*Cristinel Munteanu*[1]

# AN ANCIENT FORERUNNER OF EUGENIO COSERIU REGARDING *THE COLLAGE TECHNIQUE*: (PSEUDO) HERMOGENES OF TARSUS

*Abstract: Our paper also brings forward an ancient but (most probably) forgotten distinction of the rhetor (Pseudo)Hermogenes, referring to the insertion of the quotation (in verse) into a certain discourse. Surprisingly enough, the terms used by (Pseudo)Hermogenes are very much alike to those used by Coseriu for a similar distinction concerning the usage of RDU (= "repeated discourse units") within a text. With Coseriu, we come across* ***the collage technique*** *(when RDU are taken in a text as such), as well as* ***parodic imitation*** *(when RDU are modified for various reasons, in order to fit the new context), while with (Pseudo)Hermogenes we discover the introduction of the quotation (in verse) by* ***katà kóllesin*** *(literally, 'by gluing', identical to* ***the collage technique****) and also by* ***katà paroidían*** *(similar to the* ***parodic imitation*** *above mentioned). Furthermore, we tried, at the same time, to illustrate the principle of tradition, so much recommended by Coseriu in the research field.*

*Keywords: (Pseudo)Hermogenes, Eugenio Coseriu, the collage technique, parodic imitation*

**1.** When practising Coseriu's linguistics, there is the danger of becoming a worshipper, always ready to swear on *verba magistri* in any respect. Coseriu, who always cherished the independence of thought among his disciples, would not have liked such an attitude. In order to avoid the above mentioned danger, we think we should assume *the principles of linguistics as science of culture*, which Coseriu set and followed. Nothing is taken before being filtered critically. Not even Coseriu's ideas. But, as Coseriu himself said about Aristotle (Coşeriu 2004: 122), he is rarely wrong, more rarely than the others. These principles are the following: the principle of objectivity, the principle of humanism, the principle of tradition, the principle of anti-dogmatism and the principle of public utility or responsibility.

**1.1.** Among the five principles followed and recommended by Coseriu in research, *the principle of tradition* seems to be the most evident in his work. Coseriu's theoretical framework was based on a permanent reference to his forerunners' contributions, whose great ideas he adopted by a critical effort in a recuperatory and integrative way. Thus, the famous Romanist Iorgu Iordan, Coseriu's professor from Iaşi, was saying:

> As to what the history of linguistics is concerned, one can state, without the fear of being wrong, that Coseriu masters this field the best. […] This inquisitive linguist discovered (and proved) very often that famous «findings» in the modern linguistics are rather old… chronologically speaking" [our translation][2].

[1] University Constantin Brâncoveanu of Piteşti

[2] „În ce priveşte istoria lingvisticii, se poate afirma, fără teama de a greşi că Coşeriu este cel mai bun cunoscător al acestei materii. […] Acest iscoditor lingvist a descoperit (şi dovedit) destul de des că diverse «noutăţi» ale lingvisticii moderne sunt cam vechi… cronologic vorbind." (Iordan , 258).

**BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)**

Actually, this very important aspect of Coseriu's work can be noticed mainly in his book, *Tradición y novedad en la ciencia del lenguaje* [1977], in which he reveals Aristotle, J.L. Vives, Adam Smith, W. von Humboldt, G. von der Gabelentz [etc.]' merits as founders of a series of concepts and essential distinctions for the field of linguistics. He is known to be the best specialist in the history of linguistics and in its situation (in the sense of integral linguistics, referring, on the one hand, to philosophy of language, theory of language and general linguistics, and, on the other hand, the three linguistics: that of speaking in general, of historic languages and of text/discourse) and, accordingly, it is very difficult to find out something that was overlooked by him.

Since we have learnt Coseriu's lesson on the importance of valuing the tradition, one could wonder whether there are some of Coseriu's concepts and distinctions which have already been referred to by a forerunner, without the great scholar being aware of it. That would be a real challenge to us.

**1.2.** Our paper brings forward an ancient but (most probably) forgotten distinction of the rhetor (Pseudo) Hermogenes, referring to the insertion of the quotation (in verse) into a certain discourse. Surprisingly enough, the terms used by (Pseudo)Hermogenes are very much like the ones used by Coseriu for a similar distinction concerning the usage of RDU (= "repeated discourse units") within a text. With Coseriu, we come across *the collage technique* (when RDU are taken in a text as such), as well as *parodic imitation* (when RDU are modified for various reasons, in order to fit the new context), while with (Pseudo)Hermogenes we discover the introduction of the quotation (in verse) by *katà kóllesin* (literally, 'by gluing', identical to *the collage technique*) and also by *katà paroidían* (similar to the *parodic imitation* above mentioned).

**2.** In the latest years, under Professor Stelian Dumistrăcel's guidance (from the University "Al. I. Cuza" of Iaşi), a linguistic "school" of Coserian orientation has been founded, called *Tehnica liberă a vorbirii şi discursul repetat* (*The Free Technique of Speech and Repeated Discourse*). It has shown its results through his disciples' contributions (doctoral theses or various papers on the topic of RD). Eugenio Coseriu was the one who set the principles for the research into RD and invited the others to go deeper into this highly vast domain. In the Romanian linguistics, Stelian Dumistrăcel assumed this task passionately and he is by far the most competent authority in this field. His monograph on RD (Dumistrăcel) – *Discursul repetat în textul jurnalistic*. *Tentaţia instituirii comuniunii fatice prin mass-media* (*Repeated discourse in the journalist text*. *The appeal of the phatic communion through mass-media*) is a case in point. His main interest is in the strict classification of the species of units belonging to repeated discourse, the analysis of RD units from the *quadripartita ratio* perspective (according to Quintilian) and rendering the stylistic effects at the level of speech, of the respective restructurings made on RDU. At this point, we should mention the fact that the journalist texts are a favourable base for their production.

