

THE ROMANIAN CULTURAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL PATTERN AND THE EXPRESSION OF EMOTIONS. SOME DIACHRONIC AND SYNCHRONIC ASPECTS

■ Gabriela Stoica
■ University of Bucharest
■ Romania

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to identify some characteristics of old Romanian (16th – 18th centuries) ‘*emotionology*’ (Stearns; Stearns, 1985) and its related cultural-anthropological parameters, based on the affective conceptualization and lexicalization in a representative corpus of old Romanian texts. For the old Romanian culture three cultural dimensions seem to be salient: *collectivism* (undergoing *a social-cultural frame of interdependence*), *extroversion of self* (as a consequence of the *collectivistic* feature) and the existence of *social-communicative hierarchies*. We focus on the *expression of emotions* parameter, analyzing some contexts that illustrate the high transparency of emotions in the old Romanian culture. In the last part, we illustrate this cultural characteristic by a case study, analyzing the contextual-semantic occurrences of the word *a săruta* [*to kiss*].

KEYWORDS

emotions, cultural-anthropological pattern, affective conceptualization, expressive-emotional isotopies, contextual-semantic analysis

1. PRELIMINARIES

The present paper deals, in broad terms, with the cultural-anthropological pattern of the Romanian culture and its intercultural and cross-cultural communicative implications. More precisely, in what follows we propose a brief analysis of a particular and relevant topic: the expression (linguistic and

non-linguistic) of emotions in the old Romanian culture (16th-18th centuries). Emotions represent a sensitive topic in various recent works, which is approached from different and complementary perspectives (psychological, sociologic, cultural, linguistic etc.)¹.

The basic assumption is that emotions represent a fundamental cultural marker for a particular cultural setting, diachronically and diatopically variable. The appraisal and the expression of emotions can instantiate important intercultural divergences and, thus, understanding their culture-dependent functioning becomes a sensitive issue from the anthropological and communicative point of view.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Recent studies (Markus; Kitayama, in Kitayama; Markus (eds.), 1997: 341-343, Mesquita; Frijda; Scherer, 1997: 257) claim the existence of some *core cultural ideas*, in any culture, varying according to the values and concepts considered to be essential within the limits of that particular cultural setting.

According to this cultural characteristic, the existence of various *cultural-affective patterns* was underlined. Different societies display different *cognitive models for emotions*, that can be defined as 'one's structure of beliefs concerning what brings each emotion about, what its mechanisms are, what to do about it, how to evaluate its occurrence, and so on' (Russell, 1991: 428). Hence, different cultures present different conceptual patterns of representing the (same) emotional phenomena (and, implicitly, different corresponding emotional lexicons).

A classic dichotomy in intercultural anthropology (Hofstede, 1984) distinguishes between *individualistic cultures*, which are defined by a social-cultural frame of independence, and *collectivistic cultures*, whose characteristic is a cultural frame of interdependence. Following one of these two cultural patterns, affectivity may be brought forward using various means of expression and instantiation (Triandis, in Kitayama; Markus (eds.), 1997, Șerbănescu, 2007: 157-161²).

¹ For a critical synthesis of the main theoretical and methodological paradigms in the study of emotions as a psychological, sociological, cultural and linguistic phenomenon, see Lutz; White, 1986, Reddy, 2001, cf. also Stoica, 2012, 2015.

² In individualistic cultures, emotion is an intimate, personal, subjective experience, and involves the need of lexicalization and expression; the individualistic cultures are more sensitive to negative emotions. In collectivistic cultures, emotion is an in-group experience, involving an intercommunity coping; emotions tend not to be expressed, lexicalized (their expression is considered to be a virtual factor of societal disturbance); collectivistic cultures perceive and share more intensively positive emotions.

Emotions are the result of an individual appraisal, but automatically regulated by the social-cultural requirements and norms of interaction. The self is a part of an extended cultural grid, 'or meaning system, or schema [...]. It consists of language and a set of tacit social understandings [...], as well as of the social representations and practices that reflect and enact these understandings in daily life' (Markus; Kitayama, in Kitayama; Markus (eds.), 1997: 95)¹.

Basically, emotions display a double facet: on the one hand, they represent human universal categories, and, on the other hand, they are subjective realities/facts depending on and shaped by the social and the cultural setting to which they belong. The same emotion can be experienced differently, in two different cultures or within the same culture. Thus, emotions are subject both to diatopic intercultural variation, and to diachronic intra-cultural variation. Interesting differences (and resemblances) in verbal and non-verbal codification of emotions may emerge, which enables to distinguish between cultures with emotional hyper-conceptualization or hypo-conceptualization, as well as between extroverted and introverted cultures (Levy, 1984: 397-411).

All these variables frame the so-called *emotionology* (Stearns; Stearns, 1985²) that defines a set of social-cultural rules/scripts for experiencing and expressing emotions – the so-called *feeling rules* (see Hoschschild, 1979: 124), *display rules* – expected, allowed or forbidden to the insiders of a social community in various communicative contexts³.

From this perspective, emotions are processes of mediation between individuals and context, providing individuals with 'a set of socially shared scripts' (Markus; Kitayama, in Kitayama; Markus (eds.), 1997: 339) that help them cope with the in-group cultural demands, constraints and expectations.

