled because it was preliminary to the decision of embracing such a life. En route for a preset target with all his energy of human being, which does not allow shades, rewording or adjustments, he is fated to disaster when the verdict of reality cannot be postponed. The total freedom versus total submission is a clear sign of an automatism in both a direction and another. Don Quixote lacks the science of negotiation. It is either the golden age or the Iron Age; it is either life or death. And the apprehension of the golden age correlates – says Marthe Robert, who reads the novel by a psychoanalytic grid – with the heavenly feeling of the child, given by the possession of a unified world, uncivilized in the mythical sense, so innocent, undivided in any way "when it exclusively possesses a mother without a husband, a land with a 'sacred body', that the virile furrower still did not 'force it'" (1983: 194). A possible explanation for the character's sexual indifference and for

the refusal to experience individual love – as an initiative of the Father, the Creator, as a way to enter the History and Civilization – in favour of a universal love, the only law capable of defending perfect harmony and the perfect unity of the myth.

Otherwise, his love, so much displayed and only exhibited, is out of all “conditions” set by those who analyzed the feeling. Here are some “capital points” which would be the unavoidable marks of recognizing true love, as Ortega y Gasset said: the law of love is not just “to be”, as to him it’s sufficient, but “to act” towards the desired object, to be with it “in a contact and a closer proximity than the space” (Ortega y Gasset: 26). Thus, “there is no love without sexual instinct” (Ortega y Gasset: 26). Love is a phenomenon of essential choice, here it is an instantaneous fixation upon the only known object, and neither does an exam of qualities interfere in its selection, only a feeble memory of an unprofessed aspiration. Love, the Spanish essayist says, is born not from a theoretical, perfect beauty, but from the expressive grace of a way to be, from the incarnation of what each of us believes that beauty is, in the Platonic meaning of the optimum, and means to strongly argue for a particular rule of humanity. And to be born, it needs to be fixed in advance upon the object, a point in which it is radically different from pure pleasure, which may preexist. Dulcinea is born from the sea foam and, if she is also a form of voluptuousness, then she is the delight of illusion. Then, love needs a constant confirmation from the other, but this is not certified by Don Quixote who requests confirmations only to losers, absolutely formal, as the Lady of his heart is the only perfect creature on earth. More important than all is the verdict that “the human type we prefer in the other outlines the profile of our own heart”, that in love our most genuine substance is reflected. Alonso Quijano prefers Aldonza Lorenzo, such a banal figure from the known universe; that is why Don Quixote must create the high Dulcinea, his escape from the normal, the vulgar, the ordinary, the routine. Only the imagination process can tell us something positive about this character, his choice remains desolate.

In conclusion, says Ortega y Gasset, despite what is commonly believed, love is a rarely feeling, not demotic, if it is separated from his pseudo love forms, as sensual warmth or affection, with which it is often confused. It is a real talent, as the artistic talent, as bravery. “Not everyone falls in love, and the one who is capable of this, does not fall in love with everyone” (Ortega y Gasset: 146), because for a full trial it takes a combination of three components. First of all, there are the conditions of perception, i.e. being able to see the creature to be loved, which is just for the “open” souls with an existential curiosity and a longing for life (*le petit bourgeois*

cannot fall in love in an authentic way). Then, the conditions of emotion, by which we answer ourselves from the sentimental point of view to that vision of love's object by virtue of qualities that make him worthy of being loved. Finally, and crucially, the conditions of constitution, inherent to our soul, the only ones to give him the full measure, but "even if the other two operations related to perception and sensitivity are carried out properly, the respective feeling may happen not to tear or invade us or structure the whole person, because it is less strong and flexible, dispersed or without vigorous springs" (Ortega y Gasset: 147). Only the latter condition gives love the ability to grow and become plenary, gives it the specific quality, because it keeps the complexity and intellectual acuity of the person who loves. It is *sui generis* the quality of talent which admits all gradations up to the genius, the quality of creation, of an experience endowed with meaning, with *nous*, precisely because it is deeply grounded in the truth of the one who loves.

We have to admit that Dulcinea, perhaps the most difficult to understand character of the novel, is taken as a myth, but recreated again and again, with the help of fantasy and reverie, by the head of this new Pygmalion. A process that speaks not only about the character's will to assure him the perfect chivalrous scenario, but also about love or desire, says the Spanish essayist, about openness to life, which only certain beings have. Only strictly at this first level of conditionings we can put Don Quixote in relation with Dulcinea as an expression of love. Because the emotion cannot be aroused by some conceptual qualities, and when these are embodied, when Dulcinea's real pretext appears in front of him as a peasant, the disappointment is total. Moreover, the soul complexity of the character has become univocal, being decided under the impact of readings, and the object of love choice, a conventional prototype. Don Quixote's love, of which criticism did so much case, giving it unexpected merits, is not true love, there is no sublimation of love, it is a blank form, a beautiful fiction like the chivalrous love, but no whit, because it lacks the object's reality.

Dulcinea is Gloria, says Unamuno (1973: 132), the thirst for immortality as a sublimation of erotic instinct, in order that spiritual sons can be born. This explains the knight's restraining and purity, whom the human beings would have turned back from his brave exploits. Cowardice in front of any initiative to conquer Dulcinea (not for this purpose he goes in El Toboso, ahead of the third expedition) is converted into a crazy brave in the outside world. He believes he wins her attention conquering the world for her. Chivalrous script, in which only the unfortunate loves have results in spirit, suggests Unamuno. But the transcendent interpretation of

love remains in his essay within the limits of perpetual Quixotism, which lends the perspective to the central character. Apart from it, in Cervantism, we see Don Quixote neither happy, nor unhappy because of Dulcinea's absence. He is unhappy because of her witchcraft, because the necessary element for the script was altered.

And Harold Bloom sees in Don Quixote “a typical case of an unlived life” (1998: 108–109), a chaste man, who has spent fifty years from his life within the walls of his house, surrounded by a housekeeper, a niece, somebody who helps him in the field and two friends, the priest and the barber of the village. His absolute heroism, his crazy courage is beyond the courage of any hero from Western literature, it would be nothing else than a sublimation of sexual energy and the delightful Dulcinea “the emblem of glory which has to be attained through violence” (Bloom, 1998: 111). In her name he grimly keeps his chastity, because love is only a means of transcendence, not a purpose, not even an experience in itself. It is the weapons that are important, not letters, and women either. But his woman, like Beatrice of Dante, is not only the pillar of his light, but the mirror in which he can see his own image. It reveals the profile of a man for whom love is a state of being, it is the love for an ideal, of what it is high, handsome and noble.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Auerbach, Erich, *Mimesis. Reprezentarea realității în literatura occidentală*, în românește de I. Negoiteșcu, prefață de Romul Munteanu, București, Editura pentru Literatură Universală, 1967.

Battaglia, Salvatore, *Mitografia personajului*, traducere de Alexandru George, București, Editura Univers, 1976.

Bloom, Harold, *Canonul occidental. Cărțile și școala epocilor*, traducere de Diana Stancu, postfață de Mihaela Anghelescu Irimia, București, Editura Univers, 1998.

Cabas, Juan, *Istoria literaturii spaniole*, traducere, studiu introductiv, note și *O privire asupra literaturii spaniole actuale* de Doina Maria Păcurariu, București, Editura Univers, 1971.

Călinescu, George, *Scriitori străini*, antologie și text îngrijit de Vasile Nicolescu și Adrian Marino, prefață de Adrian Marino, București, Editura pentru Literatură Universală, 1967.

Cervantes, Miguel de, *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, traducere din spaniolă, cuvânt înainte, cronologie, note și comentarii de Sorin Mărculescu, studiu introductiv de Martin de Riquer, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2007.

Dumitrescu-Bușulenga, Zoe, *Renașterea, Umanismul și destinul artelor*, ediție

- integral revăzută și adăugită, București, Editura Univers, 1975.
- Dumitriu, Anton, *Cartea întâlnirilor admirabile*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1981.
- Girard, René, *Minciună romantică și adevăr romanesc*, în românește de Alexandru Baciu, prefață de Paul Cornea, București, Editura Univers, 1972.
- Huizinga, Johan, *Amurgul Evului Mediu. Studiu despre formele de viață și de gândire din secolele al XIV-lea și al XV-lea în Franța și în Țările de Jos*, traducere din olandeză de H. R. Radian, București, Humanitas, 2002.
- Ivanovici, Victor, *Formă și deschidere*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1980.
- King, Margaret L., *Femeia Renașterii*, în *Omul renascentist*, vol. coordonat de Eugenio Garin, traducere de Dragoș Cojocaru, prefață de Maria Carpov, Iași, Polirom, 2000.
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Însemnări despre Don Quijote*, în „România literară”, nr. 16/1999.
- Mustață, Ioana, *În preajma lui Don Quijote*, București, Editura Roza Vânturilor, 1991.
- Ortega y Gasset, José, *Studii despre iubire*, traducere de Sorin Mărculescu, București, Humanitas, [s.a.].
- Pavel, Toma, *Gândirea romanului*, traducere din franceză de Mihaela Mancaș, București, Humanitas, 2008.
- Răileanu, Petre, *Corabia lui Ghilgameș. Eseuri*, București, Editura Militară, 1990.
- Riquer, Martin de, *Cervantes și Don Quijote*, studiu introductiv la Miguel de Cervantes, *Don Quijote de la Mancha*, traducere din spaniolă, cuvânt înainte, cronologie, note și comentarii de Sorin Mărculescu, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2007.
- Robert, Marthe, *Romanul începuturilor și începuturile romanului*, traducere de Paula Voicu-Dohotaru, prefață de Angela Ion, București, Editura Univers, 1983.
- Roznoveanu, Mirela, *Civilizația romanului. Arhitecturi epice*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1991.
- Unamuno, Miguel de, *Viața lui don Quijote și Sancho*, în românește de Ileana Bucurenciu și Grigore Dima, prefață de Andrei Ionescu București, Editura Univers, 1973.
- Vianu, Tudor, *Studii de literatură universală și comparată*, ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, București, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române, 1963.

Florica Bodiștean is Associate Professor Ph.D. at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad, tenured for the following courses: Theory of Literature, Comparative Literature and Stylistics of Poetic Texts; Doctor in Philology since 2000. She has published: *Marin Preda sau despre complexele creației* (2002), *O teorie a literaturii* (2005, 2008), *Poetica genurilor literare* (2006, 2009), *Literatura pentru copii și tineret dincolo de „story”* (2007).

JESS

LINGUISTICS, STYLISTICS AND TRANSLATION STUDIES

JESS

Present-Day Tendencies in the Romanian Language

Rodica Zafiu

Abstract

The “condition of the language” is a subject of fairly broad interest. In Romania, any discussion regarding some breaching of the norms, or the massive presence of Anglicisms or of vulgar terms, is likely to stir passions.

Linguistic variation and change are natural phenomena, described objectively by linguists, but perceived, in most cases, negatively by ordinary speakers. Present-day tendencies in the Romanian language are, to a large extent, manifestations of more general tendencies, common for numerous languages. Today, three “global” factors have an impact on the linguistic evolution of Romanian: (a) the influence of English; (b) the influence of communication by electronic media; (c) a narrowing of the gap between educated and popular language, between writing and speaking.

In the dynamics of a living language, change is inevitable and, basically, inoffensive. Nevertheless, the concern of our contemporaries, is important: attitudes and assessments balance out and moderate evolutions that are too fast, preserving the natural dependence on cultural factors.

Keywords: language change, prescriptivism, globalization, Anglicisms, electronic media

1. The “condition of the language” is a subject of fairly broad interest. On the Romanian soil at least, any discussion regarding some breaching of the norms, or the massive presence in communication of Anglicisms or vulgar terms, is likely to stir passions and to cause severe judgments. Dominant among them are a feeling of crisis, or lamentations regarding the decline of language, formulated as *degradation, disease, perversion*¹

1 Thomas (1991) provides a long list of metaphors for linguistic decline, common for various cultures and used as arguments to support purist programs.

etc. But to deplore the degradation of language is not a new phenomenon; we encounter it in most cultures and in all centuries; it is as frequent and repetitive as saying that *the youngsters of today...*, recalling the myth of *the golden age*². For the theme to be treated rationally and in a historically founded way, however, we should establish whether or not, in the past, the language was indeed healthier and less degraded. In most cases, the landmarks are misleading: speakers report themselves to an idealized and partial image, confronting today's reality with an *ideal* or with a *sample* of language (proposed by the school, the theatre, by classic writers etc.).

Linguistic variation and change are natural phenomena, described objectively by linguists, but *perceived* in most cases *negatively* by ordinary speakers. Their attitude towards the language is psychological by nature: no one likes to participate in a game whose rules are continuously changing. Man's need for stability finds this lack of control worrisome; a lack of control perceived when the rules are changed gradually, by several millions of players (by fashion or by the tendencies of spoken language), and especially when those rules are substituted – suddenly – by arbiters (by explicit modification of the official norms). True, there is also the opposite vision, according to which a language *evolves*, becomes continuously richer, more subtle, more complex etc.; this position may be assumed, at a certain moment, by those who impose the norms of the language (in the name of an ideal projected into the future); but spontaneous attitudes of this kind, coming from ordinary speakers are not usual.

Assessment of a language – i.e. the speakers' attitude towards their language: assessments, preferences, what they consider to be good or bad, nice or ugly, opportune or inopportune – contribute to linguistic change, fostering tendencies already initiated.

When speaking about innovation and tendencies in the development of a language, the referent is not always obvious. For many speakers, there is only one "true" language: the *cultivated* variant, which is subject to norms and is relatively stable and unitary. The rest – the *popular*, spontaneous oral language – does not count (even though they themselves use it, to certain degrees and in given circumstances); it is a "non-language", a mere succession of mistakes. In linguistic disputes it is sometimes claimed that certain words, meanings or grammatical constructions simply *do not exist*, since dictionaries and grammar books do not mention them.

Conversely, linguists focus especially on what is placed outside the

2 "As a general rule in language matters, the past is believed to be pure and innovation is often suspected of corruption" (Spolsky 2004: 22); "This morbid concern for the health of English is not new" (Aitchinson 1998: 15); cf. Bailey, 1991, Battistella, 2005 etc.

norm: on the living language, on its change and dynamics. For specialists, all variants of the language are equally justified, deviations from the standard being viewed, in many cases, as inexplicit internal norms of popular usage. In open polemic with the prescriptive excesses of “language cultivators”, modern descriptive linguistics has sometimes exaggerated in the opposite direction, depriving the normative tradition of all value³. Cultivated language is not a goal in itself, it is not the only valid hypostasis of a language; which does not mean that we can deny its necessity, justified on a practical level (as stable instrument of communication, as intersection zone for numerous variants of the language), as well as on a symbolic level: just like the system of politeness and the dress code, it caters for the element of prestige, by way of practices placed above daily use, and sometimes in disagreement with them.

2. The current state of the Romanian language cannot be understood without a historical perspective. Romanian is a language subject to several layers of influence (Slavonic, Greek, Turkish etc.); its standardization occurred relatively late (the first attempts were made towards the end of the 18th century); its regional variants, even after the Union of 1918, are quite obvious. In the 19th century, the massive amount of Latin-Romance borrowings induced a radical transformation of the literary variant of Romanian (the language of culture); in the 150 years that separate us from Cyrillic writing, the orthographic norms of Romanian changed tens of times (many linguistic variations are disguised by editions that continuously update spelling, punctuation and, sometimes, even grammar). Unity and stability are relatively recent acquisitions; a quick historical survey is often sufficient to show that today’s deviation is not always an innovation, but rather, the result of the fact that the norm never truly imposed itself⁴. Certain specific features of present-day Romanian result from older tensions (little acknowledged or resolved) between the colloquial and the cultivated register.

Elusively, in the recent decades, there occurred a change in the coding system of the language (see Gavin, 1993): during the communist regime, there functioned a single centralized – institutionalized and authoritarian – standardizing system; censorship, i.e. full control of public communication, triggered the impression of a perfect, correct and unitary language. After 1989, prescriptive institutions (with the Academy holding first place)

3 “One can choose to obsess over prescriptive rules, but they have no more to do with human language than the criteria for judging cats at a cat show have to do with mamalian biology” (Pinker, 1994: 372).

4 See, for example, Zafiu, 2009.

continued to behave as though this authority had never been broken, even though, at present, the real norm is mostly established through confrontation and concurrence between several centers of prestige and cultural action (e.g. publishing houses, which often reflect regional identities).

The present-day tendencies of Romanian⁵ are, to a large extent, manifestations of more general tendencies, common for numerous languages. Today, three “global” factors have an impact on the linguistic evolution of Romanian: (a) *the influence of English*; (b) *the influence of communication via the electronic media*; (c) *a narrowing of the gap between educated and popular language, between writing and speaking*.

3. The *influence of English* – as language of globalization, of international communication, of sciences as well as of entertainment –, is a general phenomenon, but its manifestation is more intensely perceived in the Eastern European states (which had not undergone the Anglicizing wave experienced by Western countries after World War II)⁶.

The influence of English is massive in certain domains of the language (the language of IT, of economics, of politics, of entertainment, as well as in colloquial young-set talk), but fairly reduced in others (literature, plastic arts, philosophy etc.). Reaction to this type of influence is relatively moderate: both specialists and ordinary communicators criticize excesses, but accept the *necessary* component of the phenomenon, such as technical borrowings naming new notions, or terms used to avoid long circumlocutions. Attempts to reduce the English influence by translation or with the help equivalents (semantic calque) failed both at official level and that of the wide public, stirring reactions that were mostly ironic. This kind of attitude has historical foundations (often mentioned consciously by the speakers themselves) in the historic experience of periods of massive borrowing, which successively assimilated, without essentially affecting the system of the language: the Turkish and Greek influences of the 17th and 18th centuries, comparable in extent to today’s Anglicizing, ended up by enriching the language, especially its lexis, without affecting its grammatical structure. Besides, it often occurs that today’s Anglicism replaces another borrowing, one that is much older and has been fully

5 In Romanian linguistics, the tradition of describing the tendencies of the language and the relation norm-usage is prestigious, allowing us to relate current data with past observations: Iordan, 1948, Graur, 1968, Guțu Romalo 1972 (reedited in 2008). In the recent years, the results of extensive and detailed research on the dynamics of the language can be found in Pană Dindelegan 2002, 2003, 2009. Cf. and Avram 2003.

6 From an extremely rich bibliography on the issue, let us mention here the volumes of reference (dictionary, collection of studies and bibliography) coordinated by Görlach (2001, 2002 a, b).

assimilated: today we don't ask for *bere la halbă*, but for *bere la draught* (i.e. "draught beer") – an old Germanism is replaced by a recent Anglicism; or, today we no longer speak of *bani peşin* (a Turkish term, fully lexicalized in Romanian), but rather, of *cash*. The symbolic value of Anglicisms is obvious: today numerous terms are doubled by their semantic equivalents for the connotations the latter carry, e.g. *job* has been borrowed to stand by the side of synonyms, such as *serviciu* or *slujbă*, because the English word carries connotations of "modern", "current", "Western".

When faced with the choice of adding a new meaning to a pre-existing word, or providing the Romanian equivalents for a term's components (semantic or structural calque), on the one hand, and borrowing a term from English as faithfully as possible, on the other, speakers usually prefer the latter solution. For example, the IT term *site* is preserved as such, few speaker preferring to semantically extend the older French loan *sit*; the loan word *consumerism* (unanalyzable in Romanian, where the base *consumer* does not exist) is preferred to the re-motivated and transparent *consumism* (*consum* + *-ism*). And yet, some counterexamples show that the tendency of opting for a lexical loan is not general: today there also circulate in Romanian a number of English calques which pass mostly unnoticed. In most such cases, we have a kind of *re-borrowing*, with new English meanings added to older loans (elevated words of Latin origin), which entered the Romanian dictionary around a century ago, with a form and meanings taken from French. For example, new meaning from English were added to terms, such as *expertiză* (old meaning: "investigation, research"; new meaning: "experience"), *locație* (old meaning, very narrow: "rent"; new meaning: "placement, position, place"), *a aplica*, *a abuza*, *patetic* etc.⁷ In spite of the unpleasant feeling of semantic instability (perceived by cultivated speakers as "deviations from logic"), such modifications are not unacceptable and reactions are excessive: critics deplore the lack of fidelity to traditional meanings – even though the tradition is no longer than one and a half centuries old. Basically, innovations of this kind reflect a much more profound gap, one between generations: the cultural Francophony and Francophilia of two centuries ago has been replaced by a sudden turn towards Anglophony and a quasi-total disinterest in the French language.

The calque operates in the case of syntax, too; linguists are shocked by changes of regime, or by new constructions, but they pass unnoticed

7 In the case of *confort* and *confortabil*, the pressure of English affects not only the semantic structure of the word (added meaning: "support, encouragement, consolation") but, with some speakers, also its spelling: the terms sometimes appear as *comfort* and *comfortabil* (which do not abide by the Romanian rules).

for the majority of speakers (lexis is visible and stirs passions, but syntax is discreet). Constructions, such as: *a oferta pe cineva cu ceva* (passive: *X a fost ofertat de Y*), *probleme adresate*, *copii abuzați* etc., are English in origin.

It was noted, however, that the spreading of English can also be interpreted as an instrument of a globalization in which the Latin origins of European culture persist⁸. Illustrative in this respect is, among other examples, the mark for the superlative *super*: of Latin origin, and entered into Romanian via the language of youngsters, it has been lexicalized in numerous present-day languages (different pronunciations) as a common form of agreement and approval.

To sum up an extremely complex phenomenon⁹ in an inevitably simplifying way, we can say that present-day Anglicisms go very rapidly through a process of morphologic adaptation: nouns take on the inflection of plurality (e.g. the plural form *bodyguardzi* was accepted by DOOM²); verbs follow the cultivated conjugation pattern, with *-a* infinitive and the present suffix *-ez* (*a downloada* – *downloadez*, and also *a focusa*, *a prioriza*, *a emfaza*, *a accesa*, *a posta*), as well as the informal–colloquial one, with the infinitive ending *-(u)i*: *a brându* (< *brand*), *a cetui* (< *chat*), *a șerui* (< *share*). Such changes occur spontaneously and inevitably, imposed by the morphology of Romanian; without them, the words could not be used in utterances. Certain words, fewer in number, remain invariable and tend to create a pattern of juxtaposition (*situație horror*). Phonetic adaptation, minimal or partial, is also spontaneous and inevitable: similar sounds are transposed into their Romanian equivalents, while dissimilar ones are preserved more faithfully. The orthographic aspect of Anglicisms is preserved even when their transcription in the Romanian orthographic system would not be a problem. Rejection of orthographic adaptation represents a cultural attitude and option: transpositions are perceived as uneducated and comical (which is the very reason why they are used in the colloquial written register; *luzăr* < Engl. *loser*). Thus, in a language which has assimilated graphically (and phonetically) many French terms – *abajur*, *voiaj*, *șofer* – and even older Anglicisms – *meci*, *gem*, *henț* –, today the original forms are preserved: *cool*, *look*, *leadership* etc.

Some Anglicisms have already acquired pragmatic functions, they

8 In Romania, the idea was launched many years ago by Alexandru Graur (1972: 181–182).

9 The influence of English on the Romanian language is a subject of great interest in recent years and the literature is extensive; see Avram, 1997, Ștefănescu, 2001, Stoichițoiu Ichim, 2006 etc.

have become conversational instruments (as it happened, in the past, with Turkish terms, such as: *barem*, *taman*, *sadea*, or French terms, such as *deja*, *apropos*, *mersi*); an agreement is marked with the form *OK*; a surprise – with the interjection *Wow!*; a mistake – with *ups!*; adverbial modifiers, such as *pe loc* (*immediately*) and *all the time* (*permanently*) are obsessively substituted by *instant* and *nonstop* etc.

Apart from the morphological adaptation of Anglicisms (by adoption of the dominant Romanian inflective patterns), the most obvious proof of their assimilation, of their integration in the system of the language, is their lexical productivity, their capacity to develop cognate words. Most terms undergo accelerated derivational processes, as in the case of the noun *blog* (whose cognate group contains terms such as: *a bloga*, *a blogui*, *a blogări*, *bloguire*, *blogist*, *blogherist*, *blogistic*, *bloggeristic*, *blogism*, *bloggerism*, *bloguț*, *blogușor*, *blogărel*, *blogărime*, *blogăreală* etc.).

Finally, there is also internal adjustment: without any official imposition, after a while, the loans may be replaced spontaneously by their Romanian equivalents: e.g. the verb *a downloada* – by the neutral *a descărca*, or by the humorous partial translation *a da jos*; *developper* by *dezvoltator*; *e-mail* by *poșta electronică* etc.

4. The second major source of change in contemporary Romanian is *communication via the electronic media*. Apparently, this phenomenon would fall under the wing of the previous category: in the early days it was believed that the virtual space would be one of globalization, a realm where English would impose itself. But the evolution of the phenomenon has proved that, on the contrary, the internet can foster the assertion of diversity: it offers space of knowledge for disappearing languages, for regional variants or/and slangs, just as it offers access to classical texts, to academic dictionaries, to princeps editions etc. Across an extremely wide medium, the internet make possible great distance transversal communication, but it seems that the great majority of verbal exchanges still occur among small communities, in the language of the local dialect. Its contribution to the process of Anglicising is therefore only a tiny fraction, and not even the most important one, of the influence the new media exerts. The other effects of the internet seem to be related to (a) the massive stock of information; (b) the new type of reading – by leaps, superficial, but with greater numbers of connections; (c) the wide access to self-expression in writing, which leaves durable marks; (d) the new type of written communication, in conditions close to oral interaction, but also subject to additional technical constraints.

Thanks to the virtual medium, people have access to information they

were denied in the past, or did not know how to look for. The number of users who access Romanian sites with on-line dictionaries (general ones, of synonyms, neologisms, etymological one etc.) is much higher than that of persons likely to have opened a dictionary before. In the same way, the number of people who write – on blogs, forums, discussion lists, commentaries to articles – is much higher than that of persons likely to have had access to public space some decades ago (e.g. by mail to the editor, or by printing a self-financed volume). The process of wording enhances one's possibility for self-assessment and correction, but diminishes his internal need to do so (as long as the text can be published in any way).