**2.1.** Among the terms used in the afore mentioned book, we noticed the key word *colaj* ["collage"] (Dumistrăcel 7 and *passim*), as well as other expressions including it, such as „integrare de tip «colaj»" ["integration of the *collage* type"] (Dumistrăcel 11) or „tehnică «de colaj»" ["the technique of *collage*] (Dumistrăcel 30) or „utilizare de tip «colaj»" ["usage of the *collage* type"] (the last one is used in the very title of chapter 3 of the first part: *Utilizarea de tip „colaj" a EDR* [*The usage of the collage type* of RDU], Dumistrăcel 85) or „intertextualitate de tip colaj" ["intertextuality of the *collage* type"] (Dumistrăcel 151) or „tehnică a «colajului»" ["technique of the *collage*"] (*passim*) etc., with reference to the way in which RDU are inserted in texts. Coseriu is the one who established the connection between this procedure and the pictorial technique of collage (see *infra*, **3**.). The fact that the term *collage* is used in most cases (both by Coseriu and Stelian Dumistrăcel) with inverted commas is explainable, since it is an analogy. This usually happens with the terms borrowed from other domains, terms which have not been assimilated yet by linguists or are used in a figurative way. We think that Stelian Dumistrăcel's use of this term and his persistence in practising it is justified bearing in mind the name of this technique and its etymology. His initiative is praiseworthy, since it follows – as we aim to prove – a certain tradition (going up to the Middle Ages at least) whose origins can be traced back in Antiquity. It is about the technique of inserting

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

a quotation in a text, according to Pseudo-Hermogenes, by pasting (*katà kóllesin)* or parodying (*katà paroidían*). Thus, the saying which goes "Great spirits meet sometimes" is proved. We need to give some explanatory notes before presenting this distinction.

**2.2.** First of all, one should mention the fact that *repeated discourse* is for Coseriu "everything that is repeated in a community's speech in a more or less identical type of ready-made discourse of more or less fixed combination, as a long or short fragment of what has already been said" (our translation) (Coşeriu 2000: 258). This type of tradition is opposed to "the free technique of discourse" (which comprises "the constituent elements of language and the «present» rules of combination and modification, that is «words», lexical and grammatical instruments and methods"). Famous quotations, sayings, wellerisms (are studied in text linguistics), fixed expressions, terms of comparison and other such expressions are included in the sphere of RD (Coşeriu 2000: 259-262). However, only a part of them refer to idiomatic competence [= *el saber idiomático*], namely the ones known in the Romanian linguistics as *phraseologisms* (i.e. expressions and locutions, referred to by Th. Hristea as real or potential equivalents of words).

2.2.1. It seems that the term *discurso repetido* [*repeated discourse*] was coined by Coseriu, or at least he was the first to introduce it in linguistic research. He used it in German as *wiederholte Rede* ("repeated speech"), in French as *discours répété*, in Spanish as *discurso repetido*, in Italian as *discorso ripetuto.* The term, at least for the German variant (but not only, since *speech* also means «discourse» in English) could have been suggested to Coseriu by Leonard Bloomfield who, referring to meta-language (which he named *hypostasis*), states that "Hypostasis is closely related to quotation, the repetition of speech" (Bloomfield 148). Thanks to the critical version of *Lingüística del texto*, which also refers to some unpublished manuscripts, one can find out that Coseriu had introduced "el discurso repetido" long before, in the '50s. He says in his unpublished work *El problema de la corrección idiomática* (finished in 1957): „discursos ya hechos y transmitidos como tales, a lo que puede llamarse *discurso repetido*" (*apud* Coseriu 2007b: 143, the editor Óscar Loureda's note)[3]. In this Coseriu used the expression "técnica libre y actual del hablar" (Coseriu 2007b: 143)[4].

2.2.2. But it is worth noticing that Bloomfield's distinction and connection between *quotation* and *meta-language* (see *supra*, 2.2.1.) are, for Coseriu, the terms of a different distinction, which he traces back to Saussure's *langue* (that is the «functional language»): "Via a succession of seven distinctions, E. Coseriu arrives at the desired homogenous object of investigation, which can only then be subjected to a structural semantic analysis." (Coseriu, Geckeler 47). So here are the necessary preliminary distinctions between: extralinguistic reality (objects) and language (words); language (primary language) and meta-language; synchrony and diachrony; technique of discourse and repeated discourse[5]; architecture of language (historical language) and structure of language (functional language).

The fact that the two terms belong to different levels does not mean that they are opposed. On the contrary, one can find RDU in meta-language, since the meta-language function is focused mainly on phrases, clichés, quotations etc. when referred to in a conversation. The connection between a quotation

[3] I should, at this point, mention that Óscar Loureda presents in the note in question a large excerpt from *El problema…* in order to render the evolution of the Coserian types of *competence* [*saber*], and not that of the concept of «discurso repetido».

[4] On the other hand, *Lezioni di linguistica generale* is the only place where Coseriu also uses the term *discorso di riuso*, making a reference to H. Lausberg: "Oltre a questi allusioni, una buona parte di tradizione linguistica, pur non riferendosi a testi di autori noti, forma tuttavia una tradizione letteraria, un discurso di riuso, secondo una recente definizione che di questo concetto ha proposto il Lausberg." (Coseriu 1973: 137).

[5] "Under this distinction, valid within synchrony, *technique of discourse* means the freely available elements and procedures of a language, whereas the term *repeated discourse* embraces everything that, in a linguistic tradition, appears only in fixed form: fixed expressions and locutions, idioms, proverbs, 'refranes', Wellerisms, quotations (even from other languages), etc. In repeated discourse we are dealing with a kind of collage of past discourse (du 'déjà parlé'); the elements of this 'discours répété' are not commutable." (Coseriu, Geckeler 51-52).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

(as a species of RD) and meta-language is even stronger when every element taken in meta-language (be it a sound, word, syllable, prefix, a sentence or a fragment from a text) is placed between inverted commas, as it happens with quotations. (Still, one must remember that only the famous quotations belong to RD).

