



ALECU RUSSO STATE UNIVERSITY OF BĂLȚI,  
REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

# Speech and Context

International Journal of Linguistics,  
Semiotics and Literary Science

2(VI)2014

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: *Limba 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 and CiteFactor. It is listed in EBSCO, Genamics, MLA International Bibliography, DOAJ, Summon Serials Solutions, ProQuest, La Crie: 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 *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. (Alecă Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova).

### *Scientific Board:*

**Adriana-Gertruda ROMEDEA**, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Bacău, Romania);

**Alexander OGUY**, Professor, Ph.D. (Yuri Fedkovich National University of Chernovitsy, Ukraine);

**Ana BONDARENCO**, Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Laura BĂDESCU**, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Pitești, Romania);

**Lelia TROCAN**, Professor, Ph.D. (University of Craiova, Romania);

**Ludmila ZBANȚ**, Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

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

**Natalia HALINA**, Professor, Ph.D. (Altai State University, Russia);

**Nicanor BABĂRĂ**, Professor, Ph.D. (Moldova State University);

**Nicolae IOANA**, Professor, Ph.D. (Dunarea de Jos University of Galați, Romania);

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Georgeta CÎȘLARU**, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Paris 3 Sorbonne Nouvelle University, France);

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

**Iulia IGNATIUC**, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alecă Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova);

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

**Ludmila BRANIȘTE**, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alexandru Ioan Cuza University of Iași, Romania);

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

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

**Valentina ENCIU**, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova);

**Valentina ȘMATOV**, Associate Professor, Ph.D. (Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova).

*Editing Coordinator:*

**Silvia BOGDAN**, Senior Lecturer (Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova).

*Proofreader and Translator:*

**Silvia BOGDAN**, Senior Lecturer (Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova).

*Technical Editor:*

**Liliana EVDOCHIMOV**, Lecturer (Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova).

*Editorial Office:*

Room 465, B 4,  
Alec Russo State University,  
38, Pușkin Street, 3100, Bălți, Republic of Moldova

*Telephone:* +37323152345

*Fax:* +37323152439

*E-mail:* [acosciug@yahoo.com](mailto:acosciug@yahoo.com)

Publishing House: Bălți University Press.

Journal Web Page: [http://www.usarb.md/limbaj\\_context/](http://www.usarb.md/limbaj_context/)

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

The journal is issued twice a year.

Language of publication: English (from May 2013).

Materials included in this volume were previously reviewed.

**ISSN 1857-4149**

©Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova, 2014

*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.





## CONTENTS

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

#### Articles

- Fee-Alexandra Haase, *‘Protolanguages’ vs. Linguistic Networks Across Language Branches’. A Basic Inventory for Relations of Concepts in Prehistoric States of Linguistic Communication* ..... 13
- Elena Tamba, *International Terms in Romanian* ..... 41
- Vyacheslav Dolgov, *Perceptive and Figurative Representation of Linguistic–Cultural Description of Foolishness* ..... 47

#### Short Studies

- Gergana Petkova, *Ukrainian and Belorussian Masculine Proper Names, Derived from Roman Mythological Names* ..... 55

### (LITERARY) LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CONDITIONING

#### Articles

- Mioara Dragomir, *An Essential Characteristic of the Derivation System from the Language of Metropolitan Dosoftei’s Texts - Consequence of the Spiritual Basis of the Moldavian Scholar* ..... 61
- Onoriu Colăcel, *The Narrative of Clan Clustering in Two American Novels* 70
- Diana Vrabie, *The Correlation between Historiography and Literature of Confession* ..... 77
- Notes on Contributors** ..... 86



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

---



# "PROTOLANGUAGES' VS. LINGUISTIC NETWORKS ACROSS LANGUAGE BRANCHES'. A BASIC INVENTORY FOR RELATIONS OF CONCEPTS IN PREHISTORIC STATES OF LINGUISTIC COMMUNICATION

**Fee-Alexandra Haase,**  
Professor, Ph.D.  
(University of Nizwa, Oman)

**Abstract:** *The following is a study of the representation of the reflexes of the roots of the Borean language family in the Eurasiatic, Afroasiatic, Sino-Caucasian, Austric, and Amerind language families. This Borean language family is considered to be a macro-language family, which comprises the aforementioned language families as their members. With the selection of words of this macro-family we can state that the roots of this macro-family are neither equally distributed among the member families nor distributed in the framework of the traditional borders of natural language families. In order to check the distribution of these Borean roots, we use the "100-Words-Swadesh List" to check extensions of the related roots within the 5 different language families. The results are presented in a list of 100 concepts and a theory of the conditions of linguistic communication in pre-historic time, for which linguists usually employ the concept of 'protolanguages'. We derive from our findings that the early hypothetical linguistic states of humans allowed the representation of oneself and the environment as its thesaurus entailed the conceptual meanings for it. On the contrary, a grammaticalization in the traditional understanding is not obviously resulting from the material as well as unlikely to have happened. The linguistic state was a 'phonetic networking network' across language families, so that the concept 'language family' should be critically revised.*

**Keywords:** *protolanguage, concept, a prehistoric state, linguistic, communication.*

## **1. Introduction: About the need of theory of linguistics at the end of linguistic history**

The following article is an approach to find answers to the question of relations between languages transgressing the traditional classification systems of language branches of natural languages. While no doubt exists among linguists that natural languages change in a diachronic range for historically documented chronological ranges of natural languages, the situation is completely different for languages and/or linguistic varieties, which lack historical documentation, since they were just orally transmitted. Nevertheless, historical linguistic studies have since the 19<sup>th</sup> century discovered that the branches of language families have hypothetical common ancestors or at least share a common morphological material at the level of the words of their lexical inventory.

The contemporary state of knowledge in linguistics represents that the concept of 'language' is multilayered and also alternative conceptual frameworks should be taken into account in order to describe the linguistic situation for pre-historical linguistic states. The state of lack of historical material leads *volens volens* to the necessity of theoretical frameworks about linguistic states in pre-historical times. The scientific approach needs to be experimentally based on non-empirical comparisons of documented linguistic material

from different branches and the detection of the maximum amount of commonly shared linguistic features within the lexicon of the linguistic varieties and/or languages. This work of historical linguistic research has brought forward since the 19<sup>th</sup> century not only the knowledge of relationships between widely dispersed languages as language families (, which also tells us something about the migration backgrounds that can be additionally compared to findings in archeology and anthropology as supporting evidence). Also systematic linguistic inventory lists of the commonly shared lexical inventory have been presented by linguists. Pokorny's list of Indo-European roots as well as the Starostinian approach of multiple comparisons of similar material across language families supported by rich database material can be mentioned here besides selective studies in 'language contacts' (, a problematic term we like to exchange against 'linguistic communication'), which uncover linguistic communication beyond the area of the commonly established language families.

The question how a community of speakers actually evolves increases our relative helpless state of methodological approaches, as even the theoretical material seem to be in need of a revision. The assumption that a language exists in pre-historical times, means that also the contemporary dominant associations of the concepts 'language' is applicable for pre-historic linguistic states. But this is not the case and we will in the following article based on the material of the Borean language family demonstrate how the a community of speakers through differentiation of linguistic material and secondary grammaticalization could have communicated without the social and cultural borders we usually associate to linguistic varieties.

## **2. The state of research: language as faculty of linguistic communication, the concept 'protolanguage', and the idea of an evolution of languages**

P. Kiparsky's article *Historical Linguistics and the Origin of Language* [7, p. 97-103] still refers to the idea of an origin of language in the tradition of the philologies of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century. In *Reconsidering the "Isolating Proto-language Hypothesis."* in *the Evolution of Morphology* J. Dubé wrote: "Much recent work on the evolution of language assumes explicitly or implicitly that the original language was without morphology. Under this assumption, morphology is merely a consequence of language use: affixal morphology is the result of the agglutination of free words, and morphophonemic (MP) alternations arise through the morphologization of once regular phonological processes [3]. This hypothesis is based on at least two questionable assumptions: first, that the methods and results of historical linguistics can provide a "window" on the evolution of language, and second, based on the claim that some languages have no morphology (the so-called isolating languages), that morphology is not a necessary part of language. The aim of this paper is to suggest that there is in fact no basis for what I will call the

“Isolating Proto-Language Hypothesis” (henceforth IPH), either on historical or typological grounds, and that the evolution of morphology remains an interesting question”. J. Dubé mentioned that “to appeal to a random genetic mutation or to a stroke of lightning in order to explain the evolutionary origins of language, or of one of its components, is clearly not an explanation, but it is equally unhelpful to keep a demonstrably wrong hypothesis because it may be the only available alternative to date to the argument from ignorance. Both of these views risk having the effect of preventing interesting investigations of the *problem* (not the *mystery*) of the evolution of morphology” [*ibidem*]. K. R. Gibson in *Language or Protolanguage? A Review of the Ape Language Literature* described actual ape behaviors without prejudging their linguistic nature concluding “that a number of apes mastered essential components of protolanguage, but none constructed hierarchically structured sentences containing embedded phrases or clauses” [4]. J. R. Hurford in *The Evolution of Language and Languages* mentioned that “Bickerton's term *protolanguage* is a useful attention-focussing device, postulating that the class of ‘languages’ biologically available to *Homo erectus* was the class of protolanguages, defined quite roughly as systems for concatenating vocabulary with none of the complex syntactic dependencies, constituencies, command and control relations characterizing modern languages. A *Homo erectus* individual, even if somehow presented with modern linguistic experience, could not make of it what a modern child makes of it, due to innate limitations” [5]. The researcher stated that “the language faculty has evolved as other genetically determined traits have evolved, via selection over the millions of alleles that contribute to the human genome. The phylogenetic evolution of the language faculty must have been slower by several orders of magnitude (assuming one could even quantify such things) than the sociocultural evolution of individual languages” [*ibidem*]. Proto-Indo-European is “presumed to have been spoken somewhere in Eastern Europe about five thousand years ago, and Proto-Iroquoian, the ancestor language from which the modern American languages of the Iroquoian family, such as Mohawk, are descended”. J. R. Hurford [5] and D. Bickerton [1] wrote regarding the timing of protolanguage: “The question of when protolanguage emerged merits a brief consideration, if only because an adequate theory must eventually be able to integrate language evolution into the overall development of the genus *Homo*. The wide range of estimates in the literature (from the australopithecine era to the emergence of our own species) suggests that there are inadequate constraints to determine dates at this point. Much depends, too, on the nature of the initial selective pressure. If this was scavenging (as suggested above) the likeliest time of onset would be between two and three million years ago. It seems intrinsically plausible that a longish period elapsed between the emergence of symbolic units and the emergence of

syntax, since complex connections not required by any previous brain operations had to be forged, while perhaps also a critical mass of “recruitable neurons” had to be achieved”.

The usual approach for the reconstruction of linguistic states, which lack historical documentation, is the reconstruction of a hypothetical former state based on the material of words in historical languages, which show similarities. These similar words can be cognates or other phonetically similar words. A common hypothetical ancestral root of the protolanguage both share is made in a method called ‘comparative method’. The state of the protolanguages is discussed, as one position refers to them as hypothetical, whereas another position states that these protolanguages have existed and were used around 5000 BCE. In other words: The previously mentioned approach tends to an evolutionary perspective of languages including protolanguages going hand in hand with the evolution of the human from the apes, which already partly were able to produce and use features of the protolanguages (see [4]). Al. Bouchard-Côté, D. Hall, Th. L. Griffiths, and D. Klein in *Automated Reconstruction of Ancient Languages using Probabilistic Models of Sound Change* (2013) stated that “one of the oldest problems in linguistics is reconstructing the words that appeared in the protolanguages from which modern languages evolved. Identifying the forms of these ancient languages makes it possible to evaluate proposals about the nature of language change and to draw inferences about human history” [2]. According to these linguists, “protolanguages are typically reconstructed using a painstaking manual process known as the comparative method. We present a family of probabilistic models of sound change as well as algorithms for performing inference in these models. The resulting system automatically and accurately reconstructs protolanguages from modern languages” [*ibidem*]. They stated too that “the key observation that makes reconstruction from these data possible is that languages seem to undergo a relatively limited set of regular sound changes, each applied to the entire vocabulary of a language at specific stages of its history” [*ibidem*]. Like for other approached of historical linguistics, the phonetic material is the subject of research: “Using phonological representations allows us to perform reconstruction and does not require us to assume that cognate sets have been fully resolved as a preprocessing step. Representing the words at each point in a phylogeny and having a model of how they change give a way of comparing different hypothesized cognate sets and hence inferring cognate sets automatically”. Al. Bouchard-Côté *et alii* use a probabilistic model of sound change and a Monte Carlo inference algorithm “to reconstruct the lexicon and phonology of protolanguages given a collection of cognate sets from modern languages. As in other recent work in computational historical linguistics (13–18), we make the simplifying assumption that each word evolves along the branches of a tree of languages, reflecting the languages’ phylogenetic relationships. We model the evolution of discrete sequences of



phonemes, using a context-dependent probabilistic string transducer". The database *Tower of Babel* entails indexes of the major language families with roots of protolanguages and the hypothetical Borean root as the antecedent root with representations in the main branches of language families. Based on the Borean root, it is possible to trace the relationships between words of protolanguages and the related reflexes in natural languages.

## **2. Question, methodology, and approach of our research: change and variations as underlying principles of development of 'linguistic communication'**

Our study is based on the corpus of the Tower of Babel project. In the tradition of 'big questions' of humankind the question how words and things refer to each other would be the guiding question of our research. In academia the question is approached since antiquity by philosophers and rhetoricians and in the heritage of the tradition of Western academic studies in linguistics, semiotics, and communication sciences further answered. How linguists interpret the findings from the comparisons of linguistic varieties varies. While naïve early 19<sup>th</sup> century researchers in the tradition of Herders *Ursprache* still assumed the existence of arch-languages as ground for later languages, the framework of the concept 'language' was more and more critically revised. Still the term 'proto-language' is commonly used for a hypothetical antecedent language/linguistic variety. The simplest description for the common features we are interested in is an inductively derived morphological material at word-level, which is shared among language varieties. Our research interest focuses on the common linguistic features of languages beyond the level of a single branch of languages. The Starostinian database and the concept of the Borean macro-language family allow us to have material for the comparison of material beyond the level of language families. The term 'linguistic communication' is used for any linguistically relevant material, which also entails our hypothetical material as representations of 'linguistic communication'.

As propedeutics for the problem and our discussion and as the description of the segment of our research in a case study we select a semantic framework idea of most common words of a linguistic variety and semantic categories of lexical material. It is statistically possible to rank the most commonly used words within a text corpus of a thesaurus. An example is the list of the most commonly used words in the English language (see table below). On the contrary, it is not possible to determinate the exact meaning of words, when operating at the level of hypothetical linguistic states, since here *conceptual meanings* are associated to the material. We also have here examples of semantic framework ideas, which aim at the classification of the inventory of a linguistic variety according to the closeness to this field. Usually, these categorizations refer as *orbis pictus* to the world. The *Semantic Fields for Indo-European Linguistics* used at the University of Texas at Austin

for the categorization of semantic fields of Pokorny's etyma (see table below). The semantics of the roots of the Borean hypothetical ancestral linguistic variety result from the semantic meanings of the Starostian databases at *Tower of Babel*. (Below we discuss their actual function as concepts rather than lexicological meanings). For our theoretical framework, we rely on the theory of transpositional grammar based on the assumption that parts of speech can be subject of a transposition from one to another part of speech and also complex expressions can be associated to this process.

J. R. Hurford stated that "historical linguists have catalogued many types of change that can occur in the evolution of individual languages, changes such as weakening and strengthening of the meanings of words, change of basic word order, loss of inflections, grammaticalization of lexical words (nouns, verbs, adjectives) into grammatical function words (articles, pronouns, auxiliaries), merger of phonemes, the emergence of novel phonemic distinctions, lowering, raising, fronting, backing and rounding of vowels, palatalization, glottalization, and so on" [5]. The selected 100 words from the *Swedish List* are analyzed regarding their individual reflexes in the main language families, which form cognates across language families. The sets of associated reflexes in protolanguages are the nodi, which connect the conceptual Borean roots with natural languages across the main language families. Concerning the main aspects of linguistic studies, the historical linguists rely on a symbolically recording system of phonetic sounds for words and reconstructed or evident roots, which is usually IPA. As the symbolic representations are strings of phonetic values, the morphological aspect of the lexicon is also present. When it comes to semantics, as soon as we leave the area of the historical records, the associated meaning must be considered to be a conceptual meaning, since grammaticalization and differentialization are not reconstructable in linguistic states prior to the existence of historical natural languages. So the meaning 'green' is actually the concept 'green' allowing grammatical alterations like 'greenish', 'green', 'the green', and 'be green' usually coming together with a grammaticalization of the roots. About the syntactical formation and transposition of the lexical inventory of protolanguages we know less. Usually word orders in word compounds (like sentences) and change of the root or its alteration with grammatical markings of single words are the syntactical features of natural formats of linguistic communication like natural languages.

### **3. Propedeutics of contrastive studies: word lists and other semantic-driven linguistic inventories**

A hypothetical construct of a lexical thesaurus of a community of speakers is produced by linguists with top-used lists of words of thesauri of natural languages. For a community of speakers this hypothetical construct would represent the most commonly used words shared in linguistic communication

acts. The most commonly used words for the community, which used the roots of the communication system of the Borean roots of course cannot be determinate. The actual problem of the semantic meanings associated to roots will be discussed below and instead of them, the concept, from which the transpositions derive, will be promoted as theoretical approach. In contrast to the *Swedish List*, contemporary top-100-lists entail grammatical and lexical elements, which are linguistic and grammatical markers (like below *the* and *a, be, of, if, her* and *she* and *his* and *him, would* and *could* as conditionalizing markers, prepositions like *at* or *in, which, when, or* and *and, not, just* and *only, because* and *so*, which are not referring to the semantic world of things, but their relations in a linguistic framework. They are usually from natural language to natural language differently expressed. In the *Swedish List* they don't exist. According to the *Oxford English Corpus* (2014), the following are the most used words in the English language as of the year 2014:

Rank	Word	Rank	Word	Rank	Word	Rank	Word	Rank	Word
1	<i>The</i>	21	<i>This</i>	41	<i>So</i>	61	<i>people</i>	81	<i>Back</i>
2	<i>Be</i>	22	<i>But</i>	42	<i>Up</i>	62	<i>Into</i>	82	<i>After</i>
3	<i>To</i>	23	<i>His</i>	43	<i>Out</i>	63	<i>Year</i>	83	<i>Use</i>
4	<i>Of</i>	24	<i>By</i>	44	<i>If</i>	64	<i>Your</i>	84	<i>Two</i>
5	<i>And</i>	25	<i>From</i>	45	<i>About</i>	65	<i>Good</i>	85	<i>How</i>
6	<i>A</i>	26	<i>They</i>	46	<i>Who</i>	66	<i>Some</i>	86	<i>Our</i>
7	<i>In</i>	27	<i>We</i>	47	<i>Get</i>	67	<i>Could</i>	87	<i>Work</i>
8	<i>That</i>	28	<i>Say</i>	48	<i>Which</i>	68	<i>Them</i>	88	<i>First</i>
9	<i>Have</i>	29	<i>Her</i>	49	<i>Go</i>	69	<i>See</i>	89	<i>Well</i>
10	<i>I</i>	30	<i>She</i>	50	<i>Me</i>	70	<i>Other</i>	90	<i>Way</i>
11	<i>It</i>	31	<i>Or</i>	51	<i>When</i>	71	<i>Than</i>	91	<i>Even</i>
12	<i>For</i>	32	<i>An</i>	52	<i>Make</i>	72	<i>Then</i>	92	<i>New</i>
13	<i>Not</i>	33	<i>Will</i>	53	<i>Can</i>	73	<i>Now</i>	93	<i>Want</i>
14	<i>On</i>	34	<i>My</i>	54	<i>Like</i>	74	<i>Look</i>	94	<i>Because</i>
15	<i>With</i>	35	<i>One</i>	55	<i>Time</i>	75	<i>Only</i>	95	<i>Any</i>
16	<i>He</i>	36	<i>All</i>	56	<i>No</i>	76	<i>Come</i>	96	<i>These</i>
17	<i>As</i>	37	<i>Would</i>	57	<i>Just</i>	77	<i>Its</i>	97	<i>Give</i>
18	<i>You</i>	38	<i>There</i>	58	<i>Him</i>	78	<i>Over</i>	98	<i>Day</i>
19	<i>Do</i>	39	<i>Their</i>	59	<i>Know</i>	79	<i>Think</i>	99	<i>Most</i>
20	<i>At</i>	40	<i>What</i>	60	<i>Take</i>	80	<i>Also</i>	100	<i>Us</i>

Table 1: *The most used words in English as of the year 2014*

The contemporary text corpus-based 100 most common words in English can – in contrast to the conceptual semantic meanings of proto-material- be classified with exactly one part of speech. In hypothetical linguistic communication material the meaning is conceptual and thus beyond the level of grammaticality. According to the parts of speech the ranking of the top-100 words in English is as follows:

Nouns	Verbs	Adjectives	Prepositions	Others
• Time	1. be	1. Good	1. to	1) the
• person	2. have	2. new	2. of	2) and
• year	3. do	3. first	3. in	3) a
• way	4. say	4. last	4. for	4) that
• day	5. get	5. long	5. on	5) I
• thing	6. make	6. great	6. with	6) it
• man	7. go	7. little	7. at	7) not
• world	8. know	8. own	8. by	8) he
• life	9. take	9. other	9. from	9) as
• hand	10. see	10. old	10. up	10) you
• part	11. come	11. right	11. about	11) this
• child	12. think	12. big	12. into	12) but
• eye	13. look	13. high	13. over	13) his
• woman	14. want	14. different	14. after	14) they
• place	15. give	15. small	15. beneath	15) her
• work	16. use	16. large	16. under	16) she
• week	17. find	17. next	17. above	17) or
• case	18. tell	18. early		18) an
• point	19. ask	19. young		19) will
• government	20. work	20. important		20) my
• company	21. seem	21. few		21) one
• number	22. feel	22. public		22) all
• group	23. try	23. bad		23) would
• problem	24. leave	24. same		24) there
• fact	25. call	25. able		25) their

Table 2: The ranking of the top-100 words in English

G. Starostin in *Preliminary Lexicostatistics as a Basis for Language Classification: A New Approach* presented a 50-item-wordlist for the global lexicostatistical database [8]. This list entails all words of the *Swedish List*, but ranks them differently.

