

# OCTAVIAN PALER: THE SUBJECTIVE MEMORY OF MYTH

**Mariana Simona Vîrtan-Pleșa**

1 Decembrie 1918 University of Alba Iulia, Romania  
mariana\_vartan@yahoo.com

As a manifestation of the sacred in its deep, archetypal structure, myth can be thought of as an engine for generating a primordial understanding of the passing events of life *ab initio*. More than that, though, myth modulates a possible meeting with the sacred, which is “revealed” as a way of giving meaning to life and is felt to come, in essence, *ab origine*<sup>1</sup>. Man has always felt the need to give sense to the natural phenomena that mark, in some way, his existence, naming them, interpreting them and explaining them as stories, as “objects of aesthetic pleasure”<sup>2</sup> that appear to match the pure shape of the unadulterated sacred – a perception that is assumed all around the worldwide to derive “from the beginning”.

It can be said that the world assumes its own need to reveal itself in stories in this relationship between human experience and the numinous. One account of this is to be found in the essays of Octavian Paler, in which he considers, in a fresh and personal way, the fundamental myths of our culture, “taking them into his inner world, contaminating them with his existential obsessions, conferring them his own value and judgment”<sup>3</sup>.

As he saw it, the writer’s avoidance of realism allowed him to construct his ideas in a subjective manner, to return to himself and to the human condition through a consideration of myth in the light of his own existential obsessions, value judgments and self-reporting to the world, and thus through his own experience of the intensity of life. His writings – *Polemici cordiale (Cordial Polemics)*, *Viața ca o coridă (Life in the Bullring)*, *Scrisori imaginare (Imaginary letters)*, *Caminante, Memorii subiective (Subjective Memories)*, *Drumurile memoriei; Egipt, Grecia, Italia (The Roads of Memory: Egypt, Greece, Italy)* – testify to his ontological approach to classical stories, which he deepens through serious meditation on his own terms, thereby demonstrating “a real ability to theorize, to detect problems, to divide them”<sup>4</sup>. The mirror of myth reflects the personality of the creative ego, which

is exiled between two points that are diametrically opposed: the myth itself and its recreation through the use of a personal key. Nevertheless, it can be said that these points also have a common substrate; both involve a transparent vision of pleasure, taken to obsession, and a return of primordial myth through its own identity to the writer's soul.

Paler's exploration of personal myth can be viewed as a means of transcending a primordial myth through an attempt to recover from, obsessively, the sad end of the well-known story of his loss of his "famous manuscripts" in 1948. Integrated in this way, "together with the cultural legacies of the primordial one"<sup>5</sup>, for him this approach was not a frustrating story of childhood, but as he testifies in *Life in the Bullring*, an obsession that he identifies with a dramatic accident lived in "that peaceful, gentle, autumn afternoon of 1948". It transforms his personal loss into a sense of a writer's vocation. For him, myths become a sort of decorative mobile that compensates for the obsessions and failures involved in his first failed attempt in the area of writing, the disastrous loss of three manuscripts.

His intention to give up writing was balanced by a strong desire to find a justification for the act of "divine nature" that had guided him to the writer's space in the first instance. In a sense this was a breach of a promise, and it was made possible by the use of myth as a way of internalising his own being as a kind of prison, one that was perhaps less harsh than an actual one, but which represented an experience that he felt to be just as powerful in its demand that he "self-pass" it. The lost manuscripts themselves became myths that the writer sought out as a refuge for the countless frustrations that had accumulated from his "late youth", as he confesses: "By the time I could dream of myself being an eagle, I had more pressing matters to attend to, which turned me into a mole"<sup>6</sup>.

Whenever he encounters a suitable opportunity, Paler displays and, as it were, checks the tensions of his own anxious existence in the mirror of myth. In his quest for meaning, the author will set a particular mythic story in the context of a new existential vision, thereby revealing meanings that he derives from this "test" of their traditional meaning. Myths are placed in a new perspective by considering them from an existential point of view – an activity that highlights their symbols and important fields of interest. "In our age, reading like this, in a meaningless way, is mostly habitual", he writes<sup>7</sup>. The inherited tradition associated with the well-known myths of our culture thereby gains a new interpretation.

