



**UNIVERSITATEA DE STAT „ALECU RUSSO”
DIN BĂLȚI, REPUBLICA MOLDOVA**

[https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2020\(1\)](https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2020(1))

Limbaș și context

**Revistă internațională de lingvistică,
semiotică și știință literară**

1(XII)2020



**ALECU RUSSO STATE UNIVERSITY OF BĂLȚI,
REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA**

Speech and Context

**International Journal of Linguistics,
Semiotics and Literary Science**

1(XII)2020

The administration of Basel (Switzerland) is the sponsor of the journal from 2011.

Speech and Context International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science (in Romanian: *Limbaș și context – revistă internațională de lingvistică, semiotică și știință literară*) is indexed in *ISI, Universal Impact Factor, Index Copernicus, Directory of Research Journals Indexing, Open Academic Journals Index, InfoBaseIndex* and *CiteFactor*. It is listed in *EBSCO, Genamics, MLA International Bibliography, DOAJ, Summon Serials Solutions, ProQuest, La Criée: périodiques en ligne, Vaggi.org Directory, Unified Database for Serial Titles, WorldCat, Open Library, The Linguist List, NewJour, Fabula* and *Jurn Open Directory*.

From July 2014 *Limbaș și context / Speech and Context International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science* is a Moldovan **B Rank** journal.

JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD MEMBERS

Editor-in-chief:

Angela COȘCIUG, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova).

Editors:

Ecaterina FOGHEL, Ph. D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Silvia BOGDAN, Lecturer (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova).

Scientific Board:

Simona ANTOFI, Professor, Ph.D. (Dunărea de Jos University of Galați, Romania);

Sanda-Maria ARDELEANU, Professor, Ph.D. (Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania);

Norbert BACHLEITNER, Professor, Ph. D. (University of Vienna, Austria);

Laura BĂDESCU, Professor Researcher, Ph.D. (Academy of Sciences of Bucharest, Romania);

Lace Marie BROGDEN, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Regina, Canada);

Georgeta CÎȘLARU, Professor, Ph.D. (University Paris Nanterre, France);

Ion DUMBRĂVEANU, Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

Bernard Mulo FARENKIA, Professor, Ph.D. (Cape Breton University, Canada);

Luminița HOARȚĂ-CĂRĂUȘU, Professor, Ph.D. (Alexandu Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania);

Victoriya KARPUKHINA, Professor, Ph.D. (Altai State University, Russia);

Nataliya KHALINA, Professor, Ph.D. (Altai State University, Russia);

Catherine KERBRAT-ORECCHIONI, Emerita Professor, Ph.D. (Lyon 2 Lumière University, France);

Daniel LEBAUD, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Franche-Comté, France);

Dominique MAINGUENEAU, Emeritus Professor, Ph.D. (University of Paris 12 Val-de-Marne, France);

Gina MĂCIUCĂ, Professor, Ph.D. (Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania);

Sophie MOIRAND, Professor, Ph.D. (Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle University, France);

Yuri MOSENKIS, Professor, Ph.D., Corresponding Member of Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (Taras Șevcenko National University of Kiev, Ukraine);

Thomas WILHELMI, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Heidelberg, Germany);

Solomia BUK, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Ivan Franko National University of Lvov, Ukraine);

Ludmila CABAC, Ph. D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Viorica CEBOTAROȘ, Associate Professor, Ph. D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Oxana CHIRA, Associate Professor, Ph. D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Mioara DRAGOMIR, Senior Scientific Researcher, Ph.D. (A. Philippide Institut of Romanian Philology, Iași, Romania);

Seyed Hossein FAZELI, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran; University of Mysore, India);

Ecaterina FOGHEL, Ph. D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Elena GHEORGHITĂ, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

Ion GUȚU, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

Irina KOBIAKOVA, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (State Linguistic University of Pjatigorsk, Russia);

Ana POMELNICOVA, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Valentina PRITCAN, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alecuro Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Valentina RADKINA, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (State Humanities University of Izmail, Ukraine);

Estelle VARIOT, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (University of Provence, Aix Center, France);

Micaela ŢAULEAN, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alecuro Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

M'Feliga YEDIBAHOMA, Ph.D. (University of Lomé, Togo), Researcher (University of Franche-Comte, France);

Irina ZYUBINA, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Southern Federal University, Russia).

Proofreaders and Translators:

Ecaterina FOGHEL, Ph. D. (Alecuro Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova);

Ecaterina NICULCEA, Assistant Professor, MA (Alecuro Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova).

Technical Editor:

Liliana EVDOCHIMOV, Lecturer (Alecuro Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova).

Editorial Office:

Room 465, B 4,

Alecuro Russo Balti State University,

38, Puşkin Street, 3100, Balti, Republic of Moldova

Telephone: +37323152339

Fax: +37323123039

E-mail: limbaj_context@usarb.md

Publishing House: Centrul editorial universitar

Journal Web Page: https://www.usarb.md/limbaj_context/

Journal Blog: <http://speech-and-context.blogspot.com>

The journal is issued twice a year.

Language of publication: English, French and German.

Materials included in this issue were previously reviewed.

p-ISSN 1857-4149, e-ISSN 2953-6812

Undoubtedly there are all sorts of languages in the world, yet none of them is without meaning. If then I do not grasp the meaning of what someone is saying, I am a foreigner to the speaker, and he is a foreigner to me (1 Corinthians, 14: 10-11).

JOURNAL TOPICS

- **Overview of signs, speech and communication:** overview of sign; overview of speech; speech aspects; overview of communication and speech act; sense and signification in communication; intention in communication; speech intelligibility
- **Types of sign, speech and interactional mechanisms in communication:** icons; indexes; symbols; speech act in everyday communication; mimic and gestures in communication; language for specific purposes; sense and signification in media communication; audio-visual language/pictorial language; language of music/language of dance; speech in institutional area; verbal language in cultural context; languages and communication within the European community
- **(Literary) language and social conditioning:** ideology and language identity; language influences; morals and literary speech; collective mentality and literary image; (auto)biographic writings, between individual and social; voices, texts, representation
- **Language, context, translation:** role of context in translation; types of translation
- **Languages and literatures teaching and learning**

CONTENTS

TYPES OF SIGNS, SPEECH AND INTERACTIONAL MECHANISMS IN COMMUNICATION

Lilia Trinca, *Linguistic Stereotype vs. Gender Stereotype* 15

Lilia Trinca, *The Concept of Fear vs. The Cultural Profile of the Affective Cognitive Model (Based on Units of Repeated Speech)* 27

(LITERARY) LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CONDITIONING

Svetlana Melnic, *Alexei Marinat: The Cathartic Function of Confession in the Diary "Me and the World"* 41

Svetlana Melnic, *The Anatomy of Authentic Autobiographic Narratives* 51

Victoria Barbun, *"Ulysses": Studies of Novel as the Modern Interpretation of "Odyssey"* 61

Vladimir Brajuc, *The Polysemy of Symbols in The Novel "Oblomov" by Ivan Gončarov* 73

LANGUAGE, CONTEXT, TRANSLATION

Elena Olariu (Chicoș), *The first translation of Hamlet into Romanian by Ioan BARAC (1776-1848)* 93

Elena Olariu (Chicoș), *An Overview on Demetrius's Translation of Hamlet (1878-1942)* 103

**TYPES OF SIGNS, SPEECH AND INTERACTIONAL
MECHANISMS IN COMMUNICATION**

LINGUISTIC STEREOTYPE vs. GENDER STEREOTYPE

Lilia TRINCA

Associate Professor, Ph. D.

(Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

lilia_trinca@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6472-6682>

Abstract

The fact that the Romanian society values more the features associated with masculinity, manifesting attitudes strongly flanked by stereotypes and prejudices regarding gender, beliefs related to gender differences, can easily be justified by linguistic stereotypes – expressions belonging to the repeated discourse – proverbs, sayings, phraseological expressions etc. We started from the fundamental idea that language is not only an instrument, but also a deposit and form of thought, and proverbs, beyond the fact that they are universal and are transmitted over time from one nation to another, yet they reflect the local, historical, and linguistic specificity.

*In order to put ourselves in line with the mutations of the extralinguistic context on which it is projected, in our research we have resorted to the correlation of the cognitive and cultural dimensions, with the purpose of highlighting the peculiarities of linguistic **coding** of the concepts related to gender, which provides access to cognitive structures and schemes involved in the conceptualization of the **woman**. For this purpose, **we** have used the data of the “Associative Dictionary of the Romanian Language”.*

Keywords: *stereotype, linguistic stereotype, repeated discourse, linguistic universals, cognitive scheme*

Rezumat

Faptul că societatea românească valorizează mai mult trăsăturile asociate masculinității, manifestând atitudini puternic flancate de stereotipuri și prejudecăți referitoare la gen, credințe legate de diferențele de gen, poate fi cu ușurință justificat de stereotipuri lingvistice – expresii aparținând discursului repetat – proverbe, zicători, expresii frazeologice etc. Am pornit de la ideea liminară că limba nu e doar un instrument, ci și depozit și formă a gândirii, iar proverbele, dincolo de faptul că sunt universale și se transmit de-a lungul timpului de la un neam la altul, totuși reflectă specificul local, istoric și lingvistic.

Pentru a ne pune în acord cu mutațiile contextului extralingvistic pe care se proiectează, în cercetarea noastră am recurs la corelarea dimensiunii cognitive și a celei culturale, pentru evidențierea particularităților de codare lingvistică a conceptelor referitoare la gen, ceea ce oferă accesul la structuri și scheme cognitive implicate în conceptualizarea femeii. În acest scop, am apelat la datele „Dicționarului asociativ al limbii române”.

Cuvinte-cheie: *stereotip, stereotip lingvistic, discurs repetat, universalii lingvistice, schemă cognitivă*

The concept of stereotype has come to the attention of several categories of researchers, the generally accepted definition of most being that of "a set of beliefs shared with regard to personal characteristics, personality traits, but also behavior, specific to a group of people" (Bourhis et al., 1997, p. 98).

In other words, stereotypes are preconceived ideas about facts, people, actions, etc., which are not caused by our personal experience regarding them, but are impregnated/imposed in our mind by society (the cliché that the Germans are punctual, the Roma are thieves, the Jews are good merchants and run the world, the lawyers lie, the teachers are serious, etc.) One of the most widespread stereotypes is that of gender. Gender stereotypes define themselves as organized belief systems and consensual opinions about the characteristics of women and men, as well as about the supposed qualities of masculinity and femininity.

Starting from this fundamental idea that language is not only an instrument, but also a warehouse and form of thought, in this material we have proposed to reveal the way in which the problem of gender is reflected in the Romanian mind based on the linguistic material: thus, the experience and knowledge of past generations are accumulated in language and through it are transmitted to the next generations, and a nation not only thinks in a particular language, but thinks through it, submitting all thoughts to a pattern. We set out to analyze the way in which the social (gender) stereotypes are reflected in the popular mind and, respectively, in the facts of language (clichés/linguistic stereotypes) expressions, stable combinations of words, called by the linguist Eugen Coşeriu deeds of "repeated discourse" (proverbs, sayings, phraseological expressions etc.).

Healed by the irrational idealization of the past, devoid of scientific rigor, from whose perspective we would look at the history of civilization, we must admit that, although a pious being, much closer to the sources of the sacred than the man, the woman was viewed in a discriminatory way, being subjected for millennia to violence and humiliation, which would implicitly explain the multitude of wars and even the collapse of civilization. The idea of the inferiority of the woman to the man is deeply imbued in the collective subconscious. Thus, no matter how harsh the statement may seem, philosophers of all times hated the woman: or, Aristotle states that "the silence of the woman is her glory", Plato considers that "the woman is a woman for her lack of qualities", and the man must thank the gods that he is not a woman.

In the Old Testament, in the Roman Code, etc., the woman is a being inferior to the man, and he can abuse her in any way. Since he had a "placid" existence, according to Hegel, the distinction between man and woman is that "between animal and plant". Such opinions no longer arouse perplexity as long as religious writings, such as the Quran, the Bible, the Talmud, etc. contain in abundance defamatory statements referring to the woman. It is enough to remember how the disciples of Christ become outraged when he speaks to the Samaritan woman. So, gender inequality is an idea deeply imbued in the collective subconscious, which has generated a multitude of stereotypes, which have been perpetuated over the centuries. The stereotypes

in question are some "cognitive filters" (Stănculescu, p. 5), which impose a certain way of seeing things.

Of course, the mentalities of traditional societies have evolved, but nevertheless, the view of gender has remained in the everyday collective mind, constituting a resistance to the change of stereotypical constructs. Even today, the traditional images about man and woman are a tribute to stereotyped representations, according to which masculinity is associated with such qualities as competitiveness, aggressiveness, assertiveness, objectivity, rationality (all determined by hormones), and femininity, on the contrary – obedience, sensitivity, passivity, emotiveness, compassion, which is due to oxytocin.

We mention that the relationship between gender and language has always been controversial. A full understanding of gender-building is reflected, in particular, in the understanding of the relationship between language and ethnicity. The sociology of language is related to gender issues. In today's linguistics it has already become common ground that the social role played by language has as a result the creation of a mentality common to all speakers of that language. So, the internal structure is shaped from the sum of peculiarities adopted and transmitted throughout history and from the permanent reinterpretation of the linguistic material within an ethnic pattern. Peoples have a fundamental, essential, archetypal structure of correlation of language with the world, but it is equally obvious that there are nuances specific to each people. Language is the lord of science. It designates "the limit and outline of all human knowledge" (as "We are not the masters of the language, but the language is our master", Eminescu warned us).

The fact that the Romanian society values more the features associated with masculinity, manifesting attitudes strongly flanked by stereotypes and prejudices regarding gender, beliefs related to gender differences, can easily be justified by linguistic stereotypes – expressions belonging to the repeated discourse – the fact that the Romanian thinks stereotypically (including ideas about gender). Beyond the fact that proverbs are universal and are transmitted over the time from one nation to another, however, each people adapts them according to their own customs, therefore, it is often possible to reflect the local, historical and linguistic specificity. Being short phrases/idioms, which express gnomic truths, outside of historical time, paremies represent a code of culture that they reflect. Therefore, the collections of proverbs and sayings are true and authentic anthologies of popular common sense, resulting from the experiences of each people and being representative of the different languages (cf. (Dragoș Vlad Topală)).

The first finding regarding the material under investigation is that, from a competent point of view, the inventory of expressions related to the concept of woman is much more representative than the one regarding the man, and

the terms of reference for the former are neutral or have a negative connotation (girl, woman, old woman, blowjob), and for the latter they are neutral (man or boy). Most of the qualities (traits) revealed in women are related to the depreciative register, the most manifest is the feminine malice and cunning:

Cu o femeie rea să trăiești e mai rău decât toate relele din lume (= Living with a bad woman is worse than all the evils in the world)¹.

Ferește-mă, doamne, de foc, de potop și de femeia rea (= Protect me, Lord, of fire, of flood and of the bad woman).

Mai bine manânci numai pâine cu apă decât să trăiești cu o femeie rea (= Rather than living with a bad woman, you better eat only bread with water).

Cu femeia rea îmbătrânești, cu cea bună întineriești (= Living with a bad woman you get old, with a good one you get younger).

Ce e mai rău decât o femeie? Două (= What's worse than a woman? Two women!).

Femeia a scos pe om din rai (= Man has been brought out of heaven by woman).

Se poate păzi un sac de purici, o turmă de iepuri, dar nu o femeie (= One can guard a bag of fleas, a flock of rabbits, but not a woman).

Femeia și câinele să nu-i crezi (= Do not trust a woman and a dog).

Iușcă de femeie (rar) (= A she-devil (rare)).

De nebun și de muierea rea fiece înțelept fugе (= Every wise man flees away from the fool and the bad woman).

Muierea rea, război la casa ta (= A bad woman is war at your own home).

Nicio muierе fără fiere (= No woman without bile).

Precum la haine molia, așa și la bărbat muierea rea (= As the moth is for the clothes so, is a bad woman for a man).

Muierea multe face și bărbatul vede și tace (= A bad woman does lots of things, while man sees it and keeps silent) etc.

We even emphasize a diabolizing trait of the woman, admitting that it is a possible reminiscence of the medieval era:

Chiar și cea mai bună femeie are o coastă de drac într-însa (= Even the best woman has a devil's rib).

Femeia are nouă suflete, ca pisicile (= A woman has nine souls, like cats).

The series of ratings for women continues with qualities that define or characterize femininity depreciatively:

¹We propose here and below our translation in English of the cited Romanian fixed units.

- laziness:

Femeia care nu vrea să frământa, toată ziua cerne (= *The woman who does not want to knead, sifts all day*) is said of those who waste time; it is also said about the lazy ones, whom the heart does not pull to work.

- anger:

Cu muierea² să umbli ca cu o bubă coaptă, că îndată se sparge (= *With a woman one should deal as with a ripe boil, as it suddenly might break*).

Femeile sunt ca norii: cand se întâlnesc, tunetele nu întârzie (= *Women are like clouds: when they meet, thunder is not late*).

- weakness:

Muierea poale lungi, minte scurtă (= *Woman, long skirt short mind*).

Muierea, minte ușoară (= *light mind*) shows the mind weakness of a woman.

Muierea de la cap răcește (= *A woman starts getting cold from the head*) shows the mind weakness of a woman.

Muierea ca un vas slab, de nimic se necăjește și cu nimic se îmblânzește (= *A woman is like a weak vessel, troubles about nothing and is tamed with nothing*) shows the weak and changeable nature of the woman).

Sfatul muierii muierilor folosește (= *The advice of a woman is useful to a woman*).

- greed:

Muierea pofteste și la urdă de curcă, și la lapte de cuc (= *A woman lusts both at the turkey cheese and the milk of cuckoo*) shows the insatiable nature of women, who covet even things that are not from this world.

Muierea înghite o mare întreagă (= *A woman can swallow a whole sea*) shows the insatiable woman.

Ce se naște în cap de muier, într-înșă neistovit nu pier (= *What is born in the head of a woman does not perish easily*) shows the perseverance with which a woman follows her decisions.

- avidity:

Ochii muierii sunt la pungă (= *a woman eyes are on the purse*) indicates that a woman values the man for the wealth he has.

- inconsistency:

Muierea te iubește/Până ce altul găsește (= *a woman loves you until she finds another one*) or *Inima femeii este ca timpul de primavară* (= *The woman's heart is like spring time*) indicate the changing nature of a woman.

- the trait of being gossipy/of judging:

²The designation *muier*, although neutral at origin cf. lat. *mulier* (female), potentiates the depreciative character.

Unde s-au strâns zece femei, gata și tribunalul (= there where ten women gathered, the court is ready) or *Femeia judecă pe dracu' și-l scoate dator* (= a woman judges a devil and sets him in debt).

- the tendency to be quarrelsome:

Cearța fără femeie nu se poate (= There is no argument without a woman).

- Other features – in the Romanians' view, at a first glance, stereotype about a woman is part of the positive register, however, at a second look it reflects her inferior position as related to man:

- obedience:

Femeia cea mai laudată este cea care nu vorbește nimic (= The most praised woman is the one who speaks nothing).

Femeia care știe să se supună soțului, face să se răsucescă luna pe degetul ei cel mic (= The woman who knows how to obey her husband, makes the moon twist on her little finger).

Femeilor le plac mâncărurile acre și picante și soții autoritari (= Women like sour and spicy dishes and authoritarian husbands).

Femeia care tace, mai deșteaptă-i ca savantul (= The woman who is silent, is smarter than the scholar).

Diligence is the quality that reflects the condition of the woman in the traditional family, since the basic role of the woman was to serve the family, respectively, the man: Cf.:

Femeia îngrijită se cunoaște după hainele bărbatului ei (= The neat woman is known by her man's clothes).

Femeia harnică ține casa cu fusul (= The hardworking woman keeps the house with the spindle).

La omul care este harnic / Întotdeauna este praznic (= The industrious man, always feasts).

Omul harnic, muncitor / De pâine nu duce dor (= The hardworking man, never lacks bread).

Femeia gospodină e coroana casei (= A good housewife is the crown of the house).

La gospodina bună, / Mulți vecini s-adună (= The good housewife gathers many neighbors) refers to the women who "take good care of their home".

O femeie vrednică e coroana casei (bărbatului) (= A worthy woman is the crown of the house (of the man)).

It is worth to mention the fact that a series of stereotypical representations about women are related to the concept of „fata mare” (meaning *virgin girl*), which is a "stone in the house" (Chirița's saying), as it involves the care of the parents for gathering the dowry, the search and the choice of the future son-in-law and the phobia of remaining an unmarried girl: *Fetele mari numai după*

urși nu merg (= *Virgin girls would go for anyone, except for a bear, with the meaning "girls marry not at will, but as the parents want"*). *Cine are fete multe, însoară mulți măgari* (= *Whoever has many girls, will get many donkeys married, in the sense that he gives them to whoever happens, or however stupid*). *Fete multe, sărăcie la casă* (= *Many girls, poverty at home, because they need dowry*). *Cine are fete multe, adună nebunii de pe drumuri* (= *Who has many girls, gathers the fools on the roads, in other words "he gives them to whoever happens, or however stupid"*). *A fi ca fata nemăritată* (= *to be like the unmarried girl*), meaning to be pointless in the world). *Fată mare, minte n-are* (= *Virgin girl, she has no mind*) meaning "the girls have no mind, for whoever can deceive them". *Fată mare, grijă mare* (= *Virgin girl, great worry*), meaning that "they have an easy mind and anyone can deceive them". *Fata mare, ispravă n-are* (= *Virgin girl, no achievement*), meaning good for no business). *A fi fată la cap* (= *virgin at head only*) meaning to "have lost her virginity" a.s.o.

It would be unfair not to mention that there are also Romanian proverbs that highlight the positive features of the woman, such as:

- *beauty*:

La femeia frumoasă e bine să privești, cu cea deșteaptă e bine să întinerești (= *It's good to stare at the beautiful woman, with the smart one it is good to rejuvenate*).

Fără bărbat, e ca fără cap, fără femeie, e ca fără minte (= *Without a man, it's like without head, without a woman, it's like mindlessness*).

Și deșteaptă, și frumoasă și devreme acasă (= *Smart and beautiful, and early at home*).

- *kindness*:

Muierea bună, ca pâinea caldă (= *A good woman is like warm fresh bread*).

- *cleverness*:

Femeia vede chiar și unde bărbatul abia zărește (= *The woman can see even there where the man barely notices*) shows the keenness of the woman's mind. *Femeia care-și cârmuiește bine casa este o aouție de neînlocuit* (= *The woman who steers her house well is an irreplaceable wealth*).

Another stereotypical representation of the woman, which has biblical support, implies the fear of the man: *Femeia trebuie să se teamă de bărbat, că i se suie în cap* (= *A woman must be afraid of the man, otherwise she may start having funny ideas*); *Muierea cât de bună să n-o slăbești din frâu* (= *No matter how good the woman is, do not weaken her from the reins*) etc., which may also involve coercion: or, the corrective „treatment” applied to the woman by the man is perfectly part of the specific Romanian rural mentality: *Femeia nebătată e ca moara neferecată* (= *the woman that is not beaten is like a mill without a locker*), with the version *Femeia nebătată e precum calul neșeslat* (= *The unbeaten woman is like the un-brushed horse*), meaning so as the mill must be protected to take

out the good cornmeal, so the woman must be beaten in order to be able to work with her" (Zanne, II, 1895, p. 278).

Noteworthy is also the term "old woman", which appears in a series of expressions: *taie-babă* (= *fighting an old lady*) it is said against boastful people; to be like a *Turkish old woman* is said about the hairless man and with wrinkles on his cheek; to give the old woman's brook signifies "to mess up things willingly or unwillingly"; to toil in... like old women in puppies and tomcats means "to love something at once and beyond measure" etc.

It is worth to mention, also, the fact that there are also units of repeated discourse that express personality traits:

Cât e baba de bătrână/Tot dorește ziua (voia) bună (= *As old as the old lady is/ She still wants the good day (will)*)! meaning that "a human, however old might be, still does not want to die".

Baba bătrână nu se sperie de drugă (druga) groasă (= *The old lady is not scared of thick log (beam)*), which means "the old man, being more tried in need, is not scared of anything (it is said about the one who has happened and knows a lot)".

A cășunat ca baba (mătușa) la mormânt (= *He fell like an old lady (aunt) at the tomb*) is said to the man who, being called somewhere, does not want to leave, as well as to the one who does not finish a thing quickly).

Baba e talpa iadului (= *Baba is the sole of hell*) meaning that "an old lady is a masterful of evil.

Știe cât baba mea (= *She knows as much as my old granny*), meaning little to nothing, when drawing attention to the identification of a notion with a value, in this case derisory or sanctioned by contempt (Zanne, II, 1895, p. 5).

A fi o babă (= *being an old lady*) they say, in mockery, to people devoid of personality).

The most widespread stereotype is related to the inferiority of the woman to the man, which is found in the following proverbs:

Muirea cât de puternică, bărbat pe jumătate (= *as strong as a woman might be, she is half of a man*) shows how much stronger a man is in many aspects compared to a woman.

Muirea e jumătate cruce, românul e cruce întreagă, cruce de voinic (= *A woman is half a cross, while the Romanian is a whole cross*) shows how much stronger a man is in many aspects compared to a woman.

In opposition to a woman, man in the collective mind is not endowed with complex meanings, except for a few indications of gender recognition:

Bărbatul după vână și femeia după dinți (= *The man by his arm and the woman by her teeth*) shows the gifts that are required of a man and a woman" (Zanne, II, 1895, p. 14).

Bărbatul să fie puțințel mai frumos decât Dracul (= *Man needs to be just a little more handsome than the devil*), which denotes the fact that the man is asked for more other talents than beauty, being allowed to be uglier, while the woman must be, first of all, beautiful.

A fi bărbat "un om cu vlagă" (= *To be a man "a human with strength"*) means to be a reliable man).

Bărbatul este cheia (stâlpul) casei (= *The man is the key (pillar) of the house*); the proverb emphasizes the meaning of the man).

Unde bărbatul lipsește, ca gândul când lipsește, pază nu se găsește (= *Where the man is missing, it's like the thought that is missing, the guard is not found/ the house is unguarded*) reveals the role of the man in the family).

In order to put ourselves in line with the mutations of the extra-linguistic context on which it is projected, in our research we have resorted to the correlation of the cognitive and cultural dimensions, in order to highlight the peculiarities of linguistic coding of the concepts related to gender, which provides access to structures and cognitive schemes involved in the conceptualization of the woman. For this purpose, we have resorted to DALR³ data, gathered through the method of associative⁴ experiment, elaborated in psycholinguistics, which ensures the conceptual-historical reflection of a certain cognitive model specific to a culture.

The analysis of the results of the psycholinguistic experiment, incorporated in the DALR, only confirms the findings made after the analysis of the expressions related to the repeated speech. Thus, for the word-stimulus BĂRBAT (= *man*), the following words-reactions were obtained: *femeie* (=

³Popa Gh., Sainenco A., Prițcan V., Trinca L. et al. (2016). *Dicționarul asociativ al limbii române* (vol. I "De la stimul la reacție"). Editura Junimea.

⁴EA free was performed with young people aged between 18-25 years, whose mother tongue is Romanian. The respondents were asked to answer instantly with the first word that came to their mind when they heard the word-stimulus MAN/WOMAN (each proposed investigation contained 100 stimulus -words, selected and computer-generated from about 500 stimuli, which are part of the core and mass of the basic vocabulary of the Romanian language: the stimulus MAN/WOMAN appears, on average, in one of 5 surveys). However, compliance with this condition during the investigation allows to reduce to a minimum the time interval between stimulus and reaction: the respondent should not meditate on the reaction, as the concept of association excludes the idea of "reflection" on the answer (cf. Фрумкина/Frumkina). As respondents there were about 1000 students from several universities in the Republic of Moldova and Romania. It should be noted that the decisive actor for choosing students as respondents within EA is the fact that at the age of 17-25 years the formation of lingual identity is already taking place, and the associations, identified within EA, reflect the linguistic competence and are relevant for the Romanian mentality (Караулов/Karaulov, 2011, p. 192).

woman) (134)⁵; *ființă umană* (= human being) (79); *putere* (= power) (75); *puternic* (= powerful) (44); *soț* (= husband) (30); *tata* (= father) (22); *fiu* (= son) (19); *înalt* (= tall) (19); *barbă* (= beard) (14); *mascul* (= male) (14); *băiat* (= boy) (13); *iubit* (= lover) (11); *masculin* (= masculine) (10), *masculinitate* (= masculinity) (8); *forță* (= potency) (7); *adevărat* (= true) (6); *sprijin* (= support) (6); *curajos* (= brave) (5); *prieten* (= friend) (5); *autoritate* (= authority) (4); *capul familiei* (= family head) (4); *iubire* (= love) (4); *mare* (= big) (4); *siguranță* (= security) (4); *tânăr* (= young) (4); *voinic* (= strong) (4); *inteligent* (= intelligent) (3); *protecție* (= protection) (3); *rău* (= mean) (3); *respect* (= respect) (3); *sex* (= sex) (3); *Adam* (= Adam) (2); *ajutor* (= help) (2); *bun* (= good) (2); *cap* (= head) (2); *domn* (= gentleman) (2); *dur* (= tough) (2); *duritate* (= hard) (2); *erou* (= hero) (2) etc. 790/201/72/129/1⁶ (DALR, 2016, pp. 44-45).