1. we	21. one	41. leaf
2. two	22. tooth	42. kill
3. I	23. new	43. foot
4. eye	24. dry (e.g. of clothes)	44. horn
5. thou	25. eat	45. hear
6. who	26. tail	46. meat (as food)
7. fire	27. hair (of head)	47. egg
8. tongue	28. water	48. black
9. stone	29. nose	49. head
10. name	30. not	50. night
11. hand	31. mouth	
12. what	32. ear	
13. die	33. bird	
14. heart	34. bone	

15. drink	35. sun	
16. dog	36. smoke	
17. louse (head)	37. tree	
18. moon	38. ashes	
19. fingernail	39. rain	
20. blood	40. star	

Table 3: G. Starostin's 50-Words List (2014)

Did a community of speakers have the same 'orbis pictus' have in mind and words like a contemporary human? Definitely not, but some basic fields like the nature or human features are continually stable. A list of semantic fields of the lexicon of languages was made in the Department of Linguistics of the University of Texas at Austin [6]. The Department of Linguistics of the University of Texas at Austin employs the following semantic fields for the historical linguistic thesaurus:

Agriculture/Veg. Animals Body Part/Function Clothing/Adornment Dwellings/Furniture Emotion Food/Drink Language/Music Law/Judgment Mankind Mind/Thought	Motion/Transport Physical Acts/Mat'ls Physical World Possession/Trade Quantity/Number Religion/Beliefs Sense Perception Social Relations Spatial Relations Time Warfare/Hunting
--	---

Table 4: *Indo-European Linguistics. Semantic Fields.*  
List 1. University of Texas at Austin

The Department of Linguistics of the University of Texas at Austin employs another list of semantic fields for the historical linguistic thesaurus:

1. Physical World 2. Mankind 3. Animals 4. Body Parts & Functions 5. Food & Drink 6. Clothing & Adornment 7. Dwellings & Furniture 8. Agriculture & Vegetation 9. Physical Acts & Materials 10. Motion & Transportation 11. Possession & Trade	12. Spatial Relations 13. Quantity & Number 14. Time 15. Sense Perception 16. Emotion 17. Mind & Thought 18. Language & Music 19. Social Relations 20. Warfare & Hunting 21. Law & Judgment 22. Religion & Beliefs
--	--

Table 5: *Indo-European Linguistics. Semantic Fields.*  
List 2. University of Texas at Austin

The classifying categories for the 'orbis pictus' or –otherwise expressed– the thesaurus of a human linguistic communication enabling system (like a natural language) usually aim at presenting an abstract reference framework for a thesaurus. The *Swedish List* is simpler than the categories of the semantic fields and lacks any complex conditions of single semantic items. Nearly all of the semantic meanings or words of the *Swedish List* are present in the database *Tower of Babel* in the Borean-Proto-Level-database. Our study is based on the so-called 'words' of the *Swedish List*. The *Swadesh List* is a compilation of basic words for the purposes of historical-comparative linguistics [10]. This choice derives from the needs of a semantic selection than from the actual indexing of this list. We discuss the theoretical problems of the *Swedish List* at another place of this article. The list entails the following entries:

1. I	41. nose	81. smoke
2. You	42. mouth	82. fire
3. we	43. tooth	83. ash(es)
4. this	44. tongue	84. burn
5. that	45. claw	85. path
6. who?	46. foot	86. mountain
7. what?	47. knee	87. red
8. not	48. hand	88. green
9. all	49. belly	89. yellow
10. many	50. neck	90. white
11. one	51. breasts	91. black
12. two	52. heart	92. night
13. big	53. liver	93. hot
14. long	54. drink	94. cold
15. small	55. eat	95. full
16. woman	56. bite	96. new
17. man	57. see	97. good
18. person	58. hear	98. round
19. fish	59. know	99. dry
20. bird	60. sleep	100. name
21. dog	61. die	
22. louse	62. kill	
23. tree	63. swim	
24. seed	64. fly	
25. leaf	65. walk	
26. root	66. come	
27. bark	67. lie	
28. skin	68. sit	
29. flesh	69. stand	
30. blood	70. give	

31. bone	71. say	
32. grease	72. sun	
33. egg	73. moon	
34. horn	74. star	
35. tail	75. water	
36. feather	76. rain	
37. hair	77. stone	
38. head	78. sand	
39. ear	79. earth	
40. eye	80. cloud	

Table 6: Swadesh's 100-Word List.  
Department of Linguistics, Portland State University

#### 4. The interpretation of findings: 'how was pre-historic linguistic communication like?'

Even though we rely in research on the database for the so-called Borean proto-language, we are still aware that the concept 'language' is here more than problematic and we will finally discuss alternatives below. Nevertheless, the merits of the database and the approach of Starosin are evident. The linguistic communicative macro-format we suggest for this kind of linguistic communication is out of the range of the natural language as far as we describe it within the framework of our linguistic method; the list of the Borean roots, which follow the pattern  $K1-V2- K1- V2$  for *consonant 1 - vowel 1 - consonant 2 - vowel 1* within the traditional root scheme of morphology of words, refers to a general word pattern of two radical consonants followed by a vowel. The Borean roots of one of the semantic meanings refer to at least one of the following language families:

- E: Indo-European Language Family
- A: Afroasiatic Language Family
- SC: Sino-Caucasian Language Family
- AU: Austric Language Family
- AM: Amerindian Language Family

The hypothetical Borean roots, our material from the *Tower of Babel* database, we indexed according to the 100 top common semantic fields of the *Swedish List*. (see table below) Generally speaking, we can say that the majority of the semantic fields of the *Swedish List* has more than one reference to Borean roots. The majority of the Borean roots also refer to more than one language family. The presence of multiple Borean roots in one language family for the representation of a linguistic concept can be interpreted as:

1. Presence of Multiple Borean roots and their reflexes in one language family;
2. Indicator for a sub-segmented distribution of the Borean roots and their reflexes in the topographical area associated to a language family;

3. The general occurrence of root material in more than one of the traditional language families.

Some of the semantic fields of the *Swedish List* are not or surprisingly thin covered by Borean roots (e.g. 'drink' and some colors). This can be interpreted as a lack of the coverage of these semantic fields in the text corpus of the database *Tower of Babel*. The data derived from this database are probably not sufficient for the coverage of all existing roots. (Below we discuss this as phenomenon of transpositional grammar). We assume that the semantic fields actually allow multiple grammatical realizations in the sense of the transposition grammar, which was in disciplines like Egyptology successfully employed for the description of linguistic features of an early language, which evolved within the transformation of images to writing. The here presented roots are concepts, which have either no concrete part of speech as associated grammatical feature and/or we are not able to construct grammatical features like the associated part of speech out of the material. One the one hand we have an extreme interwoven pattern of concepts and multiple roots across several language families, or the other hand we a low level of grammatical features. Except the pronouns, we have a morphological pattern of two radicals. (Ancient Egyptian has as standard pattern three radicals). This material allowed alterations for the purpose of grammatical features and in this regard the structure would not be very different from contemporary languages, which use additional sounds for grammatical markings).

##### **5. An outlook to a linguistic categorization: towards a theory of concepts and conceptualization of (pre-historic) linguistic communication as 'phonetic networking network'**

In the tradition of transposition grammar we conclude that the semantic inventory of the *Swedish List* must be in the context of our root analysis considered the conceptual inventory of a thesaurus, which allows transpositions of parts of speech for each concept. Alternatively, it can also be assumed that the morphological material was simply not semantically differentiated; it was applied and within the course of the usage among speakers individual meanings as well as the differentiation of grammatical features occurred and was coded within a selected community of speakers. In the theory of 'transposition grammar' the generation of parts of speech is according to transposition grammatical approaches a secondary phenomenon, as an expression can be transposed from one part of speech into another one generating syntactical patterns. The actual appearance of the semantic connotation associated to the roots must be classified as conceptual meaning or concept lacking any grammatical aspects. The meanings are grammar-free concepts, which can be transformed (when realized) into grammatical forms. This conceptuality of the meanings of the roots has to be critically mentioned, when commenting the associated meanings.



<b>(1) Nominal Expressions</b>	Humans	Nouns and Nominal Expressions
	Objects	Nouns and Nominal Expressions
<b>(2) Verbal Expressions</b>	Actions	Verbs and Verbal Expressions
<b>(3) Adjectival Expressions</b>	Nominal Qualities	Adjectives and Adjectival Expressions
<b>(4) Adverbial Expressions</b>	Verbal Qualities	Adverbs and Adverbial Expressions

Table 7: *Transpositional grammatical framework for lexicological entries*

In the following chart the types of actual expressions associated to the words of the *Swedish List* are added. Under the paradigm of the transpositional grammar the concept derive from each of the words is able to have its reflexes in the full range of expressions derived from the main parts of speech. Of course, the realization of the reflexes doesn't occur in all languages and the concept can be expressed in a certain part of speech with the use of another concept and roots.

1. I	NE	41. nose	NE	81. smoke	NE
2. You	NE	42. mouth	NE	82. fire	NE
3. we	NE	43. tooth	NE	83. ash(es)	NE
4. this	NE	44. tongue	NE	84. burn	VE
5. that	NE	45. claw	NE	85. path	NE
6. who?	NE	46. foot	NE	86. mountain	NE
7. what?	NE	47. knee	NE	87. red	ADJE
8. not		48. hand	NE	88. green	ADJE
9. all	NE	49. belly	NE	89. yellow	ADJE
10. many	NE	50. neck	NE	90. white	ADJE
11. one	ADJE	51. breasts	NE	91. black	ADJE
12. two	ADJE	52. heart	NE	92. night	NE
13. big	ADJE	53. liver	NE	93. hot	ADJE
14. long	ADJE	54. drink	VE	94. cold	ADJE
15. small	ADJE	55. eat	VE	95. full	ADJE
16. woman	NE	56. bite	VE	96. new	ADJE
17. man	NE	57. see	VE	97. good	ADJE
18. person	NE	58. hear	VE	98. round	ADJE
19. fish	NE	59. know	VE	99. dry	ADJE
20. bird	NE	60. sleep	VE	100. name	NE
21. dog	NE	61. die	VE		
22. louse	NE	62. kill	VE		
23. tree	NE	63. swim	VE		
24. seed	NE	64. fly	VE		
25. leaf	NE	65. walk	VE		
26. root	NE	66. come	VE		

27. bark	NE	67. lie	VE		
28. skin	NE	68. sit	VE		
29. flesh	NE	69. stand	VE		
30. blood	NE	70. give	VE		
31. bone	NE	71. say	VE		
32. grease	NE	72. sun	NE		
33. egg	NE	73. moon	NE		
34. horn	NE	74. star	NE		
35. tail	NE	75. water	NE		
36. feather	NE	76. rain	NE		
37. hair	NE	77. stone	NE		
38. head	NE	78. sand	NE		
39. ear	NE	79. earth	NE		
40. eye	NE	80. cloud	NE		

Table 8: *Swadesh's 100-Word List.*

*Department of Linguistics, Portland State University*

The question of the most important words in a thesaurus is – to conclude finally - an unnecessary question; as the transposition of words allows as derivations from one concept multiple realization of reflexes, this question and its answer can only be approached in limited empirical studies. One of the explanations of the multiple appearances of several roots related to different concepts within the Borean roots we examined is that the word lists like the *Swedish List* do not take into account that it should be conceptual meanings and not thesaurus inventory of languages. One root concept (SUN) could for example have represented an adjectival expression in one reflex (sunny), while another one was used for the noun ‘sun’ or ‘shine’. The benefit of the attached list of Borean roots and their conceptual meaning lies in the representation of the widest range of trans-familiar linguistic relations for 100 common words.

The knowledge about pre-historic linguistic states of course needs to be similarly approached like historic linguistic phenomena and thus aims at answers for questions about the lexical, semantic, morphological, and phonetic qualities of representations of linguistic communication as reconstructed forms from historical documentation of historical linguistic material of natural languages. At the level of the concept, e.g. SUN, such linguistic features are irrelevant. The linguistic features become relevant as soon as the linguistic material is the topic of the research; in our case six Borean roots for the concept SUN exist; five of them are in more than one language family present.

NVJV	E/AF	Sun
KVMV	E/SC	Sun
HVKV	SC/AM	Sun
NVRV	E/AU	Sun
PVCV	AF	Sun
TVNV	E/SF/AU	Sun

The associated meaning `sun' is actually a hypothetical or conceptual meaning. Approached by the transpositional grammatical theory, it could also refer to such lexical forms like shiny, shine (like the sun), shining etc. Our findings clearly support the existence of a relation of one word of the Swadish list to more than one semantic meaning associated to a root. This is a network, which is not governed by the rules of traditional language families. On the contrary, it exists as not by the borders of language families ruled network. As we are here in the hypothetical area of reconstruction, we have to face also the question of the qualities and features of the pre-historic state of linguistic communication. The problematic state of the term 'proto-language' was raised in recent research. The concept 'language' is here not sufficient, as it implicitly involves the idea that a natural language-like phenomenon exists. The material discussed here actually forces us to assume the contrary: a topographically diverse networked layer of conceptually related linguistic text elements at the micro-level of words. Factors for their extensions and limitations must be seeks in non-linguistic and / or socio-linguistic aspects. As for now, we formulate of theses as follows for global aspects of pre-historic linguistic communication:

1. Linguistic communication in pre-historic settings was not (only) ruled by the differentiation of languages in language evolution as we know it typically in sets of language families;
2. Micro-linguistic units like the examined roots demonstrate that words or other micro-linguistic contents of linguistic communication in their morphological material and the semantic meaning transcended borders of traditional language families;
3. Instead of the assumption of a word and a semantic meaning we must operate with concepts and conceptual meanings for the description of pre-historic states of linguistic communication.

However linguistic communication took part, we assume that it was less limited and structured as contemporary definitions might imply. The content of these pre-historic linguistic communication was highly communicable and less regulated by socio-cultural factors. Also its grammaticality stands at disposal. We know that older languages have a low level of grammatical markers. The exchange of vocals as the principle of grammaticalization is a feature of languages, which usually fall from a language-evolutionary perspective in a time frame, which was before the use of distinct grammatical markers. (Arabic is a language, which still uses the vowel changing, while in Germanic languages this principle was exchanged by implemented markers, which were/are not vowels). The relative simple sound patterns of the roots of the Borean language family allowed alterations among the communities of their users. We can assume that among the variety of roots offered the members of open speech communities saw themselves permanently in the position of selecting and specifying the linguistic communication material they received.

Within this process actually a 'community of speakers' could rise and evolve and distinguish itself from the other users of linguistic communication.

Our interest is not to find evidence or contribute to a theory of the evolution of language as a human faculty or as a system of linguistic communication. The evolutionary approaches we discussed in the introductory part of this article assume that language evolves from simpler forms (like proto-languages) to higher patterns of linguistic communication like the contemporary natural languages. But this is not the aim of our studies here, which look for an answer regarding the kind of formation of language varieties. As far as we see the distribution of Borean roots, we can assume that linguistic communication operated, generally speaking, in all directions as a networking process of the networked substance for the communicative performance. This undirected and unstructured process was on the other hand modified by social and extrinsic (e.g. natural) conditions. The participation in a common phonetic symbolic system allowed participating in social activities. The stabilization or codification of the 'phonetic networking network' was not practiced and when it occurred, it marked in a region with a community of speakers the step from a-historical to historical time. We should not project our - actually accrued - contemporary understanding about language etc. onto the situation of the state of 'linguistic communication' before the rise of historical languages. We are able to reconstruct common aspects of groups of languages in the linguistic symbolic representation of phonetics. But we are not able to differentiate a grammatical structure. Even the association of a grammaticalization of former linguistic states is wrong, as the earliest natural languages were coded signs (China, Egypt). Letters as arbitrary signs did not exist, they developed later. Additional information, for which we usually use grammar (like plural, tense etc.), were and are implemented by markers for the change of a word or a specific grammatical phenomenon or the establishment of certain positions or orders of words. What we can say about the status of the linguistic communication is that specific patterns ('strings') of vowels and consonants were stable components of communication across generations in terms of their phonetic components and basic morphological components as well as concerning their reference to a specific semantic concept. Such strings for specific concepts existed in wide areas across the globe. They do not show the regional limitation to a certain region like we find it in the separation of regions associated to the main branches of language families for historical languages. The communication of the humans able to perform linguistic communication was purely applied and allowed the sharing entities to communicate within a symbolic representative system of sounds the world around them and themselves as a semiotic process for references. We do not know if the communication at this state already entailed functional pragmatic aspects like expressions of orders, conditions, negations etc. But looking at the variety of linguistic forms for such functional aspects in natural languages, it is likely that this was a state of differentiation among smaller units of speakers driven by the rules of their own socialization.

