



THE 11TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

Interdisciplinary Dimensions of Communication Science

**The Briand Plan of European Union Commented by the Interwar
Romanian Press**

Fanel Teodorascu¹

Abstract: With each passing day, the construction called the European Union presents increasingly clear signs of disease. Something is not working and it is likely not to work anymore. For this reason, more and more resounding voices announce the decline of Europe. The Greek crisis, the Ukrainian crisis, the refugee crisis are just some of the issues that shows that countries that make up the European family (28 countries) find it difficult to act as a whole. After the completion of the Second World War, Romania did not matter in any way in achieving the European family plans, entering in the sphere of influence of the Soviet Union. Things were not always this way. The plans for a federal state comprising the European countries have existed before the interwar period, as we shall see below. The years between the two world wars were marked by political debates on this theme, which have not been seen before.

Keywords: federalization; speech; press; crisis; European Union

1. Introduction

In Romania, the interest for this topic was as high as in any other European country that emerged from war with some territorial gains and unwilling outbreak of a new world cataclysm. It is understood that the Romanian state people have addressed the issue of uniting the European states into speeches both at home and abroad. What interests us, however, is how the theme “federalization of Europe” was analyzed in the interwar media.

European Union as it stands today has as its starting point year 1951, when it was created the European Community of Coal and Steel (ECSC). Until reaching to this point, the European political leaders had to go through a long and arduous path. Among those who supported the idea of a united Europe was the French statesman Aristide Briand. His plan was, however, considered by some authors as being inaccurate. (Judt, 2000, pp. 136-139)

Despite this “defect” of the thought plan of Aristide Briand, the Romanian journalists, more or less skilled in such matters, reacted promptly to the idea of the emergence of a political construction that is able to guarantee peace in Europe. Many claimed the idea of building a European federal state, showing that this is the only way it can be achieved an economic balance between the European countries. There were, of course, and challengers of the idea that, at that time, that the federalization of

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Communication and International Relations, Danubius University of Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., Galati 800654, Romania, Tel.: +40372361102, Corresponding author: teodorascu.fanel@univ-danubius.ro

Europe could be achieved. The theme of federalization Europe was not debated only in the Bucharest press. Provincial newspapers, more or less important, reserved generous space for this issue.

2. Economic and Moral “Federalization”

In June 1930 in the pages of the Sibiu publication *Revista economică/The Economic Review* it was published, signed by Dem. I. Georgescu, a consistent article about the need to reorganize Europe. According to the mentioned author in order to achieve a federal state encompassing all European countries it was necessary to act in two directions: one economic and the other moral. Creating the Federal European Union would have solved two major issues: strengthening worldwide the economic position held by Europeans and eliminating the fears regarding the possibility of an outbreak of a new World War:

“The key word in the current political and economic state Europe is Union in order to live and prosper in the common interest. The dictum “unity is strength” has never been more proper than now. The “Federalization of the European States” will bring to the whole Europe the much needed peace and a real improvement in the international economic life.” (Georgescu, 1930, pp. 219-221)

Regarding the *political union*, it *“will be achieved only if needed and only after the people will be convinced of the benefits it will have the economic, moral, social, intellectual, etc. union.”* The outcome of Aristide Briand's action was everything but what the author hoped in the above text. The European states have failed to find the way of fulfillment of the federalization plan of Europe, and the biggest fear of the European political leaders of good faith was the outbreak of a new World War, which later would have become reality.

3. The Need to Achieve an Economic Balance between the European States

In November 1930, the *Revue Economique Internationale/The International Economic Journal* published a study of Mihail Manoilescu, the Minister of Industry and Commerce at the time. The text will be duplicated, a month later, in the newspaper *Adevarul/The Truth*. From the mentioned study, we will highlight only two fragments, the most conclusive ones, in our opinion. In the first passage, Manoilescu talks about the need to achieve economic balance between the European states. Without this economic balance, the same author stated, the European civilization itself was in danger of extinction:

“It was discussed a lot before the war, the European balance, but in a strictly political sense. It was then a continental interior balance between the various political powers of Europe.

Quite to the contrary of what the European balance means today. It is about an economic balance and not an interior balance, but also the equilibrium determining the Europe's position towards other continents and which keep Europe in its current situation.

What is, in truth, the current situation of Europe?

Today, Europe is a high placed and the major problem for it is to keep its position, of not to going down and, if I may use a more serious expression, not to collapse.

Facing this hypothesis, the question arises: is there truly a danger for Europe?

Is Europe threatened? The civilization which we represent is on the verge of a true catastrophe? (as in the day that Europe's economic superiority would not be able to maintain, its political supremacy would be in danger)." (Manoilescu, 1930, p. 3)

In support of his statements, Manoilescu comes with the following arguments:

"In China, for example, the productivity of today is only about 250 Swiss francs per worker, per year.

If so, if it would start today to introduce new industries in China, those industries, even working with the lowest output possible, it would achieve a much higher productivity, therefore the purchasing power of part of the Chinese population would increase.

What force could prevent this irrepressible trend? Even if the coercion could no longer continue its course. And on behalf of what principle could such a development be prevented?

Our conclusion is that the danger which Europe is going through is not transient. Deep causes lead to a sustainable economic development.

A new adaptation will be necessary for Europe to retain still a predominant position in mankind." (Manoilescu, 1930, p. 4)

Details of the difficult situation, in which the strong economies of Europe were in, were presented by Costin Stoicescu at a conference organized on 14 February 1932 by the Romanian Social Institute (ISR). The text of the lecture was then published in the *Arhiva pentru știință și reformă socială/ The Archive for science and social reform*, ISR publication. We will mention only a short excerpt of which it can be detected, despite the optimism displayed by the author, the bleak atmosphere that reigned over Europe:

"The sinister predictions of some philosophers and others who, if they are not philosophers, are bad croakers, predictions that the organization of today's world is about to end, we expect a new state of things, where people will not never want to live better, they will not want to make progress, they will not want to feel the satisfaction of their work, these predictions prove to be unfounded. The mankind's response to these predictions was at a time when the issue was put forward, the answer of the wholesome reason: we continue to work, we continue to produce, we continue to progress." (Stoicescu, 1932, p. 53)

Another very interesting text on the need to complete the Aristide Briand's project can be read in the publication *Chemarea Tinerimii Române/The Call of the Romanian Youth*. In this article, however, the author states that the plan of the French state man has never had a real chance of success:

"There are many arguments advocating for the European Federation. However the project of Mr. Briand - commented live - has little chance to succeed. Predicting results on the matter is risky. However, having a general opinion of the world press, you reach involuntary to pessimistic results." (Vasiu, 1930, p. 3)

A categorical position of the chances of success of the plan for federalization of Europe we find on another interwar journalist.

4. The Federalization of Europe - a Great Deception

Pamfil Șeicaru analyzed in several articles in *Cuvântul/The Word* and *Curentul/The Current* the plan of Europe's federalization launched by Aristide Briand, statesman, that some journalists claimed that

he was the opposite of Benito Mussolini, the one who with his speeches feed the fears of the outbreak of a new World War. The Press influential man did not believe possible the Briand's project. In his opinion, Eastern Europe has always been ignored by the Western Europe, Westerners seeing the Eastern Europeans just good to be "*cannon fodder*". In the article titled "*Patria europeană/European Homeland*", the text of which was published in the period that interests us, Șeicaru argued that the failure of European statesmen to create a genuine relationship of equality between big states and small states make it impossible to achieve a *European federal state*. (Șeicaru 1929, p. 1)

In another article, "*The federalization of Europe?*", in May 1930, Pamfil Șeicaru showed that the project of Aristide Briand, who was only a new *comforting deception*", was intended to replace *the lost illusion of the League of Nations*. Șeicaru believed that the federalization of the old continent was possible only if it was previously achieved a *rationalization of Europe's economy*. This reorganization of Europe's economy implied that the *industrial countries* would fund the *agricultural countries* and would impose high customs duties on agricultural products from the two Americas and Australia.

In December 1930 Șeicaru showed his support for the project by Iuliu Maniu for setting up a Central - European Confederation. The Romanian statesman had made known his project in the newspaper *Neue Freie Presse* from Vienna. Maniu considered at that time, that *the integration process towards a major economic unification* could be achieved only by creating a *Central - European Confederation*. This union of states was to include the following countries: Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece and Romania.

The idea of this confederation is the source of unfulfilled expectations of Romania to receive attention from France, which was admired and it was considered a friendly country.

The failure of Briand's approach to achieve a state building in which the European countries would stop fighting each other is announced by Șeicaru in the article "*Himera egalității popoarelor/the illusion of equal nations*." The text refers to the failure of the League of Nations and it is interesting to follow as the author brings solid arguments against those who believed that a principle as that of equal peoples could underlie a political, economic or moral construction, involving all European states. (Șeicaru, 1932, p. 1)

5. The Danger of Extinction of the European Culture

On 1st June 1930 in order to mark the end of the cycle of the conference entitled "*The Contemporary social and political experience*", which was organized by the Romanian Social Institute in the period 1929-1930, Dimitrie Gusti had a lecture based on the issue of European states federation. From the text of the lecture, which we will render only a fragment, would appear in the newspaper *Arhiva pentru știință și reformă socială/The archive for social science and reform*. In his lecture, Dimitrie Gusti seeks to answer to some questions that disturbed both ordinary citizens and Romanian statesmen¹:

"Europe is a rational and activist idea, culminating in the scientific creations and technical applications, which dominate and absorb other human cultures.

¹ *Is there a crisis of the European culture? From an economic perspective, can Europe compete with other continents? Is it possible the union of European states? How real is the danger of an outbreak of another world war?*

Some talk persistently about a crisis of the European culture. [...] Let's not exaggerate! When there is a science and a European Technique, which are nor the leaders of all mankind's destiny, one cannot speak of a crisis of the European culture.

But the phenomenon of Europe is interested from another point of view. Europe begins to doubt of itself; its worldwide hegemony is discussed and questioned; for the first time, the other continents are put before it as rivals.

American expansion, the awakening of the yellow race peoples, the evolution of Islamic nations towards a more active conception of the public life are reasons that impose severely in the European conscience. For Europe it is not only in danger of losing its supremacy in the world, but something more precious, its very independence!

[...] Europe is to buy! This is the economic situation.

But to the economic considerations it is added to the political situation, worse yet! Let us not delude ourselves. In Europe, as it is established today, a new war appears as something possible, nay, sometimes even as inevitable.

[...] So here it is the great peril: Europe impoverished, the vassal Europe, the barbaric Europe.

What is to be the salvation from this awkward situation that designs painful perspectives? In order to answer, we should see once again what may be causing this situation?

All European states are ill. The disease consists of their isolation. Saving them would necessarily and logically imply their union.

