

THE BIRTH OF THE ORATOR

A situational approach to “the moment’s glory”

Roxana PATRAȘ

ABSTRACT • Following recent research devoted to “rhetoric’s sensorium” and “rhetorical situation”, the essay aims at relating the birth of the orator to his “moment of glory”. The analysis departs from the similarities of Mihail Kogălniceanu’s and B.P. Hasdeu’s discontinuous careers, both of them eminent Romanian personalities of the 19th century who gave up literature on account of its inherent uncertainty, afterwards pursuing success as political orators. Nonetheless, even if both of them discover that sensuality can be converted into brilliant oratory, it is the aspiring orators’ education (both education of the senses and institutional education) that makes the difference between the former’s glory and the latter’s failure. A series of examples extracted from early literature and grouped according to the frequency of favored rhetorical effects proves that each one understands “glory” in a different manner, which makes the former a typical *persuader* (a mediator of experience) and the latter a *manipulator* (a seeker of the Absolute). Each orator’s manner (persuader vs. manipulator) becomes apparent in the way autobiography is functionalized within political speeches: while Kogălniceanu formalizes autobiography so that it becomes a trope enabling the orator to reinvent himself in any new rhetorical situation, Hasdeu attaches autobiography to a sense of exceptionalism. Hence, the relationship between the birth of the orator and his moment of glory is discernible not only in his awakening of senses but also in the orator’s (aptitude for) rebirth in new situations.

KEYWORDS • Sensorium, Rhetorical Situation, Risk, Autobiography, Jacotot.

1. A moment’s glory

The literary productions of Mihail Kogălniceanu (1817-1891) and B.P. Hasdeu (1838-1907) have drawn the attention of Romanian researchers chiefly for their apparent propagandist functions in the context of 19th-century transition to modernity. Curiously, the idea that literary endeavors are marred by ideology was meant to make peace between literates and historians, who otherwise would have disputed heavily over these “heroes with a thousand faces”, active and authoritative in fields such as history, literature, linguistics, archeology, journalism, politics, ethnology, and so forth. Beyond debate, what brings together the two figures is their risk-taking style of personal branding, their oratorical ambitions (with greater success in Kogălniceanu’s case and with lesser in Hasdeu’s), and their casual literary occupations.

Among Kogălniceanu’s literary works, the best known are the sketches: *Filozofia vistului/ philosophy of Whist* (1838), *Adunări dănțuitoare/ Dancing Parties* (1839), *Nou chip de a face curte/ A New Way of Courting Ladies* (1840), *Iluzii pierdute/ Lost Illusions* (1841), *Fiziologia provincialului în Iași/ the Physiology of the Provincial at Iași* (1844). But he also left what looks like an unfinished novel, *Tainele inimii/ The Heart’s Secrets* (1850), and several historical short-stories inspired by the history of The Principality of Moldavia during Stephen the Great’s time (15th century). The list of titles appears to cluster around 1840, which determines Nicolae Iorga to assume that there is a moment, apparently around thirty, when Kogălniceanu quit writing

literature and converted his creative energy into something else (Iorga 1920, 76). In the same fashion, Hasdeu's literary consecration occurs between his mid-twenties and early thirties. Extremely active, he publishes poetry (a collection is published in 1873 and another, miscellaneous, in 1897), a gallant short-story entitled *Duduca Mamuca. Din memoriile unui studente/ Lady Mammie. From the Memoirs of a Student* (1862), republished two years after under the new title *Micuța/ The Little One* (1864), and preceded by a Lermontovian diary written in Russian (translated posthumously by E. Dvoicenco); furthermore, an unfinished historical novel featuring the Moldavian boyar Iancu Moțoc, republished under the title *Ursita/ The Fate* (1864), and a historical romance on the Moldavian ruler *Ioan vodă cel Cumplit/ John 3rd the Terrible* (1865), mixing history and mystification. Several plays written in a Shakespearian vein – among which *Răzvan-Vodă*, later known as *Răzvan and Vidra* (1867) – made him the pioneer of historical theatre in Romania.

A brief analysis of Hasdeu's list of publications shows that, like Kogălniceanu, he involved himself thoroughly in the foundation and editing of various newspapers, which he deserted afterwards. At one point, literary activities seem to be estimated as something that enfeebles one's personal brand. Thus, creative energies are converted into new modalities of being on the public market. However, whereas Kogălniceanu's success seems easier to tackle with (he gave up literature just in time and discovered the higher calling of tribune speech), Hasdeu's failure both as writer and as orator requires a deeper analysis.

Described in *De oratore*, Cicero's ideal orator is a man of wisdom and eloquence, of virtue and practice/ technique, of "mind" and "heart", a man able to "define in a comprehensive manner the complete and special meaning of the world" (Cicero 1967: 47), a philosopher and a poet at the same time. If we take Cicero's word for it, Hasdeu's poetic talents and not Kogălniceanu's prosaic experimentalism should stand as the decisive argument for being accepted among the high ranks of Romanian oratory.

The poet - says the Ancient rhetorician - is a very near kinsman of the orator, rather more heavily fettered as regards rhythm, but with the ampler freedom in his choice of words, while in the use of many sorts of ornament he is his ally and almost his counterpart; in one respect at all events something like identity exists [emphasis added] (Cicero 1967: 51).

Yet, in comparison to Kogălniceanu and in spite of his natural endowments, Hasdeu did not receive the right of residency within "the republic" of Romanian orators. Envious of the others' success, he commits himself to parody or black humor (Lăzăreanu n.d.). For instance, Kogălniceanu's own oratorical style – a style of colportage marked through the verbal automatism "Zice el"/ "Says he", his false obedience to the rulers of the day, his speculative impartiality in politics (Hasdeu 2006: 197-198) become Hasdeu's target in a bitter poem published in 1864. A story of emulation turned into envy can be detached from the above-mentioned parody.

Indeed, the two careers are stamped by similarities and competition, by the same interests and strategies of personal branding: the history of the Principality of Moldavia (high Moldavianism), the provincial mores (low, provincial Moldavianism), the historian's encyclopedic profile, the desire for consecration within both national and international academia, the greed for archeological items and archives, the antiquarian's profile. Whatever the differences and animosities, these early dispositions show that the appetite for public staging is awakened by the one and the same stimulus acting upon senses: "the illusions of love". Apparently, the sentimental education comes before rhetoric education; the education of senses arises awareness of the rhetoric's articulation to sensorium.

In their early prose, both Kogălniceanu and Hasdeu thematize the birth of a man's senses, the first instances of courtship in a man's life. In front of young lovers, both men try to convert

sensuality into (apparently successful) oratory. In a situational frame of rhetoric (Bitzer 1968: 6-7), not only *the rhetorical exigences*, that is, the urgencies that can be resolved only with the assistance of the discourse, *the constraints* imposed on urgencies (the pedagogical method by which the orator is formed as well as his sentimental education), and *the typified audience* (highly impressionable women) are relevant. *Spaces* such as the boarding school classroom, the student's room, the teahouse, the ice-cream parlor, etc., where an aspiring orator's senses are awakened and educated, *modal embodiments* of the orator's self, and outer *stimuli/ instant responses/ motivations* provide a key to what has been considered so far as inaccessible – *rhetoric's sensorium*.

