



Florin Oprescu & Monica Oprescu

**Mateiu Caragiale –
Through the Leftovers' Glass.
From the *Journal* to *Ephemerides***

Abstract: Mateiu Caragiale's canonical image is bound exclusively to the novel *Craii de Curtea-Veche / Dandies of the Old Court*. But the famous novel is only one of the author's artistic images, texts such as the *Journal* or *Ephemerides* representing the fragments that complete the complex artistic mirror which reflects his immense dandy pride. Considered unfinished works, leftovers or bizarre pieces, the fragments analyzed reveal the fact that, through the complex instrument of ellipses, Mateiu Caragiale succeeded in recovering and recomposing a forgotten world, with all its mystery.

Keywords: Elliptic Texts; Biography and Literature; Dandyism.

FLORIN OPRESCU

University of Vienna, Austria
florin.oprescu@univie.ac.at

MONICA OPRESCU

West University of Timișoara, Romania
monica.oprescu@e-uvvt.ro

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2017.33.10

Mateiu Caragiale's enigmatic style arose from the juxtaposition and intentional mixture of biography and literature, which pertained to an assumed way of life, cultivated and dramatized in his writings, a similar case to that of the great dandies of the nineteenth century. The absolute models of this artistic aesthetics are Jean-Marie-Mathias-Philippe-Auguste de Villiers de L'Isle-Adam, Charles-Marie-Georges Huysmans and Oscar Fingal O'Flaherty Wills Wilde, names that prove the bombastic register of their biography. But unlike his masters, Mateiu Caragiale lives the drama and frustrations of an anti-dandyist biography, feverishly searching for an aristocratic past or for noble origins and creating or inventing them with an artisan's admirable skill. The artificial biographical self dictates the artistic self a type of naturalness that makes the novel *Craii de Curtea Veche / Dandies of the Old Court* the most authentic novel of the first half of the twentieth century.

The literary critic Șerban Cioculescu introduced the phrase "the compensatory dream of nobiliary ancestry,"¹ which was rapidly transformed into a biographical



obsession, the critic mentioning the fact that the illegitimate child tried exclusively to associate phonetically the name Caragiale to that of the Italian family Caracciolo, in favor of a dynastic argumentation. Therefore, ever since adolescence, the son of the illustrious playwright developed a fixed preoccupation for heraldic, aristocratic histories, illustrious family trees and honors, prizes, distinctions etc., an obsession which would amplify in time. “Vexed by his son’s conceited proposal,” Barbu Cioculescu relates, “Caragiale sobers him relentlessly, telling him that he comes from a kin of Albanese piemakers, who gave him the flat shape of the head.”² The conflict father-son seems relevant through these words, revealing a structural distance based on the evident dissociation of the two writers’ styles, between the irony and pragmatism of the father and the sober, ambitious, stiff projections of the son. The irony of the father conflicted with the tragic appetite of the son, without an honorific biography, living the obsession of a failed destiny, a stolen tradition, a future he had to make up.

The options of the two regarding the future were different, the father wishing the son would follow a juridical career, while the latter led an easy life, in the luxury of decadence, inherited or obtained through marriage or through comfortable administrative positions, such as the one of a Minister’s “head of cabinet.” Following the courses of the Faculty of Law, due to the insistence of his father and under the careful watch of his friend, Barbu Ștefănescu Delavrancea, Mateiu Caragiale tried at first to please his ambitious parent, but Delavrancea’s letter to I. L. Caragiale, who was in Berlin at the time, revealed that the

son was more preoccupied with the vanity of his looks than with studying law: “But the gloves, the collar, the boots and the pomade left a disagreeable impression.”³ What Șerban Cioculescu names “a manifestation of Mateiu’s snobbery in accordance to his nobiliary illusions”⁴ would be called a dandy ethics, in accordance with a cult of artificiality representative for the author of *Craii de Curtea-Veche / Dandies of the Old Court*, which will literaturise both the nobiliary obsession, through characters such as Pantazi or Pașadia, and the conflict with the father, as a contradiction of the styles mentioned before. The term does not necessarily attain a negative connotation, considers Angelo Mitchievici, the snob being “the emblem of this new aristocracy of adventurers refined through reading/culture, arrogant beyond measure,”⁵ the critic labeling Mateiu Caragiale and his friend N.A. Boicescu “crai, a degraded, decadent formula of the dandy.”⁶

Ion Vartic portrays him in the hypostasis of the dandy:

In public, Mateiu consistently attempted to impose the image of a dandy. [...] In Berlin, during his love escapades, dressed as Baudelaire, “entirely in violet,” he wants to pass by as a “young dilettante”; “emotionless as a dead” [...] Later on, during full maturity, Mateiu Caragiale, giving up eccentricities and the style à la fonfé, followed the austere line of a dandy in Brummel’s line [...], respecting strictly the indications of the one who inspired Barbey to write the study on dandyism.⁷

Nevertheless, George Călinescu portrays him in a manner that contests his



quality of a dandy: “a man that immediately attracted attention through his appearance. [...] He was visibly insufficiently dressed for the season, although you could see not only the lack, but also the wish of maintaining a uniform outfit which determined this choice.”⁸ Too old fashioned for the times he was living in, he resembled the dandies of the *fin de siècle*, being influenced by his French readings, but also by his lived experiences.

