

FRENCH ROMANTICISM AS AN IMPORTANT CATALYSER IN ROMANIAN LITERATURE

Ludmila Braniște, Assoc. Prof., PhD, "Al. Ioan Cuza" University of Iași

Abstract: The progress of the Romanian dramaturgy on historical subjects has always nurtured itself from the national spirituality; however, it also creatively assimilated universal values. The present study is aimed at looking closer at the perception of V. Hugo and French historical drama in order to discuss the issue of various types of literary relations and affinities. The main emphasis here is on the valuable evolution of this perception and on the motivation of the influences and parallelisms in the evolution of the Romanian historical drama of the 19th century.

Keywords: French romanticism, influences, Romanian dramaturgy

Introduction

Any national culture as an evidence of the people's creative spirit aspires to universality; its contribution to the common treasury of humanity is determined by the valuable and specific elements it adds to the world's heritage. Value and originality imply the idea of relation since both of them are established according to a number of aesthetic criteria through the confrontation with the features typical of other literatures. The correlation with other national literatures as well as international contacts and fruitful literary relations do not lead to the elimination of distinctive features and leveling [1]. On the contrary, the study of numerous and various relations which are established between world's literatures (without coming into conflict with the originality of a national literature) offers sound arguments for demonstrating the original spirit of that literature.

The Issue of "Influences"

What has just been said shows the necessity of resorting as often as possible to the "interference" into the domains beyond the limits of a national literature; such interferences are to be performed not empirically, but in an organized way using the comparative method [2]. Correlations with the literary phenomena beyond the limits also involves remakes, translations, "influences" and sources as well as parallelisms, analogies from another literary tradition etc. Such correlation with the values cherished by universal literature offers great possibilities to axiological study on a more general scale; this happens even when a work of verbal art which belongs to a national literature involves foreign influences, since borrowing can often be a starting point for a personal unique and valuable work. In his tragedy *Romeo and Juliet* Shakespeare developed an Italian novel from the Renaissance period, preserving the narrative thread, the conflict, and even the characters. However, the piece he created with the help of his demiurgic power and his talent is magnificent and highly original. Another convincing example that can be adduced here is that of Goethe: the genius from Weimar was not ashamed of declaring openly, as he did in a conversation with his friend Eckermann, that "surely, we all have personal capacities, but the evolution is made by means of thousands of influences of a great literature from which we learn as much as we can. I am highly obliged to the Greek and the French. I have become extremely obliged to Shakespeare, Sterne and Goldsmith. However, through this the sources of my culture are not exhausted; I would never

stop and it would not be necessary. The most important thing here is the soul that loves the truth and adopts it from any source it finds.” [3] John Ruskin and decanted the *ars poetica* of his generation by polemicizing intertextually with Ruskin’s work [4]. A national literature is universalized through what it offers as well as through what it gets. That is the reason why the correlation of national values with foreign cultural and literary phenomena becomes so necessary for revelation and cognition of the spirit of a literature by means of comparison. “A history of a national literature is not possible without the contribution of comparative studies” [5], whereas the global and general image of humanity cannot be realized without looking into the aspects of national literatures. We should not ignore neither the practical use of such study which contributes to the process of approximation between literatures and peoples united by kindly feelings, respect and solidarity, far from any expression of cosmopolitanism and narrow nationalism. Ignoring the “influences” (the term is put in quotation marks since we use it in a certain sense, the one according to the reality) means adopting an unrealistic position. The theory of “not-communicating vessels” cannot be maintained. There is no literature – neither big, nor small – which has no “influences”. Their existence is necessary if they are properly appreciated. “Influence” cannot be measured quantitatively; it is revealed through various displays which form a real chain. These are literary translation (obligatory loyal to the text of the original), imitation (a conscious influence which does not mean loyalty to the original, which is usually considered to be blamable), adaptation, original to a certain extent (often based on a translation and largely used in Romanian literature in the period of its modern emancipation), “influence” with the emphasis upon the receiver and the original work which becomes original through borrowings, assimilations and creation.