Rapid writing without rereading, the so-called oral-writing of the chat, of the messenger or of the sms (Crystal, 2006: 31–52), influences the current practices of communication and has a series of orthographic and syntactic consequences on the language of today. In the field of spelling, the practice of neglecting of diacritical signs, or the attempt to recover them by other means, as well as the system of abbreviations established by use, tend to step out of the virtual space and invade even handwriting (*shi = ši, tzine = ține, dak = dacă*). Orthographic innovations are not only functional, but – and especially – symbolic, expressive and ludic: take, for example, crossword-puzzle-like abbreviations (*k = ka, d = de, k&cum = ca și cum* etc.), or using *k* instead of *c* and *j* instead of *ș* (*kum = cum, jmeker = șmecher*). The rules of spelling and punctuation are broken; and yet, it would be a mistake to believe that in spontaneous electronic communication is absolutely random. The comma is often dropped, but the full stop is not, while suspension marks are used more and more frequently, to show that an utterance is unfinished, or that the syntax is based on suspension. The early observers of this form of communication were also impressed by the attempt to recover the context of face-to-face conversation, or by that of transmitting feelings by way of mimicry, gesture and intonation – using the so-called emoticons; still, their role is not so great as one might believe, and senders still employ traditional forms to point to the affective component of their message.

The greatest risk of such forms of communication is that they deprive writing of the practice of rereading and revision, that they turn punctuation rules into optional recommendations and, most of all, that they promote a textual model that is destructured and fragmentary. By opening the door towards orality, they foster a shocking enough stylistic blend – specific for the third main direction of contemporary language development.

5. *Reduction of the gap between writing and reading* is closely related to an obvious democratization of public communication in general, and of

writing, in particular; it is an older consequence of mass alphabetization, and a more recent one of the electronic media, as well as of the ever wider accessibility of the mass-media (to a public whose number increases continuously). It is a motion back-and-forth, with the public discourse descending into the zone of the colloquial, and even the vulgar, where speakers insert, without any adjustment of register, their own voices into the general polyphony.

As a result of a leveling of registers, terms which initially belonged to slang (*tun*, *șpagă*, *țeapă*) acquire regular usage, colloquial structures (*care* not preceded by *pe*) are widely accepted, or dangerously contaminate public discourse (*decât* in affirmative constructions). The interference of languages, however, does not produce a homogenous mass, because they face the opposition of certain contrary tendencies, which emphasize differences of register. In fact, today there are two directions for ling variation, two types of tendencies: popular (spontaneous, old or innovative) and cult (excesses of “hypercorrectness” triggered precisely by a refusal of popular tendencies). Sometimes, the two types of tendencies are symmetrically opposed: in popular language, inflectional genitive-dative forms are replaced by constructions with preposition *la* (*scriu la o prietenă, din cauza la o vecină*), while educated language extends the use of the dative even to situations where the prepositional construction would be normally used (e.g. *indiferent situației*). In this case, too, we notice that the image speakers have about language and norm has consequences upon linguistic change. The excessive sensitivity of present-day (educated) speakers with regards to the esthetic component of the language, their horror to supposed cacophonies, may also strike one as strange. Every year, the list of situations perceived as cacophonous lengthens; fear of cacophony results in distorted utterances, in the appearance of syntactically unmotivated, but rapidly spreading, constructions (the sequence *ca și*), restoration of form become archaic (*precum*).

Typically, the conflict between tendencies can be appraised by studying the status of diminutives, or more exactly, the present ever wider extent of diminutivizing. Structurally, Romanian – like other Romance languages (Italian, Spanish) – allows diminutives easily, and it is neither limited to the noun, nor to the denotative value of “smaller”; a means to convey affectionate or ironic-depreciative connotations, as well as a means for discursal gradation or attenuation, diminutivizing is richly represented in colloquial Romanian. From the cultivated norm it was rejected – on the basis of rational and esthetic arguments, but probably also under the influence of the French model (Zafiu, 2010); today it is making a forceful

come-back, either by derivatives that are accepted into the standard register (*mămică, filmuleț, animăluț*), or as pragmatic mark of attenuation and politeness (*minuțel, bonuleț, facturică*).

We can also observe socio-linguistic changes that occur within the code of politeness; besides, this code is not exactly stable, oscillating permanently between an educated pole and a popular one, each with its own norms and formulas. To these, new models are being added today, either under external influences, or triggered by internal evolutions, spread by the mass-media and, especially, by advertising: e.g. in the case of the T/V¹⁰ system, the colloquial *tu* address replaces the polite *dumneavoastră*; the colloquial *Bună!* functions as a stylistically neutral greeting¹¹. Another category of tensions is related to the use of the feminine forms of certain professions: in the system of the Romanian language, feminine forms of nouns are easily coined (*profesoară, directoare, președintă*); the educated norm rejects such forms, continuing to associate prestige with the masculine variant (*doamna profesor/director/președinte*).

A series of morpho-syntactic tendencies illustrate the social component of using language as promoting or sigmatizing factor. Popular tendencies manifest themselves by strongly marking grammatical categories by modifying the form of the word and by redundancy; educated tendencies reduce to the minimum formal modifications (showing etymological fidelity) and give preference to non-redundancy (a “rationalizing” of the means). In present-day Romanian we can perceive, on the one hand, a tendency for adjustment, analogy and agreement (e.g. in the case of the common noun *mass-media*, whose description as feminine singular was validated by DOOM²: *mass-media românească*), and on the other, a tendency to preserve, even against the norm, of etymological differentiation (status of neutral plural: *mass-media românești*).

6. In the field of a language’s evolution, predictions are quite risky; a collection of linguistic humour could be made of predictions, regarding the success or failure of a linguistic form or tendency, which proved to be totally false. If embraced and spread by a large number of speakers, linguistic innovations, even those considered to be mistakes and harshly criticized by normative bodies, are explainable and, in fact, necessary. Fashion itself is a psychological necessity, as are redundancy or the creation of clichés. In

10 From the French *tu/vous*.

11 In a recent advertising spot, the male character greets, on a first encounter, his supposed future in-laws by saying *Bună!*; certain informative e-mails use the same opening formula even though in the rest of the text the pronoun of politeness (*dumneavoastră*) is used; etc.

the social game of using the language, however, resistance and opposition to innovation are also essential.

A few years ago, a significant episode in the confrontation between norm and use revealed the complexity of the situation. The normative dictionary, issued in 2005 under the patronage of the Academy (DOOM²) allowed, among other things, some concessions to popular use, accepting in the standard language several morphological variants considered, until that moment, to be pure mistakes. In spite of the present-day tendency of narrowing the gap between the popular register and the educated one, the reaction of speakers to those permissive regulations was mostly negative (see Vintilă-Rădulescu, 2006).

In the dynamics of a living language, whose system needs to remain functional and adapted to speakers' communicative needs, change is inevitable and, basically, inoffensive. But the concern of our contemporaries is important, because attitudes and assessments balance out and moderate evolutions that are too fast, preserving the natural dependence on cultural factors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Aitchison, Jean, *The Media are Ruining English*, in Laurie Bauer, Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Language Myths*, London, Penguin Books, 1998, p. 15–22.
- Avram, Mioara, *La créativité e l'«hospitalité» du roumain*, in “Revue Roumaine de Linguistique”, XXXVIII, nr. 1–3, 1993, p. 23–26.
- Avram, Mioara, *Anglicismele în limba română actuală*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 1997.
- Avram, Mioara, *Considerații asupra dinamicii limbii și asupra studierii ei în româna actuală*, in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, 2003, p. 15–22.
- Bailey, Richard W., *Images of English. A Cultural History of the Language*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1991.
- Battistella, Edwin L., *Bad Language: Are Some Words Better than Others?* Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Ciobanu, Georgeta, *Anglicisme în limba română*, Timișoara, Editura Amphora, 1996.
- Crystal, David, *Language and the Internet*, ed. a II-a, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- D'Achille, Paolo, *L'Italiano contemporaneo*, ed. a III-a, Bologna, Il Mulino, 2010.
- Garvin, Paul L., *Styles of Codification*, in “Brno Studies in English”, 20, 1993, p. 17–22.
- Görlach, Manfred (ed.), *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms. A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages (DEA)*, Oxford, Oxford University

- Press, 2001.
- Görlach, Manfred (ed.), *English in Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002a.
- Görlach, Manfred (ed.), *An Annotated Bibliography of European Anglicisms*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002b.
- Graur, Alexandru, *Lingvistica pe înțelesul tuturor*, București, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1972.
- Graur, Alexandru, *Tendențele actuale ale limbii române*, București, Editura Științifică, 1968.
- Guțu Romalo, Valeria, *Corectitudine și greșeală. Limba română de azi*, ediția a III-a, revăzută și adăugită, București, Humanitas, (ediția I: 1972), 2008.
- Iordan, Iorgu, *Limba română actuală. O gramatică a „greșelilor”*, Iași, Institutul de Arte Grafice „Alexandru A. Terek”, (ediția a II-a: 1948), 1943.
- Leech, Geoffrey, Marianne Hundt, Christian Mair, Nicholas Smith, *Change in Contemporary English: A Grammatical Study*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Niculescu, Alexandru, *Individualitatea limbii române între limbile romanice. Contribuții socioculturale*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1978.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (coord.), *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii române actuale [I–II]*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2002, 2003.
- Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela (coord.), *Dinamica limbii române actuale – Aspecte gramaticale și discursive*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2009.
- Pinker, Steven, *The Language Instinct*, New York, Harper Collins, 1994.
- Spolsky Bernard, *Language Policy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Stoichițoiu Ichim, Adriana, *Aspecte ale influenței engleze în româna actuală*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2006.
- Ștefănescu, Ariadna, *Cultural and Linguistic English Influence in Romania(n)*, in “Verbum”, nr. 2, 2001, p. 267–294.
- Thomas, George, *Linguistic Purism*, London & New York, Longman, 1991.
- Vintilă-Rădulescu, Ioana, *Primele reacții la noul DOOM*, in Gabriela Pană Dindelegan (coord.), *Limba română, aspecte sincronice și diacronice*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2006, p. 39–47.
- Zafiu, Rodica, *Constituirea unei norme gramaticale: relativul pe care*, in “Limba română”, LVIII, 2, 2009, p. 285–296.
- Zafiu, Rodica, *Evaluarea diminutivelor*, in Gheorghe Chivu, Oana Uță Bărbulescu (ed.), *Studii de limba română. Omagiu profesorului Grigore Brâncuș*, București, Editura Universității din București, 2010, p. 291–297.

*

DOOM² = *Dicționarul ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române*, ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, coord. Ioana Vintilă-Rădulescu, București, Univers Enciclopedic, 2005.

Professor **Rodica Zafiu** Ph.D. holds a chair at the Faculty of Letters of Bucharest University and functions as researcher at “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics, Bucharest. Books published: *Poezia simbolistă românească* (commented anthology, 1996), *Narațiune și poezie* (2000; awarded the Romanian Academy’s “Timotei Cipariu” Prize), *Diversitate stilistică în româna actuală* (2001), *Limba și politică* (2007), *101 cuvinte argotice* (2010). Collaborated on: *Enciclopedia limbii române* (coord.: Marius Sala; 2001, 2nd edition: 2006), *Gramatica limbii române*, I-II (coord.: Valeria Guțu Romalo, 2005, 2008), *Gramatica de bază a limbii române* (coord.: Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, 2010), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte/Histoire linguistique de la Roumanie*, 2009 (coordinators: Gerhardt Ernst et alii) etc. Coordinated (in collaboration) several collective volumes of linguistic studies; editorial secretary for “Revue Roumaine de Linguistique”. Published, in collective volumes and specialized publications, studies of speciality, articles and book reviews: “Degrés”, “Revue de linguistique romane”, “L’information grammaticale”, “Rivista Italiana di Onomastica”, “Il Nome nel testo”, “România Orientale”, “Revue Roumaine de Linguistique”, “Analele Universității București”, “Bulletin de la Société Roumaine de Linguistique Romane”, “Bulletin de l’Association Internationale d’Etudes du Sud-Est Européen”, “Euresis – Cahiers roumains d’études littéraires”, “Limba română”, “Revista de istorie și teorie literară”, “Studii și cercetări lingvistice” etc. Contributed to cultural magazines: “România literară”, “Luceafărul”, “Dilema”, “Dilemateca”, “Vineri”, “Observator cultural”, “Orizont”, “Cultura”, “Cuvântul” etc. Weekly column of linguistics, in “Luceafărul” between 1990 și 1993, then in “România literară”, 1993 to present.

Actul comunicativ din perspectivă discursiv-pragmatică. Modalizarea în limba română contemporană^{1*}

Lizica Mihuț, Bianca Miuța

A Discursive-Pragmatic Approach to the Communicative Act. Modalization in Contemporary Romanian

Abstract:

When people speak, they shape words, they establish relations between them, they select the content which is appropriate for their intention of conveying ideas. The links between morphology and syntax are obvious: the form of the words is enforced by the rules of syntactic combination of words, in order to give our ideas content. It could even be said that morphology exists because of syntax, i.e. words acquire their meaning in a context.

Keywords: pattern-making, speech, communication, discursive-pragmatic perspective

Comunicarea orală implică în primul rând limbajul, fenomen misterios, însă unealtă de bază în transmiterea informațiilor. Limbajul este folosit de către toate ființele umane, îl folosim din plin și adesea fără ezitare fiind partea centrală a personalității pe care o expunem celorlalți.

Abilitățile lingvistice se dezvoltă fără efort conștient (suntem adesea ezitanți, lenți, lipsiți de imaginație sau voluptuoși și captivanți etc), însă ele nu reprezintă ceea ce suntem noi, și pot fi modificate și îmbunătățite, pe de o parte prin ascultarea și imitarea altora, acolo unde observăm că funcționează, și pe de altă parte printr-o preocupare permanentă de îmbunătățire a propriului stil, dar mai ales prin conștientizarea interacțiunilor complexe ce se stabilesc între vorbitor, mesaj și public.

Din perspectivă discursiv-pragmatică, actul comunicativ funcționează

1 * Exemplificările sunt preluate din *GALR*, p. 656–686.

prin intermediul mai multor categorii de elemente denumite *coordonate ale cadrului deictic* (GALR, II, 2005: 635):

- *coordonata personală*, reprezentată de participanții la actul de comunicare;
- *coordonata temporală*, prin care sunt distribuite faptele la care face referire enunțul din perspectiva timpului când se petrece;
- *coordonata spațială*, prin care sunt proiectate faptele referitoare la enunț în raport cu locul în care acesta se produce;
- *coordonata socială*, prin care sunt proiectate relațiile sociale interpersonale, raportate la situația locutorului/alocutorului;
- *coordonata discursivă*, prin care sunt reprezentate raporturile reciproce dintre diferite componente ale discursului.

Dintre aceste categorii de elemente, doar coordonata personală și cea temporală reprezintă gramaticalizare propriu-zisă (prin intermediul mijloacelor codificate morfologic, sintactic și lexical) în timp ce coordonatele spațială, socială și discursivă dispun doar de o gramaticalizare lexicală (realizată prin mijloace sistematice, de natură lexicală).

Expresiile deictice pot fi, în funcție de felul în care se realizează evocarea elementelor de context comunicativ, fie cu referent precis determinat convențional în contextul comunicativ dat, fie cu nucleu semantic simbolic de natură categorială sau mixt, parțial simbolic și parțial ostensive.

Categoria semantică, parțial gramaticalizată, care exprimă raportarea locutorului la un conținut propozițional prin intermediul limbajului se numește *modalizare* (GALR, II, 2005: 673–697).

Modalitatea (GALR, II, 2005: 673) trebuie legată de atitudinea cognitivă, volitivă sau evaluativă față de stările, de lucrurile, reale sau potențiale ale locutorului, iar principalele sale tipuri de manifestare sunt:

- *epistemică* (cognitivă)
Se spune că s-au îndreptat lucrurile.
- *deontică* (prescriptivă și volitivă)
Trebuie să se îndrepte lucrurile.
- *apreciativă* (evaluativă)
E bine că s-au îndreptat lucrurile.

Modalizarea depinde de actul sau tipul de limbaj realizat prin fiecare tip de enunț, fie el reprezentativ (enunțuri asertive), fie directiv (enunțurile imperative sau interogative), act promisiv (realizate prin enunțuri din mai multe categorii) sau expresiv (enunțuri exclamative), toate presupunând diferite tipuri de modalizare.

Modalitatea este o categorie subiectivă, care se realizează în două variante:

- prin subiectivitate asumată (folosirea persoanei I singular: *sunt sigur, mi se pare, îmi place*);

- prin aparentă obiectivizare cu ajutorul expresiilor verbale impersonale: *e sigur, se pare, e frumos*.

Modalizatorii sunt mijloace de marcare a atitudinii modale în enunț și pot fi de mai multe tipuri:

- *gramaticali*:
 - modurile verbale
- *lexico-gramaticali (expresii modale specializate)*:
 - adeverbe și locuțiuni adverbiale, semiadverbe
 - verbe modale (*operatori modali*)
- *lexicali*:
 - verbe cu sens modal (*epistemice, volitive, deontice, apreciative*)
 - perifraze stabile sau libere
- *prozodici*:
 - intonația

Expresiile modale adverbiale sunt predicate semantice, funcționând ca modificatori ai unei întregi propoziții cu predicat enunțiativ sau ai unui element izolabil cu predicție semantică:

Poate au primit deja rezultatele.

Expresiile modale pot apărea în construcții sintactice diferite:

- ca element gramatical regent al propoziției modalizate: *Cu siguranță că vine*;

- ca element incident, parantetic: *Vine, cu siguranță*;

- ca element integrat: *Cu siguranță vine*.

Modalizatorul circumstanțial integrat sintactic, neizolat prin pauză și intonație, poate viza atât propoziția în ansamblu, dar și un element component al ei, cu condiția de a apărea înaintea respectivului component. Circumstanțialul de modalitate se realizează atât în poziție inițială, cât și în poziție mediană sau finală.

Cu siguranță vine azi.

Vine cu siguranță azi.

Vine azi cu siguranță.

Vine la aici cu siguranță azi.

Verbele funcționează ca modalizatori, în cazul în care exprimă o atitudine a locutorului (fiind ancorate deictic, cu forma de prezent, la persoana I singular: *Cred că vine azi*), sau o opinie ori o atitudine curentă invocată de locutor (în construcții impersonale: *Se știe că vine azi*), dar nu și atunci când *descriu* sau *relatează* o atitudine a altui locutor sau a aceluiași locutor (în alt moment temporal: *El crede că vine azi*).

Construcțiile cu verbe care au sens modal pot apărea ca propoziții regente sau independente: incidente, *parantetice* (DEX, 2009: 750).

Se știe că vine azi, dar nu e nimic nou.

Perifrazele au rol de operator modal, sunt de mai multe tipuri, iar în măsura în care formează propoziții, pot fi față de propoziția modalizată regente sau incidente. Se construiesc cu:

- adverbe/adjective: *e bine, e sigur, e obligatoriu;*
- adjective și participii: *sunt sigur, sunt obligat;*
- substantive: *am permisiunea, am certitudinea.*

Modalitatea epistemică sau cognitivă (GALR, II, 2005: 678) se realizează în două forme principale:

- *modalitatea epistemică propriu-zisă (judicata epistemică)* care constă în actul de de indicare a gradului de certitudine pe care îl are locutorul în legătură cu realitatea stării de lucruri descrise în propoziție (fiind semnificată prin următoarele expresii lingvistice specifice, multiplicat cu ajutorul mijloacelor de gradare și aproximare – *absolut cert, foarte sigur, destul de probabil, cam incert, mai mult ca sigur* etc.)

Mijloacele lingvistice de realizare a modalizării epistemice sunt: modurile verbale, verbele modale, verbele cu sens modal, diferite adverbe și locuțiuni adverbiale, adjective în diverse construcții, particule pragmatice, îmbinări lexicale libere care conțin substantive cu sens modal; anumite adjective și adverbe cu sens modal se pot obține sistematic prin sufixare (cu sufixul *-bil*). Modalizarea epistemică este reprezentată, în primul rând, prin propoziții principale (nondependente).

- *evidențialitatea* reprezintă înscrierea în mesaj a surselor pe care locutorul le-a avut la dispoziție pentru a cunoaște conținutul unei propoziții.

Distingem câteva tipuri de surse:

a) procesele mentale, de deducție:

Studenta trebuie să fi auzit, de nu mai ajunge.

b) preluarea informației de la alții, citarea:

Se presupune că studenta ar fi auzit.

c) percepția directă, senzorială, mai ales cea vizuală:

Uite, nu mai vine nimeni!

În funcție de tipul de sursă a informației propoziționale, pe care îl indică, evidențialele pot fi clasificate în mărci *ale inferenței (deducției), ale relatării (citării) și ale percepției* (GALR, II, 2005: 679).

Modalitatea deontică indică gradul de obligativitate sau de permisivitate a situațiilor descrise într-o propoziție, fiind marcată sugestiv prin termenii *obligatoriu și permis*. Ea impune enunțurilor un caracter nonassertiv, realizând acte de limbaj de tip directiv (*ordin, îndemn* etc.), în

care expresiile deontice sunt folosite performativ și prescriptiv.

Se realizează prin:

- *modalitatea deontică propriu-zisă* nonsubiectivă, întemeiată pe condiționări exterioare și exprimă prin moduri verbale, verbe modale, adverbe și locuțiuni specializate, verbe care au conținut lexical deontic și îmbinări libere de cuvinte.

Trebuie să te supui regulilor!

- *modalitatea volitivă, deziderativă*, apropiată de cea deontică propriu-zisă, în măsura în care formulele deontice au adesea (în afara celor strict juridice) o bază subiectivă: *se cere* înseamnă de fapt *îți cer* (cererea subiectivă presupunând o dorință/voință a locutorului).

Modalitatea volitivă se exprimă prin moduri verbale, verbe cu conținut lexical deziderativ, construcții cu adverbe, adjective sau substantive cu aceeași semnificație și se realizează și în construcții de tip *urare*, inclusiv în *imprecații*, cu verbul la condițional-optativ, caracterizate de o intonație exclamativă specială și de inversare.

Arde-l-ar focul să-l ardă!

De-ar veni odată...!

- *modalitatea apreciativă* este cea mai subiectivă dintre tipurile de modalități, chiar dacă poate lua forme aparent obiective, impersonale, bazându-se pe evaluări curente, împărtășite de grupuri mari de vorbitori (GALR, II, 2005: 694). Modalizarea apreciativă, raportează conținutul propozițional la locutor și la momentul enunțării, iar mijloacele sale lingvistice pot fi folosite și nonmodal, descriptiv.

E minunat să fii tânăr!

Se disting construcțiile apreciative:

a) subiective, referirea la persoana I realizându-se prin forma verbului (*apreciez*) sau prin pronumele clitic (*îmi place*).

b) obiective (*e minunat*).

c) nonemotivă, evaluativă (prin apel la valori) – *E minunat să fii tânăr*.

d) emotivă (prin apel la sentimente, stări interioare) – *E îmbucurător să fii tânăr*.

Mijloacele de exprimare a modalizării apreciative sunt: verbele cu sens lexical apreciativ, anumite construcții cu adverbe și locuțiuni adverbiale, cu adjective sau substantive cu sens apreciativ, interjecții și particule exclamative și – mai mult decât la celelalte tipuri de modalizare – intonația (GALR, II, 2005: 695).

Verbele cu sens lexical apreciativ sunt: impersonale – *a-i plăcea că.../să..., a-i dispăcea că.../să..., a merita să..., a-l dura că..., a-l deprima că.../să..., a-l enerva că.../să..., a-l îngrozi că.../să ...* (emotive, afective),

personale: *a aprecia că.../să..., (evaluativ), a detesta să..., a urî să..., a regreta că..., a se bucura că.../să... etc.*

Adverbele și locuțiunile adverbiale apreciative pot intra în tipare de construcție diferite, ca regent al propoziției conjuncționale, în calitate de adverb predicativ sau în construcție cu o copulă: *e ciudat că..., e bine că..., e rău că..., e de mirare că...* etc. În această construcție pot să apară extrem de multe adjective cu utilizarea adverbială: *e curios, minunat, superb, paradoxal, regretabil, trist, util, esențial* etc., locuțiuni adverbiale cu funcția de circumstanțial de modalitate incident sau integrat: *din fericire, din păcate, din nenorocire, din nefericire.*

Substantive care exprimă, lexical, ideea de evaluare pozitivă sau negativă intră în construcții relative stabile, cu câteva tipare principale: ca eliptic și căpătând valoare adverbială, ca regent al unei subordonate conjuncționale subiective (*păcat că nu vine*), ca subiect postpus copulei, însoțit sau nu de articolul nehotărât sau de determinative: *e păcat că..., e mare nenorocire că..., e o nenorocire că...* etc., ca subiect antepus copulei: *problema e că..., lucrul interesant e că..., nenorocirea e că...* etc., în poziția de complement direct: *a avea bucuria/plăcerea să.../de a...Am bucuria să anunț promovații.*

Un discurs bun nu înseamnă numai a pune în practică ceea ce este logic, ci înseamnă a folosi logica în orice tip de activitate, însă întâi de toate trebuie ca activitatea să fie înțeleasă.

BIBLIOGRAFIE :

- * * * *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, Editura Academiei Române, Institutul de Lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, București, 2009.
- * * * *Dicționarul ortografic, ortoepic și morfologic al limbii române*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, Institutul de Lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, București, 2005.
- * * * *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, Editura Nemira, București, 2001 (autori: Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela, Călărașu, Cristina, Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana, Mancaș, Mihaela, Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela).
- * * * *Gramatica limbii române*, ediția a II-a revăzută și adăugită, vol. II, *Sintaxa*, Editura Academiei, București, 1966.
- * * * *Gramatica limbii române*, vol. II, *Enunțul*, Editura Academiei Române, Institutul de Lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, București, 2005.
- * * * *Gramatica uzuală a limbii române*, coord. Teodor Cotelnic, Editura Litera, București, 2000.
- Borchin, Mirela-Ioana, *Lingvistica în știința secolului al XX-lea*, Editura Excelsior

Art, Timișoara, 2002.

Irimia, Dumitru, *Gramatica limbii române*, Editura Polirom, Iași, 1997.

Mihaela, Mancaș, *Limba artistic românească în secolul XX (1900-1950)*, Editura Științifică, București, 1991.

Mihuț, Lizica, *Corectitudine în vorbire și în scriere*, Editura Dacia, Cluj-Napoca, 1999.

Nagy, Rodica, *Sintaxa limbii române actuale. Unități, raporturi și funcții*, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2005.

Tomescu, Domnița, *Analiza gramaticală a textului. Metodă și dificultăți*, Editura ALL Educațional, București, 2003.

