Table of contents

Interdiscursive Strategy of Integration in A. S. Byatt's Literary Discourse

Nataliya Chendey, Uzhhorod National University, Ukraine

Abstract

The process of discourse interaction, also referred to as interdiscourse, presents one of the relatively new concepts in the field of modern linguistics. The notion is based on the theory which states that any discourse contains traces of other surrounding discourses. The relevance of our research is based on the fact that the versatile aspects of interdiscursivity are insufficiently studied, in particular the specificity of its implementation in the context of literary discourse. The aim of our research is to explore the phenomenon of discourse interaction and its strategies in A. S. Byatt's literary heritage.

Keywords: interdiscourse, integration, diachronic, genre interdiscursivity, A. S. Byatt.

Introduction

The notion of interdiscourse (a term coined by Norman Fairclough) presents a relatively new concept in modern linguistics. Interdiscourse is defined as a process of discourse interaction in a literary text, the study of which was initiated by M. Pêcheux who pointed out that "any discourse contains traces of other discourses" (Pêcheux 1982). However, the question of the demarcation line between them seems to be open due to the blurriness of the notions discourse and text on the one hand, and interdiscourse and intertextuality on the other. Consequently, there is no unified comprehension of this phenomenon in scientific literature (Foucault 2003; Fairclough 2003; Rozenfeld 2018; Widdowson 2004; Williams 1999; et al.). Taking into account the specificity of discursive processes with regard to the external factors, it appears possible to define interdiscourse as a process of interaction of a literary discourse with other verbal and non-verbal discourses within the scope of a definite literary text or a thematic unity of texts. A strong focus is laid on the shift to some other cognitive system, representing a circle of conceptual perception: an author (individual conceptual domain) – artistic reality (conceptual structure of a text) – a reader (cognitive mechanisms of perception) and their interaction.

1. The notion of interdiscourse and its specificity

The term 'interdiscourse' was coined by Norman Fairclough, one of the founders of critical discourse analysis. Discourse analysis, as stated by Fairclough, is not merely the linguistic analysis of texts, but an oscillation between a focus on specific texts and a focus on what he prefers to call the "order of discourse" (Fairclough 2003: 3). According to Fairclough, an 'order of discourse' is a particular combination or configuration of genres, discourses and styles which constitutes the discursive aspect of a network of social practices. Fairclough points out that critical discourse analysis aims at investigating the relationship between discourse practices and the wider social and cultural context. The term 'order of discourse' can be traced back to Michel Foucault (2003: 25), a French philosopher, who argues that discourses emerge and transform not according to a developing series of unarticulated, common worldviews, but according to a vast and complex set of discursive and institutional relationships, which are defined as much by breaks and ruptures as by unified themes. Based on the theoretical findings

of Foucault, the notion of interdiscourse was introduced, in order to indicate extraverbal processes external to discursive practice, which act as sociocultural and linguistic context and determine the semantic characteristics of discursive acts.

Foucault suggests that "the unity of a discourse is based not so much on the permanence and uniqueness of an object, as on the space in which various objects emerge and are continuously transformed" (Foucault 2003: 45). Therefore, the driving force of change occurring in a discourse is not some force external to discourse, but the discourse itself. 'Space' in Foucault's statement implies the relationship between "institutions, economic and social processes, behavioral patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification, modes of characterization" (Foucault 2003: 62). A discursive formation limits the form of objects, and, according to Foucault, this is a function of the interdiscursive relations between different discursive formations and the relation between discursive and non-discursive practices that constitute the discursive formation. In a narrow sense, interdiscourse denotes discursive-linguistic phenomena which in relation to a certain discursive integrity act as external.

M. Pêcheux (1982: 39) introduced a true innovation into the theory of discourse: his theory of interdiscourse, defined as the 'complex whole in dominance' of conditions of discourse production. Discourse began to be perceived as affected by several, mutually different, discursive formations (which are also called types of discourse) involved in unequal relations. In order to develop a method for describing such relations, an interdiscursive domain had to be taken into account which was conceived of as the linguistic 'outside' of single discourses. Based on this theory, any discourse contains traces of other surrounding discourses, thus the subject of discourse is not the only source of its meaning. It is also a discourse in the process of its formation, which is simultaneously disintegrated in the framework of complex relations of language and interdiscourse. That is, the object of discourse analysis was not the discursive formation itself but its constitutive frontier, and its identity was linked to the stabilization of a certain enunciative configuration. Interdiscourse was seen as a modality of a relationship which served to highlight such a configuration.

Interdiscourse also refers to the specific surroundings of the discursive process, those external factors which determine the form and content of discourse. It is not a mere representation of existing discourses, simply the designation of prior discourses, or description of what is common for all discourses, but a linguo-sociocultural space of a discursive nature, in which a certain type of discourse is generated and formed. Interdiscourse presents a domain of existence and development of discursive formations, which, according to Pêcheux, "constitute a structure of a discourse in accordance with certain cultural and historical conditions" (Pêcheux 1982: 111). It also designates the discursive and ideological space which deploys the discursive formations, in functions of relationships of domination-subordination contradiction.

For the purposes of our research and taking into account the outlined specificity of interdiscourse, we consider it possible to define this notion as a process of interaction of a literary discourse with other verbal and non-verbal discourses within the framework of a certain literary text or a thematic unity of texts.

2. The interdiscursive strategy of integration in a literary discourse

Interdiscourse is, to a large extent, a recipient-oriented concept, which creates a hierarchy of contexts by means of including various codes from different areas of culture. It may be frequently manifested in a literary discourse, which is perceived as a compilation of literary

works that constitute the result of an interaction between the text, the author's intentions, and a complex set of possible reactions of the recipient. Literary discourse is manifested in the complex ideological and thematic unity of an indefinite number of literary works. This unity of literary works that are in close and dynamic interaction within the corresponding cultural and historical context provides the basis for the division of literary discourse into various types. Literary discourse, consisting of an infinite number of implementations of the intertextual structures, reveals itself as a chaotic combination of various types of discourse that educe the text to the interdiscursive level.

Literary discourse is inevitably related to the communicative space of the era in which it is created, and a literary text acts as the point of intersection of various types of discursive practices. The study of the interaction between different types of discourses opens up a possibility of a more diverse interpretation of the author's intention in a particular literary work. It also allows tracing the general tendencies of cross-discursive interaction and, therefore, reliably determining the cultural and philological context of the literary text. The interaction of discourses introduces a new sociocultural context into the main discourse and produces new meanings.

Interdiscourse, which results from a cognitive shift from one typological model of text production and perception into another, may be spontaneous or deliberate (simulated). Spontaneous interdiscursivity is manifested in "a natural process of reintegration of human knowledge dispersed in different discursive formations" (Kristeva 1980: 24). Deliberate interdiscursivity manifests itself as a special strategy of the author, which is implemented with the purpose of conscious and purposeful text production. The deliberate introduction of the lexical and structural features of other types of discourses into the literary discourse expands the semantic connections of the literary text and makes the discourse authentic.

The author of a literary text may include in its structure any kind of discourse in order to express their worldview. The presence of the elements of various types of discourses in the speech of the characters makes the model of reality, created by the author, complete. Interdiscursivity contributes to the ambiguity of the text, making its meanings multidimensional. It enables the text to discover its cultural justification and cultural context and allows the author to enter into a dialogue with the cultural context of the era as well as with the recipient of the text. The mechanism of interdiscursivity is implemented by means of various strategies of the author. Despite the increasing interest in exploration of the concept of interdiscursivity and abundance of research devoted to this notion, scientists have not investigated the peculiarities of interdiscursive interaction strategies in literary texts. For the purposes of our research, we should explore simulated interdiscourse as a result of a deliberate process of text production performed by the author of a literary text. We should differentiate between two types of discourse heterogeneity in a literary discourse: integration, which is performed as a singular inclusion in the domain of a literary text, and interaction as a reciprocal influence of discourses which is performed at the level of the entire text. Thus, various discourses may be implemented by the author of a literary text into the main discourse by means of integrative or interactive interdiscursive strategies. In order to perform the analysis of interdiscursive strategies in a literary text, we should designate the typical forms of interdiscursive relations. Interaction as an interdiscursive strategy may be implemented in a literary text by means of diachronic and genre interdiscursivity.

Diachronic interdiscursivity presents the process of interaction within the framework of a literary text of discourses which belong to distinctive epochs. As a spontaneous type of discourse interaction, interdiscursivity in its diachronic aspect relates to any written text since

all texts present a prerequisite and condition necessary for the formation of a new text. The interdiscursive process is attributed not only to the interaction of texts which belong to different epochs, but also to the interrelation of the systems of texts correlated with the norms and knowledge characteristic of those epochs. However, spontaneous diachronic interdiscursivity presents a certain difficulty in the process of its identification, as this kind of discourse interaction is involuntary and exists in all types of texts. Simulated diachronic interdiscursivity, on the other hand, is recognizable in a text, as a deliberate change of the discourse of modernity to the discourse of a particular historical epoch, or their interaction in a literary text.

Diachronic interdiscursivity may be expressed through the purposeful violation of the conventional speech norms. Nevertheless, the author of the simulated discourse, as well as the recipient of the text, as a rule, does not possess any communicative experience in the framework of the simulated discourse. Therefore, this lack of experience for appropriate discourse reproduction imposes certain restrictions on the possibilities of marking the simulated discourse in a text. Diachronic interdiscursivity is, to a large extent, determined by the general cultural competence and the knowledge of the author of a literary text. It is based on the author's intentions and the ability to reproduce a simulated discourse by reference to the knowledge obtained from other sources. The perception of the text by the recipient is respectively based on his/her ability to identify the simulated discourse created by the author.

Genre interdiscursivity presents a process of interaction within the framework of a literary text of discourses which represent various genres. Integration of distinctive genres creates a complex narrative which may intricate the perception of the text by the recipient. Genre interdiscursivity is implemented in the text by means of the use of characteristic features of distinctive genres. In the process of their interaction one genre can dominate the discourse, while the other performs a subordinate role; or their typical features are equally implemented in the text. The use of this type of discourse interaction is determined by the author's intentions and artistic conception.

3. The strategy of interaction

3.1: Diachronic interdiscursivity in A. S. Byatt's literary discourse

The interdiscursive strategy of interaction is implemented in Byatt's literary works in the form of reciprocal interaction of various genres and temporal discourses performed on the level of the whole text.

The novel *Possession: A Romance* by A. S. Byatt, which is considered to be Byatt's most prominent work, is a manifestation of the strategy of diachronic interdiscoursivity at its finest. It establishes a dialogical relationship between the nineteenth and the twentieth century. Byatt defines it as an "attempt to connect a bygone time with the very present that is flitting away from us" (Byatt 1991: 2). The author notes that with the course of time and the older she becomes, the more habitually she thinks of her own life as "a relatively short episode in a long story of which it is a part". Byatt is known for her professional concern with the past, particularly the 19th century, as a researcher of the Victorian era, which was also reflected in her works.

The compositional organization of the novel is two-dimensional. It is based on the narration of two stories, which are of the same significance in the context of the novel and consist of overlapping sets of events. The narrative of the novel traces the adventures of two present-day literary scholars, Roland Michell and Maud Bailey, in their joint quest for the story

about the relationship of two fictional nineteenth-century poets, Randolph Henry Ash and Christabel LaMotte. The two temporal discourses are portrayed separately. Although the narrative of the novel is mainly located in the twentieth century, it moves backward in order to consistently reveal the development of the story between the nineteenth-century poets.

The novel reconstructs the impression of the Victorian novel. In *On Histories and Stories* A. S. Byatt noted that "it seems somehow important to be able to make coherent texts using words as they were used, together" (Byatt 2001: 3). She also believes in historical resurrection through fiction and states:

> I do believe that if I read enough, and carefully enough, I shall have some sense of what words meant in the past, and how they related to other words in the past, and be able to use them in a modern text so that they do not lose their relations to other words in the interconnected web of their own vocabulary.
>
> (Byatt 2001: 6)

Thus, the authenticity of her nineteenth-century texts is of great importance to the writer.

Possession, as a complex multi-layered novel, which, as Byatt herself states:

> […] plays serious games with the variety of possible forms of narrating the past – the detective story, the biography, the mediaeval verse Romance, the modern romantic novel, and Hawthorne's fantastic historical Romance in between, the campus novel, the Victorian third-person narration, the epistolary novel, the forged manuscript novel, and the primitive fairy tale of the three women, filtered through Freud's account of the theme in his paper on the Three Caskets.
>
> (Byatt 1991: 7)

The 'forged manuscript novel' in Byatt's perception refers to the variety of texts created by her, which are aimed to represent the Victorian discourse.

The sophisticated process of recreation of the discourse of the past is presented in different ways. A. S. Byatt aimed to create an illusion of fidelity to the nineteenth-century environment. She pointed out that writing Victorian words in Victorian contexts, in a Victorian order, and in Victorian relations of one word to the next was the only way I could think of to show one could hear the Victorian dead. Byatt also informed that she "read the dead writers Christabel read, the French monk, Jean d'Arras, John Keats and John Milton, whose snakes and Lamias inform her writing" (Byatt 1991: 4). For the Victorians were not simply Victorian. They read their past and resuscitated it. Representation of Victorian discourse in the novel is embodied in the use of Victorian vocabulary, Victorian documents and the omniscient Victorian narrator. Victorian vocabulary is represented through stylization of literary texts of that period, such as tales and poems, written by fictional characters.

Byatt's conviction of the possibility of restoration of the nineteenth-century discourse is illustrated in the extracts of Victorian poetry. However, the author states that "the 19th-century poems that were not 19th-century poems wrote themselves. They fitted into the metaphorical structure of my novel, but were not mine, as my prose is mine" (Byatt 1991: 1). Nevertheless, these instances of Victorian poetry were also written by the author herself:

> Since riddles are the order of our day
> Come here, my love, and I will tell thee one.

There is a place to which all Poets come
Some having sought it long, some unawares,
Some having battled monsters, some asleep
Who chance upon the path in thickest dream,
Some lost in mythy mazes, some direct
From fear of death, or lust of life or thought
And some who lost themselves in Arcady […]

(Byatt 1991: 420)

The discourse of the past is also evidenced in numerous insertions of non-literary Victorian documents, such as diaries and private letters. A unified picture of the past is presented through these textual traces:

We are rational nineteenth-century beings, we might leave the coup de foudre to the weavers of Romances - but I have certain evidence that you know what I speak of, that you acknowledged, however momently (that infinite moment) that at least what I claim is true

(Byatt 1991: 175)

They serve as manifestation of the everyday speech of the Victorian characters of the novel:

My dear, I sit here and write, to whom but thee? I feel better here amongst thy things-the pen is reluctant to form 'thee', 'thy', there is no one there, and yet here is still a presence […]. I am no blind mouldiwarp, my Lady, nor no well-trained lady's maid to turn my head and not see what is stated not to concern me. You need not hurry them away to lie in your sewing-basket or run upstairs to fold them under your handkerchiefs. I am no Sneak, no watcher, no Governess. A governess is what I am most surely not. From that fate you rescued me, and you shall never, for one moment, one little moment, suppose me ungrateful or making claims.

(Byatt 1991: 42)

The discourse of the twentieth century is also reflected through perception of the past by the main character. Roland, a Victorian scholar, who lives in the basement of a decaying Victorian house, and reads books covered in "tenacious Victorian dust", attends "international conferences on Victorian poetry" and in his quest visits Seal Court, an example of "Victorian Gothic at its most tracery-like" with "a Victorian water garden" (Byatt 1991: 96).

Another feature which contributes to the representation of Victorian discourse in the novel is the use of a third-person omniscient narrator. It is widely recognized that the nineteenth-century narrator was assuming the omniscience of a god. However, Byatt perceives this kind of narrator as a kind of a fictive narrator who can creep closer to the feelings and the inner life of characters – as well as providing a Greek chorus – than any first-person mimicry. This omniscient narrator is deliberately used by her three times in the historical narrative, always to tell what the historians and biographers of the fiction never discovered, always to heighten the reader's imaginative entry into the world of the text.

The combination of various forms of realization of the past creates its persuasive image and serves as a manifestation of discourse of the nineteenth century. The discourse of the past in *Possession* influences the development of the action, since the process of deciphering the

mysteries of the past forms the basis of the novel's narrative. Fiction and history are blended in order to create a new perception of the past and the present as well. The development of the story in two temporal discourses puts readers in a position which allows them to form multiple judgments and interpretations.

3.2: Genre interdiscursivity in A. S. Byatt's literary discourse

The interactive strategy of genre interdiscursivity is used by Byatt in her story *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye*. Byatt herself refers to it as a fairy story, a term, which presumably may be the result of combination of two literary genres: a short story and a fairy tale. However, the story in its nature also presents some characteristic features of novellas, particularly in its length. As a novella, it depicts the tale of one particular character and does not involve any major conflicts or sub-plots. In *On Histories and Stories*, while reflecting on the process of writing of this story, Byatt points out that it was written as a result of her discovery, that "an interest in tales is something the young have, and the ageing rediscover" (Byatt 2001: 131). She perceives a literary fairy tale as a wonderful, versatile hybrid form, which draws on primitive apprehensions and narrative motifs, and then uses them to think consciously about human beings and the world.

A fairy story is a combination of two narrative types which results in a synthesis of a folklore discourse of a fairy tale and a realistic discourse of a short story. As Byatt states, these are modern literary stories and they do play quite consciously with a postmodern creation and recreation of old forms. The manifestation of the interactive strategy of genre interdiscursivity in *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye* is expressed through its compositional diversity as well as the interaction of fairy and realistic elements. The characteristic elements of the two genres can hardly be differentiated due to their vague outlines. The text presents a transition from a realistic narrative to a fairy tale narrative. Their synthesis is represented by means of various compositional and structural forms. The fairy tale discourse in the story is introduced by the very opening sentence:

> Once upon a time, when men and women hurtled through the air on metal wings, when they wore webbed feet and walked on the bottom of the sea, learning the speech of whales and the songs of the dolphins, when pearly-fleshed and jeweled apparitions of Texan herdsmen and houris shimmered in the dusk on Nicaraguan hillsides, when folk in Norway and Tasmania in dead of winter could dream of fresh strawberries, dates, guavas and passion fruits and find them spread next morning on their tables, there was a woman who was largely irrelevant, and therefore happy.
>
> (Byatt 1995: 43)

The cliché 'once upon a time' serves as an immediate signpost of a fairy discourse. Different variations of fairy tale clichés may be evidenced throughout the whole text "At the time when my story begins the green sea was black, sleek as the skins of killer whales, and the sluggish waves were on fire, with dancing flames and a great curtain of stinking smoke" (Byatt 1995). The protagonist of the story is also introduced through the help of a fairy tale cliché of directly addressing the reader: "Nevertheless our narratologist, whose name was Gillian Perholt, found herself in the air, between London and Ankara". The omniscient narrator serves as a reminder of a fairy discourse in the story: "Equally, you can imagine Emmeline Porter for yourself, she has no more to do with this story" (Byatt: 1995: 45).