When do the “influences” appear? It has been shown that they appear more often and are more fruitful in the period of the development of a national literature and of “the change of direction of a certain tradition in a certain literature” [6]; this can easily be observed in Romanian literature in the periods of Enlightenment and romanticism. Paul van Tieghem stresses that the “influences” also appear when the fortune of a writer or a number of writers and the opinion concerning their works in various moments of cultural evolution are appreciated, the way it happened with the works of Shakespeare in France in the Romantic period, or the works of Lamartine, Victor Hugo and Byron in the Romanian literature. That is the source of the discussion about “influence” and “success” (the French school) and “influence” and “reception” in case of other comparativists. The “influence” is not the cause of a mechanical process but the result of a complex action, of a system of relations where artistic contribution is decisive. It has already been stated that the most significant aspect here is not “borrowing of the ideas and structures but their transformation” [6]. However, the “influence” is not the only way to produce an exchange of ideas, feelings, themes and procedures. Reducing everything to “influence” means limiting comparativism only to the study of the genetic relation between two works or authors. There are some analogies that do not originate from “influences”; they are more numerous than the others and “instructive as well, thus opening vast philosophic, social and anthropological horizons” [7]. In quite a few cases the “influence” is neither necessary, not sufficient. An authentic piece of verbal art is not a product of an “influence”, but the result of interweaving of a great number of elements of “various nature and unequal share”. Moreover, “an “influence” cannot be isolated since it is rarely pure and comes from a single source” [7]. Therefore, the value of “influence” should

not be overestimated in a study of the relations between two works and two authors since the phenomenon cannot be thoroughly discussed by looking closely only at “influences”, the latter always being the result of a number of factors. R.Etiemble is right when he states that a sheep can become a lion, a tiger or a boa snake; it depends on the organism which digests it. This is, in fact, a remake of P. Valéry’s maxim: “the lion developed from the sheep that he had swallowed. Originality means to nurture yourself by the works of others in case you digest them” [8]. Eminescu formulated this assertion metaphorically: “foreign ideas enter the door, come through the darkness of the hall and do not exit unchanged and cold (...), coming through an illuminated hall, they become fraternal at the exit” [9]. We insisted upon these theoretic issues concerning comparative literature since these preliminary data make clear the way we discuss the issue of the relations between Romanian historical dramaturgy and French romanticist model in the present study. “Thus, a kind of risorgimento” [10].

The model of French historical drama

There is no such literature which would blindly follow other models; it always has a natural motive conditioned by quite a few local and historical circumstances. The progress of Romanian historical dramaturgy has always nurtured itself from the national spirituality, at the same time assimilating universal values in a creative way. The present study is aimed at looking closer at the perception of V. Hugo and French historical drama in order to discuss the issue of various types of literary relations and affinities. The main emphasis here is on the valuable evolution of this perception and on the motivation of the influences and parallelisms in the evolution of the Romanian historical drama of the 19th century. Romanian literature turned towards France at the earliest stages of its development, the interest in French literature being most intense. The open friendliness expressed towards this country has deep roots which deal with the affinities of the ethnical character (common origin, cognate languages) and the needs of the Romanian society. When the Romanian people try to carry out a social, political and spiritual restructuring on new modern bases which result from its own ascendant evolution, France experiences a remarkable attraction through the revolutionary and renewing boom of the social-politic programme. A culture chooses and incorporates only those foreign values which correspond to its needs and possibilities. The dramas *Marie Tudor* and *Angelo, le tyran de Padove* by V. Hugo were printed in France in 1833 and 1835 respectively. The preference to French literature demonstrated by other eloquent examples of rapidity explain why other foreign models come later. The most read, translated, remade, adapted and commented books are the French ones [11]. This is the period when the alternative between French and German “influences” appears. For example, Alecsandri acknowledges the fact that in 1840 “the French and the German formed two rival parties, each of them eager to promote the ideas of the country where they were educated.” [12] The French “party” won, at least as yet. In case of Junimea there was a slight “drifting apart” from French literature in favour of the German one; however, Romanian culture and literature were still profoundly oriented towards France, as far as politics and art are concerned. In one of his beautiful and exciting works, L. Blaga made a distinction between the Pastoral space and the modeling nature of the French culture on the one hand and a catalytic German one on the other hand. French “invading” culture requires a most loyal imitation of its models, whereas the German one calls to return to the individual nature, stimulating the efforts of self-discovery. This idea can

be maintained partially since French literature also occurred as an alimentation ferment of the French spirit. The example of V. Hugo in particular and French romanticism in general demonstrates that the Romanian critical spirit opposed to any foreign “invading” pressure, thus determining Romanian literature as a selection filter and a specific assimilation media for foreign values opening a ways to itself. Lucian Blaga developed this idea in an aphorism, acknowledging that “a great personality is like a mountain: if you stand on his shoulders, he broadens your horizon; however, if you are at his knees, he narrows your horizon and does not let you see anything except what you have already seen.” [13].

