

CARMEN POPESCU  
(coord.)

**COMPARATISM, IDENTITATE, COMUNICARE**

**Descrierea CIP a Bibliotecii Naționale a României**  
**Comparatism, identitate, comunicare / Carmen Popescu**  
(coord.). - Craiova : Universitaria, 2012  
Bibliogr.  
ISBN 978-606-14-0480-3

I. Popescu, Carmen (coord.)

82.09

Copyright © 2012 Universitaria  
Toate drepturile sunt rezervate Editurii Universitaria

Tipărit la Tipografia Universității din Craiova

# **COMPARATISM, IDENTITATE, COMUNICARE**

Lucrările conferinței

Craiova, 21-22 octombrie 2011

# **COMPARATIVISM, IDENTITY, COMMUNICATION**

Proceedings of the Conference

Craiova, 21-22 October 2011

Coordonare:  
Carmen Popescu



**EDITURA UNIVERSITARIA**  
**Craiova, 2012**

Apărut: 2012  
Tipografia Universității din Craiova  
Str. Brestei, nr. 156A, Craiova, Dolj, România  
Tel: +40 251 598054

Tipărit în România

## INTRODUCTION

The present volume, *Comparatism, identitate, comunicare* (*Comparativism, identity, communication*), comprises a selection of papers from the fourth edition of the International Conference “CIC”, Craiova, a conference initiated in 2008 by Prof. Emilia Parpală, the main coordinator of the event ever since.

The acronym CIC stands for several notions which have concerned us over the years: for the first two editions, 2008 and 2009, it was *Communication, identity, context*. For the next edition, 2010, *culture* has replaced *context* and we started exploring the overlap of these key notions, together with *postmodernism*, which has been studied within two workshops in 2010 and 2011, also under the aegis of the conference. Each edition has resulted in the publication of Proceedings, with Universitaria Publishing House, Craiova. More recently, the *comparative* account has entered the scene, and in this volume it constitutes the preferential method of approach with numerous authors.

Over the years the conference has been attended by many Romanian and foreign scholars and graduate students working and studying in the fields of literary studies, linguistics, communication and public relations, and even in domains like sociology, pedagogy and psychology.

While laying emphasis on the unavoidable interdisciplinarity of recent times, we have nevertheless endeavoured to avoid heterogeneity and to preserve a coherent line for the scientific research focusing on identity and communication in a contemporary perspective.

As stated in the call for papers for the latest edition, modern comparative studies can provide new insights into the complex problematic of intercultural relations and identity issues, but also for the area of communication studies. While focusing on general and comparative literature, we did not wish, however, to limit the interest of the conference to this discipline. Comparison is here understood as an all-encompassing scientific method, which might cover linguistics, anthropology, cultural studies etc. Our premise has been that the interdisciplinary perspective and the generous thematic spectrum will allow the rethinking of the issues mentioned above.

World literature and comparative literature are well-represented in the collection of papers, and even the studies which have as an object Romanian authors include in the most natural way the comparative approach, through free analogies or the tracing of foreign influences and filiations. As a *palimpsestic* literature since its very inception, always involving the (mimetic or polemic) reference to prestigious Western models, Romanian literature is the epitome of the “literature in the second degree” discussed by Gérard Genette (1982). And, of

course, so are the Serbian, Hungarian or Albanian literatures, or the Brazilian and Arabian one, among the illustrations chosen by the authors present in this volume. But even the English, American, French, Italian, Latin or German examples preferred by other contributors are no less palimpsestic or intertextual than the samples from the so-called “small” or lesser-known literatures. Modern and contemporary literature worldwide enjoy deserved attention but classical authors, in their turn (for instance Ovid or Goethe), are not at all despised, thus creating an interesting balance for the make-up of the book and suggesting that the canon of world literature (just like the canons of various national literatures) should be perceived as a dynamic reality.

The intertextual approach is given due credit, as a legitimate methodological solution for the eternal “crisis” of comparative literature. The close interconnection between comparativism and literary theory (poetics, theory of genres, stylistics and so on) is also emphasized in those papers dedicated to literary criticism. An important component of comparative theory and practice, here illustrated by one of the papers, is that involving the parallel between text and image, thus investigating the connection of two different codes in their mutual mirroring.

The comparative/ contrastive analysis applied to linguistic and discursive facts is on the one hand valuable in itself, and on the other hand can serve as an inspiration to literary comparison *per se*. The latter can benefit in the future, in terms of rigor and clarity, from the technical and systematic template employed by language scholars. By the same token, comparison of cultural data as practiced by anthropologists is equally relevant to philologists, as the study of mentalities, values, belief systems, customs, tradition and rites is vital to any worthwhile comparison which puts together items from different cultures, literary movements, and sometimes from different ages. Highlighting similarities and searching for invariants between the terms of comparison continues to be an important task for comparatists, but pointing out differences and idiosyncrasies or the irreducible elements of originality is no less poignant.