The interaction of the two discourses is reflected in Gillian's attitude towards the magical creature, and its abrupt appearance in her hotel room: "She was later to wonder how she could be so matter-of-fact about the presence of the gracefully lounging Oriental daimon in a hotel room". She does not question the fact of existence of this marvelous being, as "at the time, she unquestioningly accepted his reality and his remarks as she would have done if she had met him in a dream – that is to say, with a certain difference, a certain knowledge that the reality in which she was not everyday" (Byatt 1995: 82). The other characters of the story also perceive the djinns as quite prosaic. Gillian's colleague and friend, Orhan, in his speech during the conference informs, that these creatures are "one of the three orders of created intelligences under Allah […], formed of subtle fire, and man, created from the dust of the earth". There are three orders of djinns – flyers, walkers and divers; they are shape-shifters, and like human beings, divided into servants of God and servants of Iblis, the demon lord. The Koran often exhorts the djinns and men equally to repentance and belief, and there do exist legal structures governing the marriage and sexual relations of humans and djinns. They are creatures of this world, sometimes visible, sometimes invisible; they haunt bathrooms and lavatories, and they fly through the heavens. They have their own complex social system and hierarchies.

A fairy tale discourse is also reflected in a common motif of magical wishes. After the main character of the story releases the djinn, he grants her three wishes and informs her on the limits of his magical abilities:

> There are laws of the praeternatural within which we work, all of us, which cannot be broken. You may not, for instance, wish to have all your wishes granted in perpetuity. You may not wish for eternal life, for it is your nature to be mortal, as it is mine to be immortal. I cannot by magic hold together your atomies, which will dissolve.
>
> (Byatt 1995: 78)

He also emphasizes, that the number of wishes is restricted to three, a typical magical number peculiar to a fairy tale discourse: "Three is three, a number of power" (Byatt 1995: 79). Thus, as peculiar to fairy tale, the fairy discourse in Byatt's story is characterized by some definite rules. She notes that:

> […] an all-important part of our response to the world of the tales is our instinctive sense that they have rules. There are things that can and can't happen, will and won't happen – a prohibition is there to be broken, two of three brothers or sisters are there to fail, the incestuous king will almost always dance at his daughter's wedding to the prince in whose court she has found refuge as a kitchen slave or a goose girl
>
> (Byatt 1995: 12)

Contrary to a characteristic fairy tale 'happily ever after', the story's resolution is unpredictable and more typical for a novella. Since the preternatural laws require the Djinn to remain Gillian's service until all three wishes have been made, the protagonist uses her third wish to implement the Djinn's dearest desire and grant him freedom.

In the subtitle of her novel *Possession* Byatt defines it as romance. The choice of the subtitle as a clarification of the genre serves as an invitation for the readers to approach the text as an example of this genre. Byatt notes that romance allows for "a certain latitude, both as to its fashion and material", which a writer "would not have felt himself entitled to assume, had he professed to be writing a Novel" (Byatt 1991: 2). In her comparison of the two genres she

suggests, that a novel is presumed to aim at a very minute fidelity, not merely to the possible, but to the probable and ordinary course of man's experience", while a romance "must rigidly subject itself to laws, and while it sins unpardonably so far as it may swerve aside from the truth of the human heart - has fairly a right to present that truth under circumstances, to a great extent, of the writer's own choosing or creation. The reasons behind her choice of the genre are explained by her in the following way "The point of view in which this tale comes under the Romantic definition lies in the attempt to connect a bygone time with the very present that is flitting away from us" (Byatt 1991: 4).

However, the genre, as defined by Byatt, is not homogeneous in its nature, and the traces of many other genres may be evidenced in the text of this novel. This fact provides the basis for the possible use of genre interdiscursivity by the author.

Possession is often defined as a neo-Victorian novel, the term which was coined and defined by Dana Shiller as a subset of the historical novel "at once characteristic of postmodernism and imbued with a historicity reminiscent of the nineteenth–century novel" (Shiller 1997: 1). This novel is also referred to as historiographic metafiction, a work of fiction, which combines literary devices of metafiction with historical fiction. The term was coined by Linda Hutcheon. According to Hutcheon, in *A Poetics of Postmodernism*, works of historiographic metafiction are "those well-known and popular novels which are both intensely self-reflexive and yet paradoxically also lay claim to historical events and personages" (Hutcheon 1988: 5). She defines such novels as those, "whose metafictional self-reflexivity (and intertextuality) renders their implicit claims to historical veracity somewhat problematic" (Hutcheon 1989: 3). This genre is used as a representation of history and fiction as human constructs. Since Byatt knowingly engages the readers in a dialogue with texts of the previous century; by doing so, the past and present become connected. Hutcheon calls the modern kind of narrative as the mimesis of process, in contrast to the Victorian linear narration which is called 'the mimesis of product'. Thus, Byatt's narrative can be referred to the definition of 'the mimesis of process' as it consists of multiple levels of narration.

Conclusion

Interaction, as an interdiscursive strategy, may be implemented in a literary text by means of diachronic and genre interdiscursivity. Diachronic interdiscursivity presents the process of interaction within the framework of a literary text of discourses which belong to distinctive epochs. It depends on the general cultural competence and the knowledge of the author of a literary text. It may be expressed through the purposeful violation of the conventional speech norms. Diachronic interdiscursivity finds its full manifestation in Byatt's most prominent work and a Booker-prize winning novel *Possession*, as it establishes a dialogical relationship between the nineteenth and the twentieth century. The novel is based on the narration of two stories, which are of the same significance and present different temporal discourses, which are portrayed separately. A unified picture of the discourse of the past is presented through various textual traces, as they serve as a manifestation of the everyday speech of the 19th –century characters. The representation of the Victorian discourse in the novel is embodied in the use of Victorian vocabulary, Victorian documents and also the omniscient Victorian narrator. The combination of two temporal discourses and their simultaneous development allows the readers to form multiple judgments and interpretations.

Genre interdiscursivity, as one of interdiscursive strategies, presents a process of interaction within the framework of a literary text of discourses which represent various genres.

It may be implemented in the text by means of the use of characteristic features of distinctive genres and is determined by the author's intentions. It is used by Byatt in *Possession* since the novel combines the features of several genres. Although it was identified by the author as a romance, *Possession* is also often referred to as a neo-Victorian, a subset of a historical novel, and as historiographic metafiction, a work of fiction, which combines literary devices of metafiction with historical fiction, since Byatt engages the readers in a dialogue with texts of a previous century, connecting the past and the present. The strategy of genre interdiscursivity was also implemented by Byatt in her story *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye*, which was defined by the author as a fairy story. This term presumably denotes the result of interaction of two literary genres: a short story and a fairy tale. In addition, the structure of the story also resembles another literary genre – a novella. The *Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye* combines two narrative types, which results in a synthesis of the folklore discourse of a fairy tale and the realistic discourse of a short story. Their manifestation is expressed through the compositional diversity of the story as well as the interaction of fairy and realistic elements, the use of fairy tale clichés and other fairy elements, such as magical creatures, magical wishes, and magical numbers.

References

Byatt, Antonia Susan. 1995. *The Djinn in the Nightingale's Eye*. London: Vintage Books.

Byatt, Antonia Susan. 1991. *Possession: A Romance*. London.: Vintage.

Byatt, Antonia Susan. 2001. *On Histories and Stories*. London: Vintage Books.

Cros, Edmond. 1988. *Theory and Practice of Sociocriticism*, translated by Jerome Schwartz. University of Minnesota Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 2003. *Analysing Discourse Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, Michel. 2003. *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Helsloot, Niels. 2008. *Pecheux's contribution to discourse analysis*. Historical Social Research.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1988. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. New York and London: Routledge.

Hutcheon, Linda. 1989. *Historiographic Metafiction Parody and the Intertextuality of History. Intertextuality and Contemporary American Fiction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kristeva, Julia. 1980. *Word, Dialogue and Novel. Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York, NY: Colombia University Press.

Pêcheux, Michel. 1982. *Language, semantics and ideology*. London: MacMillan.

Rozenfeld, Július. 2018. The concept of a new nation or the new concept of a nation". in esse: English Studies in Albania 1: 57-70.

Scollon, Ron, Scollon, Suzie Wong. 2001. *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach*. Oxford – Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Shiller, Dana. 1997. *The redemptive past in the neo–Victorian novel. Studies in the Novel*. Denton-Texas: North Texas State University.

Widdowson, Henry George. 2004. *Text, Context, Pretext: Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, Glyn. 1999. *French Discourse Analysis: The method of post-structuralism*. London: Routledge.

Nataliya Chendey
Uzhhrod National University, Uzhhorod,
Faculty of Foreign Philology
Universytetska Street, 14
88000
nataliia.chendei@uzhnu.edu.ua

Cohesion as a Linguistic-Stylistic Strategy in the Poem *Irọ́* Written by Akinwumi Isola

Michael A, Abiọdun and Taiwo A. Adekẹmi, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria
Orebe O. Oluwabukọla, Federal University, OyeEkiti, Nigeria

Abstract

Writers and speakers rely on linguistic resources in the construction of texts. They are conscious of building unified, readable and decodable texts that will carry intended meanings to their audience. Different linguistic resources are deployed and utilized to construct texts, and one of the resources is cohesion. As a linguistic resource in text construction, it is a strategy of using linguistic elements that reflect a relation of meaning in a text to create unity. Such elements may be in the domain of lexis or syntax (grammar). This study examines and describes cohesion as a linguistic strategy in the construction of the poem **Irọ́** *written by Akinwumi Isola. The poem describes one of the inherent behaviour of lying or engagement in falsehood that is common among the human species. The study relies on the orientation of Systemic Functional Linguistics as advanced by Halliday and Hassan (1976). It is revealed in the study that cohesive devices are reliable instruments in text construction, in this case, a poem. The study adds to our knowledge of cohesion as it applies to the analysis of Yoruba texts.*

Keywords: cohesion, texts, meaning, poem, inherent behaviour.

1. Introduction

Cohesion is one of the strategies used in text construction for the purpose of unity, clarity, and above all, to create meaning. Writers and speakers make use of cohesion as a linguistic resource to enhance coherence, and thereby effect the success of discourse. A text is adjudged successful if it is readable and meaningful to the reader. This is because effective readability and understanding implies that a writer has successfully transmitted intended information and messages in the text, (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Osisanwo 2005, Tanskanen 2006).

This study investigates and describes how Akinwumi Isola, one of the foremost creative writers in the Yoruba language, uses linguistic resources from the Yoruba language to build a readable and decodable poem titled **Irọ́** 'falsehood'. It is one the poems in his collection of poems in *Àfàìmọ̀ àti àwọn àròfọ̀ mìíràn*. In the poem, the author describes one of the human traits, which is the act of lying or engagement in falsehood, and which, he claimed, is practiced at every level of human relations. The author avers that the act is common to every person or group of persons and is practiced in every condition and situation. To effectively bring the message of the poem to the reader, the author deploys a number of cohesive devices to put the poem together as a unified text; this study brings to the fore these cohesive devices as displayed in the text.

2. Cohesion

Cohesion is a linguistic technique of creating unity in a discourse with the aim of rendering the discourse readable and meaningful. It is a strategy of enhancing an effective communicative goal. Either in speech or in writing, cohesion plays a prominent role in eliciting meaning in discourse. It explains how meaning is construed based on the semantic relations that are established between and among lexical and grammatical elements in discourse (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Lonyangapuo 2015). The scholar Schiffrin (1987: 62) writes that "cohesion has to do with semantic meaning. It consists of related lexical and grammatical markers through discourse to facilitate coherence, and (it) is a means by which speakers (and writers) meet communicative goals effectively." Cohesion can be lexical or grammatical; each is designed to create continuity in a text by linking linguistic elements to one another in a meaningful way within discourse such that information is easily accessible to the reader or hearer.

Grammatical cohesion is achieved in discourse through cohesive devices that include reference, substitution, ellipses and conjunction. They all play robust roles in text or discourse construction. It must be stressed that a piece of discourse does not need to exhibit all the devices before it is meaningful to the hearer or reader. Reference refers to that strategy of making the interpretation of a linguistic element in a discourse dependent on another element, (Halliday and Hasan 1976). Reference may be anaphoric or cataphoric. When reference is made to an element previously mentioned in the discourse it is anaphoric, but when it is made to an element or a feature that would come later in the text it is cataphoric. Ellipsis refers to cases in discourse whereby words are deliberately omitted in a sentence without any loss in meaning (Osisanwo 2005, Jabeen, Mehmood and Iqbal 2013). It is an omission of elements in a clause, and the reader is required to refer to previous clauses to retrieve the omitted element for effective understanding of a text. Substitution, as a grammatical cohesive device signifies cases where a linguistic element is used to replace a previously mentioned element or expression. Halliday and Hasan (1976:89) write that "it is a relation on the lexico-grammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary." Conjunction has the semantic function of relating elements within a text to enhance and direct the flow of information. In discourse, conjunctions are used to show how previous events lead to others in a logical and semantically related way (Morley 1985). Conjunction may be additive, contrastive, alternative, consequence/causal (Halliday 1985).

Lexical cohesion describes meaning as displayed by lexical relation in a text. Lexical elements are used in relation to one another in discourse such that they create unity and continuity, thereby creating meaning and a smooth flow of information (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Tanskanen 2006). Cohesive devices under lexical cohesion include reiteration and collocation. Reiteration captures repetition, synonyms/near-synonym, super-ordinate or generalization (Tanskanen 2006). Collocation according to Jobbins and Evett (1985: 615) "is a predisposed combination of words, typically pairwise words that tend to regularly co-occur." Words in collocation have the tendency of occurring in relation to one another within the same environment in discourse "because they describe things or happenings that occur in similar situation" (Tanskanen 2006: 60).

3. Theoretical Framework

Systemic Functional Linguistics claims that language is a resource of meaning. The model avers that language is a social activity that takes place in a social context. It is a basic tool for coding information, and it only functions effectively if the decoder (listener or reader) is able to understand and make meaning from the information. Making meaning out of discourse is paramount in the orientation of Systemic Functional Linguistics. When linguistic elements are used in coding information, they are largely understood within the context of their production. The model is, strictly speaking, functional rather than structural. It focuses more on eliciting meaning from the linguistic elements in a text. (Halliday 1970, Halliday and Hasan 1976, Martin 1984, Halliday and Matthiessen 2014, Almurash 2016).

Three metafunctions are assumed in SFL: ideational metafunction, interpersonal metafunction and textual metafunction. The present study is concerned with textual metafunction, that aspect of SLF that relates to speaker's or writer's text-forming potential. It deals with the organization of clauses and sentences in discourse with the goal of creating a smooth and effective flow of information. Morley (2005:14) writes about textual metafunction thus:

> It is the function which organizes the language in a textual corpus in such a way as to give it **narrative coherence** (in which the ideas are presented in an acceptable logical sequence), and **message cohesion** (in which the wording of a sentence in a discourse takes account of and is linked to that of previous sentences), to arrange it as units of information, and avoid unwanted repetition.

From the above, it is reflected that textual metafunction is concerned with shaping the nature of a text in its spoken or written mode, and it deals with the fashioning the texture of a passage (Morley 2005). The other metafunctions: ideational and interpersonal, largely depend on textual metafunction. This is so because they "depend on being able to build sequences of discourse, organizing the discursive flow and creating cohesion and continuity as it moves along." (Halliday and Matthiesssen (2014: 30-31).

4. Related Works

Investigation reveals that there are a good number of works on the different texts of Akinwunmi Isola from linguistic perspective. Adewole (2008) examines the use of the particle **ti** in *OgúnOmọdé.* Based on his findings in the text, he argues against Awobuluyi's (1967, 1978) and Owolabi's (1976) position that the particle is a noun. In support of Oyelaran (1982), the scholar claims that the particle is a genitive marker. Adesola (2008) is another work on *Olú Ọmọ* one of the creative works of Akinwumi Isola. The scholar looks at the phonological, morphological and syntactic features in the text. The study reveals that the writer deploys the linguistic features mentioned above in building his text. Owonibi (2008) works on *Ó Le Kú,* the focus of the scholar is on code-mixing and code-switching in the text. The scholar reveals that social factors determine the realization of the sociolinguistic features in the text. He claims that only student characters code-mix and code-switch. Other characters such as parents, teachers, artisans and others do not

display the features. From the foregoing, it is clear that language/linguistic scholars have investigated different language aspects in the works of this great Yoruba creative writer.

One particular study that is directly relevant to the present study is Olakolu, Saka, Asiwaju and Oye (2017). The scholars examine cohesive devices in *Ó Le Kú*, and they reveal that reference, ellipses and conjunctions are the major cohesive devices used by the writer in the construction of the text. They agree that devices help in making *Ó Le Kú* a unified and meaningful text. The present study examines cohesion in one of the poems **Irò** written by this great creative writer. Investigation reveals that scholars have not presented a linguistic analysis of the poem; in particular there is no study of cohesion of the poem. Thus, apart from contributing to knowledge about the works of this writer, this is designed to fill an existing gap in relation to the work of the writer.

5. Methodology

The researchers read the text to identify the different cohesive devices used in the construction of the text. Pieces of data that illustrate each of the cohesive devices were extracted and written out for discussion. Each of the identified cohesive devices is taken in turn for discussion. For ease of reference, lines where the data were drawn from are included in the discussion.

6. The Poem

The poem, **Iró** 'falsehood' is a creative work by Akinwumi Isola, and its theme is about human nature relating to deceit or the act of falsehood. The poet asserts that the act of lying, deceit or falsehood is pervasive in the nature of the human species. In the opinion of the poet, no individual/person or group of persons is left out of the act, and there is no aspect of human existence and endeavour that human beings do not lie about. The poem avers that human beings tell lies in every condition and situation. The poem has forty-one (41) short lines in all, with the lines devoted to the theme of the poem, which is the lying nature of man. While the author devotes most of the lines to the exposition of the act of lying or engagement in falsehood, he condemns the act towards the end of the poem (lines 38-41), and counsels that humans should desist from the act because by and large, it does not pay in any way. For easy access and convenience of readers, the poem is presented and translated below.