As if to prove it, Coseriu uses the same example in his first observations on the distinction between *primary language* and *meta-language* (in his study *Determinación y entorno*, published in 1957) and on the famous quotation, as a form of RD (in *Lecciones de lingüística general*, first published in Italian in 1973 and based on Coseriu's lectures given in Italy between 1968-1971), namely the first line of *Divina comedie* ("*Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*").

> En realidad, aislada de sus contextos, la frase es otra; es *nombre* de la frase real e implica un translado del lenguaje primario al «metalenguaje» (al hablar *sobre* el lenguaje). [...] Pero no hay que olvidar que la frase-ejemplo es, precisamente, un «nombre» con el que referimos a aquella otra frase que significa en una multitud de contextos, así como con la palabra *árbol* hablamos de los «árboles» reales y no pretendemos que ella misma sea verde y tenga espeso follaje. Si me propongo investigar el significado del verso de Dante: *Nel mezzo del cammin di nostra vita*, el verso al que me refiero no es éste que acabo de escribir, sino el que se halla en la *Divina Commedia* y que significa de manera cabal sólo en relación con todo el poema." (Coseriu 1967b: 323)

> Nella stato di lingua, inoltre, ci sono ancora due specie di tradizioni: una, propriamente tecnica e libera, che si rifà a elementi della lingua e li combina e riadatta per i vari livelli del linguaggio; una invece, il *discorso ripetuto*, che riprende tali e quali brani di testi, lunghi o brevi che siano, e li riusa. Se dico *il buon samaritano*, oppure *questo matrimonio non s'ha da fare*, mi riferisco a un testo determinato, cui alludo anche variandolo in parte, dicendo, ad esempio, *questa lezione non s'ha a fare*, *nel mezzo del cammin di questo libro* ecc.: in certi casi, l'allusione al testo si configura come imitazione parodistica dell'opera letteraria. (Coseriu 1973: 136-137)

**3.** We have already mentioned the fact that Coseriu uses the term "collage" figuratively. The following fragments, taken from his lectures and books, where the word in question is found in suggestive comparisons or even placed between inverted commas or bolded are a case in point.

> [a] Il caso è analogo a quello di un quadro eseguito a *collage*: nel cuadro, oltre alla tecnica del pittore che compone il quadro, ci possono essere pezzi di pittori, che il compositore del *collage* inserisce nel suo quadro. Altrettanto, nei nostri testi e discorsi possiamo riprendere testi e discorsi altrui. (Coseriu 1973: 137)
> un discurso concreto puede ser análogo a un cuadro realizado, en parte, como *collage*... (Coseriu 1981: 298)
> Unter diesen Gesichtspunkt kann ein konkreter Diskurs häufig einem zum Teil als *Collage* angelegten Bild gleichen. (Coseriu 1988: 276)

> [b] Diese Art der «Collage-Technik», des Weiterschaffens innerhalb des bereits Gesagten, kann zur Entstehung des Sinnes in neun Texten beitragen. (Coseriu 2007a: 108)
> Questo tipo di «*tecnica à collage*», di ricreare all'interno del già detto, può contribuire al sorgere del senso in nuovi testi." (Coseriu 2002: 109)
> Este tipo de *técnica de collage*... (Coseriu 2007b: 202)

> [c] …è, per così dire, come un quadro dipinto in parte per mezzo della tecnica propria di un pittore «attuale» e in parte construito «*à collage*», con pezzi già dipinti. (Coseriu 2007c: 258)

**BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)**

> [d] …vorbirea este *ca un fel de pictură cu colaj simultan*, adică, în parte este tehnică actuală şi în parte sunt bucăţi de vorbire deja existente şi duse, ca să zicem aşa, de tradiţie, în toate aceste expresii, locuţiuni fixe, în proverbe, citate ş.a.m.d. (Coşeriu 1994: 55)
> [e] Vorbirea e *ca un tablou pictat*, în mare parte, cu tehnica actuală a pictorului, însă, în parte, şi cu *tehnica numită colaj*, adică cu fragmente de vorbire. (Coşeriu 2004: 98).

**4.** The fact that other contemporary researchers have also drawn this analogy (from a literary perspective, as intertextuality) is highly important. They have referred to the way in which some writers introduce quotations or phrases from somebody else in their own texts. Here is the definition of the technique called *collage* (a term already used in the British literary theory) from an English dictionary of literary terms: "A term adopted from the vocabulary of painters to denote a work which contains a mixture of allusions, references, quotations and foreign expressions" (Cuddon 145).

The word *collage* (< fr. *collage* "pasting") is defined in dictionaries as follows: 1) an artistic technique which consists in the making of a painting by pasting together some heterogeneous elements. 2) (Pex) A painting made using this technique. The same term can be used to refer to some products obtained through a similar technique in cinema or theatre, but also in music, architecture and literature – it even relates to "digital collage" or "lesson-collage" in pedagogy. Pablo Picasso is said to be the inventor of this technique in painting and to have put it in practice in 1912 (Georges Braque was also using a similar technique in the same year). In fact, the term is universal. In English, Italian, Spanish and German the term *collage* is spelt identically or similarly as in French. We consider the term *technique* more appropriate than *procedure* and it is preferred in the case of RD. When using it, Coseriu thought of the Old Greek term *téchne* (which, according to Aristotle, means ʻexact, but unjustifiable knowledge').

**5.** Coseriu could have got the idea from aesthetics, which he was mastering in (he had a doctorate in philosophy in Italy on aesthetics). He even said once: "I am still fond of Aesthetics – I think I own some of the best books on Aesthetics – and this could also be noticed in my work" [our translation][6].

What is more, he frequently draws a comparison with painting (*ut pictura linguistica!*) in his studies on general linguistics or philosophy of language. For instance, referring to the act of linguistic creation, he invokes this art: "by facts of reproduction, we see the original act […] we see the original painting made by Picasso and not its reproduction" [our translation][7].