For the word-stimulus FATĂ (= girl), the following reactions have been recorded: *frumoasă* (= beautiful) (101), *băiat* (= boy) (88), *frumusețe* (= beauty) (40), *domnișoară* (= Miss) (28), *femeie* (= woman) (24), *bună* (= good) (14), *gingășie* (= sensitive) (14), *om* (= human) (14), *prietenă* (= friend) (14), *femininitate* (= femininity) (10), *feminin* (= female) (10), *chip* (= face) (8), *cuminte* (= being good) (8), *gingașa* (= delicate) (8), *ea* (= she) (8), *inocență* (= innocence) (8), *păr* (= hair) (8), *deșteaptă* (= smart) (7), *drăguță* (= pretty) (7), *păr lung* (= long hair) (7), *persoană* (= person) (7), *sensibilitate* (= sensibility) (7), *iubire* (= love) (6), *rochie* (= dress) (6), *veselă* (= happy) (6), *delicatețe* (= delicacy) (5), *codițe* (= hair) (4), *dragoste* (= love) (4), *finețe* (= fine) (4), *haine* (= clothes) (4), *tinerețe* (= youth) (4), *blondă* (= blonde) (3) *curată* (= clean) (3), *dragă* (= dear) (3), *dulce* (= sweet) (3), *elegantă* (= elegant) (3), *floare* (= flower) (3), *inteligentă* (= intelligent) (3), *mamă* (= mother) (3), *mic* (= small) (3), *ochi* (= eyes) (3), *roz* (= pink) (3), *sexy* (= sexy) (3), *slabă* (= skinny) (3), *soră* (= sister) (3), *spate* (= back) (3), *urâtă* (= ugly) (3), *atracție* (= attraction) (2), *bărbat* (= man) (2), *blândețe* (= kind) (2), *cochetă* (= good looking) (2), *coșuri* (= pimps) (2), *elegantă* (= elegant) (2), *fetiță* (= little girl) (2), *firavă* (= weak) (2), *fustă* (= skirt) (2), *gagică* (= lover) (2), *gingașă* (= kind) (2), *iubită* (= loved) (2), *înaltă* (= tall) (2), *machieaj* (= make up) (2), *mireasă* (= bride) (2), *modestă* (= modest) (2), *papuşă* (= doll) (2), *sex* (= sex) (2), *sex feminin* (= female) (2), *simpatică* (= attractive) (2), *adolescentă* (= teenager), *plăcere* (= pleasure), *plăpând* (= weak), *plete* (= long hair), *plimbă* (= walking), *prieten* (= friend), *probleme* (= problems), *prunc* (= infant), *pur* (=

⁵You see here the number of reactions to the word-stimulus *bărbat* as a *femeie* (= woman).

⁶Here and below the first number (for example 790) indicates all the reactions to the word-stimulus. The second number (for example 201) indicates the different reactions. The third number (for example 72) indicates the reactions which have a frequency more than 1. The fourth number (for example 129) indicates the reactions which have the frequency 1. The fifth number (for example 1) indicates the absence of any reaction.

pure), *puritate* (= purity), *rafinament* (= refinement), *Raluca* (= Raluca), *răutate* (= malice), *rea* (= bad), *regină* (= queen), *relație* (= relation), *responsabilitate* (= responsibility), *ruj* (= lipstick), *saturație* (= saturation), *scumpă* (= expensive), *secret* (= secret), *sens* (= sense), *sensibilă* (= sensible), *sexul frumos* (= beautiful gender), *soție* (= wife), *sprințară* (= lively), *suferință* (= suffering), *suflet* (= soul), *șatenă* (= brown hair), *școală* (= school), *șmecheră* (= Tricky), *Tamara* (= Tamara), *tatei* (= father's), *tânăr* (= young), *tot* (= all), *trăsături* (= features), *tristă* (= sad), *vagin* (= vagina), *verde* (= green), *viață* (= life), *cu viață* (= alive), *viitoarea mamă* (= future mother), *viitor* (= future), *vio Viorela* (= vio Viorela), *wow* (= wow), *zâmbet* (= smile) (1) etc. 826/232/76/156/0 (DALR, 2016, pp. 107-108).

Upon a comparative analysis, we can easily see that associations are tributaries to stereotyped representations, thus, the MAN associating himself with strength, power, masculinity, authority, and the WOMAN with beauty, tenderness, femininity, sensitivity, her physical appearance having an important role (long hair, dress, skirt, skinny etc.). Of course, the female movement and the aspirations to acquire rights and freedoms that have been denied to them for centuries could not fail to influence the less discriminatory way of thinking of the Romanians today. However, contrasting-pattern ideas do not imply the relativization of prejudices that hover over gender relations, on the contrary, they have produced unfavorable attitudes towards emancipated women. Moreover, the courage of defying the rules of traditional behavior was harshly sanctioned by the common mind, by labeling it with depreciative features, such as: masculinized woman, coldness, work/career dependence at the expense of the role of mother.

In conclusion, it is worth to be mentioned that the study of linguistic stereotypes regarding gender denotes a stereotypical mentality of the Romanian regarding the issue of gender. However, each language constitutes a certain model of everything that exists by interpreting the world according to its own semiotic system that is affected by the individuality of each cultural code, and linguistic stereotypes are only a reflection of stereotypes in the collective mentality.

References

Stereotipuri, discriminare și relații intergrupuri (1997). Bourhis, R.-Y, Leyens, J.-Ph., Tonner, D. (coord.). Editura Polirom.

Stănculescu, E. *Stereotipurile de gen din perspectiva cognitiei sociale*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309489657_STEREOTIPURILE_DE_GEN_DIN_PERSPECTIVA_COGNITIEI_SOCIALE.

Фрумкина, Р. М. *Психолингвистика: что мы делаем, когда говорим и думаем*. https://www.google.ru/?gws_rd=ssl#newwindow=1&q=%D1%84%D1%80%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0% / Frumkina, R.M. *Psiholingvistika: što*

my delaem, kogda govorim i думаem. https://www.google.ru/?gws_rd=ssl#newwindow=1&q=%D1%84%D1%80%D1%83%D0%BC%D0%BA%D0%B8%D0%BD%D0%

Topală, Dr. VI. *Din universul proverbelor românești: elemente de analiză etnolingvistică*. <http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/V386/pdf>.

Dictionaries

Popa, Gh., Sainenco, A., Pritcan, V., Popa, V., Lacusta, E., Trinca, L. (2016). *Diționarul asociativ al limbii române*. Editura Junimea (=DALR).

Zanne, Iu. (1895). *Proverbele românilor* (vol. I, II). Editura Librăriei Socec.

Diționar de proverbe și zicători românești (2001). Gr. Botezatu, A. Hâncu (alc.); col. iniț. și coord. de Anatol și Dan Vidrașcu. Editura Litera.

Караулов, Ю. Н., Ю. А. Сорокин, Е. Ф., Тарасов, Н. В., Уфимцева, Г. А., Черкасова (2011). Русский ассоциативный словарь как новый лингвистический источник и инструмент анализа языковой способности. В: *Русский ассоциативный словарь*. Книга 1. Прямой словарь: от стимула к реакции. Ассоциативный тезаурус современного русского языка. Часть I. Изд-во «Помовский и партнеры» / Karaulov, Ju. N., Ju. A. Sorokin, E. F., Tarasov, N. V., Ufimceva, G. A., Čerkasova (2011). Russkij asociativnyj slovar' kak novyj lingvističeskij istočnik i instrument analiza jazykovej sposobnosti. In *Russkij asociativnyj slovar'*. Kniga 1. Prjamoj slovar': ot stimula k reakcii. Asociativnyj tezaurus sovremenogo russkogo jazyka. Čast' I. Izd-vo «Pomovskij i partnery».

THE CONCEPT OF FEAR vs. THE CULTURAL PROFILE OF THE AFFECTIVE COGNITIVE MODEL (BASED ON UNITS OF REPEATED SPEECH)

Lilia TRINCA

Associate Professor, Ph. D.

(Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

lilia_trinca@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6472-6682>

Abstract

In modern linguistics, it has already become axiomatic that each natural language reflects a certain way of perception/conceptualization and creates its own "image" of the world. We believe that, in modern conditions of globalization and computerization, the study of the linguistic images of the world is extremely valuable and can gain relevance within the context of the dialogue between cultures. The manner emotions find their linguistic representation mirrors a model/grid for conceptualizing the affective experience specific to a culture. Still, the same emotion can be experienced differently in two different cultures or within the same culture and can therefore be the object of intercultural and intra-cultural, diachronic and diatopic variations. As a research methodology, in order to reveal the Romanian specificity of the forms of linguistic manifestation of the affections, in this case FEAR, we resorted to data obtained from the analysis of the units of the repeated discourse – proverbs and sayings, idioms, Romanian fixed expressions – which represent a code of the Romanian culture, based on their updating in a representative corpus, which includes approximately 180 units, a set of "credible", relevant and representative sources, reflecting the emotions and ways of affective expression specific to the Romanian cultural area.

Keywords: repeated discourse, linguistic universals, cognitive scheme, linguistic image of the world, cognitive-affective model

Rezumat

În lingvistica modernă, a devenit deja axiomatic faptul că fiecare limbă naturală reflectă un anumit mod de percepție/conceptualizare și creează propria „imagine” a lumii. Considerăm că, în condițiile moderne de globalizare și informatizare, studiul imaginilor lingvistice ale lumii este extrem de valoros și poate căpăta relevanță în contextul dialogului culturilor. Modul în care emoțiile își găsesc reprezentarea lingvistică oglindește un model/grilă de conceptualizare a experienței afective specifice unei culturi. Or, aceeași emoție poate fi experimentată diferit în două culturi diferite sau în cadrul aceleiași culturi, putând fi, deci, obiectul unor variații interculturale și intra-culturale, diacronice și diatopice. Ca metodologie de cercetare, pentru relevarea specificului românesc al formelor de manifestare lingvistică a afectelor, în cazul de față FRICA, am apelat la date obținute din analiza unităților discursului repetat - proverbe și zicători, frazeologisme, expresii românești – care reprezintă un cod al culturii române, pe baza actualizării lor într-un corpus reprezentativ, care include circa 180 de unități, un set de surse „credibile”, relevante și reprezentative, care să reflecte emoțiile și modalitățile de expresie afectivă, specifice spațiului cultural român.

Cuvinte-cheie: discurs repetat, universalii lingvistice, schemă cognitivă, imagine lingvistică a lumii, model cognitiv-afectiv

In modern linguistics it has already become axiomatic that each natural language reflects a certain way of perception/conceptualization and creates its own "image" of the world. We believe that, in modern conditions of globalization and information technology, the study of the linguistic images of the world is extremely valuable and can gain relevance within the context of the inter-cultural dialogue. This was the mover that determined us to propose as an object of research the affective cognitive model specific to the Romanian cultural space. Emotions, as the researcher E. Illouz states, constitute individual, subjective experiences, but reported (and updated) to a broader (Illouz et al., 2014, pp. 221-244) social and cultural context. Emotions are placed at the interface of individual experience, collective meanings and social constraints (*ibid.*). However, affectivity is a reality that is placed at the interface between language/language system and culture. The way in which emotions find their linguistic representation mirrors a model/grid of conceptualization of the affective experience specific to a culture, from a two-way perspective:

- 1) language can determine or guide affective conceptualization;
- 2) the cultural configuration of a community (at a certain time and in a certain cultural space) through values, norms of conduct, relevant concepts, etc. implies a certain categorization of the affective life forms in the glottic sphere (through the segmentation of the surrounding world realities, specific lexicalization, a certain semantics of the affective terms, etc.)⁷.

From the very start, we need to make two clarifications. The huge bibliography that has as its object of investigation the affectivity (*the affections/emotions/feelings*, etc.) configures a kaleidoscopic reality, which can be circumscribed to various fields: sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology, linguistics, history of mentalities, etc. and implicitly generates multiple divergences of opinion, gravitating mainly around a few pertinent and defining features of the affections, namely: the biological, social, linguistic, linguistic dimension, anthropological, cognitive, etc.

In the scientific world, the idea that emotions constitute a universal language is circulated and, yet the hypothesis of linguistic relativity – according to which the systems of concepts existing in a person's mind and, therefore, the essential features of his thinking are determined by the specific

⁷In the anthropology studies have been revealed some dimensions of intercultural variation, in relation to which we also distinguish the variations of the affective experiences (it is about, for example, the value parameters *individualism-collectivism*, *distance from power*, *masculinity/femininity*, *avoidance of uncertainty*, *temporal orientation* of the model proposed by Hofstede in 1984). A classical dichotomy is that between cultures *individualistic* (defined by a structure socio-cultural independence, *a cultural framework of independence*) and cultures *collectivist* (defined by a socio-cultural pattern of interdependence, *a cultural framework of interdependence*) (see Hofstede).

language of which he/she is a person – accredits us the idea that emotions are built by socio-cultural parameters.

The second specification regards the main controversy related to the *universal* vs. the *culturally specific* character of affectivity. Although apparently dichotomous, these two dimensions are not mutually exclusive: the existence of some primary emotions *of the affective universals*, recognizable transculturally, which constitute a cognitive-affective nucleus, impregnated in the universal genetic code of people, finding linguistic expression (lexicalization) in all the languages of the world does not cancel the idea of their dependence and modeling on the socio-cultural framework in which they are updated (see Wierzbicka). Thus, as the researcher Gabriela Stoica states, the same emotion can be experienced differently in two different cultures or within the same culture, and can therefore be the object of inter-cultural and intra-cultural, diachronic and diatopic variations (Stoica, 1780-1840, p. 13).

By extrapolation, we emphasize that the affective language, so the linguistic expression of the affections has an implicit semiotic function, being culturally dependent. In this respect, it follows that both the affective concepts and their linguistic expression know a great transcultural and linguistic variety.

The objective of the research was to capture the way of conceptualization and lexicalization of emotions and the revealing of the affective cognitive model specific to the Romanian cultural space. We intend to highlight the cultural profile of the affective cognitive model related to several concepts, such as *fear, longing, happiness, bitterness, etc.*, because we consider them circumscribed to the Romanian cultural space, having a landmark value in the Romanian language.

As a research methodology, in order to reveal the Romanian specificity of the forms of linguistic manifestation of the affections – in this case *FEAR* – we resorted to data obtained from the analysis of the units of the repeated discourse – proverbs and sayings, idioms, Romanian expressions – which represent a code of the Romanian culture (cf. Noica, Blaga, Stoica etc.), based on their updating in a representative corpus, which includes about 180 units of repeated discourse, a set of "credible", relevant and representative sources, reflecting the emotions and ways of affective expression specific to the Romanian cultural space.

In the alternative, I mention that, beyond the fact that proverbs/sayings, set phrases are universal and are transmitted over time from one nation to another, however, each people adapting them according to their own customs, therefore, they reflect the local, historical, and linguistic specificity. Short phrases/syntagms, which express gnomic truths, outside the historical time, paresthesias represent a code of culture, so they constitute true and authentic anthologies of common sense popular, resulting from the experiences of each people, being representative of the different languages.

Fear is an affect that has tangencies with the cultural dimension the distance of *power* (from Hofstede's model), which can involve variations of the forms of manifestation of affectivity. Cultures with a great power distance favor values such as conformity, obedience, hierarchical authority, which implies a specific update of fear. In such cultures, an emotional censorship is more strongly suppressed, in order to maintain the harmony of the social or institutional hierarchy (for example, the overt expression of disagreement with the interlocutor having a superior state is avoided)⁸.

Fear is a kind of essential matter, which is related to human existence. Very eloquently, Heidegger described the fact that *fearing* is a basal form of existence in the world (according to Rotilă, p. 46). In mythology, fear was considered a more powerful force than men, which could be tamed with sacrifices and offerings so that its action, which sows horror, would turn to the enemy. The cultivation of fear in temples and churches with scenes of martyrdom and with paintings about the last judgment managed to frighten people, who were taught that fear is ubiquitous: on land, on water, in fire, and in the cold. This culture was maintained by the escathological biblical legends of the end of the world and revelation. Authors such as Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky, Freud, Kafka, Agatha Christie, Virginia Woolf, and many others have wielded anxiety from study and description to literary paroxysms, helping to decrypt and decipher human anxiety.

Fear is undoubtedly a general-human emotion. However, it is considered that each people interprets fear in a particular way: as such, "each people has, left by God, their own face, an image of themselves to see the world and to have it reflected for others" (Vulcănescu, 1996, p. 165).

Thus, it is believed that the Thracians, Dacians, Asian peoples and Vikings would not have had the cult of states of fear, and these states were attributed especially to women and children, to whom the idea that they must die at any time without fear was inoculated. The Geto-Dacians, according to the ancient chronicles, were not afraid of death, and even believed themselves immortal and went to meet their enemy with their bare chests, because they believed in eternal life. In his study titled *The Romanian Dimension of Existence*, the philosopher Mircea Vulcănescu says that the fear of death is not suitable for the Romanian mentality, and this distinguishes the Romanian people from all western peoples. This demeanor is anchored in eternity, and

⁸In the Romanian language, there have been many terms for *fear*, and the specific terminology - *anguish* and *anxiety* - has been taken in at the beginning of 20th Century (Ancient Greek and Roman cultures honored Fear, calling it *Anguish* or *anxiety*, which etymology has Sanskrit roots: "amhas" in other words *strait, narrowing*). Latins used *angusta*, term taken in French and German like *angoisse* and *angst*. Verb *anxiare* (*a difficult breathing, to suffocate*) and adjective with sense *medical anxious* is used in documents from 16th century).

the fear of death is a method coming from the west (...). And this lack of fear in front of death is very well staged in the Romanian folk ballads, with all their symbolism, and⁹ *Miorita* is the most eloquent in this respect: the only thing that preoccupies the hero when he finds out that he was put in a bad mind is not the fear of death, otherwise he would have taken the elementary precautionary measures, it's the fulfillment of the ritual.

We mention, in this respect, also the fairy tales of immortality among the Romanians, as a good "youth without old age and life without death" by P. Ispirescu, who, in the vision of the Romanian philosopher C. Noica, most appropriately expresses the being as an archetype in the Romanian version and, at the same time, the contrast between blind becoming – becoming for the sake of becoming – and meaningful becoming, becoming into being (see Mamulea, 2015, p. 157).

The idea is found crystallized in several Romanian proverbs, formulas of thought, which can lead to the reconstitution of popular philosophy and ethnosophy: *Of death do not be afraid and of life do not be careful; the one who fears death, runs after it.*

Undoubtedly, globalization and Westernization contributed to the desacralization and breaking of traditions, which changed the appearance and character of the Romanian. He has become as fearful today as a Westerner, an aspect recorded in phrases such as: *There is no cure for fear; It has nothing to do with fear; You're afraid with me, as I've got my gall broken with you; To be afraid of one's own shadow; When the serpent bites you, you are also afraid of earthworm; The bunny is not fearful, only that it kind of hides down; Of holy, may you be holy, but you still be aware of fear; Because of fear he cannot see the world; Fear is greater than being afraid; Fear always brings distress; Fearful' fears his shadow; The fearful one frightens others; Sturdy, but a little fearful; Are you afraid of me? Because I'm really scared of you; The fearful man always walks with the ice in his bosom, and so on.*

Often fear forces the Romanian to be honest, to respect the norm/laws: *Fear guards the melon fields; The clear sky of lightning is not afraid.*

Romanians see courage as an outcome consequence of fear: *Courage is the ability to behave the right way even when you are half dead from fear.*

⁹After M. Vulcănescu, Romanian soul is constituted from two antagonistic elements: the highlanders, i.e. the man living in the mountainous Romania and the people living on the huge plains of Romania. Moreover, the fight between Thracian shepherding ethos and the Slavic-Roman plowshare ethos went on for centuries, from 8th to 19th century, with variable outcomes. With the deforestation and transformation of Romania from a country of shepherds and cattle breeders, and from a country of soldiers, the shepherding ethos appears to give way to the plowshare ethos. The peoples' spirit of adventure, the spirit of peaks, the spirit of faraway horizons and bitter depths are slowly removed in favor of small horizons people of small villages in the plains, settled down and fearful (Vulcănescu, 1996, p. 193).

With the *institutionalized* emergence of religion, the fear generated by death, the implacable passage of time, as well as fatality often becomes a reason for ritual, which starts from a complex of inferiority of the collective mind in front of an incomprehensible nature. This implies the population of the collective Romanian imaginary with strong representations of divinity "along with the cycles of time lived subjectively by the individual – unstable, changeable, leading inexorably to old age and death, time lived with its sudden upheavals, with its unpredictable whims, with its anguishing irreversibility" (Ivancu, 2013, p. 87): Cf. *Why you're not going to get rid of what you're afraid of! Whoever sees that the neighbor's house is burning, must be afraid of his own; There is no magic cure for fear. Some die rather of fear than from illness, etc.*

However, the Romanian interprets fear as a vilifying emotion, its appearance being justified, as it is specific to the guilty one in the background: *The man of guilt is also afraid of his own shadow; He who is still afraid, does nothing; Sheep's courage: always nose-down; You had better not go to the forest if you are afraid of leaves; The fearful is half defeated; The thief of thieves is afraid; Hatred and fear beget cunning; The unjust man fears everything and everyone.*

Often the Romanian ironizes at the expense of the emotion of fear: *the fearful is also afraid of all the weeds; He's afraid of his nest getting cold; He who fears more, he forgets the open door; Before the battle he opens his mouth and then fears the bite; Even a saint has a sense of fear; He is not taking a sun bath fearing his nose might melt; The horse is afraid of the whip, the man of the word, and the stubborn – neither of one nor of the other; The forest is not afraid of an axe without a tail; If you save money all your life for fear of poverty, you have already become her slave; there is nothing one could tie fear of.*

Fear makes the sinner more cautious. According to O. Ivancu, "Individually, the Romanian is always hesitant when it comes to important, significant actions. He thus becomes vulnerable because "the indecisive person lives permanently in the horizon of regret, of double regret. On the one hand, he anticipates the regret he would eventually know by acting and which, in fact, makes him not act" (Ivancu, 2013, p. 142). Here are some proverbs that come to confirm these findings: *He who got burned with porridge, he will blow even in the cold water; He who has got burned with soup he would blow even in yogurt.*

Fear is associated by Romanians with animals / insects, namely: *No fear of the ant, of the mosquito – no idea; Out of fear he takes his hat for a cat. He's afraid like a gypsy of a bee; He would go into the woods, but he fears the serpent; The coward is afraid even of an ant; If the world feared sparrows, it would not sow cornmeal; The craftsman spoils and drains of fear; He who's got bitten by the snake is afraid of the lizard too; Fear causes the rabbit to fall; Scalded cat is afraid of the cold; The sheep keep their heads down for fear of being seen by the wolf; If you're afraid of the wolf, don't go into the woods; If the wolf were afraid of rain, he would wear the mantle; The fox is not afraid of the hunter who boasts in the evening, etc.*

I've also noticed a few proverbs that record why there is no need to be afraid: *The voracious sharpener is not afraid of the scythe; Old lady is not afraid of soft bread; The poor man is not afraid of robbers; One only knows the fear of illness*, etc.

We also record some somatic phraseological expressions that refer to the concept of *fear*: *To have (to be with) the heart close to the mouth; To get fear into the bones; To wear the fear on shoulders (or in the chest)*.

Thus, *fear* is associated with a low temperature: *to get your blood frozen in your own veins; to get your liver frozen of fear*, an image that we also find in Russian and in French, which indicates the universality of the conceptualization of fear: Cf. *rus. Кровь стынет в жилах; Кровь леденеет (холодеет) в жилах, fr. être glacé de peur / d'effroi etc.*

And even *the voice*, within the somatic phraseological expressions, illustrates the emotive concept of *fear* in Romanian, as well as in Russian: *he lost his voice of fear vs. язык отнялся* (see Lifari).

Moreover, fear also has color in Romanian – yellow: *To turn yellow with fear*.

Of course, the study of the units belonging to the repeated discourse places the analysis of the Romanian cognitive-affective models on a cultural background specific to an older historical period (most of the Repeated Discourse (RD) units having centuries old age). The cultural dimensions revealed in the model proposed by Hofstede, such as *individualism/collectivism, independent self/interdependent self*, etc. are diachronic variables, also determining changes in the conceptual and linguistic representation of the affective life. Thus, essential mutations regarding the way of setting up the self, produced as a result of the larger socio-cultural changes, will immediately reconfigure the way of affective conceptualization. Therefore, the modernization of the society (involving a process of individualization, gradual emancipation of the individual) implies a redefinition of the affective experiences.

As it is known, the fundamental feature of the Romanian culture is the interference, the organic fusion between the traditional, Oriental-Balkan cultural model and the new, modern-western one; This overlapping of two apparently dichotomous mental patterns has *generated* a harmonious interpenetration, when certain aspects of Western culture graft on a local cultural matrix of classical and folk-traditional type, engaging/generating a *sui generis* cultural configuration, where the old and the new, the East and the West, the traditional and the modern coexist.

Therefore, to synchronize with the mutations of the extralinguistic context on which it is projected, justifying the diachronic variations of linguistic coding of the affective concepts, we resorted in the research to the correlation of the cognitive and cultural dimensions, in order to highlight the peculiarities of linguistic coding of the affective concepts. The broader

theoretical paradigm in which the research is located is generally that of cognitivism, which provides access to cognitive structures and schemes involved in the conceptualization of emotions.

For this purpose, we resorted to the data of the *Associative Dictionary of the Romanian Language*, gathered through the method of the associative experiment (elaborated in psycholinguistics). Thus, the pragmatic and associative meanings in which each word that designates an emotion is trained are particularly rich. The complex meaning of each word of this kind is the result of the important role these words play in articulating a whole range of cultural values, social relations.

The premise from which we started is that such a study can reflect the conceptual-historical dynamics of a certain *affective cognitive model* specific to a culture.

In order to reveal the Romanian specificity of the concept of *fear*, we also resorted to the data stored in the *Associative Dictionary of the Romanian Language*¹⁰, gathered through the method of the associative experiment (hereinafter AE) elaborated in psycholinguistics – a frontier discipline, which tries to substantiate the connection between neuropsychic processes, the world of thought and their verbal expression, between the conscious and the unconscious, in order to capture the mechanisms of representation through identifying the processes through which knowledge takes place. Studies in the field of psycholinguistics reveal linguistic and cultural relativity: thus, from a phenomenological perspective, the language and logic expressed through it represent an extremely important factor for the understanding and representation of the surrounding world. It is, in a way, an evolution of the "Sapir-Worf hypothesis", according to which different types of mentalities lead to various modeling of language. In this way, AE tries to establish the way of organizing information from a cognitive perspective, which allows us to capture the way in which various cultural forms are born. This is conditioned by the close interaction between the mental information processing system and the mental and cultural representations themselves. That is why EA's results prove, once again, that "Any culture can be characterized by a specific set of "cognitive maps", which define the experience and serve to guide the behavior of the members of the respective culture" (Terzea-Ofrim, p. 24)¹¹.

¹⁰Popa, Gh., Sainenco, A., Prițcan, V., Trinca, L. et al. (2016). *Dicționarul asociativ al limbii române*. Vol. I: De la stimul la reacție. Junimea Publishing House.

