

FROM IMAGING TO SLANDER AND DISHONOR

Iulian BITOLEANU

Ph.D., "Anastasescu National College", Roşiorii de Vede, Romania

Abstract

Instead of the controversy of ideas, some journalists (and writers) preferred misinformation, mystification of the truth, trampling on any moral principle, only out of malice, less often out of professional envy, not taking into account the imminence of an intellectual "death" or professional career. For example, horrified by the plagiarism indented by an obscure publicist (Caion), the great classic I.L. Caragiale chose Germany as its residence and oasis of peace after 1900. Exile in a civilized country where the law is obeyed and abuses and imposture restricted can be a solution to disappearing from a tainted, "poisoned" world.

Sometimes for the systematic "attacks" in the press, but illogical, unfounded, the issuer will pay / suffer hard. Specifically, the successful journalist, PamfilŞeicaru, opened many battlefields in the press of the time, flirting in his uncontrolled pride, with the effigy of a literary critic, venturing into the realms of literary and grammatical chronicle. For his malice, the

moment of revenge comes at the address of contemporary titans like Rebreanu and Camil Petrescu, not from the annoyed ones, but from unsuspected horizons, so that a drastic sentence will be avoided by taking refuge in Spain and Germany.

Keywords: slander, dishonor, Caragiale, image

Preamble

The aura of a famous writer does not automatically become a guarantor / card of peace, of the satisfaction of what you have achieved at your desk, but in such conditions, a contestant - two, not to mention an escort or a chorus of denigrators, it would tarnish the image badly, it would even trigger dramatic gestures, with disastrous consequences.

For example, an obscure publicist by the pseudonym Caion, fed from the shadows with "venom" by Caragiale's enemies / enemies - a Macedonski, a Hasdeu - accused the author of the drama *Năpasta* of plagiarism, inventing a Hungarian author, whose remarks seemed striking. with those in the Romanian play. On the advice of his friend and lawyer Barbu Ștefănescu-Delavrancea, Caragiale filed a lawsuit in the slanderer's court, and the literary world witnessed this show both in the press and in the courtrooms, with a fair sentence initially, then subjective and sweetened for Caion. Here is how a misinformation - imagining the existence of a Budapest writer, a few decades before our illustrious comedian - led to the falsification of works, to the descent from the pedestal of a classic value, a kind of trick of the image, of the writer's emblem, which disturbed the hierarchies in the art of the word at the beginning of the twentieth century (1902), so that some gullible writers were inclined to justify the denigrator. Because of this serious incident when Caragiale's originality was severely damaged by other social contexts hostile to literary

judging, the brilliant playwright went into exile in 1904, disgusted by the political scene and the chaotic measures of liberal government. He did not renounce his quality as a Romanian until he closed his eyes in 1912, especially since, there in Berlin, he found peace, reconciliation, serenity, rediscovering his family harmony and warmth. In his correspondence with his friends from the country, Vlahuță and Delavrancea, he confessed that he would not return to his homeland, to see the same "faces", those of corrupt and profiteering individuals. The disgrace of him, a successful prose writer and playwright of the time, weighed heavily in making a unique, irrevocable decision. Admittedly, his radical measure - expatriation - did not impede patriotism at all, in the shelter of a legacy of a kinship.

During his life, not a few controversies, literary disputes spiced his uncle Iancu's life, upset him, he came to the conclusion of human Pharisaism, envy and stupidity assaulting and trying to demolish the elites of time. It is no less true that the landowner over the Romanian comic mocked and satirized his confreres, oversizing some of the shortcomings of their writing, deceiving himself that his status as an authority in prose and theater would be sufficient in the minimizing evaluation of colleagues.

Caragiale- Macedonski. Controversy of ideas? Sale?

Between the two valuable and conflicting writers, staggered by two years in age, the relations were never positive although they met at less than twenty years (1871) in the same circumstance: at the editorial office of the newspaper "Ghimpele", in the positions of editor and collaborator. Neutrality, ignoring the other lasted over two decades and animosities occurred in 1893, thanks to the sarcastic playwright who was a bit severe in his media feud, "Romanian Whimsy", with the initiator of the Romanian puck. The proud

Macedonski replied twice with increasing hostility in "Literatorul" and "Românul" towards the end of the same year, giving the impression of an easy victory. Clearly disturbed by the audacity of an underestimated writer but at the same time aware of the effects of a probable controversy with the pre-thinker, the rational Caragiale withdrew diplomatically from this press dispute and simulated conciliation, maneuver thwarted by the tenacious cenacle chief and opinion leader at several periodicals. So he, the conflict, reaches high levels with serious accusations against the junimist, as if an incompatibility had been created between Caragiale's private job (he owned a brewery) and the important position in the state (as director of Romanian theaters). Through this, the vindictive poet who deluded himself with genius and cynically inferiorized Alecsandri and Eminescu, opened the "Pandora's box", signaling to the public an infringement case.