¹ 'Although human emotional endowment is no doubt largely innate and universal, people's emotional lives are shaped, to a considerable extent, by their culture. Every culture offers not only a linguistically embodied grid for the conceptualization of emotions, but also a set of 'scripts' suggesting to people how to feel, how to express their feelings, how to think about their own and other people's feelings, and so on. In fact, a culture's lexical grid and its repertoire of 'cultural scripts', including 'emotional scripts', are closely related' (Wierzbicka, 1999: 240).

² For the theoretical social-constructivism paradigm of emotions, see also Harré, 1986, Lutz, 1988, Oatley, 1993.

³ The concept of *emotionology* does not refer to the real felt emotion, but more exactly to emotion recommended to be felt and extroverted, according to a relative strict set of rules active within a certain community in a certain historical period. 'Emotionology [...] normally governs what people think they should be experiencing' ('[societies] use norms to organize the personal reactions to other people's emotions and personal regulation and perception of one's own emotions', Stearns, 1986: 14).

Briefly, each culture has an in-group emotional script that is part of a larger cultural-anthropologic pattern.

Language remains the most relevant way to access the affective reality, and more precisely the affective lexicon that is specific to a particular linguistic code in a particular cultural context (see Enfield; Wierzbicka, 2002: 2). The lexicon can be used as a tool to en/decode a cognitive and cultural pattern of emotions. Any language is culture-dependent, and its lexical-semantic selections become the reflection of this cultural determinism. Cultural differences emerge not only in lexicalization, but basically in the conceptualization and expression of affective phenomena (Wierzbicka, 1986: 594, see also Wierzbicka, 1999, 2009).

3. THE OLD ROMANIAN CULTURAL-ANTHROPOLOGICAL PATTERN OF EMOTIONS

Starting from this theoretical framework, in what follows we shall present the synthetic results of the broader research that we undertook (Stoica, 2012), dealing with the conceptualization and lexicalization of emotions in old Romanian (16th – 18th centuries) and its cultural implications, based on a large corpus of old Romanian texts. One basic aim of this inquiry was the demarcation of a cognitive pattern of emotions, understood as an exponential part of an extended cultural-anthropological pattern of the Romanian space and time.

Briefly, for the old Romanian culture three basic social-anthropological parameters seem to be salient: *collectivism* (involving a *social-cultural frame of interdependence*), *extroversion of self* (as a consequence of the *collectivistic* characteristic), and the existence of a *social-communicative hierarchy*. As a complementary aspect, the *religious dimension* can be added; the religious feeling represents an essential dimension of the old collectivistic mentality, the sacred being part of the individuals' everyday existence in the Middle Ages.

Our focus will be on one of the above-mentioned cultural dimensions: *the emotional-expressive parameter*, which is particularly salient for the old Romanian cultural-affective pattern and undergoes relevant diachronic mutations. What is specific to the old Romanian culture is the high transparency of the emotions and their manifestations even if we deal with a collectivistic culture.

As it is well known, prototypically, the collectivism is connected with a certain censorship of emotions (their feeling, but especially, their extroversion and transparency) (cf. Asian collectivistic cultures), which are perceived as a factor of disturbance of the in-group harmony or as a source

of uncertainty. For the old Romanian times, the opposite phenomenon can be noticed: the displaying, the in-group sharing of emotions that functions as a sign of belonging to a given community; thus, emotions should be expressed according to a recognized and in-group validated set of rules. *Collectivism* and the *extroversion of self* are in this way coexistent and interdependent.

3.1. COLLECTIVISM

The corpus lexical data bring forward a rather frequent *social-collective* semantic feature, conveyed by many words from the affective lexicon. Prototypically subjective emotions, such as *sadness*, *fear*, *joy* etc., become contextually relational, transitive, motivated by the constraints of the cultural and mentality background. Moreover, some social emotions are hyper-lexicalized: *rușine* (*shame*), *pișmă* (*envy*), *dragoste* (*love*). Terms designating a dysphoric emotional context, specific to an entire community, are also quite frequent: *(ne)norocire* – *necaz* – *năpastă* – *nevoie* – *răutate* – *patimă* – *păs* (*distress* – *trouble* – *pain* – *suffering*)¹. Last but not least, extremely frequent are also social-affective words (terms designating social interactions, marked by a certain emotional involvement/evaluation – positive/negative): *a ierta* (*to forgive*), *a mulțumi* (*to thank*), *a-și bate joc* (*to mock*), *a se certa* (*to argue*), *gâlceavă* – *scandal* – *sfadă* – *vrajbă* – *zăzanie* (*quarrel* – *fight* – *scandal* – *conflict* – *intrigue*) etc., or declarative-affective words (designating verbal acts, implying an affective/expressive dimension): *a lăuda* (*to praise*), *a ruga* (*to ask for*), *a slăvi* (*to honour*); *a amenința* (*to threaten*), *a bârfi* (*to gossip*), *a blestema* (*to curse*), *a cleveți* – *a defăima* (*to defame*), *a hulii* – *a înjura* – *a sudui* (*to swear*), *a muștra* (*to admonish*, *to reprove*), *a pârî* (*to tell on*) etc.

All this affective lexicon puts forward the importance granted to the validation/invalidation (sanction) of the personal image/face (*a defăima* *to defames*, *a batjocori* *to mock* etc.), to the hierarchization of the interlocutors' role (*a mulțumi* *to thanks*, *a lăuda* *to praise*, *a ruga* *to ask for*, *to pray*, *a amenința* *to threaten*), or to a conflictual social interaction (*a se certa* *to argue*, *gâlceavă* – *sfadă* *quarrel* etc.).