1	Irọ ló n'ilé ayé,	Falsehood is well rooted on earth.
	Àgàbàgebè ló nidúníyàn	Hypocripsy is the owner of humanity.
	Sọ-dúdú-di-funfunnigbogboyín fi ń jẹun	Turning black to white is the source of livelihood for you all.
	Ẹni tó kúrú, lóun ò kúrú	The person who is short says he is not short
5	Ẹni tó gùnlóun ò gùnjù	The person who is tall says he is not too tall
	Èyí tó sanra ò gbà póuntóbi	The person who is fat disagrees that he is big/plump
	Bàbá tín-ínrínlóunti ń jẹ bò	The thin man says he is already putting on flesh
	Òlẹ́dàrùnlóun ń ṣiṣẹ́ jugbogb ayé lọ	The lazy person says he works more than any person on earth

	Gbogboyín ń túró̩ tà bí èlùbó̩ !	All of you are hawking lies like you are hawking yam flour!
10	E̩ni tó lówó̩, lóun ò lówó,	The rich person says he has no money
	Ò̩tòsì tààrà lóun ò tòsì,	The very poor person says he is not poor
	Ó ní bá a bá tiyó,	He said as long as one has enough food,
	Towó di ye̩pe̩re̩!	The issue of money is unimportant!
	Olè níse̩é̩ o̩wó̩ òunlòun ń je̩.	The thief says he eats from his labour
15	Akútó̩ó̩ló̩ ninǹkankan ò múun,	The sick person says he is in good health
	Gìrìpá-kùnrinlóun ò gbádùn.	The strong person says he is not well
	Oúnje tó nílé, e̩ ní kò tó.	Food is sufficient in the house, you said it is not sufficient.
	Ebí ń pa yínlóde, e̩ lé̩ e̩ tije̩un.	You are hungry in the public, you said you have eaten.
	Bàbá piro̩ro̩, ó lóuntisùn,	The old man pretends but says he is asleep
20	O̩mo̩ ò̩dò̩ sùn, ó lóun òfojúboorun,	The house help slept, but said he didn't sleep
	Àdúrà lòun ń gbà!	He said he was engaged in prayer!
	Ilè̩ s̩ú, e̩ ní kòì s̩ú, e̩ níbi í lo̩,	It was night time, you said the night has not fallen you had places to go
	Ó dàáro̩, ilè̩ mó̩, e̩ nikòì mó̩.	It was day-break, you said it was not yet day-break.
	E̩ ń sùn, e̩ ń falala.	You remained asleep, drooling in the corner of the mouth.
25	Ohunté̩ e̩ fé̩ rí, lè̩ ń rí.	The things you desire to see are the only ones you see.
	Èyí té̩ è̩ fé̩ kò sí ńbè̩!	Those you do not desire are just not there
	Omí tutù, elégbò ló gbóná tó,	The water is cold, the man with sore said it is hot enough,
	Omi è̩ko̩ gbóná, ìyàwó ló ti tutù	The *pap* water is hot, the wife said it is already cold
	Ó ní kó̩ko̩ ó máaje̩un lo̩	She urged the husband to keep on eating.
30	Bí wo̩n ń lo̩	When they are going
	Wo̩n a ní àwo̩n ń bò̩.	They will claim they are coming
	Bówó tán ló̩wó̩	When they are short of money
	Wo̩n a lówó pò̩ ló̩wó̩ àwo̩n	They will claim they have plenty of money.
	Èníyàn ò tan ara rè̩ je̩	There is no other sense of self-deceit
35	Bí ìyá ìbejì	As displayed by the mother of twins
	O̩mo̩ rè̩ kú	Her child died
	Ó ní ó r'È̩kó rè̩é ras̩o̩ ni	She said she traveled to Lagos to buy clothes
	E̩ jé̩ gbakádàrá	You had better accept your fate.
	Ké̩ e̩ yé tanrayín je̩	And stop deceiving yourself
40	Bónígbèsè mutí yó	If the debtor goes on to get drunk,

Gbèsè ò ní í torí ẹ̀ dínkọ́bọ̀   The debt will not, on account of that, reduce by
                                        a penny.

7. Data and Discussion

As will be shown in the study, the author relies on both lexical and grammatical cohesive devices to build a unified text, and the devices further help to render the text decodable and readily meaningful. The reader is able to grasp the message of the text because of the cohesive devices deployed by the author. In the sub-sections below, the different cohesive devices are highlighted and discussed.

7.1. Lexical Cohesion

A number of lexical cohesive devices are used by the author in creating the text, and they help greatly in making the text readable and decodable. The devices identified are reiteration, which is enhanced through: repetition, synonyms and antonyms. Collocation is another cohesive device found in the text. These are discussed below.

7.1.1 Repetition:

i.	ẹni – ẹni – ẹni	one – one – one
ii.	gbogboyín – gbogboyín	all of you – all of you
iii.	ẹ – ẹ – ẹ – ẹ – ẹ – ẹ	you – you – you – you
iv.	kúrú – kúrú	short – short
v.	gun – gun	tall – tall
vi.	lowo – lowo	rich – rich
vii	to – to	enough – enough
viii.	wọn – àwọn	them – they

Discussion

Repetition is used in the text for the purpose of emphasis. The repeated elements are shown in the data above. The writer deploys repetition of linguistic elements to create clarity and unity of the text, and also to help the reader understand the message of the text very clearly. The repetition and foregrounding of the noun **ẹni** 'someone/somebod**y** (lines 4, 5, 10) is a strategy to stress the indefiniteness of the actor that may be involved in falsehood, or that the act of lying could be perpetrated by anybody. Note that the noun **ẹni** has no referent, it is, as already mentioned an indefinite noun, which means that no particular individual or group is the actor in the text, meaning that the actor could be any individual or any group. The repetition of the indefinite noun is to stress the author's belief that the act of lying is not limited to any social class, profession, gender, age, education, family background or any imaginable social class, (politicians and religious leaders inclusive). The noun implies a sense of generalization and inclusiveness, and this is emphasized through the repetition of the item. The sense of generalization is further buttressed through the repetition of **gbogbo yín** 'all of you' (lines 3, 9). The repetition of the noun phrase is for emphasis and clarity, it further reinforces the inherent meaning of the indefinite noun **ẹni**

'someone/somebody' in the text in the sense that the phrase does not leave anyone out. The repetition of the 2nd person plural pronoun ẹ in the subject position is a further emphasis on the generalization implied by the author. It is repeated in lines 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 for emphasis. The plural form of the pronoun is to reinforce the generalization and inclusiveness implied earlier in noun/noun phrase **ẹni** someone/somebody' and **gbogbo yín** 'all of you', which is also repeated in the text. From the discussion, the repetition of the various nominal elements in the text is for emphasis, unity and effective link to drive home the theme of the text, and equally emphasize a sense of generalization and inclusiveness that point to the author's position that lying or engagement in falsehood is not limited to any person or group of persons.

Looking further into the text, there is also a repetition of verbal elements for emphasis and continuity. Each of the repeated verbs is found within a compound sentence in which the first sentence is positive, and the second sentence is negative, e. g.

1.   Ẹni tó **kúrú**, lóun ò **kúrú**   The short says he is not short (line 4)
        Ẹni tó **gùn**, lóun ò **gùn**jù   The tall one says he is not too tall (line 5)

The repetition of the verbs within a sentence (compound sentence), and the strategy of preceding the repeated verbs with a negator, which is **ò** in the examples above, and **kò** in lines 22, 23, 26, is a deliberate mechanism to stress and emphasize the act of denial common to the human species, and which is the theme of the text. From the discussion above, it is revealed that repetition, as a cohesive device in the text enhances the unity of the text, it makes the text readable, and it aids clarity and easy understanding of the message implied by the author.

7.1.2 Synonym	i.	irọ́ / àgàbàgebè / sọ-dúdú-di-funfun	lie / hypocrisy / turns- black- to- white
	ii.	sanra – tóbi	fat – big
	iii.	ẹni / èyí	one / this one
	iv.	yín / e	you / you

Discussion

Synonym, which is a sense of sameness or closeness in meaning is used in the text as demonstrated in the examples above. From the example in (2i), it could be inferred that the author uses synonym to emphasize the theme of the text, because the three synonymous nominal elements: **irọ́/àgàbàgebè/sọ-dúdú-di-funfun** (in lines 1, 2, 3), semantically implies falsehood, the act of lying, twisting facts. The linguistic elements are not only repeated, they are foregrounded through a grammatical mechanism of focusing, e.g.

(2)   Irọ́ niilé ayé   → irọ́ ni ó nilé ayé → irọ́ ló nilé ayé
 Falsehood – owns – the world → falsehood – owns – the world → falsehood –owns – the world
The surface form is derived through the application of deletion process
        (3)   ni ó → ló owns
                niilé → nilé owns the house

Thus, the synonymous elements are given prominence in the text to reinforce the theme of the discourse, and to be in tandem with the meaning inherent in the title of the text: **Iró̩** 'falsehood'. In essence therefore, the reiteration through the use of the synonymous lexical elements and the foregrounding of the elements is designed to emphasize the theme of the message, and thereby help the reader to remain focused on the theme. The synonym in (2ii) strengthens the theme of the text because the fat person **E̩ni tó sanra…** 'the person that is fat' mildly denies the claim of his physical attribute by using the synonym **tóbi** 'big' in **lóun ò tóbi** '…said he is not big'. It is the author's strategy of showing that even when human beings see clearly the truth of an assertion, they still go ahead to deny by being evasive. The synonym (2iii) talks about the context of persons that are actors in the text. The author, through the use of **è̩yí** 'the person', the demonstrative element which is synonymous with **e̩ni** 'the person', and which is also an indefinite noun, emphasized the sense of generalization and inclusiveness of persons in the act of lying and engagement in falsehood. The reader is thereby reminded through the synonym that the act is not limited to any social class or group as already discussed above. This again explains and confirms the earlier observation and claim about the use of **gbogboyín** 'all of you' to emphasize the sense of generalization and inclusiveness demonstrated in the form below.

      (4)   …ni **gbogbo yín** fi ń je̩un   …the means by which you all live and survive

The synonym **yín**/e̩ that involves 2nd person plural pronouns in the object and subject positions respectively also emphasizes the authors belief that no social group is left behind, thereby reinforcing the sense of generalization and inclusiveness already mentioned above.
The use of the synonym implies that either as actor or target/recipient ([**yín**] 'you pl'), the act of falsehood is general to all. This is inferred in the form:

      (5) i. Oúnje tó nínú ilé, e̩ni ò tó.   Food is sufficient in the house, you it is not
                                           sufficient   (line 17)
        ii. Ké̩ e̩ yé tanra **yín** je̩.   And stop deceiving yourself (line 39)

In (4i) e̩ is used in the subject position thus denoting the actor in the clause, and **yín** is used in (4ii) both as actor and recipient/target of the act of lying/falsehood. This implies that the pragmatics of the **yín** in (4ii) creates a sense actor and the recipient/target of the act of lying simultaneously.

7.1.3 Antonym   i.   kúrú – gùn   short – tall
                        ii.   sanra – tín-ínrín   fat – thin
                        iii.   lówó – tò̩sì   rich – poor
                        iv.   tán – pò̩   finish – much
                        v.   lo̩ – bò̩   go – come
                        vi.   gbóná – tutù   hot – cold
                        vii.   ìyàwó – o̩ko̩   wife – husband
                        viii   baba – o̩mo̩ (ò̩dò̩) father – child (servant)

Discussion

Antonym describes a sense of contrast or opposition. The author makes use of this cohesive device as indicated in the examples above. The cohesive device is used for emphasis in order to guide the reader to understand the sub-theme of generalization and inclusiveness in the text. The author carefully uses the cohesive device to emphasize his belief that falsehood is a common trait in every person and social group. For instance, the author emphasizes that people lie about their physical attributes. The author indirectly affirms also that physical attributes do not preclude a person from engaging in falsehood. The examples in (6) confirm these observations.

(6)	i.	Ẹni tó **kúrú**…	The person who is short….
		Ẹni tó **gùn**…	The person who is tall….
	ii.	Ẹni tó **sanra**…	The person who is fat….
		Baba **tín-ínrín**…	A slim/thin father

The adjectivizable verbs: **kuru**/**gun**; **sanra**/**tin-inrin** describe physical attributes of a person, and as already mentioned, they reflect the position that lying has nothing to do with the physical attributes of a person. Short people tell lies, just like tall people do; fat people engage in the act, just like slim people. The author used the antonym to create unity in the text and help the reader to understand the theme of the poem.

The author goes further to affirm that it is not only physical attribute that people lie about, they lie about prosperity or otherwise. I also reflect that prosperity/wealth or poverty does not also exclude a person from lying. This is reflected in the form below.

(7)	i.	Ẹni tó lówó, lóun ò **lówó**	The rich person says he has no money (line 10)
	ii.	Òtòsì tààrà lóun ò **tòsì**	The very poor person says he is not poor

It is equally shown through the use of antonym that the health situation, age and intimacy captured in **ọkọ** husband/**ìyàwó** 'wife', do not preclude involvement in the act of lying and engaging in falsehood. The forms below attest to this.

i.	Omí **tutù**, elégbò ló ti**gbonà** tó,	The water is cold, the man with sore said it is hot enough (line27)
ii.	Omi ẹ̀kọ **gbóná**, *ìyàwó* ló ti**tutù**	The pap water is hot, the wife said it is already cold (line 28)
iii.	Ó ní *kọ́kọ*máajẹun lọ,	She urged the husband to keep on eating. (line 29)
iv.	Baba pirọrọ, ó lóuntisùn	The old man pretends but says he is asleep (line 19)
v.	Ọmọ ọ̀dọ̀ sùn, ó Íoun ò fojúboorun	The househelp was asleep, but said he didn't sleep (line 20)

The issue of the health situation is captured in **elẹ́gbò** 'person with sore'; a person with sore does not enjoy perfect health condition, and the issue of age is captured in **baba** 'old man' and **ọmọ(ọ̀dọ̀)** house-help, while intimacy is captured in **ìyàwó** 'wife' and **ọkọ** 'husband'. It is observed that the sense of **oko** 'husband' is captured in **kí ọ́kọ** which is reduced to **kọ́kọ** through a deletion process: **kí ọkọ → kóko** 'let the husband'. Thus **ìyàwó** 'wife' and **ọkọ** 'husband' create a sense of contrast in the text.

The author finally uses antonyms to show that in the business of lying and engaging in falsehood, any act can be denied as reflected in the active verb **lọ/bọ̀** 'going/coming', and the stative verb **tán/pọ̀** 'exhausted/plenty' as shown below.

(9) i. Bí wọn ń **lọ**,   When they are going   (line 30)
   ii. Wọn a ní àwọn ń **bọ̀**.   They will claim they are coming   (line 31)
   iii. Bówó **tán** lọ́wọ́,   When they are short of money   (line 32)
   iv. Wọn a lówó **pọ̀** lọ́wọ́ àwọn, They will claim they have plenty of money (line 33)

From the foregoing in this sub-section, it is revealed that the author uses antonyms to ensure continuity of the theme and sub-theme of the text. Verbs are contrasted or used in opposition to ensure clarity, continuity, and aid readability and effective understanding of the text.

7.1.4   Collocation

   i. oúnjẹ – ebi – jẹun   food – hunger – eat
   ii. ilẹ̀ ṣú – sùn – (fojúbo)orun   night falls – sleep – sleep at all
   iii. àárọ̀ – ilẹ̀ mọ́   morning – day breaks
   iv. ọkọ – ìyàwó – ọmọ   husband – wife – child

Discussion

Collocation is another cohesive device used to guide the understanding of the text. The collocation in **oúnjẹ-ebi-jẹun** describes one of the major needs of human beings, which is food (**oúnjẹ**), and the experience of hunger (**ebi**) that man feels when man has not eaten, and the satisfaction that follows the act of eating (**jẹun**). As important as food and feeding are, and as excruciating the experience of hunger is, man tells lies about the three. The author used collocation to draw attention to the fact that man tells lies about very important things of life. It goes further to emphasize the position of the author that telling lies or engaging in falsehood is common to the human species. Not only that, they tell lies in every condition and situation, they tell lies about physical attributes, they lie about their health, and they equally lie about major needs of life, which is food. The second and third collocations illustrated above are used by the author to strengthen the message of the text, which is a reflection of the lying about nature. This is captured in lines 22 and 23.

(10)   Ile su, e ni koi su   night falls, you said night has not fallen.
       O daaro, Ile mọ́, ẹ ní kòì mọ́   it was day-break, you said it was not yet
                                        day-break

The issue of night and day are natural phenomena. Man can neither influence the fallen of the night, nor the break of day, yet they lie about the two as reflected in the text. Finally on collocation, it is found that lying is found in the home. Wives tell lies to their husband, and mothers tell lies about their children (see lines 27-28 and 25-27).

(11) i. Omi èkọ́ gbóná, ìyàwó ló ti tutù   The *pap* water is hot, the wife said it already cold.
          Ó ní kọ́kọ máajẹun lọ.   She urged the husband to keep on eating.
      ii. Bí ìyá ìbejì   Like the mother of the twins
          Wọ́n lọ́mọ́ ẹ̀ kú.   Whose child died
          Ó ní ó r'Èkó rèé raṣoni.   She said it traveled to Lagos to buy clothes.

The excerpt above reveals that the wife tells lies to the husband, just as the mother of the twins tells lies about the demise of her child. Death is a natural and permanent thing, yet the mother lied about it. From the discussion in this section, it is revealed that collocation is used in the text to unify the text, and to emphasize the message inherent in the text.

7.2   Grammatical Cohesion

Reference, one of the major cohesive devices under grammatical cohesion, is used in the text. It has been mentioned earlier in the study that it is a strategy whereby a reader relies on the semantic interpretation of a grammatical element on what was said earlier in the text, or what would be said as the text unfolds. This implies that reference could be anaphoric or cataphoric in its realization in a text. In the text under study nouns: **òun**, **àwọn**, and pronouns: **ó**, **rẹ̀** are used as references only in anaphoric sense. The use of these references is illustrated below.

The reference **òun** is used twelve (12) times in the text to refer to nouns. The author used the reference to call the reader to look back, thereby making readability, clarity and understanding possible. The reference is used in lines 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10. 11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21. Examples of the usage are shown below.

(12) i. Eni tó kúrú l**óun** ò kúrú   The person who is short says he is not short (line 4)
      ii. Eni tó lowo, l**óun** ò lówó   The rich person says he has no money (line 10)
      iii. Olè niiṣẹ́ ọwọ́ **òun**l**òun** ń jẹ   The thief says he eats from his labour (line 14)
      iv. Gìrìpá-kùnrinl**óun** ò gbádùn   The strong person says he is not well (line 16)
      v. Ọmọ ọ̀dọ̀ sùn, ó l**óun** ò fojúboorun   The house help slept, but said he didn't sleep (line 20)

In each of the examples, the reference **òun** is used to refer to the noun that begins each construction, e. g.

(13)   Ẹni = òun
         Olè = òun
         Gìrìpá-kùnrin = òun
         Ọmọ ọ̀dọ̀ = òun

A careful observation shows that **òun** is preceded by /l/, (as in **lóun)** in the examples except on one occasion in (iii). The realization of /l/ is a result of vowel deletion, whereby the /i/ of ní 'say' is deleted, and the occurrence of a [-nasal] vowel conditions /n/ to change to /l/. The high tone of the deleted vowel eventually realigns with the initial vowel of **òun** resulting in **lóun.** This is illustrated below.

(14)   nioun → l´ oun → lóun

The instance of **lòun** in example iii, where a low tone is retained, rather than high tone found in other examples is explained by the fact that the **ni** 'to have' is not the same verb **nì** 'say' in the other examples, rather it is a focus marker with a mid-tone, the mid-tone deletes with the vowel, thus a realignment of tone observed in the other examples does not arise.

The pronoun **ẹ** 'you pl' is used eleven times in the text, **yín** 'you pl' is used four times, **àwọn** and **wọn** 'they' occur two times each, and **ó** 'he/she' appears seven times. In all the instances of their occurrences, they are used as references, in some cases, for definite nouns, and in other cases for indefinite nouns in the text. A few examples would suffice:

(15)   Ilẹ̀ ṣú, **ẹ**ní kòì ṣú **ẹ**níbi í lọ.   (line 22)
         Wọ́n á lówó pọ̀ lọ́wọ́ **àwọn**   (line 33)
         Óní **ó**r'Èkó rèé raṣọ ni.   (line 37)

The use of reference as a cohesive device is robust as explained above. The use helps the unity of the text; it further helps clarity and a smooth flow of information in the text.

7.3 Ellipsis

Ellipsis refers to omission of elements in discourse without any effect on the meaning of a clause. In the text, ellipses is realized in line 17 where the element **oúnjẹ** 'food' is omitted,

(16)   Oúnjẹ tó nílé ẹ ní Ø ò tó.