> Similarly, exemplifying his fundamental concepts borrowed from Aristotle, *enérgeia* and *dýnamis*: Leonardo [da Vinci]'s technique was his invention, he did not learn it. Given the fact that *enérgeia* is prior to *dýnamis*, his pupils and he himself took what had already been created and changed it into technique. [our translation][8]

The following paragraph is also suggestive:

> Si se nos permite una analogía, diríamos que el sistema no se impone al hablante más de lo que la tela y los colores se imponen al pintor: el pintor no puede salirse de la tela y no puede emplear colores que no tiene, pero, dentro de los límites de la tela y en el empleo de los colores que posee, su libertad expresiva es absoluta. (Coseriu 1967a: 98)

---

[6] „Şi acum am pasiunea esteticii – cred că posed una din cele mai bune biblioteci de estetică – şi se poate observa asta şi în lucrările mele" (Coşeriu 1996b: 163-164).

[7] „prin fapte de reproducere, vedem actul originar […] vedem tabloul originar pe care l-a pictat Picasso şi nu reproducerea" (Coşeriu 1996b: 50).

[8] „ceea ce este tehnică numai a lui Leonardo [da Vinci] a fost inventată de el, pe asta n-a învăţat-o. Pe urmă, dat fiind că *enérgeia* este anterioară *dýnamis*-ului, elevii lui şi chiar el însuşi au reluat ceea ce se crease şi au transformat-o în tehnică" (Coşeriu 1996b: 65).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

What is more, Coseriu appeals to musical comparisons, besides painting, even in the case of RD, just as in the case of collage (even if he does not use the term *collage* as such):

> Los hablantes hacen funcionar en su hablar sistemas diferentes y repiten en parte frases del discurso pasado, del mismo modo en que puede encontrarse en un mismo cuadro el funcionamiento sincrónico de una técnica junto a partes que imitan a cuadros anteriores, o que son simples reproducciones; *y así también en una composición musical se escuchan fragmentos que han sido tomados de otras*. (Coseriu 1996a: 27)

**6.** We are not the first in the Romanian specialized literature to refer to Pseudo-Hermogenes' distinction (*katà kóllesin* and *katà paroidían*), but we are certainly the first to have applied it to Coseriu's ideas.

**6.1.** Thus, Elisabeta Poghirc, a classic philologist interested in the issue of quotation in Antiquity, mentions the fact that the rhetor Hermogenes made a distinction between the two different types of introducing a quotation in a text: [a] *katà kóllesin* – that is "inserting the quotation (mainly the one in verse) at the end of the text, so that the connection is only superficial and the text quoted is clearly detachable" [our translation][9]; [b] *katà paroidían* – in which "the original text is assimilated with the author's text and thus tightly linked to it" [our translation][10] (referring to Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. II, Leipzig, 1854, 450). Later on, the researcher states that the first category [a] would contain "the exact quotations, in their modern meaning"[11] (with exact references). In the second [b] all the other categories are included: allusion, paraphrase, summarizing ideas, adaptation, modification and sometimes (deliberate or not) alteration of the quotation, combinations of quotations up to parody. Next, Elisabeta Poghirc illustrates all these types with different quotations (from verse or prose) from the works of our forerunners (mainly Plato), trying to establish some rules regarding the insertion of a quotation in a text (mainly exact quotations, introduced by a declarative verb, a demonstrative adjective or pronoun, by an adverb, article in the neuter, followed by a noun or article in the genitive etc.). (Poghirc 95)

But who was Hermogenes of Tarsus? Hermogenes of Tarsus (160-225 A.D.), born in Cilicia, is known to have been a child prodigy whose oratory talent (at only 15 years old!) impressed the emperor Marcus Aurelius himself, who is said to have paid him a visit just to listen to him. Antique sources mention the fact that he had written his entire rhetoric work till the age of 23. He is attributed 5 from the works left (only 4, in fact, according to some researchers): *Peri ideon*, *Progymnasmata*, *Peri heureseos* and *Peri methodou deinotetos*. Modern specialists have proved the fact that only the first two works are authentic. The other three are written by other writers, but, starting with the late Antiquity, they have been considered as the works of the same Hermogenes and were used together, as a whole fundamental treatise, eclipsing Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. We will refer to *Peri methodou deinotetos* (entitled *On Method of Forceful Speaking*, in G.A. Kennedy's translation; see *Invention and Method*), attributed to Hermogenes ever since the V$^{th}$ century and to *Peri ideon* (entitled *On Types of Style*, in C.W. Wooten's translation; see *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*).

**6.2.** We do not fully agree with Elisabeta Poghirc's interpretation. It is true that paragraph 30 (considered a chapter) from *Peri methodou deinotetos*, in which Pseudo-Hermogenes establishes the distinction in question, is rather short and with few examples, but one could understand the rhetor's principles by thoroughly reading the few lines and adding them to what Hermogenes (the authentic one) states in a section from *Peri ideon.*

---

[9] „ataşând citatul (în special cel în versuri) în continuarea textului, astfel încât legătura nu este decât superficială iar textul citat este net detaşabil" (Poghirc 94).

[10] „textul original este asimilat cu textul autorului şi practic indisolubil legat de acesta" (Poghirc 94).

[11] „citatele exacte, citatele în accepţiunea modernă a termenului" (Poghirc 94).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

George A. Kennedy thinks that Pseudo-Hermogenes is not aware of Aristotle, Demetrius, Dionysus of Halicarnas or Longinus' reflections on style and thus he ignored tradition; it could also be seen in his using a different terminology than that of his forerunners', an original one. On the other hand, there is a certain connection with Hermogenes of Tarsus, since Pseudo Hermogenes' title of the paper, *Peri methodou deinotetos*, is announced as a prospective work in the end of *Peri Ideon.* What is more, there are many other elements which prove that Pseudo-Hermogenes had read Hermogenes' treatise on types of style (*Invention and Method* 202-3).

6.2.1. We present below the paragraphs of interest to us (from *Peri methodou deinotetos*, chapter 30), followed by a very exact translation of George A. Kennedy and then we will suggest our own interpretation of these fragments.