Hence, our corpus illustrates a cultural pattern that values the in-group emotional experience. In the old Romanian epoch, emotions are to be felt and expressed within the community. They remain individual realities, but coordinated by and related to the interpersonal (strategic) needs.

¹ As the lexicalization of some emotional concepts in Romanian is more diversified than in English and taking into account the polysemy of many words from the old Romanian emotional lexicon, it is quite difficult to find suitable equivalents for every single term from a synonymic series. Accordingly, in some cases, we give only global lexical-semantic equivalents.

3.2. THE EXTROVERSION OF THE SELF

Connected with the collectivistic parameter, the emotional-expressive dimension is also a hyper-marked, salient characteristic of the old Romanian cultural pattern, configuring a complex *semiotics of emotions*. An emotion becomes transparent through an associated expressive behaviour (facial expressions, oral-expressive and somatic-behavioural manifestations etc.), governed by the feeling and display rules which are active within the community. The expressive behaviour has a symptomatic value, semiotically indicating an emotion. All corpus data suggest a transparent, extrovert affective cultural pattern. Emotions have to be displayed, recognized, decoded and shared within the community, according to a semiotic code of expressive behaviour, traditionally established and culturally limited.

3.2.1. EXPRESSIVE-EMOTIONAL ISOTOPIES

Old Romanian texts record many words designating expressive behaviour, recurrent and frequently redundant; it is the case of terms like: *a plânge (to cry)*, *a boci (to wail)*, *lacrimă (tear)*, indicating intensive emotions such as *fear*, *sadness*, *anger*, hyper-conceptualized in the old Romanian times.

These emotions are expressed by highly intensive forms, and the expressive extroversion implies not only a somatic manifestation, but also a complex behavioural script, according to the norms of emotional exhibition/censorship prescribed by the community emotionology. The old texts frequently illustrate the dynamic extroversion of *sadness/anger/love* etc., involving dramatic gestures and actions, sometimes aggressive, self-oriented, part of a stereotypical ritual, traditionally framed. The lexicalization reflects this stereotypical, ritualistic behaviour: *a se bate cu palmele peste obraz și peste cap (to slap one's own face and head)*, *a-și rupe părul/ veșmintele (to rip one's own hair/clothes)*, *a-și tunde părul (to cut one's own hair)*, *a se clătina (to wobble)*, *a-și bate pieptul (to beat/punch one's own chest)*, *a-și frânge degetele (to twist one's own fingers)*, *a leșina (to faint)* etc.

Examples (1-2) point out a self-aggressive gestural and verbal exhibition of **anger**, designated by words like: *a plânge (to cry)*, *a-și da palme (to slap oneself)*, *a-și smulge părul (to rip one's own hair)*, *a-și despleti părul (to untie one's hair)*, *a-și da pumni în cap (to punch one's own head)*, *a se zgâria cu unghiile (to scratch oneself with one's own nails)*, *a blestema (to curse)*, *a răcni (to bawl)*:

(1) tată-său Alicsandru Ecsapărățul [...] nemic nu știe de fiu-său, c-au luat domnie. Și cum au înțeles, au și-nceput a **plânge și-aș da palme peste obraz, și-aș zmulge părul din cap și din barbă, și-a blăztăma** pe fiu-său, căci au priimit domnie. (IN 322v)

‘His father Alicesandru Ecsapărâtu [...] knew nothing of his son, that he accepted the throne. And when he learnt, he started to **cry** and **slap** his own **face**, and **rip** his **hair** and his **beard**, and **curse** his son for accepting the throne’

(2) au sosit și sora Sofianii și, cum au intrat în casă, s-au apropiat de trup, o au văzut neîntocmită de moarte [...]. Ea îndată, precum vrea fi nebună, **ș-au despletit părul** și // **să zgârâia cu unghile** și **să ucidea cu pumnii în cap și în piept** și **răcniia** ca un leu [...] cât de glasul ei s-au strânsu mulți bărbați și muieri. (VS 99v-100r)

‘Sofiana’s sister came and, when she entered, she came closer to the body, and saw her unprepared for death [...]. Immediately, as if she was crazy, she **untied her hair** and **scratched herself with the nails, punching** strongly her **head** and **chest**, and **roaring** like a lion [...], so that many men and women gathered, hearing her voice’

Examples (3)-(5) include emotional isotopies indicating the behavioural expression of **sadness**; affective words like *jale* (sorrow, grief) are associated with intensive collocations illustrating the specific expressive, self-aggressive behaviour, culturally framed and codified: *a săruta* (to kiss), *jelanie* (crying, sorrow), *suspîn* (sob, sigh), *a plânge* (to cry), *a-și rupe căruntețile/părul* (to rip one’s own hair), *a-și rupe/sparge veșmintele* (to rip one’s own clothes), *a cădea* (to fall over), *a se clătina* (to wobble), *a-și frânge degetele* (to twist one’s fingers), *a-și bate pieptul* (to punch one’s own chest) etc.:

