

PHONETIC FEATURES IN ALEXANDRU PHILIPPIDE'S POETRY

Gabriela CRĂCIUN (BUICAN)*

Abstract: *The study focuses on pointing out the modernist features that are to be found in the corpus of Alexandru Philippide's poems. The poet devises his lyrical works in keeping with the period embracing them. His attitude towards his own writing is a modernist one, both in form and expression. Following Baudelaire's path, Philippide borrowed the former's authentic and unusual verbal associations.*

Keywords: *Alexandru Philippide, modernism, form, language, style*

Alexandru A. Philippide is born in an era of transition of the Romanian language and culture. Rising at the border of two centuries, the poet observes the new linguistic norms, but not fully, as he revives older forms belonging to the Moldavian language. As his father, the linguist Alexandru Philippide, the poet manifests a certain hesitation towards adopting a common language, that is the one from Muntenia. "The people from Moldavia and Transylvania were somehow uncertain whether to use the elements from Muntenia. They unjustifiedly denied the unitary character of the literary language around 1900, an opinion expressed, among others, by Philippide, Ibrăileanu, Coșbuc and Hogăș" (Costinescu, 1979: 100) (G.C. t.n.).

Choosing a common language in shaping the Romanian modern literary language is also owed to the historical baggage brought by the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century: "the union of the Principates in 1859, the act of union of Transylvania from December 1918" (Costinescu, 1979: 100) (G.C. t.n.).

Numerous studies and grammars published by Alexandru Philippide, Iorgu Iordan, Alexandru Rosetti gradually eliminates the phonetic differences existing in the literary language thanks to the writers from different areas in the country.

Although maintaining the variants of the native place and writing in the manner imposed, the poets come to adopt, at least partially, at the beginning, the new norms. The regional language starts being substitutes by the standard one: "the regional features start reducing themselves gradually and get totally erased at the majority of the writers at the beginning of the 20th century and afterwards" (Munteanu, Țăra, 1978: 176) (G.C. t.n.).

The process of unification of the Romanian literary norms was a complete process regarding phonetism, morphology, syntax and lexic.

At the phonetic level, there have been modifications in what regards the vowels and the consonants, as well.

We will consider the modifications imposed by *Îndreptarul ortografic, ortoepic și de punctuație*, edited in 1965. Among the norms imposed by this period, several are significant.

* University of Pitești, gabrielacraciun90@yahoo.com

The vowels

a) The passing of protonic *ă* to *a*, in the process of muntenization of the Romanian literary language is marked at Philippide in words like: *zadarnic* (I: 186, 190), *zadar* (I: 197), *zadarnice* (I: 183). În older editions there can be found northern versions of these: *zădarnic* (II: 90, 101), *zădar* (II: 103), *zădarnice* (II: 78).

According to the new norms of writing, we write *a* and not *ă* in *pahar*: *pahare* (I: 179). „The forms with *ă* are almost general in Transylvania and Banat, slightly appearing in the Moldavian and Muntenian language” (Gheție, 1975: 575) (G. C. t. n.).

The forms with *ă* instead of *a* or *u*: *zbierătul* (I, 206), *zdrențăroase* (I, 52) are not common at all in the style adopted by the modern language. The poet uses these forms out of stylistic reasons as well in order to show the chaos created along the poetic atmosphere in this point of his creation. The vowel *ă* is replaced by *a* in *hărțăgoase* (I, 193, 205), being preceded by the consonant *h*. This consonant placed in initial position has started to disappear from the Latin language since the 2nd century before Christ. In the modern version, this term appears as: *arțăgoase*.

b) *ă* is replaced with *e* in *blestemu-* (I: 181); *blestemat* (I: 186); *blestemați* (I: 195), in *necaz* (I: 124); *perete* (I: 183); *am retezat* (I: 164).

c) In the modern era, we use, *ă* not *e* in *băutura* (I: 179). Old forms as *beutură*, *beut* are eliminated from the common usage.

d) The vowel *i* takes the of *e* in *citi* (I: 55), while forms such as *miera* sau *mera* are replaced by *mira*, as is the situation with: *mirate* (I: 177); *mirarea* (I: 163).

e) *e* is used, not *i* in *greier* (I: 183). In contrast to the new editions, updated to our times, the older editions use forms such as *greer* (II: 79).

The substitution of *e* with *i* is increasingly used in the 20th century. Faithful to tradition, Philippide prefers the *e* forms in words such as: *molatec* (I, 122); *muchea* (I, 216); *sălbatecă* (I, 234).