The union of European states is therefore necessary; but is it really possible?" (Gusti, 1930, pp. 2-7)

6. Conclusion

As soon as the European Union (EU) emerged, many would say that this last question of Gusti has found its answer. Today, however, things do not seem as certain. In the recent years, some states, through their representatives, have spoken increasingly about their intention to leave the *European family*. Also, the pressure waves of refugees from countries in conflict weaken more visibly the already fragile cohesion of the Member States of the European Union.

7. References

Judt, T. (2000). *Europa iluziilor/The illusions' Europe*. Iasi: Polirom.

Duca, I.G. (1910). Cronica externă – Politica d-lui Briand/Foreign Chronicle – The policy of Mr. Briand. *Viața Românească/The Romanian life*, year V, no. 6.

Georgescu, Dem. I. (1930). Federalizarea economică a statelor europene/Economic federalization of the European states. *Revista economică/Economic Review*, year XXXII, no. 26.

Gusti, D. (1930). Problema federației statelor europene. The problem of the European states federation. *Arhiva pentru știință și reformă socială/Archive for social science and reform*, year IX, numbers 1-3.

Manoilescu, M. (1930). Echilibrul economic european/European economic balance. *Adevărul/ The Truth*, year 43, no. 14411.

Marcu, A. (1936). Statele Unite ale Europei în programul lui Carlo Cattaneo (1801-1869)/The United States of Europe in the program of Carlo Cattaneo (1801-1869). *Arhiva pentru știință și reformă socială/Archive for social science and reform*, year XIV, Volume II.

Stoicescu, C. (1932). Politica Institutului de Emisiune al României în Epoca Depresiunii Mondiale/The Policy of the Institute of Romania's Emission in World Depression Era. *Arhiva pentru știință și reformă socială/Archive for social science and reform*, year X, no. 1-4.

Șeicaru, P. (1929). Patria europeană/European homeland. *Curentul/The Current*, year II, no. 583.

Șeicaru, P. (1930). Confederația Central Europeană/The European Central Confederation. *Curentul/The Current* year III, no. 1055.

Șeicaru, P. (1930). Federalizarea Europei?/The federalization of Europe? *Curentul/The Current*, year III, no. 842.

Șeicaru, P. (1932). Himera egalității popoarelor/ The Illusion of equal peoples. *Curentul/The Current*, year V, no. 1756.

Vasiu, A. (1930). Memoriul d-lui Briand. Un progres al pacifismului/Mr. Briand's memorandum. A progress of pacifism. *Chemarea Tinerimii Române/The Call of Romanian Youth*, year V, no. 24.



THE 11TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

The Dictionary
between *Dictio On Air* and *Dixi(T)Onnaire*

Constantin Frosin¹

Abstract: Before this incessant swarm of dictionaries or even dicos, one wonders: what for? Have we forgotten the basic and even more fundamental dictum: *Non multa, sed multum*?! In this study, a somewhat novel approach is achieved for the sole purpose of getting out of the stream, as they say, out of the routine and the stagnation where publishers indulge themselves, publishing in a rush without bringing anything new to users, but taking advantage simply of the need for users to have a dictionary on their desks, whether students, translators or other types of intellectuals, open to the world and thus to the world of languages. At the end of this demonstration, the conclusion is that we must do something urgently, otherwise the living languages are in danger of turning into dead languages.

Pour pouvoir traiter de ce sujet, il faut remonter dans le temps, et réapprendre que *diction* – mot qui se trouve, qu'on le veuille ou non, à la base de mots comme *dictionnaire*, *dictionnaire*, *dictionnaire*, signifiait «manière de dire, quant au choix et à l'agencement des mots. Les mots eux-mêmes» (apud le *Grand Robert de la Langue Française*, 2001).

Qui plus est, on redécouvre, grâce aux *Caractères* (p. 55) de La Bruyère, que «*Les synonymes sont plusieurs diction ou plusieurs phrases différentes qui signifient la même chose*». Alors là, on peut en déduire qu'à la base du dictionnaire se trouvent non seulement le mot, mais aussi et surtout le synonyme, qui est lui aussi un mot. La clé de ce débat réside donc, en tant que solution valable, dans le fait qu'à la base du dictionnaire se trouve le synonyme et là, nous tenons à remercier le Professeur Giovanni Dotoli pour avoir remis cette question sur le tapis. Comme nous le remercions d'avoir pensé à écrire le magnifique ouvrage sur la traduction: *Traduire en français du Moyen Âge au XXI –e siècle*, éditeur Hermann, Lettres, Paris, 2010.

Mais voyons de plus près sur quoi nous étayons nos affirmations. Prenons d'abord l'étymologie du mot *synonyme* : du grec *synonymos*, *syn*=ensemble, *onyma* = nom, donc: *qui a le nom en commun*. Chez Aristote, la notion concerne les mots dont le sens est «lié» par un genre commun, et qui ont donc des sens différents. L'abbé Girard nous soutient (il nous vient de loin : la *Justesse de la langue française* (1718)...): «*La ressemblance que produit l'idée générale fait donc les mots synonymes; et la différence qui vient de l'idée particulière qui accompagne la générale, fait qu'ils ne le sont pas parfaitement, et qu'on les distingue comme les diverses nuances d'une même couleur.*», in: *Synonymes français*, p. 9 (5^e édition).

¹Professor, PhD, Danubius University of Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., Galati 800654, Romania, Tel.: +40372361102, Corresponding author: constantinfrosin@univ-danubius.ro.

La théorie que Girard met en œuvre dépasse, en outre, le cadre des seuls synonymes. *Les Synonymes français ne sont pas «seulement» un dictionnaire*. Le titre de la première édition l'affirmait avec orgueil: il s'agit de la «justesse de la langue», de cette justesse qui «convient par tout», qui «plaît toujours» et qui «plaît seule», alors que «rien ne plaît sans elle». La pensée girardienne sur les synonymes n'est pas isolable d'une conception générale du langage et c'est avec acuité que d'Alembert, dans son *Éloge*, dit de Girard qu'il est «un Grammairien Philosophe, et non un simple Grammairien de faits et de routine.»

D'Alembert lui donne raison, et pour cause: «(...) *ce qui constitue deux ou plusieurs mots synonymes, c'est d'abord un sens général qui est commun à ces mots; et ce qui fait ensuite que ces mots ne sont pas toujours synonymes, ce sont des nuances, souvent délicates, et quelquefois presque imperceptibles, qui modifient ce sens primitif et général*», in: *Eloge de Girard, Œuvres complètes*, t III, p. 360.

En effet, il est rare qu'il y ait deux synonymes parfaits, car au moins une nuance les distingue, mais aussi l'usage divers par personnes de diverses extractions sociales, ou leur *fortune* plus ou moins longue au fil du temps. En effet, l'abbé Girard ne savait pas si bien dire: c'est la justesse de la langue qui compte.

Et pourtant Et pourtant, le *Dizionario italiano ragionato* d'Angelo Gianni et Luciano Satta (editore G. D'Anna, Sintesi, Firenze, 1989), lequel fit fureur en son temps, enregistre le mot *dizione*/diction, comme les mots *dizionario*/dictionnaire et *dizionarista*/dictionnariste sous l'entrée *dire*/dire!... Cela en dit long, long comme un dictionnaire sans limites de volumes/tomes... Car un dictionnaire nous *dit* toute la vérité, voire nos quatre (cent mille) vérités sur nous-mêmes, sur notre vie, sur nos semblables, etc.

Et comme la définition de *diction*, le mot à l'origine du dictionnaire et de ses dérivés, est: acte de dire; mode de prononcer les mots ou les phrases; intonation particulière, inflexion, accent; manière de dire/de s'exprimer, locution, tout cela renvoie, on ne peut plus clairement, à *parole*, voire au sens saussurien du mot! Voyons ce qu'en pense F. de Saussure lui-même: «*Dans l'intérieur d'une même langue, tous les mots qui expriment des idées voisines se limitent respectivement: des synonymes comme redouter, craindre, avoir peur n'ont de valeur propre que par leur opposition; si redouter n'existait pas, tout son contenu irait à ses concurrents*», Ferdinand de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, p. 160.

A en croire S. Ullmann: «*Le trait le plus saillant de la synonymie française est le double clavier dont elle dispose. Il existe en français de nombreuses paires de mots, l'un autochtone, l'autre savant, pour désigner des notions apparentes. C'est là une des conséquences de la vogue du latinisme (...)*», in: *Précis de sémantique française*, p. 191, les diverses catégorisations des synonymes qui plutôt encombrement l'esprit que n'aident l'apprenti à clarifier les choses, ne sont pas à prendre en considération.

Ainsi, des spéculations comme: Synonyme distingué, populaire d'un mot; Synonymes à même radical: *frêle/fragile, misérable, miséreux*; Synonymes à radical différent: *mort, décès, trépas*; Synonymes distingués par une différence d'intensité: *fatigué/épuisé, aimer/adorer*; Synonyme d'emploi ou d'affectation: *salairé, traitement, appointements*; Synonymes de niveau social ou stylistique: *ennuyer/embêter; coursier/cheval*; Synonymes d'emploi chronologique ou géographique: *huis/porte; fête/kermesse; curé/recteur*; Synonymes qui présentent des différences objectives: *fleuve/rivière*, affectives: *agriculteur, paysan*; Synonymes partiels: *magazine* syn. de *revue*, quand ce mot désigne un périodique servent tout au plus la cause des théoriciens, alors que les praticiens des langues s'en remettent à leur double intelligence: celle native et celle du langage...

Pourquoi Baudelaire lisait volontiers les dictionnaires? Pourquoi Gautier avait dévoré les vocabulaires sans nombre des arts et des métiers? En voilà une réponse possible: «*A bien prendre les choses*, le dictionnaire est le livre par excellence. Tous les autres livres ont dedans», dixit Anatole France, in: *La Vie littéraire, Lexique*, p. 583. Sans parler du rôle important que le joue le dictionnaire dans l'enrichissement de la culture personnelle d'un individu, grâce surtout aux citations qui y abondent parfois: «*Un dictionnaire sans citations est un squelette*», disait Voltaire in: *Correspondance*, 1768, 11 août 1760.

Georges Duhamel va même jusqu'à considérer un certain dictionnaire (*le Littré*) comme: «(...) *le fondement de tout savoir à venir, pierre d'angle de tous les monuments futurs, le dictionnaire de Littré*», in: *Biographie de mes fantômes*, VIII, p. 145 (bien que, à regarder de plus près l'affirmation suivante d'E. Littré: «*L'usage contemporain est le premier et principal objet d'un dictionnaire. C'est en effet pour apprendre comment aujourd'hui l'on parle et l'on écrit, qu'un dictionnaire est consulté par chacun*», in: *Dictionnaire, Préface*, II et III, il y ait à prendre et à laisser...).