¹¹We have done a free AE with young people aged between 18-25 years, whose mother tongue is Romanian. The respondents were asked to answer instantly with the first word that came to their mind when they heard the stimulus word FEAR

Based on the achieved AE, we have identified two basic types of associations for the word-stimulus *fear* - syntagmatic associations and paradigmatic associations¹²:

Paradigmatic associations:

Synonyms: *frică* (= fear) (468), *spaimă* (= fright) (25), *groază* (= horror) (4), *anxietate* (= anxiety) (3), *fobie* (= phobia) (3), *emoție* (= motion) (2), *teroare*, *claustrofobie* (= terror, claustrophobia).

Associates: *durere* (= pain) (7), *nesiguranță* (= insecurity) (5), *singurătate* (= loneliness) (5), *examen* (= exam) (4), *slăbiciune* (= weakness) (4), *neîncredere* (= distrust) (4), *tremur* (= tremor) (3), *pericol* (= danger) (3), *tristețe* (= sadness) (3), *necaz* (= trouble) (2), *necunoscut* (= unknown) (2), *noapte* (= night) (2), *nou* (= new) (2), *pedeapsă* (= punishment) (2), *plăcere* (= pleasure) (2), *plâns* (= crying) (2), *sentiment* (= feeling) (2), *stress* (= stress) (2), *supărare* (= anger) (2), *ură* (= hatred) (2), *moarte* (= death), *boală* (= illness), *gol în stomac* (= emptiness in the stomach).

Animals or insects/creatures: *șarpe* (= snake) (5), *șerpi* (= snakes) (3), *câine* (= dog) (4), *câini* (= dogs) (4), *insecte* (= insects) (2), *emoție* (= excitement) (2), *animal* (= animal), *arici* (= hedgehog), *căprioară* (= deer),

(each proposed survey contained 100 stimulus-words, selected and generated by computer from about 500 stimuli, which are part of the core and mass of the basic vocabulary of the Romanian language: the stimulus word FEAR occurs, on average, in one of 5 surveys). So, the observance of this condition during the investigation allows to reduce to a minimum the time interval between the stimulus and the reaction: the respondent should not meditate on the reaction, as the concept of association excludes the idea of "thinking" over the answer. As respondents there were about 1000 students from several universities in the Republic of Moldova and Romania. It should be noted that the decisive factor for the choice of students as respondents within EA belongs to the fact that at the age of 17-25 years the formation of the lingual identity is already taking place, and the associations, identified within AE, reflect the linguistic competence and are relevant for the Romanian mentality (Караулов/Karaulov, 2011, p. 192). According to Karaulov's opinion, the relative stability of the linguistic capacity of native speakers (e.g., vocabulary, hierarchy of values, lexical valences) can serve straight basis for the description of mass consciousness in the Romanian society in the next 20-30 years, that is, for the period when today's respondents will constitute the active core of Society (ibidem).

¹²Respecting the tradition of modeling the associative field, at the beginning, the reaction-words that appear more often are presented (the number of reactions is indicated in parentheses), constituting the core of the associative field, after which the words that appeared less often as reactions to the respective stimulus - the periphery of the associative field - are indicated.

lupi (= wolves), *furnică* (= ant), *tigru* (= tiger), *șoareci* (= mice), *păianjen* (= spider)¹³.

Objects that cause the appearance of fear: *întuneric* (= darkness) (23), *fantome* (= ghosts) (3), *moarte* (= death) (2), *tunet* (= thunder), *impozit* (= tax), *școală* (= school), *examen* (= exam), *boală* (= illness), *monștri* (= monsters), *primejdie* (= distress), *necunoaștere* (= ignorance), *umbră* (= shadow), *țipăt* (= screaming), *violență* (= violence), *bătrânețe* (= old age).

Syntagmatic associations:

mare (= large) (9), *greă* (= heavy) (4), *negru* (= black) (3).

Causes that generate *fear of darkness* (= *frica de întuneric*) (4), *of death* (= *de moarte*) (2), *of dog* (= *de câine*), *of God* (= *de Dumnezeu*), *of wolves* (= *de lupi*), *of loneliness* (= *de singurătate*), *of water* (= *de apă*), *of evil* (= *de rău*).

A very relevant reaction for the Romanian spirit is *It does not exist*, as it comes in perfect consonance with the idea of the Romanian philosopher Mircea Vulcănescu, who mentions some fundamental attitudes of the Romanian in the face of existence. First of all, for the Romanian there is no idea of nothingness, then there is no absolute impossibility, there is no existential alternative, there is no imperative, there is no irretrievable, and most importantly, there is no fear of death – the feeling of *anchoring in eternity saves the Romanian in the most desperate situations, as he puts lead wings in the unspeakably favorable circumstances, with which the wing of fate did not touch him too often* (Vulcănescu, 1996, p. 193).

The conclusions we have reached, upon the investigation, prove that the emotional experience is not pre-cultural, but prominently cultural: emotions serve complex communication purposes, of a moral and cultural order. Emotions, therefore, are not mere labels for inner states, the essence of which is supposed to be universal. It is undeniable that emotions are forms of symbolic action with multiple joints at the level of culture and social structures. The application of the AE method has allowed us to elucidate the richness of the semantic "tasks" that the concept of "fear" carries in the Romanian. The associations identified through AE allow the decoding and construction, like a puzzle, of the significations of the given concept by engaging both the cognitive and the affective component – simultaneous, but also complementary processes, language being a preferential way in trying to reveal the way in which knowledge is organized and stored in the human mind.

References

Books and websites

¹³As it can be noticed, many of them can be identified within the RD units either.

Hofstede, G. (1984). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills.

Illouz, E., Gilon, D., Shachak, M. (2014). Emotions and Cultural Theory. In Stets, J. E., Turner, J. H. (eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions* (vol. II, 221-244). Springer.

Ivancu, O. (2013). *Identitate culturală și mental colectiv românesc în postcomunism (1990-2007) – Imagini, mituri, percepții, re poziționări*. Editura EIKON.

Lifari, V. *Categoriile conceptuale ale emoțiilor redată prin „imaginea organelor interne omenești” descrise în expresii frazeologice somatice*. <http://studiamsu.eu/nr-10-100-2016/>, <http://dspace.usm.md:8080/xmlui/handle/123456789/1182>.

Mamulea, M. (2015). *Teme filosofice în cultura populară românească*. Editura Academiei Române.

Rotilă, V. *Heidegger și rostirea ființei*, p. 46.

Stoica, L. G. *Modele ale afectivității în cultura română premodernă (1780-1840)*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317038418_Modele_ale_afectivitatii_in_cultura_romana_premoderna_1740-1840_Models_of_Affectivity_in_the_Early-Modern_Romanian_Culture_1740-1840 ISBN 978-973-167-342-4.

Vulcănescu, M. (1996). *Către ființa spiritualității românești* (vol. III - Dimensiunea românească a existenței). Editura Eminescu.

Wierzbicka, A. (1999). *Emotions across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals*. Cambridge University Press.

Dictionaries

Duda, G., Gugui, A., Wojcicki, M.- J. (1985). *Dicționar de expresii și locuțiuni ale limbii române*. Editura Albatros.

Popa, Gh., Sainenco, A., Pritcan, V., Popa, V., Lacusta, E., Trinca, L. (2016). *Dicționarul asociativ al limbii române*. Editura Junimea.

Tomici, M. (2001). *Dicționar frazeologic al limbii române*. Editura Vestala Saeculum. *Dicționar de proverbe și zicători românești*. Gr. Botezatu, A. Hâncu (alc.). Col. iniț. și coord. de Anatol și Dan Vidrașcu. Editura Litera.

Zanne, Iu. (2001). *Proverbele românilor*. Editura Librăriei Socec. *Dicționar de proverbe și zicători românești*. Gr. Botezatu, A. Hâncu (alc.); col. iniț. și coord. de Anatol și Dan Vidrașcu. Editura Litera.

Караулов. Ю. Н. (2011). *Русский ассоциативный словарь как новый лингвистический источник и инструмент анализа языковой способности*. în *Русский ассоциативный*

словарь. Книга 1. Прямой словарь: от стимула к реакции. Ассоциативный тезаурус современного русского языка. Часть I. Изд-во «Помовский и партнеры» / Karaulov, Ju. N., Ju. A. Sorokin, E. F., Tarasov, N. V., Ufimceva, G. A., Čerkasova (2011). Russkij asociativnyj slovar' kak novyj lingvističeskij istočnik i instrument analiza jazykovej sposobnosti. V: *Russkij asociativnyj slovar'*. Kniga 1. Prjamoj slovar': ot stimula k reakcii. Asociativnyj tezaurus sovremennogo russkogo jazyka. Čast' I. Izd-vo «Pomovskij i partnery».

(LITERARY) LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CONDITIONING

ALEXEI MARINAT: THE CATHARTIC FUNCTION OF CONFESSION IN THE DIARY "ME AND THE WORLD"

Svetlana MELNIC

Ph. D. Student

(Alec Russo Balti University, Republic of Moldova)

international.office@usarb.md, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8602-0683>

Abstract

Writing memoirs constituted the most eruptive phenomenon immediately after 1989, the fall of communism being followed, in terms of literature, but also extraliterary, as a documentary and moral dimension. For Alexei Marinat, the reclusion diary "Me and the World" is not only a way to share the common experience of a cursed society, but also to create a favourable space in which faith and pain can be shared. These confessions, full of candour and simplicity, offer not only public access to a private space, but also allow the diarist to create this space as a way to explore the boundaries of lived experience, expressing the desire to be discovered once in sharing the self with others. At the same time, his diary represents a space where the limits of his life are accessible for analysis and self-analysis, because here, Alexei Marinat reveals the surprising powers of liberation through the purifying exercise of autobiographical art.

Keywords: Alexei Marinat, diary, autobiographical literature, confession, memory

Rezumat

Memorialistica a constituit fenomenul cel mai eruptiv îndată după 1989, căderea comunismului fiind urmată, în plan literar, dar și extraliterar ca dimensiune documentară și morală. Pentru Alexei Marinat jurnalul reclusiunii „Eu și lumea” nu constituie doar o modalitate de a împărtăși experiența comună a unei societăți urgisite, dar și de a crea un spațiu favorabil în care credința și durerea pot fi împărtășite. Aceste confesiuni, străbătute de candoare și simplitate, oferă nu doar accesul publicului la un spațiu privat, ci permit diaristului să creeze acest spațiu ca modalitate de explorare a granițelor experienței trăite, constituind expresia dorinței de a fi descoperit cândva în împărtășirea sinelui cu alții. Jurnalul său reprezintă, totodată, și un spațiu în care limitele vieții acestuia sunt accesibile pentru analiză și autoanaliză, pentru că aici, lui Alexei Marinat i se relevă surprinzătoarele puteri de eliberare prin exercițiul purificator al artei autobiografice.

Cuvinte-cheie: Alexei Marinat, jurnal, literatură autobiografică, confesiune, memorie

Immediately after the fall of communism (1989), writers' attention has been focused primarily on testimony, out of an acute need for direct, immediate, and "unprocessed" truth. Diaries, memoirs, confessional notes have represented prolific literature works that continue their depositional career to this day. This is the age in which life itself is infinitely more interesting than fiction. The phenomenon can be traced on both sides of the Prut river, as the evil communist regime has spread rapidly for decades, capturing

writers, priests, artists, politicians, workers, young students, and exerting mass terror, with serious consequences for the human psyche. In truth, the only individuals able to talk about the horrors of the communist regime are those who really suffered during the communist period (former political prisoners, dissidents, persecuted intellectuals).

Numerous literary critics, including Mihai Cimpoi, Ion Ciocanu, Alina Ciobanu-Tofan, Diana Vrabie, Aliona Grati addressed the theme of detention memoirs in the space between the Prut and the Dniester, the literature after 1989 revealing many taboo subjects, taking a direct and impartial approach. The whole subject area is focused on the Soviet totalitarian regime, the concentration camps, the Gulag, the post-war Soviet occupation, topics that had been waiting for several decades to get an authentic, genuine representation.

“While Ion C. Ciobanu’s fiction, which portrayed the Stalinist deportations more obliquely, was published in Soviet Moldova over several decades, his colleague Alexei Marinat’s account of internment in the Stalin’s prisons, *Eu și lumea* (Me and the World) could appear only in 1989”, records the literary critic Marcel Cornis-Pope, in the vast study dedicated to the reconceptualization of the national literary histories of the countries of Eastern Central Europe (Cornis-Pope et al., 2010, p. 575). The effervescent movement to commemorate the tragic experience is also reinforced by Cicerone Ionitoiu, former political prisoner, author of the dictionary *Victims of Communist Terror*: “I saw and felt how the body of the country had become a guinea pig of foreign ideologies aimed at disintegration and enmity between us, those animated by the beautification of the same land and the realization of the same ideal: to get ready for a free, abundant life in which the mutual respect of values should dominate, and the spirit of justice should be the daily binder”¹⁴ (Ionitoiu, 2018, p. 2).

The Dictionary contains unique information about the victims of communist terror, among those imprisoned, tortured and arrested we also identify the Bessarabian memorialist Alexei Marinat, sentenced to 10 years in prison for high treason (Ionitoiu, 2019, p. 100).

Among the recurring themes of Alexei Marinat’s confession prose (the disease, coldness, time, freedom, death, loneliness, aesthetic creation, religiosity), *hunger* is the ubiquitous leitmotif, both in its direct form, of torture, and in metaphorical form, of hunger for information from the outside world. In these shocking documentary sketches of years spent in Siberian camps

¹⁴*Orig.* “Am văzut și simțit cum trupul țării devenise cobai al ideologiilor străine ce urmăreau destrămarea sufletească și învrăjbierea între noi, cei animați de înfrumusețarea aceleiași gлии și realizarea aceluiași ideal: să ne pregătim pentru o viață liberă, îmbelșugată în care să domine respectul reciproc al valorilor, iar spiritul dreptății să fie liantul de zi cu zi” (Ionitoiu, 2018, p. 2).

(Duta, 1992, p. 9), the memorialist manages to capture aspects of the terrible famine instituted by the Soviet regime: He had starved to death. But why wasn't he distended? We all know what the signs of hunger are! He died, apparently, not wanting to wait for these signs (January 23, 1947)¹⁵ (Marinat, 2017, p. 7), the first entry in the diary *Me and the World* being recorded on December 30, 1946.

Among the first published excerpts from his documentary prose, we can mention "Crâmpieie din vârtoarea vremurilor" [Crumbles from the Whirlwind of Times] (Marinat, 1989, pp. 44-63), which include the stories "Ziua X" [Day X], "Taina primei nopți" [The Secret of the First Night], "Damen vals" [Damen waltz], in the magazine *Nistru* no. 6 of 1989. Some memoirs are brought to the public in the paper "Amintiri, of, amintiri" [Memories, oh, Memories] from the magazine *Orizonul* [Horizon] no. 3 of 1989 (Marinat, 1989, pp. 68-71). The journals are later published under the title "Din jurnalele intime" [From the Intimate Diaries], in *Selected Writings* (Hyperion Publishing House, 1991), being written after 45 years from the recording of the events. Eight years later, the well-known work *Me and the World: Documentary Prose* (Writers' Union Publishing House, 1999) is out of print - in a recent edition, at Cartier Publishing House, 2017. As we will see, the volume of memoirs *Călătorii în jurul omului* [Traveling Around the Man] (2004) starts with the publication of the same diary, incorporated into the memorialistic discourse. We are witnessing a fusion of the memorialistic discourse with the diaristic one, as, in the last years, we are attesting less "pure" formulas of these species of confession, which are subject to changes in the "topography" of the genre. Eugen Simion, who delivers a detailed presentation of the writings within the confessional genre, observes that their formula is just as complex: a mixture of memories, autobiography, self-portrait, diary, and moral meditation (Simion, 2008, p. 18). On May 27, 1947, the diaries were interrupted, the diarist being arrested by the security forces in Chisinau [...] Searches were carried out in the room [...] and the three notebooks of the "Me and the World" diaries were found, they were immediately counted and itemised: "The Diary no. 1 - contains 158 written pages, Diary no. 2 - 107 pages, Diary no. 3 - 193 pages", fact to be confirmed on the spot with my own signature. From the way the searches were conducted, I realized that the security services knew about my diaries. Then I found out that they were also photographed¹⁶ (Marinat, 2017, p. 23).

¹⁵ *Orig.* "Murise de foame. Dar de ce nu era umflat? Noi doar știm care-s semnele foametei! Acesta a murit, se vede, nevrând să mai aștepte semnele (23 ianuarie 1947)" (Marinat, 2017, p. 7).

¹⁶ *Orig.* "arestat de către organele de securitate din Chișinău [...] Au fost făcute percheziții în cameră [...] și au fost găsite cele trei caiete ale jurnalelor intime «Eu și lumea», au fost pe loc numerotate și specificate: «Jurnalul nr. 1 - conține 158 de

The perquisition, followed by the arrest, was, in fact, the antechamber to the inevitable future detention. Obviously, in the situation in which the fictional literature of the obsessive decade conforms to Soviet precepts, any epic, lyrical, or dramatic freedom being severely sanctioned, it is clear that the diary, for example, cannot contain immediate reality without risks to the author (Manolescu, 1996, p. 7). For the one who records his actual, authentic impressions under an oppressive regime, even if he is careful, the risks are inherent. In the same year, 1947, Gala Galaction wrote down in his diary that "poor Moldovans die by the thousands! [...] Life, nearby and faraway, in our country and in vain - as I catch it on the radio - flows fast, diverse, dramatic, full of worries, of needs, of apprehensions"¹⁷ (Galaction, 2003, pp. 50-51).

It is the period of maximum stalinist oppression, when, in addition to the ordinary citizens, who were to be mentally exterminated, physically abused in investigations, deported or even killed, there were a large number of Bes-sarabian people who formed the intellectual elite of Greater Romania.

A decisive role in the analysis of Alexei Marinat's diary belongs to the title, the construction of which raises several issues in literature, to a greater extent than any other element of the paratext. The title, in the terminological sense of one of the founders of modern title science ("titrologie") - Leo Hoek - represents "a construct, an artifact created for reception or commentary" (Genette & Crampé, 1988, p. 693). If we follow the paradigm of interpreting the title of a literary work presented by Leo Hoek and approached by Gérard Genette and Bernard Crampé, then, in the case of the analysed diary, *Me and the World* constitutes the title of the work, while the second part - *Documentary Prose* - is its subtitle. Hence, the title is defined formally and the subtitle - functionally. Indeed, the subtitle *Documentary Prose* refers to the object of a relatively independent paratextual element ("Prose" - artistic literary creation using expressive language), to the generic indication that denotes certainty of evoking documented events. Consequently, the author consciously assigns his diary to the category of documentary literature. As for the structure of the title, presented in the format of "title plus subtitle", it involves a relationship of subordination, but also of a clear distinction of the last element compared to the first, a fact confirmed by the punctuation mark that separates them. The title *Me and the World* is an entirely evocative one, referring to the author's impulse to write about himself, about the process of

pagini scrise, jurnalul nr. 2 - 107 pagini, jurnalul nr. 3 - 193 pagini», fapt ce a trebuit confirmat pe loc cu propria semnătură. După felul cum s-au făcut perchezițiile, am înțeles că organele de securitate știau de jurnalele mele. Pe urmă am aflat că au fost și fotografiate" (Marinat, 2017, p. 23).

¹⁷Orig. "Bieții moldoveni mor cu miile! [...] Viața, aproape și departe, la noi și aiurea - așa cum o surprind la radio - curge năvalnică, diversă, dramatică, încărcată de griji, de nevoi, de aprehensiuni" (Galaction, 2003, pp. 50-51).

discovering and redefining the “self” in relation to the “world”. In this sense, the diary announces itself as a means of self-assessment and exploration of the “authorial self”. In fact, as Ruxandra Cesereanu concludes, it is the discovery and freedom of “self” that makes the detention memoir a daughter of literature (Cesereanu, 1998, p. 10). As regards the functions of the extensive title – *Me and the World: Documentary Prose* – we can underline the following: identification of the work (documentary prose), designation of the content (author’s testimonies about himself), highlighting the importance (the value of the work as a testament, the resurrection of the author’s memory, in relation to the collective memory). From a semantic perspective, Leo Hoek distinguishes between the subjective and objective functions of the title. Thus, the author delimitates two classes of titles: the “subjectal” and the “objectal” ones (Genette & Crampé, 1988, p. 709). Alexei Marinat’s diary combines both functions in a very inspired way: the subjective is manifested in the authorial “self” or the pronoun *Me*, while the objective belongs to the format itself, the designation of the text as an object – *Documentary Prose*. Hence, we can say that the title of the diary can be qualified as a “thematic”, in relation to the “content” of the text, congruent with a generalizing synecdoche, which presents the evolution of the “authorial self” as the central theme of the work. Dissimulated stays only the effect of the connotative message of the title: does the memorialist address to himself, to the whole world, or to both? Therefore, as a product of inner feelings and experience, the diary externalizes the intimate universe of the narrator, the convention of authenticity being identifiable in the sincerity of the diarist, in the authoritative and committed “self” that guarantees the credibility of the text: “I, as a witness to those events [...] do my duty¹⁸ (Marinat, 2004, p. 335).

More than obtaining the effect of authenticity on the level of the diaristic creation, the literary critic Diana Vrabie also mentions the preference for the “self” as a conceptualization and return to an inner “authorial self”, to a difficult experience of a relationship with oneself (Vrabie, 2008, p. 207) that existed in the past. In fact, “the past can never be evoked except with respect to a present: the «reality» of by-gone days is only such to the consciousness which, today, gathering up their present image, cannot avoid imposing upon them its own form, its style. Every autobiography – even when it limits itself to pure narrative – is a self-interpretation” (Starobinski, 1980, p. 74).

This metamorphosis is revealed in the prose of the Bessarabian diarist, in the personal act of restoring a public, historical, institutional, collective world, in the evocative emphasis on the existence and experience of authorial consciousness: “Escorted life - you don’t really think about much. Tomorrow morning the alarm clock rings again, another day comes with «let’s, let’s go faster», «come on, come on», put on whatever you have, run to the can-

¹⁸Orig. “Eu, ca martor al acelor evenimente [...] îmi fac datoria” (Marinat, 2004, p. 335).

teen, to devour the slice of bread and to sip from the bowl of cucumber soup or pickled cabbage, and – at work, to cut down the forest, to carry the dirt with the wheelbarrow, to batter it with the pickaxe, to lay the crossbeams, to lay the railway road – the road of suffering”¹⁹ (Marinat, 2017, p. 82).

The issue of the relationship between autobiography/biography and memory leads us to a contradictory definition, with some critics considering memory a subset of autobiography, while others assume the exact opposite. The relationship between them is complex, and the demarcation line between the genres – extremely unstable. However, the two genres generate different definitions in readers’ perceptions. Readers of autobiography are willing to give up the supremacy of the authenticity of the message, the fictional dimension being perceived as a necessary part of the autobiographical narrative. Applying this formula to memories generates a series of problems. The expectations of readers of reclusion memoirs are different: they are much less willing to accept an aestheticized description of historically identifiable times, relying on the account of true events. Memoirs carry the value of historical truth, due to the principle of their objective fidelity. In Alexei Marinat’s documentary prose, we find a note about the value of confession, but also about revealing the personal history to the public: “I want to make available to the reader excerpts, gleanings, moments, documentary short stories from these diaries, which, in my opinion, would interest him to some extent, as live experiences of a man who was, saw [...] and reflected about the events of the day”²⁰ (Marinat, 2017, p. 98).

We can identify, in these fragments, a form of assumption of existential polyphony, of human plurivocity, that is, in the terms of Mikhail Bakhtin, an invitation to “dialogism”. Self-identity is shaped by the social designation of memory, which has a significant impact on life, by making available to readers fragments of history, through this type of dialogic writing. Memory, which is the indicator of identity, becomes here a way of vigorously experiencing the agony of reclusion, and the victory over it. The loss of memory for the narrator, means the loss of identity. Memory is equivalent to the confession of fragments of the past conveyed in Alexei Marinat’s narrative, be-

¹⁹*Orig.* “Viață escortată – nu te prea gândești la multe. Măine dimineață iar sună deșteptarea, mai vine o zi cu «hai-hai mai repede», «davai-davai» (rus.), tragi pe tine ce ai, fuga la cantină, pentru a înghiți porția de pâine și a sorbi strachina de ciorbă din castraveți sau varză murată, și – la muncă, la tăiat pădure, la cărat pământul cu roaba, la bătut cu târnăcopul, la așternut traversele, la clăditul de cale ferată – cale a suferinței” (Marinat, 2017, p. 82).

²⁰*Orig.* “Vreau să pun la dispoziția cititorului fragmente, spicuiuri, momente, nuvele documentare din aceste jurnale, care, după părerea mea, l-ar interesa într-o oarecare măsură, ca trăiri pe viu ale unui om care a fost, a văzut [...] și a gândit asupra evenimentelor zilei” (Marinat, 2017, p. 98).

ing decisively encapsulated in the language of alienation. And here, memory does not exist in itself, it does not subsist only in the individual, in silence, as Adrian Crupa points out. The meaning of being of the memory is a relational one. It only exists as long as it is transmitted. In the absence of sharing, exemplarity does not make sense, and experience loses its purposefulness. The manifestation form of memory is the “confession” (Crupa, 2017, p. 27). In the act of confession, i.e., transmission of memory, the connotations of reclusion experience consumed in the Gulag camps become viable as they are shared and perceived by the audience. Similarly, the readers of Alexandr Solzhenitsyn are invited to “enter into the sweetness of the camp life and to taste its joys” (Solzhenitsyn, 2007, p. 53). The memorialist is in a constant process of adaptation, which explains the configuration of his identity over time. It is a confluence that Alexei Marinat explains through the essential constitutive experience in the culture of a country dominated by the totalitarian communist regime, finding out that there is a moment in his life when, under the pressure of terrifying events, he feels the urgent need to record them in his “green diary” (Marinat, 2004, p. 11), a diary which “saves” him.

From the very beginning of the diary, the memorialist Alexei Marinat consciously has taken over the role of narrator and author, speaking directly to the reader through the prism of his intimate diary, which lay at the origin of his memoirs: “My greetings, green diary! It is you that saves me every now and then, since you let me unload my soul: I share all my hardships with you”²¹ (Marinat, 2017, p. 15).

This autobiographical addressing is meant to emphasize that there are facts to be confessed, and their conversion into narrated events will be accomplished without alteration. At the same time, choosing to record in a diary determines the alleviation of prison suffering and the stylization of the discourse, which facilitates the emergence of a second-degree imaginary. Speaking to a diary determines the existence of the tacit agreement or contract between the reader and the autobiographer while reading an autobiographical text, i.e., in Philippe Lejeune’s interpretation – the “autobiographical pact”.

At the same time, Eugen Simion makes a clear distinction between memoirs, where the pact with history prevails and an autobiography that presumes the author’s pact with himself, urging us to take things “relatively” (Simion, 2008, p. 12), from which we can conclude that the memorialist sees himself in front of history, interpreting the historical facts he experiences, while the autobiographer emphasizes the “self” he narrates. Unlike the autobiography, which is written at a certain distance from the events that happened, the diary does not start from the

²¹*Orig.* “Salutările mele, caiet verde! Tot tu mă salvezi câteodată, pentru că mă lași să-mi descarc sufletul: toate greutățile mele ți le împărtășesc ție” (Marinat, 2017, p. 15).

recollection in time of some life incidents, but from their recording and synthesis at the time of their occurrence. The common note of these species is that they both reflect the common life of the author. In all these confessional species, however, fiction intervenes, triggering itself involuntarily due to the subjectivity of memory. Memory filters also lead to the creation of myths and images that change the factual reality. They become decisive in extreme contexts, in which, for example, the Bessarabian diarist is found. These filters, indispensable for structuring narrative identities, work particularly effectively when the detainee Alexei Marinat is faced with the impossibility of representing the traumatic experience, adjusting the description of reality for security reasons. This is evident, for example, when the memorialist praises the violence of key events, focusing on external details, as he does when recounting the moment of his arrest. The author's attention is focused on the elements of the portrait: the military uniform of the investigator, his physical appearance, avoiding any description of the physical violence committed against him immediately after his arrest: "He smiles again. A smile, like a baby snake. It is waving from the upper lip to the lower lip. Then, he unlocks his lips and a gold tooth starts shining like a line in a tunnel, revealing his connection to the wealthy, perhaps even to the noble, and educated people. Gold has always served as a sign of wealth. But gold misled me, and I always confused wealth with education and intelligence. This noble metal, which shines on an individual's tooth, makes me believe that man is intelligent. Naivety comes from the lack of life practice"²² (Marinat, 2017, p. 26).