(3) Dacă audzi că este ficiorul lui, sări de să **rugă** și începu **a-ș rupe căruntețile sale și veșmintile** de pre sine. Și cursă de **cădzu** pre trupul Svinții sale și-l **săruta** de grăia: „O, vai de mine, fiul meu cel **ubiu!** Pântru ce-m făcuș **suspîn** cu mare **jelanie!** [...] Cadi-mi-să **să plângu** cu **jele** și cu **amar**, sufletul meu! Iar dacă audzi maica Svinții sale că este ficiorul ei, începu **a-ș sparge veșmintile** sale și **rumpându-ș părul** său... (Al 14r-v)

‘When he heard it was his son, he hurried to **pray** and started to **rip his own hair and clothes**. And he ran and **fell over** his Holyness’s body and **kissed** him and said: “O, poor me, my *beloved* son! Why did you bring me so many **sighs** and great **sorrow**?! [...] It is now for me to **cry** in **sorrow** and **bitterness**, my dear soul! And when his Holyness’s mother heard that it was her son, she began to **rip** her own **clothes** and **hair**....’

(4) Începu **a plânge**. Atunci s-au pliroforisit că s-au pierdut Imberie. [...] Deci nu mai avea nădeje a mai fi viu el; și **păru ș-au tunsu**, și pre el îl **jălea**. (Imb 140v)

‘he started to **cry**. Then he understood Imberie was lost [...]. Having no hope he was alive, he **cut his hair, wailing**.’

(5) Iar părintele și maica Svinții sale să ține amândoi de nesilie Svinții sale, **clătinaându-să** și **bătându-să în peptu său** și **frângându-ș degetile**. Iar nora lor **plânge** cu **jele** mare. (Al 15r)

‘And his Holyness’s father and mother hold his Holyness’s coffin, **wobbling** and **punching their chests** and **twisting** their **fingers**. And their daughter-in-law **cried** with great **grief**.’

Example (6) (illustrating a separation between parents and son) does not explicitly lexicalize **sadness**, but this can be easily reconstructed through the numerous words that indicate the specific somatic-behavioural expression: *a*

suspina (to sob) – *suspînuri* (sobs), *a ofta* (to sigh) – *oftături* (sighs), *a lacrima* (to weep) – *lacrimi* (tears), *a plânge* (to cry) – *plângere* (crying), and also through the expressive lexical collocations indicating a highly intensive gestural language: *a îngenunchea* (to kneel), *a ridica mâinile spre cer* (to raise one's hands to the sky):

(6) Amândoi [...] mai tare **plîngea** și de la inemă **suspîna, ohtând**. Iar când au fost să le **sărute mâinile** Erotocrit, **au îngenunchet** amândoi, și **au rădicat mâinile la ceriu**, și **sărutându-l** și cu **lacrimi** udând pământul, **să ruga** și pre Erotocrit îl **blagosloviè** din inemă și cu mare **plângere** îl **săruta**. Dar Erotocrit văzînd atâte **ohtături** cu **suspînuri** [...] **au lacrămat** și de la inemă **au suspînat** și cu multi **lacrimi** și-au luat zioa bună (EA 91-91v) 'both [...] were **crying** even more and were **sobbing** from the bottom of their hearts. And when Erotocrit was about to **kiss** their **hands**, they both **knelt** and **raised** their **hands to the sky**, **kissing** him and **wetting** the ground with **tears**, they were **praying** and **blessing** Erotocrit and **kissing** him, **deeply crying**. And Erotocrit, hearing so many **sighs** and **sobs** [...], **wept** and **sobbed** from the bottom of his heart and said good-bye in many **tears**'.

Quite frequently, a highly intensive and complex expressive behaviour is associated with **love** (*romantic love, filial-parental love*), combined with **sadness** (usually caused by the partner's absence – intentional or forced), and, thus, displayed in a strongly dysphoric dimension. Especially starting with the 18th century (the epoch when the individual affectivity begins to be put forward in the Romanian cultural pattern), **love** is redundantly extroverted using a specific mimic, gestural and behavioural language:

(7) Își spune Erotocrit **pătîmile** lui cu mari **ohtături**, și **suspînînd săruta** fereastra, închipuînd că **sărută** pre Aritusa. Dar Aritusa, auzînd **patîmile** lui, cu **suspîn plângea** și de la inemă **ohta** și tăcea. (EA 73)

'Erotocrit told about his **sufferance** with deep **sighs**, and **weeping** he was **kissing** the window, imagining he was **kissing** Aritusa. But Aritusa, hearing his **sufferance**, was **crying**, **sobbing** and **sighing** from the bottom of her heart and kept silent'

(8) Când s-au înștiințat fata craiului, Militina, că tată-său vre să o dea soțâie lui Ciubulaiu, inima ei **s-au întunecat în sânge** și **lacrămile curge pârâu din ochii ei. Îș bate pieptul** și **îș rumpe pârul capului**. Vre mai bine să să omoare sângură decât să fie soțâie strașnicului și scârnavului tătar” PM 16r

'When the king's daughter, Militina, heard that her father wanted to marry her to Ciubulaiu, her heart **darkened in blood** and **her tears flowed like a river**. She **punches** her **chest** and **rips** her **hair**. She prefers to kill herself than be the horrible Tartar's wife'.

All this complex lexicalization of emotional-expressive behaviour attested by old Romanian texts illustrates the dynamic, intensive and transparent affective cultural pattern that is specific to the Old Romanian culture.