For Paler, the central figures of the Western mythological space are Oedipus, Sisyphus and Icarus. These figures become facets of the author, and their names come to express his own sense of the world. Through Oedipus he procures for himself a singular chance to survive; in Sisyphus he sees a figure that important for his sense of man's ability to make huge efforts, despite the apparent futility of doing so; while the figure of Icarus provides him with a passage through remembrance and the courage to be different.

## OEDIPUS AND THE INFINITE LESSON OF SELF RECONSTRUCTION

An old legend familiar to anyone brought up or educated within the Western tradition of mythic memory features the character of Oedipus, the son of Laius, the king of the city of Thebes, and of Jocasta. Abandoned on a hillside by the king because an oracle foretold that Laius would be killed by his own son, the infant Oedipus is rescued and brought up by Corinthian shepherds. When he grows up Oedipus comes to fulfil the prophecy by killing his father, without knowing it, in a fight. Guessing the answer to the Sphinx's question: "Who goes on four feet in the morning, at noon on two and in the evening on three?" he replies that it is man, who uses hands and feet in childhood, walks on two feet in his maturity, and uses two feet and a stick in his old age. As a reward, he receives the royal crown and Jocasta's hand, promised by the King of Thebes. In this way the throne of the city of Thebes and Queen Jocasta's hand in marriage become his.

By "consulting the oracle, [Oedipus] finds out the truth and punishes himself: he takes his eyes out and begins a long journey as a beggar, led by his daughter, Antigone, horrified by his own deed and by his incestuous marriage with Jocasta"<sup>8</sup>. In his consideration of the mythological story and its symbolism, Paler says that Oedipus's deeds were wrong, but he intervenes in defence of this character by arguing that there were mitigating circumstances. Oedipus does kill his father and marry his mother, but he is to some extent absolved from these unfortunate transgressions of duty and custom because he is doubly ignorant: he knows neither that Laius is his father nor that Jocasta, who he marries, is actually his mother.

Paler highlights this double error, not as a way to an inevitable penalty for acts of transgression whatever their intention, but as an attempt on the part of a man – and therefore mythological man – to know the truth through an inflexible manifestation of his own will. "A hypocrite would have continued to be king of Thebes and incestuous husband till his death"<sup>9</sup>, he writes. Oedipus's courage testifies to his search for truth, and exonerates him, partly because he accepts blame. It also strengthens the idea that man cannot escape his own destiny. The oracle had told Laius that he would be killed by his own son, who then would marry Jocasta. Laius's act in ridding himself of his son is only a temporary solution, because the oracle's prophecy is finally fulfilled anyway.

However, Oedipus's destiny includes a number of opposites. He saves Thebes from the Sphinx, because he is the only man who can give the right answer to its riddle; this is a sign that he is the "chosen one". Laius repays him, without knowing who he is, and thereby seals Oedipus's destiny once again. Facing his destiny, Oedipus is driven to confront himself; and it is important to note that he does not think of the consequences. A first confrontation occurs when he unknowingly kills his father on the way from the Delphi oracle. The second occurs as a result of killing the Sphinx, whose challenge to guess the answer to the question he accepts, though

until then no one has managed to do so. His third confrontation with destiny occurs when he receives the throne of Thebes while, at the same time, marrying Jocasta, his mother.

The climax of his test of faith occurs when Oedipus goes in search of his father's murderer and finds out that he himself is the one guilty for his father's death. This discovery animates the hero's tragic self-punishment. Paler finds in the tragedy of Oedipus an act of rebellion. Assuming the blame with dignity, he writes, "Oedipus turns himself into a god"<sup>10</sup>. The errors he makes will be cancelled by his self-punishment, which is to put out his own eyes. The author asks us to admire this character's courage to accept the fact of his own mistakes, however unwitting they were. Suicide would be an act of cowardice, for part of his self-punishment is to remember his errors for the rest his life. Oedipus' imaginary monologue, in *Subjective Mythologies*, becomes a demonstration of the author's character:

Yes, I had to go blind, to see nothing but the truth that I had learned, not to be able to hide from it behind a sunrise or the gentle descent of the evening over the mountains, when the gods hold their breath amazed by so much beauty. Only then I could gain my freedom from the things that could have excited me as king of Thebes and allowed me to enjoy the gifts of my rank. Since I can't see anything around me, I can always think at what I once saw; in vain would I wash my hands to remove what they have lived.<sup>11</sup>

