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Abstract
The study highlights Mihai Eminescu's linguistic ideas and his contribution to the structure of Romanian linguistics. The method used is meta-analytical and comparative.
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Introduction
Without the knowledge of the vast knowledge of philology, the journalist deals with the problems of the language, expressing pertinent points of view: linguistic and historical unity, the relation between language and literature, culture, philosophy, the role of habits and proverbs in speech, syntax, polysemy, neologisms and Gypsy argos, the indestructible tongue-to-peer relationship, etc. Eminescu's linguistic linguistic proficiency tells us that the poet's platform of knowledge has not been built on nothingness, amateurism and arbitrary reading, but on solid treaties belonging to Meyer-Lübke, Friedrich Diez, Hasdeu, Cihac plus all the grammars weather. It almost equated with a sacrilegious omission of a large linguistic work of the Eminescu classical panoply.

In the case of language, Eminescu did not speak much, which, thank God, did not bring forth proselytes “(Ibrăileanu, 1970, p. 120). Taking into account
that, for Constantin Noica, the effigy applied to Eminescu was “a universal uomo” (Noica, 1975, pp. 115-132), it was utopian that linguistics was among the “ashes” type disciplines. With increased concern about language issues and how to express themselves, Eminescu resembles Cassirer, believes Ion Dur (1996), both of whom are conscious that language is a force of culture. As long as the Romanian language has a philosophical load - sounds the hypothesis of Constantin Barbu (Barbu, 1991) - one third of the terms refer to being, reason, logos. In the works of M. Eminescu, L. Blaga and C. Noica, the three archeological concepts are added to the three concepts. To whom Sergiu Al. George consecrated a book (George, 1981), relying on two major ideas: that Eminescu had developed a philosophy and that it gravitated around the notion of “archeus.”

**Linguistics and Philology**

Returning to the philologist's face, revealed especially by C. Noica, we will note that the great thinker of the twentieth century, an ardent studio of the Eminescu manuscripts, discovered his propensity to lexicology, more specifically, the derivation phenomenon with prefixes and suffixes.

On pages 192-193 of the 2261 manuscript (Noica, 1975, pp. 37-43), Eminescu discusses the living suffixes, the dead suffixes, after having previously found 11 words from the Greek pornography. Starting from the supposition that “our language is not new”, but on the contrary “old and stationary” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 221), in the “Language of Romanian Scholars of Transylvania”, the journalist insists on qualities, maturity, homogeneity, the cohesion of Romania, because it is “fully formed in all its parts” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 221).

Above all, chanting, reticent with forced innovations, a semantic enviable wealth, spoken beyond and beyond the boundaries of Romania, bypassing sophisticated, pedantic, pompous expressions (which would degenerate into the “bird language”). An additional argument to validate that “language is the very flower of the Romanian soul's ethnic soul” (Baciu, 2005, p. 40). The Romanian
everywhere uses a simple, frustrating tone, focusing in words on deep ideas, a sign that the mentality of the people had felt their presence: “And because spirit and language are almost identical, and language and nationality - like” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 213), is appreciated in “Language and Nationality”. It seems an ordered article, but nothing more fake, because no one could order the reporter to write, in case of coincidence of opinion between the director and the editor, then, indeed, create the illusion above, an article with thesis. The substantive journalist tried a bet with himself and the specialists, opting for the definition: “The Romanian language is the organ through which the nation inherits the intellectual and historical wealth of its ancestors” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 213-214). A people can not dignity in the absence of the mother tongue transmitted from generation to generation. The German-speaking binder is seeing how it could not have been happier in our situation of the Romanian people, master of the ancestral glove. Thus, the study of the Romanian People's Unit combines skillful linguistics and history, the reader finding that on these lands, Romanian has been spoken since the sixth century when, “at the invasion of avars in Thrace” (in 579) the “ruler led by Morţiu and Comentiol “Included” people who spoke Romanian “(Eminescu, 1970, p. 215). In the footsteps of the chronicler Grigore Ureche, regarding the latinity of the language, the publicist patriot admitted: “Yes ... we come from Rome, dear and beloved compatriots, not from Dacia Traiana!” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 214). The lesson of the history of the language is prolonged by resuscitation of truism: “The unity of the Romanian nation (s) before the formation of the national states” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 214). Investigating documents and compends of national history, the journalist concludes that since the time of Matei Basarab the unity of the spoken language has been manifested. Maybe that's why he also uses a popular, argotic sample: “Better do not mix where the pot is not boiling” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 214). It is, of course, amazed at the lack of care / ease of moving from grave, serious things to humor and orality (Karpf, 2016; (Alkilani, 2017)) through an idiomatic argotic tunnel/tunnel.
After the Romanian language connections with the nationality (in Language and nationality) and with the people (in the “Romanian people's unity”) and the stability of some particularities of the language (in the language of the Romanian scholars in Transylvania), the attention of the journalist with linguistic preoccupations focuses on the structure of the Romanian language (also Renea, 2017). The basic vocabulary has, of course, also a Latin genealogy, but only Slavonic terms have been used to designate the area of the church (in the Church Books and the Church in Romanian Culture), and in Transylvania the foreign occupants brought an unpleasant infusion of Hungarianism and Germanism in the language of the Romanian scholars in Transylvania).