*

The Romanian literary critics strengthened the prejudice that "post-enlightenment" experiments, romantic verbosity and casual literary postures specific to early modernity are not worth the audacious interpreter's pains because they represent only "a moment" when "the tactic prevails over strategy, and ethics and politics over aesthetics" (Cornea 2008: 380, 376, 373). Being perceived as "moments", hence as instances of levity and evanescence, Kogălniceanu's and Hasdeu's literary pieces turned into poor inventory wrecks, placed outside the canon and visited by scholars without much enthusiasm. In Mihai Zamfir's fashion (Zamfir 2011: 126, 218-219), just about anyone could challenge the value of a sham writer "that nearly did not write literature" (Kogălniceanu); similarly, just about anyone could challenge the authenticity of a patented "genius" (declared as such by the Romanian Parliament), who quit literature around the age of thirty (Hasdeu). Romanian historians instead have not been discouraged either by this purely circumstantial manner of dealing with literature or by the myriad of postures thereby implied. Even though monographs such as Al. Zub's absorbed the literates' prejudices – chiefly the ones regarding "the excess of history" within fiction (Zub 2012: 734) or the ones regarding the literature's character of "rough sketch" with respect to the late political or historical productions, moments of casual commitment to literature are seen with enough complacency.

Be they "tactical", "ethical", "political" or else, *moments* attach themselves to a sense of greatness, magic, and risk that the dynamics of linear time has lost. Briefly put, *moments* are risked forms of life (Macé 2016: 301), defined as such by their isolation and remoteness. It is not by chance that G. Poulet uses, in one of his writings, the phrase "the island of the moment", and that McLuhan coins the phrase "momentary deities" (McLuhan 1975: 58). For consummated orators, *a moment's glory* – all *moments of glory*, in fact, should be linked with "the rhetorical situation" theorized by Lloyd F. Bitzer (Bitzer 1968: 1-14), with the *mythos* of inspired/ "embodied words" articulated to the course of history, discerned by Jacques Rancière (Rancière 1998), as well as with the realm of interconnected senses (McLuhan's *sensorium*).

Within an environment presumed as full of life, thus emotionally charged and modelled by perceptions, it is neither the arguments nor the ornaments that makes the recipe of the orator's glory. On the contrary, all elements that become subjects to senses give a key to "the island of the moment". For the orators of all times, mastering "the embodied word" is extremely significant in order to justify the risks incurred by public exposure (being booed, not being listened to, being reified, etc.). As rhetoric delivers itself as a "practical science" (Roussin 1996: 111), glory cannot be either predicted before the performance or read in the *post festum* transcriptions of speeches. It is a situational result, generally presumed to be a peak point: the point where "exigences" are resolved through "constraints" and the audience is oriented toward change; the point where the senses (the speaker's, the audience's) involved within the *sensorium* connect to the environment and to the rhetoric tradition (which, though remote and impersonal, still instantiates as an absent audience). It is quite clear that not only the orators are responsible for a moment's glory; while

they are speaking and being rewarded for that, the realm of the orators' mind and senses is inaccessible. Still, the orators' motivations for pursuing glory, their instant responses to glory and their understandings of glory can give solutions for something apparently resistant to analysis.

The orator's glory can be explored only through the remnants of the moment, through what has been left outside "the island of the moment", through "the remains of the day". Like the pre-performance or post-performance transcriptions of speeches, the orators' literature (produced before or after their experience of glory) has a residual character, which allows us to read it as a correlative of life. The livelier the oratorical moment, the more abundant its "remains". The more glorious the rhetorical delivery, the bitterer the taste of incomplete transcriptions. Hence, such literary attempts could document the relationship between (rhetorical) glory and (literary) precariousness, the latter being circumscribed to the finalist concept of "success" rather than to transitory "glory".

Turning to Mihail Kogălniceanu and B.P. Hasdeu, both of them seem to prefer short-span oratorical glory to linear literary success. According to their personal manners of looking at things and experience, they seem to assign different values to the moment's glory: while Hasdeu cannot conceive glory without its metaphysical extensions (glory is a matter of propensity), Kogălniceanu is perfectly comfortable with the moment's physicality (glory is a matter of intensity). Configured by a posture of higher risk, by deified words, and by the awakening of all senses, *a moment's glory* – the orator's glory, represents one of the central themes of the early literary works of the two Romanian personalities.

Commenting on Hasdeu's particularities, G. Călinescu remarks "the Talmudist's scientific imagination", his "aptitude to extract the fifth essence", which leaves the reader to "an insatiable hunger for knowing the unknowable" (Călinescu 1982: 379). The critic also points at Hasdeu's variegated postures, as "naturalist", "philosopher" and "poet". In similar terms, N. Iorga notices Mihail Kogălniceanu's postural diversity: "the writer", "the political man", and "the Romanian patriot" (Iorga 1920). As in Hasdeu's case, the three *personae* cannot be defined through differentiation, all of them being subjected to a type of transpersonal energy called "natural realism" (*realism organic*). According to Iorga, Mihail Kogălniceanu was endowed with "a perfectly balanced personality", which authorized him to speak on behalf of the entire Romanian society and to discharge, like a fury, its "specific forms of living" (Iorga 1936: 7-11). Notice that the three *personae* are figured as a kaleidoscopic system of *Pathosformeln* (Warburg 2015: 90-91). They represent temporary crystallizations, moments, making visible the movements occurred in the inaccessible reality of the mind and soul.

Indeed, as the two commentators suggest, Hasdeu's and Kogălniceanu's styles of postural self-defining seem to call for "a logic of modality" (Macé 2016: 57-109), apt to capture the "variations of life" on life itself. Therefore, "writing history" and "making history" (Zub 2012: 262-265), "outdated" scientific exercise and "eternal" principles of art (Călinescu 1982: 378-379), documentary value and "mysti-fictions" (Angheliescu 2016: 162-166) are not complementary heads and tails, as the critics have said until recently, but only modal variations on the same principle. In this case, postures – the naturalist, the poet, the politician, the orator, the philosopher, the historian and so forth – enable us to imagine a body engaged in the act of communication, animated and moved by an external cause, and not by an internal propeller.

Yet, just consider the idea of an orator whose life is somewhere else, an orator lacking inner motivation (chiefly the impulse of social climbing), moved around by an external force, and you will find it quite worrying. This happens because we got used to conceiving the art of oratory as a machine, as something preformatted by will and awareness at both ends: steadfast virtues, well-defined topoi (common places and clichés), precise techniques (Aristotle 2004: 187), and targeted purposes (move, persuade, convince). Yet, the rhetoric tradition, chiefly the sophists aver that the

orator must be available and ready to endorse any cause. This is why his instruction should be encyclopedic in "all divine and human sciences", in music "for voice and body" (Quintilian 1974: 108), in geometry for "graphic demonstrations" and spatial/ visual conveyance of ideas (Quintilian 1974: 110-115), in knowledge of oratorical tradition, in history (Quintilian 1974, 1: 149-155; Quintilian 1974, 3: 360), and in civil law (Quintilian 1974, 3: 356-360). Thereby, one may legitimately ask whether the orator, while he is trying to be in control of "the rhetorical situation", keeps on being his own master anymore; whether he can be made responsible for either success or failure (Sălăvăstru 2010: 38), for either glory or failure to attain glory.