Il confirme par là la valeur de vérité de l'affirmation d'Anatole France, selon qui «*le dictionnaire est le livre par excellence*». Et si deux grands écrivains le disent, l'affirment tout haut, je pense qu'on peut y donner les mains. Car maîtres du Verbe, maîtres de la langue, experts du langage, auteurs de livres, ils sont, à lire leur affirmation à l'envers, auteurs de dictionnaires, plus ou moins... A cela près qu'un livre de littérature est le Dictionnaire de la Vie, le Lexique du Faire, le Vocabulaire d'Être, le Trésor de l'Homme! Mais que faire, quand Paul Léautaud leur prend le contrepied: «*La littérature n'a rien à voir avec la richesse du vocabulaire, sinon le plus grand des chefs-d'œuvre serait le dictionnaire*»... Et puis quoi après, dirions-nous... Abel Hermant vient à notre rescousse: «*La première vertu d'un écrivain est la propriété du vocabulaire*», in: (extrait de) *Lettres à Xavier sur l'art d'écrire*.

Et qu'est-ce que les hommes en commun, selon l'étymologie du synonyme? Le mot, car lu dans le miroir, *mot* donne *homme*... Le mot est le reflet de l'homme, l'homme existe en tant que mot, et dans cet ordre, il fut précédé par le seul Verbe. Le mouvement, la vie se revendiquent et se recommandent de Dieu, l'homme se réclame d'un nom (par une drôle de coïncidence, nom se prononce comme *non*... et là, l'on pourrait se poser la question - à laquelle les humanistes connaissent la réponse: qu'est-ce que l'homme a bien pu nier pour devenir Homme? L'égal, du moins par la majuscule, de Dieu...).

Plutôt décevante la définition du dictionnaire, que nous offre le *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, 9^e édition (la plus récente): Dictionnaire n. m. XVI^e siècle. Emprunté du latin médiéval *dictionarium*, dérivé de *dictio*, -onis (voir *Diction*). Recueil méthodique de mots rangés le plus souvent dans l'ordre alphabétique. ■ *Dictionnaire de la langue*, indiquant la définition, l'orthographe, les sens et les emplois des mots d'une langue (on dit aussi *Dictionnaire général*). *La nomenclature, les entrées, les articles d'un dictionnaire. Consulter, feuilleter un dictionnaire.*

Pourquoi décevante? Eh bien, parce que, selon nous, dans un dictionnaire on a affaire à la diction des idées. Ou, si l'on veut, dans le prolongement d'un certain type de dictionnaire en vogue aujourd'hui: De l'Idée au Mot, du Mot aux Hommes, pour illustrer à l'inverse le célèbre dicton: *Bien faire et laisser dire* qui, dans cette nouvelle perspective, devient: Bien faire (un dictionnaire) et laisser dire (à ses utilisateurs), ou: Bien dire (bien faire un dico) et laisser faire (de même) à ses lecteurs/utilisateurs...

Pourquoi avons-nous mentionné l'ouvrage tout à fait remarquable de Giovanni Dotoli: *Traduire en français du Moyen Âge au XXI^e siècle*, éditeur Hermann, Lettres, Paris, 2010? Eh bien, non seulement parce qu'il a réussi à mettre les choses au point dans le domaine si controversé de la Traduction, mais il nous a fait aussi comprendre un tas de choses concernant le thème de la synonymie et du dictionnaire. En quel sens?

Si tout est traduction ici-bas, car Vivre = Traduire, parce que vivre signifie traduire dans les faits/dans l'acte de vivre: ses idées, principes, souhaits, nécessités, sentiments, etc. Si l'on a souvent pris la Traduction pour la Tradition, préférant au premier terme le dernier, nous trouvons plus plausible de dire *Tradiction*, en réunissant Traduction et Tradition, mais aussi en pensant à *dictio*/diction, ce qui nous permet de dire Tra-diction; cela éliminerait d'entrée de jeu l'allusion méchante à la trahison, évidente dans le syntagme (combien idiot et faux!): Traduttore – Tradittore! Car *Tradittore* signifie Traître... Mais la preuve (que personne, paraît-il, ne prend la peine de faire) n'est plus valable: Traduction – Tradimento (Tradizio, vx. it.). Cela prouve que ce jeu de mots fut, en effet, un jeu de vilains !...

Si parler/écrire signifie traduire nos pensées, traduire se réduit – et là, nous demandons pardons aux théoriciens de la Traduction, qui ont écrits bien des tomes pour démontrer que leur science n'a rien à voir à la pratique de la traduction (sic!) - à une affaire de synonymie! Une mise en équivalence, une synonymisation perpétuelle, une synchronisation, si l'on veut, entre pensée et parole, entre décision et passage à l'acte. Parler est synonyme de dire quelque chose, de ne pas se taire, de vouloir se faire remarquer ou comprendre. Quand le ciel se couvre, cela est synonyme de: le temps est à la pluie, n'oubliez pas d'emporter un parapluie, prenez votre imper, etc. Quand Untel rougit, ceci est synonyme de: ce type est timide, émotif, il a honte de quelque chose, ou bien il a la fièvre, il se trouve mal, etc. Quand la nature reverdit, c'est que le printemps est là, c'est le Renouveau, l'hiver est parti, etc. Ces renvois incessants entre un fait, un phénomène qui se produit et notre esprit, c'est une sorte de traduction par la synonymisation. On nous reprochera de tout mêler, de faire fi des limites imposées par la linguistique ou la lexicologie, mais le fait est que notre expérience de traducteur d'env. 200 livres à ce jour, nous permet d'en arriver là.

Car qu'est-ce qu'un énoncé du type: *Mettez en français* veut dire? Traduire oui, *id est* chercher les mots ou les phrases synonymes de celles indiquées dans l'énoncé. Par exemple: *Fa freddo oggi, meglio mettere un vestito grosso*, donnera en français: Il fait froid aujourd'hui, vous feriez mieux de mettre de gros vêtements. Ou: *Don't get out, it is raining cats and dogs*, sera synonyme en français de: Ne sortez pas, il pleut des cordes. Ou: *Taci naibii din gura odata, ma enervezi*, sera synonyme en français de Veux-tu te taire, nom d'un nom, tu m'énerves!

Et là, à propos de dictionnaire et synonymie, nous nous émerveillons encore devant la géniale trouvaille de Léon Robel: «*Un texte est l'ensemble de toutes ses traductions significativement différentes*». Plus il y a de traductions, plus cela témoigne de la créativité et de l'imagination des traducteurs, mais aussi et surtout de la richesse significative des chefs-d'œuvre. On parlait à un moment donné, de l'existence sur le marché français du livre, de plus de 4000 versions de *Hamlet*. Mais sait-on combien de facettes a un diamant poli et repoli par un grand orfèvre? Nous pensons que six mille autres versions de *Hamlet* sont possibles, à tout le moins. Si l'on accepte le dicton «Autant de têtes, autant d'avis», alors on devra accepter un autre dicton, créé *ad hoc*: Autant de traducteurs, autant de traductions! Et là, plus que jamais, la synonymie entre en jeu, c'est là que le synonyme joue en tant que vecteur traductionnel vital, voire fondamental.

Nous rêvons depuis longtemps déjà d'un Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Traduction, lequel pourrait être constitué d'un corpus d'exemples et des synonymes à utiliser ou à éviter. Les exemples pris comme modèle seraient d'une difficulté maximale, extrême et les commentaires seraient accompagnés de solutions pratiques, allant du simple au complexe, du style parlé au style écrit, du style standard au style littéraire ou livresque, c'est selon.

A preuve que nous y voyons – et visons – juste, c’est l’exemple du langage des sourds-muets, qui s’entendent à merveille entre eux, mais combien ils ont du mal à s’entendre avec un non sourd-muet. Quel calvaire, quelles peines d’enfer. Ou le langage des chiens, que l’on vient de décrypter, ou le langage corporel (si l’on peut dire) que l’on implante dans la mémoire des robots, en imitant le langage corporel des humains. Ou, si l’on veut pousser cette analyse à l’extrême, un avion est un synonyme parfait de l’oiseau, lorsqu’il est en vol. Posé sur le sol, il n’a plus l’air de rien, sinon d’un objet destiné à voler à un moment donné, mais qui, pour le moment, reste inerte en repos.

Cette mise en équivalence, cette opération mentale consistant à fouiller sans arrêt en quête de synonymes de ceci ou de cela, est une préoccupation majeure et continue de l’être humain. Par exemple, quand on dit de quelqu’un: il est passé comme une lettre à la poste, on peut penser à cela comme à un synonyme portant sur l’existence plus ou moins éphémère de l’homme. A la rigueur, tout est possible, à condition que l’on maîtrise l’art, non seulement la technique de la découverte et de l’emploi des synonymes. Comme qui dirait, l’être humain dépend des lettres et lectures qu’il a faites au fil du temps, dès sa plus tendre enfance!

Quant au thème proprement-dit, nous proposons un dictionnaire de synonymes qui, à la place des définitions/explications, donne des synonymes commentés du point de vue de leurs nuances respectives. Un tel dictionnaire servirait aux Professionnels du langage, de la Traduction si l’on veut et serait réparti en sept gros tomes, en fonction des Classes grammaticales: Nom, Pronom, Adjectif, Verbe, Adverbe, Préposition, Conjonction. Les exemples seraient donnés en abondance, suivant les registres de langue: Standard, Familier, Populaire, Argotique, Trivial, Vulgaire, Littéraire, Livresque et Ancien (neuf environ et au moins) et seraient accompagnés par citations des grands écrivains. Ces 7 volumes constituerait le premier Trésor d’une langue et servirait d’outil indispensable, répétons-le, aux philologues, traducteurs et écrivains en devenir. Un 8^e volume serait un Supplément, intitulé: Comment ne pas traduire, ou erreurs à éviter et aurait recours aux difficultés de la langue respective, illustrées par force exemples.

Un autre type de dictionnaire que nous proposons aux spécialistes, comporterait un tome dédié à chaque lettre de l’alphabet respectif et devrait offrir aux utilisateurs: définitions par le recours aux synonymes et antonymes, transcription phonétique, famille de mots, citations à profusion. Ce type de dictionnaire s’adresserait aux intéressés, à ceux qui doivent manier une langue correcte dans l’exercice de leurs fonctions, y compris élèves et étudiants.

Pour les autres, tombés dans la routine et pour qui la langue ne représente pas un centre d’intérêt, ou pour les élèves des écoles primaires, nous recommandons des dictionnaires illustrés type Larousse, indiquant les sens principaux et offrant des informations culturelles à partir des vocables respectifs. *Le Larousse* est le dico populaire (pour ne pas dire populiste) par excellence, le *Petit Robert* est le dico des intellos par excellence. Il manque aux Français les deux types de dictionnaires que nous avons proposés tout à l’heure. *Le Trésor de la Langue Française* et le *Grand Robert de la Langue Française* sont d’excellents dictionnaires, mais ne font pas l’affaire des professionnels de la Traduction, par exemple, loin de là!