Professor **Lizica Mihuț** is rector of “Aurel Vlaicu” University of Arad. She has published books in the following fields: philology – *Gramatica limbii române* (1st edition, 1966, 2nd edition, 1999); *Corectitudine în vorbire și în scriere* (1999); *Fonetică și fonologie* (2006); *Limba română. Sinteze și exerciții* (2007); *Limba română. Repere teoretice. Exerciții* (2008); *Limba română și noul DOOM în norme și grile* (2010); culture history – *Mișcarea teatrală arădeană până la înfăptuirea Marii Uniri* (1989); *Aradul și teatrul transilvănean până la Marea Unire* (1993); *Itinerarii spirituale arădene* (1997); *Teatrul arădean – privire istorică* (1998); *Transilvania și teatrul arădean până la Marea Unire* (2005); *Mișcarea teatrală arădeană după înfăptuirea Marii Uniri* (2009); university management (*Universitatea “Aurel Vlaicu”*, 11 volumes, 2000–2010); university courses related to contemporary Romanian (vocabulary, morphology, syntax, multiple choice exercises); over 50 studies and articles in the philology and teaching fields (in collective volumes or in specialised reviews from Romania and abroad); over 70 studies of culture history, over 100 theatre reviews in magazines such as “Orizont”, “Familia”, “Tribuna”, “Vatra”, but also in the printed press from Arad; cultural publications (over 900 articles, most of them in the printed press from Arad and from the Western part of the country).

Bianca Miuța is lecturer at “Aurel Vlaicu” University Arad, where she is teaching courses of Romanian phonetics, syntax and morphology. Coauthor of: *Fonetică și Fonologie* (2005, 2006), *Limba română. Sinteze și exerciții* (2007), *Limba română și noul DOOM în norme și grile* (2010).

Meaning, Image and Attitude (I)

Adriana Vizental

Abstract:

With every word the speaker utters, with every gesture he makes, he conveys not only a meaning, but also an image of himself and an attitude. To improve get access to higher social strata, the speaker learns to improve his language and paralanguage. The rise in society of Eliza Doolittle (the female protagonist of Shaw's *Pygmalion*/Alan Jay Lerner's *My Fair Lady*) is analyzed to show that a speaker of modest social origins may gain access into the highest social circles by putting on "the right clothes": good pronunciation, an elegant outfit and civilized manners.

Keywords: personal image, (non-)intentional meaning, para- and body language

Introduction: Intentional and Non-Intentional Meaning

With every word we say¹, with every gesture we make, we convey not only a variety of meanings, but also an image of ourselves, as well as an attitude; which, in their turn, carry further meanings.

Even the simplest and most basic words – such as *yes* or *no* – carry meanings regarding the speaker's *identity*: *yes* can be uttered /jes/, /jæs/, /jeə/, or /jæp/, which gives the knowledgeable receiver information regarding the speaker's geographic or social background. Obviously, communication is not based on single words, but on longer stretches of language, at which level the speaker can hardly disguise his regional background.

Thus, *pronunciation* is a key element for establishing the speaker's personal *image*. Linguistic variations can tell us whether he is British, American, Australian or non-native, whether he is educated or not, living

1 This paper focuses exclusively on oral communication.

in a city or at the country-side, etc. Standard pronunciation, grammatical accuracy and select word choice suggest that the speaker belongs to some higher level on the social scale. Conversely, dialectal speech is generally associated with the lower social classes, and defective grammar automatically gives us a picture of limited education.

Ambitious people all over the world are aware of the social value of good pronunciation, as the following excerpt suggests:

My accent was as synthetic as [...] Marilee's. Marilee and I, a coal miner's daughter and an American shoemaker's son, [...] had sense enough not to pretend to be upper class British. We obscured our humble origins in vocal tones and inflections which [...] are known as "trans-Atlantic" – cultivated, pleasant to the ear, and neither British nor American.

Kurt Vonnegut's *Bluebeard* (1987: 175)

The term *synthetic* here means "artificial" or "fabricated", in the sense that the new accent was acquired painstakingly, by careful education. Class consciousness plays an important role here: the two persons of humble origins have *sense enough* not aspire to the exclusivist upper classes, which demand "pedigree", not only good pronunciation. In their desire to occupy a decent place on the social scale, such people find that Standard English is the best choice.

On the other hand, the speaker does not always pronounce his words in the same way: the same speaker may use standard pronunciation in formal situations, and dialectal pronunciation when he is among people of lower social background. This is because he knows that *when in Rome*, it is essential to *dress like the Romans*, i.e. to use a kind of language that is similar to that spoken by his interlocutors.

Furthermore, even single words may *mean* much more than, or something different from, what the dictionary tells us they are supposed to mean. Because words mean what the speaker wants them to mean, as Lewis Carroll's Humpty Dumpty²² tells us.

With his *intonation*, or with the illocutionary force he gives to his utterance, the speaker gives voice to the *attitude* he adopts in a given situation: he can make his *yes* function as a matter-of-fact consent (low fall, meaning "I agree"), or as an exclamation of victory (high fall, i.e. "I did it!"), etc. Conversely, his *no* can function as an unemotional rejection (low fall, i.e. "I don't agree!") or as an outraged expression of disbelief (high fall, i.e. "You can't mean that!"), etc.

2 Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass*, Chapter VI.

Apart from intonation, the speaker uses *paralanguage* – tone of voice, “eye language”, gestures of the hand, etc. – to nuance his meanings and thus to convey a variety of attitudes³³.

The speaker’s *tone of voice* enhances or contradicts the meaning of his words: a *yes* uttered with a triumphant voice emphasizes the speaker’s delight in some recent success; conversely, a *yes* spoken with an ironic voice (as in, “Yeah, sure!”) conveys an opposite meaning.

Tone of voice is usually accompanied by some physical *gesture*. Gestures of the hand are the most obvious (e.g. a raised finger, a menacing fist), but “gestures” of the face, of the eye, or of the body are equally communicative and powerful. A frown, a lifted brow, or a searing gaze are also perceived as threatening – in numerous cases even more so because educated communicators refrain from wide physical gestures. Other types of body language, e.g. body posture, tantalizing or insulting gestures, dressing demurely or frivolously, etc., can be as rich in communicative content.

Obviously, for the educated communicator, vocabulary represents the most important resource for expressing meanings and attitudes. From the wide range of stylistic variants it offers, the world-wise communicator picks the ones which seem to him the most appropriate for the situational context. How important the attitudinal dimension of communication is can be seen from the fact that the category of *slang* – a highly intimate and personal category of terms – is defined as *words with an attitude*. Socially restricted and extremely ephemeral, slangy terms (e.g. *cool*, *dude*, or *freak*) are powerful and subtly nuanced carriers of the speaker’s feelings (e.g. like or dislike of a person, object or event).

Needless to say, it is not easy to assess the social context precisely; as a result, speakers often make serious blunders. The analysis in the next sections, of Eliza Doolittle’s behaviour, will reveal some such blunders, as well as their consequences.

To accomplish his communicative aims, or merely carried away by the situational context, the speaker *manipulates* his language and paralanguage so as to convey not only various meanings and attitudes, but also to create various images of himself. This kind of intentional manipulation of the language pertains to what linguists call *strategic communication*.

3 Writing is much poorer than oral communication in signs meant to convey attitude, but writers have identified some ways of recording it. For the high fall there is the exclamation mark; a rise-fall can be symbolized with a question mark placed between two exclamation marks (!?!); a fall-rise – with a series of three dots (...) to point to the speaker’s hesitation. In most cases, though, the writer will use additional comments.

To illustrate this assertion, let us take two examples from the field of pop music. Consider Michael Jackson's language, his tone of voice, his moves, when singing *Bad* and, respectively, *Heal the World*. The former, whose text says:

*Your Butt Is Mine/ ... Just Show Your Face/ In Broad Daylight/
... Gonna Hurt Your Mind/ Shoot To Kill...*

speaks of street conflicts, of threats and violence; therefore it uses numerous plosive, fricative and affricate consonants ([b], [t], [d] [k] [f], [s], [ʃ]) – to connote beat and friction), group pronunciation and slang (*butt, gonna*), it is sung with a harsh tone of voice⁴⁴, and is accompanied by fragmented, menacing gestures. This way, the singer presents himself as member of the gang.

Conversely, the message of the second song is generous and caring:

*Heal the world/ Make it a better place/ For you and for me/
And the entire human world/ There are people dying/ If you care
enough for the living ...*

There are numerous lateral [l] sounds (*heal, place, world, people, living*) to connote smooth flowing; word choice is restricted to the stylistically neutral section of the lexicon, the pronunciation is standard, the voice is soft and the body language is minimal. The singer appears as deeply sensitive and caring, a person dedicated to improving the plight of mankind.

To belong to the category of paralanguage, “gestures” – of the voice, eye or body – must be *intentional*: the speaker is signalling to the hearer that he *wants* to convey some additional meaning, or some meaning that is different from what his words say by their conceptual content. But information regarding the speaker's image and attitude is also conveyed unintentionally. For example, he may want to present himself as a member of the higher classes, but some slip of pronunciation, or some inappropriate word or gesture, will betray his humble origins. Nor can the speaker always disguise his emotional reaction to a certain situation, e.g. in moments of high tension, people often say or do things which they would not under normal circumstances. In addition, in establishing the speaker's identity, the receiver will also take into consideration other types of non-intentional body language, e.g. the speaker's physical aspect, his personal hygiene, the clothes he wears, etc.

In the following sections we shall analyse how language, para- and body language work together to build up the speaker's meaning, image and attitude. To illustrate the ideas, a classic of motion picture was selected:

4 In writing, each words begins with a capital letter, to suggest emphatic language.

George Cukor's famous musical *My Fair Lady* (book and lyrics by Alan Jay Lerner), based on a classic of world literature: G. B. Shaw's *Pygmalion*.

Assessing the Speaker

The male protagonist of Shaw's *Pygmalion*, respectively, of Lerner's *My Fair Lady*, Henry Higgins (starring Rex Harrison), is a highly skilled phonetician who has made it his *profession... and also [his] hobby* to identify people by their accent. This is how he describes his skill:

*Anyone can spot an Irishman or a Yorkshireman by his brogue.
But I can place a man within six miles. I can place 'im within two miles in London. Sometimes within two streets.*⁵⁵

According to Henry Higgins, differences in pronunciation produce an actual *verbal class distinction*:

*An Englishman's way of speaking absolutely classifies him
The moment he talks he makes some other Englishman despise him.*

Shaw's criticism of English society is bitter and cynical: by suggesting that pronunciation is basic for assessing a person's worth, he points to the fundamental shallowness of class distinction. To quote Higgins' words:

*It's "aow" and "garn"⁶⁶ that keep her in her place
Not her wretched clothes and dirty face
If you spoke as she does, sir, instead of the way you do?
Why, you might be selling flowers, too!*

One of Higgins' former students, the Hungarian language expert Karpathy, embodies the English aristocracy's concern with their exclusiveness. A highly paid *imposterologist*, his job is to detect, by their pronunciation, people who claim to belong to higher social strata than they actually do. This is what he says of a "Greek ambassador":

Greek, my foot! He pretends not to know English, but he can't deceive me. He's the son of a Yorkshire watchmaker. He speaks English so villainously that he cannot utter a word without betraying his origin.

A man without scruples, Karpathy benefits from both sides of the

5 The quotations are from Lerner's book and lyrics for *My Fair Lady* (see <http://www.script-o-rama>).

6 Higgins is talking to Colonel Pickering. The "aow" and "garn" are interjections Eliza produces. Disgusted with the way uneducated people speak the English language, Higgins even suggests that Eliza, and the others who speak like her, "should be taken out and hung/ For the cold-blooded murder of the English tongue".

barricade: he also gets paid richly by those who want to disguise their origins:

I help him pretend, but make him pay through the nose. I make them all pay.

This exclusive society is the very place where our English Pygmalion (i.e. Professor Higgins) decides to take his Galatea (in the person of Eliza Doolittle).

Eliza Doolittle: Pauper to Princess

Just like Vonnegut's protagonists in *Bluebeard*, Eliza Doolittle (the female protagonist of Shaw's *Pygmalion*/Lerner's *My Fair Lady*) is determined to improve her condition.

The moment we lay eyes on Eliza Doolittle (starring Audrey Hepburn) we realize that she belongs to the lowest classes of society: she is not only poorly dresses and dirty, but she actually crawls in the mud to pick up the flowers a hurried passer-by has made her drop – a visual metaphor for the definition Higgins makes of her: “a prisoner of the gutters”.

The moment Eliza opens her mouth (*Look where you're goin', dear. Look where you're goin'!*) we understand that she is Cockney⁷. We know it from the specific *allophones* she utters (/au/ instead of [əu] – e.g. /gauɪŋ/ for *going*; /a:/ instead of [aʊə] – e.g. /fla:z/ for *flowers*; /ɔɪ/ instead of [ai] – e.g. /sɔɪn/ for *sign*; etc.), from her specific language habits (dropping the word-initial /h/ – e.g. /a:f/ for *half*, and /au/ for *how*; etc.), as well as from the music and rhythm of her speech. In terms of word choice, her social class is revealed by her group specific interjections (e.g. *aoow, garn*), her swear words (*blimey, bloody, bloomin'*), her honorifics (*Capt'n, Governor*), by the imaginative slang she uses⁸ (*bloke, busybody, absobloominlutely*), and her faulty grammar (*I ain't done nothin' wrong; They'll take away me character...*) suggests minimal education.

7 The term *Cockney* is generally used to refer to working class Londoners (particularly those in the East End), as well as to their language. Professionally, the Cockney was mostly a *costermonger* (or *coster*), i.e. a street sellers of fruit and vegetables, owner of either a mobile (horse-drawn or wheelbarrow) cart, or of a stationary one at a market stall. Their sing-song cry or chant aimed to attract passers-by was ubiquitous in mid-Victorian England and is still found today in English markets. The Cockney was also a popular theatrical and movie character, enjoyed both for their funny-sounding slangy language and for the sound popular humour they display.

8 Eliza's speech is not rich in slang; it is her father, Alfred Doolittle who, with his natural gift of rhetoric (*I'm willing to tell you. I'm wanting to tell you. I'm waiting to tell you.*) and vivid metaphors (*drink* = a drop o' liquid protection), delights us with the colorful slang of his class.

Further information about Eliza's personality and attitude is carried by her para- and body language. Eliza is in a highly emotional state – a state induced as much by the cold and rainy weather as by the unfortunate incident (*Two bunches o'violets trod in the mud. A full day's wages.*). Unlike her educated compatriots, so famous for their emotional restraint, Eliza does not try to control her temper, but gives voice to her feelings angrily and forcefully, by highly emphatic intonation and loud screams. As the scene unfolds, and as her encounter with Higgins becomes more and more upsetting, her shrill voice and loud-mouthed complaints (which Higgins describes as her *detestable boohooing* and her *crooning like a bilious pigeon*) point to her fiercely independent personality: she is vociferous and defensive, but not humble.

Thus, at the beginning of the play Eliza is a common Cockney girl selling flowers in the street. Exposed to the rains and mud of the streets, and living among the colourful populace of London's lowlife, she is obviously dirty and ragged, and her language and behaviour are rough, just like those of the people among whom she lives. But in spite of her modest condition, Eliza is fiercely proud. She is *a good girl*, as she claims repeatedly, one who has learned to look out for herself and make an honest living. To protect her position in society, she creates various images of herself, so as to deal with various categories of persons in various ways: with possible buyers she is friendly and cunning (*Buy a flower. I'm short for me lodgin'*); with her peers, she is friendly but distant and superior (they make gentle fun of her attitude: *Would you be lookin' for a good butler, Eliza?*); with those who threaten her safety (as Higgins seems to be doing), she is defensive and confrontational (*He's no gentleman, he ain't, to interfere with a poor girl!*). Because Eliza's hard-earned freedom and independence is precarious: when she is told that a policeman is watching her, she turns for help to the man (Colonel Pickering) who seems to be more sympathetic: *Sir, don't let 'im charge me. You dunno what it means to me. They'll take away me character and drive me on the streets for speakin' to gentlemen.*

Eliza is not an ambitious person: her dreams are restricted to the basic commodities of life (*Lots of chocolate for me to eat/Lots of coal makin' lots of 'eat*) and the need for affection (*Someone's 'ead restin' on my knee*). But when she encounters Henry Higgins, a new direction in life opens up to her.

Appalled by the *ghastly sounds'* Eliza utters (by her *disgusting, depressing noises*), and challenged by his encounter with Colonel Pickering (who is also interested in phonetics), Higgins bets him that in six months he can teach that *incarnate insult to the English language* to speak such

perfect English that she can be accepted in the highest social circles. But Eliza's mind is caught by something more personal Higgins has said: that he can teach her correct English and then she could get a job *as a lady's maid or a shop assistant...*, which requires better English.

When Eliza decides to call on professor Higgins, she is no longer a petty provider of services, happy for every penny she can make, but a customer ready to pay for some specific service she requires. As such, she tries to present herself under a different light. Her (attempted) change of image can be traced down to every level of her behaviour. She has cleaned up (*I ain't dirty! I washed my face an' 'ands before I come, I did*); she has come by taxi (a fact which she thinks is likely to impress her host); she uses longer words and makes up complex sentences (*My name is of no concern to you whatsoever*, she tells the servant girl who opens the door); her pronunciation is more careful (*It's business of a [ei] personal nature*, she tells the elderly housekeeper who wants to introduce her); her intonation is close to neutral (there are no emphatic ups and downs), and her rhythm of speech is slower. As for her body language, it is also much more restrained (straight back, raised head, no wide gestures).

On addressing Henry Higgins, though, and faced with his very ungentlemanly rudeness, she gradually loses her initial composure. After greeting him with what she thinks is the proper way to address a gentleman (*Good mornin', my good man. Might I 'ave a word with you?*), and she announces that she *ain't come here to ask for any compliment and if [her] money's not good enough, [she] can go elsewhere*.

But her true self soon surfaces: when Higgins asks her how much she is willing to pay for the lessons, Eliza thinks he is eager to get back some of the money (small change for Higgins, but a lot of money to Eliza) that he had given her the night before. The colloquial style and "shoulder-rubbing" attitude she adopts (*Now you're talkin'. I thought you'd come off it for a chance to get back a bit of what you chucked at me last night. You'd had a drop in, 'adn't you?*) clash with the social status of her addressee and with the situational background.

Eliza's mistake comes from the different standards by which she and Higgins assess life and society. On the one hand, to her a man is a man, no matter what social class he belongs to, so that she addresses Henry Higgins with the friendly and cordial attitude with which she talks to her peers in street. It is interesting to note, however, that she is very polite and respectful when addressing Pickering; this is because what counts to her are not money and social position, but good manners and respect. As she says, [*Colonel Pickering*] *treats a flower girl as if she were a duchess*;

conversely, Higgins *treat[s] a duchess as if she was a flower girl* – which justifies Eliza’s similarly democratic attitude.

On the other hand, to Eliza money is money and a service is a service (she does not see a great difference between selling flowers and teaching languages). It is to Higgins’ credit that he understands that Eliza’s offer must be assessed by its relative worth, i.e. in terms of its percentage of her income: ... *if you think of a shilling not as a simple shilling, but as a percentage of this girl’s income it works out as fully equivalent of or 60 or 70 pounds from a millionaire. By George, it’s enormous. It’s the biggest offer I ever had.*

Naturally, Eliza does not understand the parallel and is horrified at the amount of money she thinks Higgins is asking for the lessons.

But once the matter is solved and the experiment agreed upon, Eliza settles down in Higgins’ house and begins to learn correct pronunciation. After long days of exhausting work (providing scenes of exquisite fun in the movie), she manages not only to pronounce the correct allophones, e.g. [ei] instead of [ai] (e.g. *The rain in Spain stays mainly in the plain*) and word-initial [h] (e.g. *In Hartford, Hereford and Hampshire hurricanes hardly ever happen*), but also musically correct intonation (e.g. *How kind of you to let me come!*)

On the other hand, Eliza’s cleaner and more sophisticated language is doubled by her constantly improving physical aspect. Gradually, she comes to appreciate not only the feel of a bath (on her first encounter with a bath Eliza had screamed and shouted, claiming desperately that she is *a good girl*), but also the look of fine clothes. Her aspect improves so much that even her father does not recognize her at first sight.

But good pronunciation and an improved physical aspect cannot ensure by themselves a better personal image: before Higgins can *pass Eliza off as a duchess* at the annual Embassy Ball, she must learn not only better language (including better grammar and careful lexical choices, differentiated by stylistic levels), but also correct behaviour (e.g. keeping silent, restraining her body language).

The scene at the Ascot races shows clearly that Eliza is not yet ready for the big event: she is beautifully attired, she can pronounce the standard allophones and give perfect intonation to her utterances but, although she abides by the strict instructions to keep to two subjects – the weather and everybody’s health –, she manages to outrage everybody present. Speaking of her aunt who had died of influenza, she gives voice to her belief that *they done the old woman in* (i.e. killed her) and *pinched* (i.e. stole) her new straw hat (*Them she lived with would have killed her for a hatpin, let alone*

a hat, she asserts). To make her point, she shows that the old lady had died although her father had given her the proper treatment: he had *kept ladling gin down her throat...*, [which] was mother's milk to her. And later on, when London's entire high society is watching the races, the only voice to be heard (*Come on, Dover! Come on! Come on! Come on!*) is Eliza's, and in the end she screams out *Move your bloomin' arse!*, on hearing which, a lady in the crowd symbolically faints.

In the given situation, apart from the occasional grammatical mistake, Eliza's English is passable, as she well knows: ... *if I was doing it proper, what was you sniggering at?*, she cuts short an amused listener. It is her choice of words, of register and of topics of discussion which make her behaviour improper and outrageous. The two worlds – that of Eliza origins and that to which Higgins is trying to introduce her – are still incompatible.

But once Eliza has mastered the rules of correct social behaviour (which also tell the speaker to keep silent unless he knows the correct things to say), the teachings of an expert dialectician and grammarian, as well as money for a beautiful dress and jewels, help her to produce a powerful effect at the Embassy Ball. Even the guest of honour, the Queen of Transylvania, singles her out as *charming*, and her son, the Prince, picks her for the opening dance. Naturally, the intrigued London society turns for help to the imposterologist. Probably for the first time in his highly lucrative professional life, Karpathy is at a loss. Although he has the opportunity of a talk with her (in an act of insane bravado, Higgins allows Eliza to dance with him), he does not seem to be able to pin down the source of Eliza's accent; or of its total absence, as it is. Because Eliza's language is not "natural" (i.e. it did not grow with its owner), but carefully and painfully produced in a laboratory; to use Vonnegut's term, it is *synthetic*. But, since a verdict is required, a delighted Karpathy finally lets the news circulate that ... *she [is] a fraud... Her English is too good [...]. That clearly indicates that she is foreign. [...] Although she may have studied with an expert dialectician and grammarian, I can tell that she was born Hungarian.* A typical case of identifying with everything that is positive and mysterious. Not satisfied with so little, Karpathy elaborates: *Not only Hungarian but of royal blood. She is a princess. Her blood [...] is bluer than the Danube is or ever was. Royalty is absolutely written on her face.*

Obviously, Eliza's Embassy Ball image of is ephemeral, because it is merely based on appearances, not on actual facts. The moment they return from the ball, Higgins and Pickering reduce Eliza to her previous status of object of their experiment, with Higgins assuming exclusive credit for the success and Pickering acknowledging it. As a result, Eliza regains her

proud and rebellious self: she runs away and threatens Higgins that she will become a teacher of phonetics herself. But her rebellion is short-lived: in an age when women had few chances to make it in the world without male support, and probably under the effect of an avant-la-letter Stockholm syndrome⁹, Eliza returns to Higgins' home, accepting his rude, though affectionate, domination.

Conclusions: Clothes Make the Man

A well-known proverb tells us that *Clothes don't make a man*, suggesting that the clothes a person wears do not determine how good-hearted or how efficient that person is. But in society, this proverb rarely works (man is generally assessed by the way he looks and behaves) so that Mark Twain's version of the proverb – *Clothes make the man. Naked people have little or no influence in society!* – is much more appropriate.

Obviously, both terms – *clothes* and *naked* – must be interpreted metaphorically.

Society disapproves of underdressed individuals and, quite often, rejects them altogether. Those who *in Rome* do not *dress like the Romans* – i.e. who do not adopt the group's or situation's dress code – have a very slim chance of being accepted. Because every social group and occasion has its strict requirements, and a person who disregards the respective dress code, or cannot afford it, will be looked down upon and rejected.

If you work in an office, you must wear a suit and tie; jeans are the standard wear among teenagers; etc. Moreover, the label on your clothes has a great bearing on your social status: your rich-kid colleagues will not accept you if you cannot afford to buy designer label clothes. Leafing through the pages of a glossy popular magazine we can see how critical the eye of the world is: stars or social celebrities are assessed not so much by their performance, or by their good deeds, as by the ups and downs in their private lives and by their glamorous look/clothes.

Furthermore, the notion of *clothes* must be interpreted metaphorically: a person may be wearing the most exclusive clothes and still be rejected if he is no master of the other components of image: language and behaviour (including para- and body language). And, as the analysis of Eliza Doolittle's story shows, pronunciation is an essential component of one's image, of one's metaphorical "clothing".

9 According to which prisoners get to sympathise with their capturers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

My Fair Lady Script, Dialogue Transcript, <http://www.script-o-rama.com/oldindex.shtml>, accessed feb. 2010.

Vizental, Adriana, *Phonetics and Phonology. An introduction*. 3rd edition, Arad, Editura Universității “Aurel Vlaicu”, 2008.

Vizental, Adriana, *Meaning and Communication. From Semantic Meaning to Pragmatic Meaning*, Arad, Editura Universității “Aurel Vlaicu”, 2009.

Vonnegut, Kurt, *Bluebeard*, New York, Dell Publishing Group, 1987.

Professor **Adriana Vizental** Ph.D. is Scientific Secretary of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of “Aurel Vlaicu” University, Arad, where she currently holds a chair of English linguistics and methodology of teaching foreign languages. She published studies and articles on topics related to linguistics and to the methodology of teaching English as a foreign language and is the author of several books in the fields: *Working with Advertisements. From functional grammar to co-operative communication* (2008); *Meaning and Communication. From semantic meaning to pragmatic meaning* (2008); *Metodica predării limbii engleze. Strategies of Teaching and Testing English as a Foreign Language* (2007); *Phonetics and Phonology. An introduction* (2007).

Modalități expresive de redare a gradării superlative prin supin în limba română

Alina-Paula Nemțuț

Expressive Means of Rendering the Superlative Degree by Supine in Romanian

Abstract:

The present study aims at discussing one of the possible means to express an Absolute Superlative in Romanian: the Supine with consecutive meaning. This non-finite verbal form occurs in a special construction: Adverb + *de* + Adjective (or Adverb), the Supine being a dependent term and relating itself to the head by the postposition *de*.