While an orator's mind and senses during the act of speaking seem inaccessible, I turned to early literary attempts in order to explore if the moment's glory is inscribed in the education of senses. Is the rhetoric's sensorium and the rhetorical situation the propitious environment where the orator can orient *doxa* and its profuseness of commonplaces according to the sophistic principles of *Kairos* (opportune moment), *prepon* (appropriateness) and *dynaton* (possibilities)? Is glorious oratory an articulation between the traditional "art of eloquence" and the art to adapt one's personal resources to the challenges of "the rhetorical situation"? Is the education of senses a resource to rely on when hinting at oratorical glory?

2. Talking your way into a woman's heart: the sentimental education of aspiring orators

Despite their young age, both authors and their literary alter egos seem already consummated in the art of eloquence. The narrative voice from Kogălniceanu's *Lost Illusions* is a boarding school student around 14, and Toderiță N.N. from Hasdeu's *Lady Mammie* is a law freshman around 17. The former is a Lamartinian hero, the latter a Lermontovian hero, an Eastern Don Juan. Their excellent command of *technê rhêtorikê* can be fully proved through their use of a pedant terminology (*digresis, narratio, exordium, captatio, exposé*), through their speculating on rhetorical rhythm (especially in deliberative and judiciary genres), and through their knowledgeable functionalization of tropes and topoi. This shows already an interest in capturing and expressing accurately the modalities of things around them.

Surprisingly, oratorical talents are not trained with large audiences but in the company of young ladies, on whom both persuasion and manipulation skills are tried. Niceta, a Greek girl of 14 and Maria-Mamuca, a Russian girl of 17 are the epitomes of the 19th-century public, the embodiments of its expectations. One of Kogălniceanu's prose pieces is entitled *A New Way of Courting Women*, which definitely stresses the importance of multi-sensorial words for one's way to erotic/ rhetoric glory, especially when the young orators are proven to lack physical accomplishments. Styling himself as a sort of Moldavian Pechorin in his diary, Hasdeu too admits the fact that he was not exactly the handsomest man in the world. Thus, the melodramatic intricacies from *Lady Mammie*, the endless series of lovers Toderiță N.N. boasts with evince the same intention of devising "a new way of courting women" with the assistance of discourse. Yet, while Hasdeu's manner of courting women (and public) uncovers a *manipulator's* mind, the deconstruction of illusions from Kogălniceanu's *Lost Illusions* and *The Heart's Secrets* make manifest a *persuader's* patience.

In what follows, I am going to identify the orator's apparel and manners (*the manipulator* and *the persuader*) in the early works of Hasdeu and Kogălniceanu. By comparing *the manipulator's* and *the persuader's* manners of dealing with the major rhetorical tropes and techniques, I intend to elucidate two problems. 1. How Hasdeu and Kogălniceanu approached the issue of glory: Extension or intensity? Perennial valorization or gratification of the moment?. 2.

Why, though both make appeal to the same strategies of personal branding, the former failed and the latter succeeded.

2.1. *Familiar and unfamiliar similarities*

A profusion of *similes* captures the atmosphere and the ways of living, communally and separately, in the mid-19th century Eastern European cities Iași (Romania) and Harkov (Ukraine). For Kogălniceanu, inherited enmities can be cooled down only by wandering around the anonymous streets and alleys of Iași. Nevertheless not the streets, but the inveterated enmities are “like the discord between Atreus and Thyestes”, “like the war of Greeks and Trojans” or “like the quarrel between Guelfs and Ghibellines”. A particular mood that the Copou neighborhood has about will vanish and be forgotten like “the Lebanon cedar”, “the wild flowers of the field” or like “the ex-Hunters’ club” and “The Historical and Natural Sciences Society”. A gathering without women is like “a garden without flowers”, “a man without beard”, “a day without sun”, “a newspaper without readers”, “a plain without grass”, “a theater without a public”, “the verses without poetry”, “a life without illusions”, “a judge without trials”, “a young man without love” and so forth:

[Ulițele anonime, fără nume, ale Iașilor] te mântuie de o mulțime de uri moștenitoare *ca discordia lui Atreu și a lui Tiest, ca a troienilor și elinilor* sau, dacă vrei o comparație mai nouă, *ca sfada guelfilor și a ghibelinilor* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 50).

Prin urmare, Copoul cum este acum în curând nu va mai fi, va trece și se va uita *ca chedrul Libanului, ca floarea câmpului* sau, dacă voiți comparații, *ca fostul club al vânătorilor* sau *ca Soțietatea istorică-naturală* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 92).

O adunare fără femei este *ca o grădină fără flori, ca un bărbat fără barbă, ca o zi fără soare, ca o gazetă fără abonați, ca un șes fără verdeață, ca un teatru fără public, ca versuri fără poezie, ca o viață fără iluzii, ca un judecător fără proțesuri, ca un tânăr fără amor, în sfârșit, ca toate comparațiile din lume* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 51).

Whereas Kogălniceanu employs the simile for its explanatory potential, which perhaps echoes Aristotle’s *Rhetoric*, Hasdeu exploits its metaphoric possibilities. For instance, the young girl hides her little nose in the collar like “the little bird that shelters its head within the wing’s warmth”. The winter “has its own poetry, diminutive, like a poem of Alecsandri”. The artist has to be cold, “cold like the positive law, cold like the letter of the law, cold like the *pandectae*, cold like...”. A candidate to a young woman’s favors is described as “handsome like a Persian, amorous like a Turk, and hot like an Arabian”.

Aleasa inimei mele mergea repede înainte, lăsând în stratul de omăt urmele unui picioruș fabulos, și ascunzându-și năsușorul în manșon – *asemene păsăruiceii, când își adăpostește căpșorul în căldura aripioarei*. Precum vedeți, și iarna are o poezie a sa, *diminutivă ca a lui Alecsandri*, pe care trebuie să o căutăm în omăt și în manșon [emphasis added] (Hasdeu 1973: 124-125).

Artistul ar trebui să fie întotdeauna rece, *rece ca dreptul pozitiv, rece ca litera legilor, rece ca pandectele, rece ca...* [emphasis added] (Hasdeu 1973: 101).

I-am spus că ești frumos *ca un persian*, că o iubești *ca un turc*, că ești înfocat *ca un arab* [emphasis added] (Hasdeu 1973: 123).

All in all, Hasdeu’s simile is meant to shock and show off culture. Metaphor-ism and experimentalism dissolve the urgency that defines the rhetorical situation.