Quel dommage que le *Dictionnaire de synonymes et mots de sens voisins* d’Henri Bertaud de Chazaud, paru aux éditions Gallimard, Quarto, en 2005, n’offre que de simples et vastes listes de mots, ce qui n’a nullement le don d’édifier l’utilisateur sur les différences et les nuances qui distinguent les divers synonymes proposés ! C’est un inventaire quasi exhaustif, d’accord, mais il y a même de ces Français qui se plaignent qu’ils n’arrivent pas à se débrouiller dans la masse des solutions proposées, qui ne leur offrent, au demeurant, que l’embarras du choix!

Que le synonyme permette d'éviter une répétition, de trouver un terme plus satisfaisant, d'enrichir son vocabulaire, que son sens soit ou non le critère majeur (ou alors le critère grammatical), l'important c'est que son emploi donne un reflet inattendu, pas forcément flatteur, mais sans doute fidèle, de la variété des comportements mentaux, politiques, culturels d'une communauté - autant de traits communs à l'être humain et aux sociétés. Aussi son importance n'est-elle plus point à démontrer, et nous pouvons terminer cet exposé par un *Quod erat demonstrandum*.



THE 11TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

Prolegomena to a Better Definition of Intercultural Communication: The Concept of Culture

Cristinel Munteanu¹

Abstract: The aim of our paper is to lay the foundations for an adequate definition of intercultural communication, a very important and highly used notion nowadays due to the present complex reality it refers to. Since the terminological phrase “intercultural communication” involves the previous knowledge of two other concepts, *communication* and *culture*, both equally “polysemantic”, we will try to establish, first of all, the “common core” for each of them in turn. For the beginning, we will attempt to clarify here, by means of essential distinctions, the concept of *culture*, planning to discuss the concept of *communication* in another paper.

Keywords: intercultural communication; culture, communication; essential distinctions; unitary designation

1. In a famous and influential American handbook of intercultural communication, *Communication between Cultures*, written by Larry A. Samovar and Richard E. Porter, it is stated, from the very beginning, the fact that “intercultural communication involves interaction between people whose cultural perceptions and symbol systems are distinct enough to alter the communication event” (Samovar & Porter 2004, p. 15). The two authors do not forget to add that their book “is about the role of culture in communication”. However, when dealing with the notion of «culture», Samovar and Porter deplore “the elusive nature of the term”, observing that “culture is ubiquitous, multidimensional, complex, all-pervasive, and difficult to define” (Samovar & Porter 2004, p. 32), also quoting the opinion of authorities such as L.E. Harrison and S.P. Huntington (the editors of the volume *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*, published in 2000), according to whom “the term «culture», of course, has had multiple meanings in different disciplines and different contexts” (*apud* Samovar & Porter, 2004, p. 32). What is more, they also mention A.L. Kroeber and C. Kluckhohn’s book from 1952, *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*, in which are listed 164 definitions of culture found in the anthropology literature. The conclusion is the following: “Definitions of culture range from those that are all-encompassing («it is everything») to those that are narrow («it is opera, art, and ballet»).” (*apud* Samovar & Porter, 2004, p. 32).

2. Eventually, Samovar and Porter will choose only one recent definition of the many given to culture, justifying their choice. We will refer to the respective definition in the end of our paper. Until then, let us concentrate on other opinions, coming from different research directions. In any case, it is obvious that, in order to understand what intercultural communication is, one must clarify the term *culture*

¹Danubius University of Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., Galati 800654, Romania, Tel.: +40372361102, Corresponding author: cristinel.munteanu@univ-danubius.ro.

itself. Almost all the specialists who have been interested in the topic of culture have underlined the complexity of the concept and its various meanings. Some have come to the conclusion that the term *culture* is *multi-discursive*, meaning that it can be used in a great number of *discourses*: “This means you cannot import a fixed definition into any and every context and expect it to make sense. What you have to do is identify the discursive context itself. It may be the discourse of nationalism, fashion, anthropology, literary criticism, viti-culture, Marxism, feminism, cultural studies, or even common sense.” (J. Hartley, in O’Sullivan *et alii*, 1994, pp. 68-69).

2.1. Obviously, the idea of “multiplicity” of meanings or of “multidimensionality” in the case of this concept has been frequently remarked (see *supra*, 1), with the mention that John Hartley’s observation seems more pertinent to us, since it can be linked to the important notion of “universe of discourse” used in logic and philosophy. According to Eugenio Coseriu, the *universe of discourse* is: “the universal system of significations to which a discourse (or a phrase) belongs and which determines its validity and meaning” (Coseriu, 1967, p. 318). Indeed, a term is correctly defined only by relating it to its universe of discourse and there are differences in meaning which result from using the same (often interdisciplinary) term in different contexts. One can wonder whether, once the necessary distinctions made, one can identify a certain semantic average, a certain “unitary signification” which can justify all its acceptations (as long as the levels are not confused).

2.2. First of all, we believe that, in the case of the term *culture*, one must first exclude from discussion its original meaning (i.e. lat. *colere* ‘to plough’), still present in phrases such as *the culture of plants*, *the culture of vine*, etc. It is only of interest to us here from an etymological point of view, in order to establish the way in which, on the basis of a metaphor, the respective term has come to its current designation. Initially, the term was linked to agriculture (the cultivation of the soil, of plants, etc.), later, by extension, it has come to refer to the culture of some beings as well, such as oysters or bacteria. With this acceptance, as John Hartley observes, “cultivation such as this implies not just growth but also deliberate tending of «natural» stock to transform it into a desired «cultivar» – a strain with selected, refined or improved characteristics” (Coseriu, 1967, p. 69). And it is only one step from here to the idea of ‘mind cultivation’. The metaphorical transfer has been made quite naturally.

3. In order to more rigorously and objectively define the term *culture*, we have to take into account the fact that we deal with an “international” or “supraidiomatic” term, which cannot be lexicographically described only from the perspective of a certain historical language, as a mere word belonging to the common vocabulary. For instance, to refer to another famous example, the signification of the French word *parole* is defined by the structural semantics of French in relation with words such as: *mot*, *discours*, *propos*, *boniment*, *devise*, *sentence*, *expression*, *langage* etc., while the term *parole* from Saussure’s linguistics is defined by the respective linguistics through a delimitation drawn within the reality itself, omitting at the same time the oppositions in which this word functions in French (*cf.* Coseriu, 1987, p. 181). Thus, after having established that we have to exclude from our discussion the initial, metaphorical signification and that we have to define *culture* both by relating it to reality and also relating it to the universe of discourse to which it belongs, we have to consider a series of distinctions which other researchers make (sometimes without the required precision). We have not aimed here to list all the definitions given to *culture* all over the world, but to focus on some of them (almost randomly chosen; some provided by Romanian specialists), which (intuitively) reveal some interesting aspects of the cultural phenomenon.

3.1. A first distinction regards the opposition between (1) *culture* and (2) *civilization*. According to Ovidiu Drimba, (1) *culture* comprises “the attitudes, acts and works limited – in point of genesis, intention, motivation and purpose – to the domain of spirit and intellect. The work, the act and the man of culture follow the satisfaction of spiritual and intellectual needs; self-revelation, discovering the unknown, the explanation of mystery and the pleasure of beauty” (Drimba, 1997, p. 6). However, by (2) *civilization* one understands (or should understand¹) “the totality of the means through which man adapts to the (physical and social) environment, managing to subdue and transform it, to organise it and to integrate into it. Everything that belongs to the horizon of satisfaction of material needs, comfort and security means «civilization».” (Drimba, 1997, p. 6). Obviously, the differentiating aspect is important and justified and it corresponds, *grosso modo*, to the two essential dimensions of man identified by Hegel: *language* and *work*. Language transforms man into a *cultural* being, while, by working, man satisfies his (increasing) necessities of a biological nature, permanently modifying his natural environment.

3.2. Once culture has been delimited, one can operate another distinction within it; in other words, culture is made to be (a) broadly speaking, *anthropological*, or (b) narrowly speaking, “*elitist*”. Accordingly, Giovanni Sartori’s opinion is worth mentioning.

Taking into consideration the first meaning, (a) the anthropological and sociological acceptance, one can say that every human being lives in the sphere of a specific culture: “If man is, as he is in fact, a symbolic animal, it results *eo ipso* that he lives in a cognitive context of values, beliefs, conceptions and, in one word, of symbolisations which constitute his culture” (Sartori, 1999, p. 16). From this generic point of view, even the primitives or the illiterate are the possessors of culture and, in fact, this is exactly the perspective from which one talks about the “culture of entertainment”, “culture of imagery”, about “juvenile culture”, etc.

If one takes as a condition of culture “the knowledge”, then one gets to (b) a narrow and appreciative acceptance, according to which “an educated person is a person *who knows*, with solid readings or at least one that is well-informed” (Sartori, 1999, p. 16). Thus, the true culture would belong only to the “educated”, not to the ignorant ones. Observing the new tendencies, G. Sartori sounds the alarm: “The message with which the new culture gets recommended and eulogized is the following: the culture of the book (elitist) belongs to the few ones, while the audio-visual culture belongs to the many” (Sartori, 1999, p. 17).

3.3. Trying to provide another anthropological definition of culture, Andra Șerbănescu believes that there are two basic acceptations of the term *culture*: (i) “the totality of the works of art created by a human community (literature, music, sculpture etc.) and, particularly, the knowledge of an individual about them” (Șerbănescu, 2007, p. 107); and (ii) “a sum of values, norms, institutions, artefacts specific to a community (lifestyles, human values, religious beliefs, customs, ways of thinking, aesthetic standards, linguistic expressions, communication styles etc.), namely a certain civilization [sic!] with all its forms of manifestation” (Șerbănescu, 2007, p. 107)

In other words, briefly speaking, culture would be “a structure of significations historically transmitted” (Șerbănescu, 2007) According to the above quoted author, the latter meaning would

¹ Due to its numerous definitions, the meaning of the respective terms has been inverted in some media, with the risk of producing confusions: “for the facts of civilisation, the Germans use the term *Kultur*, while the French prefer to indicate the fact of culture by the word *civilization*; phrases such as «spiritual civilization» and «material culture» are frequently used, which is a clear *contradictio in adjecto*; or, even more, the terms get to be overlapped [...]” (Drimba, 1997, pp. 5-6). For the invention and history of the French term *civilisation*, see Benveniste 1966: 336-345. For the distinction between *culture* and *civilization*, also see (Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952, pp. 13-17)

include the former, corresponding to the anthropological definition of culture to which she refers when discussing about the Romanian culture, the Japanese culture, etc.

3.4. According to Ștefan Bârsănescu – the author of an impressive work (published in 1937) about the politics of culture in Romania – the term *culture* has two acceptations as well: (1) “*the capital of knowledge* [cf. Germ. *Wissen* ‘science’] which makes possible the state and the economy, the art and religion, the art and morals”; (2) “*education*, representing, according to pedagogy, the *dynamic* culture or the process of perfecting of individuals and of ennoblement of collective life” (Bârsănescu, 2003, p. 37).