There are many adverbial Supines in pre-position to the adjectives or adverbs it modifies: *neajuns de*, *neasemuit de*, *neașteptat de*, *nebănuț de*, *neclintit de*, *necrezut de* a.s.o. They represent an unsuspected source of expressiveness, being encountered not only in literary texts and employed for stylistic effects, but also in journalism to serve different purposes in describing people, objects or things. Their contextual synonyms are also adverbs having enhancing content and carrying gradual-superlative semes. The relationship with the head is established by the postposition *de*: *admirabil de*, *excepțional de*, *extraordinar de*, *extrem de*. The Supine can be used to convey the same intensive meaning when it is placed after the adjectives or adverbs: *frumoasă de nespus*, *orgolioasă de necrezut* a.s.o.

Another type of Supines with superlative value discharges either the function of Subject Complement or that of Attribute, being replaceable by adjectives derived both with a negative prefix (*in-*, *im-*, *i-*) and a modal suffix (*-bil*).

It therefore results that Romanian has developed a wide range of adverbs with superlative role. The Supines belonging to this class are represented by a great number of lexemes (we estimated at least 23 by checking the *Explanatory Dictionary of Romanian* and different literary pieces and newspapers).

Keywords: Supine, Adverb, consecutive meaning, Superlative, the postposition *de*

Redarea superlativului absolut în limba română cunoaște două tipuri de mijloace:

a) sintetice:

- derivarea cu prefixe și sufixul neologic *-issim*, generatoare de noi cuvinte cu semnificație superlativă: *arhicunoscut, extrafin, hiperactiv, preasfințit, răscopt, răzbucuros, străvechi, superfin, supraomenesc, ultramodern, rarisim, Odă simplisimei flori*;

b) analitice:

- procedeul gramaticalizat prin care formei de pozitiv i se adaugă lexemele *foarte, prea, mult, tare*, unele dintre ele chiar asociindu-se: *om foarte dur, exerciții prea simple, prea multă mâncare, expresii mult folosite, o viață mult prea scurtă, un drum tare obositor*;

- construcția [Adverb + *de* + Adjectiv]: *tânăr strașnic de frumos, idee grozav de bună, om admirabil de onest, viață nespus de tristă, suflet nebănuț de fragil, necaz necrezut de mare, idee extrem de originală*;

- determinarea adjectivelor prin supine postpuse: *frumoasă de nespus, femeie orgolioasă de necrezut, greșeală mare de neînchipuit, șef aprig de temut, un sfârșit tragic de necrezut, durere cruntă de nedepășit/de nesuportat, comportament ciudat de neînțeles*;

- locuțiuni adverbiale antepuse ori postpuse: *boală peste măsură de îndurat, suferință grea din cale-afară, apariție cu totul și cu totul deosebită*;

- adjective cu rol de adjuncții legate prin *de*: *prost/proastă de bun(ă), moartă de beată, frânt de obosit, putred de înstărit/bogat*;

- substantive adverbializate: *beat criță, beat turtă, frumoasă foc, scump foc, îndrăgostit lulea, singur cuc, înghețat bocnă*;

- construcții exclamative: *Ce frumoasă te-ai făcut!, Cum ești de rea!, Cât de parșiv a ajuns!, Cât de neașteptată moarte a avut!*;

- repetarea adjectivului: *fată mare, mare*;

- lungirea și accentuarea unor sunete: *buuună prăjitură, om rrrău, femeie acră*;

- construcții echivalente cu superlativul: *sărac lipit pământului, frumoasa frumoaselor, o frumusețe de fată, o bunătate de copil, amărât cum nu se mai poate etc.*

Un tipar structural cu supinul frecvent întâlnit și bine reprezentat este acela în care forma verbală nepersonală dezvoltă un sens superlativ, fiind legată de regent prin *de* cu valoare de *postpoziție*¹, purtătoare a unui sens

1 Considerăm că acest *de* nu mai poate fi numit prepoziție, nici măcar goliță de sens („coeziunea sintactică este realizată prin prepoziția desemantizată *de*” (GALR, I, 2005: 592)). El este antepus și în aderență cu termenul subordonat. Direcția legăturii dintre su-

circumstanțial consecutiv.

Se apreciază că, în asemenea contexte, supinul are un *efect intensiv*, iar construcțiile sunt „încărcate cu valori, pe de o parte, intensive, iar pe de alta, modalizatoare [...], ele fiind atrase, ca și sinonimele lor în *-bil*, în *tiparul superlativ absolut*, caracterizat de *topica fixă antepusă* față de centrul adjectival sau adverbial și de *legarea prin marca de*. Supinul se distinge printr-o *inversiune a topicii*, inversiune sub două aspecte: este antepus în raport cu centrul adjectival/adverbial; are marca *de postpusă* *formeii de supin*. Cu această topică inversată, *supinul ajunge un subordonat adverbial* [s.n.]” (GALR, I, 2005: 520).

Supinul adverbializat încorporează seme gradual-superlative, putând ilustra:

- gradul maxim al unei cantități: *bunătate nemărginit de mare, ochi neasemuit de limpezi, accident nespus de grav*;

- depășirea unei anumite limite (GALR, I, 2005: 162)²: *recoltă nemăsurat de bogată, grâu nespus de mult, motive nenumărat de multe*.

Supinul antrenat în construcțiile superlative determină adjective și adverbe și este utilizat doar la forma negativă, acoperind, în funcție de context, și sfera semantică a dezagreabilului: *durere nesuferit de mare, comportament nepermis de grosolan, tupeu nerușinat de mare, temperaturi nesuferit de scăzute*.

Pentru intensificarea însușirilor, adjectivului/adverbului i se poate asocia unul din supinele inversate: *neajuns de, neasemuit de, neașteptat de, nebănuit de, neclintit de, necrezut de, nedescris de, negrăit de, neiertat de, neînchipuit de, neîntrecut de, neînțeleș de, nenumărat de, nemărginit de, nemăsurat de, neobișnuit de, nepermis de, neprețuit de, nerușinat de, nesfârșit de, nesperat de, nespus de, nesuferit de*³.

Este un mijloc analitic recurent, construcția specializându-se pentru *funcția de gradare superlativă*⁴ (Vulișici Alexandrescu, 1995: 135). Natura adverbială a supinului este considerată a deriva din cea adjectivală, fiind

pin și adjectivul sau adverbul regent este de la stânga la dreapta, nu viceversa, fenomen cunoscut sub denumirea de *subordonare inversă* (Drașoveanu, 1969: 241–246; 1997: 52–58). Aceeași interpretare apare la Maria Vulișici Alexandrescu, unde se ilustrează un circumstanțial cantitativ exprimat prin adverbe cu legătură inversă (Vulișici Alexandrescu, 1995: 122).

2 Am ilustrat numai două dintre ele, acestea potrivit-se construcțiilor cu supin.

3 Pentru detalierea unui astfel de tipar care include supinele cu *de* vezi Dindelegan, 1982: 87–92.

4 Verbele la supin, cărora li se alătură câteva substantive construite cu prepoziția *de*, realizează un *superlativ al adverbului*.

„un caz de conversiune, una dintre conversiunile curente ale adjectivului (adjectiv → adverb)” (GALR, I, 2005: 520)⁵.

Acest tip de supin consecutiv reprezintă o sursă nebanuită de expresivitate atât în poezie, cât și în proză, dând naștere unor epitete inedite. O demonstrează exemplele pe care le-am ales din literatura română. Se pare că și limbajul jurnalistic îl întrebuințează pentru diverse efecte:

„O, lasă-mi capul meu pe sân,/ Iubito să se culce/ Sub raza ochiului senin/ Și *negrăit de dulce*.” (Mihai Eminescu, *Luceafărul*)

„Ochii nu mai aveau acea sălbatică și noptoasă strălucire în adâncimea căroră fulgera întunecosul amor și întunecoasa dorință... ci, limpeziți, *nespus de adânci* [...]” (Mihai Eminescu, *Cezara*)

„Va fi o dimineață *neobișnuit de lungă*,/ urcând un soare neobișnuit [...]” (Nichita Stănescu, *Dimineața marină*)

„Cu mișcări *nespus de line*/ Tu te-nalți apoi spre cer [...]” (George Coșbuc, *Seara*)

„Casa avea obloane mari în perete, închise și zăvorâte de-a lungul și de-a latul în niște fiare groase și *neobișnuit de lungi*.” (Marin Preda, *Calul*)

„A venit hotărâtă spre mine (eram în uniformă de liceu, croită dintr-un material *de necrezut de prost*, care avea genunchi și coate din fabricație) și, dincolo de gardul de fier forjat, mi-a spus [...]”; „Drumul a fost *neșteptat de lung* pentru o țară atât de mică.”; „[...] când D. și cu mine am stat până dimineața într-un lan de lucernă, golind o sticlă de votcă și bătătorind lucerna pe o suprafață *de necrezut de mare* [...] – a fost un hipervis [...]” (Mircea Cărtărescu, *De ce iubim femeile*)

„O mătușă a făcut indigestie și a vomat *nebanuit de mulți* cârnăciori, uitând să tragă apa la toaletă.” (Radu Petrescu, *Fotografii de nuntă*)

„Mă gândesc: o, ce minunată și *nespus de surprinzătoare* și în același timp de duplicitară este mintea omenească!”; „Aburul dimineții *neînchipuit de umede* parcă îmi șterge fața cu un șervet muiat în apă caldă.”; „[...] marea, dincolo de ferestre, e *nedescris de frumoasă*.” (Petru Popescu, *Supleantul*)

„Lipsa, uneori, a legilor potrivite și, de multe ori, a bazei materiale și a facilităților [...] e încă vizibilă în *neajuns de așezata* societate românească.” (DV, 2010⁶)

„Copiii lor, *neasemuit de frumoși* și de fragezi, poartă pe capete, grele

5 Se afirmă totodată că „în noul tipar sintactic apare un *alt de*, nu prepoziția din construcția consecutivă cu centru adjectival/adverbial, ci marca formală din componența unor construcții cu superlativ absolut”.

6 Siglele pe care le folosim în lucrare reprezintă: DV = *Dilema veche*, RL = *România literară*, ZF = *Ziarul Financiar*, MC = *Monitorul civic*.

păcate părintești, săvârșite cu tradiție, într-o necununie de același sânge.”; „Amanda, fata cea mare, apare în ușa vagonului, palidă, înaltă și *neasemuit de frumoasă*.” (DV, 2005)

„Această «lume spălată», strălucitoare, *nesfârșit de frumoasă*-n perisabilitatea ei [...]” (RL, 2004)

„Dacă tu ești drept, puternic și *nemărginit de bun*./ Spune, pentru ce adesea, lovitura ta-i nedreaptă?” (Dron, Constantinescu, 1970: 196)

„Anul căderii economice a fost unul *neșteptat de bun* pentru investitorii la Bursă.” (ZF, 2009)

„Am învățat să cred că Eminescu a murit nu pentru că nu a mai avut zile, ci pentru că greutatea dragostei în poezia sa i-au impus cuvântul să devină neclintit. *Neclintit de veșnic*.” (MC, 2010)

Alte supine adverbiale determinând un adjectiv întâlnim și în următoarele exemple: „putere *nemăsurat de mare*”, „un Dumnezeu *nemăsurat de bun*”, „oameni *nemăsurat de talentați și de înțelepți*”, „ajutor *neprețuit de valoros*”, „fată *nerușinat de frumoasă*”, „prețuri *nerușinat de mari*”, „bărbat *nesuferit de insistent*”.

În plan semantic, supinele inventariate se pot rar echivala cu un adverb sintetic: *neajuns de ~ insuficient*, existând mai degrabă adverbe cu postpoziția *de*, dotate cu același rol de gradare superlativă prin care să se substituie: *admirabil de, excepțional de, extraordinar de, extrem de, formidabil de, grozav de, incredibil de, inestimabil de, inimaginabil de, infinit de, insuportabil de, nemaipomenit de, teribil de*.

Ca subordonat consecutiv, supinul determină mai rar adverbe:

„Doamne, și-mi era-n sicriu/ *Negrăit de bine!*” (George Coșbuc, *Pe deal*)

„Își scoase pălăria. E *nesuferit de cald*.” (Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, *Paraziții*).

„[...] se vedea că îi pare *nespus de bine* că Țurlea își amintea de el.” (Marin Preda, *Desfășurarea*)

Mult mai rar este supinul adverbial ocurent după un adjectiv/adverb:

„Era frumoasă *de nespus*/ În portu-i de la țară [...]” (Șt. O. Iosif, *Bunica*)

O altă structură cu supin consecutiv, dar în postpunere, utilizat sau nu la forma negativă, este cea în care termenul regent este un adjectiv calificativ, determinat la rându-i de un adverb cu legătură inversă:

„Accidentul i-a provocat un șoc atât de puternic *de neimaginat*.”

„Ciosu’ din luncă ne părea un om așa de înfricoșător *de temut*.”

„Inventează tâmpenii așa de mari *de neînchipuit*.”

Alteori, adjectivul regent poate fi la superlativ absolut ori nu are

un determinant intensiv, contextul fiind dezambiguizator (permițând subînțelegerea corelativului adverbial *așa de* sau *atât de* ori existând alte cuvinte sugestive):

„Cartea e prea lungă *de citit*.” (Roegiest, 1981: 427)

„De obicei, savanții prezentați acolo erau foarte distrați [...]. Cei mai mulți păreau, de fapt, nebuni *de legat*.” (Mircea Cărtărescu, *De ce iubim femeile*)

Și supinele negative cu rol de nume predicativ sau atribut verbal trimit spre o valoare consecutivă, deductibilă pe baza contextului. Funcția lor stilistică este tot de gradare superlativă:

„Și dau cadențe *de nespus*/ Durerii tale lunge,/ Pe când luceafărul e sus/ Ca să nu-l poți ajunge.” (Mihai Eminescu, *Dacă iubești fără să sperii*)

„O noapte de septembrie limpede ca sticla curată... vreme dulce și lună plină... zece trăsurii mergând la pas și banda roșiorilor cântând un marș triumfal în frunte – *de neuitat*.” (I. L. Caragiale, *Om cu noroc*)

„E o căpriță mică neagră [...], și face sărituri *de necrezut* și mehăie și fel de fel de nebunii.” (I. L. Caragiale, *La Hanul lui Mânjoală*)

„E un spectacol *de neuitat* acela/ de-a ști,/ de-a descoperi [...].” (Nichita Stănescu, *Sunt un om viu*)

„Pascu și Mitrică amuțiseră: Anghel era *de nerecunoscut*.”; Purtarea lui Ilie i se părea nelalocul ei, cu totul fără noimă, *de necrezut*.” (Marin Preda, *Desfășurarea*)

„Uneori aveam senzația că sunt un spectator rătăcit pe o scenă unde se joacă un spectacol *de neînțeles*.” (Octavian Paler, *Viața pe un peron*)

„Fără nemurire și mântuire, libertatea e *de neconceput*.” (322 *de vorbe memorabile ale lui Petre Țuțea*)

„Cum în acel moment tocmai începuse o răpăială *de necrezut* în jurul ferestrei de unde țineam sub observație curtea interioară, n-am mai stat să mă întreb de ce zâmbește [...].”; „[...] și după o lună de miere *de neuitat*, petrecută în blocul lui din Militari [...], Nucu sencurecă cu asistenta șefă [...].” (Radu Petrescu, *Banchetul*)

„Haosul de-acolo era *de nedescris*: una-și făcea unghiile de la picioare, alta-și dădea în chiloți cu intim spray [...].”; „Am mers să văd unde coborâse: scara era-n spirală și, de la a doua rotire, bezna se făcea realmente *de nepătruns* [...].”; „Frica se întindea cu forța *de neoprit* a unei psihoze”; „Alteori ar fi vrut ca ea să fie tot atât de răvășită de amintire ca și el, pentru ca între ei să existe o legătură, fie și una chinuitoare și *de nemărturisit*”; „Cum să te plectisești de frumusețea însăși, *de neatins* și *de neconceput*?”; „Mi-e greu până și să pun pe hârtie cuvintele care descriu faptul *de nedescris* [...].” (Mircea Cărtărescu, *De ce iubim femeile*)

Supinul din structurile cu verbe copulative (și, prin urmare, din cele atributive) este interpretat ca „o determinare consecutivă a unui adjectiv nul, deci neexprimat, marcând, printr-o consecință, o valoare superlativă. Apariția lui *de* poate fi urmarea valorii consecutive, *de* fiind o prepoziție purtătoare, printre alte valori, și a valorii lexicale consecutive” (GALR, I, 2005: 517–518). Este vorba, în astfel de situații, de o fenomenalizare a elipsei: adjectivul regent însoțit de corelativul său adverbial (în subordonare inversă) lipsește, dar poate fi recuperat în virtutea contextului situațional.

Explicația selectării unor forme verbale negative stă în faptul că „«starea» presupusă de adjectivul neexprimat (nul) este din *registru*l stărilor adesea neplăcute, dificile, pentru a putea fi suportate/receptate” (GALR, I, 2005: 518). Majoritatea supinelor negative ilustrează un vizibil comportament adjectival, prin posibilitatea substituției lor cu derivate, multe dintre ele parasintetice (prefixate negativ cu *in-*, *im-*, *i-* (Jordan, Robu, 1978: 300) și sufixate cu afixul modal *-bil* (Butiurcă, 2006: 66)⁷, reprezentând împrumuturi din limba franceză ori, mai rar, italiană: *de neatins, intangibil*; ~ *neconceput, imposibil, inconceptibil, inimaginabil*; ~ *necrezut, incredibil*; ~ *nedescris, indescrribil*; ~ *neimaginat/neînchipuit, inimaginabil*; ~ *neînțeles, ininteligibil*; ~ *nemărturisit, inavuabil*; ~ *neoprit, imparabil*; ~ *nepătruns, impenetrabil, insondabil*; ~ *nerecunoscut, irecognoscibil*; ~ *nespus, indicibil, inexprimabil*; ~ *neuitat, indimenticabil, indelebil* etc.

Uneori prezența pe lângă adjectiv a unui cuvânt exclamativ lămurește valoarea superlativă a supinului:

„Se visase copil și ce lucru *de neînțeles!* Crezuse că toate acestea sunt întâmplări uitate.” (Marin Preda, *Desfășurarea*)

Îl considerăm pe *ce* un pro-adjectiv exclamativ (Vulișici Alexandrescu, 2004: 20–28, 2001: 153–158), fiind el însuși un corelativ și având rol de intensificare a însușirii: *lucru grozav/nemaipomenit, încât nu poate fi înțeles*.

Din cele prezentate, reiese că limba română și-a creat o gamă variată de adverbe cu înțeles superlativ, numai supinele inversate reprezentând un număr de 23 de lexeme.

⁷ *In-* (*im-*, *i-*) sunt prefixe de origine latină sau romanică (lat. *in-*, fr. *en-*). Sufixul *-bil*, provenit din lat. *-bilis*, fr. *-ble*, a creat derivate adjectivale cu o mare extindere în latina târzie și mai apoi în limbile moderne, cu excepția limbii române: fr. *adorable, admirable*; it. *credevole*. În franceză, sufixele *-able, -ible, -uble* poartă trăsătura semantică [+posibilitate].

BIBLIOGRAFIE:**1. Izvoare:**

- Agopian, Ștefan, *Tache de tinichea*, București, Editura 100+1 Gramar, 1999.
- Caragiale, I. L., *Momente, schițe, amintiri*, vol. I–II, ediție, prefață, cronologie de Ion Vartic, notă asupra ediției de Mariana Vartic, București, Biblioteca pentru toți, Editura Minerva, 2002.
- Cărtărescu, Mircea, *De ce iubim femeile*, București, Editura Humanitas, 2005.
- Coșbuc, George, *Poezii*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1972.
- Eminescu, Mihai, *Opera poetică*, vol. I–IV, Chișinău, Editura Cartier, 1999.
- Eminescu, Mihai, *Proză literară*, București, Editura Minerva, 1981.
- Iosif, Șt. O., *Poezii*, București, Editura Corint, 2002.
- Paler, Octavian, *Viața pe un peron*, București, Editura Litera, 2009.
- Petrescu, Răzvan, *Mici schimbări de atitudine*, București, Editura ALLFA, 2003.
- Popescu, Petru, *Supleantul*, București, Editura Jurnalul, 2009.
- Preda, Marin, *Întâlnirea din pământuri. Desfășurarea*, București, Editura pentru literatură, 1966.
- Stănescu, Nichita, *Poezii*, București, Curtea Veche Publishing, 2009.
- Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Barbu, *Paraziții*, București, Editura Minerva, 1982.
- Țuțea, Petre, *322 de vorbe memorabile ale lui Petre Țuțea*, București, Editura Humanitas, 2000.

2. Bibliografie generală:

- * *Gramatica limbii române*, ediția a III-a, București, Editura Academiei, 2005.
- ** Butiurcă, Doina, *Fondul latin și vocabularul panromanic – Limba română*, în „Studia Universitatis Petru Maior”, Series Philologia, nr. 5, 2006, p. 58–71.
- Drașoveanu, D. D., *Legături de la stânga la dreapta*, în CL, XIV, nr. 2, 1969, p. 241–246.
- Drașoveanu, D. D., *Teze și antiteze în sintaxa limbii române*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Clusium, 1997.
- Dron, Virgiliu, Constantinescu, S. Gh., *Culegere de texte literare pentru analize gramaticale*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1970.
- Jordan, Iorgu, Robu, Vladimir, *Limba română contemporană*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1978.
- Pană Dindelegan Gabriela, *Structura Adverb + de + Adjectiv (sau Adverb): descriere sintactică și interpretare semantică*, în AUB, XXXI, 1982, p. 87–92.
- Roegiest, Eugene, *Constructions adjectivales transformées dans les langues romanes*, în RRL, XXVI, 5, 1981, p. 415–433.
- Vulișci Alexandrescu, Maria, *Sintaxa limbii române*, Oradea, Editura Imprimeriei de Vest, 1995.
- Vulișci Alexandrescu, Maria, *Cu privire la pro-adjective*, în AUO, Fascicola Filologie, 2001, p. 153–158.
- Vulișci Alexandrescu, Maria, *CE – dificultăți de încadrare morfo-sintactică*, în AUO, Fascicola Filologie, 2004, p. 20–28.

3. Surse electronice:

<http://www.dilemaveche.ro/index.php?nr=310&cmd=articol&id=12306>

<http://www.dilemaveche.ro/index.php?nr=91&cmd=articol&id=2336>

<http://www.civic.md/stiri/blog-vox/6866-eminescu.html>

<http://www.zf.ro/burse-fonduri-mutuale/anul-caderii-economice-a-fost-unul-neasteptat-de-bun-pentru-investitorii-la-bursa-5202544/>

Alina-Paula Nemțuț is presently Assistant Lecturer at the Faculty of Letters from Oradea, working within the Department of Romanian Language and Literature. She is a Ph. D. candidate with a doctoral thesis entitled *The Non-finite Verbal Forms in Romanian*. Her fields of interest are Romanian & English morphology and syntax, stylistics, etymology, dialectology. In her scientific research, she collaborated with different linguistic journals: “Analele Universității din Oradea”, “Analele Universității din Suceava”, “Studia Universitatis Petru Maior” (Târgu-Mureș), “Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie” (Craiova), Proceedings of the International Symposium “Research and Education in an Innovation Era” (1st & 2nd edition, Arad), Proceedings of the International Conference “European Integration between Tradition and Modernity” (3rd edition, Târgu-Mureș).

A Theoretical Approach to Telicity

Claudia Leah

Abstract:

Starting from the generally admitted idea that telicity is an important concept in the study of aspect, this paper intends to offer a theoretical approach to the telic/atelic and bounded/unbounded distinctions, which have had a long tradition in the linguistic literature. I highlighted the necessity of distinguishing between *telicity*, viewed as a pragmatic or semantic parameter, and *boundedness*, considered to be a lexico-grammatical parameter which may depend on the verb and on the semantic properties of the nominal constituents of the predication, showing that telicity also plays a role in sentence processing. In this paper I try to offer different definitions and opinions concerning aspectual distinctions in the linguistic literature, where the pair of terms “telic”/“atelic”, “bounded”/“unbounded” are frequently used as synonyms.

Keywords: telicity, (a)telic verbs, (un)bound, endpoints

The impressive number of theoretical works dealing with telicity shows the linguistic importance of this phenomenon. Most researchers generally consider telicity as one of the main concepts in the study of aspect (e.g. Vendler, 1967; Comrie, 1976; Dowty, 1979; Verkuyl, 1993; Smith, 1997), which is related to the aspectual feature of whether a situation has an inherent, well-defined, natural final endpoint. In this respect, events such as *writing a letter* and *building a house* have an inherent final endpoint while those such as *writing* and *building* do not. The former are identified as telic situations whereas the latter as atelic. Referring to aspect, the most popular approach to the perfective/imperfective distinction seems to be the one which associates this opposition with the notion of completion or reaching the (inherent) boundary of an eventuality, i.e. with telicity. This idea, which is not new, goes back as far as the 19th century. Modern semantic theories provide possible tools to formalize the notion of a temporal boundary

(Krifka, 1998), which is believed to be one of the reasons for the uptrend. *Telicity* (a linguistic term derived from the Greek *telos*, meaning “end” or “goal”) is defined as the property of a verb or verb phrase to present an action or event as being complete in some sense. A verb or verb phrase characterized by this property is said to be *telic*, while a verb or verb phrase that presents an action or event as being *incomplete* is said to be *atelic*. By taking telicity as a semantic notion, either in terms of quantizedness (Filip, 1999) or in terms of subinterval property (Borik, 2002), eventualities described by verbs, predicates, and even complex sentences may fall into the telic or atelic categories. Thus, telicity turns out to be equivalent to the notion of *boundedness* that can be applied to various language levels as well.

The concepts of *telicity* and *atelicity* are generally used to refer to two fundamentally different situation types. While the labels are always associated with presence vs. absence of endpoints in some way, the definition of *endpoints* is not uniform. Some of the definitions given to telicity are the following:

1. “The definition of telicness must take into account that what is crucial is not that there be a potential culmination of the actual process described, but rather that the phasic structure of the situation include a *culminatory phase* distinct from mere termination” (Binnick, 1991: 192).

2. “A situation, a process, an action or the verb, the verb phrase, the sentence, etc. expressing this situation has the telicity property if it is directed towards attaining a goal or limit at which the action exhausts itself and passes into something else it leads up to a well-defined point behind which the process cannot continue” (Dahl, 1977: 81).

3. Telic expressions have a “natural end-point”, “a telic expression involves reference to a non-arbitrary point of completion towards which the action tends to proceed and beyond which it cannot continue” (Declerck, 1991: 121).