There is evidence also in lines 22 and 23, the noun **ilẹ̀** is also omitted,

(17)   Ilẹ̀ ṣú, ẹ ní Ø kòì ṣú.   It was night time, night has not fallen (line 22)

24

Ó dàárò̩, ilè̩ mó̩, e̩ ní Ø kòì mó̩,   Good night, day breaks, you said day has not break (line 23)

In a similar vein there is omission in lines 25 and 26. In line 25, **ohuntí e̩** is omitted (represented by Ø), and in 26, **èyí tí e̩ efé̩** (also represented by Ø) is omitted. The illustrations below confirm the ellipses.

(18)   Ohuntí e̩ fé̩ ni Ø è̩ ń rí   (line 25)
         Èyí tí e̩ è̩ fé̩, kò sí Ø ńbè̩   (line 26)

The position where ellipses is realized is marked by the symbol Ø in the examples illustrated above.

8. Findings

The study shows the deployment of several cohesive devices in the construction of the text: **Irò̩** 'falsehood'. The cohesive devices help to unify the text and render it readable and understandable. Two major lexical devices: reiteration, marked by repletion, synonym and antonym; and collocation are widely used in the short text. Repetition occurs eight times, antonym is realized seven times, synonym appears four times and collocation four times also.

Repetition is used more than other lexical devices in the text. This is not surprising because Yoruba poems are generally marked by repetition at every level of grammar (Olatunji 1984). As shown in the study, the strategy is used for emphasis, and to build up a number of sub-themes in the text. For instance, the repetition of **e̩ni** 'someone/somebody', as already pointed out in the body of the work emphasizes generalization and inclusiveness of actors or perpetrators of falsehood. In a similar vein, the repetition of verbs puts the issue of denial in proper perspective, propositions are denied through repetition.

Antonym is another cohesive device used in building the text. It is a mechanism used in the text to show that all human attributes can be denied: physical attributes, health condition, level of wealth and level of poverty and many others. The device helps to show that natural phenomena can also be denied. Mention was made of the issue of day and night, and the demise of the child of the mother of the twins, who denied that the child is dead.

Synonyms occur in the text to emphasize the theme of the text. This is made clear by the reiteration and foregrounding of the synonymous elements in the first three lines of the poem: **irò̩/àgàbàgebè/so̩-dúdú-di-funfun.** The mechanism is also used to emphasize generalization and inclusiveness as demonstrated in the use of **e̩ni** 'someone/somebody' and **èyí** someone/somebody.

Collocation is used in the text, but the level of its realization is low. This is likely so because the poem is a short one; perhaps the length and the theme of the text do not allow for a robust use of collocation. Whatever the case, the few realizations of the device help continuity because it emphasizes the theme and the subthemes of the poem. It helps to clarify the writer's position that human beings will normally tell lies about their daily needs and nature.

Apart from lexical cohesive devices discussed above, grammatical cohesive devices are also at play in the text. Reference and ellipses are the two devices found in the text. The author

uses reference to tidy up the text and help the free flow of information in the text. The strategy creates effective link of elements thereby making the reading and understanding of the text easy. Ellipsis equally helps to tidy up the text, it enhances avoidable repetition in the text, therefore making it easy for the reader to follow the message of the text.

9. Conclusion

The study shows that cohesion is a formidable linguistic strategy used by Akinwumi Isola, a foremost Yoruba writer, in constructing a unified text that is readable and understandable. The reader is able to grasp the meaning of the poem because the author employs different cohesive devices both at the lexical and grammatical levels to build the text. The lexical and grammatical relations of the linguistic elements make the meaning of the text easily accessible to the reader. This study adds to our knowledge of cohesion in Yoruba, and how Yoruba writers deploy cohesive devices both at the lexical and grammatical levels to construct unified and meaningful texts.

References

Adesola, Olateju. 2008. *The linguistics forms of Olú Ọmọ.* In Akintunde A. and Falola T. (eds.). *Emerging perspectives on Akinwumi Isola.* Eritria: World Press. 180-204.

Adewole, Lawrence. 2008. Isola on issues in Yoruba Language. In Akintunde A. and Falola T. (eds.). *Emerging perspectives on Akinwumi Isola.* Eritria: World Press. 177-186.

Aljmer, Karin. 2016. *Modality and mood in functional linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Almurashi, Wael. 2016. An Introduction to Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. *Journal for the study of English Language,* vol. 4., no.1. 87-99.

Awobuluyi, Oladele. 1967. Studies in the syntax of the standard Yoruba. Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Columbia University, USA.

Awobuluyi, Oladele. 1978. *Essential of Yoruba grammar.* Ibadan: Oxford University Press.

Déchaine, Rose-Maria. 2006. A systemic functional approach to language cohesion. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal,* vol. 16, no. 1. 3-96.

González, Maria. 2011. Lexical cohesion in multiparty conversation. *Language Science,* vol. 33, no. 1. 167-173.

Halliday, Michael and Hasan Ruqaiya. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, Michael and Matthiessen Christian. 2014. *An introduction to functional grammar.* 4th edition. London: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, Michael. 1970. Language structure and language function. In John Lyons (ed.). *New horizons in linguistics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Halliday, Michael. 1985. *An introduction to functional linguistics.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hoey, Michael. 1991. *Patterns of lexis in texts.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Isola, Akinwumi. 1978. *Àfàìmọ̀ àti àwọnàròfọ̀ mìíràn.* Ibadan: University Press Limited.

Jabeen, Ismat, Mehmood Asad and Iqbal Muhammad. 2013. Ellipses, reference & substitution as cohesive devices in *The Bear* by Anton Chekov. *Academic Research International,* vol. 4, no. 6. 123-131.

Jobbins, Amanda and Evett Lindsay. 1998. Text segmentation, using reiteration and collocation. In *36th Annual Association for Computational linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational linguistics*. 614-618.

Lonyangapuo, Mary. 2015. Cohesion and Coherence in Lubukusu: A morphosyntactic analysis. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences,* vol. 20, no. 5. 43-53.

Martins, James. 2002. Meaning beyond the clause: SFL perspective. *Annals of Reviews in Applied Linguistics* 22. 52-74.

Martins, James. 1984. Language, register. In F. Christie (ed.). *Children writing: Reader*. 21-29. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Morley, David. 2005. *Syntax in functional grammar*. London: Continuum.

Olakolu, Oluwatoyin, Saka Idayat, Asiwaju Jumoke and Oye Taiwo. 2017. Cohesive device in Yoruba texts: A study of *Ó Le Kú. JOLAN: Journal of the Linguistic Association of Nigeria,* vol. 20, no. 2. 13-20.

Olatunji, Olatunde. 1984. *Features of Yoruba Oral Literature*. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.

Osisanwo, Wale. 2005. *Introduction to discourse analysis and pragmatics*. Lagos: Femulus Fetop Publishers.

Owolabi, Kola. 1976. *Noun-Noun construction in Yoruba: A syntactic and semantic analysis*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

Owonibi, Sola. 2008. Code alternation in literature: An overview of Isola's *Ó Le Kú.* In Akintunde A. and Falola T. (eds). *Emerging perspectives on AkinwumiIsola.* 205-213. Eritria: World Press.

Oyelaran, Olaospe. 1982. Ọ̀nà kan ò wọjà: Mofọ́lọ́jì Yorùbá. Paper presented at a Seminar at the Department of African Languages and Literatures, ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife.

Schiffrin, Deborah. 1994. *Approaches to discourse*. Oxford: Balckwell Publishers Ltd.

Tanskane, Sanna-Kaisa. 2006. *Collaborating towards cohesion: Lexical cohesion in English discourse.* Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing.

Michael Ajibola Abiọdun
Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.
email: michael.abiodun@eksu.edu.ng

Adekẹmi Agnes Taiwo
Department of Linguistics and Nigerian Languages
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

email: adekemi.taiwo@eksu.edu.ng

Orebe O. Oluwabukọla
Department of English and Literary Studies
Federal University, OyeEkiti, Nigeria
email: bukola.orebe@fuoye.edu.ng

Philosophy of Tragedy - The Writer and Hamlet
(Poet and Philosopher)

Peter Nezník, Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice, Slovakia[1]

Abstract

This study is devoted to the investigation of the philosophy of tragedy, where a person is caught in a borderline situation. The philosophy of tragedy is interested in a person thrown by life onto the border of existence and non-existence. The poet Shakespeare and the writer Miguel de Cervantes, with their immortal works Hamlet and Don Quixote, allow philosophers to investigate the depths of the spirit. The tragic hero in the works of the analysed poets is the image of a person thrown into the whirlwind of life - to wake up in an instant from a dream to a tragic feeling. The one who looks into the depths of the spirit will understand that there is no return from there - as Lev Shestov expresses it - this road knows no volunteers, there we are always forcibly dragged and, so to speak, thrown by fate.

Keywords: philosophy of tragedy, writer, poet, Hamlet, Don Quixote

Introduction: The poet and philosopher - hero or coward?

A tragic poet often leads us, just like a philosopher, along the paths of his thinking to sources and beginnings. We are introduced to questions about which we do not know, or from which we run away in fear, so that we do not have to start *really* - thoughtfully living and thinking. Philosophy means thoughtful thinking, in the words of Heidegger (1996), *thinking* thinking, not superficial or scientific thinking - *calculating* thinking. In his work, the poet reveals a world where not everything is calculable, clear and problem-free, in order to bring us back to wisdom through mysteries and secrets - the *folds* of the soul - and thus instruct us.

The history of philosophy does not have its object of study in the present, in the most current present, but in the study of *what was, in the past*... However, the past that happened should not be only *antiquarian*,[2] smelling of mothballs and corpse mist, even if we must point out to the reader that even death and dying, suffering and similar things will be the subject of our reflections. We want to think here and now through returns to the past, through the works of poets about man, his nature, soul - caring for the soul, *mind and heart*, but above all about his *ups* and *downs*, and *tragic* mistakes and delusions.

A poet and philosopher were quite rarely a rebel and a warrior in the past. They usually fought with a song, a word and a pen, those were his weapons. They were never afraid to go into confrontation with power for the sake of truth, even if he did it only in extreme need and always with reluctance. Since the time of Socrates, we have been taught - we already know - that philosophy cannot win in a dispute with power. That is why a philosopher, an intellectual in general, always has an alibi-compromising attitude at hand, like a chameleon? We have already written several times about heroism, fear, resignation and courage, also in relation to the characteristics of the renowned Czech philosopher and phenomenologist Patočka.

A Philosopher in the time of trials

Patočka was, in Dahrendorf's[3] book *Temptation of Freedom. Intellectuals at the Time of the Trials* (2008), marked as an internal emigrant, in the manner of Plato. Why? The answer is simple: the philosopher Plato, taught by a *tragic* fate, the tragic death of his teacher Socrates, refused active participation in politics, even more so a direct confrontation with power. Patočka himself often returned to this topic - the topic of tragedy, the tragic hero - in his texts and lectures. "The hero is a living question, posed from the depths of human helplessness in the face of the powers on which he depends and which alone can give him meaning..." (Patočka 1990: 31). According to Patočka, the question of life, the question about its meaning, was already asked in tragedy, "Socrates, for his questioning, the ultimate purpose of which is the meaning of life, therefore has the first, albeit non-explicit model, in the tragic man" (Ibid.). Therefore, we can consider Patočka as a philosopher *residing* in a time of lack of freedom and trials, a time recently passed, as an *academic* philosopher, detached from the problems of real life. In the words of Turgenev (1980) - for the *Hamlet* type of person who is a Nordic, cold-thinking, purely rational type, deeply sceptical, eternally doubting and prone to not acting and looking for an alibi in being, that is, a great *compromiser*...

Dahrendorf (2008) openly asked: "Is Patočka an 'internal emigrant' an Erasmite after all? He does not lack Erasmus traits either in his life or in his work. He spoke of himself as a person who 'experienced many conflicts in his life'" (Dahrendorf 2008: 113-114). According to Dahrendorf, Patočka not only tolerated them, but was able to reshape them and introduce "...them into a philosophy that primarily asked questions and sought openness. Nothing broke his faith in reason" (Ibid.). Did Patočka have the courage? "He never lacked the courage to stand his ground. All this certainly places him on a certain level among the Erasmites. He certainly wasn't just an engaged observer, he wasn't even engaged, if we ignore the last years of his life..." (Ibid.).

Wisdom says that only God should judge, not us mere mortals. According to Rozenfeld "[o]bjective reality, understandable through scientific methods and experiments, supported with logical apparatuses, among which mathematical formal logic is dominant, has not been able to produce comprehensive answers to multilayer questions of human existence" (2019: 123). For Nezník (2009)[4], also based on the study of the life and texts of Patočka, his image is captured through the image of the Nordic Hamlet, his inner way of endless conflicts with his own reason, in conflict with his own conscience and heart, and constantly remaining in a state of procrastinating inaction...

> Patočka is often like a *tragic* hero who always lacks something - sometimes the stage and the theatre, sometimes the audience. He constantly wants something, but at the same time, in the depths of his soul, he knows for sure that he does not have enough strength for this event, he is not yet ready enough to fight, and so he does not receive what is essential for heroism and fighting - he does not receive courage... He is too rational, too calculating thinking type. He fights mainly in his thinking and torn, eternally quarrelsome inside.
>
> (Nezník 2009: 145)

Let us complete the picture of the *philosopher* Patočka, this '*after all*' Erasmite through *Hamletian* characteristics of the *tragic* hero. If a philosopher is hiding from power, Berlin (2001) characterized such a life attitude as withdrawing into an '*inner castle*'. However, Dahrendorf (2008), thinking about the behaviour, metamorphoses, and mistakes of

philosophers during trials, stated that even Berlin did not consider himself a hero or a warrior. Berlin often commented on his address 'that he feels like a *coward*'.

> 'I'm a coward', he said repeatedly at various meetings. The great events of the time always found him at the port. He shared the problem with cowardice with Turgenev, whom he respected. Both were reproached that their social success was the result of constantly conforming to the great and good people - *the great and good*, as they say in England, which was considered a sign of a lack of courage. (...) 'The topic of courage really bothered him.'
>
> (Dahrendorf 2008: 56)

A poet's meditations on life and meaning

If we think about life, about its meaning, then the poet's *meditations* are about whether it makes sense in old age to waste the last years of life on something practical, or on the contrary, on something completely different. But what is that which will not be destroyed by time, and which can be beneficial not only to the author-creator, but also to others, the future? Rozenfeld underlines that "[co]ntemporary political and economic processes place a perpetual pressure upon all regions of the world, empowering homogenization processes that result in identical production, and consumption patterns becoming naturalized all around the world" (2019: 233).

Kazakhstan is a distant and relatively unknown country. It is she who leads us to the topic we would like to think about the national poet of Kazakhstan Abaj (1846-1904) wrote in the book *Forty Reflections on Life and People* (1959):

> We lived to an old age; whether we lived well or badly, we lived a piece of life - we saved and fought many times, many difficulties had to be overcome. That is why we are now weakened and weary: we have known the futility of our activity and experienced all humiliations. How do we handle our lives now? I can't find an answer to that. Should I rule the people? No, I will not rule over people.
>
> (Abaj 1959: 8)

When we read these words of the poet - rooted in the tradition of *akyns*, folk poets coming to us from a great distance and a distant time, we feel that we are connecting with something *great*, eternal, timeless, and at the same time familiar or close to us. Searching for the meaning of life is what repeatedly overtakes us in borderline life situations. The mundane things that occupied us until then will lose their meaning. The poet does not see the point in raising cattle, doing science and engaging in scientific research because he does not see anyone to whom he can impart a wise word and where to find it. He refuses to raise children because, despite his old age, he does not know the meaning of education and the mission to which he would raise them. In a moment of extreme despair, when his life was losing meaning and he could not come to any decision, he experienced enlightenment:

> I will write down the thoughts that come to mind and enjoy the white paper and black ink. If someone finds a necessary word in it, let them write it down or learn it. And if no one finds anything, don't forget that I had to write for myself. So that was my decision. And now I have nothing else on my mind but to write.
>
> (Ibid.)

Hesse (2013) wrote words about life and its seasons in the reflection *On Old Age*:

> Old age is one stage of our life, and, like other stages of life, it has its own face, atmosphere and temperature", but also its own joys and worries. "We old people with white hair, like our younger brothers, have tasks that give meaning to our existence.
>
> (Hesse 2013: 141)

The Czech philosopher Patočka (2006b) in his study *The writer and his thing* (*To the philosophy of literature*) in connection with considerations *about things, about the writer*, but also about the philosopher, the scientist, looked for what unites them and what is the difference between them. We know the old, age-old dispute between *philosophy* and *poetry*. Plato reproached the poets for having too low a concept of divinity and humanity - poems inconsistent with the true idea of being, truth, i.e., eternity. Nevertheless, even he himself was shown that the deepest ideas of philosophy cannot be expressed without poetry, myth, image, only with logos, only with abstract discourse. Poets, as Patočka stated, the greatest ones, took Plato's criticism to heart... and began to interpret (depict - describe) the world no longer as the work of *fate* (fatum) and *coincidence*, but of meaningful purposefulness, the human soul as immortal and eternally responsible for his deeds. According to Patočka, both Virgil and Dante are proof of this, because "Dante's work is a Catholic restyled myth about the cave" (Patočka 2006b: 889-890).

This note by Patočka is *fragmentary*, its continuation (perhaps on several sheets) is *unfortunately* missing. When we read this text further, Patočka (Ibid.) thinks about Nietzsche's solution to the problem of meaning through the moment and Dostoyevsky, about his insight into the depths of human life, through a different lens from Nietzsche's.

Patočka described Dostoyevsky - *the poet of human existence* - as the discoverer of a new *continent*, and that *new* continent was man infinitely interested in being precisely because he is a finite being. Dostoyevsky believed, like Columbus, that he "only found his way back to Christian theology of a mystical character" (Patočka 2006b: 891). With such an interpretation, Patočka claims, it cannot help us in our search for meaning. According to him, Dostoevsky has indicated a lot and sees possible help in Heidegger in his *Sein und Zeit* (1927), where the concept of anxiety is analysed as something that is always present in our life and ready to emerge, as well as in the text *Was ist Metaphysik*? But despite all the reservations about Dostoevsky, Patočka states that Dostoevsky's analyses seem to go further from this point of view: the author of the turn is not a person, but something deeper in him - it is this that can then form the basis for the mystical interpretation of its author. It is important for our problem, emphasized Patočka "that the question of meaning is not posed correctly when a person treats meaning as its originator" (Patočka 2006b: 891).

Life drama: Hamlet and Don Quixote

In the beginning, we talked about the thoughts-meditations of the poet Abaj, or the philosophers Descartes and Montaigne, or writers, and it was not accidental. Our reflections on *man* will be in the spirit of returning to the works of poets, which are an inherent part of our cultural memory, the treasure house of European culture. It is strange that *Hamlet* and *Don Quixote* were created *almost* at the same time. Yes, we can argue about it. There is no doubt that each of the two works has a different warmth, a different life, a different blood in it - because they were created under different suns - one under the sun of the cold *North* and the other under the

sun of the hot South. We will work with the texts of Shestov, who directly or indirectly influenced entire generations of not only Russian, but also Western, European philosophers, because many of them were lucky enough to meet and listen to the original, often provocative lectures of Shestov in Paris at the University of Paris - at the Sorbonne, where, after emigrating from Russia, he worked together with Berdjaev and many other emigrants to co-create the present-day form of Europe and European humanity. It is the two of them who are associated with the emergence of existentialism, which was also close to them through Dostoevsky and Russian spirituality.