3.2.2. A CASE STUDY: A SĂRUTA (TO KISS)

In what follows, we shall illustrate the previously presented cultural characteristics by a concise case study, analyzing the contextual-semantic occurrences of a verb that designates a particular emotional-expressive behaviour: *a săruta* – *to kiss*. In our corpus, the word has a high frequency, which points out the importance of the social-emotional manifestations for the old Romanian cultural pattern.

The word conveys an affective-social semantic meaning – ‘to touch with your lips, as a sign of respect, friendship, humbleness or as an erotic manifestation’ (DEX, our trans.), or as a greeting.

A săruta indicates a form of social interaction, implying either a close intimate interpersonal relationship, or a formal, ceremonial one. In both cases, this gesture follows quite closely the specific societal *display rules*.

Accordingly, two basic functions can be distinguished for *a săruta*, on the basis of the corpus occurrences:

(a) marker of a *genuine emotional* state. Prototypically, *a săruta* designates the somatic-behavioural expression of *love* (Rom. *dragoste*) or *friendship* (*prietenie*), possibly accompanied by respect, admiration, humbleness etc.

(b) marker of a *pseudo-emotional* state. In this case, it designates a stereotypical affective-expressive behaviour, performed as part of a formal, ritualistic protocol (of social interaction), which was currently followed within the period of time taken into account. Frequently, it functions as a sign of a **public** exhibition and recognition of a particular social or kinship relationship.

(a) For the first case, *a săruta* can be a lexical-expressive marker for various facets of *love* (see the typology of love in Kemper, 1978):

● *romantic love*

(9) Nici să gândești sau să cugeți că te vei apropia de obrazul meu ca să mă **săruți** (EA 74)

‘don’t even think about coming closer to my face to **kiss** me’

(10) Haricliia, *îmbrățoșind* pre Theaghen, **sărutându-l** de mii de ori, udându-l cu totul prin *lacrămi*, [...] au zis: – Priimăsc aceste temeri ale tale celi pentru mine [...] pentru că n-ai îngenunchet *dragostê* cè cătră mine, din nenorocirile celi multe (Et 22)

‘Haricliia, *hugging* Theagen, **kissing** him thousands of times, *soaking* him in *tears* [...], said: I accept your worries about me [...], for you didn’t give up your *love* for me because of the many troubles you’ve passed through’

(11) S-au dus și la Melixima să-ș ia zuoa bună. Iar Melixima *au leșinat de plânsu* și așă **sărutând** Melixima pi Skinder pi amândoaă fețili obrazului (Sk 29v)

‘[He] went to Melixima to say goodbye. And Melixima *fainted out of crying* and Melixima **kissing** Skinder on both cheeks’.

(12) Își luasă o fată [...] de-o ținea în brați, de-o **săruta** (IN 246)

‘[He] took himself a girl... and hugged her, and **kissed** her’

(13) Îl **săruta** cu mari *plângeri* și *obătăuri* pre Erotocrit și cu multe *lacrimi* îi zice aceste cuvinte (EA 79v)

‘[she] **kissed** Erotocrit *crying* and *sighing* and with many *tears* she told him those words’.

● **brotherly love:**

(14) Ş-au luat ziua bună unul di altu, **sărutându-să** *frățiști* (Sk 30)

‘they said goodbye, *brotherly kissing* each other’

(15) Auzind și boierii, merseră de **să sărutară** și foarte *să bucurară* (Imb 144v)

‘The boyards, hearing this, **kissed** each other and very much *rejoiced*’

● **filial-parental love:**

(16) Și sculându-să, **au sărutat** pe *mumă-sa* și pre *surori-ș* și pre *rudenii*, iar ei au început a o întreba ce au pătimit” (VS 101r)

‘And, rising up, [she] **kissed** her *mother* and *sisters* and *relatives*, and they started to ask her what happened to her’.

(b) More interesting and more relevant to the Romanian cultural pattern is the second facet of the term *a săruta*. There are many contexts in which the word designates a stereotypical behaviour, expected to be performed according to a societal expressive script. These contexts reflect the existence of a quite complex and compulsory system of norms (*the display rules*), that require the ritualistic expression not only of an emotional relationship, but especially of the **public** (*id est* collective, in-group) recognition of a hierarchization of the social roles. In these contexts (implying a hierarchization of authority) a new semantic dimension is added – /+ *respect*/. At least four cases of instantiation of *kissing* can be delimited:

1. *A săruta* (*to kiss*) as the gesture that consecrates *filial-paternal love*, in ritualistic forms, pointing out the recognition and the awareness of the paternal/maternal authority (especially in formal contexts of separation or regathering). The particular form of actualization is *a săruta mâna* (*to kiss one’s hand*), as a sign of love, and, especially, of respect. *A săruta* can also be contextually associated with *a strânge în brațe*, *a lua în brațe* (*to hug*) (or, rarely, with *a da mâna cu* – *to shake hands*), indicating a more complex complementary affective behaviour, displaying intimacy:

(17)este mumă-sa Olimbiada. Și **dede mâna** cu ie și o **sărută** dulce. Și ie iară-l **sărutăm** și pre fiul său Candusal (A 52r)

‘... it is his mother, Olimpiada. And they **shook hands** and **kissed** her dearly. And she **kissed** back her son Candusal’

(18) mumă-sa-l **luo în brațe** și-l **sărută** (A 54v)