This subjective selection of facts in autobiographical writing confirms Eugen Simion's view that autobiography can be treated as fiction, as a narrative in which the author carefully selects and constructs characters, events, and aspects of his past and present, his "self" or identity, while memory conveys a reality into fiction, conferring aesthetic values to literature. Even if the intention of the diarist Alexei Marinat is to free himself through writing while keeping an intimate diary, this act of confession and recording of his private life implies a dialogue with the public. The public, real or imaginary, contributes to the modeling of the "authorial self" in writing, of the intimate nature of the artistic "self", the diarist signing a pact with himself and a pact with history (Simion, 2008, p. 18). The possibility of creating a dialogue or a

²²*Orig.* "Iar zâmbește. Un zâmbet, ca un pui de șarpe. I se unduiește ba pe la buza de sus, ba pe la cea de jos. Apoi își desface buzele și un dinte de aur străluminează ca un fir într-un tunel. Dându-i în vileag apartenența la oameni avuți, poate chiar și nobili, și educați. Aurul totdeauna a servit ca un indiciu de avuție. Dar pe mine aurul mă inducea în eroare și, totdeauna, încurcam avuția cu educația și inteligența. Acest metal nobil, care strălucește pe dintele unui individ, mă face să cred că omul e inteligent. Naivitatea vine din lipsa practicii de viață" (Marinat, 2017, p. 26).

collaboration between the authorial self and the public is also reflected in the aesthetic system of Mihail Bakhtin's dialogism, which perceives the narrative as a conversation. The implicit existence of this conversation is confirmed by the fact that the diarist Alexei Marinat begins his diary with a dialogue with his "green diary", using the second person singular to address the personified notebook: I share all my hardship with you (Marinat, 2017, p. 15), thus anthropomorphizing his intimate diary, within a dialogical structure. By doing so, the diarist starts with modeling his narrative in the form of a conversation with a hypothetical friend or perhaps with his own "self". While we can argue that such a narrative, with elements of intimate dialogue, should not be categorized as a monologue, we note that most critics consider writing a journal to be an expression of a desire to be discovered someday, a sharing of the "self" with the "other" (Mihail Bakhtin). At the same time, these pages register a high degree of literariness, an aesthetics of the prison experience. The author uses rhetorical devices to represent the dominant feeling of crisis and fragmentation in the modern oppressive world. His social, ethical, political and cultural concerns do not always cover the desired linguistic representations, as, originally from a Transnistrian village, Valea Hotului, he does not possess sufficient knowledge of the Romanian language: "I want to start all at once: both literature and history and language. I feel like working more on the language"²³ (Marinat, 2017, p. 20).

The projective position of this autobiographical passage describes the trajectory of an artistic destiny, which is in a constant search for himself. Hence, for Alexei Marinat, the diary is not, in fact, just a way to share the common experience of an oppressed society. These confessions, full of candor and simplicity, offer public access to a private space, allowing the diarist to find a way to explore the boundaries of lived experience in writing. The literary valences of this diaristic text will always be open to an emotional reception and a ceaseless dialogue between the "authorial self" and the public. Even if it does not start from the premise to become literature, but rather to be a testimony of an oppressive reality, the diary *Me and the World* develops into an important literary work, mainly because of this confessional simplicity and the fever with which the confession is made. Like other confessional narratives in which personal trauma reverberates, Alexei Marinat's detention diary confirms its authority, especially through the authentic evocation of the detention experience and through the exorcism of memory, and the past.

References

- Cesereanu, R. (1998). *Călătorie spre centrul infernului. Gulagul în conștiința românească* [Journey to the Center of Hell. The Gulag in the Romanian Modern Conscience].

²³Orig. "Vreau să mă apuc de toate odată: și de literatură, și de istorie, și de limbă. Îmi vine să lucrez mult asupra limbii" (Marinat, 2017, p. 20).

- Cornis-Pope, M. et al. (2010). East-Central European Literature after 1989. In Marcel Cornis-Pope & John Neubauer (Eds.), *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (Vol. IV - Types and stereotypes, pp. 561-630). John Benjamins.
- Crupa, A. (2017). Memorie - Mărturie - Martiriu. Cadre ale memorialisticii spațiului concentraționar. In B. Cretu, O. Ichim & M. Clim (Coord.) *Memorialistica românească: între documentul istoric și obiectul estetic* (Ed. I, pp. 23-32). Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași.
- Duta, L. (1992). Un Soljenițin român de pe Bug: Alexei Marinat. *Adevărul literar și artistic*, 133, 9.
- Galaction, G. (2003). *Jurnal* (Ed. a doua). (Vol. V). Albatros.
- Genette, G., Crampé, B. (1988). Structure and Functions of the Title in Literature. *Critical Inquiry*, 14(4), 692-720. www.jstor.org/stable/1343668.
- Ionitoiu, C. (2018, March 21). *Jur să spun adevărul*. http://www.procesul.comunismului.com/marturii/fonduri/ioanitoiu/marturie/docs/ionitoiu_jur_1.pdf.
- Ionitoiu, C. (2019, July 1). *Victimele terorii comuniste. Arestați, torturați, întemnițați, uciși. Dicționar*. http://www.procesulcomunismului.com/marturii/fonduri/ioanitoiu/dictionar_m/m/dictionarm_11.pdf.
- Manolescu, I. (1996). *Literatura memorialistică. Radu Petrescu. Ion D. Sîrbu. N. Steinhart*. Humanitas.
- Marinat, A. (1989). Amintiri, of, amintiri. *Orizontul*, 3, 68-71.
- Marinat, A. (2004). *Călătorii în jurul omului*. Prut International.
- Marinat, A. (1989). Crâmpie din vârtoarea vremurilor. *Nistru*, 6, 44-63.
- Marinat, A. (2017). *Eu și lumea: proză documentară* (Ed. a treia). Cartier.
- Simion, E. (2008). *Genurile biograficului*. (Vol. I).
- Solzhenitsyn, A. (2007). *The Gulag Archipelago 1918-1956. An Experiment in Literary Investigation*. (Vol. 2). (Th. Whitney, Trans.). Harpe Collins Publishers.
- Starobinski, J. (1980). The Style of Autobiography. In Olney, J. (Ed.). *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical* (pp. 73-83). Princeton University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7zmtjt>.
- Vrabie, D. (2008). *Cunoaștere și autenticitate*. Artpress.

THE ANATOMY OF AUTHENTIC AUTOBIOGRAPHIC NARRATIVES

Svetlana MELNIC

Ph. D. Student

(Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

international.office@usarb.md, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8602-0683>

Abstract

The diversity of form is what has characterized autobiographical discourse since the beginning of the Western literary narrative tradition. One of the consequences of this diversity is the complexity and ambiguity of the explanation of this term, the autobiography being historically classified as one of the oldest forms of narrative, its construction model being associated with the paradigm of the ancient novel. The value of the autobiography derives from the act of writing, but also from the authenticity of the testimony presented in accordance with other documents, which describe the same events in the life of the autobiographer. The autobiography should not be read as a document of the past, but as an elaboration of consciousness or an interface between the past and the future, between experience and recollection, between the subject that reflects on writing and the text itself. The reader of an autobiographical text must insist on the authenticity and identity of the author of the text and the author from within the text, because only here the reader can find his own authenticity.

Keywords: Alexei Marinat, author's identity, autobiography, authenticity, memoirs

Rezumat

Diversitatea formei este ceea ce a caracterizat discursul autobiografic încă de la începutul tradiției narative literare occidentale. Una dintre consecințele acestei diversități este complexitatea și ambiguitatea descrierii termenului, autobiografia fiind istoric clasificată ca una dintre cele mai vechi forme de narațiune, modelul său de construcție fiind asociat paradigmei romanului antic. Valoarea autobiografiei derivă din actul scriiturii, dar și din veridicitatea dovezilor prezentate în concordanță cu alte documente, care descriu aceleași evenimente din viața autobiografului. Autobiografia nu trebuie citită ca un document al trecutului, ci ca o elaborare a conștiinței sau o interfață dintre trecut și viitor, dintre experiență și rememorare, dintre subiectul care reflectă asupra scrierii și textul propriu-zis. Cititorul unui text autobiografic trebuie să insiste asupra autenticității și identității autorului textului și autorului din text, deoarece doar aici cititorul își poate regăsi propria autenticitate.

Cuvinte-cheie: Alexei Marinat, identitatea naratorului, autobiografie, autenticitate, memorialistică

The underlying theme of this study constitutes the authenticity of the autobiographical narrative. The diversity of form is what has characterized autobiographical discourse since the beginning of the Western literary narrative tradition. One of the consequences of this diversity is the complexity and ambiguity of describing the term, the autobiography being historically classified as one of the oldest forms of narrative, its construction model being associated with the paradigm of the ancient novel. This close association between the novel and the autobiography is identifiable from the very be-

ginning of the narrative, when there are series of autobiographical and biographical forms that have had a considerable influence on both European biography and the development of the European novel as a whole, emphasizes Mihail Bakhtin (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 130). To project oneself, to confess oneself, to express oneself through fiction, this is what the writers have done more or less intentionally since J. J. Rousseau, writing diaries, at the same time, confessions, autobiographies in which the "authorial self" reveals itself freely. In the eighteenth-century autobiography penetrates decisively into fiction and this cohesion will give birth to autobiographical fiction or fictional autobiography.

The distinctive features of these early narrative forms were defined in terms of "biographical time" and the new conception of the individual, who is aware of its uniqueness, i.e., "individual's autobiographical self-consciousness" (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 130). Lifelong records constitute the essential feature for the modern definition of autobiography. In researching the origins of autobiography, Mihail Bakhtin identifies three fundamental models: (1) Plato's scheme, which elucidates the course of the individual's life in search of truthful, authentic knowledge; (2) the rhetorical model, in which the author presents himself to the public through the normative-pedagogical consecration of the "self"; and (3) memoirs, the narrative form focused on history, in which the individual is identified by his fate, heritage, or mastery. On the whole, many researchers of autobiography agree that, from a thematic and structural point of view, it is essential for the narrator to recognize the process of his own "evolution", concomitantly with the course of the narrative. Therefore, the structure of the autobiographical discourse requires a balance between the narrator's awareness of his own experience and the objectivity of this experience in the narrative. Hence, the narrative structure of autobiographical discourse is based on both the recognition of the author and the reader, the interaction or tension between the course of the narrative and an "autobiographical consciousness".

According to the authors of the study „Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives“, Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, *autos*, in Greek, means *self, bios - life* and *graphie - writing* (Smith & Watson, 2010, p. 1). Taken together, they represent the three fundamental components of autobiography, projected over time by three generations of critics. The first generation, including the famous Sainte-Beuve with his method of biographical analysis, focused primarily on the *bios*, considering the authenticity of the autobiography as a factual biographical issue that can be confirmed or rejected by resorting to the historical register. The second generation of critics - Philippe Lejeune, Elizabeth Bruss, Jean Starobinski - paid attention to *autos*, focusing on the analysis of truthfulness in the representation of the "self", especially of the author's identity. These researchers are not focused on assessing the truthfulness of an autobiography in its moral and factual implications, but approach the autobiographical narrative from a psycholog-

ical perspective, considering that any expression in autobiographical texts embodies that indisputable identity of the autobiographer (or the “authentic self”). Critics of the third generation, mainly structuralists and poststructuralists, are interested in *graphie/graphia*, or the act of producing a text, and question the referentiality of language, the authenticity of the self, founding their opinions on those “mystifications, bewilderment and confusion” (Loesberg, 2008, p. 173). A current movement, identifiable among critics of the third generation, turns its attention to the *reader* of the autobiography. In this context, the autobiography is seen as the manifestation of an act of prior reading by the author who recites his literary and cultural conventions or who seeks to seduce the reader involved in order to put the rhetorical construction of the “self” into existence. The analysis of the narrative techniques in Alexei Marinat’s memoirs of detention can be superimposed on the objective pursued by the critics of the third generation, which investigates the deep consciousness of the narrator and the reader through the prism of the act of writing. The critical accentuation of *graphie* should not challenge our research effort and the *bios* and *autos* components, all of which contribute to a holistic view of autobiographical discourse.

The debates on the distinctions of *autobiography - fiction, facts - truth, the reader - autobiographer relationship* in the autobiographical space, have not been resolved so far. James Olney argues that while some find it difficult to identify which text can be considered the first autobiography in literature, the appearance of the autobiographical critique may be specifically dated back to 1956, with the publication of the study “Conditions et limites de l’autobiographie” by Georges Gusdorf (Gusdorf, 1980, pp. 28-48). For James Olney, Georges Gusdorf’s essay constitutes a breakdown from previous approaches to the study of autobiography, precisely because of the understanding of its subject (or of *subjectivity*), the critic’s interest being focused on what is at the heart of this philosophical-psychological-literary-humanistic constellation, namely the *individual*, a self-conscious person, a witness of his own life. The emphasis is placed on the possibility of autobiography to offer a way of reflection, recollection and self-confession of a fully formed “authorial self”. Under these conditions, autobiography can no longer be perceived as a subcategory of biography or history, because it dominates the *literary* status of the reflection upon the self, and the creation of “self” in writing and not the factual status of autobiography, the revelation of an individual life experience or the actual confidences, revealed by confession. Here we identify the truth of the *individual* rather than the truth of the *facts*, which becomes legible and even pre-established in the autobiographical discourse. Thanks to the fundamental value attributed to reflection, a great emphasis is placed on *recollection*. In the author’s understanding, repetition or narration substantiates the meaning of some memories and this reiteration generates the appearance of *autobiographical consciousness*, a transfer of emphasis from the *bios* to the *autos* (the act of reflection upon the “self”). More-

over, a "Historical overview of authenticity documents a variety of mental and behavioral processes that account for how individuals discover, develop, and construct a core sense of self and, furthermore, how this core self is maintained over time and situation" (Kernis et al., 2006, p. 293).

In these circumstances, the autobiography should not be read as a document of the past, but as an elaboration of consciousness or an interface between the past and the future, between experience and recollection, between the subject that reflects on his writing and the text itself. It is from here that the reconsideration of the autobiography derives, conferring the status of a literary text, written by an author marked by his own subjectivity, in accordance with Georges Gusdorf's "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography", investing the autobiographical text outside the boundaries of the objective, historical document.

The advocates of authenticity resort to various forms of narrative, which they concentrate in a variety of literary species, such as memoirs, biographies, autobiographies, journals, letters, evocations. It is true that Søren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus are constantly changing their narrative style in an attempt to avoid the illusion of creating a system. For this reason, the main purpose of authentic authors is to externalize the *pathos of authenticity* (Golomb, 1995, p. 10) in Jacob Golomb's opinion, to recreate a personal mental strength and a sense of individuality, literature being a source inspired by capturing the reader's attention, challenging him to co-participate. "Moreover, the writers of authenticity change their genres and styles to stress the fact that certain kinds of pathos originate within themselves. The variety of their styles is yet another expression of the revolt against the tradition of impersonal and detached objectivity, a constant reminder that we are reading their writings, the personal products of their own values and goals" (Golomb, 1995, p. 10).

It determines him to follow the path of authenticity without formulating explicitly this mainly purpose. By recounting the experience in an autobiographical act, the readers are given the illusion of authenticity, this being certified by the narration in the first person, the confessional tone, the use of the present tense, etc. Taken as a whole, "most perspectives on authenticity stress the extent to which one's thoughts, feelings, and behaviors reflect one's true or core self. Moreover, most perspectives emphasize a nondefensive stance toward evaluative information, openness toward, and trust in, internal experiences, and fulfilling interpersonal relationships" (Kernis et al., 2006, p. 294).

The value of autobiography derives from the act of writing, but also from the authenticity of the evidence presented in accordance with other documents, which describe the same events in the life of the autobiographer, as well as the sincerity of the author, consistent in what he narrates. No matter how *subjective* the "inner" point of view, the autobiographer must conform to the request to tell the truth or at least what he thinks is true. Moreover, he

must convince the reader, through the power of writing, of the authenticity of the events related. His extra-textual commitment to the truth forms the connection point between autobiography and fictional autobiography or what some critics call autobiographical fiction. Here it is necessary to analyze the essential components of the *subjective* self, as they appear in a text, through which one can, furthermore, determine the features of the autobiography as such. In determining both the authenticity and the authority of an autobiography, the *self* substitutes the documentable *facts*; the registration of a conscience replaces the archival evidence. In this regard, Dorrit Cohn differentiates a first-person novel from a third-person novel in "The Distinction of Fiction" (Cohn, 1999). In "Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction" (Boldrini, 2012), Lucia Boldrini adopts the term *heterobiography* for novels-autobiographies of historical characters, bringing to light the concept of *identity theft*, as a result of merging historical, fictional and authorial identity in the characters of the narrative: "Heterobiography, the autobiography of the other, brings fully into the foreground that the concept of individual identity is an etymological contradiction: if, on the one hand, «identity», meaning sameness, requires at least two things that can be the same, on the other hand «individual» derives from *individuus*, indivisible" (Boldrini, 2012, p. 41).

Accordingly, we could adopt the notion of *fictional autobiography* to cover both scenarios, in which the narrator is a fictional character or a historical character. The fiction of *fictional autobiography* does not impose the commitment to fidelity to the lived act and the ethical obligation to tell the truth, giving freedom to *literariness* and creativity. It is oriented towards a historical context that disguises fictionality and creates a myth of *authenticity* and *truth*. An autobiography, on the other hand, must exclude fiction and aim at the historical context and authorial subjectivity, given that the author's intention, in the realm of authentic autobiography, is to create an effect of the *unquestionability*, "a powerful reality effect that qualifies authenticity as a sense, an impression, perhaps an *emotion*, rather than a fact-based certainty" (Boldrini, 2012, p. 81). However, by appealing to fiction, the historical setting and truth in autobiography can be mystified. From this perspective, autobiography implies the duality of truth and myth, along with objectivity and subjectivity, reality and fiction. Consequently, the autobiography merges the facts with the fiction and, as a result, it "breathes" fictionality, despite its declarative intentions to tell the truth. Given that the notion of *truth* is subjective, ambiguous and illusory, Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson consider that the autobiography is characterized by *subjective truth* and not by *fact* (Smith & Watson, 2010, p. 10), the truth being reached through subjectivity.

In an attempt to reveal who we are, we prove to be marked by the social constraints of a deterministic environment. It was the research of this social framework that led Sainte-Beuve to conceive of the method of *biographical analysis*, later described as a critical creative direction of portraits, of the

works of a writer and the nature of his genius, using his biography with all its peculiarities (Bratu, 1974, p. 35). Obsolete today, Sainte-Beuve's biographical method is based on the study of biographical data (race, family, education, social background) and historical documents referring to an author, the search for clues that reveal his true background, the oppositions and approaches that highlight his dominant passion and his own way of thinking, the analysis of the individual himself, despite those disguises that the literary attitude or public prejudice interposes (Bratu, 1974, p. 35), the emphasis being placed on the uniqueness of the creator, that authenticity of the "brilliant self" in cohesion with the "biographical self". Similarly, we find ourselves in a constant mode of an evolutionary adaptation, which explains the resizing of our identity in time and in the rewriting of the "self", revealed in autobiographical works, understood as the experience of self and self-experience [Eakin, 1999, p. xi]. This reconfiguration is even more valid in the memorialistic literature of detention. Since "when people are confused as to their self-identity, a serious quest for genuine self can begin. When one is painfully conscious of the danger of abandoning one's self, a cry for authenticity is heard. Indeed, given the negative sense of the notion of authenticity, discussed above, and commonsense psychology, one might dare to put forward the following rule: only one who has deeply experienced the conflict between authentic and inauthentic patterns of life and has frequently struggled to decide between them can become conscious of the importance of being authentic. Only such a person will recognize the vital significance of authentic identity and strive to make it an operative value in his life. We set about looking for our selves when we feel we are actually experiencing the disintegration of our selves and our own identity. The role of these existential predicaments explains the tendency of the philosophers of authenticity to engage in self-questioning and self-analysis; to probe the innermost layers of their selves and their turbulent lives (Golomb, 1995, p. 21).

In his research on autobiography, Paul de Man concludes that, empirically, autobiography is not subject to a generic definition. However, Elizabeth Bruss formulates several principles for defining autobiography as a genre in terms of the *authenticity of the autobiographical text*, warning of an inevitable violation of these essential rules and establishing new conventions: (1) The autobiographer is the source of the subject and structure of the text. He assumes individual responsibility for the creation and systematization of the narrative, and his existence is supposed to be a verifiable fact. (2) It is assumed that the information and events recorded by the autobiographer have taken place and are true. No matter how difficult it may be to verify the events or attitudes recorded, their authenticity is appealed to. (3) Even if what is rendered may be or has been discredited, the autobiographer appeals and insists on the authenticity of the text (Bruss, 1976, pp. 10-11).

The various forms of autobiographical writings explain the dual origin of the autobiographical narrative. The mixture and juxtaposition of the two

seemingly opposite directions, approached by autobiographical writings, gave rise to a variety of forms. On the one hand, we delimit the confessions that have their origin in the depths of the psyche and intensify the subjective presentation of the consciousness or the subconscious. On the other hand, there are the memoirs that give priority to the cultural dimension of life, their approach being to record an individual history, as an integral part of history itself or to reveal how individual life is determined by external forces. The autobiographical narrative is therefore governed by both external and internal forces.

The creation of a set of norms in the autobiographical literature and the inclusion in the memoirs of a rich factual material accentuates the authenticity of this *documentary* literature, as well as the emphasis placed on the subjective projection of the narrative, on the individual, personal and confessional aspect of the autobiographical discourse. The literary term of *documentary prose* is broader than that of *autobiography* or *memoir*, as it encompasses both. However, it is not necessary to distinguish between *documentary* and *biographical* literature, as the memorialist uses the document, both narratives being represented by a rich factual material, with a congruent aesthetic orientation towards authenticity and a natural use of documents, personal memories, authentic testimonies.

As the aim of this study is not to analyze the diversity of autobiographical discourse, we will insist on unconventional narrative structures, memoirs, and writings about the authorial *self*. Personal experience is the only authority and source of belief in the authenticity of the narrative, in which the narrator plays an intermediary role.

“Similarly, the artist seeks his personal authenticity in his entire autonomy – his goal is to be as self-defining as the art-object he creates. As for the audience, its expectation is that through its communication with the work of art, which may be resistant, unpleasant, even hostile, it acquires the authenticity of which the object itself is the model and the artist the personal example” (Trilling, 1972, p. 100).

Since the truth at the heart of some memoirs is of psychological nature, traditional methods of determining authenticity by corroborating the content of the memoir with documented external evidence are not sufficient. Each memoir is authentic insofar as it reflects the author’s *self*, the authenticity being ensured not only by the presence of externally verifiable facts, but also by the memorialist’s intention to present material connected to the *sincerity* of the facts, protecting the potential reader from possible distortion of information. Thus, in an authentic memoir, we can identify determinations of the real world, referring to space and place, time, characters and their portrayal, to their own names, all having the function of authenticity marks in the text, confirming its veracity, since “to praise a work of literature by calling it sincere is now at best a way of saying that although it needs be

given no aesthetic or intellectual admiration, it was at least conceived in innocence of heart" (Trilling, 1972, p. 6).

Returning to James Olney and the representation of the autobiography through the prism of the consciousness of the individual *self* in written form, we find the author's circumspection towards the opinions of the representatives of structuralism, poststructuralism, deconstructivism, regarding the autobiographical text. Jacques Derrida, Michel Foucault, Jacques Lacan and Roland Barthes are concerned with researching the text as the only plausible object of study. In response to the proclamation of the autobiography's death (mirroring, of course, Roland Barthes's 1968 announcement of the *author's death*), James Olney chose to save the autobiographical text or, more specifically, the *self* from the modern critic (Olney, 1981, p. 22), the study of autobiography lasting only as long as the *subject* exists. In disagreement with James Olney is Philippe Lejeune, who is not concerned with the psychological substratum of autobiography, but rather with the *contractual pact* between the author and the reader (Lejeune, 1989, pp. 3-30), with the *convention of authenticity*, made by this contractual relationship, with the imaginary presence of an autobiographical subject, who animates and gives to the autobiography the presumed meaning and vigor, emphasizing the convention of the autobiographical narrative. The convention of authenticity is revealed in the autobiographer's effort to record the *self* or the *truth* about the self through the autobiographical narrative, that indisputable investment in the capacity of the *truth* of the text, in the relationship of credibility and sincerity between the author and the reader. Therefore, not only the authenticity of the text but also the life, the relationship of the author and the reader with this *authentic life* is outlined, the reader playing the role of an expert in verifying the authenticity of the narration, insofar as the contractual agreement between the author of the text and the author from the text that bears his name is abided by or not. The reader of an autobiographical text must insist on the authenticity and identity of the author of the text and the author from the text, because only here the reader can discover his own authenticity. Insisting upon an individual *self* behind an "autobiographical self" reveals, in fact, the authentic individual *self* of the reader. Philippe Lejeune puts autobiographical criticism in the service of differentiating *authentic* creatures and fictions of the *self*. A different approach is illustrated by Paul de Man (1979), who does not present the existential phenomenological subject behind a text to convey the truth, the truth of an *authentic self* that has lived, reflected, and wrote about his life. For the author, the point of articulation of the autobiography is the aspect (face) or the conferment of a face in writing, the moment of the specular substitution between the subjects of the autobiography, since it "veils a defacement of the mind of which it is itself the cause" (de Man, 1979, p. 930). Thus, autobiography consists of the unsuccessful attempt to

find or locate the *self*, i.e., the referent of language. Being absorbed by the desire to identify the authentic substratum of memories, we find that the reality revealed by any autobiographical text is reflected in the author's impulse to confess in writing, despite the uncertainty about the ability of memories to rigorously represent the authentic experience of the authorial self. If there is a belief in an authentic representation of the *self*, it becomes imperative to draw the distinction between memory and fiction, which abolishes the possibility of the existence of a *self* detached from history, from authentic existence. How do we differentiate the *authentic* from the *fictional self*? Inevitably, if the reader is convinced of the authenticity of an individual's self that is not just a product of the author's imagination, but one with a life congruent or heterogeneous with his, then this belief is, in fact, the foundation of an authentic narrative. If the reader is convinced that an author is able to convey the truth and essence of the *self* through autobiographical narration, then he will experience the revelation of de-facing this self through the authenticity of the text. The biographical text, contaminated with fiction, is usually vehemently accused of knowingly misleading its readers. Therefore, the critics rely not only on the text itself, but also on its transcendental evaluation that supports the truth and the proper meaning of the text. Thus, the reader is mandated to meticulously monitor the boundaries between autobiography and fiction, in order to be accurate to his own truth.

In conclusion, we can say that the writer seeks in the literature of confessions a liberation of the *self* through the cathartic function of confession, as "the self expresses itself by the metaphors it creates and projects, and we know it by those metaphors; but it did not exist as it now does and as it now is before creating its metaphors. We do not see or touch the self, but we do see and touch its metaphors: and thus we «know» the self, activity or agent, represented in the metaphor and the metaphorizing" (Olney, 1972, pp. 30, 31, 34).

In this context, we also refer to Michel Foucault's relevant project on the truth and act of confession. In opposition to James Olney, Michel Foucault argues that the truth does not provide information and access to the individual who records an autobiography. All the less this truth is the key to an authentic self. Only confession, the act of enunciating the truth, the confession itself, reconstitutes the individual as such. In the context of modernity, truth is not a pre-established immutable mystery, but must be approached in a framework of secularization, which is extracted from within the individual. In this way, only the individual has access to own *genuine* truth. Through confession, the truth is externalized and certified, the individual being able to authenticate, in Michel Foucault's terms, through a discourse of truth [Foucault, 1978, p. 58], regarding the authentic *self*. There is no doubt that the rhetorical procedures used by the author in the act of writing certify the nar-

rator's life experience, facilitating the transposition into writing of an authentic live *self*, after textualization. The authenticity of Alexei Marinat's memoir is reinforced by the writer's aspiration to record, as faithfully as possible, his own experience in the name of a moral pact with the past and the present.