The group *chi* is replaced with *che* in: *întortochiate* (II: 36) evolved in *întortocheate* (I: 168), *chiamă* (II: 93) became *cheamă* (I: 191).

f) The transformation of *ă* and *î* into *i* was one of the most rapid phonetic processes, due to the sporadic use of the initial forms in the country. The low usage of these forms was the one that determined the immediate acceptance of the regions' representatives. Here are some examples obtained following modern processing: *intră* (I: 7), not *întră*, *ghicindu-mi* (I: 163), not *gîcindu-mi*, *ridica* (I: 178); *ridică* (I: 163); *ridicare* (I: 160), not the *ă* forms of these.

g) *î* is used, not *ă*, in *întâia* (II: 39), but also in *pînă* (I: 66), according to the norms entailed by the modern linguists and grammarians.

h) The passing from *î* to *îi*, according to the norms of Muntenia subdialect, is well received by the writers of the time, but the initial form is still used with words such as *cîne*, *pîne*. In Philippide's works, the son of the linguist Philippide, one of the founders of the new grammar and one of the creators of modern literary norms, we also come across *mîni* (I: 58, 167), but also its new form: *mînile* (I: 26).

From the list of words which correspond to this category, the poet from Iași uses *cîne* (I, 96); *cîni* (I, 26); *pîne* (I, 96, 112, 158), *mîne* (I, 116), but also the standardized forms: *cîni* (I: 122), *cînii* (I: 131), *mîne* (I: 112), *pîne* (I: 111, 112).

i) The forms which have *u* instead of *î* are increasing in the modern literary era, resulting words such as: *umblă* (I: 194) or *umpleau* (II: 40).

j) *u* is used and not *o* în *porunci* (I: 165), avoiding the form *poronci*, used mainly in Moldova and Transylvania.

k) *E* is substituted by *ă* in: *străin* (I: 153, 173), *străine* (I: 168), forms which have alternated until 1953 with *strein*, *streine*. Until then, both were admitted. Although he has his first appearance in 1922, Philippide chooses the Muntenia forms region from the doublet considered as correct by the Academy, not the ones from Moldova, as it could have been expected.

l) *I* is substituted with *u* and *t* with *s* în *subsuoară*. The post Philippide uses the form *subțioară* (I: 162), though. The term *subsuoară* was introduced in 1907, being replaced by *subțioară* in 1924.

m) In Philippide's time, the *ou* hiatus is reduced to *o*, as *nouri* became *nori*. We come across the modern form especially in the poem *Privești cum zboară norii: norii* (I, 155), *nori* (I, 156). The poet abundantly also used the previous form of this term, which has a high frequency, Philippide thus enshrouding his poetry with an old cloak: *nour* (I, 27, 48, 64, 71, 87), *nourilor* (I, 30), *zgârie-nouri* (I, 214). The term *nouri* seems filled with more poeticity, its old countenance opening a larger perspective towards reception: „DLRLC prefers the Muntenia and Transylvania regions forms, *nour* being seen as the literary variant of *nor*” (Gheție, 1975: 585) (G.C. t.n.).

n) The presence of *-ea* instead of *-i* or *e* can be observed in Philippide's work: *aicea* (I: 54, 234), *atuncea* (I: 73, 176, 187, 189, 228). Philippide insists on using phonetic forms previous to his era, but simultaneously uses new forms: *aici* (I: 31, 161). In Phillipide's work also appear cases in which the diphthong *-ea* is reduced to *-e*, as in the following example: *aice* (I: 187), *pe-aice* (I: 224). Still, the poet also uses the edited form: *pe-aici* (I: 31).

„The forms which have **e** instead of **i**” in words such as „*dmineață, inemă, nemic* are no longer in use” (Ibidem) (G.C. t.n.). Respecting the phonetic features imposed by the Academy, the poet adequately used their new forms: *dmineață* (I: 127), *dmineți* (I: 159, 173), *dmineții* (I: 167, 169), *inimă* (I: 183, 192), *inimii* (I: 156), *nemic* (I: 79, 81).

2. The consonantal system.

a) The labial consonant *b* is hardened in *băutură* (I: 179), the poet choosing this form and not the previous one: *beutură*.

b) The harshness of the consonants *s*, *z*, *t* is scarcely encountered in the Muntenia region editions published following the literary and linguistic norm settings than within the ones published before. In the first two editions of the poet, we encounter the harshness of *z* în *zădarnic(e)* (II: 78, 84), while the recent present the form *zadarnic(e)* (I: 183, 191). A relevant example of hardening of the alveolar consonant *s* is *mătasă* (II: 23), term which will be replaced in the recent editions with *mătase* (I: 160). Still, we encounter an old example with hardened *s* also in the new editions, *mătasă* (I: 193). The perfection of rhyme that the poet often attempts in his poetry could explain the presence of this term that was not modified as the linguistic norms of the Muntenia region way of speaking imposed. The pair is in this case composed of the terms *mătasă* and *lucioasă* (I: 193).