Not distortion, not fake-news, but evil, utopian justice, staining the Caragalian personality, and so harassed by so many enemies in a delicate moment for the living classic, when it seems that all the ironies, satires in sketches and comedies overflowed. It would have been wiser for the vain theorist of symbolism, a pioneer, indeed, of Westernization, to ignore the paradox, to camouflage, a sign of trade union solidarity, especially since they both proved critical of the powerful clay of the day. After all, they instilled in different ways the colds of a socio-political system that had shown its limits. Moreover, glory had been acquired before, and the ostracized Macedonski had been recognized as an innovator.

The poet-journalist did not win any of the quarrels with those from "Dacia literară", "Propășirea" and "Junimea", on the contrary, he attracted innumerable antipathies ...

Finally, the loser was called Caragiale, who was encamped by political / liberal "sharks", anti-conservatives eager to carve, to crumble from his artistic statue, in the context in which two other comrades (Eminescu and Creanga) from the school performance had died. of literature from Vasile Pogor's mansion ...

Once again we managed to humiliate, dishonor the most popular Romanian comedian and, possibly, spiritual prose writer!

In his axiological myopia, Al. Macedonski, although adored by several young writers trained by him, did not put the sword in the "sheath" of peace, on the contrary, he wanted a total, grotesque victory ... He diversified the strategy until the psychic capitulation of a colleague two years older, while his literary star climbed from "The Nights of Musset to the surprising rondelles and, in the preview, symbolist poems ... If the editor of "Ghimpele" did not dedicate many thorny articles to him, then why so much ferocity?

In other words, in the name of whose moral principles, the playwright-journalist allowed himself to be "whipped" by actors like Dandanache, Trahanache, Dumitrache, etc. an entire social class, the bourgeoisie, the edifier of modern Romania? The poet who sat at the 'Literary', cursing left and right, not forgetting to polish his bust as an immortal poet, insinuated that his opponent Caragiale was not entitled to rule on civic morality.

These Macedonian attacks soured the refined user of puns, pleonasms, cacophonies, tautologies, anacolutes, all put on the lips of his stage creations. In addition, they steered his will and energized his sarcasm. The proof: the journalist commentator of literature also distorts the truth, the reality, reflects them subjectively as a literary chronicler and drastically diminishes the aesthetic level of the volume of verses Excelsior (1895) belonging to Macedonski. The eccentric propagandist of symbolism and discoverer of talents

(Arghezi, Gala Galaction, Tudor Vianu, G. Bacovia) needed so much that he retaliated under the pseudonym Salustiu by inserting in the "People's Gazette", a supplement of the newspaper "Orthodox League", a material acid entitled I.L. Caragiale and his work. Beyond this, he introduces in this ideational and media tournament the student Constantin Al. Ionescu, in short Caion, with the clear mission to tease, distort and "cake" the prestige of a famous writer.

Caion and Caragiale's accusation of plagiarism

The exegetes found as a prologue to a terrible literary conflict the not at all affable attitude of Caragiale who persevered in the publication "Moral Force" the fragile poetic attempts of a june, who signed Caion. Encouraged by his mentor Macedonski, this unknown publicist invents in universal literature an author IstvanKemeny who would have written, before Caragiale, a work with many similarities, even identical lexical sequences. The reckless and talented disciple starts a media "war" with a titan of writing accusing him in the "Literary Magazine", on November 30. 1901 of plagiarism, in the article Mr. Caragiale, putting face to face replicas from the drama Năpasta and from the play Nenorocul by the fictional Hungarian writer. "Clean plastography!", As Trahanache said in A Lost Letter. The playwright himself is stunned by the evidence brought in the press, he is mentally blocked, unable to believe that there was an alter ego on the world who possessed the same thoughts, phrases. He also does not know how to break the deadlock, to apologize or to dismantle the terrifying scenario of slander, of distortion, with the effect of degrading the famous playwright, to the sterile satisfaction of Master Macedonski. He asks in a letter for help from a professional lawyer in the person of Barbu (ȘtefănescuDelavrancea). He calms him down and advises him on what to do, how to file a petition to the court, initiating a lawsuit against the evil journalist,