Paler emphasises Oedipus's tough correction of his own errors by highlighting the mythic figure's decision to keep only the memory of his actions in his visual register. If he had chosen death, he would have lost the opportunity to redeem his own sin. By removing his eyes, he must do continuous penance for the rest of his life. The decision to go blind reveals Oedipus's courage – the courage to accept the consequences of his deeds and not to evade responsibility for them, which would have been an act of cowardice and indifference. When he discovers the lie he lived and accepts its consequences, Oedipus rises to the level of the gods because his act in doing so cancels out his errors. He makes the triumph of the human character in relation to the divine possible. The last line of Paler's analysis concludes in a serious register: "There are people who dared even more than they are able to bear, and Oedipus is one of them"<sup>12</sup>.

In this way, Paler reformulates the existence and symbolism of Oedipus, showing that this character rises above everyday expectations. By accepting his guilt, he creates a passage towards freedom: "With this decision he is ruling the broom above the gods who have played with him and were awaiting entreaties for mercy."<sup>13</sup> It is on this basis that Paler situates Oedipus in the ranks of gods, for he shows himself free to release himself from his tragedy through "an act of rebellion"<sup>14</sup>. Paler also asserts that the mourning of the choir is useless because Oedipus's blindness is not a mark of suffering, but an entry into asceticism, an attempt to redefine the self in relation to the world and his acts. The element of rebellion is present, in his view, in his acceptance of the fact of his own transgressions. Oedipus has no peace

until he knows the truth, for which he paid dearly. By balancing the errors with his acceptance of self-punishment, Paler himself expresses an obvious affinity with this mythic figure. He defeats the Sphynx and stands before the gods without begging for help. The question is: can Oedipus be a model of the acceptance of freedom for the authorial self, despite all constraints and mistakes that might be involved in his cancelling, in his acceptance of his own truth?

## SISYPHUS AND THE NEED TO JUSTIFY THE ENDLESS REPORTING TO HUMANITY

Another name Octavian Paler allocates to himself is that of Sisyphus. This mythological character becomes, in the author's view, the only symbol through which man can maintain an essential human quality. His endlessly sustained and repeated effort testifies to human durability. The peak of his experience, in Paler's view, is the "question that constantly devours him and that he always destroys by his prompt 'answer', consisting in the act of rolling the rock in a direction going against the laws of inertia."<sup>15</sup>

Classical mythology presents Sisyphus as the son of Aeolus, god of the winds, the founder of the city of Corinth, and a cunning crafty and clever character who proves to be miserly and deceitful, trashing the laws of hospitality by killing the travellers he meets. Knowing that Zeus kidnapped Aegina, daughter of Hyssop, he promises to tell him everything, provided he gives water to the citadel of Corinth. He is not afraid of heavenly lightning and chooses the water's blessing. Because he does not keep the secret of the kidnapping, however, Zeus orders Thanatos, god of death, to confine Sisyphus in Tartarus. Feeling that he must enter into the kingdom of Hades, Sisyphus tries to trick Thanatos by asking to show him how the chains that confine him work. Thanatos is caught in his own trap. He remains chained in Tartarus. The death and its sacrifices disappear, ruining the order that Zeus had created on earth.

Ares, the powerful god of war, frees Thanatos from the chains that had confined Sisyphus's soul and brings them into the kingdom of shadows of the dead, where Sisyphus saves his life again. He tells his wife not to bury his body, but to throw it naked onto the public square, and not to offer sacrifices to the gods of the underworld. Hades and Persephone are waiting in vain for the burial offerings. Finally Sisyphus approaches Hades, ruler of the kingdom of the dead, and asks the god to let him return to earth, where he will order his wife to make rich sacrifices, after which he will return to the underworld. But Sisyphus does not return to the kingdom of Hades, so god sends Thanatos once more to fetch the soul of Sisyphus. For his hubris in daring to consider himself smarter and more cunning than the gods, Sisyphus is condemned to push a giant boulder up on a hill forever, without ever reaching the top. As soon as "Sisyphus finishes his endeavour, the rock is rolled down and the work must be repeated again and again"<sup>16</sup>..