‘his mother **hugged** him and **kissed** him’

(19) Să timpina cu maica lu Alexandru, și **să strânsără în brațe** și **să sărutară**, și zise Olimpiada: „Bine mi te aflaiu, suflete și inima mea [...], fata mea, Roxando, împărăteasă a toată lume!” Și o **sărută dulce**” (A 65r)

‘[she] met Alexander’s mother and they **hugged** and **kissed** each other and Olimpiada said: “Welcome, my soul and heart, my dearest child, Roxanda, empress of the entire world!”. And [she] **kissed** her dearly’

(20) Să timpinără pre covor și **să strânsără în brață** și **să sărutară**. Și zise Olimpiada: „Bine mi te aflaiu, suflete și lume me, dragul meu Alexandre, împărat a toată lume!” Și **să sărutară** și purceseră la cort” (A 65v)

‘They met on the carpet and they **hugged** and **kissed** each other. And Olimpiada said: “Welcome, my soul and whole world, my dearest Alexandru, emperor of the entire world!” And they **kissed** each other and went to the tent’

(21) Și așa s-au dus Erotocrit la împăratul. Iar împăratul, văzindu-l, l-au **sărutat** de tri ori. Așijderi și împărăteasa Artemi l-au **sărutat** (EA 124v)

‘And Erotocrit went to the emperor. And the emperor, seeing him, **kissed** him three times. And the empress Artemi **kissed** him the same way’

(22) Aritusa, **sărutând mâna** împăratului, tatălui său, și a maicăi sale și au zis (EA 125).

‘Aritusa, **kissing** the emperor’s **hand**, her father’s, and her mother’s, said...’

2. Other contexts seem to illustrate a particular semiotic function of *kissing*: a sign of reconciliation or recognition of a certain social role, performed in a **public** context. In these cases, the collectivistic parameter is emphasized, *kissing* (*a săruta*) being a culturally codified gesture, stereotypically indicating *love* (*dragoste*), displayed in front (and within) of an entire community:

(23) Și așa **au sărutat mâna** împăratului Eraclie și împăratul încă **au sărutat** pe Pizostrat și **s-au iertat**. Iar Pizostrat îndată s-au dus lângă Aritusa și cu mare *dragoste* o **săruta** și *tot norodul s-au bucurat* (EA 127v).

‘And [he] **kissed** emperor Eraclis’s **hand** and the emperor **kissed** Pizostrat and they **forgave each other**. And Pizostrat went to Aritusa immediately and **kissed** her with great love and all the people **rejoiced**’

(24) Craiu, văzând că Poliționu la nimică nu este vinovat, l-au rădicat pre el și l-au **sărutat** (PM 36v)

‘The emperor, seeing that Poliționu is not guilty of anything, raised him up and **kissed** him’.

In the contexts above, the public-collective dimension of *kissing* is underlined by complementary lexical collocations: *a ierta* – ‘to forgive’; *tot norodul s-au bucurat* – ‘all the people rejoiced’.

3. In other contexts, rather frequent, *a săruta* indicates a reverential form of expression for the *religious love* and *respect* (at the same time). The ritualistic expressive-behaviour is *a săruta moaștele* (*to kiss the holy relics*), *a săruta poalele hainei* (*to kiss the bottom of one's coat*) or *a săruta mâna* (*to kiss one's hand*):

(25) *săruta moaștele* mulțumind lui Dumnezeu (LC 101)

'[he] was **kissing** the **holy relics**, *thanking* God'

(26) *Toți boiarii și oamenii sărută moaștele* sfântului, iar tu nu vrei să le *săruți*, dar în ce chip *bulești* pre sfinția-sa așa? (LC 102)

'All the boyards and all the people **kiss** the saint's **holy relics**, and you don't want to **kiss** them, why do you *profane* His Holiness like this'

(27) Domnul cu credința sufletului și a inimii *cuprinse* coșciugul cu *moaștele* sfântului în brațe [...] și le *sărută* cu *lacrăme* și cu multă *veselie* (LC 101)

'The emperor, with all the faith of his heart and soul, *bugged* the coffin with the saint's **holy relics**, and **kissed** them in *tears* and with a lot of *joy*'

(28) Sfântul Ioan Gură de Aur au luat Evangheliia și [...] au mers la născătoarea de Dumnezeu, *sărutându-i* sfintele margini ale hainelor ei (VD 284v)

'Saint John Chrysostom took the The Gospels and [...] went to Mary, Mother of God, **kissing** the holy borders of her clothes'

(29) *Sărutând* masa cea sfântă, și evanghelia cea dumnezeiască și cinstita cruce [...] și l-*au blagoslovit* [...] mergând toată boierimea de i-*au sărutat mâna* (LC 218)

'**kissing** the holy table and the saint Gospels and the holy cross [...] and, *blessing* him, [...], all the boyards went to **kiss** his [the emperor's] **hand**'.