4. Telic predicates have an “incremental theme” (Dowty, 1991: 567).

5. “On the most general level of classification, two main classes of verbal predicates and sentences are distinguished: events, which are telic or quantized, and states and processes, which are atelic or cumulative” (Filip 1999: 16).

6. According to Garey (1957: 106), who introduced this term, *telic* verbs are verbs expressing an action tending towards a goal envisaged as realized in a perfective tense, but as contingent in an imperfective tense; *atelic* verbs, on the other hand, are verbs which do not involve any goal nor endpoint in their semantic structure, but denote actions that are realized as

soon as they begin.

7. “A verbal expression is atelic if its denotation has no set terminal point (e.g. *run*), and it is telic if it includes a terminal point (e.g., *run a mile*)” (Krifka 1992: 30).

8. Lascarides (1991: 423) says that “Event sentences describe culminations, and some of them are also associated with ‘prior’ processes that led to the culmination”.

9. Michaelis (1993: 17) underlines that telic situations are “events with goal states”.

10. Smith (1997: 19): “Telic events have a change of state which constitutes the outcome, or goal, of the event. (...) To avoid agentive connotations, I will say that telic events have a natural final endpoint, or intrinsic bound. (...) Atelic events have arbitrary final endpoints.” – “The syntactic evidence for an atelic event turns on the notion of completion, which involves the interaction of duration and change of state.” (1997: 42).

11. Van Valin and LaPolla (1997: 93): “The feature ‘telic’ has to do with whether a verb depicts a state of affairs with an inherent terminal point or not.”

These definitions show differences regarding semantic and syntactic criteria, but they also prove the existence of a consensus among researchers that the property of telicity is determined by the multi-layered interaction between the lexical semantics of the verb and different syntactic factors, which has led to use the term *aspectual composition* (Verkuyl, 1993). Many studies have been devoted to the influence of object NPs on (a)telicity, a unanimous conclusion being that mass or bare plural NPs establish atelic predicates (*Sarah ate cake/lumps of sugar*), while count NPs establish telic predicates (*Sarah ate a cake/the lumps of sugar*).

Relatively little attention has been paid though to these numerical NPs such as *eat 10 cakes, drink 5 bottles*, the few analyses explicitly referring to such predicates presenting them as telic propositions (Filip, 1997; Krifka, 1992; Ramchand, 1997; Rappaport H. & Levin, 2002: 273; Smith, 1997: 29). The compatibility of sentences with either a *for*-adverbial or an *in*-adverbial also features prominently in the situation types literature as a test to determine the atelic/telic nature of the predicate (*Sarah ate a cake in 30 seconds* (*Sarah ate a lump of sugar* = telic) vs. *Sarah ate cake for 30 seconds* (*Sarah ate cake* = atelic)).

Although lexical semantics and syntax are considered to be crucial to (a)telicity, pragmatics could also be taken into account in classifying predicates such as *Sue ate 10 cakes* and *Sue stayed in the club for 30 minutes*, which are not believed unambiguously telic. The hypothesis

defended relates to the subclass of telic utterances that contain transitive dynamic verbs (*drink two cups of coffee, write a letter, etc.*) and stative or dynamic (in)transitive verbs combined with a durational *for*-prepositional phrase. In this context, regarding telicity we can say that a sentence is telic if the situation (as it is represented in the sentence) is represented as having an inherent (natural or intended), mutually manifest endpoint beyond which the situation (as it is represented in the sentence) cannot continue (Depraetere, 1995).

In some languages, verbal predicates may be characterized as having two main properties: tense and aspect. While tense is used in linguistic analysis in order to determine the position of an event on a time-line, the aspect is concerned with the internal contour of the event itself, how it unfolds over time, regardless of where it occurred with respect to the time-line. The term *aspect* is used in linguistic theory to cover (at least) two distinct phenomena. The first one regards semantic aspect or telicity distinctions, the second one regards the morphosyntactic coding of tense and aspect.

In other words, the linguistic category of aspect has two levels: the *grammatical aspect* and the *lexical aspect*. The grammatical aspect is carried by the tense morphemes on the verb itself and is concerned with whether the depicted event is viewed as a whole ('perfective aspect') whose beginning and end are defined, or whether it is to be viewed from within, as it is progressing (Comrie, 1976). On the other hand, the lexical aspect, and telicity in particular, refers to the internal temporal contour of the depicted event. Telicity is defined by two properties: endpoint and homogeneity. Therefore, telic predicates are those involving an inherent, natural endpoint, or culmination, and may also be non-homogeneous, or non-cumulative in Krifka's (1992, 1998) terms, in the sense that one part of the event does not overlap the whole event. That the telic/atelic distinction is a real linguistic phenomenon is obvious, since telic and atelic predicates behave differently in different linguistic contexts.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Comrie (1976: 6 and 11), there is no generally accepted terminology in the treatment of aspect: either different authors apply different labels to the same concept, or the same term is used to refer to different concepts. According to Depraetere (1995), it is necessary to draw a distinction between the notions of (a)telicity and (un)boundedness. As stated by the author, telicity relates to the "potential actualization" of a situation, whereas the boundedness parameter measures the "actual realization" of the situation, in other words: (a)telicity has to do with whether or not a situation is described as having an inherent

or intended endpoint, while (un)boundedness relates to whether or not a situation is described as having reached a temporal boundary (Depraetere 1995: 2–3).

Comrie (1976: 46) highlights that the semantic range of telic verbs is restricted considerably when combined with the imperfective. Thus, a *telic* verb may be presented as *unbounded*, when viewed as non-complete or in progress:

e.g. She *made* a cake. → [+ Telic] [+ Bounded]

She was *making* a cake. → [+ Telic] [- Bounded]

Both linguistic expressions can be said to describe the same situation; however, the first verb is telic and bounded, since it entails the attainment of the terminal point: “the cake was completed”, while the second verb is telic but unbounded: “the cake was not completed at the time of speech”. Therefore, telic events are those that possess an inherent terminal point, but they are not necessarily presented as bounded. As pointed out by Depraetere (1995: 4), “the (a)telic character of a sentence, unlike (un)boundedness, is not affected by the progressive”. The above examples are telic, irrespective of whether a progressive verb form is used or not.

The telic – atelic division is present in English. As a rule, a given verb can be either telic or atelic. All state verbs (*dream, love, believe, understand*) are atelic, some action verbs are atelic as well (*sing, walk, talk*). Many action verbs are telic however (*write, come, buy*) – they all have an aim incorporated in their meaning. Most of the verbs can vary in meanings and uses, i.e. a given verb may be telic in some uses and atelic in others, or unaccusative in some and unergative in others. Therefore, as there are no significant differences between telic and atelic verbs in their likelihood to switch telicity, an atelic verb is used with a telic meaning and a telic verb is used with an atelic meaning. This shows that telicity is a verb feature, not a proper aspect, and therefore, verbs denoting a completed action are termed perfective, not telic.

The term “telic predicates” may be used for both accomplishments and achievements. “Atelic predicates” include both states and activities: *love music, know Spanish, be tired (states); grow, run, wander, drive a car, eat cakes (activities)*. Telic predicates include both accomplishments and achievements: *build a house, write a letter, run to the park (accomplishments); reach the peak, recognize someone (achievements)*.

In order to identify telic/atelic verbs, the progressive entailment is commonly used as a test for telicity (Dowty, 1986; Hinrichs, 1985; de Swart, 1998): a. *Mary was driving the car.* → *Mary drove the car.*; b. *Mary was running a mile.* → *Mary ran a mile.* The examples show that the two

types of predicates license different logical inferences: a sentence with an atelic predicate in the progressive entails the truth of the sentence with a verb in the simple past form (a), whereas a sentence with a telic predicate does not (b).

Telic sentences: a. *Joe built this house last year.* → *He is not building it now.* b. *The vase broke.* → It is no longer (in the process of) breaking.

Atelic sentences: a. *Joe wandered in India last year.* → *He is not wandering now.* b. *The tree grew.* → It is no longer growing.

Few sentence modifications affect telicity. The most well known factor that does is the reference properties of the internal arguments of the verb (Verkuyl, 1993): a. *John was building a house.* → *John built a house.* b. *John was building houses.* → *John built houses.*

The value of telicity remains unchanged even by many argument modifications – for instance, the telicity of the verb in the following sentence is not cancelled by the plurality of the subject: *Various people were running a marathon.* → *Various people ran a marathon.*

One of the most common diagnostics for telicity in English is the test of adverbial modification (Dowty, 1979). Telic predicates may be modified by the so-called ‘frame’ adverbials, such as *in an hour*, while atelic predicates are only grammatical in the context of durational adverbs, such as *for an hour*:

a. *Sara ran a mile in an hour/*for an hour.* (Telic), *Jim built a house in a month /*Jim built a house for a month.*

→ *built a house* is telic

b. *Sara ran *in an hour/for an hour.* (Atelic), **John built houses in a month/ John built houses for a month.*

→ *built houses* is atelic

In applying this test, one must be careful about a number of things:

a. The tense and aspect of a verb may affect the result of this test; for example, phrases with progressive verb forms (*is going*, *was talking*, *has been doing*, and so on) almost always accept *for an hour* and almost never accept *in an hour*. The test is therefore primarily of interest for verb phrases with verbs in the simple past tense.

b. The phrase *in an hour*, and phrases like it, are ambiguous; they can mean either “in the span of an hour”, i.e. “within an hour”, or “one hour from now”. Only the former meaning is of interest; “She will be coming in an hour” is fine, but that says nothing about the telicity of the phrase *will be coming*.

c. Strictly speaking, there is a context in which “John built houses in a month” is fine; consider “Jack took three months to build a house, while

John built houses in a month”. Here, what is meant is “John built houses; he built each house in a month”; and in this sense, *built houses* is actually telic. It can be argued that the verb phrase “build houses” is, in fact, *telic* at one level and *atelic* at another: the telicity applies to the verb without the plural object, and the atelicity applies to the verb and the object together.

(A)telic predicates may be defined in terms of two properties, namely *endpoint* and *homogeneity*. As mentioned above, the claim is that telic predicates, but not atelic ones, have a natural point at which the event comes to an end, a culmination point. A telic predicate such as *eat the sandwich* is only true when the event it describes reaches its endpoint, the point at which the sandwich is consumed and the eating cannot go on. In other words, telic predicates have an entailment of completion.

The idea of the endpoint as the defining element of telicity is adopted, either explicitly or implicitly and under various titles, in a wide range of theoretical literature (e.g. Verkuyl, 1972, 1993; Comrie, 1976; Dowty, 1979; Tenny, 1994; Depraetere, 1995; Krifka, 1998; Rothstein, 2004). In terms of the homogeneity criterion, it is claimed that atelic predicates are homogeneous while telic ones are non-homogeneous (Vendler, 1967; Dowty, 1979; ter Meulen, 1984; Krifka, 1998).

In his work on verb classes, Vendler (1967) distinguishes four basic verb classes in terms of their aspectual denotation: states, activities, achievements, and accomplishments. His classification was done according to two basic criteria, punctuality/continuity and homogeneity/heterogeneity. The actual classification and its consequences are not at all relevant for my study, but the homogeneity criterion is. In Vendler’s terms, what distinguishes between verbs such as *eat* or *draw* on the one hand and predicates such as *eat a sandwich* and *draw a circle* on the other is that while a verb of the *eat/drink* type “goes on in time in a homogeneous way; [such that] any part of the process is of the same nature as the whole” (Vendler, 1967: 101), the *eat a sandwich/draw a circle* type predicates “proceed to a terminus which is logically necessary to their being what they are”.

In Krifka (1998), homogeneity is related to the *subinterval* property of (a)telic predicates. Atelic predicates, such as *eat rice*, have this property: whenever they are true at a given time interval, they are also true at any part (or subinterval) of that interval. This is not the case for telic predicates such as *eat a sandwich*.

One of the most influential theories of compositional telicity has been developed by Verkuyl (1972, 1993). According to this account, the derivation starts with a dynamic verb, such as *eat*. This type of verbs

have the feature [+ ADD TO], which expresses dynamic progress and distinguishes them from stative verbs. A [+ ADD TO] verb provides a path along which the event unfolds over time, but crucially that is all it does. So, the verb itself is never solely responsible for the telicity value of the predicate; it merely provides the possibility for the predicate to be telic. Ultimately, it is the direct object argument that determines the telicity value of the predicate. Vendler also uses the notion of endpoint, or terminus, provides a boundary for the path created by the [+ ADD TO] verb, thus determining the value of the predicate as [+ Telic].

In conclusion, we can say that many researchers have been interested in telicity, which is seen as a semantic property that reflects the boundedness of events: verbs that denote bounded events are telic; those that denote unbounded events are atelic. Telicity is partly an inherent lexical property of verbs and partly a compositional property of predicates. Telic predicates need a delimiter, such as an object NP, to provide boundedness. There are two useful diagnostics for telicity: the *in/for* test and the homogeneity test. Atelic events are homogeneous while telic events are not homogeneous. The *in/for* test is sometimes effective in distinguishing telic and atelic verbs and sometimes not.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Binnick, R. I., *Time and the Verb: A Guide to Tense and Aspect*, USA, Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Borik, O., *Aspect and Reference Time*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Comrie, B., *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*, Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- Dahl, Ö, ed., *Logic, Pragmatics and Grammar*, University of Göteborg, Department of Linguistics, 1977.
- Declerck, R., *Tense in English: Its Structure and Use in Discourse*, London, Routledge, 1991.
- Depraetere, I., *On the Necessity of Distinguishing between (Un)boundedness and (A)telicity*, in “Linguistics and Philosophy”, 18, 1995, p. 1–19.
- Dowty, D., *The Effects of Aspectual Class on the Temporal Structure of Discourse: Semantics or Pragmatics?*, in “Linguistics and Philosophy”, 9, 1986, p. 37–61.
- Dowty, D., *Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection*, in “Language”, 67, 1991, p. 547–619.
- Dowty, D., *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1979.
- Filip, H., *Aspect, Eventuality Types, and Nominal Reference*, New York, Garland, 1999.
- Filip, H., *Integrating Telicity, Aspect and NP Semantics: the Role of Thematic*

- Structure*, in Jindrich Toman (ed.), *Approaches to Slavic Linguistics III*, Ann Arbor, Mich., Slavic Publications, 1997.
- Garey, H. B., *Verbal Aspects in French*, in “Language”, 33, 1957, p. 91–110.
- Hinrichs, E., *A Compositional Semantics for Aktionsarten and NP Reference in English*, Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1985.
- Jackendoff, R., *The Proper Treatment of Measuring out Telicity, and Perhaps Even Quantification in English*, in “Natural Language and Linguistic Theory”, 14, 1996, p. 305–354.
- Krifka, M., *The Origins of Telicity*, in S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and Grammar*, Boston, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998.
- Krifka, M., *Thematic Relations as Links between Nominal Reference and Temporal Constitution*, in I. Sag and A. Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical Matters*, Stanford, CSLI Publications, 1992, p. 29–53.
- Krifka, M., *Telicity in Movement*, in Pascal Amsili, Mario Borillo and Laure Vieu (eds.), *Time, Space and Movement*, Chateau de Bonas: Université Paul Sabatier and Université Toulouse-Le Mirail, 1995, p. 63–76.
- Lascarides, A., *The Progressive and the Imperfective Paradox*, in “Synthese”, 87(6), 1991, p. 401–447.
- Michaelis, L. A., *Toward a Grammar of Aspect: the Case of the English Perfect Construction*, PhD dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1993.
- Ramchand, G., *Aspect and Predication: the Semantics of Argument Structure*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. and Levin, B., *Change of State Verbs: Implications for Theories of Argument Projection*, in “Proceedings of the 28th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society”, 2002, p. 269–280.
- Rothstein, S., *Structuring Events: a Study in the Semantics of Lexical Aspect*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- Smith, C., *The Parameter of Aspect*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- Swart, H. de, *Licensing of Negative Polarity Items under Inverse Scope*, in “Lingua” 105, 1998, p. 175–200.
- Tenny, C., *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax–Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, 1994.
- ter Meulen, A., *Events, Quantities and Individuals*, in F. Landman and F. Veltman (eds.), *Varieties of Formal Semantics*, Dordrecht, Foris, 1984.
- Van Valin, R. D. and LaPolla, R., *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Vendler, Z., *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Verkuyl, H. J., *On the Compositional Nature of the Aspects*. Dordrecht, D. Reidel, 1972.
- Verkuyl, H. J., *A Theory of Aspectuality: the Interaction between Temporal and Atemporal Structure*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Claudia Leah is a Ph. D. Senior Lecturer at the Faculty of Letters in Oradea, tenured with the Department of English Language and Literature. Her fields of interest are Romanian & English morphology and syntax, lexicology, discourse analysis and applied linguistics. In her scientific research, she collaborated with different linguistic journals: “Analele Universității din Oradea”, “The Scientific Journal of Humanistic Studies” (Cluj-Napoca), “Studia” (Cluj-Napoca), “Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie” (Craiova), Proceedings of the International Conference “European Integration between Tradition and Modernity” (3rd edition, Târgu-Mureș) etc.

The Functional Principle in *Gramatica limbii române* (*Grammar of the Romanian Language – GALR*)

Simona Redeş

Abstract:

This article is intended to be a brief presentation of the main approaches of functionalism in Western linguistics and how these concepts and principles are reflected into Romanian linguistics, especially since the new *Grammar of the Romanian Language*, edition 2005. We insist here on the new taxonomy in classes of words and on the functional-syntactic organization which implies some distinctions between the specific functions of words.

Keywords: *GALR*, functionalism, classes of words, syntax, functions

The few grammar studies related to Romanian, written from a contrastive perspective, relied on the traditional principles and classifications, as they appear in *Grammar of the Romanian Language (GALR)*, published in 1963. Meanwhile, there have been some major changes in general linguistics concerning both the approach of linguistic structures and the research methodology. The deepest change has been the way we understand the linguistic phenomenon, as stated and proved by the functional orientation.

Functionalism developed like many other linguistic theories, from F. de Saussure's *Cours de linguistique générale*, more exactly from a negation included there, in which the linguist from Genoa objected to the comparatists that "the language functioning in communication [...] is not a cause of disorganization" (Ducrot, Schaeffer, 1996: 34). This idea was taken by some of Saussure's disciples, who considered that studying language means, first of all, investigating its functions in communication, as only during this process the internal structure of the language is framed. The first researches in this direction were in phonetics and they are due

to N. S. Trubetzkoy who, as a consequence of his results, set up a new discipline, phonology. The findings of the Russian linguist were later taken and developed by R. Jakobson, A. Martinet and the “Prague Linguistic School”. In grammar, G. Gougeheim tried to apply the methods of phonological functionalism in his book *Système grammatical de la langue française* (Paris, 1938) but without great success and considerable practical consequences.

The representatives of the Prague Linguistic School, especially V. Mathesius, managed to make the most important grammatical contribution that is the functional sentence perspective, also known as FSP (Functional Sentence Perspective). This concept relies on the statement that “the main function of an enunciation is that of bringing the receiver information that he does not have”, thus the constituents of the enunciation should be characterized “by the contribution that each of them has to the role that they have to achieve” (Ducrot, Schaeffer, 1996: 37). Firbas generalized this term through the notion of communication dynamism, CD according to the English term. The author states that “a segment of the enunciation possesses more CD according to how much new information it offers, the quantity of CD being determined by some other factors except the word order” (Ducrot, Schaeffer, 1996: 34).

A. Martinet proposes a new type of functional grammar, especially in his *Studies in Functional Syntax. Études de syntaxe fonctionnelle* (München, 1975). He distinguishes two types of significant units: *monemes* and *sintemes*, the latter being combinations of the former, which appear in the process of word formation (derivation, compounding, and phraseology). The monemes are classified according to the function they have: *predicative*, seen as the main element of communication; *autonomous*, which comprise in themselves the indication of the function they have (generally we include here the adverbial monemes: *ieri* “yesterday”, *azi* “today”, *pretutindeni* “everywhere”); *functional*, which indicate the function that other monemes have, such as the prepositions and case affixes; *dependents*, which get a new function from the other monemes, such as the nominal group, whose elements lack functional index (*DŞL*, 2005: 244).

During the generative period, as a consequence of the excessive formalism focused almost exclusively on performance, the American linguist Simon C. Dick, elaborates in *Functional Grammar* (Amsterdam–New York–Oxford, 1978) “a generally functional conception about language, that he sees as an instrument of social interaction, that is subject to linguistic variation as an effect of the communication situation and of different communication purposes” (*DŞL*, 2005: 244). Dick’s new

grammatical construction relies on the predicate, all the other elements of the enunciation are organized around it, according to three types of rules: *semantic*, *syntactic* and *pragmatic*.

Another reaction to generative grammar is the lexical-functional approach from *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations* (Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press, 1982), paper written by Joan Bresnan and R. Kaplan, which does not rely on pragmatics but on N. Chomsky's theories. Generative grammar is also challenged by S. Kuno's research on the anaphoric possibilities of the pronoun. His considerations start from the notion of "point of view", and connected to this, the informative function of the enunciation: "an enunciation is meant to tell the receiver about an event, and the sender can do it only by describing the event as seen by any spectator" (Ducrot, Schaeffer, 1996: 37). For Romanian, the type of functional syntax is the one proposed by Valeria Guțu Romalo (*DȘL*, 2005: 244).

After having shortly presented the history of functionalism, we intend to show that Romanian grammar relies theoretically, methodologically and terminologically on the concepts and principles existing in Western linguistics. In Romanian, studies of general and applied linguistics, the new trends and ideas of methodology were weakly reflected at the beginning, but during the centuries, especially the 20th century, step by step these two tendencies constantly got similar. At the level of grammar, the most relevant example of synchronization is the *Grammar of the Romanian Language (GALR)* appeared in 2005. As a consequence, the perspective of the research in contrastive linguistics field concentrated on grammar. In the particular case of Romanian, we must make a brief presentation of the theoretical basic concepts as presented in *GALR* before drawing a contrastive comparison between Romanian and a foreign language.

After the failure, even temporary, of generative-transformational grammars, the principle that gained priority was the *functional* one. As far as grammar is concerned, including the Romanian one, this principle "emphasized the relevance of some facts and aspects which were not taken into consideration before, which led to changes and deeper realizations, deriving from the introduction of some theoretical distinctions in the description and the interpretation of the grammatical phenomenon" (*GALR*, I, 2005: X). An important consequence is placing the language fact into the communication process, which means that the communication act does not depend any more only on the system, but also on the active elements of this process, the *sender* (speaker/writer) and the *receiver*, at which we should add the *situational context*. The grammatical description thus understood

category cannot be divided into flexionary classes, because each pronoun has specific flexionary particularities. Moreover, some pronouns have the category of *person*, unknown to the noun and the adjective, but specific for the verb. We can mention here a certain proportion of suppletions that appear in flexion: *eu, mi, mă*, etc., but also some specific desinences: *-ui(a), -ei(a), -or(a)* for the Genitive and the Dative: *acestuia, acesteia, acestora*.

Referentially, the lexical units from this class depend on the “support” of a co-referential name present in the speech. Within this class, a particular position is held by the *personal pronoun*, which opposes the *impersonal* ones (demonstrative, indefinite, interrogative, etc.). The class of impersonal pronouns also includes the *semi-independent pronouns* **al** and **cel**. They differ from other pronouns due to their participation to enunciation, being connected to an adjunctive or a determiner (GALR, I, 2005: 45).

2. Other word classes

2.1. The *numeral*, especially the cardinal one, due to the fact that it reunites, as “number expression”, groups of words having certain grammatical, morphological and syntactic particularities – greatly different (GALR, I, 2005: 46).

2.2. The *class of quantitatives*. It is a class made up on semantic criteria and it reunites linguistic units which contain information of “quantitative evaluation”. Besides numerals, this class also contains nouns like *pereche* “pair”, *duzină* “dozen”; indefinite pronouns and adjectives: *mult* “much”, *puțin* “little”; some adjectives and adverbs: *dublu* “double”, *triplu* “triple”, *enorm* “enormous”, *cam* “about”, *prea* “too”; certain verbs like *a dubla* “to double”, *a diminua* “to diminish”, *a mări* “to increase” and even phrasal groups: *de mii de ori* “thousand times”, *câtă frunză, câtă iarbă* “no end of” etc.

2.3. The *class of determiners*. It includes those linguistic elements which “associated to a noun are compatible, under certain circumstances, with their role to transfer the noun from the abstract zone of denomination to the substantial zone of reference [...]” (GALR, I, 2005: 47). In other words, these determiners have the quality of introducing the noun, entity belonging so far to the system, within the *enunciation*. This association “noun + determiner” leads to making an essential entity of the functional syntax, which is the *noun group*, inside which the determiner has the role of *enunciative integrator*. In Romanian, the following types of determiners can act as enunciative integrators: the article (enclitic and proclitic), the pronominal adjectives, the numerals, some adjectives of adverbial origin (*așa, asemenea*), and some phrasal groups (*astfel de, altfel de*).

If inside the extended noun group there are several determiners, only

the first one has the quality of enunciative integrator, usually the article (enclitic and proclitic), and when the article is missing any other determiner mentioned above gains this role: *acest necunoscut candidat* “this unknown candidate”. The other determiners that form the extended noun group bring some specific information. Thus, if the article has always the function of enunciative integrator, the other determiners get this quality only if they stand before the noun and, furthermore, if they hold the first position in the series of determiners. In other positions, they have only the role of adjuncts, contributing, in different proportions, to the global meaning of the noun group.

The integration in enunciation using determiners implies noun correlation with the referent involved in communication. As the noun can indicate a class of “objects”, a subclass or a single item, we have to deal with the problem of referential extension. The maximum limitation appears when the referent is identical with a single/unique representative of the class and it can be done with the help of definite or indefinite article or some demonstrative determiner (*acest/acel/celălalt concurrent* “this/that/the other competitor”).

Enunciative integration involves, most of the time, the limitation of noun extension. The grammatical expression of this report can be done, besides the situations already mentioned, using other elements like indefinite quantitatives (*mult* “much”, *puțin* “little”), adjuncts (*alt* “another”) or the demonstrative determiners (*acest* “this”, *acel* “that”). A special place is occupied by the quantitative *tot* “all”, as it determines the consideration of the entire class expressed by the noun. In other words, it produces global “information”: *tot omul* “every man”, *toți politicienii* “all the politicians”. The quantitatives *amândoi* “both” and *tustrei* “all three” also bring a “globalizing” information, mentioning only that they associate “globality” with a finite number: *amândouă personajele* “both characters”.

The situation of the possessive within the extended noun group depends on its function within it. If there is an article in the group, irrespective of the possessive’s position as compared to the noun, the integrator’s function is taken by the article: *un al nostru apropiat prieten* “a close friend of ours”, *o soră a mea* “a sister of mine”. There is only one situation when the possessive can be an enunciative integrator, namely when it is part of an adjunct series situated before the noun: *al tău acest alt vrednic prieten* “this other hardworking friend of yours”.