The process regarding the transition from the static perspective (that of culture seen as a sum of knowledge) to the dynamic one (that of the incessant/continuous producing of culture) is also rendered: “The culture education is realized through the use of *culture - spiritual goods* which is offered to the individual in order to be assimilated, mastered, as a mental exercise, etc. and it constitutes the ferment of germination for new scientific, artistic, political creations.” (Bârsănescu, 2003, p. 37)

Before drawing any conclusion from the analysis of the above mentioned distinctions and definitions, we should observe that culture, in its essence, is an *activity* that produces certain “objects”. In order to continue our discussion, we must distinguish between *productive activities* and *unproductive activities*, trying to characterize mainly the former.

4. Both the ancient Greeks and the Romans intuited that activities can be of two types: *productive* and *unproductive*. And they would express this intuition by means of language as well, since old Greek had the verbs *poiein* for ‘to make something productively’ (hence *poiesis*) and *prattein* for ‘to do something unproductively’, while Latin recorded, for the same distinction, the verb *facere*, respectively the verb *agere*. Thus, if, for instance, someone would weave a basket, he was asked *Quid facis?* (“What are you making?”), but, on the contrary, if he was walking or breathing, he was asked *Quid agis?* (“What are you doing?”) (see Coșeriu, 1996, p. 64).

Aristotle brought his contribution to this matter as well, differentiating three aspects in the case of productive activities: the activity itself (*enérgeia*), competence or technique (*dýnamis*), that is to know “how to make it”, and the product (*érgon*). *Enérgeia* is logically previous to all techniques (*dýnamis*), being creativity itself. To illustrate it, one can give the following example: the technique used by Leonardo da Vinci in painting represented a competence that the great humanist developed in time and which was his own. Based on it, he could create as many paintings he wanted, the paintings being the *érgon* which was bearing the mark of his genius, namely the product of his activity (as *enérgeia*). If one of his disciples would learn this technique, then the disciple himself could make, in his turn, works *à la* da Vinci. However, on the other hand, the disciple could bring his contribution, modifying or improving, through activity, the respective pictorial procedure. Provided an improvement was noticed in his new work, then the technique would take over the alteration, enriching itself (and thus surpassing what had already been known) (Coșeriu, 1996, p. 65).

It is true that, if we will now return to the previous distinctions and definitions, we will observe that most of them take into consideration, first of all, the status of *product* (*érgon*) of culture, and only secondly, the status of *competence* (*dýnamis* or *téchne*), as a “way of making”. In this regard, the one who seems to take into account (at least intuitively), more than the others, the above mentioned aspects is Ștefan Bârsănescu, whose definitions of culture include both the idea of “competence” and the idea of “pure activity” (*enérgeia*), as a dynamic process.

5. It is time to opt for a satisfactory definition of culture, meant to grasp the essence of as many cultural manifestations as possible. As for the significations of ordinary words belonging to a certain historical language, the structural semantics has already provided a solution. It is the notion of *unitary signification*, according to which “for each distinct linguistic form, in grammar and in lexis, one must first of all assume a unique signification, namely a unitary signification valid for all contexts in which the respective form appears and which can justify its values as motivated by means of contextual framing” (Coseriu, 1981, p. 204)¹. Unfortunately, such a notion cannot be applied in the case of this “international” terminology, since it is not idiomatically structured. Hence, we analogically suggest a similar concept, that of “unitary designation”², by which we envisage the “common core” of the various manifestations of the investigated reality.

6. We believe that the manner in which Eugenio Coseriu defines culture involves the “unitary designation” or “common core” we are looking for. Thus, Eugenio Coseriu, taking as a starting point Hegel’s conception (based on an Aristotelian idea), defines *culture* as “*the historical objectification of spirit into forms which last, into forms which become traditions, historical forms which describe the world specific to humans, the human’s specific universe*” (Coşeriu, 1994, p. 173). And the *spirit* historically objectified in the form of culture is *enérgeia* (Aristotle’s concept), that is *the creative activity or the creativity itself*: “that specific activity which is logically previous to any dynamism, to any acquired or experimented technique” (Coşeriu, 1994, p. 173). In addition, Coseriu also states (following G. Vico) that the forms of activity which constitute culture are language, art, religion, myth, science and philosophy. At the same time, one should not ignore the fact that the respective creative activity is a *free activity* (in the philosophical sense of the word *free*), namely “an activity whose object is infinite” (Coşeriu, 1994, p. 173) it never ends.

7. Let us return now to the definition Samovar and Porter have eventually chosen. This definition was given in 1994 by A.J. Marsella as follows: “Culture is shared learned behavior which is transmitted from one generation to another for purposes of promoting individual and social survival, adaptation, and growth and development. Culture has both external (e.g., artifacts, roles, institutions) and internal representations (e.g., values, attitudes, beliefs, cognitive/affective/sensory styles, consciousness patterns, and epistemologies).” (Marsella, 1994, *apud* Samovar & Porter 2004, p. 32). The American authors explain why they chose this definition: “We like Marsella’s definition because it includes what Harrison and Huntington call the «subjective» elements of culture – the elements such as «values,

¹ The concept of “unitary signification” was intuited by Aristotle and later adequately defined by Leibniz, following a criticism made to J. Locke. The importance of this concept for linguistics was shown by Eugenio Coseriu (see Munteanu 2014). It was occasioned by the setting of the general principles of lexematics (which are, in fact, the fundamental principles of analytical structuralism). Coseriu mentions, among other things, the principle of functionality, to which he adds an important corollary which regards the signification – the one of the unitary signification – as well as a methodological or technical corollary, namely that of commutation.

² Aristotle can be of help in this regard as well (especially when referring to “things” rather than “words”). This is how the British philosopher R.G. Collingwood presents his method: “Aristotle has a characteristic method in philosophical lexicography. He recognizes that a single word has several different meanings, and never falls into the stupid mistake of supposing that one word means one thing: on the other hand, he recognizes that these various meanings are connected among themselves, and that the word is not equivocal because it has more than one meaning. He thinks that of its various meanings one is the deepest and truest meaning; the others are approximations to it arising from varying degrees of failure to grasp this deepest meaning. Consequently he arranges his meanings in a series like shots on a target which gradually creep in and find the bull [= the bull’s-eye; our note, Cr.M.]” (Collingwood, 1960, p. 80).

attitudes, beliefs, orientations, and underlying assumptions prevalent among people in a society». These are the elements that shape and control perception and interaction.” (Samovar & Porter, 2004, 33).

There is no doubt that – by referring to these internal or “subjective” elements of culture, but mainly by the observation that these elements “shape and control perception and interaction” – Samovar and Porter manage to grasp (more vaguely, of course) the essence of culture as revealed by Coseriu.

8. The fact that the two realities, communication and culture, are interconnected, also results from Hall’s statement: “Culture is communication and communication is culture.” (apud Samovar & Porter 2004, p. 28). The two American specialists seem to be hesitant when having to decide which phenomenon is the most important: “Put into slightly different terms – when looking at communication and culture, it is hard to decide which is the voice and which is the echo.” (*ibid.*). Nevertheless, we have learnt from Hegel that language/communication is not only a form of culture, among other cultural forms, but the basis of culture itself. So, the next thing to do is to adequately define *communication*.

Bibliography

- Bârsănescu, Ștefan (2003). *Politica culturii în România contemporană. Studiu de pedagogie [1937]/Political culture in contemporary Romania. Study pedagogy [1937]*. 2nd Ed. Iași: Polirom.
- Benveniste, Émile (1966). *Problèmes de linguistique générale/ General Linguistics Problems*. I, Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1960). *The Idea of Nature [1945]*. London, Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1967). *Teoría del lenguaje y lingüística general. Cinco estudios/General theory of language and linguistics. Five studies*. Second edition. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1981). *Lecciones de lingüística general/Lessons in General Linguistics*. Madrid: Editorial Gredos.
- Coseriu, Eugenio (1987). *Palabras, cosas y términos/Words, things and terms*. In *In Memoriam Inmaculada Corrales*. “Estudios lingüísticos” I, Universidad de La Laguna, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, p. 175-185.
- Coșeriu, Eugen (1994). *Prelegeri și conferințe (1992-1993)/Lectures and conferences (1992-1993)*. Supliment al publicației Anuar de lingvistică și istorie literară. t. XXXIII/Directory supplement of the publication of linguistic and literary history. T. XXXIII, Iasi: Seria A. Lingvistică.
- Coșeriu, Eugeniu (1996). *Lingvistica integral/Full linguistics* (Interview with Eugeniu Coșeriu achieved by Nicolae Saramandu). Bucharest: Editura Fundației Culturale Române.
- Drimba, Ovidiu (1997). *Istoria culturii și civilizației/The history of culture and civilization*. Final Edition, vol. I. Bucharest: Editura Saeculum I.O. & Vestala.
- A.L. Kroeber, A.L. & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions* Papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology Papers. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Printing Office, Vol. XLVII.
- Munteanu, Cristinel (2014). *Problema «semnificatului unitar» la Eugeniu Coșeriu (cu o aplicație la cuvântul român)/Problema «semnificatului unitar» la Eugeniu Coșeriu (cu o aplicație la cuvântul român)/The Problem “unitary significant” to Eugene Coșeriu (with an application to Romanian word)*. In Acad. Marius Sala, Maria Stanciu Istrate, Nicoleta Petuhov (editori). *Lucrările celui de-al cincilea simpozion internațional de lingvistică/Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium on Linguistics, Bucharest 27-28 September 2013* (Academia Română, Institutul de Lingvistică Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti). Bucharest: Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, pp. 564-580.
- Samovar, Larry A.; Larry, A. & Porter, Richard E. (2004). *Communication between Cultures*. 5th Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

O'Sullivan, T.; Hartley, J.; Saunders, D.; Montgomery, M. & Fiske, J. (1994). *Key Concepts in Communication and Cultural Studies*. Second Edition, London: Routledge.

Sartori, Giovanni (1999). *Homo videns. Televisione e post-pensiero/Television and after-thought*. Roma – Bari: Laterza.

Șerbănescu, Andra (2007). *Cum gândesc și cum vorbesc ceilalți. Prin labirintul culturilor/How others think and talk. Through the labyrinth of cultures*. Iasi: Polirom.