References

- Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* (C. Emerson & M. Holquist Trans.) University of Texas Press.
- Boldrini, L. (2012). *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction.* Routledge.
- Bratu, S. (1974). De la Sainte-Beuve la noua critică [From Sainte-Beuve to the new critique]. Univers.
- Bruss, E. (1976). *Autobiographical Acts: The Changing Situation of a Literary Genre.* The John Hopkins University Press.
- Cohn, D. (1999). *The Distinction of Fiction.* The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- De Man, P. (1979). Autobiography as De-facement. In *MLN. Comparative Literature* (vol. 94, no. 5). (pp. 919-930). The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Eakin, P. (1999). *How Our Lives Become Stories: Making Selves.* Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction.* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Golomb, J. (1995). *In search of authenticity. From Kierkegaard to Camus.* Routledge.
- Gusdorf, G. (1980). Conditions and Limits of Autobiography. In J. Olney (Ed.), *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical* (pp. 28-48). (J. Olney, Trans.). Princeton University Press.
- Kernis, M., Goldman H., Brian M. (2006). A Multicomponent Conceptualization of Authenticity: Theory and Research. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology.* (Vol. 38). (pp. 283-357). Elsevier Academic Press.
- Lejeune, P. (1989). *On Autobiography.* (K. Leary, Trans.). University of Minnesota Press.
- Loesberg, J. (2008). Autobiography as genre, act of consciousness, text. *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism*, 4, 169-185. Routledge.
- Olney, J. (1981). *Autobiography, Essays Theoretical and Critical.* Princeton University Press.
- Olney, J. (1972). *Metaphors of Self: The Meaning of Autobiography.* Princeton University Press.
- Smith, S., & Watson, J. (2010). *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpreting Life Narratives.* University of Minnesota Press.
- Trilling, L. (1972). *Sincerity and authenticity.* Harvard University Press.

"ULYSSES": STUDIES OF THE NOVEL AS THE MODERN INTERPRETATION OF "ODYSSEY"

Victoria BARBUN

Assistant Professor, Ph. D.

(Alecru Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

bologanviktoria@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6761-8898>

Abstract

The article deals with the stylistic aspects of James Joyce's novel "Ulysses" as a model of modernistic techniques. We compare Homer's "Odyssey" with the novel "Ulysses", detecting some common features and some discrepancies between them. For an overall approach to the phenomenon of Joyce's style we review it in the context of the processes that were specific to its time, taking into account: (a) the history, (b) the relations with the classical literature, (c) the partnership with psychology, philosophy and some linguistics directions. We use S. Gilbert's scheme for a complete vision upon J. Joyce's work as well.

Keywords: James Joyce, "Ulysses", "Odyssey", style, techniques, modernism, postmodernism, stream-of-consciousness

Rezumat

În articol, supunem analizei caracteristicile stilistice ale limbajului lui James Joyce. Cercetarea trăsăturilor stilului lui Joyce se realizează pe baza romanului "Ulise". Comparăm "Odiseea" lui Homer cu "Ulise", identificând caracteristici comune și particulare. Stilul lui Joyce este descris în contextul proceselor specifice timpului său, luând în considerare: (a) evenimentele istorice din acea perioadă, (b) relațiile acestei lucrări cu literatura clasică, (c) aspectele psihologice și filosofice ale cercetării și unele direcții lingvistice. În prezentarea unei viziuni complete asupra lucrării lui J. Joyce, se aplică schema lui S. Gilbert.

Cuvinte-cheie: James Joyce, "Ulise", "Odiseea", stil, caracteristici, modernism, postmodernism, flux al conștiinței

Introduction

The literary impact of the Irish writer James Joyce has a great importance for the progress of modernism. He identified new targets for the development of literature for many decades ahead. The question of studying the literary manner of the writer under consideration engaged such researchers as S. Gilbert, M. and R. Kain, Fr. Moretti, V. Nabokov.

The relevance of the chosen theme is determined by the fact that J. Joyce's literary works with their peculiarities refer not only to the era of modernism, but to that of postmodernism too, being closer to the modern man of the twenty-first century. For instance, modern filmmakers such as J.-P. Jeunet ("Amelie", 2001) and T. Tykwer directed ("Run Lola Run", 2003) still build their movies on the principles, J. Joyce developed in his works. "I have repeatedly appealed to the books of Joyce before removing the picture", replied J.-P. Jeunet at Oscar film awards (Jeunet, *Adwards*).

The scientific and practical significance of this article lies in the fact that its materials can be used in lecture courses on stylistics and History of Foreign literature of the modernism period.

According to most researchers of the XXth century, J. Joyce's writing style was unique, so he stood apart from his contemporaries and he rightfully earned the name of "The Colossus of Modern Fiction" (Joyce, *Encyclopedia*).

It is known that J. Joyce is an Irish novelist who was very prolific in his work - in 16 years he wrote several essays, some plays, lyric poems (which he began to write at the age of six). The author experimented with language, plot, and characterization. He was concerned with the inner reality, the psychological reactions people have to their surroundings. Through jokes, puns, and coined words, he presented a dreamlike world of human history and unconscious. His early writing is simple and easy to understand, and then it gradually becomes more complex as he experimented with the possibilities of language. "Be prepared to extend the range of your vocabulary, to discover prose blended with poetry, and to encounter amazingly inventive word-play in the later work", noted V. Nabokov (*James Joyce greatest works*).

While exploring the phenomenon of Joyce's style we can notice that it related not only to art but also to science, philosophy and psychology. The earlier modernists were not only poets or prose writers, but even scientists and philosophers. We cannot imagine the modernist art without influential works of S. Freud, C. Jung, A. Einstein, F. de Saussure and L. Wittgenstein. The American psychologist W. James had also a huge impact on the development of basic modernistic techniques, introducing the term "stream-of-consciousness", a technique that had been later widely used by the modernists. W. James considered the consciousness as a stream or a river, where all the human thoughts, feelings, emotions and associations intertwine in strange ways, as in a dream (Руднев/Rudnev, 1997, p. 102). The visions of the world are seen as flowing, hardly ever noticed as a quick change of impressions. The stream of the torn reality which we see as the picture of the world gets distorted, while producing human consciousness. Every living being uses his own memory, which is fragmentary and from each broken pieces he tries to build up his own vision of life.

For many readers Joyce's name is forever associated with the technique of stream-of-consciousness, with the first consistent use of the principle of inner monologue. Using this technique, he ignored ordinary sentence structure. But we cannot say that he was an innovator in this area. In the realistic literature of the XIXth century this technique was already used, for example, by L. N. Tolstoj in the scene of Anna Karenina's travel before her suicide:

"We all want what is sweet and nice. If not a sweetmeats, then a dirty ice. And Kitty's the same way: if not Vronskij, then Levin. And she envies me, and hates me. And we all hate each other. I Kitty, Kitty me. Eyes, that's the truth. Tjutkin, coiffeur ... Je me fais coiffer par Tjutkin" (Tolstoj, L. N. *Anna Karenina*. Chapter 29).

Notwithstanding the merit of the Irish writer is that he gave to this literary method a new gage, making it the basis of the narration in his novels, thus he revealed all features incorporated in an internal monologue, and used them with brilliance. Due to this technique of stream-of-consciousness the reader comes to know much more about J. Joyce's characters. He understands them closely and becomes aware of their intimate world. The stream-of-consciousness technique allows J. Joyce to convey not only the thoughts of his characters, but he also can reach some new steps of psychological truth when he shows the interferences in a human mind activity, its associativeness and the role of external impressions. In the morning when the characters' consciousness is clear and is not full of impressions of the day, they can think quite clearly, shown by complete sentences, relatively logical. As the day progresses, their consciousness becomes more and more fatigued, there is less and less formal logics in it and more individual ways of seeing the world. There is no logical development of the text in this technique. The links between cause and effect can be deliberately torn or be mixed in such a way, that the text can be perceived with a maximal difficulty. The best example of such an aspect of this technique can be seen in the famous Molly's inner monologue written on forty-five pages at the end of the novel, without any punctuation mark: "O that awful deepdown torrent O and the sea the sea crimson sometimes like fire and the glorious sunsets and the figtrees in the Alameda gardens yes and all the queer little streets and pink and blue and yellow houses and the rosegardens and the jessamine and geraniums and cactuses and Gibraltar as a girl where I was a Flower of the mountain yes when I put the rose in my hair like the Andalusian girls used or shall I wear a red yes and how he kissed me under the Moorish wall and I thought well as well him as another and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down Jo me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes" (Joyce, *Encyclopedia*). From this passage we can conclude that the woman becomes asleep; her consciousness gives flashes of the day's cares, she remembers her life with parents and her different lovers. These pages convey very intimate details and that is why J. Joyce's book was not allowed to be published in England, in 1922.

Besides the stream-of-consciousness, J. Joyce's manner of writing includes characteristics such as discontinuous narrative, allusions, minimal plot development, disjointed timelines, open form, mundane subject matter and irony. Let us review more narrowly the peculiarities of J. Joyce's irony, as it is another important way used by the writer to characterize the outside world. Thus, any text becomes new when J. Joyce makes a parody of it. It may be a saint's work or a scientific article – J. Joyce applies the same me-

thod to invent other works. This may be explained by the fact that the principal notion of modernism style is "carnivalization". As it is known from the World History, a carnival is a syncretic show of ritualic character that takes place on a square. For such an event people make use of profanation, buffoonery, that is they play with the fixed canons in an ironic way. Modernist aesthetics gets a humorous attitude to any text, as well as a familiar contact, taboo vocabulary, the change of poles (the clown becomes a king and vice versa). The style, the languages and the mentality of different peoples get mixed in modernism, especially in J. Joyce's works.

One more feature of this author's peculiar style is "simulacrum", a copy of copies that is no original version of document. J. Joyce makes commentaries based on invented facts as if they were true. He refers to names, toponyms, dates and events that have never existed (Massumi, *Realer...*, p. 22). For example, in the first episode of "Ulysses" a cracked mirror of a maid is an allusion to the famous paradoxical reasoning of Oscar Wilde that "Life imitates art", published in the essay, "The destruction of Lies", while J. Joyce refers to the fictional person Mathis de Grenua.

J. Joyce's text is also founded on a play with the reader; this is made with the help of a sudden beginning or a climax so as to cheat the reader. The text may take the form of a charade where the writer hid a word. In "Ulysses" J. Joyce uses the language of flowers. We need to know the flowers' symbolism to understand such a textual message: "He tore the flower gravely from its pinhole smelt it's almost no smell and placed it in his heart pocket. Language of flowers. They like it because no-one can hear. Or a poison bouquet to strike him down. Then, walking slowly forward, he read the letter again, murmuring here and there a word. Angry tulips with you darling manflower punish your cactus if you don't please poor forgetmenot how I long violets to dear roses when we soon anemone meet all naughty nightstalk wife Martha's perfume" (*idem*).

J. Joyce's literary style is also characterized by genotext, a term coined by J. Kristeva in "Semiotics" (1969) which later received more detailed study in her doctoral dissertation "The Revolution of poetic language" (1974). *Genotext* is an illusion of a spontaneous birth of the text, as if the book were created while the reader reads: "Let's begin talking about a tree, which is not a tree at all, but it grows and gives shade, although this... Oops, no, I wanted to say about something else, I've just remembered where Stephen is now" (*ibidem*).

Lack of morality is another aspect of the Irish writer's literary style. In all J. Joyce's works, there is no homily and didacticism. This is the reader's understanding. He does not tell the reader what to think, rather they are left to come to their own conclusions; this is evident when contrasted with the moral judgments displayed by earlier writers such as Charles Dickens. Once

J. Joyce said about his work "Ulysses": "The pity is the public will demand and find a moral in my book – or worse they may take it in some serious way, and on the honor of a gentleman, there is not one single serious line in it" (Joyce, *Ulysses*).

The writer of modernism did not stop only at these stylistic breakthroughs; he also discovered some other basic principles, characterizing the novel of his time. Among these are the following:

Illusion and Reality

The text is focused on the play that shows both an imaginary world and a real world, the later being much inflected by myths. So, in this way when the reader gets involved in this play he can no longer distinguish between illusion and reality. Such a trend can be noticed in the XVth episode "Circe" of novel "Ulysses", written in a quasi-realistic style, where it remains unclear if Leopold Bloom's contract with the devil (in the maid's form) has a purely clinical nature or reality actually includes a fantastic element. Such a technique was first presented in "The Queen of Spades" by A. Puškin, who went one step forward of his literary epoch. Here, the reader cannot understand if Herman got really crazy in the middle of the narration or it was a real fact that the ghost of the dead countess told him the three cards.

The Priority of Style over the Plot

For a twentieth century masterpiece it is important *how* things are told, and not *what* is depicted. The style gets linked to the narration and finally it overcomes the plot. It is very difficult to retell the story of the novel, because the writers' attention goes to the style but not to the plot. Style becomes an important driving force of the novel, which gradually merges with the plot. It is meaningless to retell the work, as we have to talk about the authors' stylistic devices instead of actions, which are almost absent in the book. For instance, in the course of writing the novel "Ulysses", however, J. Joyce largely abandoned the technique of stream-of-consciousness and replaced it with a vast array of styles, so that the reader's attention is directed as much to Joyce's use of a variety of literary devices as to the events he describes. The priority of style over the plot generates the following principle of author's style – *destruction of the fable*.

Speaking on the prose of the nineteenth century, we can say that the plot and fable were different. In the twentieth century prose, action runs forward and describes the background of the hero. In Joyce's novel, it is impossible to restore the chronological order of events, as modernists understood time in a non-classical and non-linear way.

Neomythologism

This principle is the basic method that determined all the other stylistic techniques. The writer got oriented towards archaic mythology, he viewed

life cyclically. The modernist work is presented as a collage of quotations and allusions from some mythological works. Let's compare the novel "Ulysses" with Homer's "Odyssey", detecting some common features and some discrepancies.

The Novel "Ulysses" as a Modern Interpretation of "Odyssey"

J. Joyce's intention of writing "Ulysses" is to see everything in everything. He presents one simple day in the form of an epic narration about the history of Dublin, one of the most ancient European capitals. The main action takes place in the personage's consciousness, where time and space get a universal character: everything happens at the same time and everything mixes up. That is why J. Joyce chose the myth form, as it provides modernists with a point of departure; it is the way of overcoming a torn reality. As well, the novel is not just a mythological story about Odysseus, but it is also a mixture of Christian myths from the European history. Thus, Leopold Bloom can be seen as Dante's Virgil, as Christ, and as Shakespeare; Stephen can be interpreted as Thomas Aquinas and Hamlet, in some episodes of the book.

The action of the novel takes place during one day; on April 16, 1904 (this is the day when J. Joyce met his future wife Nora Barnacle). The actions of the main characters are described in lots of details, their thoughts and feelings are drawn thoroughly, from the moment when they wake up till they go to bed. The novel focuses on the lives of numerous characters but concentrates on three in particular: Leopold Bloom is an advertising agent in his late thirties, who spends his day in a complete routine; Molly Bloom, Leopold's wife, a concert singer, has a date with her lover; Stephen Dedalus, the now twenty-two-year-old protagonist of J. Joyce's earlier novel "A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man", both a scientist and a poet, who has a special bend towards metaphysics, delivers some lessons at school in the morning, then goes to the library and in the evening he goes to a local pub. There he meets Leopold Bloom, who invites him home and there they continue their discussion.

It is important to touch upon that all three characters of the novel have their own prototypes in the myth about Odysseus. J. Joyce appeals to the image of Homer's major character while describing Leopold Bloom, Penelope resembles for Bloom's wife Molly or Marion, and Telemachus is very close to Stephen Dedalus.

However, even if we can draw some parallels between characters in both these works, there are some features that do not coincide. Many aspects of Joyce's masterpiece, directly oppose to the events described in the Homer's "Odyssey". For instance, an epic poem takes a long time and covers much space, as the ruler of Ithaca travelled a lot, while the events in "Ulysses" are depicted during one day.

The second distinction is that J. Joyce transfers the focus from the collective themes and values to the individual and concrete ones. While Odysseus is a ruler, whom the Trojan War separated from his motherland, Leopold Bloom is only a husband, whom his wife's love affair separated from his home.

It is of interest to note that there are some vivid differences in the character's attitudes. Odysseus is strong, brave, decisive, unlike Leopold Bloom, who is indecisive, coward and weak; Telemachus remains faithful to his mother, while Stephen Dedalus practically betrays his mother, when she died he refused to accomplish her wish; Penelope is devoted to Odysseus for twenty years, while Molly has a love affair every day; Homer's sirens are cruel and dangerous, while J. Joyce's sirens Miss Kennedy and Miss Douce are melancholic and harmless. In other words, the dynamic actions from "Odyssey" are opposed to the passive actions of "Ulysses". While Homer reflects many complex outside actions and a few simple inner feelings, J. Joyce uses simple outside actions as a background for complex and mixed inner feelings.

American critics accused J. Joyce for such an ironic attitude to the classical model: "Joyce's talent is in the comic and shameless comparisons between the ancient Greek hero, and miserable Bloom", noted Declan Kilberd in Princeton University Press (*Joyce quotes on...*). We can disagree with D. Kilberd's opinion, because "Ulysses" is not only a comic text; Leopold Bloom, who appears merely comic at the beginning of the novel, seems to become more heroic, more like Odysseus, as the narrative progresses. The life of this character unfolds before the readers, who observe his tragedies, his unfortunate circumstances, his hopes and ambitions, his heart break and attempt at recovery. For a more thorough discussion of J. Joyce's major motives we can refer to V. Nabokov's "Comments on "Ulysses"". V. Nabokov noted, "Stephen's key leitmotifs, that go through the entire novel – his mother's death, a break with his family, a break with Catholicism, leaving the tower Martello, leaving the Irish and exile. Bloom's keynotes – Molly's infidelity, sad past, his father's suicide, his son's death. Both L. Bloom and S. Dedalus linked by internal misfortunes, and throughout the novel their meet is preparing as a meeting of father and son" (Набоков/Nabokov, 2000, p. 391). Most likely J. Joyce did not blindly imitate the ancient work, but he created a remarkable individual masterpiece. The novel "Ulysses" is an odyssey of people's mind, intellect and life feelings: "The human mind is a huge unlimited space, comprising both the paradise and the hell, Scylla and Charybdis, it may hide traps and self-deceiving, compassion and woes" (Joyce, J. *Ulysses*). Certainly the novel itself proves the truth of the author's words.

For the readers, "Ulysses" is in the top of the world's most difficult works, because the author wrote it in an entirely new, innovative style, experimenting with language. This brilliant work is an encoded message for the readers. First of all, the extreme rationalizing of its structure, the tho-

rough choice of every word. As J. Joyce’s literary style comprised all of the modernistic features mentioned before, we can understand why his novel “Ulysses” is so difficult for interpretation. The author had “put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant, which would earn the novel “immortality” (Budgen, 1972, p. 21). This idea can be met in any research work on this novel, but we think that comments of the american writer J. Green on “Ulysses” illustrated the most eloquently this view: “Reading this book I can not overcome more than three or four pages at a time. And a deal of it seems to me like a bad boy writing what he considers naughty words with chalk on a fence” (Green, 2004, p. 32). It is easy to guess that this novel requires a trained reader who has a literary basis, who can overcome not only more than three or four pages at a time, but who can revise the text several times. In order to make the novel easier to understand, J. Joyce contributed to the creation of Stuart Gilbert’s book “A Guide through the novel “Ulysses” (Gilbert, *Schema for Ulysses*); where J. Joyce deciphered some of the meanings of some extracts of his literary creation. In spite of these hints the critics haven’t yet understood all the riddles. Mystery remains one of the pleasures that intellectual readers enjoy, they see the novel as a rebus that can never be deciphered.

We will use the scheme proposed by S. Gilbert for a more detailed study (see Illustration 1). Let us first of all look at the basic intention of the novel and its final principle, its connection to the “Odyssey”. And the most interesting episodes of the novel will get our particular attention.

Title	Odyssey	Technique
Part I. Telemahida	Part I	Part I
1. Telemachus	Songs I, II	Narrative (young)
2. Nestor	Song III	Catechism (personal)
3. Proteus	Song IV	Monologue (male)
Part II. The Odyssey		
4. Calypso	Song V	Narrative (mature)
5. Lotus Eaters	Song IX	Narcissism
6. Hades	Song XI	In cubism
7. Aeolus	Song X	Enthymeme
8. Lestrygonians	Song X	Peristaltic
9. Scylla and Charybdis	Song XII	Dialectic
10. Wandering Rocks	Song XII	Labyrinth
11. Sirens	Song XII	Fupa per canon
12. Cyclops	Song IX	Gigantism
13. Nausicca	Song VI	Tumescence
14. Oxen of the Sun	Song XII	Embryonic development
15. Circe	Song X	Hallucination
Part III. The Return of Ulysses	Part III	Part III
16. Eumaeus	Song XVI	Narrative (old)
17. Ithaca	Song XVII-XXI	Catechism (impersonal)
18. Penelope	Song XXIII	Monologue (female)

Illustration 1: Gilbert schema for “Ulysses”

The first episode "Telemachus" links relatively with the introductory Songs I, II from "Odyssey". The main character Stephen needs to leave the house as Telemachus had done. In the next chapters the novel shows that the fact that Stephen had no real father made him indecisive and gave him a pessimistic view over life. Buck Mulligan, a boisterous medical student, a false friend who envies Stephen can be seen as Antinous, the most aggressive and rude of Penelope's fiancés, Telemachus' the main offender.

Episode III, Proteus

In the IV Song Homer depicts the scene in which Telemachus visited the Spartan king Menelaus who told him about his father's meeting with Proteus. Proteus is an early sea-god, one of several deities whom Homer calls the "Old Man of the Sea" (Goldman & Taxidoe, 1998, p. 78). He can foretell the future and change his shape. At the same time, J. Joyce describes Stephen's walk on the seashore. J. Joyce's main attention goes to the changeable sea. The symbolical leitmotif here is a transformation, fluxes. Everything seen is due to metamorphosis: the dog becomes a hare, then a deer, a bear, a wolf, a calf, a panther, leopard; the stick becomes a staff and a rod. So, here Proteus serves as Stephen's intellect.

Episode V, Lotus Eaters

Lotus Eaters also referred to as the lotophagi, were a race of people dominated by lotus plants. The primary food for this people was fruit of lotus, which caused the people to sleep in peaceful dream. This episode corresponds to one of Odysseus adventures that had happened before his stay at Calypso. This correspondence has an allegoric character in J. Joyce's "Ulysses", as Lotus eaters are those who like this flower which gets a man into some hypnotic state. J. Joyce points to a huge number of such people: soldiers, become hypnotized by form and strict order, priests at the church and L. Bloom who takes a bath gets into such a state, too. It can be also noticed that the author uses the flower motif for describing Bloom's dreams about Ceylon, the flower from Martha's letter, the flower language. It is deliberately intended by J. Joyce that the episode abounds in smells and odours. This episode has the geometrical shape of a circle and that is the lotus contour.

Episode IX, Scylla and Charybdis

Scylla and Charybdis are mythical sea monsters mentioned by Homer; According to him, Odysseus was forced to choose which monster to confront while passing through the strait; he opted to pass by Scylla and lose only a few sailors, rather than risk the loss of his entire ship in the whirlpool. But the central point in J. Joyce work is a discussion about Shakespeare's "Hamlet". Stephen fights against the cultural elite from Dublin, explaining to various scholars his biographical theory of the works of Shakespeare,

which he claims are based largely on adultery of Shakespeare's wife. It is easy to observe that no agents and no narrative details should be compared to Homer's "Odyssey". Scylla and Charybdis constitute a phraseological expression, idiom (the equivalent of the English phrase, "Between a rock and a hard place"), it shows in a symbolic way that mind has its own contradictions', that the arguments are dangerous, that Aristotle's and Plato's aesthetics are opposed, that indecisiveness should be overcome by an artist.

Episode XI, Sirens

According to Homer, sirens were three dangerous bird-women, who lured nearby sailors with their enchanting music and voices to shipwreck on the rocky coast of their island. Here Homer's correspondents with "Ulysses" are literal and not symbolic: a mermaid on a cigarette advertisement, the ocean-colored bar, the charming sirens are the barmaids; and it turns out that these siren's charm is just a physical beauty, while siren's charm in "Odyssey" is a sweet and disastrous singing. But such an opinion can not be viewed as a truth, because, the text abounds in stanzas from ballads, arias and ditties. Titles of operas, singers' and composers' names flash here too. This is the most sound abundant episode from "Ulysses": we can follow his Staccato effect – a shortened fast sounding (*You? I. Want. That*), glissando – a glide smooth from one sound to another (*Clapclap. Clipclap. Clappyclap*), fermatas – a stop or a postponement of a sound (*Rrrpr. Kraa. Kraandl*). It is worth mentioning that J. Joyce lowers his notes according to the social level of his character: "Ben Dollard, baschatermon. One more chap, who broke down. And he once was a big provider for sea business. Dollard, murmured tankard: Tram. Kran, kran, kran. Good oppor. Coming. Krاندlkrankran. I'm sure it's the burgund. Yes. One, two. Let my epitaph be. Karaaaaaaa. Written. I have" (Joyce, *Encyclopedia*).

Episode XII, Cyclops

The parody technique "gigantism" used by J. Joyce in this episode is well-known: this is hyperbole, one of the usual devices of the comical style. This trait is manifested in comical lists and enumerations; and this technique has been used before J. Joyce, but such enumerations have never been so long. For instance the writer mentions nineteen admiral titles, sixty-eight saints, ninety heroes and heroines of Ireland; here the cyclopic manner is developed through an artistic form.

It is evident how the classic model of "Odyssey" embodies in the J. Joyce's novel. Undoubtedly, "Ulysses" implements this model, what the scheme demonstrates clearly. It tells the readers about a long travelling and turning home. However, the dangerous motif of wanderings is transferred into irony and play, having lost its original meaning of personality's examination in the border situation; instead of the extremely exclusive events, the content of modern "Odyssey" becomes the daily maximum. The ending of

“Odyssey”, “Ithaca”, – is such a place in the novel where “Ulysses” and “Telemachus” do not come together and break up. The same thing is true regarding “Penelope”, whose name has traditionally been associated with marital faithfulness in the World Culture. From the facts mentioned above, we can draw the conclusion that J. Joyce’s tendency for inversion of all traditional schemes and paradigms are vividly seen in his novel “Ulysses”.

Conclusions

Based on the results of the present study, we can say that the main peculiarities of J. Joyce’s literary style are:

- using the stream-of-consciousness technique;
- ignoring the fixed order of words, the destruction of syntax;
- discontinuous narrative;
- using other books as a platform for his own books;
- the lack of traditional dramatic resolution within the stories;
- parodies of other writing styles within one text;
- allusions, irony;
- a minimal plot development;
- text as “simulacrum”;
- text as “genotext”;
- a play with the reader (intertext and hypertext);
- lack of morality;
- disjointed timelines;
- mundane subject matter.

The analysis of J. Joyce’s stylistic techniques can help us understand some other works written by modernist writers. This novel widens our knowledge about other literary works of the past because of its abundance in allusions. The Novel “Ulysses” includes basic principles that made modernism a unique trend in the history of literature. This work contributes to the understanding of the major role that modernism played as a literary movement in contemporary culture.

References

Budgen, F. (1972). *James Joyce and the Making of “Ulysses”, and Other Writings*. Oxford University Press.

Gilbert, S. *Schema for Ulysses*. <https://ru.scribd.com/document/367376597/Gilbert-Schema-for-Ulysses>.

Goldman, J., Taxidoe, O. (1998). *Modernism Anthology*. Edinburgh UP.

Green, J. (2004). *On “Ulysses”*. New World Library, 2004.

James Joyce greatest works. <https://mantex.co.uk/james-joyce-greatest-works>.

Jeunet, J.-P. *Awards*. <https://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000466/awards>.

Joyce quotes on... love, human nature, Ireland, religion, Ulysses, Bloom. <http://www>.

james-joyce.ru/bd/quotes.htm.