who was later dismissed by his boss Th. Stoenescu. From the accused, I. L. Caragiale becomes accuser. The first round (March 1902) was won by whoever deserved it, by the free accused, Caragiale, while Caion the liar was sentenced to 3 months in prison, 500 lei criminal fine and 10,000 lei compensations. The plot against an artistic celebrity failed. The act of “beheading” the writing had not been completed, because the object of accusation - plagiarism - had existed only in the imagination of some nihilists....

Gelu Negrea also refers to the hostile reception of Caragiale's creation, among the contestants being N. Davidescu with the article Caragiale and the last Phanariot occupant or his inattention to the Romanian spirit, 1935. Basically, the exegete clarifies, ethnic-Romanianism was confused, and “the accusation of non-adherence to the Romanian spirit (...) is not supported”. The legal rehabilitation (June 1902) was ephemeral because the second episode will follow with the unexpected acquittal of the hostile Caion, supported by four famous lawyers through untrue evidence, but persuasive for judges. All this weakened Caragiale's health, and his rescue - and extraction from an adversarial world - was a legacy that facilitated his alienation and residence in Germany. After Al. Condeescu, the accusation of plagiarism confused, deeply disappointed the signatory of Năpasta, who, with bitter lucidity, realized again that justice in Romania in 1902 worked randomly, as required by "interest", a venerable and cuckold married named Trahanache. So the justice had not become incorruptible, the press was telling the truth, the "factory" of fake-news, changing into negative human destinies, without remorse. It should be noted that the media at that time was not able to establish a definitive truth, to dismantle horrible mystifications, the target being "someone", an artistic personality, stigmatized to order and marked for the rest of his life by the aftermath of these injustices. .

The penultimate: the double refusal of the Romanian Academy in the premiere of the volume *Teatru* (1889), prefaced by Titu Maiorescu, or the drama *Năpasta* (1902) for childish reasons. The last disappointment: the politician D. Sturdza filed an indictment that would have offended the nation Romanian, that it would not illustrate patriotism in literature.

The slanderous slanderer, ostracized. The Controversy Pamfil Șeicaru

The valuable journalist between the two wars, owner of the written media, we would call Pamfil Șeicaru, who was said to be able to make and break governments through his super-argued texts - and we don't think it would be just a simple legend! -, as well as through political blackmail, admitting, according to some sources, huge sums to extinguish the dispute with devastating consequences for his opponent, an individual on a high level of society ... In fact, the leader for two decades of his "Current" and chosen with the butada / irony / verse "Blackmail and the floor" in social journalism. Ennobling himself with other literary dispositions, such as the literary and theatrical chronicle, Pamfil Șeicaru dared to criticize two titans of the time, Liviu Rebreanu, for the play *The Envelope* and the novel *Gorilla*, indeed, imperfect works, and the playwright-perhaps the best at the time, Camil Petrescu, with his *Mioara*, a not remarkable drama such as *Strong Souls*, *The Game of Hell* or *Danton*.

Călinescu does not prove leniency either, considering that "Gorilla is the worst writing" of L. Rebreanu, and "Mioara is, definitely, the weakest", the failure being due to the performance of the actors and the annoying interventions of the playwright in editing the play. N. Manolescu is on the same wavelength: "lamentable show", failure, even though the premiere of the light

drama of 1926 was conceived for 4 years. The shortcomings of the text are also inventoried.

I would conclude that only in appearance the literary chronicler would have wronged two valuable interwar, distorting the situation, rigging the global image, disregarding, as time has certified the sheikarian diagnosis through the two significant segments of criticism yesterday (G. Călinescu) and today (N. Manolescu), who did not forgive the inherent declines of some interwar coryphaeus. It is known that the recipe for success involves not only masterpieces, but also transitional, breathing opportunities, aimed at restoring creative "batteries". It is exactly, we think, what happened on the artistic path of the mentioned creators, significant names, difficult to extract from the history of literature even using the aesthetic criterion. Șeicaru's myth of an authentic journalist, constantly read, applauded or cursed, with the flair of a discoverer of young literary talents, was overshadowed by subversive measures in media disputes creating a halo, a dilemma around his fascinating personality that dominated about 20 years the scene of the Romanian press and maintained the question "how much is obsolete and how everlasting in his routine activity?"