V. Hugo was the most popular and appreciated French writer; his country perceived him as “a loyal image of his own genius, a kind of “hero”, thus personifying their national spirit. He was conferred a creative power; his life was intense and frenetic, in a constant vibration of being in front of the existence” [14]. In his lifetime he created an immense, vigorous and impressive pieces of verbal art which was meant to exist and “influence”. Even when his tradition was no longer followed, “everybody remembered that he was the man who opened a new way in literature; even though he was no longer called “maître”, everybody called him “père”.” [15] “A genius without frontiers”, as Baudelaire once called him, V. Hugo constructed the romantic model which dominated the 19th century. Being the theoretician of the romanticism (thanks to the Preface to the drama *Cromwell* (1830) which became the most authentic manifesto of this literary trend), the French author became omnipresent in Europeans romanticisms; French romanticism with its universality and V. Hugo in particular provided contact between the literatures of the world, creating favourable conditions for the circulation of ideas, motives, artistic procedures in the field of poetry and, last but not least, in the genre of historical theatre. In the work “Literary success. Configuration, functioning, motivations” [16], Paul Cornea discusses the “triumphal destiny” of a great poet explaining the success of his works by the “correlation” between the author and his epoch, starting with H.R. Jauss, the “relation of a successful piece of verbal art with horizons of expectation.” V. Hugo, determined by the congruent spiritual factors, had the capacity (due to the “exemplary quality” of his works) to serve the public as the “sound echo”. The role of V. Hugo was decisive in the formation of the concept of the romantic drama and, through this, conceptualization of the whole French and European romantic movement. By means of his theoretic thinking and artistic practice he offered a new formula, gave it a direction and created a whole school out of his unique talents and various inspirations [17]. The writer was sure that, due to his genius, he was the one who was meant to consolidate the movement and, therefore, he gave it a theoretic support in the *Preface* to the drama *Cromwell* (1830), thus systemizing the reformatory trends that existed in that epoch. Applauses and tumult of the audience in the evening of the presentation of the drama *Hernani*, Corneillean and Shakespearean at the same time, lead to the triumph of romanticism. This play widely opened the door to romanticism as well as to the representatives of the movement. First and foremost, the one to enter was V. Hugo, the author of manifestos, the indisputable head of the school, with a great number of poetry volumes and dramas: *The King Amuses Himself* (1832), *Lucretia Borgia* (1833), *Maria Tudor* (1835), *Ruy Blas* (1838), as well as his novel *The Hunchback of Notre-Dame*, which was considered to be the last great “word” of the school.