Joyce, J. *Encyclopedia* <https://www.encyclopedia.com/people/literature-and-arts/english-literature-20th-cent-present-biographies/james-joyce>.

Joyce, J. *Ulysses*. <https://www.bookfrom.net/james-joyce/page,88,34132-ulysses.html>.

Massumi, B. *Realer than Real: The Simulacrum According to Deleuze and Guattari*. http://www.anu.edu.au/hrc/first_and_last/works/realer.htm.

Tolstoj, L. N. *Anna Karenina*. Chapter 29. <https://www.weblitera.com/book/?id=15&lng=1&ch=218&l=ru>.

Набоков, В. Лекции по зарубежной литературе. *Независимая газета*, 2000. с. 367-464 / Nabokov, V. Lekcii po zarubežnoj literature. *Nezavisimaja gazeta*, 2000. pp. 367-464.

Руднев, В. (1997). *Словари культуры XX-го века*. Аграф / Rudnev V. (1997). *Slovari kul'tury XX-go века*. Agraf, 1997.

UDC 821.161.1.09-31"19"(092)Goncharov I. A.

[https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2020\(1\).06](https://doi.org/10.62413/lc.2020(1).06) | [Research Article Citations](#)

THE POLYSEMY OF SYMBOLS IN THE NOVEL "OBLOMOV" BY IVAN GONČAROV

Vladimir BRAJUC

Associate Professor, Ph. D.

(Alec Russo Balti State University, Republic of Moldova)

vladimir.brajuc@usarb.md, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6571-228X>

Abstract

The polysemy of the symbols "house", "path", "light" in the novel "Oblomov" by Ivan Gončarov is discussed in the article. The attention is focused on how these symbols help to reveal the images of the main characters in the novel: Il'ja Oblomov, Andrej Štol'c, Olga Il'inskaja, Agafia Pšenicyna.

Keywords: *image, symbol, home, way, light*

Rezumat

În articol, abordăm polisemia simbolurilor „casă”, „cale” și „lumină” în romanul lui Ivan Gončarov „Oblomov”. În cadrul cercetării, se acordă o atenție deosebită felului în care aceste simboluri ajută la dezoăluirea chipurilor personajelor centrale din roman: Ilia Oblomov, Andrei Shtoltz, Olga Ilinskaia, Agafia Pșenițina.

Cuvinte-cheie: *imagine, simbol, casă, cale, lumină*

We considered the problem of interpreting the image of Oblomov in the cultural, historical and literary aspects in our previous articles. We concluded that Oblomov is an integral artistic image, whose unambiguous interpretation leads to a simplification of the meaning of the novel (Brajuc, 2018a). We showed the unity of "type" and "character" in the structure of Oblomov's image. We explored the artistic devices that the author uses to create the image of the main character. We found that the dominant device in the novel is a multi-stage antithesis. We proved that the peculiarity of I. Gončarov's antithesis is that it does not convey total separation and difference, but it paradoxically expresses synthesis, unity (Brajuc, 2018b). We compared the image of Oblomov with the concepts of Russian culture and literature ("laziness" and "peace"), and we also compared his image with other characters in the novel (Andrej Štol'c, Olga Il'inskaja, Agafia Pšenicyna) (Brajuc, 2019a). We characterized the symbols "house", "path", "light" and we demonstrated their artistic role in the structure of Oblomov's image (Brajuc, 2019b).

The author also uses the symbols "house", "path" and "light" when describing the characters of the novel, when creating a figurative system, using lexemes included in the semantic fields of these names.

Štol'c's father mentally paved a rut for Andrei, a "path", but the son should not follow exactly the path that his father intended for him. According to Gončarov, the Russian university will make Štol'c the son not a philistine, but a doer:

"Since olden times, doers have been cast in five, six stereotypical forms, lazily, half-eyed looking around, put their hand to the public machine and moved it along *the usual rut* drowsily, *putting their foot* in the *trail* left by their predecessor. But the eyes woke up from drowsiness, *brisk wide steps*, lively voices were heard... How many Štol'c should appear under Russian names" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 171)!

As we can see, Štol'c's path, his life purpose is the antithesis of Oblomov's life path.

The father treats Andrej in the same way as his father, Andrej's grandfather, did to him, "letting go to all four sides":

" – ...*The lamp burns brightly, and there is a lot of oil in it. You are well educated: all the careers are open to you... Well, if you don't have the skill, if you can't suddenly find your own way, if you need to consult, ask – go to Reingold: he will teach you. ...He has a four-story house. I'll tell you the address... "Don't tell me", Andrej objected, "I'll go to him when I have a four-story house, and now I'll do without it..."* (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 165).

Štol'c wants to go his own way, he is confident that he can build a house. Štol'c's father compared his life to the burning of an icon-lamp, which burns brightly, and there is plenty of oil in it. It is no longer the image of Oblomov's sun, which is part of nature and which shines regardless of people. The lamp burns brightly because it contains oil. As I. Pyrkov noted, "...one of the light images of the novel concerning Štol'c the son bears, as we would say, a generic, family seal. This is an image of a burning lamp" (Пырко́в/Pyrkov, 2000). Štol'c prefers "the slow burning of fire".

The dominant in the symbolism of Štol'c's "path" is movement, running, and he is compared to a horse. The horse is a symbol of strength, speed, indefatigability. Štol'c manages both transactional and heart duties with dexterity, he knows how to notice the "curvature" in his path in order not to stumble and go properly Oblomov, on the other hand, thought that there was a stone on his way that prevented him from realizing in life. Štol'c does not have such stones, he does not doubt the correctness of his path:

"He went firmly, vivacity... It seems that he controlled both sorrows and joys... as with the steps of his feet... A simple, that is, *direct*, real outlook on life, that was his constant task, and, gradually reaching its solution, he understood the whole its difficulty and he was internally proud and happy whenever he happened to notice a curvature in his path and take a straight step... He felt the ground under his feet even among enthusiasm" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, pp. 167-169).

Despite the fact that in the description of Štol'c's life path, the verb "to leap" is frequent:

"...he said that" the normal purpose of a person is to live four seasons, that is, four ages, *without leaps* and carry the vessel of life to the last day, without spilling any one drop in vain, and *that an even and slow burning of fire is better than a fierce blaze*, no matter what poetry burns in them." ...And he kept going and going stubbornly along the chosen path" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 170).

Štol'c, unlike Oblomov, is able to follow the chosen path stubbornly, not relying on "chance" and "fate", hence the different perception of the "abyss"

by Oblomov and Štol'c. The abyss is impassable, irresistible for Oblomov. But any obstacle, any barrier is surmountable for Štol'c:

"There is no need to add that he went towards *his goal, bravely going through all obstacles*, and unless he gave up the task when a wall arose in his path or *an impenetrable abyss* opened. But he was not able to arm himself with the courage that, closing his eyes, *would leap over the abyss* or rush to the wall *at random*. He *will measure an abyss or a wall*, and if there is no sure means to overcome, he will go away, no matter what someone say about him" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 171).

When Štol'c says that they want to build a pier and build a highway in Verkhlyov, "so *Oblomovka will be not far from the main road*," Oblomov is horrified by this news, because the long road violates the holistic, closed world of solar eden of Oblomovka. Štol'c thinks that at last "the rays of the sun have fallen" on Oblomovka, that the "dawn of new happiness" is rising over her. This is in that Oblomovka, which, in the view of Il'ja Il'ič, is "all in shine, in the rays of sun...".

Štol'c is trying to bring Oblomov onto the "high road", where there is progress, civilization, movement. He constantly calls him abroad with him. Arriving at Oblomov, he does not listen to his objections, but demands "physical and mental gymnastic". Štol'c's life path is conveyed through the metaphor "on the move", that is, without stopping. He says to the distraught Oblomov:

"We will have lunch somewhere *on the move*, then we will go home at two, three, and... *On the way you will shave: I'll take you*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 177).

"Well, Il'ja, *hurry, hurry*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 179)!

Under the influence of his friend's speeches, youthful dreams and desires light up in Oblomov, he asks Štol'c to lead him wherever he wants:

"Give me your will and mind and *lead me* wherever you want. Perhaps I will follow you, but I *will not move alone*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 190).

Štol'c vows that he will take Oblomov first abroad, then to the village and help find a case for a friend, he says that he will not lag behind, everything will be decided now or never. Under the influence of Andrej's speeches, Oblomov is full of decisiveness. The question of the "path" for Oblomov becomes a Hamlet question:

"What should he do now?? *Go forward or stay?* This Oblomov's question was deeper than Hamlet's for him. *Going forward* means suddenly throwing off a wide robe not only from your shoulders, but also from your soul, from your mind... *What's the first thing to do?? ...To go abroad for six months, ...to go where everyone goes, by railroads, by steamers, ...to go to the fields, to go to elections, to a factory, to a mill, to a wharf. ...It means going forward...* And so the whole life! Farewell to the poetic ideal of life! *This is not life, but some kind of forge; there is eternal flame, chatter, heat, noise...* when to live? Wouldn't it be better to stay? *To stay* means *...to*

grow old peacefully in the apartment of Tarantiev's godmother... "Now or never!" "To be or not to be!" *Oblomov got up from the chair, but he was not immediately able to put on a shoe and sat down again*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, pp. 193-194).

Hamlet's suffering turns into a comic situation. Oblomov's path does not run where there are railways and steamships, where there is flame, chatter, heat, noise – all this is in the antithesis of the peace and sun of Oblomovka. The character's feet do not have time to get out on the Štol'c road, because they do not fall into the shoes. Oblomov's preparations for the journey proposed by Štol'c are also comical. The combination of "Oblomov and the Sea" sounds like an oxymoron, it does not fit into the mind of the reader, just as a travel coat and a travel bag are incompatible. The only thing that is associated with the image of Oblomov is a bag for provisions, but this already sounds like an oxymoron for Štol'c's "path".

Štol'c still managed to influence his friend to some extent and try to change his life path. He introduced him to Olga. Olga's image is also revealed through the symbolism of "path" and "light":

"...She, although unconsciously, *went a simple, natural path of life* and by a happy character, by a sound, not outwitted upbringing, *did not avoid* the natural manifestation of thought, feeling, will, even to the slightest, barely noticeable movement of eyes, lips, hands. Is it because, perhaps, she *went* so confidently along this *path*, that from time to time she heard nearby other, even more *confident steps* of the "friend" whom she believed, and measured *her step* with them" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 197).

"*Olga went* with her head bent slightly forward, so slender, nobly resting on her thin, proud neck; she moved with her whole body evenly, *striding lightly, almost imperceptibly*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 200).

Olga strides confidently in the same way as Štol'c, especially since he, like a loyal friend, tries to direct Olga's movements. And at the same time, her step is light, almost elusive. It is noteworthy that Olga, just like the main character, believes in fate, despite all her determination, intelligence and desire to build and change not only her life path, but also Oblomov's "path":

"I am waiting, looking only for happiness, and I believe that I have found it. If I am mistaken, if it is true that I will cry over my mistake, at least I feel here (she put her hand to her heart) that I am not to blame for it; it means that *fate didn't want it, God didn't give it*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 270).

The name Olga means "saint", "torch", her surname comes from the name Ilia, the name of the god of thunder. Olga's planet is the Moon, a source of light, one of the celestial luminaries deified by the Slavs (Ермолаева/ Ermolaeva, 2006, p. 21).

When the reader gets to know Olga, her "light" portrait is imperturbably calm, she was very glad when she met Štol'c:

"...although her eyes *did not sparkle*, her cheeks *did not glow with a blush*, but an *even, calm light spread* over her whole face and a smile appeared" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 196).

"Olga was not a beauty in the strict sense, that is, *she had neither whiteness, nor bright colors of her cheeks and lips, and her eyes did not shine with rays of inner fire...*", but at the same time the author points out that thin and compressed lips are "...a sign of a thought continuously directed at something, the same presence of a speaking thought *shone* in the sharp-sighted, always vigorous, never letting through the gaze of dark, gray-blue eyes" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 200).

Sharp light fluctuations (from burst to fading) form the basis of Olga's "light" portrait.

Driving around the houses of Petersburg with Štol'c, Oblomov feels:

"...how unhappy he is, how all good things perish from lack of participation, activity, how *faintly life flickers...*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 200).

But Oblomov transforms, begins to "burn", having come to Olga, his beloved sun appears:

"During lunch, Oblomov experienced the same torture as the day before, he chewed under her gaze, spoke, knowing, feeling that above him, *like the sun*, this gaze was standing, *burning* him, disturbing him, stirring his nerves, blood" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 201).

Something lit up inside Olga with the appearance of Oblomov, too:

"...a smile crawls over her face, then it *lights up her eyes*, then it *spills* over her cheeks, only her lips are compressed, as always" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 202).

For Oblomov, Olga's singing is like lightning, from which he "flashes", which destroys him:

"His heart was beating, his nerves were trembling, *his eyes sparkled* and flooded with tears from words, from sounds, from this pure, strong girlish voice. ...Oblomov *flared up*, exhausted, holding back tears with difficulty, and it was even more difficult for him to stifle a joyful cry, ready to escape from his soul ...*At that moment he would have gone even abroad, if he had only had to sit down and go.* In conclusion, she sang *Casta diva*: all the delights, thoughts in the head, rushing by *lightning*, trembling like needles running through the body – all this *destroyed* Oblomov: he was exhausted" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 204).

The author's irony in the words that Oblomov would even go abroad emphasizes the power of the influence of Olga's singing on the character. Oblomov sees only light and burning in Olga, she "flashes" from his words when he compliments her, as Oblomov "flashes" from her singing:

"My God, how pretty she is! There are such in the world! ...This *whiteness*, these eyes, where, as in the abyss, it is dark and at the same time something *shines...* it must be the soul! ...At the heart, right here, it seems to begin to *boil* and beat..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 207).

"Sing it! he said. –This is the compliment I've been waiting for! –she interrupted him, *flashing* joyfully" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 208).

"...Don't ask me to sing, I won't sing like that anymore... Wait, I'll sing one more..." she said, and immediately her face *flushed*, *her eyes lit up*, she sat down on

a chair, took two or three chords strongly and began to sing" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 209).

The experience of Olga's future love and passion and the experience of Oblomov's true love-passion are described in parallel, "light" lexemes reveal the reciprocity of feelings and the unity of experiences here: to glow, to sparkle, lightning, to flash, ray, fire, flash, to shine, dawn, brilliance:

"Her cheeks and ears *were red* with excitement; sometimes the play of *lightning* of the heart *flashed* on her fresh face, *a ray* of such ripe passion *flashed*, as if she was experiencing a distant future time of life in her heart, and suddenly, this *instantaneous ray extinguished* again, again the voice sounded fresh and silvery. And the same life played in Oblomov; it seemed to him that he was living and feeling all this – not an hour, not two, but for years... Both of them, motionless from the outside, *were bursting with inner fire*, trembling with the same trepidation; there were tears in their eyes, caused by the same mood. All these were symptoms of those passions that must, apparently, once play in her young soul, now still subject only to temporary, flying hints and *outbursts of dormant forces of life*. She ended with a long melodious chord, and *her voice was lost in him*. ...*The dawn* of the awakened, from the bottom of the soul of rebellious happiness *shone* on his face; a look filled with tears was fixed on her... *His eyes shine*, my God, there are tears in them! – ...This look was motionless, almost *insane*; it was *not Oblomov* who looked at them, *but passion*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 210).

И'ja И'ич and Olga's explanations and conversations take place on the move, they walk in the park, walk along the paths, Olga tries to bring Oblomov onto the road of life, where there is no sleep and peace, she wants to be a "guiding star" for Oblomov:

"She instantly weighed her power over him, and she liked this role of a *guiding star*, *a ray of light* that she would pour over a stagnant lake and she *would be reflected* in it" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 241).

"...But more and more often she *pushed him forward*, further, knowing that he *would not take a single step himself* and he *would remain motionless* where she left him" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 242).

The metaphor "guiding star" emphasizes the symbolism of "path" and "light" in Olga's image. Emotional and mental experiences, mood swings and inner excitement of the character are described using "light" metaphors:

"Her eyes suddenly opened wide and flashed with amazement" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 218).

"She changed in her face: two pink spots disappeared, and her eyes dim" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 218).

"...Her affectionate and curious look began to burn him again" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 219).

"...Then suddenly her face lit up with a ray of a smile..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 220).

At the same time, there was a "ray of thought", "sparks of the mind" in her gaze. Her face "lit up with consciousness". Gončarov uses a detailed simile to show the maturation of Olga Il'inskaja, comparing the soulful vigilance that came to her with the sun that illuminated the earth:

"Then her face was gradually filled with consciousness: *a ray of thought, guesswork made its way into every feature, and suddenly the whole face was illuminated with consciousness ...The sun also sometimes, coming out from behind a cloud, gradually illuminates one bush, another, the roof and suddenly floods the whole landscape with light*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 228).

Štol'c wanted the cheerful Olga Olga Il'inskaja to shake apathy and drowsiness from his friend:

" Štol'c thought that if the presence of a young, pretty, intelligent, lively and partly derisive woman was introduced into Oblomov's sleepy life, it would be like bringing *a lamp* into a gloomy room, from which *an even light*, a few degrees of heat, would spread in all dark corners, and the room will become more cheerful. That was the whole result that he achieved by introducing his friend to Olga. He did not foresee that he would bring in *fireworks*, and Olga and Oblomov did not anticipate that, even more so" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 233).

But there is no place for fireworks in Oblomov's dreams, he is afraid of insane passions leading to explosions, and expects a "quietly flickering ray of sympathy" from his chosen one:

"...And in twenty, thirty years he would have met in her eyes the same meek, quietly *flickering ray of sympathy* on his warm gaze. And so on to the grave!" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 212).

"He would run away from a woman in horror if she suddenly *burns* him with her eyes or moans herself, falls on his shoulder with her eyes closed, then wakes up and wraps her arms around his neck until he suffocates... This is *a firework, an explosion of a barrel of gunpowder*; and what's next? Stunned, blinded, and scorched hair!" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 213).

In Oblomov's dream, the "path", the "river" should be calm, without fireworks, as well as feelings:

"But isn't this the secret goal of everyone: to find the unchanging physiognomy of peace, the *eternal and even flow* of feeling in your friend? After all, this is the norm of love... ...To give passions a legal outcome, to indicate the order *of the flow, like a river*, for the good of the whole region" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 212).

Oblomov thinks that with the angel Olga, his dream of quiet and bright love will come true. But Olga's "river", her life and feeling, her "road" are not like the "quiet stream" in Oblomov's dream:

"This voice *will sound* someday, but *it will sound so strong*, it will burst out with such *a chord* that the whole world will stir up! Both the aunt and the baron will recognize, and there will be a rumble from this voice far away! That feeling will

not make its way as *quietly as a stream*, hiding in the grass, with a barely audible murmur" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 259).

Oblomov and Olga's love is combustion, fire, light. All their experiences, thoughts, doubts, joy, pain are conveyed by "light" metaphors and epithets, from bright glow to extinction:

"Happy, *radiant*, as if "with a month in the forehead", in the words of the nanny, he came home, sat down in the corner of the sofa and quickly drew the name "Olga" across the dust in large letters on the table" (Гончаров/Goncharov, 1981, p. 221). "The pride played in him, the life *began to shine*, its magic range, *all the colors and rays* that did not exist until recently" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 225).

"Suddenly his face *darkened*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 226).

"He's having fun, easy. It's so clear in nature. All People are kind, everyone enjoys; everyone has happiness on their faces" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 226).

"From the previous mistake he was only scared and ashamed, but now it is hard, awkward, cold, *sad at heart, as in wet, rainy weather*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 234).

"Perhaps that *spark* of participation, which he so carelessly extinguished at the very beginning, will completely disappear. It *was necessary to inflate it again*, quietly and carefully, but he definitely did not know how" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 241).

"...Sometimes a *glimpse* of feeling erupts from her, like *lightning*, like an unexpected whim, and then, suddenly, she concentrates again, withdraws into herself..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 242).

"...*The colors* started to *play* on the cheeks; thoughts moved; desires and will *flashed* in her eyes" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 245).

"She... read the book, and there were certainly lines with *sparks* of her mind in the book, here and there *the fire* of her feelings *flashed*..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 246).

"Now both day and night, every hour of morning and evening took its own image and was either full of *rainbow radiance*, or *colorless and gloomy*, depending on whether this hour was filled with Olga's presence or passed without her..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 247).

"He looked at her like *a burning glass*, and could not look away" (Гончаров/Goncharov, 1981, p. 249). "Oblomov's face was *blooming*, his eyes were filled *with rays*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 255).

The light and the sound, the light and the melody in various variations reflect the love of the characters:

"This is how the same motive played out between them in various variations. The Meetings, the conversations, it was all one *song, sounds, one light* that *burned brightly*, and only its *rays* were refracted and split into pink, green, yellow and

trembled in the atmosphere surrounding them. Every day and hour brought new *sounds* and *rays*, but *the light burned the same*, *the tune* sounded the same. Both he and she listened to these *sounds*, caught them and rushed to *sing*, which everyone heard in front of each other, not suspecting that other *sounds* would sound tomorrow, other *rays* would appear, and forgetting the next day that there was another *singing* yesterday. She dressed *the outpourings* of her heart in those colors that *burned* her imagination at the moment, and she believed that they were true to nature, and hurried in innocent and unconscious coquetry to appear in a beautiful headdress before the eyes of her friend. He believed even more in these *magical sounds*, in a *charming light* and hurried to appear before her fully armed with passion, to show her all *the brilliance* and all the power of *the fire* that devoured his soul" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, pp. 256-257).

In a fit of feelings, Olga and Oblomov do not think about the difference in their life positions, about the different paths they have to go, believing in the power of their love and in the opportunity to become happy. Oblomov wants the rays of Olga's light to live in him forever, and Olga dreams that from her "ray" Il'ja Il'ič would be revived to life:

"Oblomov, in essence, did not care whether Olga was Cordelia and whether she would have remained true to this image or she *would have gone a new path* and transformed into another vision, if only she would appear in the same *colors* and *rays* in which she lived in his heart, if only he was happy. And Olga did not ask if her passionate friend would lift her glove if she threw it into the lion's mouth, whether he would throw himself into *the abyss* for her, if only she saw the symptoms of this passion, if only he remained faithful to the ideal of a man, and, moreover, a man waking up through her to life, if only from *the ray* of her gaze, from her smile, *the fire* of cheerfulness *burned* in him and he would not cease to see in her the purpose of life. And therefore, in the flashed image of Cordelia, in *the fire* of Oblomov's passion, only one moment, one ephemeral breath of love, one morning, one whimsical pattern was reflected. And tomorrow, tomorrow something else *will shine*, maybe just as beautiful, but still different..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 257).

The image of Olga is always in front of Oblomov in the morning, day and night, but he would like to experience only the "warmth of love" and not feel anxious:

"...No, life *touches*, wherever you go, it *burns*! How many *new movements* and activities have suddenly been pushed into her! Love is a very difficult school of life!" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 248).

Oblomov does not imagine how it is possible to part with Olga, to leave to solve matters on his estate, he wants to be with her always. But one day he doubted whether Olga really loved him, whether it was a deception, how she could generally fall in love with him, for what. The author, with the help of "light" metaphors, conveys the inner state of the character. After Olga's confession of love, Oblomov returned home, watched the setting summer

sun with his eyes, without taking his eyes off the dawn, recalled Olga's "ray of gaze", thought only that the warmth and light would return tomorrow. But:

"Tomorrow morning Oblomov got up pale and *gloomy*; there were traces of insomnia on the face; the whole forehead was wrinkled; there was *no fire* in the eyes, no desires. ...The image of Olga was in front of him, but he was hovering as if in the distance, in a fog; *without rays*, as a stranger to him; he looked at him with a painful gaze and sighed" (Гончаров/Goncharov, 1981, p. 258).

"...And, it seems, yesterday he looked into Olga's soul and saw a *bright* world and a *bright* fate there, read his and her horoscope. What happened? ...It often happens to fall asleep in the summer on a quiet, cloudless evening, with twinkling *stars*, and think how good the field will be tomorrow with morning *light* colors! How fun it is to go deep into the thicket of the forest and hide from the heat! ...And suddenly you wake up from the sound of rain, from *gray* sad clouds; cold, damp..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 259).

"Isn't this a mistake?" suddenly flashed through his mind *like lightning*, and this *lightning* struck his heart and broke it. He groaned" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 259).

Oblomov thinks that in Olga's life there should appear a young happy man with a "fluttering spark" in his eyes, like Olga's, with a "bouncy gait" and with a "sonorous voice." Then Olga will "flare up", according to Oblomov. He believes that Olga's love burns with a "false light" due to the absence of "fire" (true love). Il'ja Il'ič writes a letter to Olga, in which his love with Olga is presented in dark colors, in the form of an abyss on their path of life:

"...I realized how quickly *my feet slide* only tonight: only yesterday I managed to look deeper into *the abyss* where *I am falling*, and *I decided to stop*. I talk only about myself – not out of selfishness, but because when I lie at the bottom of this *abyss*, you will all fly high, like a *pure angel*, and I don't know if you want to look into it. Listen, without any hint, I will tell you straight and simple: you do not and cannot love me" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 261).

"...Your present love is not true love, but future love; it is only an unconscious need to love, which, due to the lack of real food, in the absence of *fire*, burns with a *false*, non-heating *light*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 262).

When Oblomov "with animation" writes a letter, his eyes shine, his cheeks burn. He wants happiness for Olga and he is afraid to be a burden on her path, full of storms and movement. Oblomov awaits with trepidation Olga's reaction to the letter. Her tears, which he did not expect, "seemed to *burn* him, but in such a way that it made him feel *warm*, *not hot*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 267). Olga reproaches Oblomov for seeing only gloomy in the future, for not enjoying today's happiness and burning, for selfishness, for the fact that in words he rushes into the abyss, is ready to give his life, but he is afraid to live and to love in reality:

"Go", she said quietly, "where you *wanted to go*... *Lie* on your back again," she added later, "you won't be mistaken, *you won't fall into the abyss*"...Farewell, Il'ja Il'ič, and *be... at peace*; because your happiness lies in this" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 270).

Oblomov begs for forgiveness, says that now he is not afraid of anything and wants everything to return and be as before. He asks her for a branch of lilacs as a sign of reconciliation. To which Olga replies, " – Lilacs... *moved away*, disappeared! ...Look, what are left: faded! – *moved away, faded!* He repeated, looking at the lilacs. – *And the letter moved away!* he suddenly said" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 272). The symbols "path" and "light" coincided in one phrase: everything passed, moved away, faded. Oblomov wants everything to freeze and not change, but this is impossible. The pre-destination of their path is also expressed through the symbolism of flowers. N.F. Zolotnickij writes about lilacs, "In the east, where, as we know, lilacs originate, it serves as an emblem of sad parting, and therefore a person in love usually gives it to his beloved there only when they disperse or part forever" (Золотницкий/Zolotnitsky, 1994, p. 252). Choosing lilacs as an emblem, a symbol of love, the characters are unaware of it. Oblomov, who says: "...I do not like mignonette or roses, and he does not assume that he refuses those flowers that are symbols of love and love attraction, and he, together with Olga, prefers lilacs to them, which at the very beginning their relationship prophesies separation" (see Грачева/Gračeva, 1997).

Olga saw not only selfishness in Oblomov's letter, but "tenderness," "caution", "care for her", "fear for her happiness", "clear conscience", everything for which she loves Oblomov:

"She seemed to Oblomov in brilliance, in radiance, when she said this. Her eyes *shone with* such a triumph of love, a consciousness of her strength; there were two *pink* spots on her cheeks. And he, he was the reason for it! With the movement of his honest heart, he threw this *fire*, this game, this *brilliance* into her soul" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 275).

A "hot summer reigns" after Olga and Oblomov's explanation, only sometimes "clouds come and go". If Oblomov has difficult dreams and doubts knock at his heart, "Olga, like *an angel*, stands guard; she looks into his face with her *bright* eyes, finds out what is in his heart, and everything is quiet again, and the feeling *flows smoothly* again, *like a river*, with the reflection of new patterns in the sky. "The power of Olga's love is conveyed through a detailed metaphor: "It *burns* here..." she pointed to her chest... "Don't bother me, let me cry... *the fire will come out in tears*, it will be easier for me..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 282).