2.2. Amplification and concentration

Plentiful descriptive series emphasize a diversification of tastes, personal styles and endorsements during this stage of transition from old ways to modernity. Young men drop old baggy, colored clothes (the Turkish fashion) and try new tight black-and-white attires (the Western fashion). This awakens, in Kogălniceanu’s prose, a sense of mechanical behavior and maybe of public nakedness. The man that pleases is the “man-machine”, the man whose essence lies at the surface, the man ready to parade the shapes of his own body and even accept a state of nakedness.

La 19 ani ne bucurăm de joc ca de o mare desfătare; dar nu este desfătare în lume care să treacă așa de degrabă la bărbați și așa de târziu la femei... cu o suvenire desfătăcioasă, mă uitam la rămășițele strălucitei mele toalete din ziua trecută ce era împrăștiată în mijlocul odăii: *șacșării cei roși* aruncați pe covor, *galbinii papuci* dormind pe vatră, ca o mătă ce se încălzește, *mănușele aninate de coada unui ibric, cilicul cel globos*, rostogolit sub pat, și *taclitul căruia coadă*, în ziua trecută, prin scoborârea sa până la pământ, făcea mirarea tuturor babelor, ședea învăluit pe scaun. Nu zic de *fermeneaua cea roșie* care, *aninată pe ușă, semăna la cununele de pipăruși* întinse înaintea casei *unui bulgar din Huși* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1964: 9).

Omul plăcut, omul mașină, omul ce joacă se face o specialitate, o individualitate, o nevoie [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1964: 12)

Cavalerii civili... poartă neapărat o *jiletcă albă, legătură de gât de atlas neagră și gulerul fracului căptușit cu catife*; de abie la al doilea sau al triilea an al intrării lui în lume, începe a se deprinde cu *pălăria-clacă*, cu *pantalonii collants* și cu *papuci cu cătărămi de la Miculi* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1964: 13).

For Kogălniceanu, the young men’s discourses need to occur always in the open, that is, in the ice-cream parlor, in the café, in the reception room or in the ballroom.

Despite rapid change and mechanization, despite outer challenges faced by the human body (chiefly the new clothes that figure public nakedness), Hasdeu’s student is still draped and dressed from top to toe, still interested in the hidden (human) essence, in the fundamental truths about the world and mankind, in the distinctions matter-force, form-content, body-soul, etc. Perfume/medicine bottles, books, paints, and guns assembled in the student’s room indicate a severely closed and crammed intimate space, prepared for the explorations of the Absolute (Oprișan 2001), for pursuing mysteries. Hasdeu’s alter ego is thus completely unprepared to accept that the channel (that is, the man in the act of speaking) is the message itself:

Camera mea amintește lăcașul unui savant: cărți, hârtii, pene de scris, creioane, pensule, culori împrăștiate pe masa și pe sub masa, pe scaune și sub scaune, pe pat și pe sub pat, alături de borcane cu crème, parfumuri, perii, piepteni, revolver, dolman și altele. În harababura asta de lucruri e greu să găsești stăpânul. Este suficient să-ți oprești privirea pe halat și fes, ca să descoperi sub aceste găтели pe cineva, nici chiar student, nici chiar husar: este însuși stăpânul [emphasis added] (Hasdeu 2006, 1: 1327).

2.3. Topoi and bon mots

Clichés and topoi are used in order to mark intra-fictional speeches (definition, classification, series of interrogations, recapitulation, moral saying). In Kogălniceanu’s case, one speech opens with a classification of “illusions” (“political illusions”, “literary illusions”, and

“love illusions”) and ends in the manner of *Dixi et salvavi animam meam*. Another speech opens with a line of rhetorical questions as shown below.

Mesdames, iluziile care le-am pierdut sunt de trei feluri: *iluzii politice, iluzii literare și iluzii de amor* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 55).

Nou? Da ce-i astăzi nou sub soare? Nu sunt toate trecute? Nu sunt toate vechi? Nu-i cinstea veche, încât n-o mai găsești pe pământ? Nu-i patriotismul vechi, încât abia îi mai afli numele în gura procleților? Nu sunt, în sfârșit, vechi, pagine vechi, toate virtuțile și toate vițiurile, pân' și moda? Și-apoi mai ai încă pretenție să ne arăți ceva nou și încă ce?! *Un nou chip de a face curte!* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1964: 25).

Iată, *mesdames*, cum am pierdut, prin o zaharica, iluziile celui întâi amor. Altul, și eu astăzi aș face-o, ar fi mâncat inima și pe urmă s-ar fi dus și ar fi strâns pe Niceta în brațe tare și zdravăn. Dar atunci eram de cinsprezece ani; poezia și delicatetea inimei era încă pentru mine o religie. *Eu am sfârșit* [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 63).

Most of the times, the syllogisms are twisted by subjectivity, by “quasi-logical argumentation” (Perelman& Olbrechts-Tyteca 2012: 238-314), in order to designate a quasi-rhetorical situation. For Hasdeu’s alter ego, the premise “the taste is subjective” leads to the conclusion that a rabbit may have the taste of a turkey, that the rabbit is, in subjective terms, a turkey. Hegelian clichés such as “thesis”, “antithesis”, “synthesis” draw to the idea that the contradiction is impossible in nature. The same Lermontovian hero gives a tautological definition of happiness: “the happiest happiness is to be happy in happiness”.

Gustu-i subiectiv; gustul s-află în noi; și, prin urmare, iepurele dumneavoastră e curcan pentru mine, de vreme ce subiectul meu simte în acest moment un gust curcănesc.

Contrazicerea e cu neputință în natură. Dumneavoastră n-ați citit pe Hegel?

Fericirea cea mai fericită este de a fi fericit în fericire [emphasis added] (Hasdeu 1973: 118).

In both cases, *bon mots* are always ready for use; some of them are extracted from available collections, and Kogălniceanu seems to prefer ready-made solutions; some of them are ingenious, and Hasdeu is always looking for genial “sophistic effects” (Cassin 1995). As Anne Coquelin remarks, *bon mots* are, most of the time, “arguments of seduction” (Coquelin 1999: 153), thus they impress on senses and stir sensuality. Most of the times, they are a result of café small-talk, bistro conversations and reception-room discussions, but their rhetorical usage implies, beside emotional, cognitive directionality: to persuade, to convince, to seduce, to stir emotions. It is interesting that the use of *bon mots* is linked, in the early texts of Kogălniceanu and Hasdeu, with urban settings (the café, the bistro, the ice-cream parlor, the ballroom, the university, multistoried houses and so forth), which is certainly a symptom of both litterateurs’ crescent oratorical dispositions.

*

The examples provided above should be enough for drawing a few remarks on the aspiring orator’s approach to the issue of glory in particular and to the rhetorical situation in general. First of all, educational spaces (opened or closed) configure the oratorical manner and its potential for either glory or failure. Secondly, oratorical faculties are tried on young women, thus on persons “capable of being [highly] influenced by the discourse” (Bitzer 1968: 8). Young women epitomize the 19th-century rhetorical audience, that is, an audience extremely sensual and sensitive to the situation of speech in terms of *timeliness, appropriateness* and *articulation of the possible*.