**Appendix: The Historical Linguistic Paths of the Semantic Fields of Borean Roots**

<b>Semantic value/concept</b>	<b>Annotated Borean root</b>	<b>The language families, in which reflexes of the respective Borean root exist</b>
1. <i>I</i>	HVKV MV NV WV HVCV CV	E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / AU A / SC / AU / AM SC / AU / AM
2. <i>You</i>	HU MV NV TV WV CV	E / A / SC / AM AU / AM E / A / SC E / AM / SC / AM SC / AM E / SC / AU / AM
3. <i>we</i>	PV TV LV WV	AU / AM SC / AU / AM SC SC / AU / AM
4. <i>this</i>	NV KV HV CV	E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM
5. <i>that</i>	MV PV TV HV(1) HV (2) HV (3)	A / SC / AM E / A / SC / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM
6. <i>who?</i>	KV NV CV	E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / SC / AU / AM
7. <i>what?</i>	MV PV RV	E / A / SC / AM / AU SC / AU / AM AU
8. <i>not</i>	CV HV HVLV HVN MV PV TV	A / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU E / A E / A / AU E / A / SC A / SC SC / AU
9. <i>all</i>	HVLV WVNCV KVLV KVLWV	SC / AU / AM E / A / SC E / A E / A / SC / AM

10. <i>many</i>	PVLV MVNV PVHV PVTV	E / AF / SC / AM / AU E / A / SC / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC
11. <i>one</i>	HVRV TVKV HVTV HVNNV	E E / A / SC . AU / AM E / A E / AU
12. <i>two</i>	HVNLV CVRV JVRU MVLV TVWV CVNV	E / SC / AU A E E / A / SC E / A / SC / AM / AU A / SC / AU
13. <i>big</i>	HVNV MVKV TVT	E / A / SC E / A / AU / AM E / A / SC /
14. <i>long</i>	KVLV	E / AM
15. <i>small</i>	KVRCV KVTV PVTV TVHV TVHV TVNV CVKV	SC / AU E / A / SC / AM E / A / SC E / A / SC / AU E / A / SC / AU E / SC / AM E / A / SC
16. <i>woman</i>	KVNV NVCV PVNV NVTV CVCV	E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC E / SC / AU / AM E / A E / SC
17. <i>man</i>	KVNTV MVNV MVRV KVCV	E / A / SC / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AU SC / AM
18. <i>person</i>	CVPV MVCV	E / A SC / AU / AM
19. <i>fish</i>	KVLV KVMVC KVRV LVMV NVNV TVKV CVMV	E / A / AM E / A / SC / AM E / A E / A / AM E / A E / A / SC E / A / AM
20. <i>bird</i>	PVHV KVLV KVMV KVNV KVPV	A / SC E / E / SC E / A E / SC / AU E / A

	KVRV KVTV LVKV SVKV TVRV CVKV CVPV HVWV	E / A E / A / SC / AU E / A / SC / AU E / AM E / A E / A / SC / AM E / A E / A
21. <i>dog</i>	KVTV KVPV NVKV KVVV PVRV NVNTV CVKV CVRPV HVCV HVMV KVCV KVLV	A / AU E E / AM E / A / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AM E / A SC A / SC A / AU / AM A E / A / SC / AM A / AU
22. <i>louse</i>	MVHV NVJV TVJV JVLKV	AU E / A / SC E / A / SC / AU / AM A
23. <i>tree</i>	HVJWV HVLV KVJWV KVRV NVKV PVJV PVNCV TVNV TVRV CVLV WVTV	E / AM E / A / SC / AU E / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC E / AM E / A / SC E / SC E / A / SC E / A / SC E E / A / AM
24. <i>seed</i>	WVTV	E / A / AM
25. <i>leaf</i>	PVLV HVRLV LVPV PVNKV	E / A / SC E / A / SC / AU E / A / SC E / SC / AU / AM
26. <i>root</i>	TVMV MVRKV KVRV WVRTV	E / A / SC E / A / SV A / SC E / SC
27. <i>bark</i>	KVRV KVLV KVNKV KVRPV	E / A / SC / AU E / E / SC E / A / SC E / A / SC

	PVKV CVPV KVPV	E / A / Sc / AU E / A / SC E / A / SC / AU
28. <i>skin</i>	KVLV	E / A / SC / AU
29. <i>flesh</i>	TVLV HVMCV NVKRV CVLV CVCV CVKV	SC E / SC / AM E / SC / AU E / SC E / A / SC / AU E / A / SC
30. <i>blood</i>	CVLV PVLV KVRV WVRV HVN KVN PVRV CVHV CVMV CVNV	E / SC E / A / AM E / SC E / SC / AU E / SC / AU E A E / SC / AM A E / A
31. <i>bone</i>	TVKV PVNV KVRV LVNV MVKV RVNV CVMV CVNV HVCV HVKV HVMTV KVCV	AU E / SC / AM A SC / AU A / SC / AM SC / AU E / A / SC / AU / AM E / SC E / A / SC / AU / AM A / AM SC E / AF / SC / AM
32. <i>grease</i>	KVJV CVPV MVRV CVMV	E / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AU AF / E / SC / AU
33. <i>egg</i>	LVNV TVLV	SC / AU E / SC
34. <i>horn</i>	MVRKV LVRV KVRV	E / AF / SC SC E / AF / SC
35. <i>tail</i>	PVNVCV CVPV CVRV KVRV KVTV MVHV TVKV TVNV	E / SC / AU AF E / AF AF / AU E / AF / SC / AU / AM SC E / AM AU



36. <i>feather</i>	KVMV PVLV	AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM
37. <i>hair</i>	PVWV KVRV PVTV KVLV NVJV NVNV NVRV PVLV PVNV PVRV TVKV TVMV TVRV CVKV CVRV KVCV LVHV	SC / AU / AM E / SC E / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / SC E / SC E SC E E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AM E / AF E E / AF / AC / AU E / SC / AU E / Sc / AU AF / SC / AM
38. <i>head</i>	KVHV MVHV MVTV WVNLV WVTMV CVKV	AF / SC / AU / AM E / SC E / AF / SC / AU SC / AU E / SC SC / EM
39. <i>ear</i>	KVRV LVLV MVHV MVNCV CVRV HVNV	E / AF / AU SC / AU E E / SC AU SC
40. <i>eye</i>	HVNV HVPV WVMKV HVKV CVLV	E / AF / SC / AU / AM AF / AM SC E / AF / SC / AU / AM E
41. <i>nose</i>	NVKCV NVRV TVNV WVKV CVRV KVNV	E / AF / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / AU E E / AF E / SC
42. <i>mouth</i>	HVPV HVWV KVMPV	E / AF / AU / AM E / AF E / SC / AU
43. <i>tooth</i>	HVNV LVKV MVNV PVLV	E / SC / AU A / AF / SC / AU AF / SC AU / E

44. <i>tongue</i>	MVLV KVLV LVLV NVNV SVMV SVWV CVHV	SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / SC / AU E / AU / AM AU SC SC
45. <i>claw</i>	-	-
46. <i>foot</i>	PVLMV KVLV HVPV KVVV KVRV KVSV LVKV MVLV PVCKV CVKV	AF / SC / AM SC / AU E / SC SC / AU E / SC SC / AM E / AF / SC SC E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM
47. <i>knee</i>	-	-
48. <i>hand</i>	LVLV KVVV CVPV KVRV MVNV PVCV PVKV PUNKV	E / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF E / AF E / AF / SC / AU / AM AF / SC E / AF / SC / AM E / SC / AU
49. <i>belly</i>	KVRPV KVTV PVHV PVNKV PVRV TVKV WVNCV KVVV HVLV	E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AM AF / SC / AU / AM SC / AU / AM E / AF SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM
50. <i>neck</i>	KVLV KVNKV	E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC
51. <i>breasts</i>	KVRTV MVLKV MVNV WVNXV	E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AU AF / SC / AU
52. <i>heart</i>	RVKV CVLMV	SC / AU E
53. <i>liver</i>	TVRNV CVNCV KVLV LVLV MCKV	E / AF / CS / AU E / SC E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC E

	MVLV PVKV PVLV PVNTV TVPV KVPV	E / AF E E / AF / SC / AM E AU AF
54. <i>drink</i>	JVKV	E / SC / AU
55. <i>eat</i>	HVLV KVMV TVNV HVN CVHV CVMV HVTV	E / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU / AM E E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / A / SC / AM
56. <i>bite</i>	KVWV	E / SC / AM
57. <i>see</i>	HVCV WVTV KVRV NVKV TVLV HVJV	E / SC / AM E / AF / AM E / AF / SC E / SC / AM SC / AU E
58. <i>hear</i>	HVLV CVMV KVLV	E / SC / AM E / AF / AM E / AF / SC
59. <i>know</i>	NVRV TVNV HVN HVPV KVMV KVNTV KVKV KVPCV CVKV CVNV PVNV	E / SC / AU E / AU E / AF / SC E / AF / AU E / AF / SC / AU E / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / SC AF / AU
60. <i>sleep</i>	HVMLV HVMV	SC / AM E / SC / AU
61. <i>die</i>	KVLV HVLV MVRV MVTV NVKV NVWV TVNV HVN	E / SC E / AF / SC E / AF E / AF / SC E / AM E / AF / SC E / SF / SC E / AF / AM
62. <i>kill</i>	HVWV KVWV	E / AF / SC E / AF / SC
63. <i>swim</i>	-	
64. <i>fly</i>	PVLV PVRV	E / AF / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU

65. <i>walk</i>	CVHV HVMNV HVRV KVLV KVRV NVNV TVRKV WVTV KVJV HVJV	E / AF / SC E / AF / AM E / AF / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / AM
66. <i>come</i>	PVHV	AF / SC / AU / AM
67. <i>lie</i>	KVLV KVWV	E / SC E / AF / SC / AU / AM
68. <i>sit</i>	TVNV	AF / SC / AU
69. <i>stand</i>	CVRV HVHV NVHV NVKV PVTV RVPV TVKV TVNV CVLV	E / AF / SC AF E / SC / AU / AM E / SC / AM AF SC E / SC / AM SC / AU E
70. <i>give</i>	TVHV CVHV	E / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM
71. <i>say</i>	CVWV HVLV HVNV HVWV JVNV KVRV KVWV MVHRV MVLV NVKV TVHV TVPV WVKV WVTV CVWV	E / AF SC / AU SC / AU SC / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / SC E / AF / SC E / AF / AM AF / SC / AM E / AF / AM AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF E / AF
72. <i>sun</i>	NVJV KVMV HVKV NVRV PVCV TVNV	E / AF E / SC SC / AM E / AU AF E / SF / AU

73. <i>moon</i>	TVLKV	E / AF / AU / AM
74. <i>star</i>	HVCRV TVCTV CVWV	E / AF / SC E / AF E
75. <i>water</i>	HVNV KVHNV HVWV JVMV KVTV MVWV PVNV TVKV WVTV CVLV HVKV	SC / AM AF / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / AU / AM E / AM E / AF / SC / AU E / AF / AM SC / AU E / SC / AM E / SC E / AF / SC / AM
76. <i>rain</i>	HVRVCV	E / AF / SC / AM
77. <i>stone</i>	KVWV PVHV HVRV KVLV LVNV PVNV RVMLV TVHV TVLV CVNV HVMCV CVCV HVNLV KVCV	E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / SC / AU SC / AU E / AF / SC / AM SC / AU AF SC / AU AU E / AF / SC AF / SC SC SC AF / SC E / AF / SC
78. <i>sand</i>	KVCV	E / AF / SC
79. <i>earth</i>	HVMGV KVRV PUMV TVHV TVKV	E / SC / AM E / AF / SC SC / AU AF / SC / AU E / AF / SC / AM
80. <i>cloud</i>	HVMKV PVLV NVPV	E / SC E / AF E / AF / SC / AU
81. <i>smoke</i>	CVNKV	E / AF / AU / AM
82. <i>fire</i>	HVMV TVLV HVNKV PVHV TVHV HVKV CVCV HVHV	E / AF / AM E / SC E / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM AF / SC / AM E AF / AM

83. <i>ash(es)</i>	PVLV TVTV PVTV	E / SC / AM E / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM
84. <i>burn</i>	CVWV KVTV HVLTV HVRV KVPV KVRV KVRV LVKV MVKV PVKV PVLV PVLV PVRV TVKV WVRV KVVV CVLV CVNV HVCV KVJV	E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / AU AF / SC / AU E / AF E / AF E / AF E / SC / AU / AM E / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC / AU / AM AF / SC / AM E / AF / AU / AM E / AF E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC E / AF E / AF / AM E / AF / AM E / AF / AM E / AF / SC / AU
85. <i>path</i>	HVRV LVMV RVMKV KVCV	E / AF / SC SC / AU SC / AU E / AF
86. <i>mountain</i>	KVVV KVRV MVLV PVLV WURV PVRV TVKV TVLV TVPV	SC / AU E / AF / SC E / AF / SC AF / SC / AU E / AF E / AF E / AF / SC / AU / AM AF / AU E / AF / SC / AU
87. <i>red</i>	-	
88. <i>green</i>	-	
89. <i>yellow</i>	-	
90. <i>white</i>	LVKV	E / AF / SC / AM
91. <i>black</i>	HVMV KVMV LVMV LVNV MVCV MVTV NVLV	AF / SC / AU / AM E / AF / SC AU SC / AU E / SC / AM E / E / SC / E / SC

	PVRKV CVLV CVMV CVNV HVPV KVRV	AF AF / SC E / AF AF / SC / AU E E / AF / SC / Am
92. <i>night</i>	LVLV HVDV NVNV KVCV	E / AF / SC E / AF E / AF / AM E / SC / AM
93. <i>hot</i>	KVCV LVMV TVPV	E / AF / AM E / AF / SC / AM E / AF / SC / AU
94. <i>cold</i>	CVRV HVKV KVMV PVCV KVRV	E / SC E / AF / SC E / SC E / SC E / SF / SC
95. <i>full</i>	KVPV MVHV MVLV PVNV TVKV TVM TVNKV TVRV HVPTV	E / AF / SC / AU AF E / AF AU / AM E / AF / SC E / AF / SC / AM E / AU E / SC E
96. <i>new</i>	CVRV HVRV MVHV NVWV WVLV	E / AF / SC E / AF / AU AF E / AF / SC E / AF
97. <i>good</i>	HVCV HVJV KVN NVKV WVNLV HVKV	E / AF / AM E / AF / SC E / SC / AM E / AF E / AF / SC / AM SC / AM
98. <i>round</i>	KVLV TVMPV	E / AF / SC E / AF / AM
99. <i>dry</i>	KVKV RVNKV KVRV CVCV KVCV KVLV KVMV	E / AF / SC SC / AU E / AF / SC E / AF E / AF / AM E / AF / SC / AM E /

100. <i>name</i>	PVTV LVMNV MVKV CVMV	E / AF E / AF / SC AF / SC E / AF / SC
------------------	-------------------------------	---

## References

1. Bickerton D. Language Evolution: A Brief Guide for Linguists". University College Dublin, June 23, 2014. <http://www.ucd.ie/artspgs/langevo/langevobriefly.pdf>.
2. Bouchard-Côté Al., Hall D., Griffiths Th. L., Klein D. Automated Reconstruction of Ancient Languages using Probabilistic Models of Sound Change. In: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2013.
3. Dubé J. Reconsidering the "Isolating Protolanguage Hypothesis" in the Evolution of Morphology. In: Proceedings of the 37<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 2013, pp. 76-90.
4. Gibson K. R. Language or Protolanguage? A Review of the Ape Language Literature. In: The Oxford Handbook of Language Evolution.
5. Hurford J. R. The Evolution of Language and Languages. In: The Evolution of Culture. Edinburgh: University Press, 1999, pp. 173-193. <http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/~jim/dunbar.etal.html>.
6. Indo-European Lexicon. PIE Etymon and IE Reflexes. Linguistics Research Center, University of Texas, January 12, 2014.
7. Kiparsky P. Historical Linguistics and the Origin of Language. In: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 280, 1976, pp. 97-103.
8. Starostin G. Preliminary Lexicostatistics as a Basis for Language Classification: A New Approach. In: Tower of Babel Project. March 23, 2014.
9. Starostin S. The Tower of Babel. Homepage of Sergei Starostin. January 12, 2014. <http://starling.rinet.ru>.
10. Swadesh's 100-Word List. Department of Linguistics. Portland State University. March 30, 2014.
11. The OEC: Facts about the language. Oxford Dictionaries. May 23, 2014. <http://elanguage.net/journals/bls/article/viewFile/3594/3491>.  
<http://starling.rinet.ru/new100/Lexicostatistics.htm>.  
<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/words/the-oec-facts-about-the-language>.  
<http://www.pnas.org/content/early/2013/02/05/1204678110.full.pdf>.  
<http://www.utexas.edu/cola/centers/lrc/ielex/U/P1200.html>.  
<http://www.web.pdx.edu/~connjc/Swadesh.doc>.



## INTERNATIONAL TERMS IN ROMANIAN

Elena Tamba,

Senior Scientific Researcher, Ph.D.

(Al. Philippide Institute of Romanian Philology,

The Romanian Academy, Iasi Branch, Romania)

**Abstract:** *This article deals with international terms in the Romanian language, which were borrowed tale quale from other languages over the last 30 years. Moreover, these terms, designating certain new realities, are introduced, as such, in multiple languages simultaneously, in part due to the globalisation process that the society is undergoing and which results in the possibility of having a uniform understanding of the realities of all kinds, which, in turn, result naturally and immediately in a conceptual and linguistic homogenisation.*

**Keywords:** *neologism, international term, communication, globalization.*

In the entire civilised world, there's a rapidly occurring lexical renewal, due to information technology, that promotes rapid communication and, more importantly, to the access of the public to information, mainly technical and scientific in nature. Thus, the possibility to have a uniform understanding of realities of all kinds is a result of the globalisation process experienced by our society, in general, which in its turn results, naturally and immediately, in a conceptual and linguistic homogenisation.

Therefore, some terms/terminological phrases, designating certain new realities, enter as such multiple languages simultaneously, which gives them the status of *international terms*.

Romanian, as a language that is very receptive to news in the financial, technical, social, scientific, and cultural fields, possesses the adequate means for such a linguistic renewal, adopting, in various ways, these international terms.

International terms can be grouped according to the fields to which they belong, as follows:

- arts: *a fresco, artnapping, body-painting, papier collé, papier mâché, etc.;*
- cinema: *blimp, blockbuster, box-office, etc.;*
- beauty: *anti-aging, beauty center, beauty trend, blush, paraben, etc.;*
- cuisine: *al dente, bacon, bisque, blender, bloody mary, bouquet garni, brie, broccoli, café-frappé, camembert, cannelloni, capélli d'ángelo, carambola, catering, cava, chili, chips, chorizo, churro, croque-monsieur, enchilada, fast-food, gazpacho, granadilla, hamburger, hot-dog, junk food, maracuja, mimolette, mixed-grill, mozzarella, paella, piña colada, quinoa, raclette, rambol, rambutan, sangria, tagliatelle, tapas, tortilla, etc.;*
- dancing: *breakdance, flamenco, kizomba, rap, rapper, etc.;*
- economics: *account executive, account manager, accounting manager, agreement, assistant manager, banner, barter, beach-bar, boom, brand, buy back, etc.;*
- finance: *banking, e-banking, internet banking, m-banking, mobile banking, pibor, etc.;*
- IT: *adservers, adservering, adware, antispyware, backdoor, background, backspace, backup, basic, blueray, browser, buffer, bug, byte, hard, multiprocessor, multitasking, networking, OCR, off-line, on-board, overclocking, soft, etc.;*

- mass-media: *advertiser, advertising, advertorial, airplay, art director, blow-in card, board, booklet, broadcasting, media planning, new media, outdoor, etc.*
- medicine: *acupunctură, acrofobie, adenom, ADHD, adictologie, ADN, adrenalină, borderline, breakdown, breaking news, bypass, etc.;*
- music: *after-beat, background, backing-vocalist, backing-vocals, backstage, beat, big band, block chords, maxi-single, etc.;*
- dog breeds: *chow-chow, collie, husky, rottweiler, etc.;*
- sports: *backhand, badminton, baseball, biker, bodyboarding, bodybuilding, bouldering, bowling, snowboard, taekwondo, etc.;*
- tourism: *all inclusive, backpacking, bed&breakfast, tour-operator, etc.*

General terms: AA (< Alcoholics Anonymous), ABS, AC, *accelerator, acces, acknowledgement, acquis-ul comunitar, acvacultură, add, adidas, adviser, after-hours, after-party, after-school, after-shave, all season, army, baby-doll, baby-sitter, baby-sitting, backgammon, big bang, big brother, black-out, blind date, blog, blogger, bluetooth, body, bodyguard, book, bookmark, boss, brainstorming, bumper, burqa, catwalk, CD, CD player, CD writer, CD-rom, CD-RW, hard, iaido, ikebana, piñata, mouse pad, notebook, prêt-à-porter, site, etc.*

Currently, the main source of lexical and semantic enrichment is the English language. It should be noted, however, that French which, in its turn, has shown openness towards the English influence in the last decades (see Le Petit Robert 2011, GRLF, 2011 edition) has not stopped providing new words and meanings, especially for the social and cultural fields.

We note, for example, that the main source languages in the field of gastronomy are especially: French (*bisque, bouquet garni, brie, café-frappé, camembert, cava, croque-monsieur, mimolette, raclette, rambol, rambutan* etc.); English (*bacon, blender, bloody mary, fast-food, junk food, hamburger, hot-dog* etc.); Italian (*al dente, cannelloni, capelli d'angelo, tagliatelle* etc.); Spanish (*cava, chili, chorizo, churro, enchilada, gazpacho, granadilla, multi-touch, must have, myspace, paella, piña colada, quinoa, sangria, tapas, tortilla, etc.*).

A special case is that of words designating realities from the Romanian cuisine, which have been introduced, as such, in other languages, for example some lexicographical works contain, in French, the word *mămăligă* "purée de maïs consommée avec un plat ou en galette" (GRLF 2014, s.v. *mamaliga*).

Likewise, the international terms that have entered the Romanian language via English and/or French, and not directly via their source language: *aikido* < Fr. *aikido* (Japanese word); *burqa* < Fr. *burqa, burka* (Arabic word); *ikebana* < Fr., Eng. *ikebana* (Japanese word), *haşiş* < Eng. *hashishi*, Fr. *haschisch* (Arabic word); *judo* < Fr., Eng. *judo* (Japanese word); *káki* < Eng., Fr. *kaki* (< Japanese word); *noni* < Eng. *noni* (< Tahitian word); *sálak* < Eng. *salak* (< Indonesian word), *sarong* < Fr. *sarong* (< Malaysian word), *saună* < Eng., Fr. *sauna* (< Finnish word); *tae-bo* < Eng. *tae-bo* (< Korean word), *tahíni* < Eng. *tahini* (< Greek, Arabic word); *tantra* < Fr. *tantra* (< Sanskrit word); *tofu* < Eng., Fr. *tofu* (< Japanese word); *tsunami* < Fr., Eng. *tsunami* (< Japanese

word); *wasabi* < Eng., Fr. *wasabi* (< Japanese word); *wok* < Eng., Fr. *wok* (< Chinese word); *zulu* < Eng. *zulu* (< Zulu word) etc.

Many international terms or very new words will, of course, find their own place in Romanian adding precision, accuracy, and flexibility. But the newest layer of neologisms which have just entered Romanian also contains many barbarisms, words which were introduced in the language without being necessary, especially from English. These Anglicisms will disappear, of course, over time just like French loan words at the beginning of the last century through a natural settling process. But until then, they are widely used, especially by Anglophiles; the rest of the Romanian speakers don't know their meaning and often have difficulties understanding messages, in particular from the mass-media<sup>1</sup>.

The international nature of some of the neologisms is easy to note in the Romanian language dictionaries that we have analysed, as they often use a choice of multiple etymologies (see some examples above).

Many words that have been adopted *tale quale* from the languages with which Romanian speakers come into contact will acquire, in time, specific Romanian forms and will be integrated into the Romanian vocabulary. There are quite a few words that are likely to be abandoned or replaced with others, which are more suited to the Romanian language system.