Classical mythology represents Sisyphus as a crafty and avaricious thief, but Paler reinterprets “rehabilitates” this figure as a symbol of an essential human quality, in his continuous and sustained efforts toward fulfilment. If the rock were to reach the top of the mountain and not roll away, Sisyphus would lose his reason for living. The crux of the story is the question he incessantly addresses to himself. In the epigraph he places at the head of the chapter devoted to Sisyphus, Paler states:

...as for the rock Sisyphus pushed, we were tempted to imagine it as such. It would be a mistake to think that arrival of the rock at the top of the mountain would mean the crowning of his effort. Moreover, it is very sad to read what Homer says about this Sisyphus, who tied death up and who was the most intelligent and prudent of mortals. It would be better to forget these details.<sup>17</sup>

Clearly, Paler does not retain negative connotations from the details of the figure’s story, but rather the symbolic character himself. Sisyphus doesn’t hope the rock will arrive at the top of the mountain. Life is indefinite in this way, while beyond it death awaits. If the rock were to arrive at the top of the mountain, Sisyphus wouldn’t exist. He exists as long as the rock rolls and climbs again to the top of the mountain. In this journey, the author finds life: “Why should we be scared of an idea in which life triumphs? We have to push our own rock”<sup>18</sup>. The mountain of Sisyphus becomes a sort of paradise and not a Calvary of penance.

By extrapolation, the rock of Sisyphus is the result of a human quality: the courage to accept and manage one’s own destiny. As Oedipus, man will be forced to choose between glory and loneliness. As Sisyphus, he must stubbornly keep the stone rolling and prevent it from falling down away into the wilderness. He believes that his endlessly repeated act is a condition of tricking death. His destiny is not limited to the acceptance of punishment, but to the realisation that he is the only man who can achieve this: he had tricked death endlessly and when she catches him, in the person of Persephone, believing him hopeless, he fools her again. If he has faced off death, he must prove it again with every climb. Each ascent and descent means as many meetings with life.

Albert Camus said about this hero that “his scorn for the gods, his hatred for death, and his passion for life brought him that unspeakable penalty in which the whole being is cruelly exploited without result”<sup>19</sup>. Paler comes in his defence, changing our angle of perception of this character. He does not see Sisyphus as a tragic hero, but he expresses his disagreement with Albert Camus, who considered the figure happy in his condition. For his point of view, we have here a resigned hero who does not lose hope, for each roll of the rock is evidence that death cannot reach him. Sisyphus is aware of his plight, and there lies a hint of tragedy. During the inevitable descent back down the mountain, he nourishes the hope he will succeed in getting the rock to the top of the mountain, that his work will liberate him. Sisyphus is clearly conscious of the extent of his own misery. It is this lucid perception that turns his ordeal into a victory. This should be a victory, because even Camus says:

I leave Sisyphus at the foot of the mountain. Someone always finds his burden again. But Sisyphus teaches us what the higher fidelity that negates the gods and raises rocks means. He also concludes that all is well. Henceforth, the Universe without a master seems to him neither sterile nor useless. Each atom of that stone, each mineral flake of that darkened mountain is a world in itself. The struggle itself towards the heights is enough to fill a man's heart. We must imagine Sisyphus is happy.<sup>20</sup>

In Paler's view, by contrast, Sisyphus' life and his torment are transformed into a victory. He focuses on his freedom, on his refusal to hope, and on the knowledge of the absurdity of his situation. We may however observe that despite these divergences in analysis, and these different interpretations of the same figure, the reason of his continuous fight does not matter as much as long as it is a testimony of man's trust in man and not in abstractions and absolutes. This desire for life might be the motivation for Paler's flirting with this character. Icarus is representative for his act, an idea in which life triumphs. We push every rock that is given us, like Sisyphus himself, as a mark of our courage in insisting on reaching our own destiny by our own efforts.

## ICARUS AND THE CONTINUOUS BREAKING OF WINGS

Icarus, son of Daedalus, is a mythical character presented by Ovid in Book VIII of the *Metamorphoses* as the creator, with his father, Daedalus of the labyrinth of Crete – where king Minos imprisoned the Minotaur. After finishing the work on the labyrinth, he is suspected of helping Theseus, who had come to kill the Minotaur, to escape, and imprisoned in the labyrinth by the same king. In order to escape, Daedalus and make wings of wax and feathers and fly from the maze. Fascinated by the beauty of the heights, Icarus approaches too close to the sun, despite his father's counsel not to do so. Helios, envious that humans are flying, sends a fierce heat that melts the waxen wings. This action causes Icarus to fall into the Aegean Sea near the island, where he strikes the rocks and dies. Such is the force of classical mythology that since then, that part of the sea, and the island, bear his name.