Another source and source for us is the Spanish philosopher, aesthetician, and essayist Ortega y Gasset. It was he who, in the book *Meditations on Quixote* (1914), captured the tragic nature of human life through *love* and *hate*, creation and destruction, joining and dividing. "Inside every thing lies the germ of possible fullness. An *open* and noble *soul* feels the interest to develop it to perfection, to be helpful to the cause so that it reaches this fullness. And that is love - love for the perfection of the beloved" (Ortega y Gasset 2007: 8). Love, wrote Ortega y Gasset, is *the divine architect who descended to earth* (Ibid.).

Patočka (1907-1977), like Ortega y Gasset (1883-1955) who is a generation older than Patočka and a contemporary of Heidegger (1889-1976), liked to return to ancient Greece, to the beginnings and European roots. "Tragedy, no matter how paradoxical it sounds", emphasized Patočka, "with all the emphasis on fateful necessity, dictated by divine forces... is nevertheless a tragedy of freedom" (Patočka 1990: 30). A tragic action, a tragic life takes place in an atmosphere of *suffering*. Patočka was very well equipped with languages, as he was, so to speak, not only a talented philosopher, historian of philosophy, but also a philologist, and he had very good contacts with Russian emigrants in Czechoslovakia and could also read Russian philosophers whose works he translated.

Solovjov in the work produced at the end of his life, *The Drama of Plato's Life*[5] (1898), when he concluded after a long philosophical-historical analysis of the *Socrates Case* - the philosopher Socrates, who found himself in a dispute with Athens, with his hometown, in his old age, that Socrates had to die as a criminal, which was a tragic blow right at the beginning of Plato's life.

> However, historical reality is much deeper and more expressive than poetic fantasizing. Let's take e.g., Shakespeare's work. In the play *Hamlet*, the robber murders the father of the young Hamlet thanks to the compulsion of his base passions. Hamlet's natural feeling and natural commitment to his family compel him to punish the murderer and avenge his father. However, it is not so easy for him, because his mother also participated in the murder. The hero of the drama is trapped - he is trapped in a circle of fratricide, husband murder, regicide, usurpation of the throne and double or triple infidelity. His psyche falls into an irresolvable split. He finds in himself a contradiction between consciousness and will, between feeling and temperament. But, this is undoubtedly a magnificent example of a *tragic situation*, which is worthy of the greatest poet.
>
> (Solovjov 1997: 51, emphasis by the author)

Solovyov (1997) immediately added that such a situation has meaning and justification in a pagan society, where the moral obligation to avenge the father applies - where *blood feud* is decisive. For a heathen, this is, as Solovyov expressed it, a completely natural law, it is the law of blood, the law of *blood revenge*. For a Christian, however, this law does not apply at all. In this context, Solovyov stated that Hamlet, in order to have drama, had to believe in the law of blood revenge and at the same time be unable to fulfil the command of any law... "so that this

man is only a thinker, or if he likes a passive and not at all active man" (Solovyov 1997: 55, emphasis by the author). Soloviev did not want to analyse the character of Hamlet, because it would be useless to repeat what has already been done, by this he meant Turgeneev's well-known and excellent analysis of this character in *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (1980). And here I put in italics a word that may not seem strange to us at all - *thinker*. However, it is not just such an ordinary word at all.

If Solovyov (1997) was pointing to an ancient tragedy, then there the family came into conflict with the fact that the old laws of the family way of life were being broken; the essence of the tragic was that the law was bifurcated. Rod is omnipotent, but who is its representative? Who is the representative of the family - mother or father? Which natural union is truer - matriarchy or patriarchy? Father Florenskij (1994) and later psychoanalysis will also build on this in a certain way. However, for Solovyov, neither Orestes nor Hamlet was the supporting and determining factor. He focused his attention on Socrates and Plato, on the dispute between Socrates and Athens, where the whole tragedy lies in the fact that "Athens - the best social environment in all of humanity at that time - could not bear within itself the simple and pure embodiment of the principle of truth and justice" (Solovyov 1997: 60). Solovyov pointed out the dramatic turn of the life of the society, when *evil* engulfed the whole society - and so for the saint, the servant of the truth - there was nothing left but death.

> How is it even possible to live in such an evil realm in which a saint must die? Well, let's see what this "to be or not to be" is about, which Plato inevitably had to begin to solve over the corpse of the legally and publicly poisoned Socrates, deeper and more significant than the Hamletian «to be or not to be», which was caused by the illegal, i.e., the criminal, secret and essentially accidental poisoning of his father. It is clear that only a mature and internally rich personality like Plato could consciously experience and feel the full burden of the tragedy of this state.
>
> (Ibid. 60-61)

Hamlet, after the violent death of his *biological* father-king, asks 'to be or not to be' - what he means is - should I Hamlet *be or not be*? This is a purely *personal* question. But when Plato asked, after the death of his *spiritual* father-philosopher - so his, Plato's question 'to be or not to be' - was not a personal question, but 'to be or not to be' was a universal question – "can or cannot truth exist on earth?" (Ibid. 61).

Although Hamlet considered it necessary to avenge his father, his indecisive nature did not allow him to fulfil this apparent duty. However, this case is unique, because "a person who professes a religion that forbids him to take revenge, does not have to observe the customs and laws of revenge in any case" (Ibid. 52). In the same way, the whole plot of the tragedy - the hero's father was killed in the most disgusting way, he was deprived of his mother, he was expelled from the succession to the throne - would become dysfunctional if the hero was, say, not a Christian, but at least a Stoic, a Buddhist, or a follower of the modern Tolstoian principle of non-harming, non-violence. In that case, there would be only one option left - *resignation*. Solovyov writes, yes, he could be silent, he could grumble, but there is no counter-action at all - and thus no *tragedy*.

> If Shakespeare wanted to create a great tragedy from Hamlet's painful situation as we know it today, he had to create *special* conditions that do not follow from the essence of the given situation. This means that, first, it was necessary that all the horrors that occurred at Elsinore should fall on a man who, despite the fact that he actually considered

himself a Christian, sincerely recognized the necessity of bloody retribution. If this blind faith were not there, i.e. j. if Hamlet had begun to doubt his apparent duty, or if he had thought even for a moment that enemies should be forgiven, the whole tragedy would have been lost.

(Ibid. 53).

While thinking about Hamlet, Patočka (2006b) was interested in the opinion of the writer Mann, who was trying to understand the *tragic* hero through a philosophical aspect - thinking. The poet puts himself into his own creations, that it is he himself who is captured in them, and yet I conclude that in essence Mann (1976) is far *beyond* the theory of empathy, that he expresses through his own means the idea of the meaning of life, the idea of reflection of life in fantasy (Patočka 2006b: 289). I believe that the solution here is provided by Husserl's concept of the life world.

Through Husserl (1859-1938), the founder of phenomenology and his teacher, Patočka shows that what we originally live in "is not a 'world in itself', to which we gradually elaborate by eliminating anthropomorphism, but something completely other" (Patočka 2006b: 289). With that 'deviation' from the mundane and the everyday, the voice opens up. They come from far away, even though it is very important to be able to hear this sound of the world. The poet collects and reveals, he goes back from the world to the origin, to the sources - the echoic character of the world, i.e., an *echo* in which, as Patočka stated, he constantly hears life through voices coming from afar, but also our voices - that very one the echo of the world is, however, constantly revealed and shown by the writer-poet. Therefore, it does not complete, complete, or add meaning, but simply collects and reveals it (Ibid.). The poet, according to Patočka, in his relationship to the world, that is being between life practice and philosophical reflections, stands in the middle, so to speak. Until now, we only had philosophers' opinions about the *writer and his cause*. However, we will reach for how the poets themselves understand it and how they are often close to philosophers and their ways of understanding.

According to Kudrova (2016), the poet Tsvetaeva (1892-1941) was close to the philosopher Shestov (1866-1938), as both of them had a knack for uncovering, exposing, "revealing the tragic, hiding behind the usual" (Kudrova 2016: 138, emphasis by the author). Tsvetaeva's image - the characteristics of a poet, an artist, a genius, is a matter of the poet's inner self, inner pain and torn soul. It is a matter of a deep rejection of the real world, governed by reason and strict rules, counts, numbers, measures and weights. This world is determined by strict causation and what is inherent in the poet's blood, internal, *spiritual* physics - where the everyday, the mundane, rules not at all - i.e. not the horizontal, but the vertical as what is determining in the world of the poet. In 1923, Tsvetaeva had three poems dedicated to the theme of Hamlet - *Dialogue of Hamlet with Conscience*, *Ophelia in Defence of the Queen*, and *Ophelia - to Hamlet*. For Tsvetaeva, Hamlet – the Danish prince, as well as for Shestov, is a portrayal of coldness and reasoning. Where there should be a place for weeping and repentance, Hamlet only makes long-winded empty speeches. Hamlet is cold, and as if he is not even capable of love and human-warmed compassion, he is separated from other people by something like a glass wall, a dead coldness radiated from him. All this is as if a mirror image of a person of that time, the time of the modern world, which is just beginning to form and gain strength. It is about the *modern world*, where the *calculating*, *scientific* and *experimenting* reason and the coldness of the petrified heart have become decisive.

Shestov devoted himself to the topic of Hamlet for a long time because Shakespeare was particularly close to him. Even the initial, early works of Shestov[6] in newspapers, signed

only with initials or pseudonyms, e.g. *Black, Reader,* or *L.Š.,* from the period 1895-1898 can tell us a lot. His article *Georg Brandes on Hamlet* (1895) is actually a reaction to parts of the book on Shakespeare by the Danish critic Brandes published in the magazine *Russian Mind.* Shestov was convinced that the tragedy, the '*cross'* of Hamlet, is that he lacks the essentials - faith and love. These words may seem strange, but they have a deep meaning both in relation to Shakespeare's Hamlet and Shestov. In Hamlet he saw and revealed a great sufferer who is aware of his guilt, his insides, his heart is constantly *torn* by remorse.

After this article, Shestov began to work on other texts by Shakespeare, and the book *Shakespeare and his Critic Brandes* (1898), signed by Lev Shestov, was created. However, there has already been a certain shift in the evaluation of Hamlet. Hamlet continues to be a child of scepticism and eternal doubts, but his father's will is not what hangs over his head like a sword of Damocles... The *tragic* hero is not supposed to be just an executor of what the voice of his ancestors tells him - the laws of blood. We can say that Shestov, started to fight for an important and essential thing - the ability - *to see, read and understand*, hermeneutically - well ahead of how Gadamer only started to build hermeneutics, to grasp the mysterious, alive and addressed to contemporaries and the future, which the poet put into the work, into the words and lines, into the soul of his heroes. Shestov's searches are full of controversies, where arguments and passions combine, because philosophy, especially for Shestov, is about, in the words of Plotinus, '*the essential*' (Shestov 1890).

Ortega y Gasset: Surface and depth

Surface and depth, *depth* and surface - these are the two things that Ortega y Gasset thought about in *Meditations* on Quixote (2007). These are two things that are inseparable from each other. In this context, he asked *how many trees make a forest*?

> The forest and the city are two essentially deep things, and the deep is fated to become the surface if it wants to show itself. If I have two dozen stout oaks and massive ash trees around me. Is it a forest? Of course not: they are the trees I see from the forest. A real forest consists of trees that I cannot see. The forest is invisible from the beginning - that's why its name retains an air of mystery in all languages.
>
> (Ortega y Gasset 2007: 28)

The forest is something natural, original, deep, mysterious. The forest is a depth, a hidden mystery that can be revealed, revealed to show, to reveal what is invisible. The Greek name *alétheia* originally "meant the same as the later *apocalypse* - discovery, unveiling, literally the removal of a veil, a covering. If someone wants to teach us some truth, let him position us in such a way that we discover it ourselves" (Ibid.). The forest was supposed to teach us that there was a first plan of reality, and it forcibly imposes itself through colours, sounds, sensual pleasures and pains. But behind all that, it is different, higher, deeper, something which requires effort, attention, struggle and will.

Science, art, justice, decency, religion, these are the spheres of reality which do not barbarously take possession of our person, as hunger and frost do; they exist only for those who care for them". According to Ortega y Gasset, the book *Don Quixote* is an ideal forest. "It's another case of depth: the depth of a book, the greatest of books. *Don Quixote* is a book-escorzo par excellence. There was a time in Spanish life when they refused to see the depth in Quixote.

(Ibid. 34-35)

The digital age means the rise of artificial memory. Paper is our homeland. What cannot be put on paper, it's as if it does not even exist for us. Flusser in the book *Die Schrift. Hat Schreiben Zukunft? Does writing have a future?* (2007) stated that we are simply bookworms. We chewed paper for so many millennia, while this paper-mâché was fed by our saliva.

We live from books and for books. It can be seen that the book forms an intermediate stage on the way from the forest to the land of artificial intelligence. There is always a piece of forest in it: The German word for book Buch is the name of a tree Latin libre means tree bark and comes from the Greek *lepis* (peel) which in turn comes from the ancient word *lep* (to peel) the book was plucked from the forest and its leaves say what they're talking right now. But the book also represents a piece of artificial intelligence, because it is an artificial memory support and contains information computed from bits (letters).

(Flusser 2007: 98)

Yes, the *depth* of Don Quixote is not obvious, it is necessary to have what is necessary for that, which certain people, other times, and times (including ours) may not have at all. The ability to *see*, the ability to *hear*, the ability to read - this is what Ortega y Gasset had in mind when he previously mentioned Nietzsche, who was close to him, who pillaged an age in which everything great and noble was denied and clarity could not captivate the heart. Such an age cannot be characterized as an age of barbarism and dullness.

Just as there is guidance, which is insight, there is also reading, which is the reading of the interior, thoughtful reading, *intelligere*. Only to such a person will *Quixote'*s deep meaning be revealed (...) Meditation is a movement by which we leave the surface like the shores of the land and feel thrown into a finer element without material points of support. At the same time, we rely exclusively on ourselves, thanks to the rise of our own forces, we float in an ethereal sphere inhabited by forms without weight and gravity.

(Ortega y Gasset 2007: 38)

We are like a tightrope walker - tense and worried because it only takes one step, a mistake, sometimes a small inattention - and we fall down. But at the same time, during this intellectual voyage, perhaps rather like aerial swimmers, when flying up to the heights, in the words of Ortega y Gasset, *intellectual dizziness* seizes us.

Is there any deeper book than this low, mocking novel? Finally, what is *Quixote* to us? Are we sure what he wants to tell us about life? The brief flashes of light that fell on him so far came from the souls of strangers: Schelling, Heine, Turgenev... Momentary and insufficient clarifications. For these men, Quixote was a curiosity, not a matter of destiny for them as it is for us.

(Ibid. 58)

Ortega y Gasset (2007) constantly works with a purely Spanish perspective, referring and pointing to the ancient past. His returns are interesting and his views of ancient Greece returns to origins and roots and the national characteristics and peculiarities between Greek and Roman, German, French, Spanish and Russian or Italian mentalities, past and present. If we were to reach out to other authors who devoted themselves to the analysis of Don Quixote, perhaps their point of view would be diametrically different. I am referring to the Russian-American writer Nabokov (1899-1977), who expressed, in his lectures about this novel, many original and provocative opinions that went beyond the usual ideas, schemes and statements about this 'book of all books'. Nevertheless, none of them denied the *genius* of Cervantes and his immortal hero - the ingenious knight Don Quixote de la Mancha, this old rough book, a great fairy tale that enchants, entices and constantly amazes its readers.

Ortega y Gasset (2007) commented on the writer Turgenev and his text dedicated to Quixote, albeit with recognition, but at the same time, also as a not entirely satisfactory treatment of the topic, nevertheless it is necessary to recognize that before him, this text *Hamlet and Don Quixote* (1860), written by Turgenev, was expressed by several, not at all insignificant, philosophers, poets-writers and critics. It is enough to mention Tolstoy, and above all the philosopher, poet and mystic Solovyov (1853-1900), a younger contemporary of the German poet-philosopher Nietzsche (1844-1900). It will also not be unimportant if we realize the different approach and the overall intention with which Ortega y Gasset worked and Turgenev fifty years before him. Therefore, it is necessary to see and not to underestimate the time and the time of creation of the work, to have the ability to grasp the topic and problems through time and contexts. However, they were certainly united by the same thing - the effort to understand the poet, which Turgenev expressed through Goethe's idea: *"Whoever wants to understand a poet must enter his domain"* (Turgenev 1980: 330). If we want to understand the poet, we have to discover his world and share it - stay in it for a while - be in it together with him.

Turgenev: sketches of the antipodes of Hamlet and Don Quixote

The Russian writer and poet Turgenev (1818-1883) had an interesting text called *Hamlet and Don Quixote*. The speech was delivered on 10 January 1860 at a public reading organized for the Society for the Aid of Writers and Scientists.

> The first edition of Shakespeare's tragedy "Hamlet" and the first part of Cervantes' "Don Quixote" were published in the same year, at the beginning of the 17th century. This fortuitous event proved to be of great importance to us; it was the convergence of the mentioned works that led us to a whole range of ideas. We ask for permission to share these thoughts with you, counting on your kindness in advance. 'He who wants to understand the poet must enter his area,' - said Goethe; - the novelist has no right to similar demands; however, he hopes that readers - or listeners will want to travel with him, to be pilgrims in his search.
>
> (Turgenev 1980: 330)

If we talked about the fact that the opinions of writers or poets can cause disagreement, then Turgenev expected it and was well aware of it. Such is the fate of a genius, Turgenev stated, that his work, the words of his heroes, are understood and accepted in different ways, or strongly rejected. We have to agree with Turgenev that many commentaries have already

been written on Hamlet. But it is equally true that many more will be written in the future. And how different were the opinions and criticisms of these ideas and also the assessment of the work itself. Perhaps, according to Turgenev, the situation with the work of *Don Quixote*, which was created under the hot sun of the south, the glow of its rays, is quite different.

Hamlet and *Don Quixote* were created at the same time. In these *two* figures, it seems that two *types* of people are depicted, in which the opposite peculiarities of human nature are captured. There is, as it were, an axis, the opposite ends of which are represented by these two heroes, who are, in a sense, antipodes. Russian poet and philosopher Ivanov (1866-1949), Hellenist, historian and symbolist, in the text *Crisis of Individualism* (1905) made a note or correction to Turgenev's text:

> Three hundred years have passed since the writing of the admirable work of Cervantes: for three hundred years Don Quixote travels the world. Three centuries do not know the glory and the brilliant martyrdom of one of the first 'heroes of our time': the one who is connected to us in body and soul. *Turgenev was amazed at the coincidence*, but it turned out to be a chronological error. Turgenev thought that in the same year that the first part of *Don Quixote* was published, Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was also first published. Today we know that the English tragedy was most likely published already in 1602. On the other hand, the whole group of deeply thought-provoking works of Shakespeare (Hamlet, Macbeth, King Lear) in their entirety bring back our memories to the era of popularization of Cervantes' work. If we are to immediately attach the name of the Danish prince to the anniversary of the knight de la Mancha, let that name be King Lear, or Macbeth. The whole host of their great shadows is present with us at the great anniversary of the new work. These eternal human types do not look only to eternity. They also look at us in a strange and penetrating way, even though we are separated by three centuries.
>
> (Ivanov 2010: 38)

Turgenev compared Hamlet and Don Quixote, - to offer us these two types of human nature, where they are, as it were, two ideals, two possible orientations in the direction of life. One of them is comical, ridiculous, swarming, Don Quixote - he is the prototype of a person who, according to the poet, will never come to terms with the existing state of the world. Quixote will forever fight against disorder, evil and injustice, even if he himself gets into difficult situations and conflicts many times. According to Turgenev (1980), the world needs Don Quixote, despite his ridiculousness and naivety, it needs his goodness, patience, the warmth of his heart, it needs his naive faith in man.