In Romanian, many neologisms, in general, and international terms, in particular, have been adopted in different ways, allowing for the following sub-categorisation:

a) new loan-words from foreign languages, particularly English and French, some of them adapted, albeit only partially, to the morphological and phonetic system of the Romanian language: *adict, adidas, adviser, airbag, antiperspirant, audit, background, banner, bax, bestseller, betablocant, bip, bit, blazer, blister, blog, blogger, blura, bodyguard, brand, branding, briefing, broker, brokeraj, buffer, bug, bumper, business, card, cart, catering, chart, check-in, chips, cip, climatizor, climatronic, clip, clona, clonă, computer, comunitar, consumism, crawl, criogenie, criza, croissant, curricular, cutter, cybercultură, deadline, dealer, dealership, decumuniza, leasing, mop, mouse, multimedia, quarc, pacemaker, racket, rating, reloca, remake, repondent, respondent, ringtone, scoring, screening, scroll, shooting, sponsor, spot, staf, star, stent, (memory-)stick, sticks, stimulator (cardiac), stres, stresa, stripper, subcontract, summit, supermarket, suspans, sustenabil, tabloid, tabuiza, taliban, talk-show, target, targeta, teflon, teleconferință, teleprompter, teleshopping, temporiza, termoizola, termoizolant, tester, thriller, tomograf, toner, topic, top-model, trade-center, trademark, trend, troler, tsunami, tuna ("decorate"), updata, update, upgrada, upload, uploada, xerocopia, xerox, xeroxa, yahoo, zip, zoom etc.);*

b) new loan-words from foreign languages, particularly English and French, non-adapted and used as such: *acquis (comunitar), adserving, adware, after-shave, al dente, all inclusive, anti-aging, army, baby-sitter, beauty center, big brother, brain-drain, burnout, buy back, challenge, checkout, check-up, checkpoint,*

*cloning, comics, comeback, networking, new-wave, playstation, pole-position, pop-art, pop-corn, real-time, reality-show, roaming, science-fiction, scoring, scratch, shopping, sign-in, sign-out, taekwando, tagliatelle, ticketing, tiramisu, undo* etc.;

Many frequently used abbreviations appear in current Romanian, and some are borrowed *tale quale* from various sources: *CD, CD R, CD ROM, CPU, DVD, nick, RAM, rasta, SMS, www* etc.

Alpha-numeric abbreviations are also becoming a familiar feature in the current language: *4 x 4, 3D, 2.1, 4G* etc.

It may seem incredible, but some neologisms (in the category of barbarisms) are frequently used by the current speakers, and they sometimes exceed 100,000 occurrences. Thus, in Romanian and in French we have seen, on the Internet, situations like the ones that follow<sup>2</sup>:

- *account manager* (1,080,000 in Romanian, 2,307,000 in French);
- *advertising* (8,410,000 in Romanian, 4,570,000 in French);
- *advisor* (194,000 in Romanian, 833,000 in French)'
- *after school* (747,000 in Romanian, 446,000 in French), etc., to mention just a few.

This forces us to include such words in the series of recent neologisms (although many of these words are ephemeral), that the lexicographer who prepares certain dictionaries feels compelled to describe and define, to present in-context usage patterns, to establish their etymology, the areas of use, grammatical rules, etc.

As for the lexicographic treatment of these lexical elements, there is lately, both for Romanian dictionaries and for dictionaries published in other languages (in French, for example) a general tendency to introduce very recent neologisms into use. For Romanian, the volumes of the DLR that were published in recent decades included new words (few in numbers, truth be told) with a short life or lexical rarities: *dan* „degree awarded to martial arts masters”<sup>3</sup>, *dance* „electronic music genre”, *dao* „principle of Chinese philosophy”, *dealer, debirocratiza, debriefing* etc. Although they are more receptive to news, the general DEX or NDU dictionaries don't have many entries that consist of current vocabulary either.

In Romanian, just as in French, we notice the presence of the dictionaries that only cover neologisms. Romanian has an entire series of dictionaries: DN, NDN (and subsequent editions), DCR<sup>3</sup> (and the first two editions), DEN, DCSR, etc.<sup>4</sup>.

For comparison purposes, in the case of French, the proposals of the 2014 edition of Le Petit Larousse illustré are interesting, mentioned as point of interest (words like: *flaschcode, nanobiologie, biomimétisme, zumba, googliser, nomopobe, speed dating, démondialisation, slopestyle, art-thérapie, voxographie*, etc.<sup>5</sup>) or the proposals of the PRob dictionary, the 2014 edition (“living French, current words and phrases: *astroparticule, biothèque, caméo, clivant, coltan, dim sum, fadette, itinérance, locavore, microbiote, modeux, street art, transgénérationnel*, etc.”<sup>6</sup>).

The lexicographic treatment of recent neologisms (the category that includes international terms) has the following characteristics:

- an extremely reserved attitude in the thesaurus category of dictionaries for Romanian (DLR) and for French (TLFi);
- a rather served attitude in the general category of dictionaries for Romanian (such as DEX, NDU, DEXI) and for French (P<sub>Rob</sub>, GRLF, GLLF);
- a very open attitude, in dictionaries dedicated to neologisms, both for Romanian (NDN, DCSR, DCR<sup>3</sup>) and French.

At the same time, the Romanian or French speakers use neologisms frequently, despite the strong recommendations made by the special commissions for the French language, for instance.

However, it should be noted that the policy on the neologic phenomenon is far stricter in France, compared to Romania.

### Conclusion

The situation of the international terms - both in Romanian and in other languages - is an interesting one, allowing for in-depth research concerning the fields in which their presence is noticed, the adaptation to the source language, the direct or indirect origin etc.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup>Few recent neologisms have been used in literary fiction, which makes a first - and sometimes final - selection. For now, they are present in the media - in print or broadcast media; special terms (technical, scientific, etc.) have already been included in textbooks and treaties.

<sup>2</sup>Information was obtained at the beginning of 2014, using the advanced search feature of Google search, only for texts written in Romanian, for Romania, on the one hand, and in French, for France, on the other.

<sup>3</sup>Please note that, in such cases, the authors of the DLR have introduced an innovation concerning etymology: - Japanese word. As per Fr. *dan*. The direct source ranks second [!]. Similarly, *dao* - Chinese word. As per Fr. *dao*.

<sup>4</sup>See Pamfil *et alii*, 2013; <http://www.editions-larousse.fr/>.

<sup>5</sup>See <http://www.lerobert.com/dictionnaires-generalistes/dictionnaire-le-petit-robert-2014.html>.

### References

1. Dănilă E., Haja G. Neologismul din perspectivă lexicografică. In: SCL, t. LXI, 2005, nr. 1-2, pp. 71-78.
2. Pamfil C.-G., Dănilă E. Neologismul recent în limba română - reflex al globalizării. In: Luminița Botoșineanu, Daniela Butnaru, Ofelia Ichim, Cecilia Maticiu, Elena Tamba (editori). Metafore ale devenirii din perspectiva migrației contemporane. Național și internațional în limba și cultura română. Iași: Editura „Alfa”, 2013.
3. Pruvost J., Sablayrolles J.-Fr. Les néologismes. Paris: PUF, 2003.

4. Rus L.-M. Un fapt lingvistic de actualitate: influența engleză asupra limbii române. In: *Integrarea europeană între tradiție și modernitate*, Vol. I, Tîrgu-Mureș, 2005, pp. 266–272.

### Dictionaries

DA9 = Dictionnaire de l'Académie française, la neuvième édition, 1992 – à présent.

DCR<sup>3</sup> = Dimitrescu Fl. (coord.), Ciolan Al., Lupu, C. Dicționar de cuvinte recente. București: Editura Logos, 2013.

DCSR = Dănilă E., Dănilă A. Dicționar ilustrat de cuvinte și sensuri recente în limba română. București: Editura Litera, 2011.

DEN = Busuioc M.-M., Păun, M., Ștefănescu-Goangă Z. Dicționar esențial de neologisme ale limbii române. București: Editura Corint, 2009.

DEX = (Academia Română) Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române. Ediția a II-a, revăzută și adăugită. București: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, 2009.

DEXI = Dicționar explicativ ilustrat al limbii române. Coordonator științific: E. Dima. Chișinău: Arc & Gunivas, 2007.

DLR = Dicționarul limbii române, Serie nouă, tom. VI–XIV. București: Editura Academiei Române, 1965–2010.

DN = Marcu Fl., Maneca C. Dicționar de neologisme. Ediția a III-a. București: Editura Academiei Române, 1978.

GLLF = Guilbert, L., Lagane R. (eds.) Grand Larousse de la langue française, VII<sup>e</sup> vol. Paris, 1971–1978.

GRLF 2013 = Le Grand Robert de la langue française online, Dictionnaire alphabétique et analogique de P. ROBERT, ed. Alain Rey. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2013.

LITTRÉ = Littré E. Dictionnaire de la langue française. Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1991.

NDN = Marcu Fl. Noul dicționar de neologisme. București: Editura Academiei Române, 1997.

NDU = Oprea I., Pamfil C.-G., Radu R., Zăstroiu V. Noul dicționar universal al limbii române. București – Chișinău: Litera Internațional, 2006.

PRob 2014 = Le Nouveau Petit Robert online. Paris: Dictionnaires Le Robert, 2014.

The Oxford Dictionary online. Oxford University Press. <http://oxforddictionaries.com/>.

TLFi = Le Trésor de la Langue Française Informatisé – <http://atilf.atilf.fr/>.

# PERCEPTIVE AND FIGURATIVE REPRESENTATION OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL DESCRIPTION OF HOLY FOOLISHNESS

Vyacheslav Dolgov,

Senior Lecturer

(Alec Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova)

**Abstract:** *This article describes the peculiarities of perception of foolishness for Christ expressed through language. Our attention is focused on the value component of holy foolishness, as well as on those characteristics of the stereotypical perception of this rank of sainthood reconstructed on the basis of the associative and perceptual aspect of linguistic and cultural type.*

**Keywords:** *concept, stereotype, cognition, linguistic and cultural type.*

In modern linguistics, linguistic identity presents a growing interest, which often stems from E. Benveniste's planned triad "language, culture, human identity" [1, p. 45], forming together "clusters of meaning", i.e. concepts [2, p. 79-95], [3, p. 10-50]. A special kind of concept is "the linguistic and cultural type", which denotes, in V.I. Karasik's terms, a personality type, a representative of a certain ethnic and social group, recognizable by the specific characteristics of verbal and nonverbal behavior and value orientation. Since the "linguistic and cultural type" is an abstract mental formation, retaining a recognizable image of a particular culture, its content consists of a personality type. The Volgograd linguistic school contributes most to the description of the linguistic and cultural type characterized by wide recognition, associativity, recurrence, signedness, brilliance, typicality, precedence [3]. Figurative, conceptual and value sides are marked out in this type of concept [2].

The linguistic and cultural whacky type, the landmark of the Russian culture, reveals the property of duality reflected in a linguistic sign. According to dictionaries which preserve the most relevant meanings of a word, a holy fool is a "mentally deranged patient, a freak, a crazy person" [7, vol. 4, p. 775-776]. At the same time, he is also a saint who "pretended to have become a mad man and who has, in the opinion of religious people, the gift of prophecy" [8, vol. 17, p. 2003-2004]. We emphasize that in the framework of a religious discourse there is no doubt regarding the mental health of a holy fool. This seeming madness is postulated as a prerequisite, necessary to do away with pride, allowing to strengthen the achieved dispassion, and, ultimately, to experience the fullness of the passion of Christ (a Christ centered holy fool is reflected in the way of giving a name- a Fool for Christ's sake).

In the popular perception, the moral potency of the holy fool is actualized. He is the one who refers to the alleged Christian philosophy concerning the axiological range of goodness, light, salvation, soul, spirit, truth, etc. People perceive holy fools as the only bearers of the Supreme Truth who are willing

to speak out loud to kings without any fear. It is only they who are able to destroy the system of imaginary values of "partite" peace, sometimes through provocations and "satire", through working wonders and telling the truth. Everything is forgiven to these devotees: actions and deeds which are not in accordance with the circumstances of the time and place, their eccentric appearance, their strange speeches, the essence of which can not be understood at once, etc. Given the semi-legal character of holy foolishness, it is practically impossible to describe the holy fool-identification mechanism which allows to distinguish blessed fools from pseudo-holy ones, especially those, who pretend to belong to this rank of sanctity in order to achieve certain benefits and welfare. According to the definition, a holy-fool has to conceal true wisdom, piety and spiritual perfection under the mask of madness.

However, this article addresses only the perceptive and figurative representation of the linguistic and cultural whacky type (although this aspect is difficult to be separated from the valuable one, which we shall have to refer to) based on the most relevant characteristics, which reflect, in fact, a stereotypical perception. We have chosen one of Dmitri Rostov's most authoritative texts, namely, "Четьи Минеи" as the basic source to reconstruct this type of character. The appeal to the hagiographic body is not a random one, as life stories intended for cathedral reading alongside with other Russian works about the ascetics of this rank of sanctity has had a decisive role in the formation of a certain type, which influenced the native speakers' degree of assessment and their perception vector. It should also be emphasized that a person who has never faced a holy fool's raunch in real life, could, as a rule, get some information about the given rank of sanctity from different secular sources (chronicles and foreigners' confessions) or, more often, from the church written culture (life stories, religious services kontakions, troparions etc.). Following V. I. Karasik and O. A. Dmitrieva's model, we shall turn to that aspect of the analysis which is called the passport of the linguistic and cultural type.

*Sex.* Despite the fact that the first holy fool of the Eastern Orthodox world was, according to experts, a woman, most adherents of this rank of sanctity were males. However, the names of other well-respected holy fool women, including the newly canonized ones, were mentioned in the Russian church culture.

*Age.* As a rule, the hagiographic tradition willingly discloses the circumstances and causes associated with the beginning of a deed, yet, it avoids to mention the age of the holy fool. The scribe uses such nouns as "дѣвица" - "maid", "отрок" - "youth", "юноша" - "lad", "женщина" - "woman", "муж" - "husband" (meaning - a man), "старецъ" - "old man" to indicate the age. It is noteworthy that only childhood is not present in this line. There are no holy fool children in the hagiographic tradition, despite the fact that the type of children's holiness has taken a strong position in the range of "apostles", "laymen", "martyrs", and other official ranks of church sanctity.



*Social position.* There were people among the devotees who held different positions in the society: from slaves to top representatives of the higher upper class. We shall emphasize that the irrelevance of age, gender and social constraints are characteristic of a stereotypical holy fool. The linguistic and cultural whacky type is based on the perception of Christian heroism accessible for both women and men, regardless of their social status and age (except for children), when the person reaches a certain level of spiritual maturity.

*Appearance.* The way an ascetic looks like marks his “otherworldly” appearance that is perceived by others as an oddity, insanity or inability to live according to secular canons. A holy fool does not look like other people, for example, the nuns: “согласно правиламъ монастырской жизни, носили на головахъ своихъ куколь; Исидора же покрывала голову свою простой тряпкой” [4, p. 9]. This feature often acquires a modus character in life, i.e. it represents an evaluative judgment. Thus, in the life of the above mentioned Isidore the Holy Fool, the author speaks about the negative attitude towards the holy nun:

“Никогда не вела она ни съ кѣмъ ни длинной, ни короткой бесѣды и вообще ни с кѣмъ не разговаривала, несмотря на то, что другія сестры ее часто били и злословили” [4, vol. 9].

Such appearance and strange behavior will lead them to the conclusion that Isidore is “глупа и бѣсновата” (stupid and demonic) [4, vol. 9] and later, after learning about her holiness, they will bitterly regret it.

One of the incidental characters of the live story Xenia from Petersburg, desperate to cure her ill husband, describes the vision after which he had come back to life:

“Если бы я была сейчас дома, я бы поехала на Смоленское кладбище к блаженной Ксении. Там, припав к ее могиле, выплакала бы свое горе. Шум хлопнувшей калитки прервал мои думы. Кто-то вошел в сад к нам, подумала я. В это время в проеме открытой двери бесшумно появилась странная гостя. Лета ее нельзя была определить, но самым странным был ее наряд. Теплые, мягкие валенки, длинная шуба особого покроя, вся в сборках, а на голове большой белый пуховый платок: концы его были закручены на шее. Так, верно, глухой зимой в старину повязывали платки женщины-простолюдинки. Вся она была необыкновенно привлекательна” [4, vol. 5].

The character twice notes the oddity of the “The Winter Guest”. Though, as it seems, there is nothing extraordinary in her appearance, she will explained further one important fact:

“Тут только я поняла всю несообразность ее зимнего наряда при этой нестерпимой жаре” [4, vol. 5].

It is noteworthy that while describing the clothes and shoes, the hagiographic tradition will necessarily point to its incompleteness and partiality:

“рубище, едва прикрывавшее тѣлесную его наготу”, “почти необутая, едва одетая”. The assessment of appearance, is generally missing, however, in the context of other well-wishers, it acquires a positive characteristic. Thus the scribe, drawing an image of a holy fool, seeks to reproduce his struggle with the passion of men, based on the paradigm of the values of Orthodoxy, deliberately downplaying the aspect of carnal and physical aspects, to elevate the spiritual one. For example, the life story of the holy fool Maxim says: “онъ почти обнаженный ходилъ по улицамъ города Москвы, перенося и холодъ, и жаръ” [4, vol. 3].

Thus, the whacky, torturing his flesh can completely give up his shoes, regardless of the season. If there are shoes on, they will be unable to protect against weather adversities (Xenia “was wearing torn shoes on her bare swollen from cold feet” [4, vol. 5]). An ascetic sometimes does not hide his body under his clothes (which in some cases may be due to the provocative nature of foolishness). For example, St. Basil “ходилъ нагимъ и лѣтомъ и зимою, зимою замерзая от холода, а лѣтомъ страдая от зноя”, or wears something strange, inhuman, such as a goatskin or rags. Another holy fool is described in the following way: “снять ... съ себя одежду и, представляясь лишеннымъ разума, изрѣзать ее на части” [4, vol. 2].

The tradition of flesh torture, in some cases, turned into wearing fetters motivated by either the ascetic’s personal will, or by others’ decisions, as in the case of the holy fool Andrew, when his master states: “подумав, что Андрей одержимъ бѣсомъ, ... наложилъ на него желѣзные вериги и приказал вести къ церкви святой Анастасіи” [4, vol. 2].

*Portrait.* We did not find a single example of the description of the saints’ individualized portraits in their life stories. In rare cases, the scribe limits himself to the most general formulas, for example, in the life story of the fool for Christ Andrew, it is pointed out that “сей отрокъ быть прекрасенъ собою” [4, vol. 2]. It should be noted that the same characteristic (“handsome boy”) will be linked to the image of Jesus Christ who has appeared in Andrew’s vision.

*Lifestyle and habits.* One of the characteristics of holy foolishness is the conscious rejection of the ascetic’s desire “от всѣхъ удобствъ” to an “avaricious life” due to the rejection of all the worldly things, which is perceived as sinful in the context of a religious system of values, “contrary to God”. The holy fools are disinterested. The money that they get as a rule in the form of alms is immediately given it to the poor without being noticed. Thus, being well-to do in the world, Xenia “distributed all the manor”, and, leaving her home, she asked her friend only about one thing:

“Дом я подарю тебе, только ты бедных даром жить пускай; вещи сегодня же раздам все, а деньги в церковь снесу, пусть молятся об упокоении души рабы Божией Ксении” [4, vol. 5].

This circumstance makes holy fools become homeless and induces them to “подвижническое странствие” (ascetic wandering).

The place where the whacky has a rest is usually a mystery and if it is revealed in the life story, it is only used to add to the number of features of the saint’s “internal image” to emphasize his dispassion, the complete absence of pride, the desire for self-abasement, etc. The holy fool Andrew’s temporary shelter is described the following way:

«Когда же ему необходимо было уснуть и нѣсколько успокоить свое измученное тѣло, онъ искалъ мусора, гдѣ лежать собаки, и располагался между ними. Но и псы не подпускали къ себѣ» [4, vol. 2].

This is both “laughing at the world” and a kind of “a slap in the face of public taste”, which, at the same time, show the rate of extreme degree of “self-abasement” and martyrdom. The scribe writes: “Так страдалъ добровольный мученикъ и такъ смѣялся надъ всѣмъ міромъ юродивый” [4, vol. 2].

“Mortification of the flesh” motivates food restrictions. For example, the holy fool Andrew “иногда по трое сутокъ не вкушалъ ... хлѣба, иногда же голодать и цѣлую недѣлю, а если не находилось никого, кто бы подаль ему ломоть хлѣба, то онъ проводить безъ пищи и вторую неделю” [4, vol. 2].

Nobody saw Isidora to eat properly: “когда-либо ѣла кусокъ хлѣба или сидѣла за столомъ и вкушала вареную пищу, потому что она собирала крошки, падавшія со стола, и питалась ими; вмѣсто вареной пищи Исидора вкушала ту самую воду, въ которой мыла горшки и котлы” [4, vol. 9].