As far as Romanian literature is concerned, he was assimilated quite early – at the beginning of 1840s, when French romanticism was the main reference of the Romanian culture in conditions of a strong affinity. Along with Lamartine and Byron, V. Hugo was the most present romanticist in the Romanian cultural space. In the second half of the 19th century V. Hugo was still present on the pages of such important magazines as “Familia” and “Convorbiri literare”. For Maiorescu the French poet represented a “liberation of spirits from the yoke of poetry” [18]. The interest in the French poet and playwright did not end even at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries: the poetry, novels and dramas of “the greatest poet of our century” (as Dobrogeanu Gherea remarked in his work *Artists-citizens*) were translated. The success (“fortune”) of Victor Hugo exceeds other external sources in terms of extension and depth. However, in his case the success was doubled by an “influence” as he launched “a shock of revealing novelty, capable of liberating individual forces and provoking self-discovery of talents” [19]. The great “influence” which convinces us that his presence in Romanian literature was not just an accepted and later abandoned preference, but a “sensitive consonance” as far as creation is concerned, concretized in national representative works. The Romanian “career” of V. Hugo represents, as well as that of Lamartine, “a typical case of assimilation based on affinity”. The foreign model functions as a creative “ferment” which leads to its original remake. The historical process of the assimilation of the French poet also reveals the evolution of Romanian literature over the whole century, the period which can hardly be characterized by superficial and external equivalences, simple thematic or stylistic resemblances. Borrowings and similarities “do not always mean the existence of highly important relations; they are seldom “caused” by the direct action of the “sender” on the “receiver” [19]. An “influence” which functions creatively encouraging the receiver to emulate it (like a “capital”) is to be demonstrated “in terms of global structure” or representative writers whose works prove to be an “interiorization” of the model and its organic assimilation rather than at the level of minor writers. In this case the foreign model meets an active artistic conscience which knows how to “nationalize” the influence, to “remodel” it. Moving the emphasis from sender to receiver ought to be done in the case of Mihai Eminescu, the second important phenomenon after the Forty-Eighters in the history of the Romanian romanticism. Eminescu, “equal in value” to the world’s greatest romanticists, affirms the vitality of the movement in the period when it survives by means of pale imitations in South-Eastern Europe, compromised by minor writers. His genius managed to give a new fresh wave to the movement, thus proving that it can remain in world’s literatures as a state of the spirit rather than a historic direction. As for V. Hugo, the list of sources in search of the precise roots of the foreign model is useless. The majority of similarities are simple “coincidences of the romantic set of images”; there are quite a few aspects of the way of thinking and imagination common for these two romanticists which are not determined by “influences”, but by the consonance of the artistic temper. Mihai Eminescu, like V. Hugo, is a visionary romanticist attracted by inexhaustible historical and philosophic subjects; the characters of his poetry are of the Promethean constitution – humanists and revolutionaries. The “signs” of the French influence can be found in the poem *Muresanu*, in the typology of characters in *Lonely genius*, and in his dramatic works (*Decebal*, *Dragos*) – the parallelisms of spiritual states and the results of the fundamental romantic concepts. The works of Eminescu, being the superior generalization of the Romanian romanticism, demonstrates by

its value that the *reception* is not always an *influence*. Other examples that can be adduced here is the historical dramas *Vlaicu-Voda* by Al. Davila and the trilogy *Sunset, Snowstorm, Morning star* by B. Delavrancea, where the suggestions of the Hugo's model were incorporated in the author's own vision, in line with its concepts and sensibility. These writers assimilated philosophic, ethical and artistic motives of the foreign model and interpreted them *originally* since it was the discretion and the critic evaluation of Hugo's works that formed the basis of the act of assimilation. The French novel was an important catalyzer in the Romanian literary tradition stimulating its directing towards Europe and finding its creative specificity.

Eminescu's dramatic texts

Dramatic experiments of the major national poet Eminescu form the same stages. Among simple designs, the expression of the poet's feverish search for a form capable of comprising a large number of dramatic ideas which surrounded him, there are some fragmentary dramas such as *Muresanu*, the three variants from *Mira*, *Emmi* (finished in the first form), *Decebal*, *Bogdan-Dragos*. Eminescu had a so-called vocation for theatre. His dramatic experiments [20], which amount to hundreds of pages, (just in a single manuscript (2254) of the Academy Library there can be found 15 titles of dramatic works), cannot be regarded as "Exercises of a creative laboratory" owing to some "ambitions caused by a former prompter's, passionate spectator's and theatrical critic's passion for theatre" [21]. There is also another opinion as far as Eminescu's drama is concerned: he was not capable of creating works meant for the stage, like all great poets; however, the world's greatest poets such as Goethe, Schiller, Byron and V. Hugo created fundamental dramatic works. In fact, Eminescu was endowed with the "scenic pathos" [22], being able to place characters and events on stage. If he had had time, he would have finished what he had begun and the plays of "a high dramatic tension" would have been realized [22]. Being really passionate about the theatre, it became his constant occupation. This occupation was present at every stage of his poetic creation. His first projects from the series *Mira* belong to the first stage (1867-1868); after 1870, when the poet lived in Vienna and Berlin, he drafted the dramas *Emmi*, *Decebal*, and *Alexandru Voda*. During the Iasi period, he works at the dramas *Bogdan-Dragos* and *Nunta lui Dragos*. Nor in the period of illness does he renounce the theatre, drafting the scenes and characters from *Kalidassa*, *Jupiter*, *Omphale*, and at his deathbed he translates *Le joueur de la flûte* by E. Augier (the translated fragment was later published entitled *Lais*). He was preoccupied with the idea of realizing a great national epic with the elements of mythology from a mixture of the truth and legend not only in poetry, but also on the stage. Having a profoundly romantic spirit, Eminescu proved to have a great liberty of movement in time as well as in the space of Romanian history. He was interested in the period of "genesis" from Decebal until Bogdan-Dragos, the tumultuous 16th century with the voivodes from the "cursed" folk of Musatins (the way they are called in the "dramatic dodecameron") until the 18th century. Among Eminescu's dramatic experiments the most finished ones are *Bogdan-Dragos* (the character is present in over 10 manuscripts; the basic version, the one from ms. 2275 f. 5-90, is resumed, with small changes, in *Grui-Sanger*) [23]. This historical drama, like all his dramatic experiments, has a structure of the tragic conflict typical of Shakespeare. Eminescu deeply admired "immortal Shakespeare". He read him in the Romanian, German and French languages, and, possibly, even in the original [24]. For