The church has been and has remained the number one bastion of Romanianism through centuries. In those moments, the troubled have appealed to God and the Christian officers to encourage them. Not a few voivodes, headed by Stephen, Constantin Brâncoveanu, rewarded the aid received by the ascension of sacred places. There was forgotten the clean, natural, pleasant, accessible Romanian language. Over time, the language of the church was in the state language. Romance words in the popular sector have gradually replaced the Slavonic terms, gained in the Romanian culture thanks to the Christian missionaries Kiril and Metodiu.

A clear, literary monument is registered in the reign of Matei Basarab. Also in the Middle Ages there were energetic metropolitics, with a special contribution to the evolution of culture, the preservation of the national specificity.

Thus, Varlaam's church, “the spiritual mother of the nation” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 218), gave birth to the unity of the language and the ethnic unity of the people. “Among the components of the language, Eminescu first stopped at the lexicon. As mentioned, it was a Romanic priority, but it had also adopted foreign words from the peoples with whom it had come into contact in the exercise of the religious service, slowly, the Slavonic terms would be shuffled and substituted among others, neolatines. It was well known that in Transylvania, the
prints, the written works assimilated a series of troublesome Hungarians and Germans. The bold journalist proposes the eradication of those damaging vocabulary, persisting the impression of missing a linguistic implant, given that the Romanian language was already formed, stationary. Eminescu's lexical ideas sometimes get a semantic glaze. The occasion is represented by several words with multiple meanings, such as the term “sama” (Eminescu, 1970, pp. 221-222), a component of many expressions and deductions: to notice, to take of itself a single person, and realize, get yourself.

Constantin Noica (1975, p. 36) made a parallel between the Romanian verbal and the German verbs, examining the 239th eminescian manuscript. Voalat gave the idea of the polysemy of the Romanian language, a richness of meanings, which materializes / incorporates in expressions and habits. Visited excitedly by the more ingrained fate of Transylvania, Eminescu went with increasing joy to the literature written in that part of the country, despite exotic linguistic excuses that defiled the essence of our language. The proposed solution: the immediate elimination of unnecessary, non-cantable Germanic and Magyars. Depending on the ordeal of destiny of Transylvania and Bessarabia, the journalist is animated, however, by the revelation: the robustness of the tongue, the cohesion regardless of the cardinal point, the “old and the tongue” coat, concluding that it is fully formed in all parts (Nn), that “he no longer gives buds and new branches” and “a road to produce what is no longer capable, it means to abuse it and to make a road” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 221).

Ideas, press-man's initiatives have not gone unnoticed; they had a cognitive role, irrespective of the linguistic / lexical register used: “Studying Eminescu's ideas, it is firstly necessary to make the necessary distinction between the content of thinking with cognitive functions”, M. Ciurdariu (Ciurdariu, 1965, p. 81) “and that philosophical content that fulfills more thematic, artistic, metaphorical, symbolic or allegorical functions in the poet's writings.” From here, it is easy to reach magic, mythological and folkloric idealism. The semantic interest in the article About housing (Eminescu, 1970, pp. 225-226). The
bourgeois journalist poll with philologists who pleaded for the risky word “pomology”, an inappropriate term, much more clearly being the “tree culture”. An aspect of linguistics that is perceived and commented is stylistic. Admitting polysemy and figurative meaning, the inclination towards metaphor and irony is deduced. Taking as an example the quality of the Romanian language due to Metropolitan Moldavian Varlaam, himself intellectual with literary preoccupation, the journalist sneaks into the text an irony, a paradox: “But Varlaam was a fool. Nowadays neither a member of the Academy could be “(Eminescu, 1970, p. 218).

There is a hint of criticism of the Romanian elite, of the academics, where, on the wide open door, the poor, the incompetence, the lincentities with insignificant merits stepped in. Let's not look at challenging the criteria - in another article - to award the academic prize, something of an embarrassing predictability, improper for an authentic intellectual.