> What does Don Quixote represent above all? Faith above all; faith in something eternal, unshakable, in the truth, in a word, in the truth, located outside of any individual person, which is difficult to achieve, but which requires service and sacrifice. Don Quixote serves an ideal, and for that he will sacrifice anything, undergo all kinds of hardships, even lay down his life.
>
> (Turgenev 1980: 331)

His life has the value of how and with what it can be realized - ideal, truth and justice here on earth. If he were to live only for himself - to *care* only for himself - he would consider such a thing shameful. The action of Don Quixote is linked by *one and essential*.

What is Hamlet like? – asks Turgenev – what does he himself represent? Hamlet, for him is the typical analysis: egoism, and inability to believe. Hamlet finds nothing, no starting point on which to lean, to hang his soul, his Self. Hamlet is very educated, he has a sharp mind,

but his mind is in constant doubt, he is a sceptic. According to Turgenev, Hamlet "doubts everything, does not spare himself at all; he has a mind too developed to be satisfied with what he finds in himself: he is aware of his weakness, but all self-awareness is strength; hence the irony, the opposite of Don Quixote's enthusiasm" (Turgenev 1980: 332-333). Hamlet curses himself with pleasure, with exaggeration, constantly observes himself, and just as constantly looks inside himself. Hamlet knows his own shortcomings to the smallest detail, "he despises them, he despises himself - at the same time, we can say, he lives and feeds on contempt. He does not believe in himself - and he is vain, he himself does not know what he wants and why, for what he lives - he does not know why he is attached to life" (Ibid.).

Turgenev's thoughts are deep and interesting. The initially jagged, uncertain contours of these two *antipodes* - Hamlet and Don Quixote - become more and more certain and clear under his hand. According to Turgenev, Don Quixote expresses the ability to find and discover that

> The Don Quixotes are founders and the Hamlets - they are the ones who elaborate. They will ask us, and perhaps the Hamlets can, are they able to work something out if they only doubt everything and *everything*? We will answer this question that there are no complete Don Quixotes, it is only a borderline expression of two directions, they are paths outlined by poets of two different directions, paths. Life moves towards them in its efforts, but it never reaches them. We must not forget that, as the principle of analysis is brought to the tragic in Hamlet, so the principle of enthusiasm is brought to the comic in Don Quixote, but in life the completely comic and completely tragic meet very rarely.
>
> (Ibid. 345)

Hamlet's realization of Horatio's importance does him credit. This is the testimony of the fact that he recognized the high dignity of man, his noble efforts, which even scepticism could not prevent him from doing. I want to believe that potential interested parties will be happy to reach for this great text of a Russian-European writer who was so philosophical that he influenced many philosophers and even Heidegger, thinking about the philosophy of Nietzsche and nihilism, could not but mention Turgenev as the originator of nihilism, except another with his novel *Fathers and Children*.

> Hamlet gains a great deal in our eyes from Horatius being attached to him. This figure-character is wonderful, and it occurs quite often in our time. In Horatio we have a type of follower, a disciple in the best sense of the word. A person with a stoic character, a hot heart, but a little limited in reason, he himself is aware of his deficiency, he is modest, which is very rare among these people, limited people; he longs to receive advice, guidance, and therefore honours and respects the reasonable Hamlet, is devoted to him with all his honest soul, and does not expect the same reciprocity. One of the most important merits of Hamlet/s is that they create and develop people like Horatio, people who are able to further develop the seeds of ideas they have received in their hearts and spread them around the world.
>
> (Turgenev 1980: 345)

Turgenev ended his speech, poem, composition with the words of the apostle, who said that 'everything passes - only love remains'. Yes, love—a word so ringing and sweet to the human ear and heart, and yet still as unknown and mysterious. The basic directions of two essential, diametrically different, and opposite directions of the human spirit. Turgenev, an

excellent and recognized writer, a great rhetorician, fulfilled his goal - to address the listeners, to evoke the birth of an idea through his own reflections, to restore the ability to think - so that they would think not only about what he said wisely, truthfully and profoundly, but also - and above all in true philosophy goes - to think about time and us - about ourselves and our life, the meaning of our life. In this, Turgenev saw the meaning of the legacy of tragic poets for us and our present.

His followers followed up on his ideas, in agreement or with reservations. According to Ivanov (2010), if Hamlet and Don Quixote stand against each other, then in a certain interpretation we can see here the new and the old, where Hamlet is closed in his solitude, in solitude he hesitates before the new, as yet unknown, but also reveals a threat of unknown and untested, unmarked sidewalks. Hamlet hesitates whether to marry (or is the old one present in him, long lived?, as some interpret him), and Don Quixote, this opposite of Hamlet, "it may be said that no new action is born in him, but the old rises from the dead" (Ivanov 2010: 41). There is something indomitable and stubborn about Don Quixote, despite all the hardships, he is unbreakable and impossible to subdue. He bends, lays down on the ground like a blade of grass, only to rise again after a while and straighten his old, sore back. Thus, he is a partaker, this Prométheus de la Mancha, of something great and sublime, mysterious and eternal, much higher and greater than man.

We also found a dedicated interpretation of Shakespeare in Herder (1744-1803) in his texts, where he devoted himself especially to literature, and here he also invites us to read and think about the aforementioned plays by Shakespeare. Herder (2006) began his interpretation of Shakespeare in the text *William Shakespeare* with these words:

> William Shakespeare was born in 1564, a man who did not know Greek, he knew little of the Greeks, and if so, then only in translations, but he himself was a happy son of a good destiny. From the former wool merchant he became an actor and dramatic poet to such a far-reaching extent that if we call the Greeks *the poets of the Hellenic heroic cycle*, we must call Shakespeare the poet of the world cycle. *Shakespeare* wrote the tragic play Hamlet. Hamlet is his Orestes. They were deeply mistaken in his character, who passed him off as a *fool* (Hamlet), a creature who is usually called a good man; Shakespeare's subtle, deep-thinking drawing clearly refutes this. A crime has occurred; the father was maliciously murdered. Hamlet's clairvoyant soul senses something.
>
> (Herder 2006: 101)

Likewise, Schelling (1755-1854) in the *Philosophy of Art* (1802-1803 Jena, 1804-1805 Wurburg), which is a set of his lectures which the philosopher himself processed into a book, wrote about modern dramatic poetry:

> I now approach the interpretation of tragedy and comedy by modern authors. In order not to get lost in this vast sea, I will try to focus attention on a few main moments (…) The first thing we have to start with is that the foundations of modern drama lie in the mixture of opposites, that is, above all, the very mixture of the tragic and the comic.
>
> (Schelling 2007: 608)

It is very rare for a poet to be a master of both - comedy as well as tragedy, and that is exactly what Shakespeare is. According to Schelling, the poet Shakespeare

he is at the same time gentle in the comic, exciting and funny in *Hamlet*, and rough (in the scenes with Fallstaff) without ever becoming down-to-earth; but [can be] tragically torn (in *Lear*), punishing (in Macbeth), delicious, moving and propitiating in *Romeo and Juliet* and in several plays of a mixed nature. If we examine the fabric of modern tragedy, it would have to have a dignity at least worthy of mythology in its most perfect expression.

(Ibid. 609)

Shestov appreciated the same delicacy of 'pen drawing' in Shakespeare, when he compared his work Macbeth with how roughly, almost with a hammer and a carpenter's chisel, Dostoevsky worked when he addressed a topic close to him - murder, the psyche of a murderer and the relationship between a fallen hero and a poet. Here we would like to mention that Shestov was convinced that if someone wants to understand Russian literature more deeply, he should read and study the best, which are the works of Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy. Shestov in the work *Potestas clavium - The Power of the Keys* in the section *Vyacheslav the Great* (*On the Characteristics of Russian Decay*) wrote: "I think that every Russian writer can be best understood through his relationship to Dostoevsky and Tolstoy" (Shestov 1993: 247).

Let's go back to our topic, which is tragedy and the tragic hero. Shestov in the book *Shakespeare and his Critic Brandes* (1898) stated that "to unravel the mystery of Lear's soul is impossible if you have not lived through his tragedy" (Shestov 1911: 43). Well, this tragedy happened in the soul of Shakespeare.

The one who lived through the feelings of Lear, who, together with Shakespeare, was able to enter that dark, impenetrable cloud, where suddenly, after many years of safe joys, the unhappy old man ended up - that's why this big question "зачем - why? – for what?" will never cease to exist. Weak, small people run away from him, try to forget him, cover themselves from him with everyday worries and joys. Great people, however, look directly into the face of the resurrected ghost - and *either* die *or* clear up their lives. Shakespeare was not afraid of the fateful role. What it cost him, we will never know. But there can be no doubt that he bought the immortal fame of a great tragedian at a terrible price. He himself experienced the horror of the tragedy. He understood it and explained its meaning to us - he explained how it all happens and what it will do to a person.

(Ibid. 43-44)

Conclusion

How should we proceed with Shakespeare? Which is the 'Right Way'? Should we go through the reading of his works, without the biography, or should we go the other way around - through the reading-study of his biography and only then by reading his works in detail can we understand what this great poet-playwright was thinking about and what he was working on? Sometimes they choose a quite strange, even unique approach. Then, as they have their own life experiences, they begin to read and 'study', to think about his works, so that through them, through the thoughts of this poet, who was long ago identified as the greatest among all poets. Such is the procedure of an amateur, taught by life and his own life experience. "Cabinet people have always stood and will always stand far from what was happening in the soul of the great poet who threw himself headlong into life" (Shestov 1911: 46). These cabinet people, which is quite possible, will be the only ones in the role of interpreters of Shakespeare for some time, Shestov wrote, but what is much worse, they will end up smoothing everything so much that the full spontaneity of life, its storminess and unrestrainedness, which is portrayed to us in the

way they confuse the poet's dramas with their 'looming on the surface' as a confirmation of the 'unity of the composition' (Ibid. 46-47). Shestov has no desire to lay down his arms and resign himself to the scholarship' of the cabinet people, these fools. Criticism of Brandes, who, like many others, does not want to learn from Shakespeare because he himself knows *everything* beautifully. Brandes writes his book only to "show that 300 years ago, the greatest of poets knew exactly the same 'everything', and that therefore his, Brandes' understanding of life is the most correct" (Ibid. 47)

According to Brandes, it is precisely in Hamlet - this first philosophical drama of the modern age - that a typical contemporary man appears for the first time with a deep sense of the contradiction between the ideal and the harsh reality, with the awareness of a deep gap between his own powers and the task. According to this statement, the modern man is smart, he has a very nimble, nimble mind, but he does not have his own gaiety at all. He has cruelty and tenderness in him, he constantly postpones, delays things, and at the same time he is unusually impatient. According to Brandes, this is the contemporary person who is embodied in Shakespeare, in the poet who merged with his hero, with Hamlet. Not only did he join him in an inseparable unity, but he also felt the same as Hamlet. How does critic Brandes know all this? He asked Shestov's question in order to answer it immediately: "Brandes learned this not from the poet's biography, but (...) He read everything in the poet's dramas, thanks to the fact that he read them with an open receptive ear with common sense and a soul accessible to the understanding of genius" (Ibid.). Critics like to believe in their learning that they can uncover the most secret depths of a genius's thinking. Shestov showed the naivety not only of Brandes, but of many so-called connoisseurs of Shakespeare. Scientific reason fails before the philosophy of tragedy because there neither logic nor the usual arithmetical numbers 2 x 2 = 4 apply. Dostoyevsky's paradoxist clearly showed that reason shows man's desire to reason and find order, but wanting is a manifestation of the whole of life, and life sometimes has strange mathematics where 2 x 2 = 5.

> This is the plot of the tragedy *Hamlet*. Not for fun, not for psychological experience, Shakespeare in *Hamlet* threw a weak man on the open sea, as a prey to all contradictions and problems, just as in *King Lear*, the poet did it not at all for the effect, although tragic, to force the king to support his poor, grey, proud head under the raw blows of heartless daughters. The characters of Hamlet and Lear were not the cause of their miseries, nor did Shakespeare look for the causes at that time. 'Why' didn't satisfy him anymore. He asked himself: 'For what?' Already in the first act we have a sad Hamlet in front of us.
>
> (Shestov 1911: 61-62)

This is no longer something like abstract sadness, he - Prince Hamlet - is troubled by his mother's hasty marriage, and he is the one who made the prince's poor heart sad... We see that here Shestov is very close to the analysis of the German classic by Herder in the text which we stated. It is worth mentioning the ideas of Hegel (1968) in *Aesthetics*, where he noticed *characters* - the depiction of individual characters in Cervantes and Shakespeare. Despite the comical delusion

is preserved in Don Quixote what we highlighted earlier in Shakespeare. Cervantes also created his hero as an originally noble character, endowed with many-sided gifts of the spirit, which at the same time constantly interests us. Don Quixote is a soul who in his madness is completely sure of himself and his thing, or rather madness is only in the fact that he is and remains so sure of himself and his thing.

(Hegel 1968: 398)

The novel *Don Quixote de la Mancha* was an object of deep respect for Dostoevsky. Such books are sent, Dostoevsky claimed, to mankind once every few centuries. What particularly amazed Dostoevsky was the relationship between Sancho and Don Quixote, where Sancho, the embodiment of 'common sense', cleverness and the 'golden middle road', doubted many things, but at the same time sincerely believed, with the greatness of his heart, in the great intellect of his knight. According to Dostoevsky, in this book the "fatal secret of man and all mankind" is shown (Losskij 1946: 120). The cold calculating mind of science, the professorial philosophy obsessed with the pursuit of scientific credit, are subject to the power of numbers and statistics, which provide an alibi and a safe armour against the essential, which is life and thought. Millions of Hamlets came to life in the souls of us and our contemporaries. The tragic rupture of time periodically repeats itself and throws us before the question *How to live in the name of what should we act and suffer?* The hope of salvation is not given by Hamlet with his cold reasoning, but by the madness of Don Quixote, who, despite his madness, beatings and naivety, did not stop believing in the goodness and justice of this world with a childlike sincerity.

Notes

[1] This research was supported by the VEGA Project 1/0232/21 "The Relationship between Philosophy and Science Today", granted by the Ministry of Education, Research and Sport of the Slovak Republic.
[2] Nietzsche, F. 2005. O užitku a škodlivosti historie pro život. In Nietzsche, F. *Nečasové úvahy*. Translated by Krejčí, J. and Kouba, P. Praha: Oikúmené 2005, pp. 77-147.
[3] Dahrendorf, R. 2008. *Pokoušení neslobody. Intelektuálové v časech skoušek*. Translated by Zoubková, J. Praha: Nakladatelství H&H, 2008, pp. 112-113.
[4] Nezník, P. 2009. Patočka, Leibniz a dejiny filozofie. In Tholt, P., Nezník, P. (eds.): *Patočkova asubjektívna fenomenológia*. Košice: UPJŠ 2009, pp. 124-147; see also Markov, B. 2017. Obrazy Evropy u Nicše, Dostojevskogo, Shestova i Patočki. In Nezník, P., Markov, B. et al. *Dostojevskij a Nietzsche. Apoteóza nezakorenenosti. Za a proti...* Košice: UPJŠ, 2017, pp. 57-76.
[5] See also Solovjov, V. 2002. *Zmysel lásky*. Translated by Komorovský, J. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2002.
[6] See also Achutin, A. V. 1993. Odinokij mysliteľ. In Shestov, L. *Sočinenija v 2-x tomach*. T. 1. Moskva: Nauka, pp. 3-14.

References

Abaj, I. K. 1959. *Čtyřicet rozjímaní o životě a lidech*. Translated by Hřebíček, L. Praha: Svět sovětů, 1959.

Achutin, A. V. 1993. Odinokij mysliteľ. In Shestov, L. *Sočinenija v 2-x tomach.* T. 1. Moskva: Nauka, 1993, pp. 3- 14.

Berlin, I. 2001. Jež i lisa. Esse o vzgľjadach Tolstogo na istoriju. In Berlin, I. *Istorija svobody. Rossija.*

Moskva: Novoje literaturnoje obozrenije, 2001, pp. 183-268.

Cervantes, M. Saavedra de. 1950. *Dômyselný rytier Don Quijote de la Mancha*. Translated by Félix, J. Bratislava: Tatran, 1950.

Florenskij, P. 1994. Gamlet. In *Svjaščenik Pavel Florenskij: Sočinenija v četyrjoch tomach.* T. 1. Moskva: Mysľ, 1994, pp. 250- 279.

Flusser, V. 2007. *Písmo. Má písanie budúcnosť?* Translated by Münzová, A., Zmeček, A. Bratislava: Ivan Štefánik, 2007.

Hegel, G. W. F. 1968. *Estetika.* Prvý zväzok. Translated by Münzová, A. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo politickej literatúry, 1968.

Heidegger, M. 1996. *Bytí a čas*. Translated by Chvatík, I. et at. Praha: Oikúmené, 1996.

Herder, J. G. 2006. *Uměním k lidskosti. Úvahy o jazyce a literatuře*. Translated by Binder, J. Praha: Oikúmené, 2006.

Hesse, H. 2013. *Šťastie.* Translated by Diamantová, E. Bratislava: Petrus, 2013.

Ivanov, V. 2010. *Subjekt a kosmos.* Translated by Černohous, A. Olomouc: Refugium Velehrad-Roma s.r.o., 2010

---. 2010a. Krize individualizmu. In Ivanov, V.: *Subjekt a kosmos*. Translated by Černohous, A. Olomouc: Refugium Velehrad-Roma s.r.o., pp. 38-48.

---. 2010b. Nietzsche a Dionýzos. In Ivanov, V.: *Subjekt a kosmos*. Translated by Černohous, A. Olomouc: Refugium Velehrad-Roma s.r.o., pp. 49-61.

Jermičov, A. A. 2016. Do Shestova... (Gazetnyje vystuplenija L. I. Shestova 1895-1899 godov). In: *Lev Izakovič Shestov*. Moskva: ROSSPEN, 2016, pp. 262-273.

Kudrova, I. V. 2016. Lev Shestov i Marina Cvetajeva – tvorčeskije pereklički. In *Derznovenija i pokornosti Ľva Shestova. Sbornik statej naučnoj konferenciji k 150-letiju so dňa roždenija filosofa.* Sankt-Peterburg: Izdateľstvo Russkoj christianskoj gumanitarnoj akademiji, 2016, pp. 132-149.

Losskij, N. O. 1946. *Dostojevskij a jeho kresťanský svetonáhľad*. Liptovský Mikuláš: Tranoscius, 1946.

Mann, T. 1976. *O veľkosti a utrpení Richarda Wagnera.* Translated by Šimulčíková, J. Bratislava: Opus, 1976.

Markov, B. V. 2002. Chajdegger i Nicše. In *Homo philosophans. Sbornik k 60-letijuprofessora K.A. Sergejeva*. Sankt-Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskoje filosofskoje obščestvo, 2002, pp. 205-225.