him Shakespeare was the author of reference; he borrowed his symbols, themes and motives, whereas the references to characters and artistic procedures are innumerable. This “kind friend” also patronizes Eminescu’s theatre with his genius. The action in the first fully-written act (which seems to be an independent piece due to its stable structure) is “absolutely Shakespearean” [25]. Like in the tragedy *Macbeth* where the assassination of the king of Scotland is prepared by Macbeth and his wife, Eminescu’s drama depicts a slow decease of the old voievode from Maramures, Dragul, since “veninul mereu îi curge-n vine” (“poison has been flowing into his wine all the time”) for ten months. A poison is daily put in voivode’s drink by Sas, his cousin, which aspires to the throne, like his wife Bogdana. She is a noxious character, cruel and decisive in her ambitions, like a real Lady Macbeth; her ally in realizing her plans is Death itself, “which never dies” as compared to the mortals around her whom she does not trust. Sas advances hesitantly, but firmly (like a real Iago, hypocrite in relations with Dragul): “nu-i vorbă, ani de zile, lucrez ca un păianjen / Și pânda mea ajunge la craiul și la papa...” (“days and nights I work like a bee and my cloth reaches both the king and the Pope”). Bogdana eases his conscience, assuming the guilt: “a mea e și fapta dar și vina” (“both action and guilt are mine”), since “voi să te-nalț pe tine” (“I want you to rise”). Like another Vidra, she convinces him: “Au crezi tu cum că lumea făcută-i pentru bine? / Ne-o spun aceasta popii și cărțile lor vechi; / De mii de ani ne sună povestea în urechi. / Nu vezi ce răsplată virtutea are-n lume? / Un giulgi și patru scânduri; pentru așa comoară / Treci însetat pe lângă a vieții vii izvoară?” (“You think that the world is made for the good things? / It is what priests and old books say; / We have been hearing this story for thousands of years. / Don’t you see how you pay for virtue in this world? / A shroud and four planks; for such a treasure / you pass a source of vivid life?”). Being afraid of Bogdan, Dragos’ son, revealing her noxious plans, she induces Sas to kill him as well: “Vei suferi să fie alături de tine? / Ce? tu să fii viteazul și el să fie domn?” (“Will you suffer if he is near you? / What? You remain a knight, and he becomes a lord?”). But a loyal voivode’s warrior, hetman Roman Bodeiu, puts Stefan wrapped in Bogdan-Dragos’ clothes in the young voivode’s bed after a night of drinking. “Turbat ca lupii” (“Furious like wolves”), Sas thrusts the sword into the young man which was sleeping in bed (“ca puiul unei păsări supt mâni mi se zbătea” (“he tried to break away from my hands like a chick of a bird”)) and finds out with terror that he has killed his own son. The structure of characters is based on major antitheses. The infernal couple Bogdana-Sas (the Macbeths) is opposed to another couple: Bogdan-Dragoș, the son of the Maramures voivode and angelic Ana (like in *Letter IV* with a description of the nature which “crawls with metaphors”, as G. Calinescu puts it). Ana reminds of Shakespeare’s Juliet by her ingenuity (G. Calinescu also adds Margaret from *Faust*); Eminescu, following Heliade Rădulescu, Bolliac and Alecsandri reflects the folkloric way of understanding the appearance of love quite close to the models. The romantic antithesis guides characters’ oppositions, while the linear contrast typical of historical dramas of the time abounds in deep senses of moral and philosophical character (like in admired Shakespeare’s works for the “humanity full of symbolism and depth”). For these reasons the author’s rhetoric Hugo-like enthusiasm omnipresent in the theatrical pieces by the romanticist Eminescu (the triads are numerous and present a “collection of metaphors”) is joined by a “meditative constant” (Constantin Ciopraga), acquiring pathos and dramatic tension akin to the one from this tirade of the old voivode Dragul. Eminescu addresses this problem: people have an uneasy conscience, the