Moving on to another aspect, Eminescu admits tacitly that the literary language is refractory to regionalisms, linguistic varieties, but which do not interfere with the interpersonal communication, compared to the imperfections and the barriers between a sudist and a Nordist from France / Italy. In our country dialects do not encourage incommunication, the message does not fracture, as in other Western countries.

The Gazette allocates pages and encoded language to a disadvantaged social group: the Gypsies. “Bibliographic Notes” (Eminescu, 1970, pp. 235-237) is set in a review of a book on Gypsies signed by Dr. Barbu Constantinescu, Problems of Gypsy Language and Literature in Romania. It is reiterated the origin of the Roma - in India - and the specific phonetics of a randomly distributed population around the world. Like any objective chronicle, the qualities and flaws of the work in question are highlighted.

Another sector of language / linguistics, which is given special attention, is the syntax. The study of the Church in Romanian Culture - one with a thesis, with a precise message: the Romanians' theism, the respect for religious holidays
and the contribution of Orthodoxy in the crystallization of Romanian spirituality. From a grammatical perspective, some linguistic ideas are also foreseen, including “our old language, with its beautiful, but heavy syntax, with its many habits” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 218).

Of course, the journalist understood through the “beautiful” and “heavy” epithets the multitude of propositional parts, the diversity of subordinate sentences, the permutations between the subject and the predicate, between them and the attribute and complement, thus the flexible topic allowing the placement of the temporal and spatial indices at the beginning of an enunciation, infiltration of inversion and poeticity even in the narrative text. The vast horizon of grammatical knowledge belonging to the autodidact gazetteer should not be omitted. Among the grammar treatises published towards the end of the 19th century, the columnist turned to the Syntax Manual by C. S. Stocescu and D. St. Călinescu. His disappointment - double - is based on the cruel truth that “we have no serious writing on the Romanian syntax” and the filling of a void of grammatical concepts with foreign terms in inoports: “Generally, the book fades from neologisms” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 235).

Verdict sounds harsh, implacable, on the whole, the work is a wrong trial. Who would have allowed a negative diagnosis if he had not been a doctrine himself, a super-volunteer in the matter?!

Old science, the phonetic temptation, obsessed Eminescu, many years, in terms of pronunciation. A first proof: “Studies on Pronunciation” examining small phonetic differences between Moldavia and Montenegro. From the front page (Eminescu, 1970, p. 228), the publicist is tentative, persuasive: “A mistake of pronunciation is that of the Romanians in Muntenia who say: ah, here, instead of: gold, here, “then the tiring frequency of the prepositions:” pa, ““ gives, “beyond Moldova, there is the lengthening of the voice” e” in words populated by another “e”: pépene, réce, tréce, conjunctive by spraying the initial particle: do, silence. Aside from the phonitism of the native area, the attentive linguistic phenomenon observer also noticed the transformation of the conson “j” into the
group” gi”, of “z” in” dz” in the examples: giudecata, gioc, dzuu, dziua ...

Emancipation is the assimilation of the French and German languages at that time.

Instead, fear fades miraculously, when newer Romanian words are in play, some estropied ones, without mercy (Eminescu, 1970, p. 230). Here, the journalist censures deviations from the linguistic norm of Transylvania. Whenever he had the opportunity, Eminescu pleaded - in the case of Linguistic Notices - for the phonetic principle in spelling (Eminescu, 1970, pp. 232-234).

A relentless reader of magazines and newspapers, the editor of “Curierul de Iaşi” and “Timpul” was also set up with the Sibiu press. Thus, “positively welcomes the Telegraful” and “Carpathian Albina”, the aim being the thorough investigation of the writing of the journalists. With this pretext - the journal magazine - the professional journalist lobbies on another linguistic sector: spelling, orthopedics and punctuation. For example, the spelling of the second journal seems to be less phonetic than the first, but “tongue is more neat” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 234). Generosity is finally pouring out: “We are enjoying the advancement of phonetics in Transylvania” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 234).