S frequently appears in its soft version within words such as *seamă* (I: 151), *seama* (I: 164), *seara* (I: 177), *serii* (I: 175).

c) *S* and *j* are no longer hardened in Philippide's era. Even after *Gramatica Academiei* (The Academy Grammar) forbids the hardening of these consonants ancestor consoane, the poet's father, grammarian Philippide, maintains their usage in hardened form: „The hard treatment of the consonants *s* and *j* are proper only to Philippide (*jîlt*, *jitar*, *șîpot*, *șîvoi*)” (Costinescu, 1979: 107) (G. C. t.n.)

Consonants *s* and *j* followed by *e* are present in a soft form, but words such as: *gusă* (I: 39), *cenușă*, *scorușă* (I: 111), *platoșă* (I: 152), *vrajă* (I: 175), *grijă* (I: 176), *mreajă* (I: 194), nouns of 1st declension, with the radical in *s* + inflection -ă, where the utterance is hardened. When they are followed by *-ea*, the consonant *s* and *j* are uttered softly: *așează* (I: 40), *înfațișează* (II: 41).

The consonant *t* is present in soft utterances such as: *înțeles* (I: 165), *înțelese* (I: 177). Philippide follows the line of the Academy, using soft forms with *e*, and not with *ă*.

d) The lip consonant *p* finds itself in Philippide's work frequently in its hardened form. Here are some relevant examples of the hardening of this consonant: *pîn-* (I: 170), *pîn-atunci* (I: 215), *pîn-la urmă* (I: 110), *dup-un* (I: 62, 152), *pîn-la stele* (I: 201), *dup-amiezi* (I: 159, 160).

e) The hardening of the consonant *r* also appears in the work of the poet from Iași: *străin* (I: 153). The frequent use of this consonant in its hardened position reveals a willful effect of the poet, thus managing to reach, at an emphatic lever, reception.

The consonant *r* in its soft position within: *repede* (I: 163), *repezi* (II: 40).

In the old literary language, *r* used to appear in words that in our times use the consonant *l*, their utterance thus becoming softer. Still, *R* managed to maintain itself in terms such as: *turburată* (I: 33), *turbure* (I: 112, 236), *turburi* (I: 135, 169), *turbur* (I: 117). „The Transylvanians and Moldavians mainly use the *l* forms, sometimes along side the *r* ones. [...] Still, the Academy be blamed for deciding to use the *l* forms, due to the fact that these were widely spread, even in Muntenia” (Ibidem: 593) (G. C. t.n.)

We also find contemporary forms, words that contain the consonant *l*, and not *r*: *mi-am tulburat* (I: 113).

f) The consonant *d* is often met in its soft form in Philippide's work, as it can be observed in: *deodată* (I: 153, 183), *dovedeau* (I: 161), *întotdeauna* (I: 159, 164), *totdeauna* (I: 187).

g) *L* appears soft in *evantaliul* (I: 11), *evantali* (I: 17), and hardened in *astfel* (II: 40).

h) *T* appears both hardened and soft in philippidean poetry. This consonant consoană is soft in *stînse* (I: 182, 189), *stînge* (I: 67) and hard in *stînsă* (I: 83). This hardened usage is used because of a prosodical method, so as the term in discussion to rhyme with *însă* (I: 83), the poet thus managing a perfect rhyme.

By using both modern and old forms, Alexandru Philippide proves itself to be an atypical poet, who does not align to the literary and linguistic. He does not reduce poetry to a sum of rules, but raises it, starting from the traditional to the modern. The pendulation between old and new makes him a patriot of his. Not wanting to entirely bury the past, the poet plants the new poetry in old soil. Through underlining the different phonetical forms in poetry, Philippide makes an analogy between a grammatical aspect that can have several forms

and the dilemma of the modern man, always faced with the choosing or confrunting two completely opposed problems.

Bibliography

Costinescu, Mariana, *Normele limbii literare în gramaticile românești*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1979.

Gheție, Ion, *Baza dialectală a românei literare*, Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România, București, 1975.

Irimia, Dumitru, *Structura stilistică a limbii române contemporane*, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică, București, 1986.

Munteanu, Ștefan, *Stil și expresivitate poetică*, Editura Științifică, București, 1972.

Munteanu, Ștefan, Țăra, Vasile D. *Istoria limbii române literare*, Editura Didactică și Pedagogică, București, 1978.

Philippide, Alexandru, *Scrisori*, vol I, Editura Minerva, București, 1976

Philippide, Alexandru, *Visuri în vîietul vremii*, Editura pentru artă și literatură, Iași, 1939.

Vianu, Tudor, *Studii de stilistică*, Editura didactică și pedagogică, București, 1968.