The article is undoubtedly the most important element in the class of determiners. It represents the grammatical way of enunciative integration, this quality differs the article from other determiners. We are interested

in the status of the article when appearing together with a noun or an adjective. With the help of its three realizations – enclitic, proclitic and zero [ø] – the article draws up a closed system of oppositions, namely: the definite determiner (enclitic article)/undetermined (zero article); the definite determiner/indefinite determiner (proclitic article); the indefinite determiner/undetermined (zero article).

Due to its exclusive function of enunciative integrator, which goes beyond the strictly grammatical level, the article was not included among the parts of speech (see *supra* the problem of extension and referential limitation).

2.4. The *class of pro-forms* unites the very different linguistic units from the grammatical point of view. Their functional-semantic particularity can be defined by the phrase “stand for”. The pro-forms set their referent in the context, especially anaphorically, more rarely cataphorically, as related to another communication component. The class of pro-forms includes, first of all, the pronoun:

Sportivii au alergat mult, unii au obosit, alții nu. (The runners ran a lot, some got tired, others did not.)

There are adjectival and adverbial pro-forms, too:

Romanul a fost extrem de interesant. Nu am citit de mult un asemenea/așa roman. (The novel was very interesting. I have not read such a good novel for ages.)

A plecat la bunici, iar de acolo la școală. (I left to my grandparents and from there to school.)

În timpul verii e cald, atunci îi place la ștrand. (It's hot during summer, then she likes going to the swimming pool.)

Urcați-vă pe scaun și stați așa. (Climb on the chair and stand still there.)

When the referential source is a syntactic structure, we have a pro-phrase:

Se pare că au câștigat. Asta îmi convine de minune. (They seem to have won. This works for me.)

2.5. The *class of substitutes*. It is a class which is similar, to a great extent, to the class of pro-forms and to that of pronouns. This similarity derives from a mutual semantic-functional particularity of these classes, namely the one to add referential information relating to another component of the communication. We can not include into the class of substitutes the following: personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person; some impersonal pronouns, especially those with generic use; interrogatives like *cine* “who”, *ce* “what”; the negatives *nimeni* “nobody”, *nimic* “nothing”; the indefinite

is included in the enunciation, which gives the researcher the possibility to emphasize “functional variations less existing at the level of the system” (*GALR*, I, 2005: X; see also Zugun, 1983; Bancea, 2000).

From the functional perspective, the main elements of the communication are *the word* and *the enunciation*, each having a specific role, which interfere in the process of making a coherent message. The word belongs to the lexicon and to the grammar, so to the linguistic system, while the enunciation is external to this, but not totally independent of it. For contrastive linguistics both entities are important even if in many research papers the accent falls on the word. This fact can be also explained on the grounds of general theory and methodology: a strictly applicative research, based only on the enunciation, remains only an isolated act in the absence of a necessary theoretical “umbrella”. That is why we will focus our interest on the word as a fundamental element of grammar, without ignoring though the problem of the enunciation. We will note, in this context, the quality of the biplane entity that a word has, which derives from the phonetic component named *significant* and the informational one named *signified*, the latter including, most of the time, the *referent*.

The analysis of word structure revealed the fact that it can be divided into smaller units: the morphemes. They are minimal linguistic signs and they can coincide with the word (*unde* “where”, *când* “when”, etc.) and they are, most of the time, word components. In the reference literature there is a distinction made between lexical and grammatical morphemes. The former bare lexical meanings and can appear as independent units (*timp* “time”, *glob* “globe”, *aici* “here”) and as components of some analyzable words, having usually in their structure prefixes and suffixes: *ne-bun*, *re-lua* or *tractor-aș*, *plug-ar*, etc. Grammatical morphemes characterize different specific forms belonging to the inflexion of a word. The constant part of a word is the *stem* and the flexionary forms, which represent the variable component of a word, are also called *flectives*. They are morphemes which during the nominal flexion characterize the noun categories of number, case, determination and gender (in the case of the adjectives) and during the verbal flexion the categories of number and person (as *desinences*), tense and mood (as *grammatical suffixes*).

The quality of a word to cover, as definition, a great diversity of communicative units was questioned by many linguists. Thus, in many grammar books they speak about morphemes as a basic unit of morphology, the notion “word” being excluded. Lately, there has been a constant return, at least in the field of grammar, to the *word* as its basic unit. As far as we are concerned we will use, as in *GALR* II, the term *word*.

The second component of the communicative act is the enunciation. “As communicative unit, enunciation is characterized by a pragmatic correlation of a phonic sequence with information referring to a ‘fact’, ‘event’ (of the reality), information which is the aim of the communication act” (*GALR*, II, 2005: 13). Enunciation, as we have already mentioned, does not belong to the linguistic system, but it is dependent of it, as it provides the means of its realization. But we can say that the linguistic system depends on enunciation in the same time, as long as only because of it the “parts of speech” can show their categorial values. To sum up, the organization of the enunciation is a functional syntactic one, the syntactic functions specific to the language can be identified on this ground. For Romanian, applying this principle led to a separation of the functions that traditional grammar used to consider a whole “verifying on Romanian material the validity of the universal principle of ‘uniqueness’, according to which there cannot be two uses of the same kind in the same syntactic field” (*GALR*, II, 2005: 10).

The change of perspective as compared to *GLR* brought thus in *GALR* new morphosyntactic divisions and an adequate terminology for these realities. The parts of speech are divided into classes of words. At the level of the *parts of speech* the predominant criterion of classification is represented by the grammatical particularities of the lexical units while, in the case of *classes of words*, the lexical units are divided “according to some mutual *functional particularities*, which correspond in the process of communication to some specific correlations between the ‘language’ and the ‘universe’ that they ‘express’, between the *linguistic system* and the *discourse*, as a way of communication” (*GALR*, I, 2005: 60). Thus, the same class of words contains linguistic units corresponding to different parts of speech, together with words and affixes of some grammatical categories. Briefly, we refer there to lexico-grammatical classes. These classes at their turn can be divided into other subclasses, on the ground of some supplementary particularities of morphological, syntactic, and, the most important, semantic type. If we omit the old classification, which is now differently defined, in flexible and inflexible parts of speech, we will meet the following classification of the parts of speech into classes (*GALR*, I, 2005: 45):

1. The *class of pronoun*, which distinguishes from the other classes through certain morphological, associative-enunciative and semantic particularities. Despite the pronoun being close to nouns and adjectives, it is different from them because of its expression variations determined by the categories of gender, number and case. Thus, the lexical units of this

pronouns *fiecare* “every”, *oricine* “anybody”.

2.6. The *class of deictics* or the *category of deictics*. We can speak about the class of deictics by relating to the lexical elements which appear in the communicative situation, and the category of deictics, as the grammatical categories of person and time are to be taken into consideration.

The deictic configuration of the enunciation/message implies three basic components: the sender, the receiver and the communicative situation, involving the moment of the enunciation and the spatial organization of the enunciative frame. As far as the sender and the receiver are concerned, their identification is done by the personal pronoun, but also by other elements belonging to the grammatical category of person: desinences or variations of the auxiliary, within the verbal flexion. Another grammatical category is attracted into the organization of the message when the moment of the enunciation must be mentioned. We talk about tense, implying the present, the past and the future. The temporal deictic can be expressed through lexical means as the so called “demonstrative” adverbs: *acum* “now”, *atunci* “then”, *azi* “today”, *mâine* “tomorrow”. Other “temporal” lexical units like *prezent* “present”, *trecut* “past”, *viitor* “future”, *la anul* “next year”, etc. can be added.

The spatial organization of the communication is linked not only to adjectives and demonstrative pronouns, but also to some adverbs: *aici* “here”, *acolo* “there”, *departe* “far”, to which one can add some other lexical units like (*la*) *dreapta* “right”, (*la*) *stânga* “left”, *în spate* “behind”. Some verbs specific for their semantics such as *a veni* “to come”, *a pleca* “to leave” are also used.

2.7. The *class of junctives* contains those lexical units that traditional grammars used to consider as prepositions and conjunctions, but also pronouns, adjectives and relative adverbs. The junctives ensure the phrastic organization of the communication.

2.8. The *class of connectors* interferes with that of junctives. “The linguistic concept of connector has in view the linguistic means (especially conjunctions and adverbs) which establish the relationships between the componential sentences of enunciation, but also the relationships between the communicative units syntactically independent, sometimes superior to the enunciation as extension and/or complexity (representing the organization of two or more successive enunciations). The coherence of a communicative assembly and the different dimensions are made through connectors, which ensure the phrastic and transphrastic correlation of the components at the level of the text” (*GALR*, I, 2005: 59–60). In fact, there is a special chapter in *GALR* II dedicated to phrastic and transphrastic

connectors.

Syntactically, the functional principle seems to be completed by the structural one. From the perspective of these both principles, the syntactic analysis does not start from the parts of sentence, but from more complex groups, that is from syntactic groups organized structurally and hierarchically. In Romanian, we distinguish the following groups: verbal, nominal, adjectival, adverbial, interjectional and prepositional. There are other syntactic constructions: passive and impersonal, causative-factitive, constructions with predicative adjunct, comparative constructions, relative sentences, etc. All these groups and constructions are configured on the ground of some functions among which the syntactic one is the most important. The functional-syntactic organization also implies some distinctions between the specific functions:

- The distinction between *matrix functions* and *reorganized functions*: the former are inherent to the center, the latter are gained as an effect of the syntactic reorganizations.

- The distinctions between *actantial/argumental functions* and *predicative functions*: the former are specific for complements, the latter for predicatives, the object complement and the apposition.

- The distinction between *syntactic functions* and *syntactic-enunciative functions*, determined by the fact that the latter cannot be defined only at the syntactic and syntactic-semantic level, but they involve the enunciative-pragmatic level as well. The predicate of enunciation, the adverbial of manner and the apposition are related to these functions.

- The distinction between *complements* and *attributes* as the latter does not represent only a function but also a syntactic position, reuniting all the functions from the noun group: “individualization”, “categorization”, “qualification”, “possession”. We also have to mention here that each syntactic group contains different syntactic functions like the ones mentioned above.

Going back to the syntactic functions, we will notice that, as compared to *GLR* II, in *GALR* II there are some new functions: the object complement, the secondary object, the indirect object, the prepositional object, the possessive object, the comparative object and the quantitative adverbial. All these new functions were included in other parts of sentence or they were not identified as separate syntactic functions at all. The new constructions and classifications, as well as the corresponding terminology have major implication for the contrastive research and the teaching of foreign languages as related to Romanian, both fields implying the activity of translation. Not to take them into consideration is a proof of lack of

didactic and translational professional¹¹.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Academia Română, Institutul de lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”, *Gramatica limbii române*. vol. I: *Morfologia*, vol. II: *Sintaxa*, București, Editura Academiei, 1963, ed. a II-a, 1966 (abbreviated as GLR).

Academia Română, Institutul de lingvistică “Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti” *Gramatica limbii române*. vol. I: *Cuvântul*, vol. II: *Enunțul*, București, Editura Academiei, 2005 (abbreviated as GALR).

Bancea, Mirela *Cuvânt și morfem. Repere teoretice în lingvistica românească și italiană*, Timișoara, Editurile Mirton și Amphora, 2000.

Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela et alii, *Dicționar de științe ale limbii*, București, Editura Nemira, 2005 (abbreviated as DȘL).

Ducrot, Oswald, Schaeffer, Jean-Marie, *Noul dicționar enciclopedic al științelor limbajului*, București, Editura Babel, 1996 (abbreviated as Ducrot, Schaeffer).

Funeriu, Ionel, *Reflecții filologice*, Arad, Editura Universității “Aurel Vlaicu”, 2008.

Guțu Romalo, Valeria, *Sintaxa limbii române. Probleme și interpretări*, București, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, 1973.

Zugun, Petru, *Cuvântul. Studiu gramatical*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1983.

Simona Redef graduated from the University of the West in Timișoara in 1999. Since 2005, she has been teaching English, first as assistant then as lecturer, at the University “Aurel Vlaicu” of Arad. Her Ph. D. thesis is *Contrastive Approach of the Noun in English and Romanian*. Her domains of competence are: English language and literature and French language and literature. Among the articles she published are: *Gender Related Conversation* (in collaboration), in “Scientific and Technical Bulletin”, Social and Humanistic Sciences Series, Editura Universității “Aurel Vlaicu” Arad, 2008; *Gender in Romanian and English, a Brief Contrastive Approach*, in *Annales Universitatis Apulensis, Series Philologica*, 8, Tom 3, University “1 Decembrie 1918” Alba Iulia, 2007.

1 Ignorance of such “constraints” results in numerous translation errors. I. Funeriu (2008: 51–63) provides examples of different types of such errors.

JESS

SEMIOTICS, HERMENEUTICS, AESTHETICS

JESS

Logical Principles and Logos

Florea Lucaci

Abstract:

Human thinking follows a logical structure as it is based on four principles, which assure the correctness of its judgments and reasoning. If we have in view judgments regarding logical thought and faithful revelation, we note that comparable relations can be established between them. Consider the propositions:

(1) *Revelation is faith, which reveals God's deeds in the world.*

(2) *Logic is thought, which elucidates the deeds of the law in the world.*

We can deduce that there is an intersection between the contents of the predicates *faith* and *thinking*. In his *Dogmatics*, Saint John of Damascus emphasized the relations of content between these two notions.

Keywords: ontology, identity, difference, logic, hermeneutics

The religions of the Holy Book, Judaism and, of course, Christianity give great importance to language. The created world is a *hypostasis* of the divine Logos, and our thinking is brought into existence through words. In the Book of Proverbs it says: *What you say can preserve life or destroy it* (Proverbs: 18, 21), so it is necessary to pay great attention to its use. It is known that language opens the door to one's soul and knowledge, so, *If you want to stay out of trouble, be careful what you say* (Proverbs: 21, 23). It is natural then that language problems be found in the New Testament as well. Thus, Jesus Christ, tempted by the Devil, answers: *The scripture says, Man cannot live on bread alone* (Luke: 4, 4), and he confesses to his disciples: *The words I have spoken to you bring God's life – giving Spirit* (John: 6, 63).

The words of judgment or reasoning are either true or false. From the truth of this disjunction we deduce that not even common thinking has the freedom of free will or dreams. Four logical principles are absolutely necessary for thinking and implicitly for language. It is natural for any

man, including the one with little education, to establish a correspondence between his judgments and reality, distinguishing the true from the false. “Indeed, the principle of identity obliges us to avoid the confusions, the principle of contradiction and of the third excluded forbid us to contradict ourselves and the principle of sufficient reason recommends us not to make groundless statements” (Botezatu, 1997: 25).

Jesus’ disciples were common people. Their minds were not blocked by savant sophisms of interpretation of the Law, which had become by that time a “graven image”. Because the Law occulted God then, they reached a paradoxical situation described by Jesus as: *But it is easier for heaven and earth to disappear than for the smallest detail of the Law to be done away with* (Luke: 16, 17). We can say that in the case of Jesus’ disciples reasoning was rehabilitated, which means that there was an equality between *the law of mind* and *the law of God*, fact becomes possible after Saint Paul the Apostle (Romans: 7, 22–25). While talking to his disciples, Thomas and Philip, Jesus asks them to believe in the truth of His words, words coming from the Father. If the disciples “do not see” (*see = think*, according to Saint Gregory of Nazianz) in the words of Jesus either the *way* or *God-Father*, then they are asked something simple, namely to believe *because of these deeds*, the miracles that had happened such as, for example, the healing of the blinds, raising of Lazarus, etc. The illumination of reason makes possible the transformation of the concepts *knowledge* and *faith* into *correlative notions*. Saint Gregory of Nazianz sees this possibility like an ideal case. He thinks that “we have been led from the visible to God, by the reasoning that comes from God and which is born in all of us and which is the first law put in us and which is connected to all of us”. As a consequence, “according to my belief, someone will discover what God is, only when this divine faculty, like Him, our mind and our reasoning, will have been united with the One to whom it is related by nature, and when the image will have reached his image, his model, whose burning desire masters him now” (Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, 1947: 21, 2004: 54).

If we do a hermeneutical exercise, we rediscover that Leibniz’s statement regarding the functions of the logical principles, namely, “even when we confer first knowledge to revelation, the easiness with which men are able to get this theory comes from the nature of their souls” (Leibniz, f.a.: 42). Of course, Leibniz does not consider that rational thinking is in opposition to faith, rather, he thinks they are complimentary. As he clearly makes the difference between revelation, like the revealing of the divinity and its understanding, like the human possibility of analysis and determination of the significance of the *theophane* acts, he specifies that

“no proposition can be accepted as a divine revelation when it is imposed in a contradictory way”. If it were not for the principle of contradiction, then “there would not be any difference in the world between truth and falsehood”. At the same time Leibniz states that “it is absolutely unconceivable that something coming from God, this beneficent creator of our being, which, once accepted as veritable, must overturn the fundament of our knowledge and make all our faculties useless” (Leibniz, f.a.: 409–410).

Logical Identity and Divine Ontology

Jesus Christ says: *The Father and I are one* (John: 10, 30), that is he confesses His divine identity.

He also says: *Whoever listens to you listens to me; whoever rejects you rejects me; and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me* (Luke: 10, 16), i.e. he defines identity in faith. Faith found in the words of the apostles, where the divine Verb works, is the premise of the restoration of the aboriginal identity, where *image* and *resemblance* are mutual features of God and man.

The proposition *The Father and I are one* renders the principle of identity into an explicit ontological formulation. At the same time, this proposition seems to be a conclusion of a syllogistic chain. The fact that God is God and not something else obviously results from taking into consideration the following reasoning, which corroborates sentences from the Old as well as the New Testament, rewritten in a standard proposition form, i.e.:

(1) *God is One, because God is the divine Being*
 Any divine *hypostasis* (Father, Son, Holy Spirit) is God revealed,
because the y are hypostases of the same divine Being
 Father and Son are One (or *The Father and I are one*)

In a symbolic form:

All B are C, because all B are D
All A are B, because all A are D
All A are C

It is possible to understand God as God only by relating it to the principle of identity. If God had not thought identically to Himself in eternity, but in time and in a changeable way, then the notion of God would be empty. If we have in view the formula $A \equiv A$, which makes our thinking possible in comparison with God’s existence, we can write:

(2) *God exists if and only if God is identical with God*

From the truth of proposition (2), which is in the same time the formula of the ontological principle and of the logical principle of identity, we can derive the dogma of Holy Trinity. In this sense, Saint Gregory of Nazianz conceives the identity of the divine hypostasis as an “identity by definition”. He clearly states that “any being that is included in the definition is named in the proper sense, and any being that is not included in the definition is neither named nor named in the proper sense”. In relation with these logical exigencies concerning the significance of a term and the relation of reference between the name and its denotation, he specifies that “in the same way, there is a single being and a single nature and a single name of God, even if out of some special meditations one can distinguish His names and also what is named in the proper sense, that is actually what God is; and what He is according to His nature, that is also called in truth, if for us truth does not mean names but reality of things” (Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, 1947: 44, 2004: 87).

The formulation “out of some special meditations one can distinguish His names” refers to *Father, Son and Holy Spirit*. Like a subtle logician, Saint Gregory of Nazianz analyzes the sophisms and the *paralogisms* committed by heretical thinking, showing that correct argumentation is not possible if the principle of identity is not observed. Firstly he considers the problem of homonymy. The starting point is the question: “How is He God if He is not God in the proper sense?”. At the same time, there is an analogy between the “land dog” and “sea dog”. The result of this analogy is that the word “dog” expresses different notions, the first denotes a mammal and the second a fish. On the other hand “God-Father” and “God-Son” are not homonyms but synonyms. As synonyms, these syntagmas do not express the identity of a thing, let’s say A, with another thing, B, i.e. $A = B$, a case in which the utterance *The Father and I are one* would be false, but they denote one and the same divine entity. Or, according to the dogma and the words of Saint Gregory of Nazianz, “the community of naming is there for things equal in worshipping” (Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, 1947: 45, 2004: 88). We bear in mind the fact that the phrase “things equal in worshipping” seems to be the religious form of the *numerical identity* from Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, which express here the identity in faith (“worshipping”). The numerical identity in Aristotle’s conception reveals a certain sense of “One in Himself”, more exactly “identity is a kind of unity, unity of plural existence or resulting from considering several things as one, like when we say that a thing is identical with itself” (Aristotel, 1965: 177–178).

Saint Gregory of Nazianz raises the issue of the theory of causality

because it allowed Arians to state that: “The Father is bigger than the Son by nature”. He proves that this claimed inequality is the conclusion of a *paralogism*, which “starts from the conditioned to the absolute”. The falsity of heretical reasoning comes from their analysis. Thus, the principle of identity is subtly defied, which means that the meaning of words does not kept within a rational approach. Consider the poly-syllogism:

(3) *The Father is by nature greater than the Son*
By nature the Father is not absolutely greater
The greater is not absolutely greater

As a consequence,
Father is not absolutely Father
 Or,
God is not absolutely God.

Saint Gregory shows that “while we confer the phrase *bigger* to the nature of the cause, they confer the idea of *greater* to nature” (Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, 1947: 45, 2004: 89). The major premise *bigger* is an adjective used to the comparative degree and so the proposition expresses a bi-univoque. In the minor premise there is a reinforcement of the character of the bi-univoque relationship between Father and Son, emphasizing that, according to nature, the Father “is not absolutely *greater*”. That means He is not independent of any condition or relation. The first conclusion, in spite of seeming correct in the sense that it distinguishes the degrees of comparison, namely relative and absolute comparative, introduces ambiguity just through the comparison of degrees. The ambiguity of the first conclusion implies falsity in the second conclusion, that is the Father not being absolute, thus resulting in that He is not implicitly the eternal, unchanging, infinite principle that is the basis of existence, and therefore He is not the divine cause. The third conclusion, introduced by Saint Gregory of Nazianz causes the Arians’ error be visible to anyone, more exactly defying identity through the definition of God.

In the end, Saint Gregory of Nazianz again takes on a dilemma introduced by the Arians, showing its sophistic premise. The scheme of this dilemma is a *complex, constructive dilemma*, resembling the *Caliph Omar’s dilemma*. As Saint Gregory of Nazianz reverses the order of premises, I shall not quote his exact text, but I shall paraphrase it accurately, that is the dilemma in a standard form.

(4) *If the Father is a name of a being then the Son is the name of another being,*

And if the Father is a name of energy, then the Son is a creature.

The Father is a name of being or the Father is a name of energy

The Son is the name of another being or the Son is a creature

Symbolically:

If A then B, if C then D

A or C

B or D

The evident conclusion, if we accept the Arians' reasoning, would be that the *Father* and the *Son* could not be characterized by the concept *homoousia*. That means they are not co-substantial, of the same divine entity, but rather they are in a hierarchical relationship of subordination.

Saint Gregory of Nazianz offers a clear reply, according to the dogma of unity of the Holy Trinity, adopted by the 1st Ecumenical Council of Nicaea. He says: "The Father is neither the name of being, nor the name of energy but is a name of relationship and of showing how the Father is compared to the Son and the Son compared to the Father. Because, like for us, human, these names show the birth and parenting connection between father and son, in the same way, in God they show the *deofintimea* of the born with his bearer" (Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, 1947: 46, 2004: 90).

Another error of the Arians is that they equate the denominations *Father* and *Son* with notion denominations, which have a well determined denotée.

The proposition *Whoever listens to you listens to me: whoever rejects you rejects me; and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me* (Luke: 10, 16), defines the identity in faith which is identity in a logical-pragmatic formulation that implies the ontological identity or the restoration of the aboriginal identity of man. How can we understand this connection? It is known that if Jesus Christ speaks through the words of the apostles, and through Him the One who has sent Him, namely Father, then, the principle of identity is the proof of the discourse operators substitution.

If the discourse of any apostle is identical with itself and, at the same time, has the same value of truth as Jesus' discourse, then God is revealed through the words of the apostles. We could define in this way the *identity in faith*, which sustains the *equivalences substitution* at the practice level of the Christian Church. That is the way we explain the persistence of the sacred in the life of the Church. Thus, like Petre Botezatu claims, an

ontological state, namely the principal of identity, is proved. This principle “states something more profound, *the persistence of the substance, of the thing existence*, beyond accidental vicissitudes” (Botezatu, 1983: 168).

Hypostasis and Person as Theoretical and Practical Concepts of God’s Being

The identity between the divine *hypostases* and the persons of the Holy Trinity has a consecrated term in dogma, namely *deo-being* (the Being of God). In the *First Epistle of John the Apostle* it is written: *There are three witnesses: the Spirit, the water, and the blood: and all three give the same testimony.* (1 John: 5, 7–8). It stands to reason that no Christian doubts what the Holy Book states, but I cannot keep from noticing the problem of understanding and interpreting the reality of the Holy Trinity. That is how the heresies appeared. Christian unity once depended on a single letter, *i*, proposed by Marcellus to be inserted between *homo* and *ousion*, so *homoousion* (of the same nature) to become the compromise term *homoiousion* (of similar nature). Despite the importance of debating these doctrinal deviations, coming from a long time ago, from the point of view of philosophy of language, there is something more important, namely the notion of competence in rational modeling of the knowledge of the Trinity reality in two distinct situations of the epistemic topic. Namely:

- a) talking *with* God
- b) talking *about* God

If the good Christian talks with God, prays to Jesus Christ, he feels happy in the presence of the Holy Spirit, then he must be able to describe and explain adequately, at least partially, this privileged relation of feeling in divinity. It is not difficult to realize that our talking to God, our mystic feelings, are connected to practical reasoning while the possibility of describing this relation is connected to theoretical reasoning.

I think I should admit that this issue is not at all simple, even if it partially originates in the distinction made between *kerygma* and *dogma* or the double methodology of the fathers from the Orthodox Church. Thus, I think that this issue is also linked with the analytical distinction of knowledge implications generated by the different logical structures of the two ways of talking, which is *with* or *about* God. But, let’s get into more details.

The explicit manifestation of theoretical reasoning is the conceptual-linguistic constructions whose basis are cognitive propositions of the type *S is P*, which have as a knowledge value truth and false, and the pragmatic propositions are the manifestation of the practical reasoning, which

have other values and significances, like for example: correctness and incorrectness, and the significance of inner contentedness, feelings of love, hope, fear, etc. The logical form of the two types of propositions is different. If, for cognitive propositions, their truth value is totally independent of the subject stating them, pragmatic propositions are conditioned, that means that they cannot be axiologically neutral compared to the context and to the subjects involved in the communication act. “The correctness problem of a pragmatic proposition – Gheorghe Enescu shows – presupposes: a) a certain *logical position* of the fact; b) a certain *logical position* of the utterer; c) a certain *logical position* of the receiver”. The phrase “logical position” indicates a certain conversion of the exactness of the true or false disjunction into a possible state that means “the fact is possible”, the utterer has a reason for uttering demands, interrogations, imperatives, etc., and “the receiver is able to respond” (Enescu, 1980: 201).