THE 11TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

History, Culture, Peace: Rumi Mevlana

Alina Beatrice Cheșcă¹

Abstract: Along the history, for so many centuries, Rumi Mawlana – perhaps the most loved mystical poet of all times – has been alive and talking to people of all cultures through the language of love, peace, faith and true kindness. This remarkable man has always transcended the boundaries of time, space, race, religion, considering that “Love is the very meaning of creation and life”. It would not be an exaggeration to assert that the history of humankind would have been a paradise if human beings had followed such principles like peace, love and understanding. Rumi Mawlana created a splendid, humanitarian and universal type of art, culture and mentality; his message is God’s message to humankind: friendship, hope, generosity, peace, beauty, in one word: Love and happiness in all forms. Thus, he used his huge poetic talent not only in order to touch people’s hearts, but also to reach the most splendid goal of the human race: that of making people more sensitive to the eternal and most important human values.

Keywords: Sufism; God; peace; love; faith; poetry; creation

Motto: “In compassion and grace be like the sun.”

(Rumi Mevlana)

Rumi Mevlana may be considered one of the most important representatives of love and peace, being a great spiritual teacher from whom mankind should learn essential things about life, humanity, true faith, acceptance and tolerance. He is one of the most loved poets both in the East and West. However, in the 18th century, very little was known about Rumi and Sufism in Europe and America. Since then, well-known Western scholars have brought their contributions to making this spiritual leader and mystical poet famous in their countries and abroad.

Peter H. Cunz said that “*to write about Rumi and his contributions today is sending a drop of water into the ocean.*” (Rumi and His Sufi Path of Love, 2011, p. 92). He considered that Mevlana “*was far more than a poet and far more than a mystic. He is a holy man whose spirit illuminates the hearts of his followers even today.*” (Peter Cunz, *op. cit.*, p. 95).

At the end of the 18th century, J. de Wallenbourg – who was a French ambassador living in Istanbul – translated *Masnavi* into French, but unfortunately, it was burnt by the fire in 1799. Joseph Hammer was a very appreciated Austrian orientalist who knew Turkish, Arabic and Persian and translated the *Divan* by Hafiz into German. He considered that *Masnavi* by Rumi should be read by all lovers of Sufism, from India to Turkey. Hammar wrote about *Divan-I Kabir*:

¹ Associate Professor, PhD, Faculty of Communication and International Relations “Danubius” University of Galati, Romania, Address: 3 Galati Blvd., Galati 800654, Romania, Tel.: +40372361102, Corresponding author: alina.chesca@univ-danubius.ro

“Rumi found the Supreme and Everlasting Being and on the wings of highest spiritual joys and pleasure, he rose to levels that other poets (including Hafiz) could not reach. Rumi not only transcends the sun and the moon but also time, space and creation.” (Sefik Can, in *Rumi and His Sufi Path of Love*, 2011, p. 97)

Another name which is worth mentioning is Friedrich Ruckert, who died in the latter half of the 19th century. He was a Sufi and is considered to be the most appreciated German orientalist. Hammer helped him in his passion and thus Ruckert learnt Turkish, Arabic and Persian. After he had read *Masnavi* and the *Divan-I Kabir*, he became fascinated by Rumi and translated his odes into German. Later, he continued his love for the Oriental poetry by translating Sa’di and Hafiz; this is how Rumi Mevlana became known in Germany. Hans Meinke was also an adorer of Rumi, fascinated by the Divine Love and he decided to dedicate his poetry to this mystical poet. Another famous orientalist who loved Rumi was Professor Annemarie Schimmel, born in Germany; actually, she wrote a huge number of articles and books about her favourite poet (in German, English and Turkish).

Another scholar was Hippolyte Taine, specialist in English literature. Sefik Can mentions that: *“Unlike the French who are theoretical and Italians who are artists and ponderous in nature, the determined and pragmatic British also have a strong inclination toward mystical thought.”* (Sefik Can, in *Rumi and His Sufi Path of Love*, 2011, p. 101). Sir James Redhouse translated the first volume of the *Masnavi* into English in 1881 and E. H. Whinfield also translated some selected passages from *Masnavi* and published them seventeen years later. R.A. Nicholson was another important orientalist and believers; he translated many Sufi works, among which six volumes of the *Masnavi* with commentaries.

French scholars were also interested in Rumi Mevlana. C.L. Huart visited Konya at the end of the 19th century and wrote a book about this city. Maurice Barres is analyzed by Mehmet Onder in *The Life and Works of Rumi*; the latter one quotes the beginning of Barres’s memoirs: *“I can’t wait. I want to see Rumi’s lodge, whirling hall and shrine, experience his Divine rapture and hear the melodies of his poetry. He is such a genius that odour, light, music and a little bit of bohemianism emanate from him. It enraptures the reader. Only the reader? No. Jalaladdin Rumi himself is in rapture and whirling in his poems. (...) How fortunate I am!”* (Mehmet Onder, *Life and Works of Rumi*, 2007, p. 232). With so much fascination and appreciation, Barres also said that: *“The life of no poet, whom I consider to be the messengers of the world of enthusiasm, light and joy, compares to the life of Rumi. After seeing the dervishes whirling and singing to his rhythm, I noticed that there is something lacking in Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe and Hugo.”* (Asaf Celebi, *The Life and Personality of Rumi*, 2007, p. 50)

Sefik Can mentions that in the United States *“there is great admiration for Rumi and he deserves the title of the most read poet in America.”* (Asaf Celebi, *The Life and Personality of Rumi*, 2007, p. 105). In Washington there is even an institution (*Rumi Forum for Interfaith Dialogue*) and an annual Rumi Festival held in North Carolina.

Eva de Vitray Meyerovitch was another researcher, writer and translator who loved Rumi Mevlana; she approached the work and life of this unique poet in her PhD thesis and translated many of his works into French. In 1987, she was awarded the title *Doctor Honoris Causa* from Selcuk University of Konya, for extraordinary services offered to Rumi and to the Turkish culture. She considered Rumi to be *“the greatest mystic genius of all times, my spiritual leader”* and perhaps that is why she embraced Islam and took the name of Hawwa. Eva de Vitray Meyerovitch’s wish was that of promoting Rumi’s works in the whole world and spreading the Ultimate Truth. In an international congress in Konya, she expressed her mission: *“What I wish to do is to identify Rumi’s messages (...)*

and present them to Western youth who are deprived of spirituality and thirsty for meaning.” (Eva de Vitray Meyerovitch, 1st International Rumi Congress, May, 1987, Konya)

Being a Sufi, Mevlana gave up his ego and hopes for perfection; his ultimate purpose was to reach God and the true love (both for Divinity and humans). His awe for God found its perfection in *Masnavi*, a work finished in eight years; this is a huge poetic work in six large volumes, written in couplets. *Masnavi* provides insight into every issue, starting with the Sufi religion, mysticism and social relations: children’s education by means of toys, food, illnesses and herbal cures, psychotherapy, the body composition and others. In his *Diwan*, Rumi reflected divine love in accordance with the peculiarities of that time and expressed it by symbols such as: lover - beloved, rose - nightingale, vineyard - garden, wine – cupbearer, sea – drop. In some of his poems, he approaches some social issues apart from the soul of ghazals: he criticizes the officials who take bribes, warns the leaders, despises the deeds of some scholars, talks about wedding customs, children playing in the street, the marketplace. In the foreword of the oldest copy of *Diwan-I Kabir*, it is said:

“The words in this Diwan-I Kabir are the spiritual secrets. They are the arc of Noah for the lovers of All Truth. They are sacred breaths. They are breezes enjoyed by the soul. And they are divine inspirations. They are the explorations of the blessings those open the eye of the hearts at dawn. They are the infusions those come from Allah who is beyond any kind of impurities. They are big pearls of the sea of unseen. This Diwan is the diwan of lovers. It is the source of spiritual pleasures. It is the light of hearts. It is the key of people of peace. It is the flower of gardens of heart. It is a gift of journey for those who set out on the way of Lord.” (Rumi, Diwan-I Kabir, v.I, p. 2)

Mevlana also uses the metaphor of the *reed-flute*, standing for longing, the music of the soul, full of love and harmony: *“It’s the flames of love in this reed-flute burning/It’s the ferment of love in this wine enrapturing.” (Rumi, 2002, p. 57)*

Using the reed-flute, Mevlana refers to the Sufi belief that our world is the realm of separation as our soul does not belong to the material world, where God is present *“behind the veil of cause and effect”*. The human spirit is actually part of the immaterial and metaphysical world where we can have a real and huge understanding of the divine reality. The *reed-bed* is chosen to be the symbol for the source of the spirit which is represented by God. Before coming to this material world, our souls lived in another realm called by him *“The World of Spirit”*. Huseyin Bingul considers that: *“Before the day of reunion with its Creator and the attainment of the utmost proximity with the Beloved after death, the self can free itself from this prison of the body, as Rumi says, with the ladder of love placed in front of it.” (Huseyin Bingul, in Rumi and His Sufi Path of Love, 2011, p. 124).*

For Mevlana, the attraction of all existence is the consequence of our attraction to the All-Loving God. According to him, the Hidden Treasure is the breath blown into the reed-flute which gives life to it; what we feel inside ourselves is God’s breath. Thus, our spirit carries the inborn love for His Essence, which remains a mystery as no human can truly understand the Essence of God. Our ego can come close to God only if it struggles to purify itself. It must be educated and improved by the Beloved in order to give up its egocentrism and find perfection. Of all creatures, only human beings have free will. This free will should make us choose the right and moral way in life and thus our ego will be able to carry the Divine Trust. Rumi Mevlana concludes in a philosophical way: *“My life can be summarized in these three phrases: I was raw, I got cooked, I burned.”*

Mevlana regards human beings as being the most honourable of all creatures, advising us: *“Do not look at Adam, created of clay, but rather see the breath that was breathed into him and be fascinated*

by it.” (Rumi, *Divan-I Kabir*, 3, 1576). Life is the expression of the light of God’s existence. Feeling attracted by God with an unceasing force, Rumi Mevlana lives in joy and happiness:

*“When you seek love, by the grace of God
Your spirit turns into wine and your body into a jar:
When He increases the wine of His grace, the jar falls into pieces.
Every knowledgeable one knows without thinking,
That where there is disturbance, there is a Disturber.”* (Rumi, *Masnavi*)

Rumi is subjugated by the Divine Love, as his heart beats with joy whenever he finds himself close to his Beloved. In *Divan-I Kabir*, he expresses this ecstasy: *“This is love: to fly toward a secret sky, to cause a hundred veils to fall each moment.”* (Rumi, *Divan-I Kabir*, *Ghazal no. 13*). In a couplet in *Masnavi*, he states that: *“Love is the flame which, when it blazes up, burns everything except the Beloved.”*

As it is known, for Mevlana, music, dance and contemplation represents a perfect way of reaching our Master. In beautiful verses he defines music in the following couplet:

*“Music is the nutrition of the souls of the servants of the Lord,
Since, in music, there is the hope of reaching God.”* (Masnavi)

The *Sama* (i.e. the dance) represents the elevation of the spirit, the human being turning his face to see and understand the Ultimate Truth, finding peace and happiness in the Divine Love, losing itself in God, thus becoming pure and immaculate. During *Sama*, the dervish’s arms are wide open, with his right arm turned to the Sky and his left one turned down, thus receiving the gifts from God and giving them to humans. Sufis have always tried to answer the question: “What is human?” And Mevlana offered a beautiful, complete and unique answer, considering the human being to be an exponent for the whole universe. He defined love as being the essence of human creation, the holy fabric we are made of:

*“Our mother is love! Our father is love!
We are born from love! We are love!
All loves constitute a bridge leading to the Divine love.
To love human beings means to love God.”* (Masnavi)

We could state that there is no other “definition” of the human being as concise (yet comprehensive), poetical (yet realistic), perfect and unique as this one. Rumi actually touches the divine core which is inside each and every of us. In beautiful and suggestive words, Selahattin Hidayetoglu stated that: *“Rumi’s duty was to strive to lead people to attain eternal bliss.”* (S. Hidayetoglu, *op.cit.*, p. 65). In other words, peace, love for God and humans, kindness and happiness must be the ultimate purposes of mankind.