This raises the issue of *identity*, a genuine obsession in contemporary civilization, irrespective of the level on which one approaches it: *personal* or *collective* (social, ethnic and national) identity. Modern individualism might have its discontents but it appears that the constant investigation of inner depths has not remained a solely narcissistic concern of some writers, but it has opened a field of interest in the subjectivity of the Other or the unique profile of a different (but never entirely and radically different) personality, literature, culture or nation. The concern for identity and selfhood can hardly be separated from the widespread fascination with otherness in its various guises.

In the texts subjected to scrutiny by the authors of the papers there is a whole range of possible relations between the terms of the dichotomy *self – others*, but harmony/communion vs. violence/oppression represent the extremes of this continuous and unavoidable exchange between individuals, groups, races and

cultures. The current interest in the literature of exiled authors projects the issue in new and appealing ways, considering that identity emerges more and more as fluid and *already* hybridized, which nevertheless does not make the issue of alienation and acculturation any less dramatic and problematic.

Postcolonial criticism but also the archetypal and symbolic approach are appropriate frames for the analysis of identity within this section, which is also (fortunately) rich in literary illustrations. From African-American writers (Ralph Ellison, Toni Morrison) to Serbian (Milorad Pavic) and Brazilian (Chico Buarque), from French (Pierre Drieu La Rochelle) to Romanian (Gabriela Melinescu, Ana Blandiana, Gheorghe Crăciun, Paul Goma), the detailed descriptions of the workings of identity in the textual grammar of poetry, prose and non-fiction will both instruct and delight the readership.

Identity and otherness in their complex interrelationship will consequently bring into attention the third important thematic proposal of the conference, *communication*. A pervasive notion in contemporary reflection, this topic is also often promoted as a “magical” solution to the many spiritual ailments affecting both individuals and communities. Beyond any utopian speculations, the amazing development of communication studies has brought important clarifications in the field, and the acquisitions of this fairly new domain can further shed new light, as proven by the papers in this section, on enduring questions as regards interpersonal relations, both in terms of verbal interactions and of the literary configurations addressing the communicational problematic in an explicit or implicit manner.

Other contributors have responded to the communicational challenge by focusing on terminology and the study of specialized languages, on the didactics of foreign languages and the mutations brought by the new media, but also on subjects pertaining rather to sociology and political discourse and political reform.

Although each section enjoys a definite autonomy and self-sufficiency, the most rewarding thing, in arranging this volume, was to see how the main topics proposed by the conference circulate from one chapter to another, linking them in the most interesting way, due, to a large extent, to the authors’ very efforts to connect the themes, as well as to their interpretive sagacity in identifying and explicating the interplay between identity and communication in a comparative framework.

Carmen Popescu

## **Comparativism in Literature, Linguistics and Anthropology**



## IFIGENIA ÎN VIZIUNEA LUI GOETHE

**Adina BANDICI**

*Universitatea din Oradea*

Based on Tudor Vianu's claim that „*Iphigenia* is the expression of his [Goethe's] aspiration towards peace and serenity”, the aim of this article is to prove that, in Goethe's view, Iphigenia represents an ideal of classical humanism. At the same time, we will show that Orestes is released from the burden of killing his mother by confession and atonement. Goethe's version of *Iphigenia in Tauris* is a reworking of the ancient legend of the Atridae in Euripides' homonymous tragedy. While writing *Iphigenia*, the German playwright was driven by bourgeois, moral and sentimental ideas, but also by enlightened hopes of a renewal of politics and society through a new human model. Goethe transcribed Euripides' tragedy in a modern humanistic age and interwove personal experiences in his version. For him, the focus of the play lies on Orestes' healing after being haunted and tormented by the memory of matricide. Goethe uses Orestes' example to promote redemption through inner purification and public confession of guilt.

**Keywords:** Iphigenia, Orestes, Goethe, neo-humanism, classicism.

### 1. Motivul Ifigeniei în literatura universală

Potrivit *Enciclopediei Universale Britannica*, în mitologia greacă, Ifigenia (în limba greacă, *Ifigeneia* înseamnă „cea născută puternică”) este „fiica cea mare a lui Agamemnon și a Clitemnestrei, soră a Electrei și a lui Oreste. Când flota aheilor s-a oprit în Aulida, tatăl ei a sacrificat-o în cinstea zeiței Artemis, pentru ca vânturile să ducă navele spre Troia. Mama ei i-a răzbunat moartea, ucigându-l pe Agamemnon.” (*Enciclopedia Universală Britannica*: 27). Legenda țesută în jurul Ifigeniei este însă mai complexă. Se presupune că tânăra ar fi fost salvată de Artemis pentru a-i sluji ca preoteasă în Taurida, o regiune stăpânită de barbari.