Summing up, the formal-symbolic structure of the two types of propositions is:

- (a) *cognitive proposition- $F(x)$*
- (b) *pragmatic proposition- $F(x)st$*

Let’s exemplify in natural language, using the texts of the *Creed* and the *Lord’s Prayer*. We have:

- (a1) *God is One.*
- (a2) *Son is consubstantial with Father.*
- (a3) *God’s Son is Jesus Christ.*

- (b1) *Our Father in heaven: May your holy name be honoured;*
- (b2) *Give us today the food we need.*
- (b3) *Forgive us the wrongs we have done...*

For any Christian propositions (a1), (a2), (a3) are true and they send us clear knowledge. On the contrary, (b1) contains a wish, (b2) a request and (b3) a demand.

If we apply the requests of logical conditioning to the analysis of any demand, told by any Christian, more exactly to the propositions composing the demand, we see that:

(i) *In the case of the logical position of the receiver, respectively God, we can say that in His kindness He is open with love towards men; formally we cannot speak but about a single position, respectively God does not impose any condition to the quality of the propositions stated by man, to their truth value. According to the Christian vision, man is free, this freedom being justified by the concept of arbitrary freedom.*

(ii) *In the case of the logical position of the message*, respectively the demands, the wishes or the requests composing it, we have two situations: a) when the wishes, the demands, etc. are justified in relation with faith, then the message has a correct and true content; b) when the wishes are not justified from the Christian point of view, for example the aim is some gambling gain, evil or even death of a fellow man, then the message is incorrect or false.

(iii) *In the case of a logical position of the utterer*, respectively the one who prays, we have two situations: a) when the Christian has prepared before, he has a humble attitude, he prays with love etc., then the propositions are correct and true; b) when the criteria from (a) are not accomplished then the propositions or his prayer become incorrect, thus false.

Knowing and feeling divinity as distinctive ways of relating man to God are also found in the double interpretation of Trinity, that means using the conceptual doublets *being-hypostasis* and *being-person*.

From the logical-linguistic perspective, the translation of the concept *ipostas* from Greek by *persona* into Latin can be considered an accident. Why? If *ipostas* defines a certain mode of the being, respectively a metaphysical concept in the true sense, on the contrary the meanings used for the term *persona* meant exclusive social or human contents. Thus, we meet this term to the Latin writers used with four meanings: a) *mask of an actor* (*persona tragica; persona comica* – T. Lucretius Carus); b) *role, character* (*parasiti persona* – P. Terentius Afer); c) *role – in a general meaning* (*persona suscipere, persona accusatoris* – M. Tullius Cicero); d) *person* (*substituta fili persona* – Pliny the Elder).

However the concept of *persona* has been assimilated to the practical reasoning level.

But what do we understand by the *ousia-ipostas* Athanasie dualism and the Cappadocians? This was the formulation: God has a single, secret being or essence (*ousia*) incomprehensible to us but which is revealed to us through the three God's *hypostasis* being of the same nature – *homoousia*. At first sight, everything seems absurd, just like Saint John of Damascus says: “The *hypostases* are united without mingling and separated without separating one of the others, a thing which seems absurd” (Damaschin, 1993: 24). The absurd appears if we use an inadequate language to describe a mystic reality, mathematically for instance like Vladimir Lossky does involuntarily. Even if he considers God “united three and trinity” – that is correct, he writes (he believes) a “double equation: $1 = 3$ and $3 = 1$ ” (Lossky, 1993: 56), which is undoubtedly an aberration. The so-called equation

is nonsense because the mathematical language renders exclusively the expression of some quantitative relations and the terms commutation does not change the truth value of these false arithmetical propositions. Or, in the case of the *hypostases* these do not represent three gods but the revealed images of the *One who is*.

But by *being (ousia)* we understand the inner principle through which what is, is the way it is, the term *ipostas* denotes what we are given through revelation, namely what exists for us in faith: Father, Son and Holy Spirit. As Gregory of Nyssa explains, the divine being (*ousia*) can be neither named nor determined being beyond any power of conceptualization and *Father, Son and Holy Spirit* are names that we use to denote the *ipostases* used by God to make us know Him.

Mastering an impeccable logic, Saint John of Damascus describes to us the relationship between *hypostases* and divine being (*ousia*), accurately emphasizing their identity and ontological difference. Within the titles of the VI-th and VII-th chapters dedicated to the Son of God and Holy Spirit we find the syntagm “syllogistic demonstration”, which shows that Aristotle’s spirit was treasured in the Byzantine Orient not only in the Occident. As a matter of fact, he includes logic as an important part of his work. His argumentation (Damaschin, 1993: 21–23) that I have made reference to can be synthesized as three syllogisms:

M a P
M a S
S a P

VI. The word of God is the hypostasis with the same nature as God
The word of God is the Son of God himself
So, the Son of God is God’s hypostasis

VII. The Spirit of God is the hypostasis with the same nature as God
The spirit of God is the Holy Spirit himself
So, the Holy Spirit is God’s hypostasis

The relationship between the *hypostases* of the Holy Trinity is described in the following way: “it should be known that we do not say the Father comes from someone else but we say that He is the Father of the Son. We do not call the Son either cause or the Father but we say that He comes from the Father and He is the Father’s Son. And we also say that the Holy Spirit comes from the Father and we call it the Father’s Spirit. We don not say that the Spirit comes from the Son, but we call it the Spirit of the Son”

(Damaschin, 1993: 32).

If we analyze the Holy Trinity from the practice reasoning perspective, related to the Christian man, we call the *hypostasis* persons, and this perspective reveals the immanence of divinity, its presence in our world and its relationship with man.

We define the concept of *person* as someone belonging to the human race. As Jesus Christ was historically the embodiment of a person in which the *hypostatic* union between divine and human was accomplished, and He confessed on the Father and the Holy Spirit, then it is natural to accept the expression “persons of the Holy Trinity”, but I must repeat that it is valid only from the practice reasoning perspective, that answers for faith, and not from the theoretical reasoning perspective that is the ground of positive knowledge.

Father Dumitru Staniloae approaches the issue of the relationship between man and God not from a cognitive perspective but from a feeling, ethical one. Thus, love is the essence of the relationship between the persons of the Holy Trinity and between them and the Christian man. He states that: “Without a perfect and eternal love, we cannot explain love from our world and we cannot find the purpose of the world. The love from the world has its origins and its aim the eternal and perfect love of several divine Persons” (Stăniloae, 1996: 195).

Excluded Contradiction and Truth Condition

As Jesus Christ teaches his disciples, any man who believes in God ought to obey the Law of love as well as the law of truth. In the *Sermon on the Mount*, not only does He enumerate the *Beatitudes*, the axioms of the new morals, but He also mentions one of the human meditations, a certain and necessary principle, *the principle of non-contradiction* or excluded contradiction. Jesus Christ asks His disciples, his future apostles, who will spread his teaching, imperatively to be loyal to their faith in His word. He asks them: *Just say “Yes” or “No” – anything else you say comes from the Evil One* (Matthew: 5, 37). Once broken, this *principle of excluded contradiction*, clearly stated here, generates confusion and sinful thoughts or, in the language of logics, paralogisms and sophisms.

There is a similarity between this biblical verse and Aristotle’s formulation of the correspondence between ideas and reality as a ground for truth. There is an obvious distinction between truth and falseness, in other words the disjunction between YES and NO ($p \vee \sim p$) is always true and the disjunction between YES and NO ($p \& \sim p$) is always false. Aristotle says: “It is false to say what is, is not or what is not, is; on the

contrary, a true proposition is when you say what is, is and what is not, is not” (Aristotel, 1965: 155).

But let’s return to the biblical text. We notice that Saint Paul the Apostle is very careful with this principle when he preaches faith. In his *Letter to the Corinthians* he emphasizes that truth is not hidden but frank in the text of this letter, like Jesus Christ himself said: *We write to you only what you can read and understand.* (II Corinthians: 1, 13). Then, after suggesting that the Spirit of Truth lies within his thinking, he writes: *As surely as God speaks the truth, my promise to you was not a “Yes” and a “No”. For Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was preached among you by Silas, Timothy, and myself, is not one who is “Yes” and “No”. On the contrary, he is God’s “Yes”* (II Corinthians: 1, 18–19).

So, contradictions must be avoided even when preaching Christianity. What would be the consequences if we built a Church based on the *and* between YES and NO? Destruction and disappearance. These aspects are shown even by Jesus Christ when He speaks about the way the miracles of exorcism are understood. He thus anticipates the manicheism misunderstanding of the divine condition. When there were voices in the crowd saying of Him that: *It is Beelzebub, the chief of the demons, who gives him the power to drive them out* (Luke: 11, 15), Jesus Christ answers using a question, forcing them to think. He said: *Any country that divides itself into groups which fight each other will not last very long; a family divided against itself falls apart. So if Satan’s kingdom has groups fighting each other; how can it last? You say that I drive out demons because Beelzebub gives me power to do so. If this is how I drive them out, how do your followers drive them out? Your own followers prove that you are wrong! No, it is rather by means of God’s power that I drive out demons, and this proves that the Kingdom of God has already come to you.* (Luke: 11, 17–20).

This interrogation containing a causal implication in the process of exorcism makes us meditate. If Beelzebub was actually used by Jesus Christ during the exorcism, and Christ by the Pharisees descendents, then, according to transitivity, the first formula involving Beelzebub’s knowledge implies the third, of the descendents and so Christ was occult. Symbolically, this is the formula:

$$[(p \rightarrow q) \& (q \rightarrow r)] \rightarrow (p \rightarrow r)$$

Now let’s reveal some of the absurd consequences of breaking the logical principle of excluded contradiction, taking examples from the history of Christianity. I mean, I shall suggest the irrationality of some heresies. Among these consequences we mention:

(i) *The logic of and... and.* If the semi-legendary prophet Mani noticed that man can be in the same time good and bad, that means divine good and satanic evil coexist, then his disciples introduced the idea that evil is autonomous and eternal, just like divine good. It is only apparently logical to sustain this kind of idea on the bases of analogy. The error lies in the inference from conditional to absolute unconditional, from particular to universal, so the derivation is illegitimate. Thus, logic opposes common sense and the appearance of truth, more exactly, “we cannot infer an expression having reversed order quantifiers $\Pi x \Sigma y (y \rightarrow x)$ (where the sign \rightarrow denotes any kind of precedence, logical or physical) from an expression having this form $\Sigma y \Pi x (y \rightarrow x)$ ” (Kolakowski, 1993: 64).

As a consequence, contrary to ontological formulation of the excluded contradiction, *it is impossible for a thing to have and not to have the same feature*, the manicheism tried to spread the idea that *a thing can have both A and non A features*. At the logical level, such an object would be like a circle- square and it could be described only by an eternally false proposition, $p \ \& \ \sim p$.

(ii) *Elimination of the identity principle.* This absurdity derives from (i) and it seems that all things look like a single one.

If, according to manicheism thinking, God and Satan are co-eternal and equal, it means that they are identical and substitutable. Logically, if A is in the same time not-A, then it is also not-B, so it is also B.

The mono-physicists committed the same error. Saint John of Damascus shows that “they identify the notion of being and *ipostasis*”. Or, by definition, “it is impossible to speak about Our Lord Jesus Christ as being of a single nature made of Divinity and humanity, as we do about an individual (man) as being of a single nature made of body and soul. This is an individual. But Jesus is not an individual; there is not such a Christ race as there is the human race. That’s why we say that the union involved two perfect natures, the human and the divine one; neither did they mingle, nor did they replace one another (...). We confess a single *ipostasis* in the two different perfect natures of the embodied Son of God” (Damaschin, 1993: 99–100).

(iii) *Truth is substitutable with the false.* The Greek philosopher Ebulide formulated such a logical difficulty. We find a similar utterance in the Bible, utterance meant to reveal the perverse way of insinuating the false, that is: *When he tells a lie, he is only doing what is natural to him, because he is a liar and the father of all lies.* (John: 8, 44).

Two schemes apply to the auto-reference of the lie (Enescu, 1985: 271–273):

(1) $V(F) = F$

(2) $F(F) = V$

The biblical verse is similar to Buridan's formulation: *propositio scripta in illo folio falsa* (= the proposition written on this page is false). There is no doubt that the biblical verse expresses a paradoxical state, characteristic of the Devil's intervention, because the "father of the lie" is consistent with himself, he really lies. Then, how is the devil when he says that: "he is a liar and the father of the lie"? If he lies, he expresses his own truth, but this truth is a lie.

And the devil misled us! Thus, the ophite sect from the Gnostic trend granted an important role to "the biblical Snake" which set man free, the "Snake" which tempted Eve. So does the false substitute the truth?!

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Aristotel, *Metafizica*, București, Editura Academiei, 1965.
- Botezatu, Petre, *Constituirea logicității*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1983.
- Botezatu, Petre, *Introducere în logică*, Iași, Editura Polirom, 1997.
- Sântul Ioan, Damaschin, *Dogmatica*, București, Editura Scripta, 1993.
- Enescu, Gheorghe, *Dicționar de logică*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1985.
- Enescu, Gheorghe, *Fundamentele logice ale gândirii*, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, 1980.
- Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, *Cele cinci Cuvântări despre Dumnezeu*, Tipografia eparhială Curtea de Argeș, 1947.
- Sfântul Grigorie de Nazianz, *Cele cinci Cuvântări despre Dumnezeu*, în *Taina M-a uns*, București, Editura Herald, 2004.
- Kolakowski, Leszek, *Religia*, București, Editura Humanitas, 1993.
- Leibniz, G. W., *Noi eseuri asupra intelectului uman*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura „Grinta”, f.a.
- Lossky, Vladimir, *Introducere în teologia ortodoxă*, București, Editura Enciclopedică, 1993.
- Stăniloae, Dumitru, *Teologie dogmatică ortodoxă*, vol. I, București, Editura Institutului Biblic și de Misiune al Bisericii Ortodoxe Române, 1996.

Prof. **Florea Lucaci** Ph.D. is Dean of the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad in the following fields: *history of philosophy, language logics and philosophy, biblical hermeneutics*. Doctoral Counselor in Philosophy at the University of the West, Timișoara. Fields of competence: *history*

of philosophy, philosophy of the language, hermeneutics, semiotics, philosophy of religion. Recent books published: Ființa. De la Parmenides la începuturile filosofiei creștine (2008), Avatarul ideii de absolut. De la Kant la filosofia limbajului (2008), Propoziții biblice. Interpretări logico-filosofice (2005), Creație și ființare. Un temei în ontologia umanului (2002).

The Phenomenology of Critical Thinking in Literature

Dumitru Mărcuș

Abstract:

The article presents the analysis of literary critical thinking as a form of thinking over shapes and artistic expressions. Based on the principles of phenomenology, critical thinking is investigated as a way through which the literary work is related to the system of aesthetic values. Developed therein are three ideas meant to form a type of thinking expressed by various critics in relation to the literary work.

The first aspect is related to the phenomenological perception that occurs in the act of reading, the second establishes the mechanism that triggers the interpretation and the third is related to the explanation of the convergence/divergence of critical judgments. The idea of logical critical thinking with the fuzzy logic is also introduced. The article is part of a research project about the structure of critical thinking.

Keywords: conceptual analysis, aesthetics, phenomenology, critical thinking, hermeneutics, literariness

This research tries to point out the phenomenological approach to criticism. Such an approach is grounded on the following claim: texts of criticism open up to a world that is “its own thing”.

Criticism in general, and especially literary criticism, has tried repeatedly to define its role and importance in the culture as a whole. It stated its position in relation to literary creations, basing itself on philosophical and theoretical principles and adapting its discourse to the various realities of the totality of literary works. Nowadays, the space in which the literary criticism is brought forth is ample: starting from the claim of establishing a dogma, a set of fundamental values (involving the historical scale), to the idea that, now, the criticism is the PR of the literature: “Critics are like analysts, who judge the phenomenon and propose certain conclusions. This

means a lot for the readers, who often rely on their opinion, choosing the books the critics recommend. This is what happens in the Western world” (Fluierașu, 2007).

There is an interest here in the phenomenology of critical thinking, the process by which the literary creation reaches the cultural circuit and it is being evaluated and understood through a certain point of view. The creation and the criticism keep their status and meet in an area of communication and consolidate axiologically the literary work. There are at present opinions and literary creations which show that: “Literature is appropriating more and more, while it is losing more and more acutely its critical power over society and the age, becoming more of an appendix, a fragment of life; similarly, criticism is losing its creative power and is impoverished in its aesthetic-literary form” (Șchiopu, 2009: 38–39). Beyond the weakness of the above mentioned reasons and a lack of depth in the research of creation-criticism relation, there is a possibility of examining the functionality of critical thinking and its singularity exactly for defining this type of approach in the literature valorisation.

The history of literary criticism, as well as its successive changes, provides a portrait of the concept of “literary criticism”, and also of its content in its diverse frames, in different literatures in which it expresses itself. René Wellek, in *History of Modern Criticism*, places the term “criticism” at the crossroads of a widely spread meaning met in English, French and Italian literature, and a reduced meaning in German literature. The concept also remains imprecise if we apply the distinction from the perspective of “history of literature”, because “history...” implies a positioning of the values of literary creations in their attempt to set a model of time-developed literature. Moreover, the authors of the “*Histories...*” have developed their outlines based on which they valued the authors and their works. The distinction from the explicitly announced “literary theory” has a theoretical part: on one hand we have principles, theories, categories, processes, species, and on the other hand we have the analysis of certain literary creations. It is obvious that in the analysis we find the notions of the theory of literature. By contraries (the obsolete), notions, concepts, processes can be found applied through the literary creations. The difference is of another nature: the core of the literary creation is other than that of the theory. The literary creations gave birth to theories and the cases of “programs” or of “poetic arts” show that the valuable creations were always beyond the principles.

The main idea of this study is that the critical act, i.e. the concept of “literary criticism”, has three aspects: a) the setting of the formal ontology

of the literary creation; b) its status as a work of art; c) the aesthetic condition of the work and the judgement of value. The consequences of this application regarding literary works would be that literature (the texts which meet the condition of *literary*) is an *intentional* product which has a double basis: in acts of consciousness and in real objects. The literary text is an intentional act of consciousness (belonging both to its creator and to the receiver); the text is also a real object. The critical research follows the path of double layers: an objective content and an intentional essence. Modern present-day literature shows that the artist “must engage in an act of contemplation of his gesture and make the receiver of his artistic message do the same thing” (Biemel, 1987: 122).

The status of a literary work, especially concerning the new aesthetic experiences is given by one classifying component and one of evaluation. The evaluating part leads to certain problems of defining and remains as a field of uncertainties for the critics. The classifying dimension is given by the common features of literary works (family resemblances) and the validation of object as art is linked to an artistic community. Arthur Dants, the American asthetician, completes the idea that “nothing is a work of art without an interpretation which offers it this status” (de Duve, 2001: 39).

The aspect of the aesthetic dimension and of the judgement of value which is taken into consideration by the critic (as well as the concept of “literary criticism”) is linked to a perception of causal efficacy. The two perceptions fuse into a symbolic reference correlated with the mental character or disposition and it expresses itself into a judgement of value. Even if Roland Barthes, for example, reached the conclusion that there are no longer poets nor novelists – “there is nothing but writing” (Barthes, 1966: 38), and the writer can not be defined in words related to value or role (“only through a certain *conscience of the word*”, *original emphasis*), still, the author and the critic meet again in front of the same object: *the language*.

Simultaneously with the “return of the author”, the critical thinking takes upon its shoulders an important goal: to focus on the values of the literary work.

Criticism and phenomenology. Critical thinking, no matter how the critic is defined – impressionistic (most of them), scientific, semiotician – starts from the idea of artistic existence of the object and materialises itself in the area of the autonomy of the aesthetic following the social impact, and maybe a mutation in the scale of the value. Even if the concept of “literary criticism” implies a well structured domain, the experience has confirmed an exteriorisation of the meaning of critical discourse. The

literary texts launched by Monica Lovinescu from the radio station *Europa Liberă* demonstrates this fact. The concept of *East-Ethics* is considered to reflect the type of criticism that goes beyond the specific of the aesthetic, invites to attitude and indicates the moral condition of the literature in the context of a shaped society, compelled by a dictatorial ideology and decisional system.

If the criticism is an act of cultural and educational resonance, the phenomenology of thinking does not refer to establishing the hypothesis in a phenomenological aesthetics. I think that the thematical criticism, for example, indicates a phenomenological way of thinking, and the sociological one, the psycho-analytical one and the psycho-critical one, they all have the perception of the act (of creation materialised in the literary work) and its reflection in the consciousness, the real subject turns into intentional corelate, appears as perceived, thought or imagined with their own time and space, following its own destiny, although it remains “mostly depending on the content with which it was perceived in reality” (Basturea, 2008).

The literary work appears as a sketch which requires completion due to its intentional character. The critical thinking completes the literary work, its interpretation and understanding, realises the comunicational circuit and opens it to respond the needs towards a social and complex category.

Classic husserlian phenomenology enclosed the idea of hermeneutics. Husserl introduces a hermeneutical point of view, even if somewhat shyly and silently. Thus, by saying “return to things themselves”, we can observe as matter of fact, the returnal at some discourses, removable of scientific theorization. “Also, the liberation from what it cannot be given in intuition that is out running metaphysics, is another example of contribution to hermeneutics this time recent one” (*Vox Philosophiae*, 2009).

Texts which claim to have artistic characteristics are thoroughly debated by critics. The popular notion of *literarity* is the quality which needs to be searched, as Jacobson states, in the style and structure of the text, and not in the *subject*, in the *theme* or the *motives*. The verbal or written communication turns into a literary one when it contains a figurative language, of course for its own value. If we follow the contemporary poetry we find that it uses a transitive language. The cognitive semantics “wipes the differences between the *literary* language and the figurative one [...] the meaning of an lexem is not refference or the relation from the real world of which it refers its lexem a concept in our mind [...]” (Biriş, 2009: 28).

The concept is formed by the experience which it refers to. An observation is imposed: in the issue of conceptual poetry, pure, the

functionality of the aesthetics of the text is given by the capacity of the receiver (of the intentionality of the ontic conscience) to give the concepts expressive equivalents.

If we examine now a number of critical judgements regarding the same literary text, we can see a different content:

1. "Absence of a mood and too many codes to break." Paul Cernat
2. "The circuit of the metaphor in the palimpsest is more important than the circuit of the water in nature. Literature is more important than humanity." Radu Vancu
3. "The dramatism of this volume is the poet's temptation to free himself from the text, from literarity, from a much too adorned palimpsest. Of the culture that intoxicated him, turning him into a paper man, or, in the electronic environment, into a pixelled profile." (Cristea-Enache, 2008)

The poetry of O. Nimigean in the given case, and generally of the text with aesthetic functionality is like an aesthetic object: the aesthetic object has a material perception (*Vondergrund*) formed by physical factors (sounds, the printed page, the book, the virtual text) and a vision, which from the image effect reaches moral, psychical meanings. Through intuition we gain access to that second plan (*Hintergrund*) and by reference to the advent, the reality becomes transparent and the material aspects disappear in it.

The critical thinking detects the moment in which the words which bear a meaning gain another ontological status caught by a sensitive consciousness. But the content is implied in a certain form in order to be found in the perception. The conscious acts of the creator and the receiver have an intentional nature and are sensitive being linked with the object, the object being intentional correlated (Basturea, 2008).

In the given example, the aesthetic object is seen in different aspects: "lacking mood", overencoded, the metaphor is dynamic, trying to re-write the text, the *literarity* is materialized through metaphor. We must state that from a semantic and cognitive perspective a metaphor is and expresses complex situations using known concepts. *Palimpsest* is the metaphor for the notion of *culture*. The aesthetic perception has a cultural side. The critic establishes a relation with the aesthetic object through ideatic intuition, which, through its intentional deeds is after the explained of the essences considered as "the ideal meanings of the phenomenon".

The given example, by chance, tries to test the way of critical thinking and its expression in the diversity in which the phenomenon perceived with aesthetic potential. "Absence of a mood" indicates a finding judgement of a demonstration of the language phenomenon and shows an aesthetic

perception built from value and sensitivity.

“Literature is more important than humanity” reveals the aesthetic lawfulness of the text implying a value-humanity.

The “dramatism” conveyed by the critical text highlights another aspect of the poem in the volume, the relation which reveals that state perceived aesthetically is given by the tension between the will to free itself from the literature and the *literarity*, of the culture that protected it.

The literary work has a diagram: “the layers” – phonological, lexical and semantic (the unit of meaning) – represent objects, the visual image, they present the notion of *Abschattung* which indicates the perception of the work. The text, seen as a purely intentional object, the work doesn’t have a decisive but has changeables which the critic fills in or replaces them with “constants”. Thus, the work contains in its potential changeables which allow an evaluation through different point of views and different periods of time. We must mention that the smallest “layer” has a purely intentional existence, it is a cultural product and not a psychic entity.

The aesthetic perception is orientated to the meaning of perception of the artistic image, and in general, of the literarity of the text and the meaning of perception as a fact.

The shade indicates an aspect of the critical act: the image has a meaning, the criticism shows this meaning but it is involved also the meaning of the perception as an act. Regarding Lucian Blaga’s the critic Serban Cioculescu wrote in 1938 (Cioculescu, 1982: 316): “In the *Poems of the Light*, the wind, the clouds, the sun, the stars (from the sky) but also from the mythical land, the demon of the night, the light, the death and the faith also from abstract thinking, the never ending land and the sin, become a being by mixing”. Drawing a sketch, the critical perception looks like this:

The perception:

– first: cosmic elements, mythological elements, abstract notions –

Noema

– aesthetic: the artistic image with aesthetic potential

The act of perception: **Noeza**

Here starts the subject-judgement of the future developments – it contains two aspects: its uttering (*Urteilnoesis*) and the judgement of the conscience (*Urteilnoema*). The changeables of the text, the difference in perception lead to various receiving which give the work those “constants” above mentioned. The critic establishes an aspect of receiving: “The *Poems of the Light* are spotted because of philosophical considerations and by a noisy nietzschianism which does not fit with the calm mood, rilkean, of the poet”

(Călinescu, 1980: 752).