The focus plays an active role in the identification of homonyms and homographies. Some impressions of accent can also be gleaned from the Linguistic Notices article, where, with the accusations of rigor, a few cases of false marking of the accent in the Transylvanian perimeter are amended. The publicist overcomes his professional condition again (Voinea, 2017; Negrea, 2016; Voinea & Negrea, 2017), probing vast knowledge of grammar, phonetics, lexicology etc. Eminescu also showed openness to the history of the language, and to Romanic linguistics. His information on Romanity, the allogeneic element of the lexical structure of the Romanian language, the Slavic adrarast, the infiltration of the Greeks, the Turks, and the Germans, are, of course, the spheres of the history of the Romanian language. But the resemblance of Romanian spoken in the nineteenth century with post-classical Latin, along the lines of
plural forms, converges to the side of the diachronic (also in “linguistic notes”). Oases of romantic linguistics can be found in “Studies on pronunciation”, by comparing the Moldovan pronunciation with the Tuscan dialect (Eminescu, 1970, p. 230) and the Romanian language with the Calabrez dialect. A great European linguist is evoked in “Friedich Diez” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 261) which analyzed the controversies between the Romanian linguistic schools on the Romanc origin of the Romanian language, rejecting the slavofilm point of view. Going over the Orthographic Horseshoes (Eminescu, 1970, p. 262), the article Romanians in Moravia conceals in the subtext the dramatism of the Romanian language preservation, the natural pronunciation by a population condemned to the loss of self-identity (Roșca, 2017; Qatawneh, 2018). The range of Eminescu journalism also has studies unpredictable. For example: “About philologists” starts from a parable about the boy who knows “two bucks to the Germans” and imitating Schiller.

Some “arrows” are sent to philologists who have no common vision on profound linguistic phenomena and do not take into account the popular language (Eminescu, 1970, pp. 260-261).

Conclusions

Polemizing with the written language, she is accused of undoubtedly promoting neologisms, hilarious, grotesque, trivial syntaxes. From this angle, the press, scholars and academics, pseudo-instructed abroad, contributed to the emergence of a new cosmopolitan idiom, “the tongue of the bird” in Maiorescian terminology, “the drunkenness of words.”

Fortunately, a handful of shining scholars voluntarily engaged in an unequal dispute with the aim of safeguarding the language of the nation, preserving its defining features. Specifically, they are the representatives of the church, “enemies” on the face, of the mutilation of the Romanian language. The Church is due to the fact that the Romanian language spoken in these lands remained “the same, one and inseparable in the palace, in the hut, and in all
Romania” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 218). From the perspective of interdisciplinarity (Vlăduțescu, 2012; Drămnescu & Enăchescu, 2018; Basic, 2018; Vlăduțescu, 2018), Eminescu relates the linguistics of literature, culture, philosophy, perhaps not with the same abnegation with which he approached some clearly delimited themes. And yet in the intertext it can be read that language and people, language and nationality form indestructible couples.

In lexicology articles, references to neologisms and derivation could not be missed. Conservative, reticent, the journalist likes to be anachronistic, spreading the Romanian vocabulary with foreign vocabularies. Neologisms are stringent under certain conditions, when the Romanian language lacks the word apt to designate a new situation: “The confusion of elementary logic leads to grotesque contexts. Eminescu exemplifies the terms << ingrat >> and << grat >>, subject to derivation according to the model of his affixing and prefixing <<satisfactory, dissatisfied >>” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 213-214).

According to the theory of meanings, the journalist knows that there is a concrete and abstract meaning (Eminescu, 1970, p. 227), and according to another criterion, principal, secondary and figurative sense (Eminescu, 1970, p. 220-221). Sometimes, the author of language articles defames his vocation of philosophy and word games: “Satisfaction or dissatisfaction are psychological phenomena, grace, and embarrassment are entirely ethical” (Eminescu, 1970, p. 228). The history of the Romanian people was intertwined with the tongue. Compared to the subjugated people, the Turkish, Russian, Austro-Hungarian and Habsburg oppression, the language opposed the influence of foreign influences, displaying almost metallic resistance, accepting only some lexical implants or grammatical adaptations. A pillar of Romanianism, of continuity, is the church.

Being “stationary, old, fully formed” since the sixth century, the Romanian language preached from the pulpit was stripped of undesirable linguistic additions (Germanic, Slavonic, Magyar). The unity of the language impressed the unity, the solidarity of the Romanians.
Traditionally, in some respects, the journalist also expressed modernist views, as in the article Development of the Language (Eminescu, 1970, p. 219), through poets, prose writers.

The culture-literature report reveals an unexpected play of words, with philosophical (Frunză, 2018) and metaphorical irises: “The culture of the privileged classes, at least, is far above the literature of their country, but it is alien; literature is national, but it is culture. People of contrasts is a phrase “(Eminescu, 1970, p. 219). Language, reluctant, circumspect, with linguistic innovation, may remain behind culture (Eminescu, 1970, p. 221). Also in the category of philological articles are mentioned: Friedrich Diez (an obituary about the European linguist immortal) and about philologists conceived in another way: a parable with the boy who does not know “two bucks to the Germans” but who hopes to produce literature in his own way Schiller.

REFERENCES