> Kata_ po/souj tro/pouj e0n pezw|~ lo/gw| xrh~sij e0pw~n gi/netai; kata_ du&o, ko/llhsin kai\ parw|di/an. kai\ ko/llesij me/n e0stin, o3tan o9lo/klhron to\ e1poj eu0fuw~j kollh/sh| tw~| lo/gw|, w#ste sumfwnei=n dokei=n:
> [In how many ways are verses used in a prose? In two: by quotation and by adaptation. It is quotation (*kollēsis*) whenever one quotes the whole verse gracefully in the speech so that it seems to harmonize with it (*Invention and Method* 255)[12]];
> Kata_ parw|di/an de/, o3tan me/roj ei0pw_n tou~ e1pouj par 0 au9tou~ to\ loipo\n pezw~j e9rmhneu/sh| kai\ pa&lin tou~ e1pouj ei0pw_n e1teron e0k tou~ i0di/ou prosqh|~, w(s mi/an gene/sqai th_n i0de/an:
> [It is adaptation (*parōidia*) whenever, after quoting part of the verse, one in his own words expresses the rest in prose and then quoting another verse adds something of his own, so that it becomes a single idea. (*Invention and Method* 255)[13]]

Before interpreting Pseudo-Hermogenes' words, one must consider the following:

1) Pseudo-Hermogenes is not necessarily descriptive, but mainly prescriptive in his systematization. He does not illustrate all possible situations, but only those recommended for the art of oratory. As for him, the ontic [what it is] of the linguistic reality is mistaken for the deontic [what it should be] of rhetoric. For this very reason, Pseudo-Hermogenes does not consider the exact quotation, as Elisabeta Poghirc thinks, the quotation in its modern meaning (see *supra*, **6.1**) or, in other words, "the reported speech", with exact references to the author, title and number of the book. The species of the exact quotation can be traced in antiquity (as the same researcher proves), but the Greek rhetor (although he himself refers to authors and only seldom to their works) means something else when he presents the technique called *kollesis*. In fact, the concept of "plagiarism" was unknown to the ancient people (Poghirc 90-91), who would often take quotations as such, without mentioning their author, not being interested in rendering them exactly. They would very frequently count on their memory and consider the works of the classics as everybody's goods which they could shape into new, personal forms.

2) A distinction must be made between: [a] using the quotation as a goal in itself, as an example, in a text or fragment of text (which exists only to explain/comment on the quotation) – or the "exact quotation" here – and [b] the use of the quotation as an auxiliary in the production of a text (as a brick in a building), as an element organically integrated in the body of the proper discourse, leading to the formation of a new speech act (by repeating it, the quotation can become literary tradition inserted in the linguistic tradition).

---

[12] Michel Patillon's translation of this paragraf is the following: „Il y a *enchâssement*, lorsqu'on enchâsse convenablement les vers entiers dans le discours, de telle sorte que leur harmonie apparaisse" (Hermogène 542).

[13] M. Patillon's translation is the following: „On a une *parodie*, lorsque, après avoir énoncé un fragment de poème, on lui invente une suite en prose et qu'après être revenu au poème, on y ajoute autre chose qui vient de soi, de manière à garder l'unité de la forme." (Hermogène 542).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

In the first case [a] there is the function of representation (according to K. Buhler or referential at R. Jakobson, who would have mentioned here the metalinguistic function; however, Coseriu states that "there is no metalinguistic function separable from the function of representation since, if the function of representation represents things, then language can also be represented by it; given the fact that language is a part of reality, it can be thus denominated by language" [our translation][14]), which is based on quotation, while the text in which it is inserted is the comment or its framework (see also *supra*, 2.2.2, the extract from *Determinación y entorno*, where Coseriu refers to "meta-language" and the "phrase-example". The distinction can obviously be refined since (according to Coseriu) within the [a] category one could distinguish: [$a_1$] the use of a quotation, as an example in and for itself, only for the sake of its linguistic value, completely taken out of context (as in the case of the grammatical analysis of a text) and [$a_2$] the use of a quotation (or succession of quotations, cf. *supra* **3**, the quotations we used as illustrations from Coseriu's work for the term "collage") as an example for the defense of an idea for it designates a linguistic reality it refers to (exact reference, not allusion).

In the second case [b] there is also the poetic function (if one intends to "adorn" the message with quotations) or, more often than not, the phatic function (or better the *phatic communion* in Stelian Dumistrăcel's terms, based on B. Malinowski), with the intention to lure the receptor in the area of "textual" idiomatic competence or of expressive competence.

We are entitled to believe that both Coseriu and Pseudo-Hermogenes are more interested in the second type ([b]) (by *collage* or *kollesis*).

6.2.2. Pseudo-Hermogenes wonders: „In how many ways are verses used in a prose? In two: by quotation (*katà kóllesin*) and by adaptation (*katà paroidían*)". G. A. Kennedy renders the Gr. *kóllēsis* by the Engl. *Quotation*, explaining in a footnote that it means 'gluing', *ad litteram*, and the gr. *parōidia* by the Engl. *adaptation*, considering that the term *parōidia* is used in an unusual way.

6.2.2.1. It is *kóllēsis* „whenever one quotes the whole verse gracefully in the speech so that it seems to harmonize [*symphonein*] with it". Following the short characterization, Pseudo-Hermogenes illustrates it using two quotations in verse (the first from *Iliad*, the second from Euripides) identified in one of Aeschines' discourses (Demosthenes' contemporary and rival). What does this *harmonization* of quotation to discourse mean? What does the "graceful" pasting / quotation of lines in speech mean? Not in the least the fact that the connection between quotation and text is "superficial" and the quoted fragment is "clearly detachable" (as Elisabeta Poghirc thinks, see supra, **6.1**). On the contrary, the idea is that there must be an organic, normal, accepted assimilation of the quotation in the discourse. From all the 8 cases of introducing a quotation in a text, following the technique *katà kóllesin*, established by Elisabeta Poghirc, only 2 (number 6 and 8) are in accordance with the above mentioned technique, mainly the last case: "the hexameter can be frequently introduced in the sentence without the help of φημι and without mentioning the author's name; it is only the rhythm or dialect that make us think of a quotation, mainly in the case of famous verses, which are immediately recognized and need no presentation" (Poghirc 96).