As John Poulakos notices, “speaking involves a temporal choice. The choice is not whether to speak but whether to speak now”. This also means “taking a risk on contingent information”:

“the right thing must be said at the right time; inversely, the right time becomes apparent precisely because the right thing has been spoken”. Accordingly, the triangle formed by *timeliness (Kairos)*, *appropriateness (Prepon)* and *the articulation of the possible (Dynaton)* (Poulakos 1983: 35-48) leads into privileging *the-will-to-become-something* over *being*. In her article entitled *Rhetoric's Sensorium*, Debra Hawhee underlines the fact that imagination is the proper way to activate and re-balance the distribution of senses within the sensorium. In point of fact, imagination allows the orator to get outside his own mind and feeling (Hawhee 2015: 8-9), hence to get outside the premises of selfishness, seize *Kairos* and fashion new possibilities of being.

3. The birth of the Orator: “I, Kogălniceanu!” and the Jacotot Method

In *Lost Illusions* Kogălniceanu mentions the famous Jacotot method of teaching. This involves the memorization of Fénelon's novel, *Les aventures de Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse*, and then the imitation of certain fragments. He himself a rhetorician, Jacotot experienced, along his career, several absurd situations when he had to teach chemistry, math, piano lessons, painting or juridical sciences without knowing a bit of any of them. From afar, he looks like an adventurer refusing specialization. But the epiphany of a new way of teaching occurs in Louvain, where he was supposed to teach his native French to Flemish students, while neither the teacher nor the students could articulate a single word from the other's language. Realizing that he has to give up explanations for a while, Jacotot comes with a bilingual edition of Fénelon's novel and hands it to students for thorough memorization. They duly observe the master's orders and, at the end of the year, they can bring testimony that memorization has not been a mechanical, but an integrative activity. Eventually, the Flemish learn French by having as helping tool only Fénelon's text, which practically has annulled the master's mission as clarifier, as “explainer” of things. “The explainer”, says Rancière, is the one who abolishes the distance between “learning and understanding”, and maintains the prejudice that oral explanations have a greater degree of crystallization than the written ones; that an oral explanation should always re-explain what has been already explained through writing (Rancière 1991: 5).

Anyhow, (im)pressed by this Jacotot method, young Kogălniceanu had to dispose of both masters and their explanations. Unlike Hasdeu, who would not give up models (father and grandfather) and the argument of origins, Kogălniceanu finds out that he is on his own; that he has to take risks. One can imagine that, developing an appetite for risk, the apprentice aspires to be a master himself. Jacotot method is, for the pupil, a method of learning to take risks in terms of instant decisions and choices. It has been noted that the risk of choosing a particular idea/modality of living (and not any other), the risk of deriving from particular choices both capacities and incapacities, represents a way of bringing forms to the fore, of making them apparent for everyone (Macé 2016: 315-316).

Once the taste for risk is stirred by the Jacotot method, the student of Miroslava boarding school can turn his (erotic) attention to his colleague, Niceta:

Metoda Jacoto începuse atunci a fi la modă [approx. 1831]: ea fu introdusă și în pansionul nostru. Așa, îndată ce am intrat în clasă, Niceta și eu am primit de la profesor câte o carte franțuzească; era evanghelia acestei sisteme de învățătură ... Această carte trebuia s-o învățăm toată pe de rost, ca pe urmă, după metoda ei, să putem face și compuneri. Și așa cele dintâi ochiri de amor, din partea mea mai rușinoase, din partea Nicetei mai îndrăznețe, le-am schimbat când repetam în glas mare începutul cărții întâi [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 58).

The adult's narrative voice does not record Jacotot's mnemonic precepts as boring or burdening. On the contrary, he suggests that the lack of explanation and translation (into native Romanian) is supplied by the young man's own love dreams. Therefore, he embarks on writing an original prose, which is, as a matter of fact, his first rhetorical attempt:

Premiile primite la examen îmi dădură curajul să-mi arăt amorul persoanei iubite. Însuflat de mândrie și *socotindu-mă orator de căpitenie*, m-am apucat și, pe o coală întreagă, am scris Nicetei o declarație de amor în terminile cele mai înfocate. Toate comparațiile lumii, *toate cuvintele tehnice* de filosofie, *de retorică* [s.n.], de geografie, de istorie, pân și de astronomie, figura în acest vinograd epistolar [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 59).

It seems that Jacotot's method is effective not only in terms of risk-taking, but also in terms of talent awareness. This is the way the writer appears and this is also the "appropriate situation" when he feels that he must speak: the birth of the orator is a question of *Kairos* instilled in the literary domain. Imagining himself as speaking to his beloved Niceta, the teenager Kogălniceanu learns how to handle the feelings of a larger audience. "Political illusions" come always before both "literary" and "love illusions", and they are meant to be always discredited by reality. Read as a series, according to the model of a Moldavian Decameron (Boccaccio's model is invoked by the writer himself), *Lost Illusions*, *The Heart's Secrets*, and *Dancing Parties* form a network of love stories formalized as literary microstructures that may be called "illusions". Traditionalist boyars, cosmopolite lawyers, naturalized French and suchlike people tell "illusions". However, this chained structure of "illusions" is often interrupted by a speech delivered on a "professorial tone". The writer's need for rhetorical situated-ness (in terms of *exigence*, *audience*, and *constraints*) is quite clear. The inherent limitations of "the typographic language" (McLuhan 1975: 387) are felt as similar to death-like numbness:

"Îndată ce cineva se hotărăște să scrie, să se *tipărească de viu* [s.n.], el nu mai este slobod, este rob; și ca rob trebuie să se supui publicului ca țiganul armașului sau nazirului" [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 54).

4. Me as someone else: the orator's autobiography

In one of his digressions, the narrator of Kogălniceanu's unfinished novel *The Heart's Secrets* excuses himself for delivering "*a speech* [sic!], as the English say":

Cetitorii mei binevoiască a-mi ierta acest *speech*, cum zic englezii, adecă românește, *acest mic cuvânt ieșit din șirul romanului*. Cursurile însă de moral plac astăzi; de aceea moralității în secolul nostru sunt siliți ca *spițerii*, a polei hapurile ce vroiesc a da bolnavilor, [...] fie-mi iertat, între descrierea cofetăriei lui Felix și o declarație de amor, a vă zice două cuvinte în contra maniei ce avem a ni întipări numai modelele rele și abuzurile străine și de a mijloci totodată și pentru o nenoricită stare, cea mai neapărată pentru puterea și înflorirea unei țări, starea cării i s-a făcut o solenă făgăduință: *îmbunătățirea soartei* etc. [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 102-103).

Several years later, the politician develops "the speech" from Felix Barla's ice-cream parlor into real parliamentary speeches: *Discurs cu privire la reglementarea relațiilor dintre țărani și proprietari*, 1857 (Kogălniceanu in Patraș 2016, 1: 155-168), *Îmbunătățirea soartei țăranilor*, 1862 (Kogălniceanu 1987, 3: 162-196). However, this is not by far as interesting as Kogălniceanu's simile between "orator" and "apothecary" ("spițer"). The true orator, opines the young writer, is the one who is able to glaze the bitter pills with a coat of "sweetness" and "love".