References

- Aflaki, Shams-ol-Din Ahmad (1994). *Saints of the Whirling Dervishes*. Paris.
- Bakirci, Naci (2010). *Konya. Mawlana*. Konya: Servet Offset Co.
- Celebi, Asaf (2007). *The Life and Personality of Rumi*. Istanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi.
- Citlak, F. & Bingul, H. (ed.) (2011). *Rumi and His Sufi Path of Love*. New Jersey: Tughra Books.
- Ibram, Nureddin (2007). *Islamul pur și simplu/ Simply, the Islam*. Constanta: Golden.
- Bakirci, Naci (2010). *Konya Mevlana Museum*. Istanbul: BKG Publications.
- Onder, Mehmet (2007). *The Life and Works of Rumi*. Istanbul: Tercuman Yayinlari.
- Rumi, Djalal-od-Din (1973). *Divan-e Shams-e Tabriz (Mystical Odes)*. Paris: Sindbad.
- Rumi, Djalal-od-Din (1976). *Fihi-ma-fihi (The Book of the Inside)*. Paris: Sindbad.
- Rumi, Jalaluddin (2002). *Meditatii și parabole (Masnavi – e Manavi)/Meditations and Parables*. Bucharest: Kriterion.
- Rumi, Jalaluddin (1925). *Mathnawi*. Leyde (translation into English by E.A. Nicholson).
- Rumi, Jalaluddin (1912). *Rumi's Little Book of Life*. USA: Hampton Roads.
- Sahin, Bekir (2007). *Selections from Diwan-I Kabir of Rumi*. Konya: Rumi Publishing House.
- Vitray-Meyerovitch, Eva (2003). *Rumi și sufismul/Rumi and Sufism*. Bucharest: Humanitas.



THE 11TH EDITION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
REALITIES AND PERSPECTIVES

Social Borders, Identity and Urban Image Construction

Luminița Iosif¹

Abstract: The research on the borders in urban areas, both social, as temporal, spatial, economic and cultural have their coherence, first, on a common vision of the urban world apprehended from an interactive perspective and, moreover, in a move that makes visible the practical side (to do) of urban life. The purpose of this research is to show how the population relates to the lived space, what is the relationship between the centre and periphery, the symbolic borders inside the area. To understand the social reality of the suburbs as finely as possible in all its dimensions, socio-economic, cultural and institutional, I combined the documentary approach and analysis of interview survey (semi-structured). This research is based on the results of a research conducted on the social borders, identity and image in urban areas.

Keywords: urban space; borders; marginality exclusion; Identity

1. Introduction

Naturellement, la société n'est pas un espace unitaire, homogène, mais délimité, divisé, soit qu'il s'agit d'une rue ou d'un indicateur, ceux-ci donnent lieu à certaines trajectoires. De cette façon, ces « lignes » plus ou moins visibles ou évidentes représentent ce que nous appelons les frontières sociales. Les frontières bien qu'elles prennent la forme de certains éléments naturels, tels que : les fleuves ou les montagnes, divisent les territoires des groupes sociaux et engendre la différence entre « nous » d'ici et « eux » de là. Concernant l'univers urbain, chacun d'entre nous, à un moment donné, en allant d'une zone à l'autre, a eu le sentiment bizarre qu'il a traversé des mondes différents. Les signes de ce changement sont nombreux: l'infrastructure, l'accès aux moyens de transport, les commerces.

Simmel (2010 [1908]), affirmait que la frontière n'est pas un fait spatial avec des conséquences sociologiques, mais un fait sociologique qui prend une forme spatiale. La distribution des logements en fonction des revenus, statut professionnel, niveau d'éducation, appartenance ethnique, c'est-à-dire l'ensemble de formes de différenciation sociale des individus et des groupes, explique la tendance des grandes villes à converger vers une stratification sociale.

2. Définition

Le concept de frontière sociale a été approché récemment dans des études et son emploi a été encouragé grâce à l'attention accrue accordée aux études comparatives et aux recherches interdisciplinaires.

¹ Senior Lecturer, PhD, "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galați, Romania. Address: 47 Domnească Street, 800008, Galați, Romania, Tel.: +40.336.130.196, fax: +40.372.361.290, Corresponding author: luminita.iosif@ugal.ro.

Le concept de frontière sociale est défini pour la première fois dans la littérature de spécialité par M. Lamont et V. Molnar. Dans leur article *The study of boundaries in the Social Sciences*, ils définissent les frontières sociales en tant que « formes objectives de disparités sociales dégagées par l'accès inégal aux ressources matérielles et symboliques et par leur distribution inégale » (Lamont & Molnar, 2002, p. 167).

L'analyse du processus de formation des frontières sociales trouve ses origines dans les ouvrages des sociologues classiques. Nous nous intéressons au travail de É. Durkheim et à sa distinction entre sacré et profane et à M. Weber, qui analyse les groupes de statut par rapport aux groupes ethniques (Gheorghiu, 2005, p. 32).

Dans sa démarche de définir le concept de frontière, B. Moulin, distingue dans son ouvrage *La ville et ses frontières* (2001) trois significations de ce terme:

- limite d'un territoire qui détermine son étendue;
- limite qui sépare deux états – il renvoie au concept de contrôle et d'identité nationale;
- limite de démarcation – la limite qui indique le détachement, le souhait d'être singulier (p. 36).

Tous ces éléments ainsi qu'une définition du concept de frontière sociale ont été exposés pour la première fois dans la littérature de spécialité par le sociologue M. D. Gheorghiu dans l'introduction de l'ouvrage *Analyse et intervention dans la science sociale* (2005).

3. Frontières dans l'espace – recherches et perspectives théoriques

Comme nous avons précisé dans le premier chapitre, le traçage de frontières sociales a été fréquemment étudié par la sociologie urbaine, à partir des travaux de l'École de Chicago, notamment à travers le concept de « provinces morales » utilisé par Robert Park ou Roderick McKenzie (1921) pour décrire les zones de la ville Columbus comme « des univers de représentation sociale différenciés », ou à travers le concept de « ghetto », rendu célèbre par la thèse de Louis Wirth (1928).

La grande ville est aujourd'hui fragmentée en isolats résidentiels ou ghettos, ceux des pauvres mais aussi ceux des riches. C. Topalov remarquait que ce phénomène est particulièrement accentué dans les Amériques, des *gated communities* de Los Angeles aux *condominios fechados* de Rio de Janeiro et aux *torres con servicios* de Buenos Aires, mais il semble concerner de plus en plus souvent des grandes villes européennes où un intérêt croissant s'installe autour de la question des « divisions de la ville ».

Les recherches sur les frontières sociales sont en plein essor surtout aux Amériques ou en France. Utilisé pour la première fois en ethnologie, le concept de frontière désignait l'appréhension des divisions internes au sein des sociétés contemporaines. Pensées comme un mécanisme social par Charles Tilly, les frontières séparent « nous » d'« eux » et interrompent, circonscrivent ou « produisent de la ségrégation » dans des distributions de populations ou d'activités à l'intérieur des champs sociaux. Les frontières délimitent aussi les réseaux de contacts interpersonnels, en marquant des distributions d'ordre temporaire.

M. Lamont a emprunté ce concept dans ses recherches empiriques et comparatives sur les classes sociales (ouvriers et classes moyennes) dans l'Amérique de Nord et en France en construisant une typologie des frontières sociales divisées en classes et par pays.

Dans l'ouvrage « *La morale et l'argent: Les valeurs des cadres en France et aux États-Unis* » (1995) Lamont analyse les critères que les salariés utilisent pour évaluer les autres et pour tracer les frontières de classe. L'accent repose sur les frontières culturelles, socio-économiques et morales, mais aussi sur

les critères que les groupes sociaux utilisent pour marquer certaines frontières dans de divers contextes (la France par rapport aux États-Unis, les centres culturels par rapports à ceux dépourvus de culture).

Les frontières morales tiennent compte des qualités individuelles, tels que l'honnêteté, l'intégrité personnelle, la considération envers les autres; les frontières culturelles ont comme critères l'éducation, l'intelligence, la politesse, et les frontières économiques divisent les individus en fonction du revenu et des ressources matérielles (Lamont, 1995, p. 4)

Pierre Bourdieu, même s'il ne fait pas référence d'une manière explicite à ce concept, montre que les frontières sociales permettent l'observation des changements des rapports entre les classes sociales et le système scolaire (Gheorghiu & Merklen, 2011, p. 36).

À partir de l'observation de G. Simmel que la frontière n'est pas un fait spatial avec des conséquences sociologiques, mais un fait sociologique qui prend une forme spatiale, C. Selimanovski examine dans son ouvrage *La frontière de la pauvreté* (2008) le lien entre ces deux phénomènes : l'apparition et la référence à la frontière et à la pauvreté.

Les recherches de Selimanovski ont été ciblées sur la zone Strasbourg et Bas-Rhin et la population bénéficiait de formes de soutien de la part de l'État. Selimanovski observe que la pauvreté qui renvoie à la condition d'assisté crée une frontière sociale reflétée tantôt au niveau spatial, tantôt au niveau des représentations mentales. De ce point de vue, la frontière de la pauvreté est une conséquence des politiques publiques ciblées sur la population dans un état de précarité économique et sociale qui permettent l'identification des chômeurs à travers les mécanismes d'assurance – chômage, basée sur les aides sociales correspondant à la sphère de l'assistance (Selimanovski, 2008, pp. 9-11). Dans ce contexte, on se demande: d'où cette affluence de valence dans la démarche de théoriser le concept de frontière?