And constantly in Oblomov's dreams there is a house full of light and love:

"He rushed to write, to think, he even went to the architect. Soon the plan of the house and garden was located on a small table. It was a spacious family home with two balconies. "Here I am, here Olga is, here is a bedroom, a nursery... smiling, he thought" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 278).

"...Oblomovka, *bright* as a holiday, all in *shine*, in the sun's rays, with green hills, with a *silver* river swung open before him; *he walks with Olga* thoughtfully along a

long alley, holding her by the waist, sits in the gazebo, on the terrace..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 288).

The symbols of "home", "path" and "light" are always intertwined in the descriptions of the main characters, revealing the essence of artistic images.

Oblomov is worried about what other people will say about his relationship with Olga, he is afraid that they will not be able to fight the passion, which is like an abyss:

"Olga, you are young and do not know all the dangers. Sometimes a person is not in control of himself; some infernal power infiltrates him, darkness falls on his heart, and *lightning flashes in his eyes*. The clarity of the mind fades: respect for purity, for innocence, all this is carried away by the whirlwind; the person does not remember himself; passion breathes on him; he ceases to control himself, and then *an abyss opens under his feet*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 293).

Olga is not afraid of the abyss, she says: "Let it open!" Moreover, Olga does not see any lightning in Oblomov's eyes. Oblomov has a fever inside, he decides to make Olga a marriage proposal, but "what seemed so simple to him at home, naturally, necessary, smiled at him so much, which was his happiness, suddenly became some kind of *abyss*. He was afraid *to step* over it. He had to take a decisive, bold *step*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 296). Moreover, Olga teases him, "*The abyss opens up, the lightning flashes... be careful*" (Гончаров/Goncharov, 1981, p. 298)! Oblomov, having made a marriage proposal, expects from Olga not pride and firmness, but tears and passion, he would like Olga to follow him along his "path" and could sacrifice herself for him:

"Sometimes love doesn't wait, it doesn't endure, it doesn't expect... I don't know which *path* it is. *The path* where a woman sacrifices everything: calmness, rumor, respect and she finds a reward in love... it replaces everything for her. Do we need this *path*? – No. – Would you like to seek happiness in this *path* at the expense of my calmness, loss of respect? ...Would you like to know if I would sacrifice my peace of mind to you, *if I would go with you along this path*? ...*Never, no way!* she said firmly. He thought about it, then sighed. – Yes, that is a *terrible path*, and *it takes a lot of love* for a woman to follow a man *on it*, to perish and still love... Why would you *not follow it*... – Because... later people always... part on it..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, pp. 299-300).

This dialogue shows that Olga, for all her love for Oblomov, is not able to follow him always and to the end, she has her own "path" on which she hopes to lead Oblomov. And for another woman, Pšenicyna, the "path" of the character is not important, Oblomov is the main thing for her, so she is ready to sacrifice everything in her life "path".

After Olga's confession, "Oblomov *was shining* when he went home. His blood *was boiling*, his eyes *were sparkling*. It seemed to him that even his hair *was on fire*. So, he went into his room and suddenly *the radiance disappeared*

and his eyes stopped motionless in unpleasant amazement in one place: Tarantiev was sitting in his chair... He forgot that *gloomy sphere*, where he had lived for a long time, and he lost the habit of its suffocating air. In an instant, Tarantiev pulled him down as if from heaven again into *the swamp*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 301). The third part of the novel tells that the "rays of love" are gradually extinguished, "the poem passes". Oblomov needs to work, build a house, build roads, "duty, serious life begins." He thinks what step to take first: ask the aunt for Olga's hand or go to the ward "to write some paper", he needs to look for an apartment, and this is "the second step". Olga says "You first take two steps, and then..." But it is difficult for Oblomov to follow the "path" proposed by Olga and Štol'c. He suffers on these trips to the town, trying to solve the difficult questions of the way of life for him, there is not enough money for anything. The end of August is coming, it rains, the summer cottages are emptying and Oblomov moves to the Vyborg side of town:

"...Autumn evenings in the city were not like long, *bright* days and evenings in the park and grove. ...And this summer, blooming love poem seemed to stop, went more lazily, as if there was not enough content in it" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 316).

Olga "sadly" sees off Oblomov with her eyes, "her heart cries," "she wants to sing, but she cannot". She demands from Oblomov that he move more, and he gets more and more tired of this and he admires Agafia Pšenicyna more and more, who does not rush him anywhere, cooks deliciously and has "strong, like a sofa cushion, never worried chest". Oblomov comes up with an illness in order to postpone the meeting with Olga, she cries, urges him not to be lazy in letters:

"He lay down with loud sighs, got up, even went out into the street and kept looking for *the norms of life*, such an existence that would be full of content and *flow quietly*, day by day, *drop by drop*, in silent contemplation of nature and quiet, barely creeping the phenomena of family, peaceful and busy life. *He did not want to imagine it as a wide, noisily rushing river, with seething waves, as Stoltz had imagined it.* "This is a disease," Oblomov said, "a fever, a jumping with rapids, with dam breaks, with floods" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 353).

Oblomov returns to his ideal – walking in a circle of life's "path", like a quiet river, which he finds in Pšenicyna.

Olga refuses to believe that the unbuilt bridges across the Neva and Ilia's illness prevent them from meeting, she worries, goes to Oblomov on the Vyborg side, and this has a stunning effect on him. Olga sees that Oblomov deceived her, that he goes down again. The character admits that passions and worries take away his strength, that he will die if Olga is not around:

"Now I breathe, look, think and feel you. Why are you surprised that in those days when I don't see you, I fall asleep and fall down? Everything is disgusting to me, everything is boring; *I am a machine*: I walk, do and do not notice what I

do. *You are the fire and power of this machine,*" he said, kneeling down and straightening up. His eyes *sparkled as they used to in the park*. The pride and the will-power shone in them again. "Now I am ready to go where you tell me to, to do whatever you want. I feel that I live when you look at me, speak, sing..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 367).

Olga is the "fire" that makes Oblomov live. But is he able to go for the sake of Olga to hardship and sacrifice? Olga says:

"I am your goal, you say and go to it so *timidly, slowly*; and you still *have a long way to go*; you have to get higher than me. I expect this from you! I met happy people, I saw how they love", she added with a sigh, "everything *boils* with them, and their peace is not like yours; they do not lower their heads; their eyes are open; *they hardly sleep, they act!* And you... no, it doesn't seem like love, that I am your goal..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 367).

For all their attraction to each other, they speak different languages. For Olga, love is movement, burning, boiling, for Oblomov it is sunny peace of Oblomovka. Neither Olga is able to follow Oblomov to the end, nor he is able to give up the peace for her sake. This is the tragedy of the character, because he gradually "go out", dies even with all his positive qualities:

"Look, look at me: am I not *resurrected*, am I not living at this moment? ...Let me live today with this feeling... Oh, if the same *fire burns* me, which *burns* now, and tomorrow and always! After all, if you are not there, I *go out, I fall!* Now I revived, resurrected..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 368).

"How easy it is to breathe in this life, in Olga's sphere, in *the rays* of her virgin *brilliance*, vigorous strength, young, but subtle and deep sanity! ...How she *clearly* sees life! How she reads *her path* in this otherwise book and guesses his path by instinct! *Both lives must merge like two rivers*: he is her head, leader!" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 369).

But the two lives never merge into one "path". Olga's "fire" and "angelic light" could not change Oblomov; in the end, she despaired of fighting the character's laziness and apathy:

"You would fall asleep deeper every day, wouldn't you? And I? Do you see what I am? I will not grow old, I will never get tired of living. And with you we would begin to live from *day to day, wait for Christmas, then Shrovetide, go to visit, dance and not think about anything*; we would go to bed and thank God that *the day is soon over*, and wake up in the morning wishing that *today would be like yesterday...* this is our future, am I right? Is this life? I will pine, I will die... for what, Ilia? Will you be happy..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 386).

But Oblomov had just such an ideal of life from the beginning: "the path of the circle", "the path of the sun", all-repetition, family stability, as in Oblomovka. Olga did not understand Oblomov's ideal from the beginning, for her this is not life.

In Pšenicyna's house, life moves from day to day in a circle, and the character is happy with such a life. The characters living in the solar circle in-

cline towards roundness: Oblomov is full and round, Agafia Matveevna has grown plumper, even the objects in this house are round: there are pot-bellied and miniature teapots, cups, jars, pans in the kitchen, a round table in the dining room, sugar loaves, tubs, pots, baskets in the pantry. There are objects that have a certain color around Oblomov: "a curtain with a red festoon, which is the work of Agafia Matveevna's hands", teapots "with flaming hearts", geranium. There are bunch of the rowan above the fence. In the folk worldview, red symbolizes the sun. "A joyful ray of sun beat through the windows from morning to evening". The room on the Vyborg side, where Oblomov lives now, is "bright, clean and fresh". Agafia Matveevna is "very white". She is "at the zenith of her life". Her chest and shoulders shone with "contentment and fullness, her eyes *shone* with meekness and only housewifely solicitude". Oblomov "approached her like a warm fire, and once approached very close, almost to the blaze, ...to the outbreak". "He approached Agafia Matveevna, as if he was approaching a fire, from which it becomes warmer and warmer..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 401).

However, in this case, we are not talking about the fire of passion, the fire of love, but about the fire of the hearth, the focus of the house, family. The hearth is the beginning that unites people into a family. Oblomov, brought up at his home in Oblomovka, "among the meek and warm manners and customs of his homeland, passing for twenty years from the embrace to the embrace of relatives, friends and acquaintances", was deeply "imbued with the family element" and always yearned for him. The image of a hearth around which his whole life would be built, the life of his friends, relatives, lives in his dreams. Gončarov compares worshiping the fire of the hearth in the Oblomovs' house with Vesta's worshiping the fire. The inhabitants of Oblomovka did not know another fire and did not want to know. Vesta in Roman mythology is the goddess of the hearth, "eternal fire" was maintained in her temple.

The dream and the life largely coincided on the Vyborg side. Everything is calm and quiet here. The fire of the hearth burns in the house of Agafia Matveevna, who appears to the character as "kind" (Agafia from the Greek is "good", "kind"), "God's gift" (this is how the name Matthew is read), and she plays the role of a keeper hearth, its mistress. The service to the home and the service to Oblomov merge into one for her. God the Thunderer Ilia the Prophet is understood by the Slavs as a deity creating harvests, he is praised as the patron saint of harvest and fertility, a sower, a reaper. The fact that the character bakes pies, cheesecakes, bread is important in the context of the novel. She bears the "bread" surname Pšenicyňa. As Olga is intended for Oblomov, because she is Ilinskaia, so Agafia is intended for him, because she is Pšenicyňa. Olga, in the fate of Oblomov, symbolizes the divine, angelic light to which the character is attracted, dreaming of a solar paradise, and Agafia is the light of the earth, domestic, home, associated with tradition and family. Il'ja Il'ič is the sun that shone in the life of both Olga and Agafia. For them

Oblomov "radiate", "shines". They themselves "shine" in the rays of the sun – Oblomov, they revere him.

The symbolism of the "home" is also revealed through the theme of food, associated with the image of Pšenicyna. The plot center of the novel is the everyday and spiritual life of the protagonist – Ilia Ilich Oblomov. For Oblomov, the kitchen was the basis of life, most of the time was allocated to food. In the text of the novel, the attitude towards food acts as a measure of attitude towards the world, life, and also becomes a kind of "language" that allows one to express one's own view of the world. Therefore, the food, as well as sleep, is not only a satisfaction of physical needs, people eat and sleep as much as the "soul" wants, as much as the "soul" asks for. Hence, in Goncharov's novel, the characters eat often and tasty. Nothing "occupied the minds" to such an extent as care for food in Oblomovka. The characters liked to eat here: "The kitchen and the dinner were the main concern. The whole house discussed the dinner..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 114). According to the life philosophy of the inhabitants of Oblomovka, "a decent person must first of all take care of his table". They do not just eat and drink: their appetite imperceptibly turns into true gourmandise, cooking, into virtuoso skill, and the kitchen appears in a kind of temple (Краснова/Krasnova, 2000).

The apotheosis and symbol of Oblomov's satiety and general contentment is the gigantic pie, which was baked on Sundays and holidays. This cake required twice the usual amount of flour and eggs. Hence, as a result, "there were more groans and bloodshed in the poultry yard" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 115). The pies were baked with chickens and fresh mushrooms in Oblomovka. This pie "the gentlemen ate the next day; the remains fell into in the maiden room on the third and fourth day; the pie survived until Friday, so that one completely stale end of the pie, without any filling, was given in the form of a special favor to Antip, who, crossing himself, fearlessly destroyed this curious fossil with a crash" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 115). The feast continued until it was time to bake a new pie. As noted by J.M. Lošić, a real cult of pie reigns in Oblomovka. In the folk worldview, a pie is one of the most graphic symbols of a happy, abundant, blessed life. Pie is a "nosh-up", a cornucopia, the pinnacle of universal fun and contentment. Feasting, celebrating people gather around the pie. The warmth and the fragrance emanate from the pie. Thus, a kind of mythologeme "pie", containing the meaning of being, appears in the novel (Лошиц/Lošić, 1977, pp. 172-173). It is these pies that Agafia Pšenicyna prepares, it is no coincidence that Zahar says that they are no worse than Oblomov's pies.

Sharing food in this world is not an everyday detail, but a symbol of unity. From time immemorial, food, both in one's family and in the world, has been a sacred act, a rite among the Russian people. It began and ended with a prayer of thanks. Cheerful and informal communication, friendly family conversation, discussion of upcoming affairs happened at the table. The table was the rallying of family brotherhood, a symbol of unity. In the dream-

world of Il'ja Il'ič Oblomov, "food" must certainly be shared with spiritually close people, with a "colony of friends" living in the neighborhood, it is then that it acquires its true, social content. When Štol'c visits Oblomov during his birthday for the first time on the Vyborg side, he shares a table with a friend. There is a commonality of topics, openness, trust, correctness, sensitivity in their dialogue. The dialogue ends with a toast to Olga. Both characters eat and drink the same things, which stimulates rapport in conversation. Štol'c urges Oblomov not to "extinguish the fire", not to "remain in the dark" again, he says that he promised Olga "to dig him out of the grave". During Štol'c's second visit to Oblomov, the conversation testifies to the spiritual disunity of the characters. Oblomov alone talks about food at the table:

"Štol'c winced as he sat down at the table... Štol'c did not eat any lamb or dumplings, he put down his fork and watched with what appetite Oblomov was eating it all" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 456).

Upon learning that Olga was married to Štol'c, Oblomov says:

"No, tell her, remind her that I met her in order *to put her on the path*, and that I bless this meeting, *bless her on a new path!*" (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 453)!

At first glance, it seems that Oblomov's dream-world is manifested in the life of Il'ja Il'ič on the Vyborg side. Indeed, Oblomov is trying to realize his idea of an ideal life arrangement, his life norm here, on the Vyborg side: "Life is like poetry"; he tries to build an ideal, idyllic world, like the world living in his dreams. Everything flows according to a long-established, unchanging routine in the life of the character on the Vyborg side, breakfast, lunch and dinner are also the main events of the day, and "taking care of food" becomes the main concern of the inhabitants of the house of Agafia Matveevna Pšenicyna. Their "menu" is striking in its variety and abundance and is mainly represented by dishes of traditional Russian cuisine: soups, cereals, pies, and a variety of pickles.

The world of Oblomovka and the Vyborg side is the apotheosis of the material principle, which is greatly facilitated by Gončarov's pictorial narrative style. "Spirit" is not here. There is nothing that in Oblomov's dream world constituted "spiritual harmony": there is no "colony of friends", no "pensive silence", no arguments with his wife about what they read, no "joy", "pleasure" from exercise (Il'ja Il'ič walks out of necessity: so, the doctor prescribed) and, finally, there is no desired peace, to which Oblomov has been striving all his life. There is no that "fun", that "sweetness", that fullness of human existence, which consisted in the harmony of the bodily and spiritual principles. Štol'c urges on Oblomov: "Get out of this pit, out of the swamp, into the light, into the open space, where there is a healthy, normal life!" To this Oblomov replies, "I am fused to this *pit* with a sore spot: try to tear it off—there will be death... Oh, Andrei, I feel everything, I understand everything: I am ashamed to live in the world for a long time! But *I can't go your*

way with you, even if I wanted to..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 506). Before Štol'c "...suddenly "an abyss opened", a "stone wall" was erected, and Oblomov seemed to have disappeared..." (Гончаров/Gončarov, 1981, p. 507). So, the character remained faithful to his life "path" and "sun". Shortly before his death, he thoughtfully observes how "the evening sun is drowning in the fire of the dawn".

References

- Brajuc, V. (2018a). On the Problem of Oblomov's Image Interpretation. *Lim baj ši context / Speech and Context. International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science*, 18(1), 27-44.
- Brajuc, V. (2018b). The Artistic Structure of Oblomov's Image. *Lim baj ši context / Speech and Context. International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science*, 18(2), 27-54.
- Brajuc, V. (2019a). The System of Images in Ivan Gončarov's Novel "Oblomov". *Lim baj ši context / Speech and Context. International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science*, 19(1), 59-82.
- Brajuc, V. (2019b). The Artistic Role of Symbols in Ivan Gončarov's "Oblomov". *Lim baj ši context / Speech and Context. International Journal of Linguistics, Semiotics and Literary Science*, 19(2), 65-93.
- Бражук, В. (2014). Образно-символическая система романа И. А. Гончарова «Обломов». PIM / Bražuk V. (2014). *Obrazno-simvoličeskaja sistema romana I. A. Gončarova «Oblomov»*. PIM.
- Гончаров, И. А. (1981). Обломов. В: И. А. Гончаров. *Собрание сочинений*, в 4 томах (том 2). Правда / Gončarov, I. A. (1981). *Oblomov*. In: I. A. Gončarov. *Sobranie sočinjenij*, v 4 tomah (tom 2). Pravda.
- Грачева, И. В. (1997). Каждый цвет – уже намёк. *Литература в школе*, 3, 50-51 / Gračeva, I. V. (1997). *Každyj cvet – uže naměk*. *Literatura v škole*, 3, 50-51.
- Ермолаева, Н. Л. (2006). Объяснение в любви в романе И. А. Гончарова «Обломов». *Литература в школе*, 8, 19-23 / Ermolaeva, N. L. (2006). *Ob"jasnenie v ljubvi v romane I. A. Gončarova «Oblomov»*. *Literatura v škole*, 8, 19-23.
- Золотницкий, Н. Ф. (1994). Цветы в легендах и преданиях. Довира / Zolotnickij, N. F. (1994). *Cvety v legendah i predanijah*. Dovira.
- Краснова, Е. В. (2000). Фламандский стиль «Обломова»: мотив «еды» и его функции в романе И. А. Гончарова. В: *Третьи Майминские чтения* (с. 79-85) / Krasnova, E. V. (2000). *Flamandskij stil' «Oblomova»: motiv «edy» i ego funkcii v romane I. A. Gončarova*. In *Tret'i Majminskie čtenija* (s. 79-85).
- Лоциц, Ю. М. (1977). Гончаров. Молодая гвардия / Lošic, Ju. M. (1977). *Gončarov*. *Molodaja gvardija*.
- Пырков, И. (2000). Освещённые солнцем. Тема «света» в романе Гончарова «Обломов». *Волга*, 413. <http://magazines.russ.ru/volga/2000/413/pyrkov.html> / Pyrkov, I. (2000). *Osvešennye solncem*. Tema «sveta» v romane Gončarova «Oblomov». *Volga*, 413. <http://magazines.russ.ru/volga/2000/413/pyrkov.html>.

LANGUAGE, CONTEXT, TRANSLATION

THE FIRST TRANSLATION OF HAMLET INTO ROMANIAN BY IOAN BARAC (1776-1848)

Elena OLARIU (CHICOS)

Ph. D. Student

(Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania)

elenachicos@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9029-7798>

Abstract

Hamlet was one of the first Shakespeare's plays that were introduced in Romania. The first attempts to translate his works into Romanian date back to the XIXth century, and the Romanian translations were based on French Translations of the plays, given the strong cultural relationships with France and the fact that many scholars of the time knew French. Ioan Barac (1776-1848) was an Austrian translator and poet, born in Romania. He was one of the first to translate Hamlet into Romanian, working on Friedrich Ludwig Schröder's German version of it. Ioan Barac's interpretation of Hamlet in Romanian was written in the form of a manuscript, using the Cyrillic alphabet. In his version, Hamlet is presented as the flawless hero, as his growing wealth helps him defeat his cheating, murderous enemies. The denouement transforms him into a conqueror of fate, he surpasses all of the hardships and survives all of Fortuna's trials, finally reaching his father's throne. Aside from these changes, there are also certain parts that disappear. It seems like Barac continues to cut out and simplify his version not because he was forced by censorship or some theatrical purpose, but simply because this was his way of working on a translation.

Keywords: Hamlet, Barac, translation, Shakespeare, Romanian

Rezumat

Hamlet a fost printre primele piese ale lui Shakespeare care au ajuns în România. Primele încercări de traducere a lui Shakespeare în limba română datează din secolul al XIX-lea, iar traducerile au avut la bază un intermediar francez, fapt explicabil prin relațiile culturale strânse cu Franța și prin cunoașterea acestei limbi de către mulți oameni de cultură români. Ioan Barac (1776-1848) a fost un traducător și poet etnic imperial austriac, născut România. El a fost unul dintre primii care a tradus Hamlet în română, lucrând din versiunea germană a lui Friedrich Ludwig Schröder. Interpretarea lui Ioan Barac a lui Hamlet în românește este în formă de manuscris și a fost scris în alfabet chirilic. Hamlet al lui Ioan Barac apare ca eroul fără cusur, iar curba sa de avere îl face în cele din urmă să triumfe asupra adversarilor săi adulteri și ucigași; deznodământul îl transformă în învingător al Soartei, el depășește toate greutățile și supraviețuiește încercărilor Fortunei și este instalat, în cele din urmă, pe tronul tatălui său. Pe lângă aceste modificări sunt și formule care dispar. Se pare că Barac continuă metoda eliminărilor și simplificărilor dintr-o rațiune care nu este impusă de cenzură sau de vreo finalitate teatrală, ci, pur și simplu deoarece aceasta este maniera sa de a lucra.

Cuvinte-cheie: Hamlet, Barac, traducere, Shakespeare, limba română

Ioan Barac (1776–1848) was a poet and translator of Romanian origin who lived in the Austrian Empire. He was born in Alămor, Sibiu County, and his

father, Ioan, was a priest. He attended the Reformed Gymnasium in Aiud, followed by law studies in Cluj, as he was drawn to the Hungarian culture. In 1801, he taught at the Romanian Orthodox School in Avrîg. The next year, he became a teacher at the first Romanian school in Șcheii Brașovului, which was annexed to St. Nicholas Church. At the same time, he also functioned as a magistrate and, in 1805, he took over the position of Romanian interpreter for Brașov City Hall, which he held for the rest of his life. In 1837, he edited "The Sunday Paper", the first illustrated magazine in Transylvania. His first published work, "The Story of Arghir the Handsome and of Helen the Beautiful and Lonely Queen" (1801) was one of the most widely read and appreciated Romanian books of the first half of the 19th century and appeared in many editions. He was one of the first to translate "Hamlet" into Romanian and used the German version belonging to Friedrich Ludwig Schröder. Between 1846 and 1840, he published eight volumes of stories from "The Arabian Nights" and introduced stories featuring Till Eulenspiegel and Mattie the Goose-boy. His original work included *Adevarul* (The Truth) and *Cercul Timpului* (The Circle of Time). The prefaces he wrote featured interesting pre-modern aesthetic and literary ideas.

Barac was a folk poet, not only in the style of his verse, but also in conception, as he himself confesses in the preface to *Kartigam*: "Having this passion for poetry since I was young, I spent all the days of my life writing many things, among which this story." During his stay in Aiud and Cluj, the Hungarian literature was in a process of enthusiastic rebirth, which had three directions given by the three different schools: French, classical and national, he himself being an adept of the last one mentioned, "This poetic school, poets less gifted than Gvadányi, Dugonics and Fazekas are part of, has generally displayed less good taste, but showed much more consideration and patriotic enthusiasm. Their great merit is that they showed vivid interest in the vernacular and the folklore and then dilligently got their inspiration from both" (Katona & Szinnyei, 1911). And yet, he was not a poet, but a rather poor interpreter most of the times, as his translations lacked literary value and were written under the Hungarian literary tendencies of the time. The translations he started in 1775 and continued to work on until the modern era, in 1825, stand proof of it. "Barac doesn't seem to translate, he shortens them, he skips their essential ideas. It is a schoolboy's work" (Bogdan-Duică, 1933).

Unusually hard-working and quite renowned in his time, along with Vasile Aaron and Dimitrie Țichindeal, Ioan Barac was an important representative of the so-called Transylvanian School, at a time of persecution of the Romanian culture in Ardeal when progress was a zealously pursued goal. Comparing the Germans, the Hungarians and the Serbians, Vasile Aron

records this in his preface to "Reporta din Vis", 'and yet for those who have toiled for years not only in the Hungarian and German languages, but also in Serbian, the number of beautifully, well-written books is impressive! (...) But for them to come to life and bring comfort and hope to the readers, there is still need of more opportunities for education, more means and privilege" (*Catalogul manuscriptelor românești*, vol. I, p. 460, apud Bogdan-Duică, 1933, p. 17). Barac's 17th-century house, located at 3 Piața Unirii in Brașov, is listed as a historic monument by Romania's Ministry of Culture and Religious Affairs.

When first translated by Ioan Barac, a parson in the Transylvanian city of Brașov – Kronstadt, at the beginning of the XVIIIth century - about the 1820's, Hamlet was practically perceived as a XVIIth century German „Familientragödie”. In Barac's translation, the main character is a flawless hero and his gradually increasing wealth eventually leads to his triumph over his murderous and adulterous adversaries; the denouement turns him into a defeater of Fate as he surpasses all hardship and survives Fortune's trials to finally be installed on his father's throne. The final scene does not follow the original English text: The King and Queen lose their lives and the whole country was shaken and they put Hamlet the Prince on his father's throne – Curtain (Act) a (5) fifth, (16) entering (Scene), p. 296 of the manuscript. This is the tragic end of the Danish king and queen who made the people of Denmark tremble with fear, but they eventually put Hamlet on the Danish throne.

Ioan Barac's interpretation of Hamlet in Romanian was written in the form of a manuscript, using the Cyrillic alphabet and contains a number of 54 hand-written pages (page 242 to page 296 of the manuscripts collected by Ioan Barac, *Scieri în Versuri și Proză* (= *Poetry and Prose Writings*), first half of the XIXth century, a total of 373 pages) are now kept in the Depository of Documents in the Library of the Romanian Academy, manuscript n^o 209, titled *Amlet, Prințul dela Dania. O tragedie în (5) cincî (acte) perdele* (= *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, a Tragedy in five acts*) by William Shakespeare. (Performed in the Royal Court Theatre" = the play was staged at the Royal Habsburg Court Theatre) the Romanian title being the original title of the German translation published by Heufeld in the Vienna edition of 1772. The parts were put together in a single volume that was donated to the Library of the Romanian Academy by the Allpious Ioan Barac of Brașov, the author's close relative. With the exception of two scenes from act I, II and V, which were transliterated by Ion Colan in his "Life and Work of Ioan Barac", and alternatively by G. Bogdan Duica in his biographical study titled "The Work of Ioan Barac", this translation by Ioan Barac has never been printed or published and is now being carefully kept in the archives of the Library of the Romanian Academy. Barac distances himself from the original Anglo-Saxon Shakespearian spirit, which thus becomes "double-distilled" and the Romanian influence is felt all trough the text. In other words, Barac keeps both the

British literary perspective and the Romanian one, becoming part of the Romanian culture from this very first transcoding of the target text. His language uses the sounds and rhythms of the XVIIIth century Transylvanian Romania. There is both an aphoristic and moralist conciseness about the sententious language Barac makes his characters use.

Let us consider, for example, the urging parental advice Oldenholm gives his son Lertie. The very first comparative look emphasizes the provinciality and parochialism of his style, maybe because Barac was a parson, the language imbued with Transylvanian regionalism, which to us, today, may sound like clumsy archaisms, as G. Bogdan-Duica remarked, "the asperities of an unrefined language". To conclude, a question arises – how can we achieve a perceptible measurement of our cultural past and an accurate evaluation of the past coexisting with the acute sense of the present in our post-modern world?