Adherents of this rank of sanctity are lonely. As the scribe states: “Оставивъ затѣмъ отчій домъ и родныхъ своихъ, блаженный Василій въ надеждѣ на будущія блага перемѣнилъ тлѣнное достояніе на духовное, такъ какъ вмѣсто отца у него было отсѣчение бремени грѣховъ, вмѣсто матери – чистота, вмѣсто братьевъ – желаніе стремиться къ горнему Иерусалиму, а вместо дѣтей – сердечныя воздыханія” [4, vol. 12].

Rejecting kinship and family ties, having no children are acts of the holy fool’s personal faith. These acts are symbolic to a certain extent: chopping off the horizontal ties, the devotees seek to establish a direct vertical relationship with God.

Fools are industrious, they are not afraid of heavy and dirty work, which they take it for granted. The holy fool Isidore, for example, “постоянно трудилась въ поварнѣ монастырской, служба всѣмъ сестрамъ, и исполняла всѣ монастырскія работы, не гнушаясь самыми трудными и грязными. Она своими руками очищала монастырь отъ всякой грязи и нечистоты. Такъ трудилась преподобная постоянно, отъ утра и до ночи, не предаваясь покою даже и на часъ, всегда измождая плоть свою” [4, vol. 9].

Their day is filled with these and other feats, and they pray secretly to God at night, not necessarily in the temple, but whatever place they can:

Andrew “въ теченіе дня представлялся лишеннымъ разума, а ночью молился Богу и святой Анастасіи” [4, vol. 2]. This holy fools’ typical behavior is explained by the fact that God’s space is not confined to the walls of the temple for them. In the life story of St. Xenia of Petersburg, it is written: “несмотря ни на какое время года, несмотря ни на какую погоду, уходит на ночь в поле, коленопреклоненно становится здесь на молитву и не встает уже с этой молитвы до самого восхода солнца, попеременно делая земные поклоны на все четыре стороны света. В поле, по ее словам, присутствие Божие было “более явственно”” [4, vol. 5].

The ascetic way of life, the martyrdom, the strict compliance with the Commandments of God and the constant presence within the religious system of values, which the holy fool sets up by his own example, transforms the holy fool’s way into a “pure life”. This definition is often associated with the ascetic’s way of life and is generally used in the meaning of “sinless” and “true”.

Appearance, speech, lifestyle, etc. induce others (with the exception of virtuous people who are able to see the truth with “spiritual eyes”) to think about madness. Yet, in the live stories, the hollowness of the ascetics’ madness is emphasized. In this regard, the episode from Xenia’s biography, who intends to give all her possessions away, is rather notable:

“Родные мужа подали прошение начальству умершего Андрея Федоровича, прося не позволять Ксении в безумстве раздавать свое имущество. По причине этого Ксения была вызвана на соответствующее обследование, которое заключило, что она совершенно здорова” [4, vol. 5].

Constantly praying, holy fools carry their cross without complaint; they are subjected to all sorts of attacks and ridicule, which they provoke by themselves.

Hagiography, revealing in detail all the hardships of ascetics’ lives, underlines the difficulty of such an inhuman lifestyle, which can only be described as a feat: “безропотно несла свой спасительный подвиг” [4, vol. 5], “провела достаточное число лѣтъ въ такихъ подвигахъ” [4, vol. 9], “так страдалъ добровольный мученикъ” [4, vol. 2], etc.

*Superhuman abilities.* In accordance with the Christian view of the world, having reached a certain level of spiritual perfection and dispassion, holy fools are endowed with different gifts.

Knowledge about the events that are sure to occur in the future, unavailable to others, makes them prophets and seers. Blessed Thomas, foreseeing the death of the church builder who had struck him and his own death, confesses: “Съ этого времени ни мнѣ от Анастасія уже ничего не придется принять, ни Анастасій не будет имѣть возможности что-либо подать мнѣ” [4, vol. 8]. The prophecy soon came true: Anastasius died one day later, and the blessed got sick on the way to the monastery and passed away: “престалъ къ безмерной жизни” [4, vol. 8].

It is worthy to mention that their speech is vague, it is incomprehensible to others, yet, people can understand the true meaning of their words only some time later when they come to realize how prophetically gifted holy fools are. Some of them, for instance Isidora, chooses silence as a form of “communication”. The life story of Blessed Basil explains that the ascetic “не говорить и представлялся какъ бы лишеннымъ дара слова, желая этимъ скрыть отъ людей свои добродѣтели и быть вѣдомымъ только Богу” [4, vol. 12].

Holy fools can miraculously provide people with whatever benefits they need: merchants can be ensured a successful trade, unmarried maidens can arrange a happy marriage, childless parents can “be given” a long-awaited child, the weak and the sick can be healed, etc.

These are real “philanthropists”, absolute altruists, realizing that it is not enough to attain some spiritual perfection, it is necessary to “serve God” for the redemption of human vices and the edification.

Thus, the holy fool is a saint who has attained dispassion (beyond one’s age, gender and social constraints), who has discovered the absolute primacy of the ideal, the spiritual over the material, the flesh; he/she is an ascetic and a lonely mendicant pilgrim, whose appearance, speech, and actions can be perceived as a manifestation of madness (however, it is a seeming one); he/she is endowed with the gift of foreseeing, prophecy and healing; secretly helping and caring for the redemption of human vices. This list motivates those definitions that characterize the holy fool type: meekness, gentleness, humility, “the spiritual and bodily misery”, love for one’s neighbor, the intercession, the virtue, the ability to endure all the hardships, beatings, mockery and bullying without complaint, which can be provoked by the ascetic himself/herself; etc. The list of relevant linguistic and cultural characteristics of the whacky type reflects the stereotypical perception of the adherent of this rank of sanctity and acts as a foundation (together with the conceptual and value aspects) to be identified by the masses.

## References

1. Бенвенист Э. Общая лингвистика. Москва: Прогресс, 1974, с. 448 / Benveniste E. Obščaya lingvistika. Moskva: Progress, 1974, p. 448.
2. Воркачев С. Г. Методологические основания лингвоконцептологии. В: Теоретическая и прикладная лингвистика. МУЗ: Аспекты метакоммуникативной деятельности. Воронеж, 2002, с. 79-95 / Vorkačev S. Metodologičeskye osnovanya lingvokontseptologyi. In: Teoretičeskaya y prikladnaya lingvistika. MUZ: Astekty metakomunikativnoy deyatelnosti. Voronej, 2002, p. 79-95.
3. Дмитриева О. А. Лингвокультурные типы России и Франции XIX века: монография. Волгоград: Перемена, 2007, с. 307 / Dmitrieva O. Lingvokulyturnye tipajy Rosii y Frantsyi XIX veka: monografya. Volgograd: Peremena, 2007, p. 307.

4. Жития святых по изложению святителя Дмитрия, митрополита Ростовского (в 12 т). Издательство преподобного Максима Исповедника. Барнаул, 2003–2004 (номер тома указывается в скобках) / *Jytyia svyatyh po yzlojeniyu svyatitelya Dmitriya, mitropolita Rostovskogo (v 12 t.) Izdatelystvo prepodobnogo Maxima Ispovednika. Barnaul, 2003-2004 (nomer toma ukazyvaetsya v skobkah).*
5. Карасик А. В. Фанат как типаж современной массовой культуры. В: Аксиологическая лингвистика: лингвокультурные типажы. Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005, с. 269–282 / *Karasyk A. Fanat kak tipaj sovremennoy massovoy kulytury. In: Axiologičeskaya lingvistika: lingvokulyturnye tipaji. Volgograd: Paradigma, 2005, p. 269-282.*
6. Карасик В. И., Дмитриева О. А. Лингвокультурный типаж: к определению понятия. В: Аксиологическая лингвистика: лингвокультурные типажы. Волгоград: Парадигма, 2005, с. 5–25 / *Karasyk V., Dmitrieva O. Lingvokulyturnyi tipaj: k opredeleniyu ponyatyia. In: Axiologičeskaya lingvistika: lingvokuliturnye tipaji. Volgograd: Paradigma, 2005, p. 5-25.*
7. Словарь русского языка (под ред. А. П. Евгеньевой), в 4-х т. Москва: Полиграфресурсы, 1999 (номер тома указывается в скобках) / *Slovary ruskogo yazyka (pod red. A. Evgenyievoy), v 4-h tomah. Moskva: Poligrafresursy, 1999 (nomer toma ukazyvaetsya v skobkah).*
8. Словарь современного русского литературного языка (в 17 т). Москва-Ленинград: Наука, 1965 (номер тома указывается в скобках) / *Slovary sovremenogo ruskogo literaturnogo yazyka (v 17 tomah). Moskva-Leningrad: Nauka, 1965 (nomer toma ukazyvaetsya v skobkah).*

## UKRAINIAN AND BELORUSSIAN MASCULINE PROPER NAMES DERIVED FROM THE ROMAN MYTHOLOGICAL NAMES

**Gergana Petkova,**

Associate Professor,

(Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria)

**Abstract:** *The research object of the present text refers to the Ukrainian and the Belorussian masculine proper names (and their variants) derived from the Roman mythological names. The aim is to present their full list and their initial meaning as well. The researched anthroponyms are divided into three groups according to: 1) the type of the appellative used as a basis during the derivation process; 2) the model used for anthroponyms coined from a Latin name; 3) the canonization by the Catholic church, the Orthodox one, or by both of them.*

**Keywords:** *Ukrainian proper names, Belorussian proper names, Roman mythology.*

The research object of the present text is to examine the initial meanings of 12 Ukrainian and 2 Belorussian masculine proper names (and their variants) derived from the Roman mythological names:

Roman mythological names	Ukrainian masculine proper names, derived from Roman mythological names	Belorussian masculine proper names, derived from Roman mythological names
Aventinus	Авентин	-
Clusius	Клюзій	-
Genius	Геній	-
Honor, Honos	Гонор	-
Iupiter, Iuppiter, Jupiter, Juppiter	Юпітер	-
Maius	Май	-
Mars, Mavors	Марс	-
Mercurius, Mircurius, Mirqurius	Меркурій	Мяркурый (Меркуль, Мэркур, Мяркул, Мяркуры)
Remus	Рем, Ремик	-
Romulus	Ромул	-
Saturnus	Сатурн	-
Silvanus	Саливон, Сильван, Силван, Силуян (Саливониха, Саливоничок, Саливонище, Саливонка, Саливонко, Саливончик, Саливоняра)	Сільван (Селивон, Селіван, Селівон, Силван, Силиван, Сіліван, Сьльван, Сялівон)

Table 1: *Ukrainian and Belorussian masculine proper names, derived from Roman mythological names*

Власні імена людей (словник-довідник) by Skrypnyk and Dzyatkovskaya, and Словник українських імен by Triinyak are used as the main sources of information for excerpting the Ukrainian anthroponyms. *Беларускі іменьнік* and *Беларуская антрапанімія*, volume 1 and 3 by Birila are used for the Belorussian examples. The internet sites: [www.behindthename.com](http://www.behindthename.com) and <http://kurufin.narod.ru/> are used for both Slavonic name systems and for the etymology of the Roman mythological names as well.

All the additional sources of information are listed in section *References* at the very end of the text.

The researched anthroponyms are divided into three major groups according to:

(I) the type of the appellative used as a basis during the process of their derivation. We distinguish here:

(a) anthroponyms, derived from a noun:

- *Honor, Honos* (< *honor, oris*, m - "honour");
- *\*Silvanus* (< *silva, ae, f* - "forest, woods");

(b) anthroponyms, derived from an adjective:

- *Mars, Mavors* (< *maris* (a form for Gen. sg. of *mas, maris* - "male, masculine"));
- *Romulus* (< *Romulus, 3* - "belonging to Rome");

(c) anthroponyms with more than one supposed etymology:

- *Aventinus* (< (1) Lat. *avena, ae, f* - "oats"; (2) Lat. *Aventinus, i, m* - "Aventine hill of Rome" (one of the seventh hills of Rome));
- *Clusius, Clusivius* (< (1) Lat. *cludo, 3/ claudo, 3* - "to lock"; (2) Lat. *Clusium, ii, n* - "Clusia (a region in Etruria, a citizen of that area);
- *Genius* (< (1) Lat. *genius, ii, m* - "genius, a Roman guardian spirit of a male power"; (2) Lat. *genus, eris, n* - "family"; (3) Lat. *gigno, 3* - "to bear");
- *Iupiter, Iuppiter, Jupiter, Juppiter* (< (1) Indo-European *\*Dyeu-pater* meaning "the father of gods, of the light" (from *Dyeus/ dieu* - "god" and *pater, tri, m* - "father"); (2) Etruscan *dyeu-pater, dyeus* ("shadow" or "sky") and *pater* - "father"; (3) Lat. *iuvo, 1* - "to help");
- *Maius* (< (1) Roman mythological name *Maius* (< *\*magjos* - "who makes things bigger"); (2) Lat. *Maius, ii, m* - "May");
- *Mercurius, Mircurius, Mirqurius* (< (1) Lat. *mercor, 1* - "to trade"; (2) Lat. *merx, mercis, f* - "goods, wares"; (3) Lat. *merces, edis, f* - "payment, salary");
- *Remus* (< (1) unknown meaning; (2) Lat. *remus, i, m* - "oar");
- *Saturnus* (< (1) unknown meaning; (2) Lat. *satur, ura, urum* - "filled, seated, rich"; (3) Lat. *sero, 1* - "to sew, to join"; (4) Lat. *sator, oris, m* - "sower, planter");

(II) the model used for anthroponym coined from a Latin name, i. e. if:

(a) the Slavonic name is derived from the form for *Nom. sg.* of the Roman mythological names:

- *Clusius* (> Ukr.: *Клюзії*);



- *Genius* (> Ukr.: *Геній*);
- *Honor* (> Ukr.: *Гонор*);
- *Iupiter, Iuppiter, Jupiter, Juppiter* (> Ukr.: *Юнітер*);
- *Maius* (> Ukr.: *Маї*);
- *Mars, Mavors* (> Ukr.: *Марс*);
- *Mercurius* (> Ukr.: *Меркурій*; Blr.: *Мяркурыў*);

or

(b) from its working basis, i. e. the form for *Gen. sg.* of the Roman mythological name, the case ending is omitted:

- *Aventinus* (> Ukr.: *Авентин*);
- *Remus* (> Ukr.: *Рем*);
- *Romulus* (> Ukr.: *Ромул*);
- *Saturnus* (> Ukr.: *Сатурн*);
- *Silvanus* (> Ukr.: *Саливон, Сильван, Силван, Силуян*; Blr.: *Сільван*);

3) the canonization of the saint names:

(a) only by the Catholic church:

- *Romulus*;

(b) only by the Orthodox church:

- *Iupiter, Iuppiter, Jupiter, Juppiter; Maius; Mars, Mavors*;

(c) both by the Catholic church and the Orthodox one:

- *Aventinus; Clusius, Clusivius; Honor, Honos; Mercurius, Mircurius, Mirqurius; Saturnus; Silvanus*.

### Conclusions:

The largest group in number is the one where the anthroponyms with more than one supposed etymology are encountered. The result is a logical one, because they are very ancient and their certain origin is unclear and their initial meaning is forgotten. Most productive appellatives are adjectives, followed by the nouns.

There are two models of coining a Slavonic anthroponym from a Roman mythological name. First, the Slavonic name is derived from the form for *Nom. sg.* of the Roman mythological names, and second, the Slavonic name is derived from its working basis, i. e. the form for *Gen. sg.* of the Roman mythological names with omitted case ending. In this very research, more productive is still the first one.

Almost all of the researched anthroponyms (except *Genius* and *Remus*) are saint names. The biggest in number is the group of saints' names, canonized by both the Catholic church and the Orthodox one, followed by the group of Orthodox saints, and that of the Catholic ones.

## References

<http://kurufin.narod.ru/> (visited 24.07.2013).

[www.behindthename.com](http://www.behindthename.com) (visited 24.07.2013).

Антропонимический словарь региона. Белорусские имена указаны в хронологическом порядке (упоминание в письменном источнике либо годы жизни носителя) / Antroponimičeskiy slovary regiona. Beloruskiye imena ukazany v hronologičeskom pokyadke (upominaniye v pismenom istočnike libo gody jizny nositeliya). [www.pros.at.tut.by](http://www.pros.at.tut.by) (visited 15.01.2012).

*Беларускі іменьнік* / Belarusky imelnik. [www.dzietki.org](http://www.dzietki.org) (visited 18.01.2012).

Бірыла М. В. Беларуская антрапанімія. Т. 1 (Уласныя імёны, імёны-мянушкі, імёны пабацьку, прозаішчы). Мінска: Навука і тэхніка, 1966 / Birila M. Belaruskaya antrapanimiya. Vol. 1. Minsk: Navuka y tehnika, 1966.

Бірыла М. В. Беларуская антрапанімія. Т. 3 (Структура ўласных мужчынскіх імён). Мінска: Навука і тэхніка, 1982 / Birila M. Belaruskaya antrapanimiya. Vol. 3. Minsk: Navuka y tehnika, 1982.

Скрипник Л. Г., Дзятковская Н. П. Власні імена людей (словник-довідник). Київ: Наукова думка, 1986.

Трійняк І. І. Словник українських імен. Київ: Довіра, 2005.

## **(LITERARY) LANGUAGE AND SOCIAL CONDITIONING**

---



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

**Mioara Dragomir,**

Senior Scientific Researcher, Ph.D.

(A. Philippide Institut of Romanian Philology, Iași, Romania);

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

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

1. All the experts who have dealt with the language of Metropolitan Dosoftei's texts noted that derivatives were a distinct note of his lexical creativity. So important is the element of derivation in his work, that in "Istoria limbii române literare" [23, p. 151], for example, they tried dividing the words by the absence or presence of the prefix into two categories, "pre-fixed groups" and "non-pre-fixed groups", while derivatives with suffixes were grouped in various subcategories, all types being supported in this work by a series of examples. In a monographic study like that of D. Pușchilă [22], derivatives are grouped into grammatical classes: nominal derivatives, noun derivatives, verbal derivatives. The author says in a brief introduction that "regarding the words formation Dosoftei's *Molitvenicul* has a great number of derivatives [in which he includes, however, the change of the grammatical value], some existing in language, but many of them formed ad hoc with the help of suffixes and prefixes" [22, p. 57].

2. G. Ivănescu states that besides the phonetic reforms performed in the old literary language, this great scholar "aimed to perform a lexical revolution of language" [14, p. 54]. By making this statement, the scientist from Iasi referred, inter alia, to the taking over of the neologicistic Latin and Greek element by Dosoftei, and in this sense, he expresses an important conclusion, which we shall quote in full, as it refers to the old period, on the whole: "He is a new type of Romanian theologian, different from the one common to those times, who was inspired especially by the church Slavonic language; Dosoftei knew Greek and Latin and sought to enrich the language with Greek and Latin elements. Only Simion Ștefan had tried this before, but not to the same extent as Dosoftei. It is therefore not surprising that Dosoftei's translations present a large number of neologisms of Greek and Latin origin, as it will be

the case with D. Cantemir. It is true that, in his time, other activated who were inspired by the Greek and Latin languages and who borrowed neologisms from these languages: some Wallachian clergy, brothers Greceanu, N. Milescu. But the work of Dosoftei is, in this aspect, the most impressive" [14, p. 57].

By analyzing the derivatives from the work of the Moldavian scholar, we extracted several features of the derivation system, of which we present here *the formation of derivatives with affixes from a Latin or Greek neologistic word (for this period)*. In a relatively recent paper, Eugen Munteanu finds in the language of Dosoftei's texts a category of "derivative lexical creations, in which the Romanian suffixes are attached to foreign-tongued roots" [18, p. 183], "foreign-tongued" also include the derivatives from a Slavonic radical. Distinguishing this category of products on the basis of the analysis, we have in view, as closer to the specificity of Dosoftei's derivatives, only the derivatives with a Latin and Greek radical, because we think that the Slavonic language, as it was most widely known then and many words were inherited from the previous century, the Slavonic radical - maybe not with the same frequency as in Dosoftei - was widely used at the time<sup>1</sup>. In addition to this argument we must consider, especially in case of the Slavonic words, an idea advanced by Ivănescu which is an own vision and comes from a deep observation of the dynamics of ancient literary Romanian: "It is possible that a large number of neological terms were present in the language of the clergy and nobles in the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth century; but they never had the opportunity to be recorded in writing and, therefore, they can only be presumed" [14, p. 53]<sup>2</sup>.

3. From the category of derivatives discussed in relation to Dosoftei's work<sup>3</sup>, we have distinguished two sets:

(a) the one which consist of derived words: *aposcărăchință, aschitac, aselghiciune, demonesc* with the form *dimonesc, despuitoresc, a disputui, a dogmățici, dogmățicit, formuire, formuit* and with the form *furmuț, înformui, neînformuit, nemateriă lnic<sup>4</sup>, necompozit* and with the form *necompozuit, nefigurat, nemăculat, plăzmătareț, plăzmător, a plăzmui, plăzmuire, politicie, a preformui, a preplăzmui* and with the form *prăplăzmui, a ritorici* etc. We must point out that some derivatives of this type appear in the era in other scholars' work, and a number are considered as creations of Dosoftei, original both in terms of form as well as in terms of meaning;

(b) words with the suffix *-icesc*, such as: *aselghicesc și mirtopicesc*, created by analogy with a number of loans that Dosoftei tended to take over with this termination.