To better understand Pseudo-Hermogenes, we have to read Hermogenes, who is clearer in this respect. In *Peri Ideon*, Hermogenes of Tarsus refers to the issue of verse quotation, since they induce pleasure, "sweetness" (*glykytes*, in Wooten's translation) to discourse. Sweetness represents, according to Hermogenes, a virtue of style, obtained not only by the use of poetic quotations but also by invoking myths and legends, praises, love thoughts, personifications, allegories and epithets, as well as the use of the ionic dialect.

[14] „Nu există o funcţiune *metalingvistică* separabilă de funcţiunea de *reprezentare*, fiindcă, dacă funcţiunea de reprezentare este de reprezentare a lucrurilor, atunci între lucrurile pe care limbajul le poate reprezenta găsim şi limbajul; dat fiind că limbajul e şi o parte a realităţii, atunci şi limbajul poate fi denumit prin limbaj." (Coşeriu 1994: 148).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

> Moreover, you must realize that whether you are quoting your own poetry or someone else's, the references must be woven into the passage in such a way that *the quotations from poetry and the prose seem to form one body* rather than distinct entities, as when laws and decrees are read out during speeches. For that produces something other than real Sweetness, as in: «Read to me also the verses that you butchered, 'I come from the dwelling of the dead and the gates of gloom' and 'Know that I announce sad tidings against my will'» (Dem. 18.267) (*Hermogenes' On Types of Style* 80);
>
> But, as I said, it is obvious to me that if there is a clear distinction between the poetic references and the prose passage in which they are quoted, either the pleasure-producing quality of the reference will be lost or it will be weakened considerably. (*Hermogenes' On Types of Style* 80)

In order to illustrate "sweetness", the Greek rhetor gives numerous examples (especially from Plato) in which there are few references (such as "Homer / Hesiod says that…"), or they even lack, the poetic quotations being naturally absorbed by the contexts in prose. Thus, Hermogenes was considering references as a way to fragment the discourse, disrupting the harmony of the whole.

6.2.2.2. In the other case of using verses in prose, namely *parody* (*parōidia*), Pseudo-Hermogenes states that: "It is adaptation (*parōidia*) whenever, after quoting part of the verse, one in his own words expresses the rest in prose and then quoting another verse adds something of his own, so that it becomes a single idea". Later, in his particular style, he gives only one example taken from Demosthenes (in the *False Embassy*): "«Who on an embassy delights in the company» of Philocrates,/«I never inquired, knowing» that he took money, as Philocrates admits he did" (*Invention and Method* 255)[15].

In the example above one can only identify the technique of addition (*adiectio*) or possibly that of substitution (*immutatio*), but in a previous brief chapter (number 24) on "on escaping notice while repeating what you or others have said", Pseudo-Hermogenes speaks about "change of order [inversion/permutation], and lengthenings and shortenings" (*ta&cewj metabolh/, kai\ mh/kh kai\ braxu/thtej*), considering that the method is similar to paraphrase (*h( de_ au0th_ kai_ tou= parafra&zein me/qodoj*) (*Invention and Method* 243).

One can recognize the technique through which the phrases which belong to RD are modified according to *quadripartita ratio* (Quintilian), which Stelian Dumistrăcel fully dealt with. He is justified in saying that this type of phrases are submitted to changes that can be grouped in [only] the four "figures of construction" referred to as "solecisms" by Quintilian in *Inst. Orat.*: *detractio* (suppression), *adiectio* (addition), *immutatio* (substitution) and *transmutatio* (permutation).

We illustrate them, on our account, with some Latin phrases and sayings: 1) *suppression* – is used when, in some contexts, it is enough to say just *verba volant* or *scripta manent*, there being a left or right suppression of the phrase *verba volant, scripta manent*; 2) *addition – homo homini lupus (est)* became in the Middle Ages *homo homini lupus (est), femina feminae lupior, clericus clerico lupissimus*; 3) *substitution* – Plautus' formula, *homo homini lupus (est)* is changed at various classics in *homo homini deus est* (Caecilius) or *homo res sacra homini* (Seneca); 4) *permutation – ubi bene, ibi patria* was inverted by nationalists: *ubi patria, ibi bene*. All types of modification go under these four categories: there are not more (they are universal), just as there are only four cardinal points. Mixed situations are also common in speech (the so-called "cameleonic figures", as referred to by the members of the μ Group from Liége), cases of combination of the above mentioned figures just as in geography, we orient ourselves according to coordinates such as NW, SE, N-NW etc. Here is a context in which there is an addition, suppression and substitution. A rhetorician of the French Revolution, while speaking in the Constitutional meeting from 1789 about his political rivals, said: "*Catilina* est aux portes, et l'on délibère" (*Catilina is at the gates of the city and we deliberate*). The result is interference between *Hannibal ante/ad portas* and

[15] Kennedy supposes that the two fragments inserted in Demosthenes' phrase belong to Euripides.

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

another Latin quotation, less famous: *Dum Roma deliberat, Saguntum perit* (*While Rome is deliberating, Sagunt is dying* [it seems that the original expression, belonging to Titus Livius is *Dum Romae consulitur, Saguntum expugnatur*]), referring to Hannibal again, who conquered Sagunt in the year 219 B. C. Catilina is the conspirational type, consequently, the French Republic is menaced by plots and not by armed forces. As already seen, modifications can be made on the original translation also, not only on the original text.

6.2.3. Here are some observations on the terms *kollesis* and *collage.* They both come from the same etymon: the word *kolla* (*kolla*) from old Greek, meaning *glue*. They both mean "pasting". With reference to the issue of quotation and RD generally speaking, they were both used figuratively, referring to a similar technique. We have already clarified things concerning the term *collage*; as for the term *kollesis*, the only attestation for the meaning "the union of a verse quotation with prose", recorded in one of the best old Greek (Liddell, Scott) dictionaries is given by Pseudo-Hermogenes himself (in the paragraph we have referred to); thus, it is a purely rhetorical use of the term.