Among the lines dedicated to Icarus in *Subjective Mythologies* and *The Memory Roads. Egypt. Greece*, Paler presents himself as a defender of the mythological character. In his view, by disobeying his father, a decision which finally brought his death, Icarus is, in fact, not making an unfortunate one but one that could also be his own, in that he seeks to surpass the limits of the unknown: "Ignoring the advice of Daedalus not to get too close to the sun, Icarus crashed into the Aegean Sea. But the candour he invested in the euphoria of flight, the idea that everything was allowed, will put us, eventually, on Icarus's side, even though we might be initially tempted to see an example in his father's success, since the last one managed to reach Sicily."<sup>21</sup>

Here the author considers Icarus' reckless gesture as a desire to quench his thirst for knowledge. This underlines the possibility that our appreciation should not go to his father, Daedalus, who safely reaches Sicily, but to his impetuous son. He breaks

an age-old rule by failing to listen to his parent's advice, but in doing so he becomes a model of resistance against the quotidian, the ephemeral and the routine.

Paler appreciates Icarus's courage, masked by a strong dose of candour, as an example of a human's attempt to situate himself beyond the limits set out by the gods. In his view, his act is more than a new victory over death: "he will collapse, but bathed in light"<sup>22</sup>. His victory in freeing himself of the labyrinth, where he had been confined in oblivion, becomes an insignificant gesture in comparison to his effort to challenge the sun. This action, which turns into defeat through his death, makes the character an example of the idea that "there are defeats worth more than a victory without consequences"<sup>23</sup>. Together, the two characters, Icarus and his father Daedalus, reflect the two human options in facing the unknown: Icarus continues his striving towards knowledge, while Daedalus prefers to proceed with caution. The leitmotif of the flight becomes, in Paler's view, is represented only by Icarus. Daedalus does not value or accept sacrifice.

The story of Icarus becomes an attribute of the artistic enterprise in its attempts to surpass the artificial in favour of the essence of existence. Paler says that his decision is synonymous with risk, in that he chooses an act despite any consequences. By comparison, his father is judged, though antiquity saw him as a great hero because of to his inventive genius. Daedalus warns his son to be cautious, but allows him the possibility of free choice and insists on not saving him. Paler reflects on Icarus's act: "the sacrifice of a poet, of an artist, not the death of a flying man"<sup>24</sup>. Icarus finds himself only through flying. In a way, the wings constituted an obstacle to true flying, and to achieve his object he would have been forced to quit them. His flight becomes a condition of his achieving own destiny.

By acting like Oedipus, Icarus lives his destiny to the end. Both are unable to deny their instinct to push beyond given bounds. Through Icarus' imagined monologue, included in the above- mentioned book, Paler seeks to justify his character in terms of the choice he makes:

I was born to fly and I do not want to be afraid to live my destiny. On the contrary, I am flying towards my destiny. My soul is still trembling, though because of mistake I will pay with my life. Light is gods' wine, and I feel I'm getting drunker and drunker while I'm approaching the sun. And I realise that, in my whole life, only that mistake will remain, and these burned wings after my fall. What else will anyone know about me? People will say: Icarus, who dreamed of flying, went too close to the sun. To them I will be both guilty and the victim, without my consent. I only wanted to fly and I am proud that I can surpass that which reminds me how much I will pay for this moment of happiness. I cannot go back, only because I'm afraid of the light. If I do so, I wouldn't have deserved these wings. As if I had not flown at all, but was dragged through the air like a snake through leaves. I did not forget my father's advice, but the moment I got up into the air and floated over the sea, I realised that I could not follow him. Through approaching the sun, I felt free and equal to the gods. And perhaps I really am a god, if I feel equal to them. I have never bathed in so much light... I understand what this thought will cost me. I am too happy now to be punished by the gods for



my boldness. From Olympus they will want to remind people that they are not birds. But my mistake fills me with a boundless joy and just because of it the gods learned that I exist.<sup>25</sup>

By imagining this monologue of and identifying with the figure, Paler perceives his own destiny. He allows us to understand that Icarus accepts his destiny, while recognising that his elevation will cause his death. The proximity of the sun can be associated with the too-great nearness of a deity. As Paler sees it, Icarus's act of freedom is a substitution of himself for the gods. Although he is heading toward death, he gains something more precious than life, in that he transcends immortality and even the hereafter. Icarus's only thought is to ascend into the light, which Paler sees as a justified act: Icarus will accept the consequences of his audacity not because he dares to challenge the gods but because they will understand that he reaches his goal.