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

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

The etymology is *aposcōrachință* < ἀποσκορακίζω + suffix *-ință*<sup>5</sup> [18, p. 172], and ἀποσκορακίζω < ἀπο- + σκορακίζω < ἐς κόρακας ‚la corbi; la dracu‘, according to BABINIOTIS (s.v.).

Given the context, which refers to God, and its meanings ἀποσκορακίζω [17, 13, 1] we believe that by *aposcōrachință* Dosoftei wanted to express the state of the one who feels abandoned by God, as if he had a curse on him, therefore the meaning would be “curse, anathema; repudiation”. The Metropolitan must have found this meaning in his many readings of sacred texts, primarily in the *Bible* (ἀποσκορακίζω în Isaiah 17:13 and in the Psalms 26:15, and ἀποσκορακισμός in Isaiah 66:15)<sup>6</sup>.

To the same category, of the derivatives with a Greek or Latin radical, belong a number of other derivatives. For example *aschitac*, from Gr. Ecl. and Ngr. ασκητικός (< ασκητής ‚hermit, recluse‘) [13]<sup>7</sup>, accommodated by suffix *-ac*: “(Părinții noștri, blagonosnicii săhastrii) *aschitacii*, (carii acea mai zăbaonică și mai trudnică măcenicie a științii luptară) [11, p. 12]; *aselghiciune* < *aselghie*, by abstract suffix *-iciune* (cf. [6]), of the formations which occur only in Dosoftei<sup>8</sup>: (*pîngărite*) *aselghiciuni* [11, p. 274]; *despuiitor* < *a despui* (present indicative first person from *despune* [5] s.v. *despuietor* < Lat. *disponere*) + suffix *-tor*: (*Acestea le păzîm noi pînă la dzua giudețului, cînd va veni*) *despuiitoriul* (*Dumnădzău*); *despuiitoresc* from *despuiitor* (based on the neological Latin root *disponere*) + suffix *-esc*: (*O și prăznuim, făcîndu-ă și sărbătoare și*) *despuiitoreasă* (*dzî pentru Domnul*) [11, p. 217]; *dimonesc*, from *demon* (< Lat. *daemon*, Gr. Δαιμόνιο<sup>9</sup>) + suffix *-esc*: (*S-au luptat cu multe supărări și, mai vîrtos,*) *cu dimonești* [11, p. 126]; *a dispotui*, ‚to explain, to debate‘ (< Lat. *disputo*, *-are*) + suffix *-ui*<sup>10</sup>: (*laste ș-altă a lui carte asupra păgînilor, întru carea pentru firea dimonilor*) *disputuiaște* [11, p. 401]; *a dogmățici*<sup>11</sup> we believe that it was formed by analogy from adjective *dogmatic(esc)*<sup>12</sup> (< Lat. *dogmaticus*, *-a*, *-um* (according to [5]; without attestations in the old age), but we also believe that Gr. Ecl., Mgr., Ngr. δογματικός) + verbal suffix *-i*; adjective *dogmățicit* < *a dogmățici*. These derivatives can be found in Dosoftei, *Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la faptul lumii...: (Daturile [...] de sinții părinți) dogmățicite* (*aședzate*) [8, f. 229<sup>r</sup>]; verb *do<g>mățiciră* appears in the marginal gloss in relation to the context *Tocmiră și pentru sintele icoane și a sintei cruci, să fie de închinat* [8, f. 344<sup>r</sup>].

We found in Dosoftei’s writings several derivatives from the verb *formo*, *-are*, and under the influence of noun *forma* *-ae*<sup>13</sup>, such as: noun *formuire* < *a formui* < Lat. *formo*, *-are* + suffix *-ui*: (*fericita*) *formuire* [11, p. 164]; participle *formuite* (*cu ceara*) [11, p. 162] and in (*trii păhară*) *furmuite* [8, f. 59<sup>v</sup>]; verb *a înformui*, formed by parasyntetic derivation from prefix *în-* + *a forma* (< Lat. *formo*, *-are*) + suffix *-ui*, used in [7] in the same context as in [22]: (*Ai făcut pre omul din țărîină și pre acesta*) *l-ai înformuit* (*în fai și-n bunătate*) [22, p. 198]; *L-ai înfurmuie* (*în faiu și-n bunătate*) ‚to give shape, to create‘ [22, f. 81<sup>v</sup>]; (*De iznoavă*) *ai înformuit* (*acea stricată de păcat firea noastră*) [7, p. 293]; the participle from this verb, with prefix *ne-* appears in [8], in the context (*Cum să fie trup acee ce-i nesămui-*

tă și nehotărîtă și) neînformuită, (nehizmuită și nepipăită) [8, f. 361<sup>v</sup>]. Another verb created from Lat. *formo*, -are is a *preformui* < prefix *pre-* + a *forma* + suffix *-ui*, 'to adorn' [22, f. 141<sup>v</sup>]. This can be found, according to [5] (s.v.) in [3], with the meanings "to compose, arrange, to plan" and "take someone's shape to turn to". In [2] another derivative from the same radical and with the same prefix can be found, but with a different suffix, *înformălui* with the sense "to polish, to arrange", used by this scholar as participle and the noun, *înformăluire*, meaning "information, explanation". In [6] it is supposed that these words are either scholarly formations from medieval Latin *informo*, -are, or form *formo*, -are with prefix *în-* and the attestation in [22] is not given. In [2], *înformăluire* may be based on *informo*, -are, but we believe that the Metropolitan scholar created the words analyzed in this section rather by derivation from *formo*, -are "to create, to shape" because, on the one hand, this is the meaning with which he uses it again and, on the other hand, the same radical lies at the basis of the other derivatives disclosed herein.

Another derivative from the series discussed here is the adjective *nematoriă lnică*, from [22], present in the context: (*pentru fâgăde și rugi*) a *nematoriă lnicilor* (tăi slujitori) (f. 95<sup>v</sup>). By analyzing this word, D. Pușchilă gives the hypothesis, which we consider true, that this could be a typo, and that in fact, the word created by Dosoftei is *nemateriă lnică*, from Lat. *mătēria*, -ae<sup>14</sup>, and the sense of the derivative would be 'spiritual'<sup>15</sup>.

Other derivatives of this type are: *necompozit*, with the form *necompozuit*, from Latin neologism *compono*, -ere "to put together, to reunite; to compile", with the glossed sense: (*Esti Dumnădzău [...] necompozit, (adecă netocmit din bucăți)*) [8, f. 327<sup>v</sup>] and (*Așe-i și la dumnădzăiasca,*) *necompozuita* (*fire în cumeniciune dumnădzăirii, unirea*) [8, f. 351<sup>r</sup>].

Dosoftei creates from Latin *figuro*, -are "to form, to shape" derivative *nefigurat*, present in the context: (*Unul Dumnădzău, ună tuturora începătură ne-ncepută și nezidită [...], nefigurată, (o ună din sus de fință supradumnădzăiască, dumnădzăire în trei staturi)*) [8, f. 355<sup>v</sup>].

In [22], the derivative adjective *nemăculată*, was used along with Latin neologism *macula*, -ae, from which it was formed: (*fără prihană, fără oc<ar>ă, fără maculă,*) *nemăculată* (f. 155<sup>r</sup>).

Dosoftei uses the verb *a plăzmui* with the meaning "to create", adapted by suffix *-ui* after Gr. *πλόσμο* and Lat. *plasma*, -ātis: (*Mînule Tale mă făcură și mă plăzmuiră*) [7, p. 19, cf. and 16], also used in [11]: *Au plăzmuiră (omeneasca fire)* (p. 182), and in [8] (*Pre sine au deșertat singur Născutul Fiiu și Dumnădzău, om de s-au făcut din fetescul singe cu alt ustav decît a firii obicei*) *de s-au plăzmuiră* (f. 359<sup>v</sup>) and also, several times in [9]: *Plăzmuiră (Dumnădzău pre omul, țarnă luînd din pămînt)* (p. 112); *Te-am plăzmuiră (și te-am dat și te-am pus în testament veacinic)* (p. 163, cf. and 113, 146, 157, 184, 190). The noun from this verb is also used, *plăzmuire*, with the meaning of "God's creation", in [22, f. 81<sup>v</sup>] and in the context (*Să nu treci cu căutatul a Ta*) *plăzmuire* from [7, p. 199, cf. and 293,



295). The derivatives in this category include the verbal derivative *a pre-plăsmui*, with the form *a prăplăzmui* with the meaning “to prefigure” < prefix *pre-* + *plăsmui* (< Gr. πλάσμα, Lat. *plasma*, -ătis), from the context: *prăplăzmuind (a ceruirilor împărăției)* from [11, p. 221]. Other derivatives created by Dosoftei based on the neologistic radicals mentioned here are: noun derivatives *plăzmătareț* “creator” [22, f. 146r] and *plăzmător: (Tu -) Plăzmătoriul (nostru și lucruri mînului tale, toț noi)* [9, p. 305]. In the era, the verb *a plăsmui* is also used in [3], meaning “to imagine, to invent”. In [3] we can also find noun *plăsmuire*, with the meaning “creation”, and noun derivative *plăsmuitor* “creator, maker”. The latter with the meaning of “person who imagines, invents” appears in a writing from 1798, according to [5] (s.v.).

A derivative created from Greek πολιτική, formed by adapting this noun to suffix *-ie*, is *politicie* from [8], in the context (*Așe s-au înfrîmășat Rîmul de Romul cu cele de războiu, iară de-acesta, cu cele de cetățenie, politicie (și de pace)*) (f. 75v).

A derivative based on a neologistic radical is the verb *a ritorici*<sup>16</sup>, formed by analogy, like *dogmatici*, from adjective *ritoric(esc)*<sup>17</sup> (< Gr., Ngr. ρητορικός, Lat. *rhetoricus* + verbal suffix *-i*: (*Ceale dumnezeiești ritoricia* [9, p. 255]; (*Bun măiestru și bine grăitori rost) a ritorici (nu poate să te cînte)* [9, p. 280, cf. and 271]. This verb also appears in [4].

We also noticed in the language of Dosoftei’s texts the frequency of words with termination *-icesc*, adapted in general, in the old literary Romanian after Gr. -ικός and Lat. *-icus*<sup>18</sup> such as: *astronomicesc, canonicesc, dogmaticesc, icumenicesc, iroicesc, loghicesc, politicesc, practicesc, silloghicesc* etc. The recent study on the suffix *-icesc* conducted by Carmen-Gabriela Pamfil and Elena Danilă Tamba, which examines the history of this issue and the etymological solving from *Thesaurus Dictionary of the Academy* offers solutions to the different eras of literary Romanian regarding the etymology of words terminated as such and for the etymological paragraph of this dictionary, solutions that we consider reasonable and fair. Thus, in agreement with other opinions [19, p. 259-272] according to which suffix *-icesc* could be formed “toward the end of the eighteenth century and especially in the nineteenth century” [20, p. 200], the authors conclude in a nuanced way with which we agree, that “adjectives borrowed from Greek and Latin, ending in -ικός and *-icus* in old literary Romanian as in the case of loans from other languages, entered in the phase of transition to modern literary Romanian” [idem, p. 201], the conclusion is that they should be considered loans adapted to the Romanian language system, and not derived words.

We said that Dosoftei tends to adapt by means of this termination the type of neologisms in question, but we must emphasize that, more than that, he had linguistic intuition and felt this termination as a suffix. We also found in his texts formations such as *aselghicesc*<sup>19</sup>, *mirtopsicesc* and with the Slavonic radical *vračebnicesc, mironosicesc*<sup>20</sup> and also *tăinuicesc*, that have no equivalent in any foreign language, so that in these cases, we can say that we are dealing

with derivatives that Dosoftei created by analogy: *aselghicesc*<sup>21</sup> < *aselghie* (< ἀσέλγεια 'dissipation') + suffix *-icesc*; *mirtopsicesc* (we have not found in the Greek dictionaries forms corresponding as loans) < *mirt* < μύρτο, which by closeness to the verb μυρεψώ "to prepare something like ointment" could give for euphony the consonant group *-ps-* + suffix *-icesc*; *tăinuicesc* < *tănui* + suffix *-icesc*. These derivatives appear in contexts such as: (*spurcăciuni*) *aselghicești* [22, f. 96<sup>r</sup>]; (*curvii spurcate*) *asîlghicești* [8, f. 230<sup>r</sup>]; (*spurcări*) *aselghicești* [8, f. 230<sup>v</sup>]; (*petrecînd în necurății*) *aselghicești* [9, p. 314]; (*Svîntul măcenic [...] împlînd văzduhul de miros scump*) *mirtopsicesc*, (*să sui ca o stea luminoasă la Dumnăzău*) [11, p. 304]; *tăinuicesc* [22, f. 101<sup>v</sup>].

4. Therefore, when they discuss a philological problem such as the authorship of a text or language problems such as the literary language of Dosoftei's works or the evolution of the Romanian literary language (in the old period), they should consider this aspect of derivation, which characterizes the language of the Metropolitan scholar's texts: *the formation of derivatives with affixes from a Latin or Greek neologistic word* (for this period). This is a characteristic determined by features of his spiritual basis – we adapt and apply this concept of A. Philippide–G. Ivănescu doctrine<sup>22</sup>, which is very useful and entirely appropriate – such as: the knowledge of the classical language, and the tendency to assimilate neologisms and to integrate them in the Romanian literary language – with a special vision on the ones coming from Latin [12] – and, of course the sense of language, the linguistic intuition, too, combined with linguistic creativity, the latter being a feature of the creators of language, especially rare in the old period.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup>See also [23, p. 149], which states: "The words of Slavonic origin, great in number [in Dosoftei's language] were somewhat in fashion in old Romanian literary language, especially in ecclesiastical and administrative language".

<sup>2</sup>We must mention here that once finished the first edition of the *Romanian Language Dictionary* of Academy – even if it has the imperfections inherent to a work of this importance and extension – has already opened the way towards the study of ancient vocabulary, which Ivănescu thought about.

<sup>3</sup>We extracted the material for analysis from [7], [10], [9], [11], [8], [22].

<sup>4</sup>We kept the transcription system used by D. Pușchilă to extract the words from [22] that he analyzed.

<sup>5</sup>See the *Romanian Language Dictionary* accomplished by A. Philippide and his team, where the definition of the word is 'chasing out with disdain' and the following is stated for the first time: "Dosoftei issued the word, which was not used before him nor after him, from the Greek word ἀποσκορακίζω 'chasser avec mépris'"; also see the complete etymology and the discussions from 17, p. 172.

<sup>6</sup>We prepare a broader communication about this creation of Dosoftei, which we intend to present at the fifth edition of the international symposium "Explorations in Romanian and European biblical tradition" held in Iași, and whose works are to be published in Volume *Receptarea Sfintei Scripturi între filologie, hermeneutică și traducto-*

logie (*Reception of Holy Scripture between Philology, Hermeneutics and Translation Studies*) which reached the fourth volume, in preparation for printing.

<sup>7</sup>The *Romanian Language Dictionary* [6] states that this is „A word Romanized by from Neo-Greek. √Φ60946 Η. Cf. *ascet*.” This process was produced by derivation.

<sup>8</sup>Also see [15, p. 450, 470, 472].

<sup>9</sup>According to [13] in Eccl. Gr. it means “unclean, crafty soul”.

<sup>10</sup>The word was not recorded in [5]. Instead they recorded *disputație*, without attestations in Dosoftei’s texts.

<sup>11</sup>In [5] the verb is recorded with the form *a dogmatisi* (s.v.) < δογματίσσω, aor. of δογματίζω, without attestations in the old period.

<sup>12</sup>For *dogmaticesc* see: (*cuvințele*) *dogmătițești* (Dosoftei, *Vieța și petrecerea svinților*, p. 199); (*Șese săboară, pentru credință, cercare s-au făcut și socoteală, adecă hotariu*) *dogmaticesc* (*s-au scos*) (Dosoftei, *Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la faptul lumii...*, f. 342<sup>v</sup>).

<sup>13</sup>This Latin neologism appears in Dosoftei’s writings, see [22, p. 93], [7, p. 124], [11, p. 12, 164, 376].

<sup>14</sup>The neologism *materie* is used several times in [8] (f. 348<sup>v</sup>, f. 351<sup>r</sup>, f. 352<sup>v</sup>, f. 356<sup>r</sup>).

<sup>15</sup>See [22, p. 82]. D. Pușchilă states that the word is a “derivative of Dosoftei” and he considers it analogous to *înfurmui* derived from *formă*. Therefore, this linguist believes that the verb *înfurmui* is derived from the Latin noun *forma*, not from the verb *formo, -are*. He reaches this conclusion because in [22, f. 12<sup>v</sup>] the noun *formă* (*de șerb*) appears as well.

<sup>16</sup>In [5] s.v. *ritorici* the etymology *ritor* + suffix *-ici* is suggested.

<sup>17</sup>For *ritoricesc* see [11]: *Era învățat în toată filosofia și deprins la cuvintele ritoricești* VS (184).

<sup>18</sup>For explanations about this category of words and this process valid for old age, see [20, p. 191-202].

<sup>19</sup>[6] suggests the etymology: „Derived from *aselghie*, by adjectival suffix *-esc*”.

<sup>20</sup>With Slavonic radical, by closeness to *врачевьнь*, adj. ,ιατροῦ *medici*’, *врачевьскъ* adj. ,ιατρικός *ιατροῦ medici*’, *врачевьскы* adv. ,ιατρικώς *arte medica*’ [16] is *vračebnicesc* ,healing; medical’: *Aceștiia [...], de meștersugul vrăcebnicesc foarte fiind iscusiți, îmbla la tot orașul și cetatea, tămăduind fără plată* [11, p. 89]; by closeness to *mironosica* ,murofovro unguentum ferens’ [16]: (*Acea [...] femeie, a ta simțind dumnezăire*) *mironosicească, (luînd rînd tînguind miruri ție [...] aduce)* [8, f. 251<sup>v</sup>].

<sup>21</sup>We have not found in the Greek dictionaries a form \*ασελογικός, but the adjective is *ασελογής, ής, ές*.

<sup>22</sup>View a summary of A. Philippide-G. Ivănescu doctrine on the issue of *articulatory basis* and *psychological/spiritual basis* in [21].

## References

1. Bailly A. Dictionnaire greco-français (redigé avec le concours de E. Egger, édition revue par P. Séchan et P. Chantraine). Paris: Hachette, 1997.
2. Μπαμπινιωτης, Γεωργίου Δ. Λεξικό της νέας ελληνικής γλώσσας. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Λεξικολογίας, 1998.
3. Cantemir D. Hronicul vechimei a romano-moldo-vlahilor (ediție îngrijită de Gr. G. Tocilescu. București: Institutul de Arte Grafice Carol Göbl, 1901.

4. Cantemir D. Istoria ieroglifică. Vol. I-II. București: Editura pentru Literatură, 1965.
5. Chesarie Ch., episcopul Rîmnicului. *Mineiul*, luna lui octombrie, care s-au tipărit acum întâi rumânește..., 1776.
6.  $\varepsilon\zeta\eta\theta\iota\kappa\lambda\mu\text{;}\Gamma, \text{O}\Delta\text{Z}\Phi\Theta\Xi\text{H. ;}\Xi\cong \delta, >46 \bar{2}0\Phi\forall\Lambda\Delta \bar{H} \bar{8}0H \text{ }90H, 880<46ZH (8\phi\Phi\Phi\forall H. !2$   
 $Z<\forall: A\forall(6 \bar{\Phi}:4\cong H, 6*\cong 946 \bar{H} \cong \Delta(\forall<4\Phi: \bar{H} (\phi.\alpha).$
7. Dicționarul limbii române. Tom I-II. București: Tipografia ziarului „Universul”, Imprimeria Națională, 1913-1914.
8. Dicționarul limbii române, serie nouă, tom VI-XIV. București: Editura Academiei, 1965-2010.
9. Dosoftei, mitropolitul. Dumnezăiasca liturghie 1679 (ediție critică de N.A. Ursu, studiu introductiv de ÎPS Teoctist, arhiepiscop al Iașilor și mitropolit al Moldovei și Sucevei). Iași: Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, 1980.
10. Dosoftei, mitropolitul. Novă adunare de istorii, începînd de la faptul lumii... (traducere de mitropolitul Dosoftei, în 1689, după cronograful lui Mattheos Kigalas; păstrată în ms. 3456, Biblioteca Academiei Române-BAR).
11. Dosoftei, mitropolitul. Parimiile preste an, Iași, 1683 (ediție critică, studiu introductiv, notă asupra ediției, note și glosar de Mădălina Ungureanu). Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2012.
12. Dosoftei, mitropolitul. Psaltirea în versuri 1673 (ediție critică de N.A. Ursu, Cuvînt înainte de ÎPS Iustin Moiescu, arhiepiscop al Iașilor și mitropolit al Moldovei și Sucevei). Iași: Mitropolia Moldovei și Sucevei, 1974.
13. Dosoftei, mitropolitul. Vieța și petrecerea svinților, Iași 1682-1686 (text îngrijit, notă asupra ediției și glosar de Rodica Freñțiu). Cluj: Editura Echinox, 2002.
14. Dragomir, M. Elementul latin în Hronograful den începutul lumii. Noi argumente în sprijinul paternității lui Nicolae Milescu Spătarul. In: Analele Universității „Ștefan cel Mare”, Seria Filologie, A. Lingvistică, Tomul XIV, nr. 1, 2008, p. 83-10.
15. Ivănescu G. Studii de istoria limbii române literare (ediție îngrijită și postfață de Al. Andriescu). Iași: Editura Junimea, 1989.
16. Manea L. Dosoftei. Viața și petrecerea svinților. Studiu lingvistic. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2006.
17. Miklosich Fr. Lexikon paleoslovenico-graeco-latinum. Vindobonae: Guilelmus Braumueller, 1682-1685.
18. Munteanu E. Studii de lexicologie biblică. București: Humanitas, 2008.
19. Oprea I. Originea sufixelor adjectivale compuse din perioada premodernă a limbii române literare. In: Limba română, XXXVII, 1988, nr. 3, p. 259-272.
20. Pamfil C.-G., Dănilă Tamba, E. Soluții etimologice pentru adjectivale neologice în *-icesc*, propuse de Dicționarul Academiei. In: Cultură și identitate

românească. Tendințe actuale și reflectarea lor în diasporă. Iași: Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”, 2013, p. 191-202.