A good analysis of Barac's translation of Hamlet requires observing other translations of the time that influenced his work. Heufeld's translation (1773), after another one Wieland made (1766), where parts of the original text are cut or more simply phrased. These changes and shortenings stand proof of a tendency to progress in making texts more prosaic. Apart from the gradually disappearing formulas, we notice a fundamental change of tone of the character of Hamlet, who becomes melancholic, while poetic and doubtful in the original text. It seems that Barac keeps using the method of elimination and simplification for reasons that have nothing to do with censorship or any theatrical finality, simply because it is his way of doing things.

Similar to the translation of one of his Hungarian contemporaries Kazinczy (Ferencz), made after a text by Schröder (1790), Barac's interpretation lacks the depth of the tragic effect, of the poetic form, and parts of the original text can no longer be found in it.

In order to follow the making of Barac's translation of Shakespeare's work, we will consider Bayer's critical analysis.

Hamlet's stage glory started in Cluj and headed West with a troupe from Ardeal that made it to Debrețiu (1798 and 1799); and, on the other hand, without leaving Cluj, where Barac lived, and where it was staged again in 1800, 1804, 1805, 1810, 1812.

In Cluj, Hamlet had been presented before Barac finished his studies in Aiud and Cluj. Knowing he was familiar with the flourishing literary life in both Aiud and Cluj, Barac most certainly knew how popular Hamlet was, but, without any evidence of it, I could not say "I am certain he did see or read the play at the time" (Bayer, p. 157, apud *Bogdan-Duică*, 1933, p. 125).

According to G. Bogdan-Duică, Hamlet's title in Barac's manuscript, is recorded at n° 209 at the Romanian Academy.

"Amlet

Prințul de la Dania.
O
Tragodie
în cinci peredele.
După Sakespear
Sau producăluit în k. kräescul
Teatru al Curții”²⁴.

This is the exact title of the 1772 edition (Vienna). For his translation, however, Barac did not use this Heufeld text, but the modified version and/or the version modified by Schröder in 1777 (Hamburg). There is no Laertes in 1772 Heufeld text, but the character is present in Barac’s translation in Act I, Sc. 8, not only in the table of characters.

Laertes had also been present in the two remakes from 1777 (Hamburg, Herold Library) and 1778 (Hamburg, I.M. Michaelsen): Of the two editions, scene 40 (The Prince, then Ghildenstern) of Act IV; In the Michaelsen edition it is Sc.15, also in Act IV. This means that Barac used the 1778 Hamburg edition for his translation.

A representative scene that helped identifying the edition that Barac used for his Hamlet translation is the last scene in Act IV, which sounds in Romanian as follows:

„A patrasprezecelea arătare.

Craiul, apoi Ghildenstern.

Craiul. Du-te, nebuno, care poți tu să te scobâlțest întră mine și întră el, fiul tău? Dar nu vezi tu, acest fiu al tău turbează după sângele meu ca un foc nestins. Să să ducă la Englitera - așa; dar acolo să și moară.Vino, Ghildenstern! (Vine Ghildenstern).

Ghildenstern. Iată eu Măria ta!

Craiul. Am lipsă de tine, dragul meu,că Hamlet au omorît pre bătrânul Oldenholm în turbarea sa. Și o așa nenorocire ameliņa dela el cătră toți. Gătește-te de drum, că el trebuie să să ducș la Englitera, că împrejurările statului nu suferă să mă pui în primejdia care în tot ceasul o ameliņa nebulnea lui, ci caută să ocolesc.

Ghildenstern. Eu mă voiu găti de drum. Că aceasta este o frică sfântă pentru atâtea sute de suflete, de a-i păzi, care traesc întru Maestatea ta.

Craiul. Cautăți trupul lui Oldenholm,și-l îngropați pă taină, să nu afle nimenea de să va putea.

Ghildenstern. Tocma acum am aflat Măria ta o împrejurare care îți ameliņa primejdie:cș tânărul Laertis,aruncat de vânt, să află în port. Lezne poate să auză de moartea tătâni-său. Apoi nu va căuta el izbândă?

Craiul. Tocma cătră el va fi mântuirea, ducerea la Englitera a lui Amlet spre pedeapsa morții. Dar cum va putea afla el? Când moartea lui Oldenholm nu este

²⁴In English: *Amlet, Prince of Dania, a tragedy in five acts after Shakespeare was produced at The Royal Theatre.*

știută la nimenea și caută să și rămâe tăinuită. Mergi și îi căutați trupul; și te gătește de drum. Îți voiui și da împuternicire numai de cât“.

Barac translated Scene 8 of Act II (Hamlet allein), which in the original text is a reply from Act I, Scene 5, right after the disappearance of the spirit and Horatio and Marcellus enter, in verse:

“Amlet (singur)
Oh cete cerești cu gloate!
O pământe! mări și toate
Dar tu ce zici, iadule?
Oh inima mea cea mare
Ține-te în vine tare!
Vai! Vai! blestematule!
Iubitele mele vine!
Țineți-vă forte bine!
Nu cumva să vă slăbiți!
Nu vă lăsați a vă teme,
Să nu cumva fără vreme
Sămi vă îmbătrâniți,
Ci să mă purtați vânjoase
În puteri și sănătoase!
Și la tine să gândesc?
Cum să nu gândesc la tine?
Ba toate alte mai bine
Ce-i în lume voiui uita,
Toate ideile mele,
Cărți cetite, și pre ele
Toate le voiui depărta.
Orice din copilărie
Am avut spre bucurie
Toate le voiui pune jos,
Și porunca ta cea mare
Cu multă înfierbântare
O ascult mai bucuros.
Oh ceriule! Oh muere!
Oh om rău! Spurcată here!
Om de răs, spurcatule!
Muere făr’de rușine!
Om făr’de lege ca tine
Nu e blestematule!
Astfelu unde să mai poate
Să le iau în scris pre toate“.

(Scrie)

“Puteți râde surezând,
Râdeți acum, ce vă pasă

Ori și unde va să iasă!
În fărâdelegi răsând!
Auziți ce-mi zice mie?
Sănătate bună, ție
O fiul meu cel iubit!
Adu-ți aminte de mine
Și te socotește bine
C' ai văzut că sânt scârbit“ (*Filele*, p. 257-258).

Comparing this version and the original text, we notice the following differences: the word *nerves* in Shakespeare's text becomes *vine* (veins), memories no longer fade away, they are put down according to the Hungarian *le-tenni* and hardly ever add any new idea (Bogdan-Duică, 1933, p. 130).

After Weilen, the scene where the beautiful white bosom was deleted, in Schöder, the verses addressed to the Queen by Oldenholm appear in act III, scene 2; in Barac's version, they appear as being truncated - act III, scene 2:

“Zi, mândro, că cele s(f)inte
Și că adevărul minte
Și că el va fo greșind;
Să nu crezi că arde focul
Și soarele în mijlocul
Verii ziua strălucind;
De nu crezi, puțin îm(i) pasă,
Numai atâta să iasă
Din inima ta, poftesc
Ca biruință să fie
Și să-mi crezi tu numai mie
Precum că eu te iubesc“.

Another scene that reflects the expression of the Shakesperian work in Barac's vision is scene 7 from act III, which, according to the original text, is the equivalent of scene 2 from act II after the departure of Rosenkranz and Guildenstern:

“Amlet (singur)
Acuma sânt numai eu
Să-m[i] mai vărs amarul mieu
Aha tu curvoariu de casă,
Spărgătoriu de bună masă!
Fără suflet ucigaș!
Un vânzătoriu preste fire
Și fără milostivire,
Mai mult ca un ciunăgaș,
Amestecătoriu de sânge,
Nu te temi că te vor strânge
Pentru tâlhăria ta?
Om rău și fără simțire

Făr'de lege preste fire
Care grea seamă vei da!
Oh, ce de nimic răbdare
Mă oprește așa tare?
Pre mine, un fiu ce sânt
Al prea scumpului meu tată
Să nu-mi izbândesc odată
Moartea lui de pre pământ?
Să mă las ca o muere
Slabă și fără putere,
Care numai cu ocări,
Cu limba își izbândește
Spre vrajmaș și-l ocărăște
Cu hule și cu măscări.
Dar sânt oreri în căpățân!
Și cu sabia în mână!
Oh, vai de voi slăbiciuni!
Socotește înaițe,
Tu precepere și minte,
Privind la deșertăciuni,
Am aflat că vinovatul
Îș[i] dobândește păcatul
În teatru atunci când
Așa faptă îl lovește
La suflet și îl rănește,
Lucru potrivit jucând;
Când omorul limbă n'are,
Îi aduce oarecare
Povestiri și graiuri vîi
De fapta cea tîinuită,
De omor ca dovedită
Rămîne la oameni vîi,
Voiu să le dau înainte
Cuvînt la acești vuminte
Teatraliști a juca
O faptă asemănată
Cu a bunului meu tată
Omor, și-l voi apuca,
Atunci, dacă n-are limbă,
Să-i văz fața cum să schimbă,
A craiului vinova,
Rama deschizându-i-să
La os pătrunzându-i-să
Păcatul cel încuibat;
Apoi voiu vedea mai bine
Că Duhul care la mine
Noaptea mi s'au arătat
Va fi duhul ce mă pune

Să fac și eu o minune
 La ce m'au înfierbântat,
 Așa cursă-i voiu întinde
 Prin care eu îi voiu prinde
 Și îi voiu descoperi
 Cunoștința sufletului
 Cu prihana cugetului,
 Precum se va nimeri.
 Eu sm un temeiu mai mare
 Decât acea arătare
 Care mi s'au arătat;
 O priveștițe să fie
 Care să-mi arate mie
 Păcatul cel neertat,
 Ca să prinz cu cunoștința
 Sufletului și căința
 Craiului a să muștra
 Dându-să de gol pe sine
 Să priceapă ori și cine
 Că nu va putea răbda".

Barac's text resembles an autochthonous popular ballad, in which one is surprised to find the presence of the first person of the present tense of the verb "a voi" (to want), its future tense "voiu" (I will), the gerundial that lengthens the state of things ("deschizându"-opening, "pătrunzându"-entering), the verb being dominated by all these moods at a lexical and morphological level at the same time, through an attitude of genuine familiarity.

As a consequence, the Anglo-Saxon atmosphere is not only diminished, but completely eliminated, the morphemes that the protagonist utters sound very Romanian in style, with many interrogations and rhetorical exclamations, which turn the translation into a personal creation, thus leading to the disappearance of the original scenes of the Shakespearian drama lyric poem.

The fact that Barac's translation would have had the merit of being published in 1928 is justified by Bogdan-Duică (Ion Colan, p. 49, *apud* Bogdan-Duică, 1933, p. 133) through Ophelia's monologue in Act III, Scene II, which corresponds to Ophelia's last line in Act III, Scene I in the original text:

"A unsprezecea arătare.

Ofelia (singură)

Oh ce suflet nobil s'au stricat aici. Ochiul unui bărbat de curte, limba unui învățat, sabia unui viteaz, așteptarea ca să înflorească nădejdea statului, oglinda în care toți se oglinda, ca să-i placă. O modelă delă toate ce este mare, frumos și vrednic de iubire s'au nimicit cu totul. O eu nenorocita care odată cu așa poftă sugream armonia lingușirilor lui și acum caută să văz în ce chip își dă din sine duhul cel mai frumos tonul cel mai stricat, ca și clopotul cel spart și cele neasemănate flori ale virtuții care acum înfloria cum se veștezesc întru întunerecul nebunii! Oh vai mie! căci am văzut ce am văzut și căci văz ce văz (Să duce)".

In his analysis, Bogdan-Duică refers to Ophelia's Songs (Act IV, Sc, 5, V, 6, V, 10) concluding, „ The evidence entitles me to say that only an insane Englishman, or maybe a German, also insane, would consider publishing Barac's entire Hamlet, which translation will, however, be mentioned in some detailed history of how Hamlet became known, in the still unwritten chapter about Shakespeare in Romanian“ (Bogdan-Duică, 1933, p. 134).

References

Katona, L., Szinnyei, Fr. (1911). *Geschichte der ungarischen Literatur*.

Bogdan-Duică, G. (1933). *Ioan Barac. Studii*. Ședința de la 20 mai 1932. Academia Română, studii și cercetări, XXII, Monitorul Oficial și Imprimeriile Statului, Imprimeria Națională București.

AN OVERVIEW ON DEMETRIUS'S TRANSLATION OF HAMLET (1878-1942)

Elena OLARIU (CHICOȘ)

Ph. D. Student

(Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania)

elenachicos@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9029-7798>

Abstract

Vasile Demetrius was a remarkable writer of the time, contributor to countless literary journals, poet, novelist and prose writer. Unfortunately, the posterity didn't pay much attention to him, although he dedicated his whole life to writing. As a translator, his modest knowledge in languages and exaggerated tendency to find a lively manner of expressing the text, based on bold associations, led to the creation of inaccurate translations. On a lexical level, Demetrius's translation of Hamlet can be identified as a meeting point between the tendency of the previous translations of the XXth century to finding Romanian equivalents and the trend manifested in the versions before 1900 to finding new vocabulary entries. Analyzing the facts, we can mention two categories: on one hand there are the terms from the familiar register, consisting of archaic words and, on the other hand, we have the neological register, with expressions and terms from the French language, as a consequence of the impact of French literature. This influence offers modernity and actuality to the text. Although the value of Demetrius's translation is debatable, it managed to follow the Shakespearean version as it was.

Keywords: Hamlet, Demetrius, translation, Shakespeare, Romanian language

Rezumat

Vasile Demetrius a fost un scriitor remarcant al vremii, colaborator la nenumărate reviste literare, poet, nuvelist și prozator. Din păcate, posteritatea nu i-a acordat o atenție deosebită, cu toate că și-a dedicat viața scrisului. Ca traducător, cunoștințele modeste de limbă și tendința exagerată de a găsi o exprimare vie, bazată pe asocieri îndrăznețe, a dus la crearea unor corespondențe nepotrivite. La nivel lexical, textul dramei Hamlet, în traducerea lui Demetrius, poate fi identificat drept un punct de întâlnire al tendințelor de etnicizare al celorlalte traduceri anterioare din secolul al XX-lea și al tendințelor neologice manifestate în variantele dinainte de 1900 și, din această cauză, se poate vorbi de două categorii de termeni. Pe de o parte, se includ termenii din registrul familiar, cu termeni popular-regionali, iar, pe de altă parte, registrul neologic, cu expresii și termeni neologici din limba franceză, urmare a influenței textelor franceze. Această influență conferă textului modernitate și actualitate. Deși valoarea traducerii lui Demetrius este discutabilă, aceasta are meritul de a fi urmat în întregime textul Shakespearean.

Cuvinte-cheie: Hamlet, Demetrius, traducere, Shakespeare, limba română

At the beginning of the 20th century, the intense confrontation with various inherent ideological trends causes less interest in translation, noticing preferences for decadent literature that cultivates the morbid side and trivial

inspiration as the critic T. Vianu points out: "The library store is beginning to be flooded by translations the selection criteria of which are only their commercial value..." (Vianu, 1955, p. 4). Thanks to people with a taste for literature, the classics are also translated, including W. Shakespeare's works, which have never lacked of public interest. In the literary context of that time the opinion that governed was that of which: "the translation was appreciated as a literary annex reserved for the dilettantes and writers who were deprived of talent" (*ibidem*), which include V. Anestin and V. Demetrius.

V. Demetrius was a remarkable writer of those times, a contributor to countless magazines, a poet, novelist and writer. Unfortunately, posterity did not pay any particular attention to him, although he devoted his life to writing. In *Dicționarul general al literaturii române* (*Dicționarul*, 2004, pp. 625-626) it is mentioned about "his refined lyrics with symbolic meaning which combine both meditation and the floral colours of the rainbow", and about his novels that "brought a high quality to the realistic prose of the first two decades of the 20th century" to which are mentioned the two translations from Hamlet and Macbeth.

In the time of his difficult childhood, he comes into contact with books, as a worker at Sfetea library, an episode evoked by his daughter L. Demetrius: "It was only when they hired him at the Sfetea library that he had calmed down. Books had drifted into his hand before, he had looked for them, but there were plenty of books here. He could read as much as he wanted. He even had to read, as Sfetea sent its employees to workers' home with a quiver of books, which they had to recommend from what they knew. My father was very good at it" (Demetrius, 2005, p. 9). A writer herself, his daughter, sharing the literary destiny of his father, published a volume of memoirs covering the period 1975 to 1991, in which "privileged by the intense affectivity of the author, her father, V. Demetrius, is the key figure. Under his daughter's pen his biography acquires the dimensions of an exemplary destiny of a novel character" (Burța-Cernat, 2006). In the preface of the volume, O. Dimiseanu considers as exaggerated the way the daughter "overpraises her father from the literary point of view", and he accuses the critics of those times of ill will: "some people's attitude toward her father, and especially of those who had been close to him, remains a human evaluation criterion, perhaps the most conclusive one" (Demetrius, 2005, p. 9).

In *Portrete și amintiri* [Portraits and memories] V. Eftimiu thinks that V. Demetrius is not capable to accept his own limitations, and that he has a superior way of thinking about himself compared to the world, he writes about Demetrius's unwillingness to find the appropriate audience category that would have made him known and valued. The feeling of frustration is exaggerated by the hard work he was doing as head of "Biblioteca pentru

toți”, from 1923, when he has to publish volumes which he considered inferior to his own literary creations. According to V. Eftimiu, „V. Demetrius publishes, under miserable technical conditions, novels about the suburban life of Bucharest, serious novels in which not the humor and vulgarity of the slum vibrate, but the human preoccupations of a distinguished soul. He approached people and things with a lot of understanding and delicacy. He was indeed a delicate soul, a poet as poets imagined at the time, an isolated, timid, almost grumpy man, a man who lived only for his inner dreams, in the world of his poetry, without any other preoccupations” (Eftimiu, 1965, p. 217).

Because there is a dating problem, the year in which the translation is published may be subject to controversy. The translation is recorded into the archive of the University library in Iasi, in 1936 and is also mentioned in *Dicționarul general al literaturii române* [General Dictionary of Romanian literature], “Translations” part in the article dedicated to V. Demetrius. In the same time number 139-140 from „Biblioteca pentru toți” is released. Following a simple and logical algorithm, P. Brânzeu calculates the date of publication according to the year 1896, when the volume with no. 114 comes out of print and comes to the conclusion that V. Demetrius' translation dates around 1910 (Brânzeu, 2006, p. 29). In *Bibliografia românească modernă* [Modern Romanian Bibliography], V. Demetrius' translations of H. de Balzac, Bl. Ibanez, P. Bourget and G. de Maupassant published between 1911-1918 are mentioned (Teodorescu et al., 1986, p. 64). He joins I. Barac, D. P. Economu, A. Stern and Gr. Manolescu in their attempt to transpose the meanings of the Shakespearean masterpiece into our language.

The result reached by V. Demetrius in his attempt to translate, in prose, the short complex-sentence succeeded by moments based on subordinations using many epithets, metaphors and comparisons, manifested in a rare tension and beauty in the human internalizations of Hamlet, which is not avoided, especially due to the level of knowledge of English. The translation, as Vl. Stinu notes is "unsatisfying even for minimal requirements" because of its countless errors, together with some press slips: *apuze* instead of *apuse*, *putrn* instead of *patru*, *acuastra* instead of *aceasta*, etc.

We can also point out some deficiencies in grammar and vocabulary, which make the style of the translation difficult and the meaning often ambiguous. The translator imitates the structure of Anestin's sentence, even the vocabulary, as he confesses in the preface to his version, that he used "English interpretations" and other sources (Demetrius, 1913). His text is full of neologisms: *comtagiune*, *heraldică*, *bioba*, *cancanul*, *comesticuri*, which diminishes the metaphorical and dense meaning of the original. Due to the fact that Demetrius, following Anestin, adopts a too flexible attitude to the English text, he fails to overcome the linguistic traps of the hamletian verse. The

fact that word games in the original text are not used properly, can be noticed in the passage of Polonius' advice to Laertes: *Give every man thy ear but few thy voice* reproduced: *Pleacă-ți urechea la orice om și foarte rar spre tine* (*idem*, p. 29). While the first sentence in the original text (*Give everyman thy ear*) is translated *Pleacă-ți urechea la orice om*, while, the second sentence (*But few thy voice*) is wrongly translated "*și foarte rar spre tine*".

The translator's modest knowledge of the English language and the exaggerated tendency to find a lively expression, based on bold associations, led to the combination of some unsuitable translations, such as Hamlet's words: *Te-ar costa un geamăt, dacă mi-ai ascuțit țeapa* (*idem*, p. 96).

To avoid the discrepancy between the translation and the original, it should be noted that the only decisive thing for the value of the translation is to preserve the authenticity of the tone and the atmosphere of the original, requirement written by T. Vianu in his article *Ceva despre arta traducerii* [Something about the art of translation] (*Gazeta*, 1955). In Demetrius's translation it is this aspect that is neglected. We should see the reply of Polonius given to Reynaldo at the beginning of scene 1, act II: *Pe legea mea, nu, dacă, știi să păstrezi o măsură în acuzări. Astfel nu-l vei acuza de cusurul obrăzniciei. Nu, acesta nu e gândul meu; aruncă-i defecte ușoare, așa ca ele să pară numai urmările libertății* (Demetrius, 1913, p. 47), a difficult to understand translation, lacking the dramatic vibration of the original verse:

"Faith, as you may season it in the charge,
You must not put another scandal on him,
That he is open to incontinency,
That's not my meaning, but breathe his faults
So quaintly
That they may seem the taints of liberty" (V. 28-32, p. 90).

The frequency of the negative adverb *no* distorts the text, not present in 3 of the 5 original verses and it gives an opposite interpretation of the meaning of the translated sentences: *aruncă-i ușor defecte* pentru *breathe his faults so quaintly*, *urmări* for *taints*, *obraznic* for *incontinency*.

The lack of a nuanced understanding of the images and the necessary sensitivity, compared to the ideas of the great English playwright, leads to a blurred, colorless interpretation, making the beauty of the original text and the Shakespearean intention fade. Metaphors like *nici pîrîul nesecat al ochilor* or the comparison *neagră ca cerneala*, obviously used to deepen the protagonist's pain, represent minor achievements of Demetrius while the frequent use of vocative and interjections, inexistent in the source text, doesn't increase the literary quality of the translation, but changes the way the original character expresses himself (for example: *Semne! Hm! Așa! Ei!...ei!...ah. ...ah! băieți!*).

At the graphic level, we identify the same features as for other translations after 1900, the translator usually follows the spelling of that time. The

text is written using *â*, excepting *pîrîul* (104), *urîtă* (109). Final unaccented *u* is used for the auxiliary verb for future tense, in the first person singular: *voiu trăi*, *voiu pune* (143). The apostrophe is used as much as the hyphen, the first one being used to mark the elimination of a sound: *n'am* (8), *iat'o* (9), *printr'un* (11), *v'am* (16), *m'am* (63), *s'a* (119), *s'ar* (141), *s'au* (174). The hyphen connects the verb to the other enclitic or proclitic atonal pronominal forms: *a-mi* (39), *luându-i* (64), *să-mi* (67), *ia-ți* (81), *de-ar* (99), *mi-aduc* (162), *despărțiți-i*, *văzându-te* (174). We can also notice the way the verb *to be* is written in the 3rd person, plural with the letter *â*: *nu sânt* (p. 90), and the auxiliary verb *a avea* [to have] that is used to form the present conditional is wrongly written like this: *ași amorți* (p. 96), *putea*, *vedea* (p. 97), *crede* (p. 146).

When we study the text from the phonetic point of view, we see that some of the words were written with *e* instead of *ie*: *trebue* [trebuie] (pp. 11, 120, 138), *proect* [proiect] (p. 147), or words that are written with *i* instead of *e*: *deosibesc* [deosebesc] (p. 67), *închiagă* [încheagă] (p. 39), or the lack of *i*: *or-care* [oricare] (p. 112), or *s* instead of *z*: *desnădejdea* [deznădejdea] (p. 35), *sboară* [zboară] (p. 69), words ending in *iu*: *temeiu* [temei] (p. 127), double *e*: *scânteetoare* [scanteietoare] (p. 169), *e* used instead of *ă*: *sufer* (p. 171), and the double consonant: *Regina: Innecată, înneacă* (Shakespeare, p. 148), *tennis* (p. 48).

At the morphological level, the archaic form of plural is noticed today: *boalele* (p. 121) for *boli* (illnesses), the form of the adverb *spaimantator* (p. 35) for *înspăimântător* (frightening). In the case of the verb there is the alternation of the past perfect tense and perfect simple with the future, in forms ending in *-u* at the first person singular: *îmi voi aduce aminte* verbal expression [îmi voi aduce aminte] (p. 40), gerund form *rămâind* (p. 165), the use of the interrogative pronoun *cari* for *care* in the accusative (*Ce actori sunt acei pe cari i-ați adus?*) and the relative pronoun (*Chiar aceia cari vă desfătau odată, tragedienii din oraș* (*ibidem*)).

At the syntactical level we notice the inversion: *Dați-mi voe să primesc după obicei, pentru ca primirea bună, ce voi face-o actorilor și pe care trebue, să le-o fac să nu vă pară mai bună de cât aceia pe care v'o fac* (*idem*, p. 67), phrases that do not have a logical syntactic coherence.

We would like to mention the following sentences that do not have a verb: *Gânduri întunecate, mâna dibace, otravă minunată, ocazie favorabilă, anotimp propice și nicio ființă de față* (*idem*, p. 96).

At the lexical level, Demetrius's translation of Hamlet, can be identified as a meeting point for all the other previous translations from the XXth century and of the tendency for using neologisms before in the versions before 1900. Because of this we can talk about two categories of words. On one hand there are the words included in the familiar register, consisting of regionalisms like: *hal*, *liman*, *crezământ*, *a adăsta*, *arvună*, *rachiu*, *grozavă*, *hâd*, *a tământui*, and, on the other hand there are the neologisms, mostly from

French, inspired by the French texts Demetrius translated from: *investit* < fr. *investir*, *himeră* < fr. *chimère*, *a uzurpa* < fr. *usurper*, *tiran* < fr. *tyran*, *leal* < leale, *principe* < it. *principe*, *avaritie* < fr. *avarice*, *credulitate* < *crédulité*, *simptome* < fr. *symptôme*, *purgativ* < fr. *purgatif*, *sanguinară* < fr. *sanguinaire*, *bravoură* < fr. *bravoure*, *laș* < fr. *lâche*, *a se prosterna* < fr. *se prosterner*, *funeră* < fr. *funèbre*.

The French influence gives the text modernity and timeliness, even if some terms seem very bookish.

Although the value of Demetrius's translation, as well as Anestin's, is questionable, it has the credit of having followed the Shakespearean text, and together with the one written by Stern, has a modest contribution to the perception of Shakespeare's work by the Romanian readers.

References:

Brânzeu, P. (2006). Recycling Old texts: Petre P. Carp's Translation of Macbeth (1864). In M. Matei-Chesnoiu (ed.). *Shakespeare in Nineteenth Century Romania*. Humanitas.

Burța-Cernat, B. (2006). Memoria ca datorie. *Observator cultural*, 307. http://www.observatorcultural.ro/Memoria-cadatorie*articleID_14796-articles_details.html.

Demetrius, L. (2005). *Memorii*. Editura Albatros.

Dicționarul general al literaturii române (2004) (Vol. 2, litera C/D). Editura Univers Enciclopedic [= *Dicționarul*, 2004].

Eftimiu, V. (1965). *Portrete și amintiri*. Editura pentru Literatură.

Gazeta literară, 25, 1955 [= *Gazeta*, 1955].

Shakespeare, W. (1913). *Hamlet*. (V. Demetrius, trad.) [= Demetrius, 1913].

Shakespeare, W. *Hamlet-Tragedie în 5 acte* (V. Demetrius, trad.). Ed. „Librăria Universală” [= Shakespeare].

Teodorescu, T. et al. (1986). *Bibliografia generală modernă* (1831-1918) (Vol. 2 (D-K)). Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Vianu, T. (1955). Ceva despre arta traducerii. *Gazeta literară*, 25.