Far from the gratuitous / exaggerated glorification of Pamfil Șeicaru, we also accept the conjecture that his position as a prolific author should not be neglected, with 14 literary works - novels, theater, memoirs, pamphlets ... -, of course, unequally aesthetic, plus 915 satirical articles and sarcastic. The important critics of the time ignored him as a drastic reviewer, so the contesting act, falsifying the artistic image, did not diminish by any amount the reputation of Rebreanu and Camil Petrescu ...

On the other hand, the reductionist attitude, of minimizing the Sheicarian literary mentoring for N. Crainic, Cezar Petrescu, Gib Mihăescu, G. Dem

Teodorescu, Al. Busuioceanu, Tudor Teodorescu Braniște represents a subjective gesture, a reflection of his belligerent spirit ...

Therefore, the attempt to retouch the axiological retelling of some prose writers, playwrights already established thanks to the audience "capital", failed and the insult hit the vain press man. The review charges for Victor Eftimiu or Horia Furtună did not provoke "victims" either, on the contrary, the collective hatred increased, alerted the literary world, paying special attention to the Lovinescu diagnosis and to the comments of Pompiliu Constantinescu, Perpessicius; to all this was added the reaction of the new political regime after 1925 which judged him very harshly, accusing him of Hitlerist and Antonescu collaborationism and anti-democracy, the inhuman sentence sending him to Spain, confiscating his property, and not another great journalist Stelian Popescu (director of "Universul"), who, according to some scoundrels, would have deposited his assets in Swiss foreign banks ...

The "blind" destiny worked completely against Șeicaru, with attempts to change the literary hierarchy, reaching himself a slander, an absolute degradation, a kind of "persona non grata", forced to a humble modus vivendi extra muros... Rehabilitation he came late, with no artistic shock. From the perspective of uncompromising critics, I would draw the conclusion that Pamfil Șeicaru paid dearly for some ideological and value deviations, his positive deeds dissipating, looking impermissibly easy, and with it his whole image of acid pen, as , director of consciences suffering enormously, with the repercussion of the disintegration of the publishing, fictional self ...

Cantemir vs. Brâncoveanu

Compared to Wallachia and its stable political situation at the end of the century. the 17th and the beginning of the next century, in Moldavia, the end of

the voivode Constantin Cantemir in 1693 and Brâncoveanu's plots produced a carousel of temporary lords- C. Duca (1693-1695), Antioh Cantemir (1696-1700), again C. Duca (1700-1703), Mihai Racoviță (1703-1705), again Antioh Cantemir (1705-1707), a sign that the country's destiny no longer depended on the will of the boyars, of its people, on the whims of the Gate, but on the involvement of Mr. Muntean - G. Călinescu warned us - what his son-in-law or his obedient friend wanted at the seat of Moldova, "he was interfering with Vultur (Muntenia) in the affairs of Dobitoacelor (Moldova)". A Moldavian scholar of European stature, temporarily (1710-1711) at the head of a Romanian state, invested as an academician by the Berlin forum, in 1714 vs. a long-lived ruler in Muntenia, great patriot and martyred Christian, special case of unfriendliness, lack of solidarity against the common enemy, the Ottoman Empire, although they had the attention and support of other military forces of the time, a situation reminiscent of animosities between two cousins in the fifteenth century century, Stephen the Great and Vlad the Impaler.

Constantin Brâncoveanu also referred to the West, N. Manolescu assures us: "... it is no less true that between the Court of Brâncoveanu and that of Louis XIV some similarities can be established. Two contemporary historical personalities who do not have On the contrary, from their chronological perspective, Hieroglyphic History, the reader finds out that the characters Filul, alias Antioh Cantemir, and Inorogul, Dimitrie's transvestite Cantemir, disliked Corbul (Constantin Brâncoveanu) for interfering in the internal affairs of Moldova, supporting to the throne a puppet, Struțocămila (Mihai Racoviță), by no means two worthy intellectuals, whole, with personality, with personal vision, not enslaved to the neighboring state, even The narrator puts the two voivodes in antithesis, denigrating the counterpart from Muntenia, a martyred Christian, he and the suite of 4 children, plus his son-in-law (Ianache), respi

denying freedom and survival as a price of adherence to Mohammedanism, accepting beheading in the name of ardent, unadulterated patriotism. The Cantemir brothers, horrified by the so curious and morally inexplicable diplomatic maneuvers of the orthodox Brâncoveanu, falsified his image as an enlightened leader who imposed a style in architecture and surrounded himself with foreign scholars, such as Antim Ivireanu and the Italian secretary Del Chiaro demonizing him, perceiving him. in an ungrateful enemy, without cultural merits-let alone political?! -, and the outlined portrait is under the sign of caricature.