21. Pamfil C.-G. Alexandru Philippide. București-Chișinău: Editura Litera, 2008.
22. Philippide Al. ms. of Dicționarul limbii române (Romanian Language Dictionary), BAR Iași.
23. Pușchilă D. Molitvenicul lui Dosoftei. In: Analele Academiei Române, seria II, Tomul XXXVI, 1913–1914, Memoriile secțiunii literare. București: Librăriile Socec & Comp. și C. Sfetea, Leipzig Otto Harassowitz, Viena Gerold & Comp., p. 1-114.
24. Rosetti Al., Cazacu B., Onu L. Istoria limbii române literare. Vol. I: De la origini pînă la începutul secolului al XIX-lea. București: Editura Minerva, 1971.

## THE NARRATIVE OF CLAN CLUSTERING IN TWO AMERICAN NOVELS

Onoriu Colăcel,

Lecturer, Ph.D.

(Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania)

**Abstract:** *Bruce Benderson's The Romanian (2006) and Andrei Codrescu's The Poetry "Lesson" (2010) promote a somewhat clannish agenda, enduring in story telling despite the pluralistic kind of society the North Atlantic mainstream culture pledges to build. Way too diverse in kind and nature to be safely defined, this view of the world readily available in Western narrative fiction accounts for much of the bias still displayed presently by the novel genre. Explicitly, the cultural backdrop of (Eastern) otherness against which the plot unfolds is the litmus test of the professed inclusive values of the cosmopolitan Westerner. The metropolitan cultures' competence in policing the civilizational divide between the many worlds available inside and outside the American-European cultural continuum shows through the pages of the books. For example, the two English-written novels dwell on the marginal Romanian identity in order to narrate the world-making patterns of fictional invention. The American Bruce Benderson employs extensively the stock language of orientalism, while the American-naturalized Romanian Andrei Codrescu touches on the identity narratives of his home country. Conclusively, I find that both narrators largely exemplify the value-laden language of narration in terms of instrumentalizing the ethos of the E. U. enlargement and the European heritage.*

**Keywords:** *tribalism, Romania(n), West(ern), narrative.*

The aesthetic credentials of the novel genre best convey the adjustment to the social environment both narrators and readers live in. Irrespective of the time-honoured tradition of beauty appreciation, the cultural meaning conveyed by narration is relative to the purpose it serves. Mostly, it has to do with producing and circulating narratives of "social cohesion" [4, p. 30] or disruption. The current reinterpretation of the pragmatist and Marxian paradigms in the memory studies shifts the stress (simplistically said) from use-value and cultural institutions (focused on economics and class) to memory, i.e. to "knowledge with an identity-index, [...] knowledge about oneself; that is, one's own diachronicity, be it as an individual or as a member of a family, a generation, a community, a nation or a cultural and religious tradition" [2, p. 123]. Tracking down collective memory helps to better understand the unspoken suspicion of the other lurking in the background of most public narratives, be they fictional or not. Particularly, the device of narration proper turns out to be informative of clan clustering on two levels. Firstly, some narrators go to great lengths to campaign on behalf of the people they feel deserve their services. Secondly, the actual plot development re-tells the characters' dealings with each other, as observed through their social outcomes. The aim is to emphasize the benefits of strong emotional and cultural ties between one individual or another and an easily recognizable ethnic, professional or sexually-oriented group.

The need to reproduce ancestral patterns of resilient group loyalty is plain to see in the novels of Bruce Benderson, *The Romanian*, and in Andrei Codrescu's *The Poetry Lesson*, respectively. Essentially, the commitment to a particular 'band of brothers' of which the narrator is obviously a member keeps together the narrative address. Beside the outspoken gay and academic credentials of the two stories, a Western political culture (and eventually identity) is outlined in their unfolding, with the side effect of a Eurocentric narrative meant to display the various attributes of the current American mainstream culture. The Eurocentrism of the fictional address is a matter of describing a counterfactual civic-minded response from the readers. This response is engineered by narrative fiction mostly in terms of character delineation and self-assertive language. The narrative voices are out to secure (poetic) justice for themselves and their people. In doing so they resort to the in-progress fairness policy of Brussels and to European cultural heritage. My interest lies with the mainstreaming of the Romanian narrative attempted by the two writers through advertising 20<sup>th</sup> century Romanian history - members of the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen dynasty, the communist regime, Transylvanian exoticism, Balkanism, etc.

In the two novels, on the one hand, identity markers such as formal schooling, sexual orientation, etc. are foregrounded in the story. On the other, the characters' ethno-national conditioning is never scrutinized, although the very plot is structured around the ethno-symbolism of an American (gay or literary) identity, as explained by the ethos of the E. U. enlargement and by the cultural and aesthetic traditions of the old world. Apparently, "historic nationhood [and] everyday nationhood" [11, p. 134] are mentioned to the extent to which they credit the aesthetic autonomy principle, historically at play in the reception of art since modernism. This is particularly true considering that both stories seem to demand similar recognition, mainly on account of their cultured take on the theme of gay identity and teaching. This is to say that homosexual culture (*The Romanian*) and literary education (*The Poetry Lesson*) are framed in such a way as to promote a conspicuously Eurocentric view of the subject matter.

Well-known ideological underpinnings, pertaining to the way current metropolitan cultures of the world - USA and EU - are fictionally represented, bring together these otherwise strikingly different two contemporary novels. Their competence in policing the civilizational divide between the many worlds available inside and outside the American-European continuum is exactly the same. Unambiguously, their address succeeds in broadcasting a narrative (i.e., loose and disjointed) comprehension of the competing views on globalization most successful in the 1990s: the "end of history" [7, p. 288] and the "clash of civilizations" [8, p. 28]. The novels merge them together into an all-encompassing and self-contradictory storyline about the North Atlantic exchange of ideas, people and money. The end result comes

across literally as an “imagined political community” [1, p. 6] that works irrespective of national borders, even if it does not necessarily boast trans-Atlantic national commitments. To all extents and purposes, the two English-written novels dwell on several marginal identities in order to narrate the so-called free world. The world-making patterns of fictional invention fuel the grand narrative of the West in the eyes of the outsiders – the Romanians, the African Americans, the gay community, etc.

Essentially, the narrative voices spell out contrastive associations that are part and parcel of popular culture, which is insistently quoted: “Europe marches gloriously into the North American model” [3, p. 4]; “It seemed to me that American kids were younger than European kids, or at least I was older when I was their age” [6, p. 65], etc. The process of acknowledging their sources is of great concern for the authors of *The Romanian* and *The Poetry Lesson*. The referencing is sophisticated enough to introduce the already mentioned euro-centric language of storytelling. Reverence for the oldest part of the free world is meant to showcase the best of the European highbrow culture. These stories are told from the perspective of the clan enclave each author advertises for. The agenda of Bruce Benderson is overtly acknowledged on account of his commitments to the memoir genre. He covers the closeted homosexual life of a Romanian hustler by contrast to the “frills of the out gay life cherished by today’s contemporary Western gays” [3, p. 54]. Benderson engages in a propaganda battle for the sympathies and the prejudices of his people in the face of state-enforced discrimination. Anyway, on the both sides of the hetero/homosexual fence seem to stand equally entitled victims of the recriminatory 20<sup>th</sup> century cultural paradigms. In the words of Andrei Codrescu, even the conventional “heterosexuality, marriage, and all the negative emotional baggage those two carried became philosophically suspect. That sliver of cultural difference [...] was fertile enough to give birth [...] [to] Queer Studies” [6, p. 57]. In the same rather irreverent manner, various other social subgroups are mentioned as being on the cultural fringes of the society: “a skinhead-styled subculture of abstinence and heroism with tints of racism and survivalist ethos” [*ibidem*, p. 54]; “in every American city of the twenty first century there was now a hole-in-the-wall where disaffected and affluent youth sat between walls festooned with sickles-and-hammers, wearing Che Guevara™ tees” [*ibidem*, p. 53]. As a matter of fact, this is a hands-on approach to calling names and making accusations by means of creative writing, besides exemplifying notions of bias in education. Everything is staged by *The Poetry Lesson* in effective academic terms that even define the “chauvinistic days” [6, p. 12] of the 1960s, when it was safe to broadcast “a phrase implying something hierarchical and unsavory” [*ibidem*, p. 13]. Surprisingly, both these 21<sup>st</sup> century American novels are littered with exactly the same (mildly) objectionable content.



Coming back to Bruce Benderson, his nine months stay in Romania is used as a test for ranking the rate of partiality to 'your people,' whoever they are: homosexuals, Romanians, Americans. The text suggests that all those concerned seem to have experienced first-hand such dramatic events. In other words, his story instrumentalizes the issue of otherness, which is inadvertently exemplified by his own reading of Romanian identity. It pre-empts criticism about his orientalisating and objectifying Romanians by the instrumental use made of his Jewish and gay credentials. Thus, preconceived ideas that injuriously affect the subject are unleashed on all: on homosexuals, on the Romanian identity, on the Roma community. This is an unfortunate instance of essentialism. The novel indicts mainstream heterosexual culture with demonizing 'his people' (mostly on account of their inherent otherness), while the text parades the same non-contextual (and disparaging) reasoning, used to define the East and, particularly, Romania. Accordingly, the reader is given plenty of historical insight into the issue. For example, the German-born kings of Romania "feared its Oriental and Byzantine elements and were shocked by its Latin sensualities" [3, p. 66].

Facetiously, the naturalized American Andrei Codrescu does the same when it comes, for example, to his students. He speaks on behalf of those who hold the right to teach publicly in the universities of "our country" [*ibidem*, p. 53]: "I pissed smugly on academia, which is a way of saying that I pissed on myself, which I do, regularly, to extinguish my pretensions" [*ibidem*, p. 98]. Witty or not, the literary discourse deals in stereotyping the other in terms that eventually resort to biased reporting on race and ethnicity. It happens even if the very (aesthetic) disclaimer of fictional invention tries to play down an essentially offensive language. *The Romanian* is quite blunt about it and does not target exclusively Eastern Europeans: "African-Americans, who approached one another like members of a cult, all obsessed with the culture of Germany. In their eyes I saw a perverse audacity in favoring a country once known for its racism" [3, p. 257]. Likewise, in *The Poetry Lesson* racial colour is openly mentioned as an educational reference not for African people but for the Caucasian: "Letitia Klein's hair was fiery red, hence her nickname, "Red". In fact, now that I let my eyes roam over the heads of my poetry students, all their hair ran the gamut of red, from shades of golden-red to glowing embers. [...] a room full of red" [6, p. 86].

According to the authors, the benchmark against which to measure these adventurous statements of theirs should be the already mentioned, inconsistent storytelling pattern that quotes popular (mis)conceptions of Europe. Ultimately, it is a narrative trail that links the places, the people and the facts of the old world. They are made to fit into the ideological reading of reality ideal for the needs of the group on whose behalf the writers speak. The two of them are very matter-of-fact about it. Alongside Benderson, who is the

ambassador of gay emancipation and self-consciously Jewish, Codrescu openly acknowledges his Romanian descent (yet there is no mention of him being Jewish – his last name was originally Perlmutter), his teaching job or his migrant history (“the many zigs and zags I made between cities and countries” [*ibidem*, p. 63]) in the plot of *The Poetry Lesson*. This is the cultural background that effectively underplays the occasional glaring bias present in the fictional (aesthetic) reporting on social reality.

Both narrators indulge in rephrasing a holistic comprehension of a virtual continental unity verified on the European, as well as on the American soil. Decisively, the need to perceive and actually to produce a coherent Western identity in these two novels mainly hinges on the narrative evidence of European values, genealogies, etc., not to mention the American ethnicity. Nonetheless, the steady flow of information about both the E. U. and the European civilization legitimizes the sometimes contentious fictional rhetoric, while explaining the American comprehension of the world.

These two stories amount to the attempt of the novel genre to exhibit a Eurocentric outlook on the “cultural foundations” [10, p. 1] of various national, sexual or professional identities. They target the mass culture and the emerging national tradition of Europeanism. Its rise among “European citizens first at the individual level, and then over the past 30 years at the aggregate level” [5, p. 4] is appropriated by instantly recognizable fictional language. From the classic, pan-European, Hellenistic and Roman heritage to the possible core values of inclusiveness sported by Brussels, all seems to make sense. For example, the tabloid “story of a Romanian rentboy, abject passion and problematic sex” [3, p. 256] is also “the time worn story of Pygmalion” [*ibidem*, p. 122]. Equally, the half-humorous pedagogical insights of the poetry teacher are revealing of literature’s dependence on the rarefied world of aesthetics as well as on pop culture stereotypes. For example, over quite a number of pages Andrei Codrescu makes a case for loving domestic cats. They are thought to be somehow representative of both the American national character and beauty: “Self-consciousness is a beautiful thing if the self is conscious of its beauty. Need a self so beautiful also be self-conscious? In this matter, cats have it all over us” [6, p. 108]; “America is a pet-loving nation and cats are our national pet” [*ibidem*, p. 104]. Irrespective of such idiosyncratic statements, the author is obviously able to rephrase the rhetoric of collective consciousness in a rather entertaining manner, which is definitely not the case of the more politically committed Bruce Benderson.

However, it turns out that the novel genre enacts a rather widespread idea that “one should move away from simplistic assumptions concerning linear trends towards greater tolerance in the West” [9, p. 177]. Meaning that, storytelling acts out the cultural narrative of fear and bigotry best summarized by a tribal politics of suspicion, which I want to believe has always been at the heart of literary realism.

The retrograde cultural policy both novels rely on is a matter of partisan politics and literary realism. Everything has already been said in the optimistic assessment that “literary realism’s democratizing impulse opened channels of sympathy to all people, including the members of groups systematically misrepresented in the elitist art of the dominant culture” [12, p. 6]. The partisanship of novelistic realism is readily available to all misrepresented or culturally dominant readers. Similar assumptions regarding the accuracy and fairness of narrative representation are blown to pieces due to similar announcements casually made by Bruce Benderson: “this will confirm my conception of Romania as a well of occult belief that enriches art and literature but that also provides fodder for irrational constructions” [3, p. 233]. Once more, Andrei Codrescu seems to follow the lead of the gay advocate who looks to Europe for answers about the essentially American world he lives in.

In a less panicked way, the narrative voice of *The Poetry Lesson* suspects that the poetry of one character he actually shares with Bruce Benderson, the British-born Queen Marie of Romania, is “full of shepherds” [6, p. 54]. The wife of King Ferdinand and mother of Carol II, this “granddaughter of Queen Victoria” [3, p. 17] was first a “frightened seventeen-year-old English bride in a strange Eastern country” [*ibidem*, p. 46]. The reader finds out that she then blossomed “into a figure synonymous with Romanian identity, nationalism and pride” [*ibidem*]. Of course, she wrote poetry.

If read together, *The Romanian* and *The poetry Lesson* prove that the services rendered to her adopted country by Queen Marie have never actually ended. She is repeatedly mentioned as the one who “brings Romania to the attention of the West” [*ibidem*, p. 17] in quite a number of ways. For example, she seems to have had “the most touching one-night stand in the history of poetry” [6, p. 6] with “a lumber baron in Washington” [*ibidem*, p. 6] in the 1920s, while on an American tour. Allegedly, Missy, as she was affectionately known, decisively helped “enlarging Romania rather than partitioning it” [3, p. 45], in the aftermath of World War I. “Queen Marie’d been a flapper, friend of Isadora Duncan and Rodin, among others” [6, p. 6] – a fashionable woman of the roaring ’20s who showed independent behaviour, though Queen of a European country. Her professed Romanian identity, her friends and connections, even her present-day museum in Washington (set-up by the grateful baron) shapes the image of the oriental Romanians into something less strange and even offensive. She has become a cultural icon that translates Romanian otherness into the familiar language of a westernized social reality.

These two novels of Bruce Benderson and Andrei Codrescu work to advance the agenda of Romanian alignment to European values and, ultimately, to put on the map the interwar Romania of Queen Marie once more.

Conclusively, I find that both narrators largely exemplify a value-laden language of narration in terms of instrumentalizing the ethos of the E. U. enlargement as well as a rather popular notion of the European heritage. The cultural backdrop of otherness against which the novels’ plot unfolds is their major achievement and highlights the professed standards of Western

European progressiveness. This only comes to reinforce a number of widely held beliefs about the gay community, the Romanian identity, the European citizenship, etc. As a matter of principle, they either go unmentioned or are glossed over in mainstream reporting on social reality. Taken for granted or considered way too political, they are thought to be controversial enough to grab attention and trigger strong popular emotion. I have briefly mentioned them in my attempt to come to terms with the transparently clannish agenda advertised by the academically-oriented language of the narrative. Mostly they elaborate on various unsavoury practices exposed by the literary discourse for being, each and every one, alive and kicking throughout the Western world.

### References

1. Anderson B. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (revised edition). London and New York: Verso, 2006.
2. Assmann J. *Globalization, Universalism, and the Erosion of Cultural Memory*. In: Assmann, A., Conrad, S. (eds.). *Memory in a Global Age Discourses, Practices and Trajectories*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010, p. 121-137.
3. Benderson B. *The Romanian*. London: Snowbooks, 2006.
4. Bruhn J. G. *The Group Effect. Social Cohesion and Health Outcomes*. Heidelberg London New York: Springer, 2009.
5. Bruter M. *Citizens of Europe?: The Emergence of a Mass European Identity*. Hampshire and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
6. Codrescu A. *The Poetry Lesson*. Princeton University Press, 2010.
7. Fukuyama Fr. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, 1992.
8. Huntington S.-P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996.
9. Rother N., Medrano J.-D. *Is The West Becoming More Tolerant?* In: Ester P., Braun M., Mohler P. (eds.). *Globalization, Value Change, and Generations: a Cross-National and Intergenerational Perspective*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006, p. 151-178.
10. Smith A.-D. *The Cultural Foundations of Nations: Hierarchy, Covenant and Republic*. Malden, MA., Oxford and Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.
11. Smith A.-D. *Ethno-Symbolism and Nationalism: a Cultural Approach*. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2009.
12. Wonham H.-B. *Playing the Races: Ethnic Caricature and American Literary Realism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

## THE CORRELATION BETWEEN HISTORIOGRAPHY AND LITERATURE OF CONFESSION

**Diana Vrabie,**

Associate Professor, Ph.D.

(Alecus Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova)

**Abstract:** *Correspondence, alongside with autobiographies, memoirs and diaries, belongs to the literature of confession. Being a literary perception, it also maintains its quality as a source of information for historiographers. It is difficult to identify from confessional writing how much belongs to the actual history and how much is literature. The present study will offer some suggestions on this perspective and will provide a historical retrospective of the Epistle which reveals its contradictory way to great literature. We shall try to delineate between the actual and the literary correspondence, making some reference to the poetics of communication. In this respect, we shall address the following dichotomies: private/public correspondence, documentary/authentic/fictional correspondence etc.*

**Keywords:** *correlation, historiography, literature, confession, writing.*

Being referred to in several ways and without having a "canonized" name, the autobiographical literature still remains in search of its identity and its elements loom somewhere between the *literature of confession, paraliterature, non-fiction, biographical literature, literature of autobiographical narrative, subjective literature, confessional writing* etc. Thus, we have opted for the concept of literature of confession from this amalgam of "names", which are likely to further complete each other, since any diary, memoir, autobiography, correspondence; confessional interview becomes a "creative subject" in any obvious way (Jean Rousset).