Ifigenia a fost și a rămas, la fel ca mulți dintre Atrizi, un motiv îndrăgit în literatura universală. Figura Ifigeniei apare în scrierile antice și la Homer, Eschil și Sofocle, dar una dintre cele mai importante adaptări ale mitului Atrizilor se găsește în tragediile lui Euripide (480-406 î.Hr.) care au avut-o ca protagonistă pe Ifigenia: *Ifigenia în Taurida* și *Ifigenia în Aulida*. Printre adaptările moderne se numără tragedia *Iphigenia* (1617) a dramaturgului olandez Samuel Coster, tragedia lui

Racine *Iphigénie* (1674), piesa de teatru a lui Goethe *Iphigenie auf Tauris* (*Ifigenia în Taurida*, 1779/ 1786), *Iphigenia in Delphi* (*Ifigenia în Delfi*, 1941) și *Iphigenie in Aulis* (*Ifigenia în Aulida*, 1943) ale scriitorului german, aparținând curentului naturalist, Gerhart Hauptmann, tragedia *Ifigenia* (1941) a lui Mircea Eliade, tragedia *Im Trauerland* (1977) a scriitorului german Jochen Berg, *Iphigenie in Freiheit* (*Ifigenia în libertate*, 1992) a lui Volker Braun, piesa de teatru *Iphigenia and Other Daughters* (1995) a scriitoarei americane Ellen McLaughlin, *Iph...* (1999), o adaptare a piesei lui Euripide aparținând dramaturgului irlandez Colin Teevan, romanul *The Song of the Kings* (*Cântecul regilor*, 2002) al scriitorului englez Barry Unsworth, piesa de teatru *Iphigenia* (2003) a dramaturgului norvegian Finn Iunker, romanul *Fiica lui Agamemnon* (2003) a scriitorului albanez Ismail Kadare, și piesa *Iphigenia 2.0* (2007) a dramaturgului american Charles L. Mee.

## 2. Receptarea mitului Atrizilor la Goethe

### 2.1. Modelele literare antice ale lui Goethe

Tudor Vianu vede proslăvirea seninătății antice în operele neoumaniștilor germani ca „o compensație oferită neliniștilor prezentului”, din această stare de spirit rezultând, printre scrierile lui Goethe, *Ifigenia în Taurida*, *Elegiile romane*, *Hermann și Dorothea* (Vianu, 1963: 238). Pentru Vianu, „*Ifigenia* este expresia aspirației lui [Goethe] către liniște și seninătate” (*Enciclopedia Universală Britannica*: 234).

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe realizează o operă unică în literatura germană, în care îmbină liricul, epicul și dramaticul. Goethe a străbătut în evoluția sa artistică mai multe curente literare, de la iluminism, la „Sturm und Drang” până la clasicismul german, proclamând un ideal literar umanist, prin ilustrarea unui nou tip de om, caracterizat prin armonie, moralitate, noblețe și eleganță.

Modelele literare antice ale lui Goethe pentru scrierea piesei *Ifigenia în Taurida* sunt *Orestia* lui Eschil și *Ifigenia în Taurida* a lui Euripide. Scriitorul german a scris inițial o versiune în proză în 1779, pe care a transpus-o în versuri în 1786, în timpul călătoriei sale în Italia. *Ifigenia în Taurida* aparține unei epoci de tranziție de la năzuințele libertare, promovate de curentul „Sturm und Drang”, la idealurile estetice ale neoumanismului clasic.

La Euripide, tragedia greacă progresa în adevăr psihologic, în varietatea de sentimente și de idei, în suplețe și mișcare, în asemănarea cu viața reală și în sporirea efectului patetic. Euripide era considerat un răzvrătit, un pesimist, care afirma că toți oamenii sunt egali de la natură. A fost criticat în vremea sa pentru că trata problemele noi ale vremii. Euripide a revoluționat tragedia, i-a dat o structură mai complexă, urmărind obținerea unui efect patetic. Aristotel critică compoziția sa defectuoasă, însă îl numește „cel mai tragic dintre tragici” (Drimba 1970: 76). Euripide elogiaza cele mai frumoase sentimente umane prin figurile Polixeniei,