The mutilation of reality, of the status of state leader, with many relations in a Europe divided / crushed by wars, absurd territorial claims and disputes for supremacy. The novelist intentionally thickens some defects of the rival from the North of the Danube, hyperbolizing his own qualities and canceling the inherent mistakes, shortcomings. The ruler with almost 3 decades of brilliant mandate is reduced to an ordinary tyrant, skillful over imagination, cunning and promoter of pseudo-values in domestic and foreign policy. The reader of "Hieroglyphic History" is induced a gross untruth that the medieval leader from Wallachia would only want the maximum harm to the Cantemirești brothers ...

Or history has shown the reverse, more precisely that Brâncoveanu was really a blacksmith of culture, a keeper of the independence of his homeland, an emancipated man, who was affiliated with the most powerful state at that time. It's just that through a certain negation of it in the allegorical and pamphleteering novel, an unfortunate act of minimization was committed, not to mention demystification for the voda sacrifice already passed in the Christian calendar. In short, the lack of objectivity on the part of a witness of that feudal

age (Dimitrie Cantemir, the narrator), mystification mixed with hatred of imaginary guilt, uncertified by historians.

Conclusions

An anonymous slanderer, Caion, directed from the shadows by his uncle Iancu's opponents on the basis of false, invented evidence, caused the genius comedian an inner imbalance, despite the favorable sentence given by the Court. However, horrified by what happened to him, a notorious writer, appreciated, inexplicably avoided by the academic forums in the annual awards ceremony, Caragiale decided to say "Goodbye Romania!", settling in Berlin and thanks to an unpredictable situation.

Pamfil Șeicaru, a figure at the time, a front-line journalist, with inflated writing desires, hyperbolizing his reputation gained in the journalistic area, allowed himself to attack, to severely examine the works of some confreres at the top of the pyramid. A mixture of recklessness, vanity, audacity? Real slander? Or aesthetic truth, demonstrated by Călinescu and Manolescu?

Finally, two medieval rulers, founders, promoters of culture, who really wrote history, who sanctified the place, fought, unforgiving their mistakes, in the diplomatic and literary realm.

REFERENCES

*** History of Romanian literature, vol. III. The Age of the Great Classics, Academy Publishing House, 1973

Andrei, Monica - The Caragiale-Caion Trial, from the literary duel to the accusation of plagiarism, in 'Ziarul Metropolis', June 2015, Bucharest

Călinescu, G. - History of Romanian literature from its origins to the present, Semne Publishing House, 2008

Condeescu, Alexandru - The Caragiale Trial - Caion, Muzeul Literaturii Române Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998

Constantinescu, Pompiliu - The Romanian novel between the wars, Minerva Publishing House, 1977

Library of the Great Trials, year I, May-June, no. 4-5, 1924, The Caragiale-Caion Trial

Manolescu, Nicolae - The critical history of Romanian literature. 5 centuries of literature, Editura Paralela 45, Pitești, 2008.

Negrea, Gelu- Caragiale. The great paradox, Cartea Românească Publishing House, 2012, Bucharest

Negrea, X. (2019). Social journalism in online world. Conceptual delimitations. Social Sciences and Education Research Review, 6(1), 227-234.

Perpessicius, Critical Mentions, Litera Publishing House, Bucharest, 1997

Popescu, A. D. (2019). The Value Of Data From An Artificial Intelligence Perspective. Annals of the University of Craiova for Journalism, Communication and Management, 5(1), 172-194.

Voinea, D. V. (2019). Newsworthiness and the expectations of sources in health journalism. Social Sciences and Education Research Review Volume 6, Issue 1, 2019, 222.

Voinea, D. V., Busu, O. V., Opran, E. R., & Vladutescu, S. (2015). Embarrassments in managerial communication. Polish Journal of Management Studies, 11.