---. 2017. Obrazy Evropy u Nicše, Dostojevskogo, Shestova i Patočki. In Nezník, P., Markov, B. et al. *Dostojevskij a Nietzsche. Apoteóza nezakorenenosti. Za a proti...* Košice: UPJŠ, 2017, pp. 57-76.

---. 2021. *Političeskaja imunologija*. Moskva: Progres, 2021.

---. 2022. *Filosofija protesta. Messijanizm – liberalizm – konservativizm*. Sankt-Peterburg: Vladimir Daľ, 2022.

Nezník, P. 2009. Patočka, Leibniz a dejiny filozofie. In Tholt, P., Nezník, P. *Patočkova asubjektívna fenomenológia*. Košice: UPJŠ, 2009, pp. 124-147.

Nietzsche, F. 2005. *Nečasové úvahy.* Translated by Krejčí, J., Kouba, P. Praha: Oikúmené, 2005.

---. 2005. O užitku a škodlivosti historie pro život. In Nietzsche, F. *Nečasové úvahy.* Translated by Krejčí, J., Kouba, P. Praha: Oikúmené, 2005, pp. 77-147.

Ortega y Gasset, J. 1993. Idea divadla. Translated by Přidal, A., Housková, A. In *Divadelní revue.* 1993, Vol. 5., No. 2, pp. 10-16.

---. 1993a. Dvojí divadlo. Translated by Housková, A. In *Divadelní revue.* 1993, Vol. 5., No. 2, pp. 17-18.

---. 2007. *Meditace o Quijotovi.* Translated by Mašínová, M. Brno: Host, 2007.

Patočka, J. 1990. *Kacířské eseje o filosofii dějin.* Praha: Academia, 1990.

---. 1990a. *Sokrates. Přednášky z antické filosofie.* Praha: SPN, 1990.

---. 2002. Duchovní člověk a intelektuál. In *Péče o duši III.* Praha: Oikúmené, 2002, pp. 355-371.

---. 2004. *Umění a čas I.–II.* Praha: Oikúmené, 2004.

---. 2006a. Spisovatel a jeho věc (K filosofii literatury). In *Češi I.* Praha: Oikúmené, 2006, pp. 280-292.

---. 2006b. Humanita a nihilismus. In *Češi I.* Praha: Oikúmené, 2006, pp. 883-892.

---. 2006c. Dostojevskij – Nietzsche – Masaryk. In *Češi I.* Praha: Oikúmené, 2006, pp. 893-898.

Rozenfeld, J. 2019. The Subjective Reality of Documenting in Digimodernims In Šnircová, S., Tomaščíková, S. (eds.). Postmillennial Trends in Anglophone Literatures, Cultures and Media. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 122-142.

Rozenfeld, J. 2019. Eastern European Struggles to Redefine the Local in a Globalised World In Šnircová, S., Tomaščíková, S. (eds.). Postmillennial Trends in Anglophone Literatures, Cultures and Media. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019, pp. 232-244.

Schelling, F. W. J. 2007. *Filozofia umenia.* Translated by Bakoš, O. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2007.

Shakespeare, W. 1963. *Hry. Sen noci svatojanské. Romeo a Julie. Hamlet. Othelo.* Translated by Hruška, K. Praha: Mladá fronta, 1963.

---. 1980. *Pět her. Richard III. Sen noci svatojánské. Večer tříkrálový. Hamlet. Král Lear.* Tranlated by Bejblík, A. et al. Praha: Odeon, 1980.

---. 2006. *Ako sa vám páči?* Translated by Feldek, L. Bratislava: Ikar, 2006.

Shestov, L. 1911. Šekspir i jego kritik Brandes. In Shestov, L. *Sobranije sočinenij v 6-ch tomach.* T. 1. Sankt-Peterburg: Šipovnik, 1911.

---. 1991. *Apofeoz bezpočvennosti. Opyt adogmatičeskogo myšlenija.* Leningrad: Izdateľstvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1991.

---. 1991a. ´Julij Cezar´ Šekspira. In Shestov, L. *Apofeoz bezpočvennosti. Opyt adogmatičeskogo myšlenija.* Leningrad: Izdateľstvo Leningradskogo universiteta, 1991, pp. 181-190.

---. 1993. *Sočinenija v 2-ch tomach.* T. 1. Moskva: Izdateľstvo Nauka, 1993.

---. 1993a. Potestas clavium. In Shestov, L. *Sočinenija v 2-ch tomach.* T. 1. Moskva: Izdateľstvo Nauka, 1993, pp. 17-312.

---. 2001a. Dobro v učenii gr. Tolstogo i F. Nicše. In Sineokaja, J. (ed.) *Nicše: Pro et Contra…* Sankt-Peterburg: Izdateľstvo RCHGI, 2001, pp. 339-444.

---. 2001b. Dostojevskij i Nicše. (Filosofija tragediji) In Sineokaja, J. (ed.) Nicše: *Pro et Contra…* Sankt-Peterburg: Izdateľstvo RCHGI, 2001, pp. 445-597.

---. 2006. *Athény a Jeruzalém.* Olomouc: Refugium Velehrad-Roma, 2006.

Solovjov, V. 1997. *Drama Platónova života.* Translated by Černohous, A. Samotišky: Spolek moravských nakladatelů, 1997.

---. 2002. *Zmysel lásky.* Translated by Komorovský, J. Bratislava: Kalligram, 2002.

Turgenev, I. S. 1980. Gamlet i Don-Kichot. In Turgenev, I. S. *Polnoje sobranije sočinenij i pisem v tridsati tomach.* Moskva: Nauka, 1980, pp. 330-348.

Peter Nezník
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice
Department of Philosophy
Faculty of Arts
Moyzesova 9
040 01 Košice
peter.neznik@upjs.sk

Annie Ernaux – Little Honour Outside Her Own Country?

Ian Butcher, Independent scholar

Annie Ernaux has published some 23 books, many shorter texts and articles, and is much celebrated in her native France. Her most famous book *The Years* (Ernaux 2017) won, among others, the Prix Renardot in 2008, the Premio Strega in Italy in 2016, the Marguerite Duras prize, the 2019 Warwick Prize for Women in Translation and Francois Mauriac prize. In 2017 she won the Marguerite Yourcenar Prize for her life's work. Many other awards followed, and in 2022 she was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature. Only the seventeenth woman, and first French woman to win it. The Nobel Committee celebrated her "uncompromising" 50-year body of work, that "reveals the agony of the experience of class, describing shame, humiliation, jealousy or inability to see who you are…she gives words to these experiences that are simple and striking". They praised "her courage and clinical acuity with which she uncovers the roots, estrangements and collective restraints of personal memory" (Nobel 2022). Her books are regularly used as set books in French schools, and are considered contemporary classics in France.

Yet… Ernaux is little known in English-speaking countries, apart from in certain academic circles. The Nobel Prize has certainly increased interest in her work. Although many of her works had been translated into English over the years, only now are the remaining ones being translated. Some currently remain in French only.

One could be forgiven for seeing Ernaux's *oeuvre* almost as an extended memoir, a continued layering of familiar, key themes which she evokes repeatedly throughout her books. She refers to the "palimpsest sensation" where various memories "float on top of each other" (Ernaux 2017). A palimpsest is a parchment or document where earlier texts are covered over or barely legible by layers of new writing. Ernaux continually amends and reassesses her version of events as new exterior events happen and she is changed by them. Every time she repeats a story she tells it slightly differently Just like the extended-family dinners: always the same but with different people filling the roles.

Born in 1940 in Lillebonne, née Duchesne, into a prudish Catholic family, her parents left school at 12, worked in factories and moved to Yvetot to run a modest café-grocery store in one of the poorer quarters of town. Ernaux was a talented student and her education took her out of her parents' working-class milieu. It was when she came into contact with middle class girls as a scholarship student that she felt the shame of her parents and her humble origins, yet at the same time did not feel that she belonged entirely either to her "new" intellectual, bourgeois class. She writes that her mother "spent all day selling milk and potatoes so that I could sit in a lecture hall and learn about Plato" (Ernaux 1991). For this reason, she considered herself as a "social defector" from her class (Nobel 2022).

She dedicates one of her books – *A Man's Place* (Ernaux 1992) – to the death and memory of her father. Another, a sort of mirror-image, *A Woman's Story* (Ernaux 1991), focuses on her mother's decline and death from Alzheimer's. In an ironic reversal, she becomes the care-giving, mother-figure to her ailing mother. Perhaps in echo of Camus' *The Stranger* (Camus 2012), ("Mother died today. Or maybe yesterday. I don't know"), the memoir begins matter-of-factly "My mother died on Monday 7 April in the old peoples home attached to the hospital at Pontoise..". She seeks to understand the woman who raised her and the guilt she feels about describing someone she had known so intimately, but who had a life independent from hers. When she was alive, her mother imposed strict rules and codes that did not allow

for deviation. Typically, having kicked against her ambitious mother's strong will all her life and having been somewhat cowed by her, she discovers that she loved her more than anyone else, that her mother's voice was "everything", and is totally devastated by her death. As she reflects "The worst thing about death is the loss of voice" (Ernaux 1991). Her mother's Alzheimer's is as much about forgetting as Ernaux's work is about remembering. The fragmentary, unreliable nature of her memory and her struggle with the mechanisms of it is reflected in her spare writing style, and her extensive use of lists and single sentences.

Her book *Shame* (Ernaux 1989) begins with the laconic narrator as a twelve-year old girl witnessing a momentary family altercation: "My father tried to kill my mother one Sunday in June, in the early afternoon". It should be noted that the father did not kill the mother, and the couple returned to their normal lives within a few minutes. However, to the girl, the event was a shock which refuses to go away, a mature woman's vision of herself in a moment when childhood innocence is shattered by childhood terror as we are plunged into the minutiae of that day. It is notable that Ernaux sums up her reaction to the event in terms of shame – given the almost instantaneous return to normal life after the event - rather than fear, trauma, terror, or other sentiments.

As Ernaux confesses in her Nobel Prize acceptance speech, her work is about "shame and shame at feeling shame" and "the writing which had caused me to be distanced from my origins". Indeed, a key thread is the exploration and categorisation of the various types of shame. As she swore at the age of twenty, her objective in writing was to "avenge my people and avenge my sex…delving into the unspeakable in repressed memory, and bringing light to bear on how my people lived" (Nobel 2022). Her "people" are the forgotten underclass, the downtrodden and those oppressed by the great disparities regarding gender, language and class.

Her unflinching gaze examines her life and confronts taboos in austere, hard detail and clinical analysis: her own body, her first periods, burgeoning desire and first, disappointing sexual experiences in *A Girl's* Story, at a time when "no one was supposed to have sex before marriage" (Ernaux 2020). Mixing the personal and the public, this traumatic and disappointing sexual and emotional awakening (arguably a rape) takes place during "the summer of De Gaulle's return, the new franc and the new Republic… and Dalida's *Histoire d'un amour*". It was the summer when "thousands of servicemen left France to restore order in Algeria". Memory – public and private – lives both inside and outside of us.

She recounts her wrenching, illegal back-street abortion that almost killed her in *Cleaned Out* (Ernaux 1990) and *Happening* (Ernaux 2001). She "saw the thing growing inside me as the stigma of social failure" (Ernaux 2001). Other painful memories are of cancer; her unhappy, failed marriage and divorce in *A Frozen Woman* (Ernaux 1997); her physical obsession as the mistress of a married Russian diplomat in *Simple Passion* (Ernaux 1993); social inequality; the pain of the death of an older sister who died before her birth in the French-language only *L'Autre Fille [The Other Girl]* (Ernaux 2011); the deaths of her parents; changing class, the rise of the feminist consciousness… All these testimonies resist the temptation to erect barriers and remain silent, secretive and complacent about "extreme human experience" (Ernaux 2001). All of these themes are explored again and again in her work and testimony to how individual memories interact with the collective social and cultural contexts in which they occur.

She judged her eventual marriage with trepidation. Her then husband belonged unambivalently to the middle classes, settling in one of the suburbs that she knew and describes so well: "I am afraid of getting into this quiet and comfortable life, and afraid to have lived without being aware of it" (Ernaux 2017). This life was a barrier to her long-time ambition of

writing her book. She had to pretend to work on a PhD to get some time alone to write her first novel. When the novel was published at 34, her then husband was upset, saying "If you are capable of writing a book in secret, then you are capable of cheating on me" (Capelle 2020).

From the age of 16 she had been an assiduous writer of notes and diaries, which remain the basis of much of her writing. Some of these diaries have been published, their rawness forms a complex relationship with the carefully-written memoirs on the same topics. For example, *Getting Lost* (Ernaux 2022) is the diary she kept during the two-year illicit affair she had with a married man, and which she turned into her book, *Simple Passion.* In it she admits that she "measured time differently, with all my body". Time tends to speed up when the lovers are together and suspended when he is not with her. She does not attempt to excuse, contextualise or explain the affair; she simply describes it. Writing honestly – and cathartically – about her infatuation helps to break down the very real taboo at the time of women having affairs.

Typically, *Exteriors* (Ernaux 1996) is a diary which turns outwards to the public sphere rather than the usual intimate diary focusing upon oneself. One might call it a public diary. She is even an archivist of family super-8 films which she turned into a film with her son, *The Super-8 Years* (Ernaux-Briot 2022). The objective is to record and, as she writes in *I Remain in Darkness* (her mother's final words), "attempt to salvage part of our lives, to understand, but first to salvage" (Ernaux 1999). She writes about searing pain and profound personal suffering with controlled detachment.

Apart from her first couple of "traditional" novels, her books have no plot, little humour and no "characters" in the classical sense, and are more memoir or autofiction. Her aim was to stay away from mainstream fiction. Ernaux called herself the "ethnographer of my own life" (Ernaux 1999), attempting to find "the collective in the particular", the "lived dimension of history" (Guardian 2022). She claims to write "something between literature, sociology and history". One could also call her an archaeologist in that she excavates her own life, examining and investigating in great detail the fragments she unearths. The act of writing helps her understand what she discovers. Interestingly, one of Ernaux's English-language publishers – Fitzcarraldo Press – publishes fiction under "blue covers", whereas Ernaux's work is published under "white covers", classified as "non-fiction", indicating the autobiographical and historical nature of the works.

She writes in great detail about banal, fleeting experiences, such as travels on RER trains, parking the car, anonymous encounters in big-box supermarkets in the currently untranslated *Regarde Les Lumieres Mon Amour [Look at the Lights, My Love]* (Ernaux 2014). As she opines in *Exteriors* "A supermarket can provide just as much meaning and human truth as a concert hall" (Ernaux 2021). Supermarkets are rarely the subject of art or literature, or the glitzy France of popular imagination, but are part of everyone's life and thus deserve to be included and explored. She looks around and sees "anonymous figures glimpsed on a street corner or a crowded bus, unwittingly bearing the stamp of success or failure". She considered writing "a political act" (Aubonnet 1994) which helped her discover what she had not properly grasped until that moment. The politics is in the attention she pays to these seemingly insignificant things.

The Years is generally regarded as her masterpiece, her magnum opus, her iconic defining work. Originally written in 2008, the English translation of the work was nominated for the Man Booker prize international in 2019, of which the judges commented that it was a "genre-bending masterpiece" (The Years 2019) where she uses "language as a knife to tear apart the veils of imagination" (Nobel 2022). A memoir about her generation and its origins,

it opens with the words that "All images will disappear", hence her quest to understand them and write them down and bear witness before they vapourise. Her objective in writing the book is to "capture the reflection that collective history projects upon the screen of individual memory". Written "in an unremitting continuous tense" (229), with only paragraph breaks to allow for subject change, there are no chapters in the book, but a long flow of text which moves in chronological order from 1941 to the 2000s.

The book can be divided into roughly five sections of 30-50 pages each, often delineated by contemplation of an old photo featuring the unnamed girl: childhood and schooldays; adolescence and life at university away from home; the married woman and her divorce, against the backdrop of the troubles of May 1968; middle-age with grown-up sons having left home, with right-wing politicians on the rise; now retired with grandchildren and struggling with the new technologies and in a relationship with a much younger lover. Fragmented images flash before her like a flickering film, sometimes barely a sentence, sometimes developed over several pages. The first few pages of the book are (deliberately) muddled and fragmented as they represent the memories of a small child.

The first images in the book – a woman urinating in public in the ruins of post-war Yvetot, a film star dancing in a film, seeing an adult thalidomide victim, an old TV ad, a supermarket jingle… There are poignant, haunting memories such as the demented old man in the nursing home in pyjamas and slippers, holding a dirty piece of paper with a telephone number on it, crying and asking visitors to call his son. The narrator socializes with her peers but tends not to seek deeper friendships. Throughout, her "characters" appear to be isolated, though not necessarily lonely, with a suggestion in the narrative that the self-isolation is linked to her social status. The overall tone is somewhat complaining, melancholic, with a poetical undertone and sense of loss.

She acknowledges her debt to Proust's *Remembrance of Things Past* (Proust 2022) as the true model for her work, and her own search for past time and the mechanics of memory. Although she tries to write "against" such writers, so as deliberately not to write like them (Aubonnet 1994). She is attempting to write a new kind of biography. She delves into her past trying to find and understand her present through the lens of memory. *The Years* explores the collective memory of a generation across 60 years of a woman's life from girl, student, wife, mother, orphan, divorcee, lover, teacher, grandmother. For Proust, memories are evoked by the dipping of the madeleine in the tea. For Ernaux, her memoir is stimulated and catalysed by a memory-box of photographs of herself at various decades of her life, each of which churns up new recollections which overlap with each other, and time collapses. The narrator comments on the photos and attempts to suppose what the child/girl/woman is thinking, but always tentatively, prefaced with "perhaps", "no doubt". The females she sees in the photos are strangers: "The girl in the picture is a stranger who imparted her memory to me…The girl is not me, but is real inside me". She even refers to herself in the third person as in, for example, "the girl of '58" (Ernaux 2020). They are her various past egos which have morphed over time.

The memories evoked (sometimes aided by naps which help the old times to resurface in dreams) are of words, Normandy dialect and outdated expressions, slang, books, advertisements, brands and jingles, TV programmes, radio, graffiti, popular songs, products, politicians, food, summer camps, newspaper headlines, clothes, films, supermarkets, popular trends, the birth of the computer and mobile phone…This is set against the context of geopolitical events such as May 68, the Vietnam War, the decline of the Catholic church, the rise of industrialism, immigration, various French politicians, nuclear threat... Each element is explored as they coincide with the character's own development: what is happening to the

world through what is happening to the narrator. These same memories may evoke similar memories in the reader. Sometimes it takes her several decades to unravel and understand complex events that have befallen her – and the damage suffered – in her own mind. All this, as she writes in the last line of *The Years* is an attempt to "save something from the time where we will never be again".

Her world as a child is limited largely to her parents' home and the immediate environs of devastated, post-war Yvetot. It then expands to her high school in Rouen, her first, liberating stint away from home working in a summer-camp, and her stay in London as an *au pair*. As the narrator matures and glimpses the new world afforded by her education, she expresses her shame at her parents' cramped home, the lack of running water, poverty, life and habits (her father continues to eat with a pocket-knife), she has to share a bedroom with her parents and the outdoor toilets with the clients of the café. Her parents spoke the Normandy dialect, which she spoke at home with them. For her "the original tongue…the language that clung to the body, was linked to slaps in the face, the Javel water smell of work coats…the sound of piss in the night bucket, and the parents' snoring" (Ernaux 2017). "La Javel" (a cheap cleaning product) is how her social superiors referred to her as they claimed to smell it on her clothing (Ernaux 2013).