6.2.4. The proof of the validity of the two techniques (*kollesis* or *collage* and *paroidían* or *parodic imitation*) is found at Stelian Dumistrăcel, who makes a distinction between "allusive intertextuality of the collage type and that of changing the sentence by different ways of construction" (Dumistrăcel 151). Going back to the tradition of our forerunners (which continued up to the Middle Ages or Renaissance at least) is vital. In a poem written around 1060-1067 for the young would-be emperor Michael [Mihail] the VII$^{th}$ Doukas, a Byzantine professor, Michael [Mihail] Psellos was making in a poem (544 lines of 15 syllables) a concise synthesis of the Hermogenic corpus (4 books, not to mention *Progymnasmata*). Despite its conciseness, in the last section (line 538), he was still mentioning *katà kóllesin* and *katà paroidían.*

**7.** Finally, one could ask oneself (as an *advocatus diaboli*) whether "pasting" (*katà kóllesin*) and "parody" *katà paroidían* are two different techniques of inserting a quotation (as RDU) in the text, in other words, whether the distinction is justified. Isn't parody (in Hermogenes' terms) a particular form of *kollesis*? Doesn't the technique of partial variation of RDU (by parodic imitation – Coseriu) also belong to the technique of collage?

**7.1.** At first sight (from a "naïve" perspective), one would think that there is a collage in both cases. If a certain discourse is similar to a collage, then "in a painting, apart from parts made by the painter, there could also be fragments taken from other paintings, made by other painters" (Coşeriu 2000: 259). In other words, apart from the free technique (FT), one will also come across "ready made" (already said) phrases. A text (Tx) obtained through the technique of collage (*katà kóllesin*) can be shown as such:

Tx = {FT → [RD] ← FT},

While a text obtained through the technique of Hermogenic parody (*katà paroidían*) could be drawn in this way:

Tx = {FT → [RD → (FT) ← RD] ← FT}.

And still, irrespective of the number and ways in which RDU are used, there will always be "fragments" /excerpts (the context of relevance) from the "paintings" (=texts) of other "painters" (=speakers) and the result would be similar to a collage. Thus, making a distinction between the two techniques would seem irrelevant.

**7.2.** At a closer (and deeper) look, one would consider the distinction appropriate. It must be mentioned that, according to Coseriu's doctrine (following Aristotle and Humboldt's distinctions), language is a productive activity in itself. All productive activities are characterized by three aspects: the activity in itself (*enérgeia*), the competence or technique (*dýnamis*) and the product (*érgon*). *Enérgeia* is prior to any technique (*dýnamis*), being creativity in itself. Language is *enérgeia*, based on a learnt/acquired technique, but, since it is a creative activity, it goes beyond the learnt/acquired technique. For this very reason, Coseriu would state (following Ortega Y Gasset) that language is made, un-made and re-made continuously, like Penelope's fabric.

Thus, we should not mistake the product with the technique when doing our research. The product (*érgon*) obtained, irrespective of the technique (either *katà kóllesin* or *katà paroidían*) would still be a

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

"collage" since there is still more or less imitation / reproduction (regarding the others' RD), even if we will have to distinguish between the two types of collage:

[a] ***the collage itself*** (in Coseriu's terms, obtained through *katà kóllesin*), where there is only the acquired/learnt technique (or a tradition – *saber idiomático textual* [Coseriu 1991b: 258]), considering only the using of RDU as such in a discourse. *Katà kóllesin* is a technique with an expressive effect, yet deprived of originality.

[b] ***the parodic collage*** (obtained through the technique of *katà paroidían*), which goes beyond the acquired technique (or tradition), since RDU undergoes changes in a new context. *Katà paroidían* is a technique whose expressive effect is superior to the other one. What is more, it is characterized by originality (or creativity).

Thus, distinguishing between the two techniques is necessary and Stelian Dumistrăcel is right in mentioning two different forms of intertextuality (see *supra*, 6.2.4).

If need be, one must say that a discourse/text is rarely a parodic collage on the whole. The linguistic act can better be seen as interference between the two types of collage and it is very frequently found in the form of the collage itself. There are also texts which are characterized by the absence of RDU and there is no collage in such cases. The explanation comes from the speakers' differences in idiostyle or from the various topics of texts. There are speakers who do not use RDU, just as there are some who prefer them. There are even fewer speakers who are born with a special linguistic sense and operate changes on RDU.

**8.** According to Eugenio Coseriu, language is characterized by five universals: creativity, semanticity, alterity, historicity and materiality (Coşeriu 2004: 73-75). The first three are primary universals, the latter two are secondary universals, derived from the first ones. Creativity is specific to all forms of culture (religion, art, philosophy etc.), not just to language, since alterity ("being with the other" cf. lat. *alter*) is characteristic to language only. Creativity leads to variety in language and to its continuous change. Alterity, on the other hand, assures the homogeneity of language:

> L'altérité […] est le fondement de l'historicité du langage, qui est manifestation constante de la solidarité avec une communauté de sujets parlants et avec ses traditions et, donc, de l'essence sociale et de l'historicité intrinsèque de l'homme. (Coseriu 2001: 431-432)

Accordingly, taking into account the RD domain, the *katà paroidían* technique is given by creativity, while the *katà kóllesin* technique is conferred by alterity. What is more, alterity is the one which limits the liberty of the *katà paroidían* procedure. Alterity imposes at least a minimum context of relevance when we change RDU: "We play very often with these phrases, but what do we understand? We understand that the new expression is an allusion to the old one" [our translation][16]. Even if the interlocutor (because of his ignorance) did not get the meaning of our allusion, we thought, when modifying RD, that he would do it (by offering him elements of recognition).

The artistic literature (or "poetry" in Coseriu's terms) is deprived of alterity (Coseriu 1991a: 206-207). Poets do not want to be understood very easily and reaching originality is their major purpose. That is why a literary genre as parody has always been considered a minor one.