Icarus becomes a figure who loves life but he refuses to live anyway. If the ascension to light means destiny, he gladly gives his life to reach that light given to all mortals – but from a distance. As compared to Icarus's boldness, his father's caution appears as an act of mediocrity, although the classical tradition also sees him as a model of awareness of the limits of human possibility. Paler reveres the victory of Icarus; the hero is predestined to tragedy; it is only man's attempt to transcend mediocrity that gives life a sense of certainty. He recognises the figure's mistake in tempting the gods, but defends him by arguing that we must be able to make a similar decisions ourselves. His acceptance of the possibility of death becomes, in Paler's view, an example for the Greeks. His desire to transcend the limitations of earth is an example that they look up to, returning back to everyday life purified. Icarus performs this act for them, or on their behalf. His wings have discovered, simultaneously, both rise and fall, heaven and earth.

## CONCLUSION

Eugen Simion has criticised the essayist's distance from the reality of the world, arguing that he chooses to withdraw into the fascinating world of myths. "The essayist's spirit feels more comfortable... "really happy", he told me in a letter, "among parables and myths. He does not want and for this reason cannot be, a realistic writer"<sup>26</sup>. This the essayist himself admitted in an interview with Daniel Cristea: "I have no realistic vocation. Hence the scarcity of epic in my books: the realistic one. I am tempted to say that I lived somehow like a sleepwalker. In one way, I dreamed my life instead of living it. I guess that explains my reduced sense of observation. What attracted me more was what the priests of Apollo from Delphi called the "second view"<sup>27</sup>.

In Paler's analysis, these central mythological stories begin with their traditional meanings and proceed to attain new shapes that are strictly existential. He creates new interpretations of these familiar stories, but also provided them with another

functionality. Classical myth continues to exist as long as the old symbols are respected and re-interpreted beyond the images and ideas that have come to us from the ancient world. He offers new interpretations to awaken a new awareness of them. These three mythological stories are rediscovered, not in order to provoke sensation, but to reveal the mind of the writer, and they become rather like confessions that demonstrate the seriousness of life. Indeed, they are so important to him that their role in his imaginative life becomes a condition of his own existence as author. Yet, in taking up these old myths, and in his use of direct dialogue, Paler appears also to challenge his own existence. Their unhindered presence throughout his writings reveals “an unbridled admiration of faith and mystery”<sup>28</sup>.

## NOTES

1. Mircea Eliade, *Sacrul și profanul*, (*The sacred and the profane*), translated by Brândușa Prelipceanu, Bucharest, Humanitas Publishing House, 2005, p. 73.
2. Ivan Evseev, *Cuvânt, simbol, mit*, (*Word, symbol, myth*), Timișoara, Facla, 1983, p. 48.
3. Ileana Alexandrescu - Voicu, *Octavian Paler - Mitopoeticaeseului*, (*Octavian Paler – Mitopoetics of the essay*), Iași, Alfa, 2008, p. 56.
4. Marin Sorescu, *Ușor cu pianul pe scări* (*Easy with the Piano on the Stairs*), Bucharest, Romanian Book Publishing House, 1985, p. 211.
5. Gilbert Durand, *Figuri mitice și chipuri ale operei – de la mitocritică la mitanaliză* (*Mythical Figures and Faces of work – From Mythocritics to Mythoanalysis*), Bucharest, Nemira, 1998, p. 18.
6. Daniel Cristea-Enache, *op. cit.*, p. 32.
7. *Ibidem*, p. 193.
8. Ana Ferrari, *Dicționar de mitologie greacă și română* (*Dictionary of Greek and Romanian Mythology*), translated by Emanuela Stoleriu, Dragoș Cojocaru, Dana Zamosteanu, Bucharest, Polirom, 2003, pp. 602-603.
9. Octavian Paler, *Calomniile mitologice. Fărâme din conferințe nerostite* (*Mythological Slanders. Pieces of Unspoken Conferences*), Bucharest, Adevărul, 2010, p. 25.
10. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
11. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-30.
12. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 31.
13. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.* p. 33.
14. Eugen Simion (coord.), *Dicționarul general al literaturii române* (*General Dictionary of Romanian Literature*), Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic, 2007, p. 19.
15. Dumitru Micu, *Istoria literaturii române de la creația populară la postmodernism* (*History of Romanian Literature from Popular Creation to Postmodernism*), Bucharest, Saeculum IO, 2004, p. 572.
16. Ana Ferrari, *op. cit.*, pp. 773-774.
17. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

18. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 69.
19. Albert Camus, *Fața și reversul. Nunta. Mitul lui Sisif. Omul revoltat. Vara*, (*The Face and the Reverse. The Wedding Myth of Sisyphus. The Outraged Man. The Summer*), Bucharest, RaoP, 2001, p. 80.
20. Albert Camus, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
21. Octavian Paler, *Mitologii subiective*, (*Subjective Mythologies*), foreword by Daniel Cristea-Enache, 3rd edition, Bucharest, Polirom, 2009, p. 141.
22. *Ibidem*.
23. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 142.
24. *Ibidem*, p. 143.
25. Octavian Paler, *op. cit.*, p. 78.
26. Eugen Simion, *Scriitori români de azi* (*Contemporary Romanian Writers*), vol. IV, Bucharest, Chișinău, David. Litera, 1998, p. 189.
27. Daniel Cristea-Enache, *Convorbiri cu Octavian Paler*, (*Speaking with Octavian Paler*), Bucharest, Corint, 2007, p. 19.
28. Octavian Paler, *Mitologii subiective*, (*Subjective Mythologies*), *ed. cit.*, pp. 145-146.

## REFERENCES

- Alexandrescu-Voicu. 2008. Ileana, *Octavian Paler – Mitopoetica eseului* (*Octavian Paler – Mythopoetics of the Essay*), Iași, Alfa.
- Camus, Albert. 2001. *Fața și reversul. Nunta. Mitul lui Sisif. Omul revoltat. Vara*, (*The Face and the Reverse. The Wedding. Myth of Sisyphus. The Outraged Man. The Summer*), Bucharest, Rao.
- Cristea-Enache, Daniel. 2007. *Convorbiri cu Octavian Paler* (*Conversations with Octavian Paler*), Bucharest, Corint.
- Durand, Gilbert. 1998. *Figuri mitice și chipuri ale operei – de la mitocritică la mitanaliză* (*Mythical Figures and Faces of Work – From Mythocritics to Mythoanalysis*), Bucharest, Nemira.
- Eliade, Mircea. 2005. *Sacrul și profanul*, (*The Sacred and the Profane*), translated by Brândușa Prelipceanu, Bucharest, Humanitas.
- Evseev, Ivan. 1983. *Cuvânt, simbol, mit* (*Word, Symbol, Myth*), Timișoara, Facla.
- Ferrari, Ana. 2003. *Dicționar de mitologie greacă și română* (*Dictionary of Greek and Romanian Mythology*), translated by Emanuela Stoleriu, Dragoș Cojocaru, Dana Zamoșteanu, Bucharest, Polirom.
- Micu, Dumitru. 2004. *Istoria literaturii române de la creația populară la postmodernism* (*History of Romanian Literature from Popular Creation to Postmodernism*), Bucharest, Saeculum IO.
- Paler, Octavian. 2009. *Mitologii subiective*, (*Subjective Mythologies*), foreword by Daniel Cristea-Enache, 3rd edition, Bucharest, Polirom.
- Paler, Octavian. 1987. *Viața ca o coridă*, (*Life in the Bullring*) Bucharest, Cartea Românească.
- Paler, Octavian. 2010. *Calomniile mitologice. Fărâme din conferințe nerostite*, (*Mythological Slanders. Pieces of Unspoken Conferences*), Bucharest, Adevărul.

- Simion, Eugen. 1998. *Scriitori români de azi (Writers of Today)*, vol. IV, Bucharest, Chișinău, David. Litera.
- Simion, Eugen, (coord). 2007. *Dicționarul general al literaturii române (General Dictionary of Romanian Literature)*, Bucharest, Univers Enciclopedic.
- Sorescu, Marin. 1985. *Ușor cu pianul pe scări (Easy with the Piano on the Stairs)*, Bucharest, Cartea Românească.