For the orator who uses words in the manner of an apothecary, the rhetoric space (the ice-cream parlor) and the urgencies of love conspire in order to bring about the best speech delivery. Surprisingly, in *Lady Mammie*, the main character's nickname is exactly "The Apothecary". The students at the University of Harkov find Toderiță N.N. such a funny nickname not only for his renowned taste for perfumes and pomade, and not only for his love-affair with the apothecary's widow, but also for his way of wrapping "despicable realities" into sublime phrases. When the reality is despicable, one is always tempted to adopt a spiritualist philosophy, and look for the Absolute. Note that while Kogălniceanu's orator *is like* an apothecary, Hasdeu's orator *is* the Apothecary. As the examples discussed above have shown, Hasdeu's similes are always closer to metaphorical identification (*A is B*) than Kogălniceanu's (*A is like B*).

In spite (or maybe because) of his Don-Juan-ism, Hasdeu's alter-ego from *Lady Mammie* shapes his erotic behavior as a polemic and poetic reaction against Bentham's utilitarianism (Hasdeu 1973: 107). Strong political models are placed in poetical circumstances. For instance, the one known as The Apothecary can walk, hands on chest, in Napoleon's manner. Love's ways are described as so intricate that only Metternich's mind can solve them. The lover's air, the narrator comments, should be as joyful as Alexander the Great's (Hasdeu 1973: 119-120). Instead, Kogălniceanu's café conversationalists count on the low triad of "pleasure", "utility", and "truth-to-life" (Coquelin 1999: 25), which turns them into experience vehicles, into artists of common places who, by refusing strict identification, leave all the possibilities open. Deriving knowledge from experience, they mediate and facilitate the "meteorological" and "epidemiologic" circulation of *doxa* (Coquelin 1999: 77-94) within the rhetorical microclimate.

What obstacles Hasdeu on his way to oratorical glory is exactly this spiritualist attitude towards reality, his will to provide ingenious solutions to "*doxa*-related" experience. As he himself admits, his only educational model is the one provided by his father's encyclopedic propensity. Thus, the orator's discourse may be presumed as being grounded on an arborescent memory that cannot be shrieked into clichés. It is common knowledge that B.P. Hasdeu fetishized his princely origins as well as all sciences related to origins (etymology, archeology, ethno-psychology, astrology) in general. His esoteric sensibility as well as his strict identification makes him rather tyrannical, unable to negotiate with *realia* and impassible to ridicule. So, when he tries to speak for the many and to the many, he cannot refrain from manipulating and vulgarizing tendencies. He is always looking down on people and things. Consequently, people suspect him of malevolence and improbity, which is absolutely devastating for an orator's reputation.

For instance, in his series of political speeches entitled *Olteneștele* (1883) and in his previous *Hrist și Tudor Vladimirescu* (1871), the candidate to a MP seat advances two quasi-absurd hypotheses. The royal dynasty founded by the Wallachian king Basarab can be related to... Bessarabia, that is, to the eastern part of the old Principality of Moldavia and Hasdeu's birth place; Stephen the Great's mother was born in Oltenia, which is the Western part of the Principality of Wallachia, so the great Moldavia ruler (and epitome of high Moldavianism) proves to be in fact... a Wallachian (*oltean*). Such argumentation recalls the already mentioned fictional situation where Hasdeu's alter ego wants to pass a rabbit for a turkey. Departing from these false conjectures, the political orator can formulate a claim to represent king Basarab's descendants – that is, the inhabitants of Craiova, in the Parliament of Romania:

Nu sunt născut în Craiova, dar dv. până acum în curs de secole ați tot dat bărbați celorlalte părți ale României, ați dat pe Basarabi, pe Tudor, pe Brăiloi, pe Otetelișeni, pe Bengești, pe Nicolae Bălcescu și alții. Ați dat mereu. Aveți, dar, dreptul și datoria a primi și dv. Bărbați din celelalte părți ale țării (Aplauze). Sunt basarabean. Basarabia... acest nume îmi provoacă o lacrimă (Aplauze). Basarabia este pierdută pentru mine ca individ, dar nu e pierdută pentru România (Aplauze). Basarabia nu e numai un pământ, ea este un popor și acel popor e român, cugetă românește, simte românește, cugetă

și simte ca mine, va rămânea totdeauna al nostru (*Aplauze*). Eu, basarabean, nemiavând pentru mine un cuib al meu în Dacia lui Traian din Basarabia, am venit în țara Basarabilor. *Dacă mă veți onora cu voturile dv., veți arăta lumii că românii nu au pierdut Basarabia (Aplauze prelungite și entuziaste)* [emphasis added] (Hasdeu in Patras 2016, 2: 385-389).

Here is what the speaker writes his wife after the performance: “my improvised (not written) speech has been admirable... I have shaken and moved everybody’s hearts, so many of them burst into tears” (Hasdeu in Patras 2016, 2: 385). The socialist press, especially V.G. Morțun, laughs at the orator’s glorious moment (Morțun in Hasdeu 2006, 4: 1823-1826). Quite apparent, his manner of using autobiography as an argument of authority cannot be missed by anyone. Although he mimics modesty (“work” and “research” are his only “wealth”), Hasdeu baffles the public formed of secondary-school teachers with an impressive list of works, most of them books already awarded with prestigious prizes by the Romanian Academy (*Istoria critică a românilor, Ion Vodă cel Cumplit, Arhiva Istorică a României*).

“Din munca mea, din studiul meu – căci munca și studiul sunt singura mea avere –, din acestea, mai mult de jumătate le-am închinat Olteniei (*Aplauze*), le-am consacrat Craiovei (*Aplauze*). *Istoria critică a românilor*, pedestal pe care s-a ridicat modesta mea reputațiune, vorbește mai mult despre Oltenia, am urmărit în parte originile orașului Craiova. Nu numai atât. *Memoria lui Tudor Vladimirescu* a fost deșteptată de mine la 1871. Cu vro doi ani înainte, o grupă de studenți cu inimi românești m-au ales de președinte al lor. Se vede că și guvernul m-a considerat de oltean, când mai an *mă trimisese aci spre a primi și duce la București steagul lui Tudor ...* [Ca deputat] Publicasem deja pe *Ion Vodă cel Cumplit* și patru tomuri din *Arhiva Istorică a României*” [emphasis added] (Hasdeu in Patras 2016, 2: 386-387).

*

A different strategy and functionalization of autobiography can be noticed in Kogălniceanu’s political speeches. None of the 19th-century Romanian orators seems so prone to confession. His Reception Speech at the Romanian Academy (1891) is in fact an autobiography, his lecture in the opening of Academia Mihaileană (1840) is not a historical excursus but a self-legitimation, and his speech in defense of 1860 Government sounds like a personal creed.