interior conflict is tragic and this dialectics of the contraries, as well as the transformation of the tragic into the final catastrophe were borrowed from the works by Shakespeare. It is a catalytic “influence” of the English genius upon a Romanian genius which reveals the reaction of a great poet to the experience of another writer [26]. The other dramatic fragments which can also be regarded as Eminescu’s historic dramaturgy are small in terms of length and far from the final form (*Decebal*, *Alexandru Lapusneanu*, *Stefanita Voda* (a more elaborated variant from the dramatic cycle *Mira*)), a dramatic scene *Muresanu* (analyzed by G. Călinescu), which finally became a poem in its third variant elaborated in 1876. This poem with a large number of Faustian emphases would lead a researcher to a single conclusion: the poet and dramaturg confers a high philosophic vibration on the issues of national history, far from being just a superficial remake rendering certain ideas. The destiny of the country and the Romanian people is depicted against the background of the greatest problems of humanity. As far as the historical and literary context of the last decades of the 19th century is concerned, if Eminescu’s dramatic texts had been finished and represented, they would have surely determined another course of the development of Romanian dramaturgy.

Conclusions

Having followed the destiny of V. Hugo in the evolution of dramaturgy and historical inspiration, we have arrived at the conclusion that his assimilation was far from being either a fortuitous phenomenon, or an “individual reference”. It was an option which revealed a certain intellectual and artistic climate and “a social fact” [21]. Victor Hugo fertilized Romanian theoretical thinking due to the novelty, relevance and consistency of his ideas, whereas his poetry and historical drama laid a foundation for an external decisive source of the development of the Romanian historical drama. The internal dimension of the act of assimilation is an essential premise in comparative studies. Victor Hugo was not appreciated and approved of by all his contemporaries. The trajectory of his destiny was not always ascending, but also descending. However, it should be acknowledged that in the context of his epoch he had an innovatory spirit of theoretical thinking and artistic creation. He became a romantic model for all literatures. He was a constant element of relation, a “creative stimulus” in the configuration of the European romanticisms, revealing and illustrating the “correlation between a writer and his epoch” [27].

Notes and comments

- [1]. All commentators proceed from the considerations made by Croce in his *Aesthetics*.
- [2]. Dima, Al. *Principii de literatură comparată*, chapter *Caracterele diferențiale ca obiect al cercetării comparate*, București, Editura Enciclopedică Română, 1972, p. 178.
- [3]. Eckermann, I.P. *Convorbiri cu Goethe*, București, Editura pentru Literatura Universală. 1965, p. 291, *apud* Roman, I. *Ecouri goethiene în cultura română*, București /f.e./, 1980, p. 7.
- [4]. Cogeanu, O. *Travelling for America: J. Ruskin and W.M.D. Howells*, “ABC – American, British and Canadian Studies”, “Lucian Blaga” University Press, Sibiu, vol. 15, 2010, p. 68-76.
- [5]. Tieghem, Paul Van. *La littérature comparée*, Paris, Ed. Colin, 1939, p. 89 și Guyard, M.F. *La littérature comparée*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1965, p. 5.