Language, on the other hand, is constantly updating by reproducing, for thousand times and ways, the original acts of creation. It is made and re-made constantly and the linguistic change (at the level of tradition) works gradually, only if accepted by the other speakers and if it follows tradition. Without their consent, innovations remain at the *hápax* level. For this very reason, in language the procedure *katà paroidían* cannot be classified as a "minor" technique, but as a *major* one, which corresponds to the essence of language.

---

[16] „Ne jucăm, de multe ori, cu aceste expresii, însă ce înţelegem? Înţelegem că expresia nouă este o aluzie tocmai la cea veche" (Coşeriu 1994: 56).

BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)

**9.** Art and many other fields have borrowed terms from painting. For instance, Vasile Alecsandri (a famous Romanian poet) adopted the term *pastel* in literature to refer to a descriptive poem which belongs to the lyrical genre. André Gide introduced in the novel (see *Les faux monnayeurs*) the pictorial technique of the "mise en abyme", and there are many other such examples. Linguistics also borrowed a term taken from the same area: *calc* (*loan translation*).

In conclusion, one can state that, although the term "collage" was taken by many domains, in linguistics, mainly in the analysis of speech, its use is fully justified (even more than in other cases) since there was a similar term in ancient times (an etymological quasi-doublet), *kollesis*, which referred to a similar technique concerning the insertion of a quotation in the text. Thus, the collage is about to be "successful" in the meta-language of our subject/field.

**10.** People have always been intelligent and, consequently, one can sometimes find (in ancient times, for instance) remarkable intuitions at our forerunners. You can only exclaim (just as Aelius Donatus did) *Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt!* or apply the judicious principle of tradition, recommended by Coseriu in research. Going back to our forerunners is not only an obligation of ours but also a win, and if we sometimes find things that were said before by our ancestors, one must not be resentful, but pleased. In fact, the *guarantee to objectivity is intersubjectivity*: we are certain that objects around us exist just because the others see them and communicate the same thing.

## References


Bloomfield, Leonard. *Language* [1933]. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited, 2005.

Coseriu, Eugenio. "Sistema, norma y habla" [1952], in Coseriu, Eugenio. *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1967(a). 11-113.

Coseriu, Eugenio. "Determinción y entorno. Dos problemas de una lingüística del hablar" [1956], in Coseriu, Eugenio. *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1967(b). 287-323.

---. *Lezioni di linguistica generale*. Torino: Editore Boringhieri, 1973.

---. *Lecciones de lingüística general*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1981.

---. *Einführung in die Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*. Tübingen: Francke Verlag, 1988.

---. "Tesis sobre el tema «lenguaje y poesia»", in Coseriu, Eugenio. *El hombre y su lenguaje. Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Segunda edición, revisada, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1991(a). 201-207.

---. "Sobre el desarrollo de la lingüística", in Coseriu, Eugenio. *El hombre y su lenguaje. Estudios de teoría y metodología lingüística*, Segunda edición, revisada, Madrid: Editorial Gredos, 1991(b). 257-263.

---. *Prelegeri şi conferinţe (1992-1993)* [ca supliment al publicaţiei *Anuar de lingvistică şi istorie literară*, T. XXXIII, 1992-1993, Seria A, Lingvistică]. Iaşi, 1994.

---. *El sistema verbal románico*. México [sic]: Siglo XXI editores, 1996(a).

---. *Lingvistica integrală* [Interviu cu Eugeniu Coşeriu, realizat de Nicolae Saramandu]. Bucureşti: Editura Fundaţiei Culturale Române, 1996(b).

---. *Lecţii de lingvistică generală*, Trans. Eugenia Bojoga. Chişinău: Editura Arc, 2000.

---. "Linguistique historique et histoire des langues", in Coseriu, Eugenio. *L'homme et son langage*. Louvain – Paris – Sterling, Virginia: Éditions Peeters. 2001. 431-437.

---. *Linguistica del testo. Introduzione a una ermeneutica del senso*. Edizione italiana a cura di Donatella di Cesare. Roma: Carocci editore, 2002.

---. "Filozofia limbajului" [Răspunsuri la întrebări]. *In memoriam Eugeniu Coşeriu*, Extras din „Fonetică şi Dialectologie", XX-XXI, 2001-2002. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române, 2004. 119-130.



**BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**

**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)**

---. *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, Tübingen, 2007(a).
---. *Lingüística del texto. Introducción a la hermenéutica del sentido*. Edición, anotación y estudio previo de Óscar Loureda Lamas. Madrid: Arco/Libros, 2007(b).
---. "Interdisciplinarità e linguaggio", in Coseriu, Eugenio. *Il linguaggio e l'uomo attuale. Saggi di filosofia del linguaggio*, a cura di Cristian Bota e Massimo Schiavi con la collaborazione di Giuseppe di Salvatore e Lidia Gasperoni, Prefazione di Tullio De Mauro. Verona: Edizioni Centro Studi Campostrini, 2007(c). 243-268.
Coseriu, Eugenio, Geckeler, Horst. *Trends in Structural Semantics*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1981.
Cuddon, J. A. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* [fourth edition]. Penguin Books, 1999.
Dumistrăcel, Stelian. *Discursul repetat în textul jurnalistic*. *Tentaţia instituirii comuniunii fatice prin mass-media*. Iaşi: Editura Universităţii „Alexandru Ioan Cuza" din Iaşi, 2006.
*Hermogenes' On Types of Style*. Trans. Cecil W. Wooten. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
Hermogène. *L'art rhétorique*. Trans. Michel Patillon. Paris: Editions L'Age d'Homme, 1997.
[Hermogenes of Tarsus.] *Invention and Method. Two Rhetorical Treatises from the Hermogenic Corpus*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
Iordan, Iorgu [coord.]. *Istoria lingvisticii româneşti*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1978.
Liddell, Henry George, Scott, Robert. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
Poghirc, Elena. "Problema citatului în antichitate (cu privire specială la Homer)". *Analele Universităţii Bucureşti*, Limbi clasice şi orientale (1971): 89-100.

**BDD-A3738 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.143 (2026-11-18 21:00:25 UTC)**