One of his admirers jots down the following: “often, the Parliament of Romanian has seen him in tears” (Burghel 1901: 37). Nicolae Iorga also points out that many of Kogălniceanu’s political speeches contain autobiographical elements: *Chestia Universității din Iași, Cuvânt la Adresă, Cuvânt în contra Adresei*, etc. (Iorga 1920: 93). In point of fact, Nicolae Cartoian considers that there are three propellers of Mihail Kogălniceanu’s endurance as political orator: 1. historical excursus; 2. citation from literature; 3. recalling personal memories (Cartoian 1942: 16-17). Asking himself how Kogălniceanu’s inner portrait must have looked like, Mihai Zamfir suggests an egocentric nature, incapable of fictional *travesty*, and having a taste for hybrid genres such as memoirs and diary (Zamfir 2011: 130-131).

Nevertheless, Zamfir’s hypothesis of egocentrism is refuted by all testimonies. V.A. Urechia, for instance, likens his friend’s eloquence to the profoundness of the sea (Urechia 1878: 127-158). Anghel Demetrescu (Demetrescu 1937: 312-317) and N. Petrașcu (Petrașcu în *Mihail Kogălniceanu...* 1936: 76-81) recall Kogălniceanu’s prodigious memory; apparently, it was not a disseminating encyclopedic memory such as Hasdeu’s, but an active memory, ready to turn soon into a battle gun. Language intuition and “wonderful quickness in catching one’s psychology” add to the orator’s endowments. By and large, these evocations emphasize the orator’s situational intuition, the orator’s orientation towards *timeliness, appropriateness and possibility*.

Relieved of the self’s load and formalized to the schematic structure of a rhetorical *topos*, Kogălniceanu’s autobiographic equation can be detected at all levels of speech preparation:

invention, disposition, elocution, and chiefly memoria (memorization). In *Lost Illusions* for instance the first person narrative is used purposefully; it does not convey confession, but the right quantity of personal recollections so as to dodge the opponents' direct attack and their virtual *ad hominem* argumentation. Who speaks of oneself can be taken for a civilized sentimental, but never for a disarticulate barbarian.

In the history of Romanian oratory, Kogălniceanu earned some reputation for his endurance. He is always ready to cut in, to speak for about 6 hours in a row, to make and comment history. It is not by chance that the statesman's biography becomes *a way of medializing* facts, historical data, economic, ethnographic, and statistical considerations. His autobiography is not, as in Hasdeu's case, a statement of exceptionality, a case of desperate seeking for what is behind and beyond reality. Kogălniceanu's autobiography can stand formalization as a rhetorical trope because it exalts the values of common-ground experience. This is why every time he appeals to this autobiographical trope, the orator is born symbolically and reinvented in a new situation. Consequently, the orator's "I" overlaps in fact a "collective I"; the orator's "I" is always referring to "we, the Romanians", functioning as an argument *ad populum*. Revealing "an affective organization of arguments" (Sălăvăstru 2010: 241-272) and not arguments as such, autobiography can turn into a powerful trope of persuasion. Moreover, when circumstances call for it, autobiography can even take the shape of the opponent's biography:

De câte ori am vorbit de alții, chiar adevărat, totdeauna am pățit pozna... *am jurat să nu mai vorbesc decât de mine*. Poate așa nu s-a mânia nimene și m-a lăsa să spun adevărul de mine, dacă nu pot să spun de alții [emphasis added] (Kogălniceanu 1974, 1: 60).

We can notice that, while Hasdeu's orator cannot take leave of biographic exceptionalism, Kogălniceanu's orator manages to formalize autobiography for rhetorical use. This formalization makes him apt to be reborn in a new situation, whenever the "illusions" (be they love, political or literary illusions) dissolve and must be fired again with the assistance of discourse. For him, reality is a field of negotiated experience, where "I" means taking as many faces as possible, where "I" means the ability to be numberless.

5. Conclusions

The literary productions of Mihail Kogălniceanu (1817-1891) and B.P. Hasdeu (1838-1907) have drawn the attention of Romanian researchers chiefly for their augural air and for their apparent propagandist functions in the context of 19th-century transition to modernity. Indeed, the two careers are stamped by the same interests (the history of the Principality of Moldavia, the provincial mores, the historian's encyclopedic profile, the desire for consecration within both national and international academia, the antiquarian's profile and so forth) and by the same discontinuities (giving up literature for higher callings, chiefly public glory).

The analysis of early works has shown that the birth of the orator, his appetite for rhetorical staging is awakened by the same stimulus acting upon senses: "the illusions of love". For both writers, "the illusions" are not only psychological or cognitive realities, but also literary forms (prose fragments) that, like any other literary forms, lead an incomplete and precarious life. The dissolution of "illusions", which menaces both literary form and sensitive realities, is resolved through the insertion of Kairos (opportunity, risk, urgency) within the literary domain. Apparently, the sentimental education comes before any other institutionalized education (rhetorical education included). Also, the education of senses arises the awareness of the rhetoric's

situated-ness in terms of both “rhetorical situation” (exigence-audience-constraints) and “rhetoric’s sensorium” (localization, embodiment, the senses’ mechanisms).

While the orator’s mind and senses during the act of speaking seem fairly inaccessible, I turned to literary attempts in order to explore if rhetorical glory can be related to the education of senses, to sentimental education in general. In order to do that, I discriminated between (literary) success and (oratorical) glory, the former belonging with the linear time and the latter belonging with what G. Poulet calls “the island of the moment” and what M. McLuhan calls “momentary deities”. Even if such expressions convey the isolation, the mystic and the remoteness specific to the *moment*, I preferred to use the term “a moment’s glory” for its understated articulation with *risk*. When addressing the issue of risk-taking in oratory, I had in mind the risk taken on contingent information in the spirit of the Sophists’ *Kairos*, the risk of choosing a specific idea/ modality of living (and not any other), as well as the risk of deriving from one’s choice both capacities and incapacities. Lastly, *risk* proved to be extremely important for the birth and rebirth of the orator because it is a way of bringing new forms of life to the fore, of making them apparent for everyone. Briefly put, risk is a method of glory.

Having divergent visions on reality and experience, each of the chosen personalities seems to attach a personal value to *the moment’s glory*: while Hasdeu cannot conceive glory without its metaphysical extensions (glory is a matter of propensity and immortality), Kogălniceanu is perfectly comfortable with the moment’s short spanning (glory is a matter of intensity, birth and rebirth cycles). The birth of the orator (the awakening of senses, chiefly of one’s appetite for risk) must be also linked with the orator’s possibilities of being born again and again, according to “the meteorology of clichés”, within the frames of new rhetorical situations. Birth and rebirth should be also connected to the orator’s own perception of autobiography. Analyzing the uses of autobiographic accounts in the political speeches delivered by each of the two personalities, I was able to notice that a rhetorical formalization of autobiography (autobiography can even take the shape of the opponent’s biography) can provide, along with risk, an access key to the orator’s manner of addressing the issue of temporality. A moment’s glory, the moment’s glory.