Even in the absence of a "Christian name" unanimously approved of this type of literature spectacularly invades the bookstores, rivalling the canonized species. The literature of confession remains a segment which seduces unconditionally its readers; it is a wonderful rematch of "the author removed from the equation," as Eugen Simion puts into words. The authors, in their turn, are generous. Let us have a random look at some recent titles of confessional writing from a much larger list: *Memoirs of an Ideal Library* by Bogdan Suceava, *A Small Diary with Memories* by Nadia Anghelescu, *The Box of Monkeys. The Journal* by Răsvan Popescu etc. Diaries, confessions, memories relived in writing, interviews, uncensored autobiographies, correspondence, autobiographical essays and talks outshine casually fiction. Recently, the Polirom Publishing House initiated a new collection entitled *Memory (including diaries, autobiographies, memories)*, which comes to meet the readers' constant interest in memoirs.

The increased interest in the undisguised inner world, the tendency to reflect the unique experience, the search for one's own individuality and, thereby, the attempt to understand the human being determined the refuge of the literary sincerity in its familiar environment represented by *autobiogra-*

*phies, diaries, memoirs, private correspondence, dialogues, memories, biographical essays, together with a plethora of deviant formulas such as interviews, conversations, outstanding personalities' memories, portraits etc. The related species which might merge with or without the author's knowledge into a confession co-exist in a paradise of mutual tolerance, approaching or moving away from the biographical literature. However, the literature of confession is considered to be everybody's and nobody's territory at the same time, unable to determine precisely how much of the writing is history and how much is literature, where a confession text ceases to be literature and where its historiographical borders begin. According to Paul Cernat, being unable to confess something to the world and being susceptible to damaging the contemporaries' image beyond the admissible limits, confessional species remain to be an uncomfortable area that are accepted with reservations and regarded as something adjacent. Needless to say, not all the literature of confession has some aesthetic value, even if it might be considered literary. It is the author himself who takes the whole responsibility being a "naive and awkward" or a "dull and methodical" narrator. "Some memoirists have the gift of synthesis being closer to historiography, others are analysts par excellence, being closer to the letter. Whether there is a conscious or an involuntary literary treatment, it does not depend on the authenticity and authority of the writing or of the experience, but on the memoirist's aesthetic temperament" [3, p. 12-13].*

Biographical literature, sufficiently heterogeneous, refuses the punctual classifications and claims a conglomerate of species where the primacy is held by the *autobiography, the diary, memoirs* and the *private correspondence*, whose advocate it appears to be. If the diary, memoirs and autobiographies succeeded in leaving the field of paraliterature, in the last decade, private correspondence, receiving increased attention from the literary critics, is still deprived of this privilege. Although we have a rich epistolary literature, the synthetic approaches focusing specifically on this species are very few in number: an old study devoted to Al. Săndulescu's epistolary literature, the volume entitled *Large Correspondence* (1981) by Livius Coicîrlie, several chapters from *the Biographical Genres* (2008) by Eugen Simion, some sporadic implications from *Literature and Communication. The Author-Reader Relationship in the Romanian Prose of the 1848 Period and Post 1848 Period* by Liviu Papadima, references to the medieval epistle in the Romanian literature (*And They Wrote the Book. An Essay about the Medieval Epistle in the Romanian Literature* (2003) written by Laura Badescu and we could identify just a few more sources.

If essential key species of the literature of confession have acquired a relatively autonomous status, leaving the paraliterature by passing the test of literalness, *correspondence* has to face many "canonized" prejudices. The blame is partially on some correspondence that has compromised the species and, partially, on the reluctance which characterizes a "drawer" species, as well as

on the theorists' ambiguities that slow down the definite boundaries between *correspondence/epistolary literature; private/public correspondence, documentary/authentic/fictional correspondence/epistolary convention; letter writers and epistolary* etc. Many problems remain still open, such as the morality of publishing and commenting private correspondence of some people who have never intended to exhibit publicly intimate details of their life; self-censorship assessment and, respectively, the degree of sincerity of the person who brings the epistle to public attention, the fluctuating boundary between the literary and the nonliterary; the type of communication matrix which it belongs to etc.

Even though the correspondence assessment is carried out from different (philosophical, rhetorical, aesthetic, historical and especially, from literary history and criticism) perspectives, it is clear that in the history of mentalities, the epistolary literature as a source of information and as a source of aesthetic value cannot be ignored. Epistles were very widespread and enjoyed great popularity in the Latin era, functioning as a literary species. Al. Săndulescu, making a brief foray into the European epistolary tradition, stated that it was the Romans who had endowed the universal culture with the first epistolary masterpieces: "The first letters belong either to a father or a mother: Cato the Elder to his son Marcus, Cornelia to her sons Gracii" [10, p. 21-22]. Cicero, Apostle Paul, Pliny the Younger, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius, St. Augustine complete the gallery; due to them "the letter becomes more and more a philosophical and religious message, preserving a direct, oral, intimate form of address" [*ibidem*, p. 23].

Literary correspondence represents an epic species belonging to the epistolary genre which involves an exchange of letters among cultural figures implying consistent documentary, biographical, historical, cultural, psychological, ethical and aesthetic values. Of all the confessional writing species, correspondence "seems to be the least literary, because it excludes the poetic function. Basically, the letter exists as a go-between. It says somebody something from someone else" relating to a *poetics of communication*.

Correspondence is an intimate, private communication governed by numerous (informative, narrative, didactic, critical, emotional, controversial) intentions, hence the uniqueness of the relationship between the sender and the recipient. Considering communication matrices that deal with the majority of address strategies, Liviu Papadima includes correspondence in the intersubjective matrix, since it is dominated by the contact function and it touches upon the themes of "inner emotions" and individual experience: "The epistolary begins where the pedagogical issue ends: the latter aims at balancing a consensus which needs to be created at the end of the text. The former tends, on the contrary, to create an experiential communion within the text itself with a suspended "conclusion"" [8, p. 89]. This presence ready

to respond would precisely make the epistolary brand. If at the time of writing it is a solitary act imitating mutual communication, in reality, it is a monologue that the recipient will have access to in some time.

Radu Toma [11, p. 31] places the discussion of the epistolary genre in the immediate extension of the memorial speech, considering one to be the transformation of the other. The epistle, belonging more to the travel prose, makes ostentatiously its way into the bosom of literature, generating its own poetics. Spontaneity, artistic creativity, the biographical and confessional character and confessing the unmediated experience discourage its exclusive affiliation to the biographical document, the latter having the following formal elements: the sender, the place, the date, the recipient, the signature and the seal as essential markers.

Several distinctions are required from the outset in order to penetrate into the intimacy of this species: first, one should not confuse the *actual correspondence with the literary one*. Trying to capture the transgression mystery of an informational letter in a literary text, Livius Ciocîrlie begins with the communication epistolary instances highlighting the reader's crucial role: "if, by any chance, the letter is taken out from the information flow that it has initially been intended for, that is, if the reader is not the same as the original addressee and it ignores the sender's identity, then a remarkable phenomenon takes place: the letter turns from a simple message into a literary text". In other words, the letter, barely detached from its natural context, can become literature generating another context by its ability to project an imaginary universe. "A certain freedom, thus, is necessary for this transformation to happen; only freedom, which is a false paradox, allows the existing content of the letter to be aesthetically measured by the reader". Lack of informational intentionality ensures its accession to the status of a literary text, although it only remains an initial premise.

Numerous distinctions were made over time within the *correspondence itself* based on the individual's need "to communicate" in order to make an effective assessment, starting from simple issues. One such issue might focus on partners involved in an exchange of letters, while the other one might be based on a division into genres which run as follows: demonstrative, judicial and deliberative genres. Another epistolografic criterion refers to the *geographical and psychological distance*. In order to delineate the epistolary material of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, Rita Marquil has turned to the physical and geographical distance criterion: "to give a general characterization of the subject matter of epistolography, we proceeded with a classification made on the basis of the physical distance that can motivate private correspondence: the distance caused by individuals' lack of mobility who were incarcerated for legal reasons or who belonged to that social community, or by the distance created by the geographical mobility" [apud 1, p. 39-40]. The evolution of



correspondence was largely determined by the process of emigration and geographical discoveries. Operating with the criterion of 'theme' found in popular messages, Daniel Roche [9, p. 214] comes to distinguish between *love letters*, letters describing *family relations* and *letters concerning labor dynamics*. Horace and Cicero's letters are frequently cited for their diversity of topics. The latter will propose one of the first epistolary classifications: *genus familiare et icosumand genus severum et grave*. According to the salient characteristics of the letters, they can be lyrical, pathetic, elegiac, ironic, praise, polemical, satirical, allegorical etc. Given the commercial nature of popular messages, another researcher, Franzini, distinguishes the following letter types: *private greeting letter, letter of recommendation, letter of information, letter of request, letter of complaint and letter of denunciation* [apud 9, p. 47].

In addition, within the first category, we shall make a distinction between *private* correspondence without the intention of being published during the sender's lifetime, and, in Michel Tournier's terms, *public* correspondence. The latter would include that public "book of calculations and family events" [12, p. 7] which the French writer refers to and, namely, to the *royal correspondence* which had a crucial role in the public life; in brief, the correspondence with an editorial outcome. In Romania, Constantin Brâncoveanu seemed to have the most dynamic diplomatic activity reflected in 282 letters [6, p. 153], followed by Mihai Viteazul (Michael the Brave) with 240 letters [2, p. 130]. At the end of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, due to a need for "a communication code that often reflected a distinct social behavior" [1, p. 35] the so-called *epistolary manuals* appeared, a sort of rhetorical handbooks, functioning as "concise prescriptions for the sender, the receiver's status and the message" [*ibidem*, p. 35]. The oldest representative epistolary for our culture entitled *A Short Method on How to Compose a Letter* was used at the Royal Academy and is kept in a codex (1666) in Venice. Then comes the frequently mentioned breviary of the 18<sup>th</sup> century entitled *On Theophil Corydaleau's Epistolary Methods*. The appearance of these epistolary manuals will actually generate conventionalism and unauthenticity which are considered enemies of correspondence.

Requirements of objective nature determined the existence of the epistolary writing since ancient times. Once shaped, the history of correspondence evolved as a specific structural mode of written communication. Consequently, each historical epoch made use, to a greater or a lesser extent, of this dialogic genre which was accredited in time. Today, in the e-mail, messenger and chat age, private correspondence recorded on paper has become obsolete.

We shall have to divide the private correspondence into letters with *documentary value* and letters with an *increased factor of literary expression* for a fair assessment of correspondence, because, beyond the failures inherent to any species which began without a literary claim, there are enough examples that prove the artistic value of correspondence. A literary epistle does not

necessarily imply that the sender should be a writer. For example, the artistic value of some correspondence of the Roman Empire is considered nowadays incontestable (Cato the Elder's correspondence with his son Marcus, Brutus' letters, Marcus Aurelius' letters, Cassiodorus' letters or Saint Augustine's letters etc.)

If the actual epistolary genre has existed since antiquity, then correspondence with a high degree of literary expression appeared especially after 1900s and it was subsequently reinforced in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries when the epistle moved from everyday usage into the field of literature.

The Middle Ages records a real epistolary trade which is used by the Church and Universities. The epistle obtains the status of art and becomes a discipline of study in Italy, thus establishing its constituent parts: *salutatio*, *benevolentiae*, *captatio*, *narratio*, *petition* and *conclusio*. In A. Rocha's perspective, a Portuguese researcher, the background of literature is completed through the emergence of a net division between *letter writers* and the *epistolary*, the latter indicating the acquisition of the status of *ars* by the letter.

*The Renaissance* encourages this species of vulnerable sincerity, of the unconfessed preserving some of the renowned kings' correspondence such as: Francis I, Maria Stuart, Henry IV or of the Baroque philosopher Montaigne and of some doctrinal theological figures (as François de Sales or Calvin). Correspondence represents a wonderful opportunity of search and reflection of the unique experience addressed to a real or formal recipient in an age when the concept of self has inevitably changed. The latter's role is to contribute to revealing the Other, the world of relativity. Much of the published correspondence is under the influence of the ancient authors that *the Renaissance period appealed to*. However, reading Cicero or Titus Livius will not generate a genuine correspondence trend; on the contrary, there is a rigid belief that "one's own portrait should correspond to an active public behavior, to an ideal of life" [13, p. 17]. More examination is required to identify how authentic the public figures' correspondences of the time is and, additionally, how much interest in the authenticity of the event is needed when we refer to a purely subjective literary genre.

Classicism will provide a favorable development of correspondence through its tendency to theorize the rational imitation of literature, by means of cultivating the balanced, simple and elegant expression, which will get a distinct profile in France. The cycle of letters addressed to a provincial written during 1656-1657 and compiled under the title *The Provincials* by Pascal is regarded to be the French writer's fundamental work. This is a harsh indictment of the Jesuit moral which legitimizes the evolution of consciousness towards self-revelation. Madame de Sévigné, Madame de Simiane, and such personalities of the revolution as Mirabeau, Mrs. Rolland, Camille Desmoulins and others belong to the same gallery of classicist letter writers.

These individuals' portraits and characters come to life inside their letters through a skillful *puzzle* game, even though their correspondence still shows what is visible and accessible to all, sacrificing the interior. Without having a unitary meaning, correspondence builds its essence from a multitude of separate meanings which, once put together, may reveal a destiny.

In the Enlightenment period, the self paradigm gets "a new dimension by promoting individual peculiarities in the community" [13, p. 22]. New sensitivity encourages all the forms of self-exploration, including correspondence. It reveals the unknown features of such personalities as J-J. Rousseau, Voltaire; the latter's correspondence consists of over 18,000 letters that outrun aesthetically the master's prose. Taking into account the alternation of anecdotal, historical and everyday life, correspondence frequently acquires a special unity and coherence as in the case of Diderot's letters addressed to Sophie Volland.

Even if modernists do not give up the privileges of correspondence, it is worthy to mention that at the literary level, it will stand out as a literary species in classicism and romanticism, evolving synchronically with the development of literature. Due to specific features pertaining to the nature of communication and certainly to the author's talent, it acquires diversity becoming sometimes an independent literary product.

The power of seduction of the epistolary style was felt by the Romanian writers. The first Romanian epistles, having a strict informational character, became available to readers through their publication in volumes of readers in literature [4, p. 29] or literary language [7, p. 43]. The volumes of correspondence denote the assertion of epistolary standardized formulae used both in the Romanian Country and in Moldova or Transylvania.

As privacy is revealed to us only in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the first literary correspondences are documented relatively late compared to European impulses. It is to be noted, however, that our artistic prose in its first stage appears and develops in the form of epistolary and travel memoirs and belongs to the 1848 period. Almost all the literary genres and species except the theater were modeled according to the correspondence pattern. This layout is adopted, with some alterations from other species, by travel memoirs (*The Transylvanian Traveller* by Ion Codru Drăgușanu; *A Trip to Africa* by Vasile Alecsandri), by short stories (Costache Negrizzi, Ion Ghica, Vasile Alecsandri and Vasile Porojan), by the sentimental novel (*Manoil* by D. Bolintineanu) and by poetry (*Epistles* by Gr. Alexandrescu) etc.

The correspondence with a documentary value will be highlighted by Titu Maiorescu, M. Eminescu, Duiliu Zamfirescu and later on by some interwar writers such as E. Lovinescu, Hortensia Papadat-Bengescu, N. Călinescu etc. The correspondence by Al. Odobescu, M. Kogalniceanu, V. Alecsandri, I. L. Caragiale C. Dobrogeanu Gherea displays a certain literary value, as

well as E. Lovinescu's novel epistolary experience with Mihail Dragomirescu and Elena Farago, or G. Călinescu's correspondence with Al. Rosetti. Eminescu and Micle correspondence constitutes an invaluable material for the literary historians who could fill out many gaps in the poet's biography, where as the critics could establish some bridges with the literary creation. The interwar period preserves the famous epistolary dialogue between Mateiu Caragiale and his friend Bonicescu, as well as Liviu Rebreanu's, Pompiliu Constantinescu's, Emil Cioran's and I. D. Sârbu's correspondence. The original *Provincial Letters* by Stephen Bănulescu, Emil Brumaru's letters to Lucian Raicu or, more recently, *A Pheasant's Letters* by Alexander Musin come next, where one can denote a careful man's observations of the relief and pressure changes in literature, besides the description of the society. The correspondence discloses the sender's background, his/her mental state and mood, emphasizing his/her autobiographical elements which include a narcissistic view.

Correspondence itself may contain extremely precious value judgments that can be detected only after a thorough research work. A new, practically an unexplored paradigm in Romania would be the one related to the explanatory notes to Security.

When we approach things in terms of literalness, not all correspondence will obviously have some literary value, as well as not every epistolary dialogue will be considered a document revealing something important. When we speak of correspondence as a species of literature of confession only those authentic epistles, valuable as human documents and doubling the aesthetic value, will stir genuine interest and will also have an increased therapeutic touch. Moreover, we refer to literary correspondence when writing itself acquires a certain shape.

*Literary Conversations* Journal expresses its main point concerning the *personality* concept and the concept of *writing as an event* by publishing excerpts from Alecsandri's or Negruzzi's correspondence: not all the original documents are interesting, but only those that concern the great writers' life and focus on their personalities. The "publishers" show interest in what lies behind a writer's creation due to the positivist spirit of the age. Thus, given these documents, the writer's image becomes a new interface in literature. In case of a writer's correspondence, the document has a two-fold interest: first, for the revealed reality and secondly, for the possibility to project that writer's image. Among the numerous literary correspondences, whose value cannot be contested, there are those written by Voltaire, Goethe, Schiller, Mérimée, Balzac, where the writer's image might be summed up from what the letters say. The exchange of letters between Gide, Francis Jamme and Paul Valéry, Jacques Rivière and Alain Fournier or that between Paul Claudel and Roger Martin du Gard, Marcel Proust and Emile Straus, as well

as Flaubert's letters which outline his most significant inner portrait, or Dostoevsky's letters (over 1300) which are a beneficial overture to his artistic work, prove their aesthetic value. As far as famous writers are concerned, their correspondence may compete with their great novels. Voltaire's correspondence is more frequently read nowadays than his novels, in the same way as Flaubert's correspondence is more topical than some of his fictional writings considered a genuine aesthetic literary treaty. The publication of epistolary files and documents allow us to observe, as in the case of creative journals, the transformation process of some epistles into literary works.

Correspondence remains a species which follows its unimpeded "existential" path in the great challenge launched by literature, being a bearer of destiny and less of sense whose tutelary god is time.

### References

1. Bădescu L. *The Epistle in the Medieval Portuguese Literature*. Pitesti: Parallel 45, 2007.
2. Cernovodeanu P., Florin C. (eds.) C. Brîncoveanu. Bucharest: Academy of the Socialist Republic, 1980.
3. Cesereanu R. *The Gulag in the Romanian Consciousness. Memoirs and the Literature of Communist Prisons and Camps*. Bucharest: Polirom, 2005.
4. Chițimia I. C., Toma, St. (eds.) *A Reader of Old Romanian Literature*. Vol. I. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia, 1984.
5. Ciocîrlie L. *Big Correspondence*. Bucharest: Romanian Paper, 1981.
6. Mazilu D. H. *The Voievod beyond the Throne Room*. Iași: Polirom, 2003.
7. Munteanu S., Oancea I. *A Romanian Reader. Reading Literary Texts. Old and Early Modern Age*. Timisoara, 1972.
8. Papadima L. *Literature and Communication. Author-Reader Relationship in the Prose of 1848*. Iași: Polirom, 1999.
9. Roche D. *The People of Paris*. Paris: Aubier, 1981.
10. Săndulescu Al. *Epistolary Literature*. Bucharest: Minerva, 1972.
11. Toma R. *Episteme, Ideology, Novel: French Eighteenth Century*. Bucharest: Editura Univers, 1982.
12. Tournier M. *Public Journal*, trad. Sergiu Radu Ruba. Bucharest: Humanitas, 2009.
13. Ursa A. *Metamorphoses of the Mirror*. Cluj-Napoca: Limes, 2006.

## Notes on Contributors

### **Fee-Alexandra Haase:**

- Ph.D., Professor, University of Nizwa, Oman;
- author of significant scientific and didactic publications;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences.

### **Elena Tamba:**

- Senior Scientific Researcher, Ph.D., A. Philippide Institute of Romanian Philology, The Romanian Academy, Iasi Branch;
- author of significant scientific and didactic publications;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences.

### **Vyacheslav Dolgov:**

- Master of Philology, Senior Lecturer of Department of Slavic Studies, Alecu Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova;
- author of significant scientific and didactic publications;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences.

### **Gergana Atanasova Petkova:**

- Associate Professor, Ph.D. Student, Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv, Bulgaria;
- author of significant scientific and didactic publications;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences;
- research areas: historical linguistics.

### **Mioara Dragomir:**

- Scientific researcher I, A. Philippide Institute of Romanian Philology, Romania;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences;
- author of important scientific works.

### **Onoriu Colăcel:**

- Ph. D., Lecturer, Ștefan cel Mare University of Suceava, Romania;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences;
- author of important scientific works.

### **Diana Vrabie:**

- Ph. D., Associate Professor, Alecu Russo State University of Bălți, Republic of Moldova;
- author of significant scientific and didactic publications;
- participant in national and international scientific conferences.