- [6]. Grigorescu, Dan. *Constelația Gemenilor: artă și literatură în perspectivă comparată*, București, Editura Meridiane, 1979, p. 39, 55.
- [7]. Cornea, P. *Conceptul de “concordanță” în literatura comparată și categoriile sale*, în *Studii de literatură comparată*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968, p. 34, 35.
- [8]. Valéry, P. *Oeuvres II*, 1966, p. 478, *apud* Cheie-Pantea, I. *Eminescu și Leopardi*, București, Editura Minerva, 1980, p. 7.
- [9]. Munteanu, G. *Rolul conceptului de “biografie interioară” în studierea lui Eminescu*, în “*Limbă și literatură*”, IV, 1974, p. 680.
- [10]. Arhip, O., *Opera picturală – o interpretare semiotică*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 2009, p. 83.
- [11]. Cornea, P. *Traduceri și traducători din prima jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea*, în vol. *De la Alexandrescu la Eminescu*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1966.
- [12]. Alecsandri, V. *Proză*, București, 1967 (ed. C.G.Nicolescu), p. 320.
- [13]. Blaga, L. *Pietre pentru templul meu*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1921, p. 8.
- [14]. Popa, N.I. *Actualitatea lui V.Hugo*, from the magazine “*Atheneum*”, year I, nr. 3, 1935, p. 8.
- [15]. Mabillean, L. *V.Hugo*, Paris, Hachette, 1925, p. 94.
- [16]. Cornea, P. *Regula jocului*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1980, p. 71-92.
- [17]. Cornea, P. *Regula jocului*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1980, p. 22 et sequitur; Tacciu, Elena. *Romantismul românesc*, II, *Alte lecturi romantice Hugo și Lamartine*, București, Editura Minerva, p. 465 et sequitur; Ion, Angela. *Victor Hugo dans la vie littéraire roumaine*, in volume *Victor Hugo*, București, Universitatea, 1985, p. 11-23.
- [18]. Maiorescu, T. *Critice*, II, București, Editura Socec, 1967, p. 209.
- [19]. Cornea, P. *Lamartine în România. Mirajul operei și mitul personalității*, in volume *Oamenii începutului de drum*, București, Editura Cartea Românească, 1974, p. 281 et sequitur.
- [20]. An exact descriptive analysis and a complete philological transcription of these projects and dramatic experiments can be found in *Opere*, volume IV, publishing house Aurelia Rusu, introduction by George Munteanu.
- [21]. Mândra, V. *Incursiuni în istoria dramaturgiei românești*, București, Editura Minerva, 1971, p. 67.
- [22]. Călinescu, G. *Opera lui Mihai Eminescu*, II, București, Editura Minerva, 1970, p. 438.
- [23]. Avădanei, Șt. *Eminescu și literatura engleză*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 1982, p. 40.
- [24]. G. Călinescu believes that “Eminescu could not have possibly known English” (*Opera lui Mihai Eminescu*, I, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1969, p. 352); this opinion is shared by Al. Duțu in *Explorări în istoria literaturii române*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1969, p. 145 (see also *Shakespeare in Rumania*). Other scholars, such as Vl. Străinu, is convinced that Eminescu was “an insistent reader in the English language” (in *Eminescu și limba engleză*, “*Luceafărul*”, year XI, nr. 6, 10 February 1968, p. 1, 7. Ion Levițchi agrees with him: “Eminescu knew the English language at a certain level and in a certain sense” (*Eminescu traducător al lui Shakespeare*, “*Secolul XX*”, nr. 6, 1976, p. 16). An extensive discussion on that subject can be found in Șt. Avădanei, *Eminescu și literatura engleză*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 1982, chapter *Eminescu și Shakespeare*, p. 24-50.
- [25]. Ciorănescu, Al. *Teatrul românesc în versuri și izvoarele lui*, Casa Școalelor, Craiova, 1943, p. 103; G.Călinescu also insists in *Opera lui Mihai Eminescu*, I, București, Editura

pentru Literatură, 1969 upon Shakespeare's influence. In an older study by Filimon Tăniac (*Bogdan-Dragoș*), in the Bulletin "Mihai Eminescu", 1933, nr. 11, p. 7-12, it is mentioned that the first act from Eminescu's drama resembles Shakespeare's *Macbeth* "like a drop of water". See also another article of the same author *Lady Macbeth, Bogdan și Vidra, idem*, 1934, nr. 12, p. 21-30.

[26]. Dumitrescu-Buşulenga, Zoe. *Eminescu: cultură și creație*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1976 and Avădanei, Șt. *Eminescu și literatura engleză*, Iași, Editura Junimea, 1982, p. 60-61.

[27]. Cornea, P. *Succesul literar. Configurație, funcționare, motivații*, în *Regula jocului*, București, Editura Eminescu, 1980, p. 71.