4. «Nous» et «eux» dans la formation des frontières sociales

Utilisant comme point de départ la définition des frontières sociales, on remarque la différence entre « les élus » et « les exclus », entre dominants et dominés, entre stables et marginaux, les frontières sociales étant le résultat du processus d'exclusion. La frontière est perçue comme « un instrument de l'ordre sociale : elle divise et organise les contacts entre catégories, groupes... » (Gheorghiu, Merklen, 2011, p. 33). À l'intérieur d'un groupe social, elles définissent les principales caractéristiques, disposent des hiérarchies et délimitent « *les insiders* » des « *outsiders* », étant associées à l'exclusion d'une certaine catégorie de la population. D'une autre côté, mobiles et perceptibles, les frontières sociales rendent possible l'inclusion de ceux considérés comme différents.

L'étude de N. Elias et J. Scotson, réalisée à la fin des années 1950 dans le quartier Winston Parva situé près d'une grande ville industrielle anglaise, est aujourd'hui une parfaite illustration du phénomène de la séparation et de la désolidarisation de la population. Le quartier, séparé du reste de la zone Winston par une voie fermée, se composait de trois zones. La zone 1 était la zone résidentielle, habitée par des bourgeois et les zones 2 et 3 par les ouvriers. On pourrait s'imaginer que les liens entre les zones 2 et 3 étaient solides et eux, à leur tour, étaient solidaires avec les habitants de la zone 1. Mais les barrières sociales qui séparaient les deux zones étaient les mêmes, voire plus fortes que celles qui les séparaient de la zone 1.

Comment s'explique ce paradoxe ? La zone 2 représentait l'ancien quartier ouvrier et les habitants vivaient là depuis longtemps contrairement à ceux qui habitent dans la zone 3 et qui y ont emménagé récemment (Palmonari, Zani, 2007, pp. 28-29).

N. Elias et J. Scotson ont analysé le processus de formation et de conservation au fil du temps de la ligne de démarcation entre ces deux zones, regroupant d'une côté les *established* et de l'autre côté les *outsiders*. Les premiers étaient conscients de leur supériorité et cherchaient constamment à imposer leur supériorité à ceux habitant dans la zone 2, qui ont fini par l'accepter. D'une part, cette situation augmente la cohésion des habitants de la zone 2 et ce processus se réalise graduellement par l'internalisation des règles établies au niveau du groupe, d'autre part, les nouveaux arrivés (zone 3) finissent par intérioriser le stigmate et les convictions dépréciatives (Palmonari, Zani, 2007, p. 30).

Cet écart est l'expression de la violence symbolique présente dans les quartiers périphériques et qui, parfois, est accompagnée de violences physiques ou verbales.

5. Frontières et identité dans les périphéries urbaines

L'identité représente une des directions importantes de la recherche urbaine contemporaine. L'exclusion et la ségrégation sociale intervenant dans la formation de l'identité d'une communauté, les investissements et le développement d'une ville, d'un quartier font parties du processus de mise en forme de l'identité personnelle et sociale d'un individu (Mata Barreiro, 2004, p. 41). L'identité personnelle est liée à l'individu en tant que personne unique et tient à l'expérience du sujet de ressentir qu'il existe et qu'il est reconnu par rapport à l'autrui. L'identité sociale est donnée par un ensemble de caractéristiques objectives qui permettent d'identifier l'individu de l'extérieur. Le fait que nous nous percevons comme des membres d'une catégorie sociale constituée nous permet de nous identifier du point de vue social. Étant donné le fait qu'un individu peut avoir un « répertoire d'identités sociales » (sexe, nationalité, groupe d'âge, catégorie professionnelle, pratique culturelle, etc.), son identité sociale se définit comme un ensemble de groupes avec lesquels un individu peut s'identifier ou entrer en contact. Cette dimension objective de notre identité marque la position du sujet dans la société et dans la zone où il opère (Catrina, 2010, p. 46).

Par conséquent, la notion d'identité sociale est commune à plusieurs personnes, c'est une identité définie par un sentiment d'appartenance des individus à un groupe social. À cet égard, R. Poledna note qu'une telle identité peut « être construite, dans un certain contexte et climat social » (Poledna, 2001, p. 57).

Les théories sur l'identité sociale sont fondées sur les recherches de Tajfel et plus tard sur celles de Turner et ont montré que l'individu essaie de maintenir ou d'augmenter l'estime de soi – en acquiesçant une vision positive de soi. En même temps, aux groupes ou catégories sociales (et l'appartenance à ces groupes) on associe des connotations positives ou négatives, et c'est pourquoi l'identité sociale peut être positive ou négative en fonction des évaluations des groupes qui contribuent à la mise en forme de l'identité sociale de l'individu. De plus, l'évaluation de son propre groupe se fait par rapport à d'autres groupes spécifiques, à travers les comparaisons sociales en termes d'attributs ou de caractéristiques valorisés. Une différence positive entre le groupe d'appartenance et un autre groupe engendre un grand prestige, et une différence négative entraîne un faible prestige (Luca, 2010, p. 70-71)

Manuel Castells montre que l'identité est un processus de construction à partir d'un ou plusieurs attributs culturels, qui reçoit priorité sur toutes les autres sources. Un même individu, ou un même acteur collectif peut en avoir plusieurs. Dans cette étape il y a un point commun avec la théorie de l'identité sociale de Tajfel et Turner, notamment l'idée de la pluralité des identités. L'élément distinctif

est que dans la théorie de l'identité sociale, l'identité émerge de l'appartenance au groupe, et ainsi un individu peut être membre de plusieurs groupes.

En analysant le problème du rôle, Castells distingue entre « identité » et « rôle ». Les identités sont sources de sens plus importantes que les rôles, grâce au processus d'(auto) construction qu'il implique. Les rôles sont des primates, les identités sont construites. Les identités organisent le sens – l'acteur social construit son propre sens autour d'une intériorisation, le sens étant ce qu'un acteur identifie symboliquement comme l'objectif de son action – les rôles organisent des fonctions (Castells, 2003, p. 7).

Dans l'ouvrage « *Les identités urbaines* » Blaise Galland définit l'identité urbaine comme le processus d'agencement et de structuration de l'ensemble des représentations que les différents groupes sociaux internes et externes d'une ville se font d'elle, de son passé, de son présent et de son avenir, et ceci à un moment donné de l'histoire (Galland, 1993, p. 3). Ainsi, l'identité désigne l'ensemble de caractéristiques d'un groupe qui fait la différence par rapport à d'autres groupes ainsi que sa constance le long du temps.

En même temps, une étude réalisée par Henning et Lieberg souligne l'importance des liens périphériques dans la zone habitée. Les gens ont tendance à avoir des liens solides à l'extérieur de la zone d'habitation et, bien qu'ils croisent leurs voisins plus souvent, ils entretiennent des relations superficielles avec eux (Forrest & Kearns, 2000, p. 7). La zone d'habitation peut jouer un rôle très important dans le processus de socialisation d'une personne, non seulement à travers la composition et la dynamique interne, mais aussi par la façon d'être perçue par les résidents d'autres régions. Les identités résidentielles surgissent dans un cadre psychologique comparatif où chaque zone est appréhendée et analysée par rapport à une autre. Ce dialogue entre les divers groupes trace une carte mentale de la ville ou du quartier et établit de bonnes ou mauvaises réputations. La perception externe de certaines zones peut avoir des conséquences au niveau des comportements et attitudes des habitants et peut renforcer la cohésion et consolider la réputation (Forrest & Kearns, 2000, p. 9).

La distance qui sépare un quartier d'un autre, une zone de l'autre, tient compte des différences de façades, de la qualité zonale, du prestige de l'endroit, à travers le statut social des familles, les études ou les professions de leurs membres, mais aussi de la place des habitants dans la trajectoire personnelle, à travers les relations avec leurs familles et voisins. Les mêmes frontières peuvent avoir des significations différentes, en fonction du rôle qu'ils jouent dans les différents types de trajectoires des individus.

6. References

Castells, Manuel (2003). Identity and Meaning in the Network Society. *The Power of Identity: The Information Age, Economy, Society and Culture*. Blackwell Publishers.

Catrina, Sonia (2010). A fi rom în Europa comunitară. Despre drepturi și justiție socială/ Being Roma community in Europe. About rights and social justice. *Sfera Politicii/Sphere Policy*, no. 154, available online at <http://www.sferapoliticii.ro/sfera/154/art07-Catrina.php>.

Forrest, Ray & Kearns, Ade (2001). Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood. *Urban Studies*, vol. 38, no. 12, pp. 1-19.

Galland, Blaise (1993). Les identités urbaines. *Cultures, sous-cultures et déviances*. Convention romande de 3e cycle de sociologie, Bulle, 24-26 novembre 1993/Cultures, subcultures and deviance, available online at www.artfactories.net/IMG/pdf/identite_urbaine_blaise_galland.pdf.

Gheorghiu, M. Dinu (2005). *Analiză și intervenție în știința socială/Analysis and intervention in social science*. Iasi: Editura Universității Alexandru Ioan Cuza.

Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu & Merklen, Denis (2011). Frontierele sociale. De la reflecție la punerea în practică a unui concept/Social borders. From reflection to implement a concept. In Gheorghiu, Mihai Dinu, de Saint Martin, Monique (coord.) *Educație și frontiere sociale Franța, România, Brazilia, Suedia/Education and social borders France, Romania, Brazil and Sweden*. Iasi: Polirom.

Lamont, Michèle (1995). *La morale et l'argent: Les valeurs des cadres en France et aux Etats-Unis/Morality and Money: The frames of values in France and the US*. Paris: A.-M. Métailié.

Lamont, Michèle & Molnar, Virág (2002). The Study of Boundaries in Social Study. *Annual Review Sociology*, Vol. 28, pp. 167-195.

Luca, Sabina-Adina (2010). *Identitatea socio-culturală a tinerilor/Socio-cultural identity of youth*. Iasi: Institutul European.

Mata Barreiro, Carmen (2004). Identité urbaine, identité migrante/Urban identity, Migrant identity. *Recherches sociographiques/Sociographiques research*, Vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 39-58, available online at <http://id.erudit.org/iderudit/009234ar>.

Moulin, Brigitte (2001). *La ville et ses frontieres. De la ségrégation sociale à l'ethnicisation des rapports sociaux/The city and its borders. Social segregation ethnicization of social relations*. Paris: Editions Karthala.

Palmonari, Augusto, Zani, Bruna (2007). Studiile comunitare/Community studies. In Moscovici, Serge & Buschini, Fabrice, *Metodologia științelor socio-umane/Social and human sciences methodology*. Iasi: Polirom.

Poledna, Rudolf (2001). *Sint ut sunt, aut non sint? Transformări sociale la sașii ardeleni, după 1945. O analiză sociologică din perspectivă sistemică/Transylvanian Saxons social transformation after 1945. A sociological analysis of systemic perspective*. Cluj: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Simmel, Georg (2010[1908]). *Sociologie: étude sur les formes de la socialisation/Sociology: study on forms of socialization*. Trad. Lilyane Deroche-Gurcel, Sibylle Muller. Paris: PUF.

Selimanovski, Catherine (2008). *La frontière de la pauvreté/The border of poverty*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.