4. The religious pattern of emotional behaviour (illustrating the public deferential relation to an authority) is also transferred to the laic context, with the same function, reflecting the specific Middle Age hierachization of the social roles; the collocation designating this expressive behaviour is *a săruta mâna împăratului* (*to kiss the emperor's hand*):

(30) Mers-au de *au sărutat* și *mâna împăratului* (LC 154)

'they went to **kiss** the *emperor's hand*'

(31) S-au bucurat toți, și *au sărutat mâna* mării-sale, și *au mulțumit* (RP 533)

'they all rejoiced, and **kissed** His Highness's **hand**, and *thanked* him'

(32) Alexandru *sărută-i mâna*, elu-l puse lângă el în jilțul lui de aur și-l *sărută* pre Alexandru și-l *blagoslovi pre cap* (A 11v)

'Alexandru **kissed** his **hand**, and he put him next to him in his golden chair and **kissed** Alexandru and *blessed* him on the head'

(33) Cându să aduna vezirul cu unul de acéia [dregători ai curții sultanului], spun că le *săruta poala* hainelor (MClet 227v)

‘When the vizier met one of those [governors in the Sultan’s court], they say he **kissed** the **bottom** of their coats’.

In all the previously discussed contexts, collocations such as *a săruta moaștei* (to kiss the holy relics), *a săruta mâna* (to kiss one’s hand), *a săruta poalele hainei* (to kiss the bottom of one’s coat) designate stereotypical social behaviours, imposed and expected within a particular cultural setting. They do not convey the manifestation of a real emotional experience, but only a standard, ceremonial social behaviour, showing the interpersonal hierarchization of authority (a cultural parameter prevalent and salient for the old Romanian society) (see also, in the contexts above the collocation with the declarative-affective verbs: *a blagoslovi* (to bless), *a ierta* (to forgive), on the one hand, and *a mulțumi* (to thank), on the other hand, indicating deferential subordination).

4. FINAL REMARKS

The above concise analysis of old Romanian contexts illustrating the expression of emotions aimed to underline the saliency/importance of the **extroversion** of **emotions** for the old Romanian cultural pattern and its particular correlation with the **collectivistic** and the **hierarchical** (laic and religious) cultural dimensions. The frequent affective isotopies point out an intensive behavioural expression of feelings, as part of the community’s emotionology, traditionally and culturally shaped and framed.

The particular case of *a săruta* reflects *in nuce* the relevance of the emotional transparency in the old Romanian epoch and also the importance of complying with the in-group stereotypical, ritualistic demands of the emotional manifestation. The *extroversion of self* and *collectivism* are closely connected in the old Romanian culture; showing an emotion (according to the prescribed set of *display/feeling rules*) means showing (and, hence, affirming) the group affiliation.

If we take into consideration the diachronic evolution of these features and make reference to the present-day Romanian culture, few mutations can be noticed. For the case of *a săruta* (framing a particular expressive interaction) we can observe an interesting diachronic extension of its pragmatic use: *sărut mâna* (initially designating only a stereotypical gesture displaying the recognition of the (respectful) interpersonal hierarchy) becomes a particular form of greeting in modern Romanian – index of a rather informal deferential interpersonal relation (which codifies also age and gender parameters: ‘form of greeting or thanking addressed to a woman or to an elder person’ – ‘formulă de salut sau de mulțumire adresată unei femei sau unei persoane mai în vârstă’, DEX).

We can also notice the preservation of the ceremonial use of the gesture designated by this word, in the particular religious context, traditionally

framed and still essential for the Romanian anthropological pattern: to kiss the priest's hand and the holy relics are still current and expected ritualistic actions (usually performed within the frame of a religious ceremony), as a marker of institutionalized respect and recognition of a hierarchical authority relationship (sacred-profane).

Recent studies of intercultural communication have delineated the following profile (according to the cultural dimensions developed by G. Hofstede) for the present-day Romanian culture: 'mostly collectivistic culture, displaying high distance power, mostly feminine, high uncertainty avoidance and short term orientation' (Șerbănescu, 2007: 306); 'at the same time, it is a culture with a high degree of contextual dependence, present oriented' (Vasilescu, 2007: 207, our translation).

The affective cultural pattern distinguished for the old epoch (analysing the affective lexicon of old Romanian) partially confirms this modern profile: the collectivistic feature, the importance of social validation and the protection of personal image, the recognition of the social hierarchy and subordination (see the high distance parameter, in Hofstede's terms), the tendency of uncertainty avoidance by constant reference to a firm set of social rules (laic and religious). Yet, the only cultural dimension that seems to be different in relation to the present-day cultural pattern is the **emotional extroversion**. This is required by the cultural set of *display rules* that govern all the in-group individual manifestations.

The emotional transparency tends to diminish in modern times. As it was underlined (Rosenwein, 2006), modernity brings the emphasizing of individual affectivity (even inside the collectivistic cultures), the control and a certain discipline of emotional manifestations. This dynamics is also valid for the Romanian cultural-affective pattern.

CORPUS

[A, A2 – a. 1717]: *Alexandria*, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2006.

[Al]: *Alexie, omul lui Dumnezeu*, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2001.

[EA]: *Istoria lui Erotocrit cu Aretusa*, in *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963, vol. II, pp. 27-85.

[Et]: *A lui Eliodor istorie etheopicească (Etiopica)*, in *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963, vol. II, pp. 125-170.

[Imb]: *Istoriia lui Imberie, fecior împăratului al Provenții*, in *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963, vol. II, pp. 7-27.

[IN]: Ion Neculce, *Letopisețul Țării Moldovei*, București, Editura Minerva, 1982.

[LC]: *Letopiseșul cantacuzinesc*, în *Cronicari munteni*, București, Editura pentru literatură, 1961, vol. I, pp. 83-224.