“Spotted”, “Nietzschianism”, “calm mood”, we notice that they do not indicate a notion, a concept. The judgement is expressed through *noema*, the act of perception, *noeza* being involved in uttering the judgement. G. Călinescu forwarded the idea of art loaded with intellectuality, the aesthetic was perceived intuitively and rationally. The cultural component is obvious in case of perception expression. After half a century, N. Manolescu stated: “there is not a more precise characterisation” (Manolescu, 2008: 677). He sustains his judgement also through a statement of E. Lovinescu: “Most of Mr. Blaga’s problems are nothing but polished images; their shine can not replace the missing flame”. He catches the convergence of the judgement through the perspective of phenomenological perception as a intentional correlate, as a noema.

In the critical relation and in the judgement expressed we see two factors:

a) What is to be observed or aspects through which the aesthetic is received

b) The categories which organize and describe our observations. In the observations there are categories – the critics confirm it – but through elimination of judgement (*epoché*) appears the *description* of what it appears. So „spotted by philosophical considerations”, “Nietzschianism” they contain the theories put aside and are described as “polished images” with “the missing flame”.

Now we take a step further in the plan of analysis regarding the concept of *description* (Marica, 2008). There is an assimilation of it in the field of oppositions: description/hermeneutical interpretation; description/normative evaluation which leads to a re-measuring of the concept. The critical judgement includes in the theoretical plan the new features of the concept and the evolution of the content of aesthetic perception.

The present critique is not enough sustained in its discourse by the concept of literarity. In my opinion, *literarity* does not concentrate all the notes which define the literary creation:

1. *Literarity* does not get mistaken with connotation. The nowadays poetry encounters a move towards the creativity of the language in every day usage, turning down rhetorical appearances.

2. The art of the word is also about ideas sent through few words.

3. Figures of speech are met in the every day language.

4. *Literarity* it is considered – cannot be defined without public preferences. The implication of this aspect is more profound: a literary fact or a literary value of an epoche can be a cultural fact for the other.

The example of the *Histories...* signed by G. Călinescu in 1941, and by N. Manolescu in 2008, discuss the literary texts of our cultural history for no more than five centuries. There are other options, some of them hazardous, which talk about a pre-Romanian literature. We can also mention here the mistaken value judgements based on the deficient concept of literacy.

According to my view, this fundamental concept in establishing the aesthetical parametres must be reframed either in terms of our *necessary and sufficient condition*, or in terms of certain *criteria*. I consider that an analysis in terms of criteria can lead to a correct and complete definition of the concept.

Postmodernist literature provides a perception horizon which can accept fuzzy logic. A fuzzy concept is a concept in which context, values, boundaries of application can vary according to the conditional context, instead of being fixed once and for all. Usually this means the concept is vague, lacking a fixed, precise meaning without being meaningless altogether. It does have a meaning, or multiple meanings (it has different semantic associations), which however can become clearer only through further elaboration and specification.

I must also mention the fact that within literarity, fiction and the imaginary cannot be dissociated. Critical thinking perceives the work and filters emotions, which are the reality (mediated imaginary) of the fiction. "Our psychological reactions towards the fictional work are real and fully rational" (Cuțitaru, 2001: 24). Phenomenology avoids psychologism. Critical judgement performed from a phenomenologic perspective describes the structure of an artistic experience as represented in the consciousness as an aesthetic object, not as facts, but as an essence of things.

To be validated, all judgement must be based on evidence, i.e. an experience of an existent object and its way of being. For the criticism, the literary work remains the experience which, through the phenomenological method, sets values in the cultural horizon of a society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

*** "Vox Philosophiae", vol. I, nr. 2, 2009.

Barthes, Roland, *Critique et vérité*, Paris, Edition du Seuil, 1966.

Basturea, Sorin, *Orientări în estetica fenomenologică contemporană*, 29.10.2008, <http://www.poezie.ro>

Biemel, Walther, *Expunere și interpretare*, trad. de G. Purdea, prefață de Al. Boboc, București, Editura Univers, 1987.

- Biriș, Gabriela, *Pentru un model semantic-cognitiv al poeziei douămiiste*, în „Analele Universității Apulensis – Series Philologica”, nr. 7, 2009.
- Călinescu, G., *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, Madrid–Paris–Roma–Pelham NY, Editura Nagard, 1980.
- Cioculescu, Șerban, *Poeți români*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1982.
- Cristea-Enache, Daniel, *Poeme elementare – Nicolina Blues*, de O. Nimigean, 26.05.2008, <http://atelier.liternet.ro>
- Cuțitaru, Codrin Liviu, *Christofer New, Philosophy of Literature. An introduction*, în „Observator cultural”, nr. 94, 11 decembrie 2001.
- de Duve, Thierry, *În numele artei: pentru o arheologie a modernității*, Cluj-Napoca, Editura Ideea&Print, 2001.
- Fluierașu, Petre, *PR-ul literaturii*, 09. 08. 2007, <http://www.poezie.ro>
- Manolescu, Nicolae, *Istoria critică a literaturii române. 5 secole de literatură*, Pitești, Editura Paralela 45, 2008.
- Marica, Sorin Claudiu, *Descrierea încotro? A phenomenologic inheritance 150 years after the birth of Husserl*, 20.10.2008, <http://www.filozofie.eu>
- Șchiopu, Rareș, *De la critică la dia-critică. Considerații asupra avatarului actual de critici*, în „Idei în dialog”, An V, Nr. 4 (55), Aprilie, 2009, p. 38–39.

Associate Professor **Dumitru Marcuș** Ph.D. holds a chair of Romanian literature at the University “Cyril and Methodius” of Skopje, Republic of Macedonia. He published studies and articles on religious literature, the philosophy of culture, drama, and aesthetics in cultural, specialized, and professional magazines. Author of the following books: *Ființa și Firea. Reconstrucția fenomenologică a gândirii lui Mircea Vulcănescu* (2002); *Aspecte ale literaturii române vechi* (2004); *Estetica și arta literaturii* (2009). Lectures on the following topics: *Contemporary Romanian Literature, Aesthetics, Rhetoric and Argumentation*.

JESS

REVIEW ARTICLES

JESS

Basarab Nicolesco: le quotidien comme un miracle

Radu Ciobotea

Dans le monde parisien, Basarab Nicolesco jouit de la célébrité d'un acrobate de l'intelligence converti à l'exercice, plus pacifique, de la réflexion, mais aussi du prestige d'un philosophe qui dissout le scepticisme de Cioran dans la structure moléculaire de l'espoir. Son emplacement exact sur une scène imaginaire de la recherche et de la spiritualité roumaine dans le Hexagone reste impossible, car toute tentative de l'associer rigoureusement à une discipline serait annulée par le spectre, plus complexe, d'une transdisciplinarité féconde.

Pas du tout retranché derrière une tour d'ivoire ou il pourrait s'employer à chercher, d'une manière infatigable et silencieuse, le tiers inclus, Basarab Nicolesco est une présence dynamique, spontanée, ouverte vers l'expérience culturelle et vers le dialogue. Si d'autres engagements ne l'attirent pas vers des pays lointains, on peut le rencontrer aux conférences des grands penseurs ou bien au lancement des livres qui ouvrent des nouvelles voies d'interpréter le monde. Une curiosité profonde, une soif irrépressible de nouveauté dans l'ordre des découvertes spirituelles le pousse incessamment vers les possibles miracles. D'une certaine manière, sa passion est le miracle, dans sa mystérieuse construction et dans son insaisissable passage à travers et parmi nous. Le miracle, dans son insoupçonnable diversité de formes, à partir des infinitésimales sélections atomiques dans la physique quantique, jusqu'au grand mystère de la poésie, et à partir de la traversée des disciplines des connaissances, jusqu'au silence.

Comme il soutient dans maintes écritures, le miracle est l'action d'un niveau de réalité sur un autre niveau de réalité. Simple et troublant. Avec la découverte des différents niveaux de réalité, l'existence de Basarab Nicolesco s'achemine vers un plan de l'horizon toujours lointain. Il est à

nos côtés, mais il cherche inlassablement quelque chose d'autre. Il cherche le surplus initiatique d'une rencontre, le signe caché d'une réplique, l'ouverture potentielle d'un geste. La réalité dans laquelle il conçoit les petits événements quotidiens n'a rien de dérisoire. Et l'on pourrait dire même que, en fin de compte, il n'y a aucun « petit » événement quotidien, il n'y a que l'espace-temps qui nous enveloppe, il n'y a que les miracles qui nous échappent, mais qui constituent, essentiellement, la partie poétique de notre existence.

Mais ce n'est pas la poésie le sujet dont Basarab Nicolesco nous parle dans ses interventions publiques, très attendues et toujours surprenantes. Et le miracle non plus, si on le considère un phénomène surnaturel devant lequel il faut s'agenouiller, en croyant sans chercher. Au contraire, il nous conseille de chercher, de pousser notre recherche le plus loin possible, de toucher le noyau chaud du mystère, de tenter la sortie hors des déterminations étroites des trop nombreuses disciplines et d'amener la raison jusqu'à la limite de l'irrationnel. Ce n'est pas une sortie de l'ordre universel, mais justement un changement de substance dans une « autre chose » qui lui est supérieur. Une quête rationnelle au nom d'un ordre qui dépasse la raison, en l'englobant dans un autre type de connaissance. Une connaissance plutôt poétique, si le terme ne mènerait dans une direction généralement mal comprise. Pour lui, comme pour Jakob Böhme, Dieu signifie Ordre, le suprême ordre retrouvé dans le Cosmos, et justement cet ordre, dans son infinie dynamique, recèle le tiers inclus. Inclus dans les procès mystérieux de la vie, inclus dans les soubresauts de la particule dans la physique quantique, inclus dans l'éclair du passage d'un niveau de réalité à celui immédiatement supérieur. Dans tout cela, Basarab Nicolesco voit la poésie. Non pas celle qui prend rigoureusement une forme versifiée, mais celle qui coagule un état intérieur, en traversant les espaces de notre existence. C'est bien là qu'on peut retrouver la transdisciplinarité, en tant que parcours qui nous révèle la dimension poétique de l'existence. La phrase est souvent affirmée publiquement et, même sans avoir lu une seule ligne des livres du philosophe roumain, on sent sa perfection de diamant. Ou plutôt de émeraude, car Nicolesco est un fin connaisseur des textes ésotériques, et *Tabula Smaragdina* est plusieurs fois présente dans son œuvre, dans son assertion la plus célèbre, sur les correspondances entre le « haut » et le « bas », comme hypostases du même univers et parties du même miracle.

Eloquent dans ses interventions, alerte aux polémiques, présent dans les débats, Basarab Nicolesco fait valoir, énormément, le silence. Pour lui, c'est une forme saisissante de la présence ouverte vers l'autre. Le

silence réceptif, absorption raffinée des messages extérieurs, est l'un de ses traits constitutifs. La plupart des photos rassemblées tout au long de sa vie le montrent silencieux, en regardant, en écoutant. En participant. L'événement se perd dans une infinité de possibilités académiques, dans un passé récent qui ne garde, maintenant, que ce regard interrogatif, calme, pensif. Le philosophe a une certaine manière de regarder autour de lui, et le silence fait partie de ce regard, comme un miroir qui renvoie le mot dans un autre monde, parfaitement existant, mais dénuée de matérialité.

La corporalité du mot est remplacée, en effet, par l'image en miroir du mot écrit. L'esprit, pour lui, est une forme de purification, un accès vers l'état poétique de l'être, un témoignage sur les événements qui se passent dans l'intervalle existentiel où il nous arrive de vivre. Ici, dans l'écrit, le silence est l'espace entre les mots, la dimension qui confère de la profondeur à l'idée. La troisième dimension. Le silence de Basarab Nicolesco est un rejet de la dualité stérile dans son infinie opposition, une compréhension du binaire dans la perspective d'un ternaire qui ne se manifeste que rarement, mais qui reste l'essentiel des processus organiques, physiques, spirituels.

Lors d'une conversation avec lui, à Paris, l'écrivain avouait qu'il avait écrit son premier livre, sur Ion Barbu, dans les moments de presque réveil, quand l'aube commence à transformer le moment dans un univers étrange, sans aucun rapport avec les certitudes de la journée ou avec les rêves de la nuit. «Je suis allé un mois et demi à Varatec et, dans le silence de la monastère, j'ai écrit le livre. En écrivant, j'ai trouvé des nouvelles structures, que j'ignorais jusqu'alors», disait-il. Il se trouvait, comme maintenant, à la recherche d'une certaine instabilité de l'esprit et de la matière, qui lui aurait assuré l'accès à un autre niveau, la fulgurance d'une vision, l'éclair d'une vérité. Au delà de l'opposition entre jour et nuit, dans l'intervalle incertain d'un perpétuel passage, son écriture traverse les silences des commencements, en cherchant la lumière créée, apportée par Ion Barbu dans le vers.

Les chambres et les couloirs de son appartement témoignent, aussi, de cette quête avoisinée plutôt à la révélation qu'à l'hésitation. Des livres rares, fondamentaux, des veilleuses vouées juste à fuir une partie de l'obscurité, en laissant la pénombre inonder l'espace sans l'exposer, comme des icônes qui rassemblent les couleurs de chez soi dans des irisations de verre et des stylisations de bois, des photographies rassemblant l'histoire des moments dans l'éternité d'une rencontre.

Le lieu où écrit Basarab Nicolesco regorge de mots non-dits et de lumières fragmentaires. Sa présence leur confère, tout d'un coup, une dynamique propre, comme si tout aurait trouvé un sens et se serait assis

dans un ordre normal de la recherche ou de la rêverie. Son absence les transfère, peut être, dans une logique de l'attente, dans un état d'existence ajournée, comme si, au dessus des frémissements de Paris, au-delà des fenêtres, et des frémissements silencieux des images à l'intérieur aurait manqué un troisième terme. L'espace du milieu, celui qui transforme l'intervalle dans un incessant début de journée dans lequel les vérités se réjouissent, caressées par la douceur du matin, et Dieu reste, proche et impénétrable, à l'autre bout du mystère.

Radu Ciobotea is Associate Professor Ph.D. at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of "Aurel Vlaicu" University of Arad, where he currently holds a chair of Journalism. He is the autor of several books in the field, published in Romania and France: *Întoarcerea la Shaolin* (1995), *După Revoluție, târziu* (1996), *Une guerre sans vainqueurs* (Éditions Paris-Méditerranée, Paris, 2003) *Război cu Doctor Blues* (2003), *Pantera roz rămâne în vitrină* (2003), *Reportaj și literatură* (2005), *Reportajul românesc între cele două războaie mondiale* (2006), *Le mot vécu. Le reportage français et roumain dans l'entre-deux-guerres* (L'Harmattan, Paris, 2010), as well as a historical novel, *Apărătorii* (2006).

Cel de-al treilea om și etica responsabilității: Sandu Frunză, *Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel*

Florea Lucaci

Ni se dă cumva o problemă? Da. Sandu Frunză, un „frate” din mediul academic clujean, ne incită cu ultima sa carte¹ să reflectăm asupra temeiurilor eticii. Este vorba de vechea și, totodată, actuala problemă deschisă a relațiilor interumane și de proiecția sacralizată, respectiv relația om – Dumnezeu. Provocarea cărții semnată de Sandu Frunză este alimentată din două perspective, una general-teoretică, iar cealaltă privat-memorialistică.

Astfel, aduc în discuție faptul că funcționalitatea relațiilor menționate este posibilă, se crede, în baza unor categorii, adică: *bine și rău, dreptate și injustiție, libertatea* cu derivatele sale, și anume *libertate religioasă, libertate politică* etc. pe de o parte și *intoleranța, prigoana, teroarea* etc., pe de altă parte, *responsabilitate* și *indiferență* etc. Ne întrebăm: valorile, principiile și normele ce reglementează comportamentul individual și chiar social au în subsidiar logica deontică? Dacă da, atunci cum se explică comiterea nenumăratelor fapte imorale și injuste? Dacă nu, atunci pe ce temei se admite așa-zisul „silogism practic” care ar sta la baza gândirii și acțiunii oamenilor? Se pare că dacă există o logică a gândirii morale ce permite distincția dintre *bine* și *rău*, este greu de susținut că aceste valori operează neutru, asemenea *adevărului* și *falsului*. De ce? Credem că acțiunile ce cad sub conceptul de morală sunt supuse „judecății” conștiinței individuale și „exigenței” opiniei publice, infuzate puternic de subiectivitate. Dar credem că este la fel de posibil ca faptele imorale și prelungirea lor penală să fie tolerate sau tratate cu indiferență. Istoria

¹ Sandu Frunză, *Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel*. O etică a responsabilității, București, Editura Contemporanul, 2010.

confirmă ambele opțiuni.

Apoi experiența limitei trăită de Elie Wiesel în lagărele naziste și transpusă în memoria unor cărți este inclusă de unii occidentali într-un fenomen definit „industria evreiască a Holocaustului”. Cu alte cuvinte, cărțile ce descriu ororile lagărelor de exterminare sunt socotite în mod straniu o formă de răzbunare după celebra lege a talionului – ochi pentru ochi și dinte pentru dinte – fiind o „combinație de terorism intelectual și șantaj moral” (David Irving). Totodată, se insinuează că Elie Wiesel impune o viziune asupra Holocaustului ca „religie a misterului”, deci un fenomen inabordabil, ce se situează în afara istoriei, astfel că nu poate fi explicat.

Ce face Sandu Frunză? Fiind filosof, el caută să surprindă autenticul omenesc și să-l ridice la generalitatea unui discurs conceptual. Firește, el este conștient că fiecare eveniment istoric este unic, deci și Holocaustul, ceea ce permite insinuarea paradoxalului în analiza cărților lui Elie Wiesel. Prin urmare, el operează asupra relației ontologice de întemeiere a existenței umane, relație ce în proiecție etică presupune raporturile *indiferența – răul* și *responsabilitatea – răul*. De altfel, încă de la început, în introducerea la cartea sa, el precizează: „Aceasta este o carte despre indiferență. [...] Cele două căi ale indiferenței se întrepătrund într-o complicitate cu răul absolut ca manifestare cotidiană în lagărele morții. Răul este scos din sfera teologicului și este transferat în cea ontologică. [...] În această realitate construită pe o logică a războiului, răul nu mai are o semnificație morală și existențială de ordin religios, ci i se conferă o realitate strâns legată de acțiunea sau non-acțiunea umană” (p. 5). Așadar, Sandu Frunză ne spune că în posibilitatea decriptării răului trebuie să avem în vedere gândirea ce se poate ipostazia în judecată axiologică și acțiune.

De ce se reduce totul la om, la gândirea și la modul său de a acționa? Este adevărat, jocul negației între existență și non-existență își are expresia logică în principiul necontradicției, dar poate sugera și altceva. Astfel, din perspectivă platoniciană rezultă că dacă existența unui lucru depinde de participarea lui la ideea lucrului, atunci și lucrul, și ideea sa trebuie să participe la o a treia esență care, de asemenea, ar trebui să participe la a patra ș.a.m.d. Avem aici schema unei dialectici ascendente prin care se constituie conceptele. Este schema argumentului cunoscut în antichitate sub denumirea *Argumentul celui de-al treilea om*. Un simplu exercițiu hermeneutic dezvăluie că existența lui Elie Wiesel ca paznic al memoriei, presupune existența ideii de om de sacrificiu, iar Isaac și moartea sacrificială devine paradigma ce se predică distributiv despre fiecare evreu în parte, apoi tema sacrificiului implică în mod colectiv poporul lui Israel și, în final, misterul relației om – Dumnezeu. Constantă în mereu reluată relație

de asemănare dintre lucrurile sensibile și idei este gândirea și conștiința distribuirii acestora în diverse ipostaze.

Tot din perspectiva memoriei, cărțile lui Elie Wiesel implică reacția lui Sandu Frunză. În primul rând, este o reacție de om, de cititor sensibil, ce are capacitatea, de exemplu, de a auzi aieva ecoul cuvintelor rostite cu bunăvoință cinică de un *Blockälteste*, cuvinte ce se înfing în memorie ca un cui. Este vorba de scena în care i se explică tânărului Eliezer „legea supraviețuirii în lagăr”, lege menită să „să învingă dorința sa de a-și arăta atașamentul față de tatăl muribund” (p. 180). Memoria lui Elie Wiesel este asumată de Sandu Frunză și, prin urmare reia din *Noaptea* cuvintele ce sfidează condiția umană:

Ascultă bine ce-ți spun, băiatule. Nu uita că te afli într-un lagăr de concentrare. Aici fiecare trebuie să lupte pentru viața lui și să nu se gândească la ceilalți. Nici măcar la tatăl lui. Aici nu mai există tată, frate, sau prieten. Fiecare trăiește și moare pentru el, singur. Ascultă sfatul meu: nu-i mai da bătrânului rația ta de pâine și supă. Nu mai e nimic de făcut. Și te omori cu zile. Ar trebui, dimpotrivă, să mănânci și porția lui... (Elie Wiesel, *Noaptea*, București, Univers, 2005, p. 119).

Asumarea este aici o formă de angajare, adică îndeplinirea funcției de mărturie a memoriei, de comunicare.

În al doilea rând, din perspectivă filosofică, memoria implică necesitatea argumentului, adică este necesară dovada că unicitatea Holocaustului este echivalenta unei universalități. Prin termenul *universal*, înțeleg ceea ce este enunțat despre toate subiectele. Pentru lămurire, să analizăm un posibil argument, care sintetizează demersul lui Sandu Frunză:

Elie Wiesel este evreu și erou al Holocaustului
Supraviețuirea lui a trecut în memoria cărților sale
Resurecția Holocaustului este o realitate a cărților lui Elie Wiesel
Evreii martiri ai Holocaustului sunt și eroi ai cărților lui Elie Wiesel
Toți cititorii cărților lui Elie Wiesel iau act de experiența răului
Memoria cărții implică memoria oricărui cititor
Sandu Frunză a resuscitat memoria într-o realitate conceptuală
„Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel” este modul filosofic de a
gândi răul

Deci, memoria este o stare mentală, dar funcționează și ca relație conceptuală

Dacă memoria este o relație, atunci are proprietăți:

Este reflexivă: toți cei implicați de memoria cărții au o responsabilitate de sine însuși

Este simetrică: memoria lui Elie Wiesel implică memoria cititorilor,

dar și invers

Este tranzitivă: memoria se transferă prin sine însăși la terți, implicând responsabilitatea

Dacă Holocaustul este interpretabil atât ca o noțiune singulară, cât și universală,

Atunci este posibilă o reacție morală individuală, dar și o etică a responsabilității.

Ce mai constatăm? Hermeneutica și schema cercului afirmă că partea dă seamă de întreg, iar întregul își află expresia exemplară în parte. Mai concret, Elie Wiesel nu este un simplu ins ce aparține unei mulțimi – poporul evreu. El este evreul ce se identifică și în biblicul Isaac, și în tatăl său, și în „tînărul cu chip de înger” condamnat la moarte, și în fiecare suflet ce agonizează în „Regatul Noptii”. De aici reiese că memoria implică cel puțin responsabilitatea mărturisirii, iar mărturisirea este, de exemplu, substanța cărții *Noaptea*, dar și a cărților ce adevăresc cărțile lui Elie Wiesel, deci inclusiv cartea lui Sandu Frunză – *Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel*.

Sandu Frunză nu este un simplu cititor al lui Elie Wiesel, cartea sa fiind un veritabil argument – cel de-al treilea om. Într-o interpretare modernă, cartea universitarului clujean se înscrie firesc în seria interpretărilor adecvate ale conceptelor eticii. Plecând de la povestirile lui Elie Wiesel, el realizează o *Introducere la problema răului și a responsabilității*. De aici derivă și structura cărții *Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel*, care, formal, este deschisă, adică vizează atât empiricul încărcat cu imagini sensibile, cu descrieri palpabile ale manifestărilor pe relația uman – inuman, cât și teoreticul. Discursul se înscrie inițial în orizontul unei filosofii a mărturisirii Inexprimabilului, apoi analiza este concentrată punctual asupra conceptelor *răul, suferința, indiferența și responsabilitatea, omul și Dumnezeu*. În ultima parte, a V-a, intitulată *Moartea omului și moartea lui Dumnezeu*, este tematizată căutarea lui Dumnezeu. Ridicarea la concept, la absolutul pe care îl sugerează execuția unui inocent și întrebările ce se insinuează dureros în mintea lui Elie Wiesel, are o dimensiune apocaliptică. De ce? Moartea omului implică moartea lui Dumnezeu. Pasajul din *Noaptea* are ritm de verset biblic:

„Unde-i acum Dumnezeu?” Și am auzit înlăuntrul ființei mele o voce care-i răspundea: „Unde e El? Unde e El? Aici, atârnă aici, în spânzurătoare” (p. 160).

Reflecția teoretică are ca referențial relația om – Dumnezeu, relație ce ar trebui să legitimeze temeiul etic și, în extensie, cel juridic al lumii

omului. Numai că există momente în care rostirea se închide în tăcere. În acest sens, Sandu Frunză ne spune că „Relația dintre întrebare și răspuns face ca tăcerea să capete un rol important în teologia holocaustului” (p. 165). Absolutul apocaliptic este surprins clar: „Tăcerea lui Dumnezeu se așază, astfel, peste ființele dezumanizate ca efect al acțiunii răului absolut, peste cadavrele celor ce au cunoscut violența extremă a lagărului. Tăcerea se lasă și peste lumea pe care aceștia au lăsat-o în urmă și care a dispărut fără nici o posibilitate de a mai fi adusă la viață altfel decât prin intermediul memoriei și al mărturisirii asumate de către cei ce au avut șansa supraviețuirii” (p. 166). În aceste condiții interpretarea relației om – Dumnezeu și implicit posibilitatea unei lumi în vederea omului presupune un imperativ de sorginte neokantian, și anume „ca fiecare individ să iasă din indiferență și să acționeze în vederea regăsirii de sine prin practicarea unei etici a responsabilității” (p. 184).

Oricare recenzie trebuie înțeleasă ca având rolul de a semnaliza importanța și originalitatea unei cărți, în cazul de față o carte ce confirmă vocația de gânditor a lui Sandu Frunză. Fără îndoială *Dumnezeu și Holocaustul la Elie Wiesel* este o carte necesară ce pune probleme autentice și actuale. Mesajul este clar: omule, nu te lăsa copleșit de rău, gândește și acționează, învinge răul cu binele. O ipostază a binelui este responsabilitatea.

Editura Universității „Aurel Vlaicu” Arad
Acreditată CNCIS

Arad, str. Elena Drăgoi, nr. 2-4
Telefon: 0257-219555
e-mail: editurauav@yahoo.com

Tipar executat la Imprimeria Universității „Aurel Vlaicu” Arad, România