REFERENCES

A. Sources

- *** (1936), *Mihail Kogălniceanu. Ciclu de conferințe ținute la Radio București în februarie 1935*, Bucharest, Cultural Foundation “Mihail Kogălniceanu”.
- Hadeu, B.P. (1973), *Duduca Mamuca. Din memoriile unui student*, edited by Ion Șeuleanu, Cluj Napoca, Dacia Publishers.
- Hasdeu, B.P. (2006), *Opere IV. Publicistica politica*, edited by Stancu Ilin and I. Oprisan, Bucharest, FNSA-Univers Enciclopedic Publishers.
- Hasdeu, B.P. (2006), *Opere. I. Poezii. Proza*, edited by Stancu Ilin and I. Oprisan, Bucharest, FNSA-Univers Enciclopedic Publishers.
- Kogălniceanu, M. (1964), *Tainele inimei. Scrieri alese*, Bucharest, EPL.
- Kogălniceanu, M. (1974), *Opere I. Beletistica, studii literare, culturale și sociale*, edited by Dan Simonescu, Bucharest, RSR Academy Publishers.
- Kogălniceanu, M. (1987), *Opere III. Oratory I. 1856-1864*, edited by Dan Simonescu, notes and commentaries by Vladimir Diculescu, introduction by Dan Berindei, Bucharest, RSR Academy Publishers.
- Patraș, R. (2016), *Oratorie politică românească*, vol. 1-2, Iași, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Press.

B. Secondary Literature

- Anghelescu, M. (2015), *Lâna de aur. Călătorii și călătoriile în literatura română*, Bucharest, Cartea Românească Publishers.
- Anghelescu, M. (2016), *Mistificațiuni. Falsuri, farse, apocrife, pastișe, parodii, pseudonime și alte mistificații în literatură*, 2nd edition revised and completed, Bucharest, Spandugino Publishers.
- Aristotle (2004), *Rhetoric*, translated into Romanian by Maria-Cristina Andrieș, notes and comments by Ștefan-Sebastian Maței, Bucharest, IRI Publishers.
- Bitzer, Lloyd (1968), *The Rhetorical Situation*, "Philosophy and Rhetoric", 1, pp. 1-14.
- Burghel, G.G. (1901), *Mihail Kogălniceanu. Conferință...*, Bucharest, "Eminescu" Institute of Graphic Arts.
- Călinescu, G. (1982), *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, 2nd edition revised and completed, Bucharest, Minerva Publishers.
- Cartoian, N. (1942), *Mihail Kogălniceanu. Activitatea literară*, în *Academia Română. Memoriile secțiunii literare*, 3rd series, tome XI, Bucharest, Lupta Națională Publishers.
- Cassin, B. (1995), *L'effet sophistique*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Cicero (1967), *De oratore*, translated into English by E. W. Sutton, London, Heinemann-Harvard UP.
- Cicero (1942), *De oratore*, with an English translation by E.W. Sutton, London, William Heineman.
- Coquelin, A. (1999), *L'art du lieu commun. Du bon usage de la "doxa"*, Paris, Editions du Seuil.
- Cornea, P. (2008), *Originile romantismului românesc*, 2nd edition, Bucharest, Cartea Românească Publishers.
- Demetriescu, A. (1937), *Opere*, Bucharest, "Regele Carol II" Foundation for Literature and Arts.
- Gusti, D. (1984), *Ritorică pentru tinerimea studioasă*, edited by Mircea Frânculescu, Bucharest, Editura științifică și enciclopedică Publishers.
- Hawhee, D. (2015), *Rhetoric's Sensorium*, in "Quarterly Journal of Speech", vol. 101 (1), pp. 2-17.
- Iorga, N. (1920), *Mihail Kogălniceanu, scriitorul, omul politic și românul*, Bucharest, Socec Publishers.
- Lăzăreanu, B. (n.d.), *Umorul lui Hasdeu*, Bucharest, Adevărul Publishers.
- Macé, M. (2016), *Styles. Critiques de nos forms de vie*, Paris, Gallimard.
- Macintyre, A. (2007), *After Virtue. A Study in Moral Theory*, 3rd edition, Notre Dame-Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1975), *The Gutenberg Galaxy*, translated into Romanian by L. & P. Năvodaru, foreword by V.E. Mașek, Bucharest, Editura politică Publishers.
- McLuhan, M. (2011), *Galaxia Gutenberg*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, <https://books.google.ro>.
- McLuhan, M. (2011), *Să înțelegem media. Extensiile omului*, translated into Romanian by Ovidiu George Vitan, Bucharest, Curtea Veche Publishers.
- Oprîșan, I. (2001), *B.P. Hasdeu sau setea de Absolut. Tumultul și misterul vieții*, Bucharest, Saeculum Publishers.
- Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (2012), *Tratat de argumentare. Noua retorică*, translated into Romanian by Aurelia Stoica, prefaced by Michel Meyer, Iași, "Alexandru Ioan Cuza" University Press.
- Poulakos, J. (1983), *Toward a Sophistic Definition of Rhetoric*, in "Philosophy and Rhetoric", vol 16 (1), pp. 35-48.
- Quintilian (1974), *Arta oratorică*, vol. 1-3, translated into Romanian, prefaced and annotated by Maria Hețco, Bucharest, Minerva Publishers.
- Rancière, J. (1991), *The Ignorant Schoolmaster. Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*, translated with an introduction by Kristin Ross, Stanford, Stanford UP.
- Rancière, J. (1998), *La Chair des Mots*, Paris, Éditions Galilée.
- Roussin, P. (1996), *Retorica*, in Ducrot, O. & Schaeffer, J.-M. (eds.), *Enciclopedia științelor limbajului*, translated into Romanian by Anca Măgureanu, Viorel Vișan, Marina Păunescu, Bucharest, Babel Publishers.
- Sălăvăstru, C. (2010), *Mic tratat de oratorie*, Iași, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza”.

-
- Urechia, V.A. (1878), *Despre elocința română. Oratoria forense, amvonul, haranga. Oratorii moderni. Panu, Barbu Catargiu, Cogălniceanu, Bratianu &. &. Lectura publică ținută în 12/24 decembrie 1866*, Bucharest, Carol Göbl Publishers.
- Warburg, Aby (2016), *Essais Florentins*, Paris, Hazan.
- Zamfir, Mihai (2011), *Scurtă istorie. Panorama alternativă a literaturii române*, Bucharest, Cartea Românească Publishers.
- Zub, Alexandru (2012), *Mihail Kogălniceanu, istoric*, 2nd edition, Iași, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University Press.

C. Electronic resources

<https://archive.org>

Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, translated by W. Rhys Roberts, <http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/rhetoric.3.iii.html>.

ROXANA PATRAȘ • PhD in Philology (2012), is a Researcher at the Department of Interdisciplinary Research in Social Sciences and Humanities, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, Romania. Books: *Cântece dinaintea Decadenței. A.C. Swinburne și declinul Occidentului* (2013). Editor: *Ibrăileanu. Scrieri alese* (2010), *Oratorie politică românească (1847-1899)*, 3 vol. (2016). Co-editor: *Figures of Migration* (2016), *From Manuscript to E-book* (2015), *Perspectives in Humanities. Keys for Interdisciplinarity* (2015). Research topics: political eloquence, history of rhetoric, 19th-century contexts.

E-MAIL • roxana.patras@uaic.ro; roxana.patras@yahoo.ro