[MClet]: Miron Costin, *Letopiseșul țării Moldovei de la Aron vodă încoace*, București, Editura de stat pentru literatură și artă, 1958.

[PM]: *Istoria lui Polițion și a Miliției*, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2003.

[RP]: *Istoriile domnilor Tării Rumânești de Radu Popescu*, în *Cronicari munteni*, București, Editura pentru literatură, 1961, vol.I., pp. 227-577.

[SK]: *Istoriia lui Skinderiu-împăratu cari istorii s-au tălmăcit di pri limba turciască pri limba românească*, în *Cărțile populare în literatura românească*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1963, vol. I, pp. 323-346.

[VS], [VA], [VD]: *Vedenia Sofianei. Viața lui Anastasie. Vedenia lui Chir Daniil*, București, Fundația Națională pentru Știință și Artă, 2002.

REFERENCES

Enfield, N.; Wierzbicka, A. (2002), 'Introduction: the body in description of emotions', *Pragmatics and cognition* 10 (1-2), pp. 1-25.

Harré, R.; Gillet, G. (1994), *The Discursive Mind*, Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Harré, R. (ed.) (1986), *The social construction of emotions*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Hofstede, G. (1984), *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*, Sage, Beverly Hills.

Hoschschild, A. R. (1979), 'Emotion work, feeling rules, and social structures', *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (3), pp. 551-575.

Kemper, Th. D. (1978), *A social interactional theory of emotions*, Wiley, New York.

Levy, R.I. (1984), 'The emotions in comparative perspective', in Scherer, K.R.; Ekman, P. (eds), *Approches to emotion*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 397-412.

Lutz, C. A. (1988), *Unnatural emotions: Everyday sentiments on a Micronesian atoll and their challenge to western theory*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Lutz, C.; White, G. M. (1986), 'The Anthropology of Emotions', *Annual Review of Anthropology* 15, pp. 405-436.

Markus, H. R.; Kitayama, Sh. (1997a), 'The Cultural Construction of Self and Emotion: Implications for Social Behavior', in Kitayama, Sh.; Markus, H.R. (eds), *Emotion and Culture. Empirical studies of mutual influence*, American Psychological Association, Washington D. C., pp. 89-130.

Markus, H. R.; Kitayama, Sh. (1997b), 'The Cultural Shaping of Emotion: A Conceptual Framework', in Kitayama, Sh.; Markus, H.R. (eds),

- Emotion and Culture. Empirical studies of mutual influence*, American Psychological Association, Washington D. C., pp. 339-351.
- Mesquita, B.; Frijda, N.; Scherer, K. (1997), 'Culture and Emotion', in *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology*, vol. 2., *Basic processes and developmental psychology*, Allyn & Bacon, Boston, pp. 255-297.
- Oatley, K. (1993), 'Social construction in emotions', in Lewis, M.; Haviland, J. M. (eds), *Handbook of emotions*, Guilford, New York, pp. 341-352.
- Reddy, W. M. (2001), *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Rosenwein, B. H. (2007), *Emotional communities in the Early Middle Ages*, Cornell University Press, New York.
- Russell, J. (1991), 'Culture and the Categorization of Emotion', *Psychological Bulletin* 110 (3), pp. 426-450.
- Stearns, P. N.; Stearns, C. Z. (1985), 'Emotionology: Clarifying the History of Emotions and Emotional Standards', *The American Historical Review* 90 (4), pp. 813-836.
- Stearns, P. N.; Stearns, C. Z. (1986), *Anger: The Struggle for Emotional Control in America's History*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Stoica, G. (2012), *Afect și afectivitate. Conceptualizare și lexicalizare în româna veche*, Editura Universității din București, București [*Affect and Affectivity. Conceptualization and Lexicalization in Old Romanian*, University of Bucharest Publishing House, Bucharest].
- Stoica, G. (2015), *Modele culturale ale afectivității în cultura română premodernă (1780-1840)*, Editura Muzeul Literaturii Române, București [*Models of Affectivity in Early Modern Romanian Culture (1780-1840)*, Muzeul Literaturii Române Publishing House, Bucharest].
- Șerbănescu, A. (2007), *Cum gândesc și cum vorbesc ceilalți. Prin labirintul culturilor*, Polirom, Iași [*The way the others think and talk. Through the labyrinth of cultures*, Polirom, Iași]
- Triandis, H. C. (1997), 'Major Cultural Syndroms and Emotions', in Kitayama, Sh.; Markus, H.R. (eds), *Emotion and Culture. Empirical studies of mutual influence*, American Psychological Association, Washington D. C., pp.285-306.
- Vasilescu, A. (2007), *Cum vorbesc românii. Studii de comunicare (inter)culturală*, Editura Universității București, București.
- Wierzbicka, A. (1986), 'Human emotions: Universal or culture-specific?', *American Anthropologist* 88, pp. 584-594.

- Wierzbicka, A. (1999), *Emotions across languages and cultures: Diversity and Universals*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Wierzbicka, A. (2009), 'Language and metalanguage: key issues in emotion research', *Emotion Review*, vol. I, nr. 1, pp. 3-14.
- *** (2012) *Dicționarul explicativ al limbii române*, Editura Univers Enciclopedic Gold, București [The Explicative Dictionary of Romanian Language] [DEX]