Yet – the eternal conflict – she is grateful that her parents are proud of her achievements and encourage her to succeed in her initial objective to be a teacher. Her father proudly keeps newspaper clippings of her exam results in his wallet and her mother agrees to buy anything she might need to further her studies (while complaining about the expense and her daughter's perceived ungratefulness at the same time).

Even though the memoirs and internal monologues are obviously highly autobiographical – she even reflects on the book she is writing as she writes it – Ernaux eschews using the "I" and favours "she", "we" or "one" (the useful French pronoun "on"), calling it in her Nobel Prize acceptance speech "transpersonal". It is as if the selves she is writing about are no longer her but someone else from another time, with herself eliminated. She uses no dialogue, favouring direct and indirect discourse. Starting after her fourth book, she writes, "I adopted a neutral, objective kind of writing, 'flat' in the sense that it contained neither metaphors nor signs of emotion". There are no "lyrical reminiscences, no triumphant displays of irony…I have to tear myself away from the subjective point of view", all "in search or reality and truth". As the Nobel Prize Committee put it: "plain language scraped clean…reflective, intimate – but also impersonal and detached".

A highly unscientific, random survey of half a dozen English bookshops revealed that two had a few Ernaux books on their shelves, notably since she was awarded the Nobel Prize. Whereas the rest had none. Translating Ernaux's quirky French into English must not be easy, but the various translators have done an excellent job. Ernaux's works are slim – sometimes barely 80 pages – but plunge extremely deep, deeper and deeper into the core events of her life, those of her country and working-class compatriots, giving words to experiences that are simple and striking. She has invented a new kind of biography, revolutionised the memoir and created a new language for speaking about women's lives. She deserves rightful and long-overdue recognition and a wider readership outside her native France for her extraordinary catalogue of work and her seemingly inexhaustible memory.

References

Aubonnet, Brigitte. 1994. Interview in Encres Vagabondes. Encres-vagabondes.com.

Capelle, Laura. 2020. A Voice in French Literature: Her Own. *New York Times,* April 7, 2020.

Camus, Albert. 2012. *The Outsider.* Translated by Sandra Smith. London: Penguin Classics.

Ernaux, Annie. 2011. *L'Autre Fille.* Paris : NiL Editions.

_____. 1990. *Cleaned Out.* Translated by Carol Sanders. London: Dalkey Archive Press.

_____. 1996. *Exteriors.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 1997. *A Frozen Woman.* Translated by Linda Coverdale. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 2022. *Getting Lost.* Translated by Alison L. Strayer. London: Fitzcarraldo Editions.

_____. 2020. *A Girls's Story.* Translated by Alison L. Sayer. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 2001. *Happening.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 1999. *I Remain in Darkness.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 1992. *A Man's Place.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 2016. *Regarde Les Lumières Mon Amour.* Paris : Editions Gallimard.

_____. 2013. *Retour a Yvetot.* Paris : Editions de Mauconduit.

_____. 1993. *Simple Passion.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York : Seven Stories Press.

_____. 1998. *Shame.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 1991. *A Woman's Story.* Translated by Tanya Leslie. New York: Seven Stories Press.

_____. 2017. *The Years.* Translated by Alison L. Strayer. New York: Seven Stories Press.

Ernaux-Briot, David. 2022. *The Super-8 Years.* Paris: Les Films Pelleas.

The Guardian View on Annie Ernaux: A Vintage Nobel Winner. Editorial. October 7, 2022. *The Guardian.* 2022. Accessed Month Day, Year?

https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2022/oct/07/the-guardian-view-on-annie-ernaux-a-vintage-nobel-winner

The Nobel Prize in Literature 2022. Annie Ernaux. NobelPrize.org. December 7, 2022. Accessed Month Day, Year? www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/2022/ernaux/facts/

The Years, Written by Annie Ernaux. 2019. *The Booker Prizes.* Accessed Month Day, Year?. https://thebookerprizes.com/the-booker-library/books/the-years.

Proust, Marcel. 2022. *Remembrance of Things Past.* Translated by C.K. Scott Moncrieff. London: Penguin Classics.

Ian Butcher
110 Vlierbeekberg, 3090, Overijse, Belgium
AND 111 Roret, 3070, Snekkersten, Denmark
ian.butcher@hotmail.com

BOOK REVIEW

The Place It Was Done: Location and Community in Contemporary American and British Crime Fiction

Šárka Bubíková and Olga Roebuck, Jefferson: McFarland, 2023, pp. 185

From the second half of the twentieth century onwards, discussions of space and place have gradually taken centre stage in humanities and social sciences. Fuelled by the writings of French thinkers such as Michel Foucault, Henri Lefebvre, and Michel de Certeau, scholars across various disciplines have embraced this spatial turn. Discussions of space and place continue to feature prominently in literary studies today. Literary scholars draw on knowledge and theories from geography, physics, sociology, or cultural studies to get a better understanding of the significance of space, location, mapping, and mobility in literary texts, and of the interconnection of fictional locations and movements with those in the real world. *The Place It Was Done: Location and Community in Contemporary American and British Crime Fiction* by Šárka Bubíková and Olga Roebuck represents a noteworthy contribution to this debate.

Bubíková and Roebuck are literary scholars and lecturers at the University of Pardubice. While Bubíková is an expert on American literature, Roebuck specialises in British fiction. In *The Place It Was Done* they combine their expertise to produce a volume that analyses and contrasts the various roles place plays in contemporary crime fiction written on both sides of the Atlantic. Crime fiction scholars agree that setting is one of the central elements of any detective novel. In *Adventure, Mystery, and Romance: Formula Stories as Art and Popular Culture* John G. Cawelti lists setting as one of the three essential elements of the detective formula. However, Bubíková and Roebuck understand place in crime fiction as more than mere setting against which the plot unfolds. Instead, they argue that in contemporary crime fiction place is depicted as a complex environment, interesting in its own right, and not simply as a backdrop to action or a repository of clues. Moreover, they see depictions of place as crucial to the continuing success of the genre, claiming that place and community represent "key dynamic elements contributing to the 'propagation and flexibility' of crime fiction" (p. 5). Thirdly, the two authors emphasise that place always entails a combination of physical and social elements, and in their analysis, they pay attention to the relationships between locations and the characters or communities that inhabit them. Finally, throughout the book the authors highlight that the potential of descriptions of particular localities to provide verisimilitude lends itself perfectly to the tendency towards realism in contemporary crime fiction.

In the introduction to the volume, Bubíková and Roebuck briefly sketch out these theses, however, as they do not wish "to burden [their] readers with theoretical discussions" (p. 6), this section of the book is brief, and the two authors move right on to the three analytical chapters. Each of these deals with one of three possible settings for crime novels: the city, the country, and the wilderness. The first chapter is the most extensive, reflecting the predominance of urban settings within the genre. This chapter is symmetrically divided into two parts: the first discusses urban environments in works by British authors, while the second is devoted to their American counterparts. The chapter offers analyses of novels by multiple authors including Robert Galbraith, Ian Rankin, or Sara Paretsky, and touches on issues of boundaries, difference, class (in the British section) and race (in the American section),

mobility, history, and memory. The second, much slimmer chapter, discusses rural settings as employed by contemporary crime writers, highlighting that while some of these authors build upon the pastoral tradition, which depicts the country as a site of moral innocence and authentic community, others reject this vision, offering a more sober portrayal of the country as a place that must contend with many of the same global problems that plague the contemporary city. The third chapter is arguably the most interesting of the three, as wilderness as a setting of crime fiction is often overlooked in theoretical discussions, with many critics solely focusing on the urban/rural dichotomy. Bubíková and Roebuck do a good job of highlighting the significance of wilderness as a setting in both American and British crime fiction, while also problematising the concept of wilderness itself by exposing its Eurocentric bias as well as its socially constructed character. They also note the environmental focus of most contemporary crime fiction set in the wilderness, which presents a contrast to traditional depictions in which wilderness is rendered as an abstract symbolic entity rather than a physical place.

The Place It Was Done is an immensely readable, informative book. Its two authors analyse an eclectic mix of crime novels and manage to find striking parallels but also significant differences between them, testifying to the variety present within the genre today. The individual sections of the book offer well-thought-out discussions of a wide range of topics from the dominance of realism in the genre to the environmentalist tendency in some of the novels. However, the breadth of the debate in the book naturally detracts from the depth. The volume is constructed as a survey of the various trends and tendencies within the genre rather than as a detailed analysis. What I also found lacking were transitional sections between individual chapters: the chapters often ended rather abruptly, and the different points raised throughout were not tied together. Similarly, there was no concluding chapter at the end of the book that would combine all the various findings into a unified message.

Overall, however, I found the book to be an inspiring read. It offered a comprehensive overview of the diverse functions place can play in contemporary detective fiction. As such it might serve as an excellent starting point from which to embark on the study of the role of place in literature. Therefore, *The Place It Was Done* might prove a great resource not only for literary scholars, but also for students who wish to acquire a deeper understanding of the crime fiction genre.

References

Cawelti, John G. 1976. *Adventure, Mystery, and Romance: Formula Stories as Art and Popular Culture.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mgr. Silvia Rosivalová Baučeková, PhD
Department of British and American Studies
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice
Moyzesova 9,
04001 Košice
silvia.baucekova@upjs.sk

BOOK REVIEW

Food Studies: Matter, Meaning, Movement

David Szanto, Amanda Di Battista, and Irena Knezevic (Eds.). Ottawa: Food Studies Press, 2022, 864 p.

This book, edited by David Szanto, Amanda Di Battista and Irena Knezevic, contains 63 essays dealing with diverse topics within the broad field of Food Studies. Aside from elementary methodologies defined for Food Studies as a discipline, essays embraced by this book branch out into a multitude of other theories and methods used in sociology, cultural studies, environmental studies, approaching issues related to health, global and local identities, sustainability, folklore, and many others in interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary perspectives. In general, the book contains very interesting, relevant, and up-to-date insights into the field of Food Studies, and its uniqueness can be found in the approach – it does this through very specific examples. It is also important to note that this publication is written as a textbook for undergraduate students which makes it an invaluable source for students of the above-mentioned disciplines all around the world.

Regarding the organisation of this publication, the book contains a traditional introduction, a set of instructions on how to use it, the essays themselves and a very useful glossary at the end. The glossary provides the reader with specific yet concise definitions of the most important Food Studies concepts. Each of the essays includes a short introduction about its author, while some of them also include exercises, discussion questions and learning outcomes. The exercises usually take the form of an activity related to the topic discussed in the essay. Some of them ask the reader to replicate an artistic technique, create haiku or analyse a picture, while others ask them to discuss their standpoints and opinions. These exercises are a very creative and interesting addition, which provides the reader not only with information, but also memorable experiences in which many of student may clarify and remember concepts related to Food Studies. The discussion questions are another very important element included in the book. By providing the reader with an opportunity to discuss the topic at hand, interesting new insights can be found. Lastly, the learning outcomes provide the user with a short and specific goals which can be attained by reading the essay. These sections are great tools to transform the process of learning into a diverse and interesting academic experience.

As for the content, this book is organised in quite loose thematic circles. The most general and everyday topics, such as food preparation, are included at the start of the book, with more specific chapters, such as food habits in a specific country, included at the end. This form of organisation is both logical and effective, first providing the readers with necessary vocabulary and information which is then required to understand later, more complicated, and specific essays. Moreover, essays are divided into three groups, those being: a Case, Creative, and a Perspective. Cases deal primarily with the most elementary concepts related to food, its preparation and consumption. Examples include food preparation traditions in specific countries, difficulties and challenges of sustainable food production or the relationship between food and culture. Creatives deal with food from more abstract viewpoint. Most essays deal with the connection of food and art, poetry, and other forms of expression, while also exploring the cultural implications of food in human society. The last category of essays entitled Perspectives provides the reader with broader insight into background aspects of food studies such as financialization, economy, or ethics. This division creates a variety of lenses through which

food studies can be understood, thus allowing the reader to understand related concepts more easily.

Due to the large number of authors who provided their essays for this book, it is impossible to assess a specific writing style. While it is true that most authors follow a classic essay format, their writing styles are significantly different. Some of the authors use concise, short, and informative sentences, while some use more ornate and metaphoric language, which includes a multitude of questions and contemplations. This is once more most evident in the previously introduced categorisation of essays. While Cases and Perspectives usually include more concise language, Creatives include more artistic form of expression. Another aspect of note is the use of pictures, tables, graphs, and poems. Essays from the Creative category are most likely to include pictures and poems to serve as examples, while essays from the remaining two categories are most likely to include graphs and tables. As for the pictures themselves, most are examples of specific art pieces, but there are also many various photos of food items, preparation processes, and people preparing and consuming food. All these devices provide much needed and welcome variety, allowing the reader to take a break from reading large amounts of text.

While all essays deal with topics of Food Studies, it is important to note that some approach these topics from a more specific perspective than others. Some of the many examples of topics discussed in these essays include concepts of authenticity, food identity in Japan, Samoa, Kyrgyzstan, the meaning of food, food and folklore, food and school systems, nutrition, pollinators, allergies, breast milk, food advertising, insecurity, waste, access, financialization, trade, ecology, traceability, safety, insect-based food, morality, veganism, and many others. Due to this large number of areas, only three essays from each category have been selected to be analysed in this book review.

Starting with the Case category, the first essay selected for analysis is written by Lucy Long and is titled *Food and Folklore.* This essay deals with the influence of the environment and history of a region on food traditions, and an explanation of folkloristic concepts of tradition and the relationship between commercial foods and local cultures. The author starts the essay with an introduction of several concepts such as tradition, folklore, identity, ethos, and aesthetics. The next chapter deals with a discovery of a tradition, in this case green bean casserole. The author examines the process through which a tradition is created, and she does this by interviewing residents about the food and then cross referencing the results with older members of the community. The following text deals with the dish itself and all of different aspects which contribute to its position as a traditional and folklore related food. In the conclusion of this essay, the author creates a connection between traditional food and its preparation with more commercial and mass-produced versions of it. The author provides a sufficient theoretical framework, upon which a more specific issue is then analysed. The essay also includes a new development in the field which once more serves as another viewpoint through which the complicated field of food studies can be understood.

The second essay from the Case category selected for analysis was written by Melissa Montanari and is titled *Veganism and Morality.* Topics discussed include common rhetorical strategies used to construct narratives of moral consumption, complex relationship between mainstream veganism and discourses of white femininity using the skill of close-reading and analysis of food media within enduring and overlapping systems of power. The introduction is devoted to the current and past development of veganism, its link to religion and so-called diet culture, and the relation between mainstream veganism and systems of violence. The second chapter of the essay deals with PETA and its relation to white, middle-class sentimentalities,

while the third chapter discusses the cultural participation of different brands on social media and their effort to support social justice. The conclusion provides the reader with a recapitulation of topics discussed, while also pointing out a connection between use of language and reinforcement of violent structures of power. The essay in its entirety provides a concise introduction of its concepts but includes too many different topics for a text of its length.

The last essay chosen from the Case category was written by Leda Cooks and is titled *Food Rescue.* Cooks discusses topics such as connection of food waste to hunger and examines food rescue networks and their situation as sub-systems of food. The first chapter includes the issue of food waste and provides numbers and graphs depicting how much food is wasted. It also includes the introduction of concept of food rescue, a description of its functions and its importance in global hunger relief. The second chapter of the essay provides even more in-depth description of the food rescue system mainly from the theoretical point of view, while the following chapter deals with this concept from a much more practical point of view. This chapter deals with food rescue in western Massachusetts specifically, thus providing the reader with concrete and precise example through which previously mentioned concepts can be understood. The conclusion recapitulates previously stated pieces of information. The author's style of writing which connects theoretical background with more specific examples is easy to understand and quite effective in conveying the information in question.

Essays included in the Creative category usually include much less text than those from remaining two categories, shifting their attention to artistic depiction and understanding of food related concepts. One of examples includes an essay written by Andrea Elena Noriega titled *Poems for Pollinators.* This essay includes only a very short introduction which explains the author's motivation behind the creation of said poems. The rest of the essay includes the poems themselves and some pictures painted by the author. It is evident that aside from essays from the Case category, essays from this one usually do not include a conclusion in which some new information is provided or confirmed.

Another example of the Creative category includes essay written by Annika Walsh titled *Herding Humans.* As in previous the example, only a short introduction explaining the inspiration of the author is provided, while the rest of the essay consists of artwork which compares human food behaviour to that of cows. As before, this essay provides no real conclusion aside from artistic experience.

The last essay used as an example of the Creative category is written by Vincent Andrisani and is titled *Street Food Vendors.* Aside from a short introduction which was provided in a similar fashion to previous examples, this essay contains even more experimental features than poetry and pictures. The essay itself largely consists of a video documentary to which a link is provided within the book. The larger part of the essay consists of exercises through which the reader is led to experience various sounds, tastes, and smells of places where street food is sold. This experimental and sense-oriented approach is quite peculiar and may prove very effective in the process of teaching about food.

The last category of essays analysed is the Perspective category. As mentioned above, these essays deal with issues which are less connected to food studies themselves, but rather to economy, ecology and other industries connected to production of food. The first essay chosen for analysis from this category is written by Evalyn Nimmo and André E.B. Lacerda and is titled *Agroforestry.* This essay discusses importance of local ecological knowledge and histories supporting and developing sustainable food systems and the impact of conventional industrial food systems on traditional food cultures, and it describes how researchers can

integrate scientific approaches and traditional knowledge to develop innovative solutions to food system challenges in rural Brazil. In conclusion, this essay provides a very well-structured overview of basic concepts related to agroforestry, introduces concepts and practices of original inhabitants of the region, and most importantly introduces the most recent scientific methods developed to help the region.

The second essay chosen from this category is written by Janet Colson and is titled *Breast Milk*. A topic discussed in relation to food studies less frequently, this peculiar essay discusses topics such as the history of infant feeding practices over the last three centuries the importance of human milk for infant survival, differentiating between cross-nursing, wet-nursing, and milk-sharing and pros and cons of pasteurizing human milk. This essay is much more data heavy than previous examples provided, relying heavily on tables and numerical data. The author also provides a detailed comparison of different breastfeeding methods and milk alternatives. It is important to acknowledge the importance of less traditional essays related to food studies mainly due to their usually unique perspectives on more general problems discussed.

The last essay from Perspective category analysed is written by Liam Cole Young and is titled *Salt*. The essay discusses intersections between culture, economics, and technology related to salt, explains how human cultures ascribe symbolic meaning to foods that transcend flavour or nutrition, and describes how to build links between the histories of food production, distribution, and consumption and aspects of contemporary food cultures and supply chains. Seemingly a common kitchen commodity, the author of this essay discusses salt from multitude of viewpoints which provides a unique opportunity to change the readers' understanding of it. This kind of essay once more provides a new and alternative viewpoint on a seemingly everyday concept.

In conclusion, the essays included in this collection provide very interesting and alternative viewpoints of elementary Food Studies concepts. The division of essays into three categories provides a set of unique lenses through which Food Studies can be approached and understood. The theoretically and methodologically diverse insight into the field can find readership among students in many humanities and social sciences.

Mgr. Róbert Šarišský
Department of British and American Studies
Pavol Jozef Šafárik University in Košice
Moyzesova 9, 04001 Košice
Slovakia
robert.sarissky@student.upjs.sk