Material misfortune forbid Mateiu Caragiale from leading the life of a dandy, as there was a “contradiction between the ideal, imagined hypostases and the mediocre existence he was forced to lead.”⁹ The financial aspect was of great importance to a dandy who, although despising money, material things, was conditioned by them to lead a life in luxury. Mateiu Caragiale can be integrated in this pattern of the great dandies, living periods of poverty that alternated with those of a careless existence. However, the essential elements of a dandy – the preoccupation for appearance, attire, manners, the mask he wore in society, elegance, refinery, aestheticism taken to extremes, the transformation of his own life into a work of art – all these were relevant for Mateiu Caragiale, making him an authentic dandy. Vladimir Streinu takes this interpretation further and calls him “Brummel in Romanian interpretation. He did not need either physical beauty, or sumptuary luxury for this. He himself knew that the model was called ‘handsome’ only with reference to his sensitivity and his social behavior.”¹⁰

This dynastic obsession is also explained by Ovidiu Cotruș who, when tracing “*Hotarele operei/ The Boundaries of the work*,”¹¹ remembers Perpersicius’

reservations in publishing Mateiu Caragiale’s *Journal* fragments that referred to his father, due to the harsh ethics of literature. Moreover, even Șerban Cioculescu proposes that we “pass into oblivion” just those “non-reproducible lines”¹² which Mateiu Caragiale wrote at the death of his illustrious father. The journal fragments only reconstitute a biographical profile of the author, necessary for understanding the juxtaposed facets underlying the literary works he wrote, but also a notoriety element, the man and his contradictions. Starting from Ovidiu Cotruș’ famous affirmation, that the dandy whom Delavrancea described turned “his own life”¹³ into a work of art, we could state that Mateiu Caragiale was an anti-Caragiale, building his life as a work of art, dedicated to it, as if part of a narcissist cult. He aestheticized and was aestheticized in the remembrance of “set” times which could be invoked and sanctified. Therefore, the dandy did not make a clear distinction between the social ethics and the literary one. The latter can be seldom observed in the case of Mateiu Caragiale. We can only understand this constitutive theatrical wish of mystified and bombastic reality, which formed the basis of his biographical and literary existence.

Starting from the observation that the detail is a distinct benchmark of the biographical cult, the natural horror which dominated the existence of the illegitimate son and its *remainders* become essential in an overall assessment of Mateiu’s work and his destiny. Therefore, we realize that not only his unfinished texts, such as the poetry volume *Pajere*, the novel *Craii de Curtea-Veche/ Dandies of the Old Court* and the novel *Remember*, are “worthy” to be read



and explained. If we insist that there is no great difference between the cult of the art and the cult of biography in the case of this category of writers, we have to discuss the *Journal* or even *Ephemerides*, literary works that are representative for the eclecticism of his writing, but also for the intentional confusion between biography and art.

Mateiu Caragiale's *Journal* covers the period between 1927 and 1935, therefore including the moment the novel *Craii de Curtea-Veche/ Dandies of the Old Court* (1929) was published. This text represents a radiography of the context in which the novel was written. The specification is important if we decide to reconstitute the background of the mystified biography, which formed the basis of Mateiu's novel. If the journal in itself is a genre dominated by the convention of authenticity and of the natural or real, these conventions are contrary to the authentic dandies who were horrified of the natural and of direct confession. In the case of dandies, a category to which our writer belongs, "the need of self-mystification" is recurrent,¹⁴ according to Cotruș, and so are artificiality and the ritualization of the biographical. Therefore, Mateiu Caragiale's *Journal* is the object of precious analyses that outline it as an exceptional artistic biography.

If Mateiu's literary work lies undoubtedly "under the sign of memorialist fiction,"¹⁵ according to the famous statement of Ovidiu Cotruș, the autobiographical parts are marked not only by biographical confession, but by the necessity of a report, a deposition regarding the track of his public becoming, under the sign of the biographical construct. Neither the *Journal*, nor *Ephemerides* (which is a sort of a nobiliary and heraldic mortuary register)

starts from the memorialist convention of a pure confession, but they appear as registers of an arrogant biography. The writing of the *Journal* in French, besides the actual habit of the time of writing in French, is extra further argument supporting the claim that we are facing the construct of an image, contrary to the first notation in the journal, on 28 November 1927: "Ces notes je les écris uniquement pour moi."¹⁶ The monument of vanity built here can be addressed to his own person; it does not have public intentionality, but a personal one, of addressing this cult of the biographical self.

Nevertheless, the reader of the journal is surprised by his eclecticism on different levels, from the stylistic one to the intentional-biographical one. Even if the author respects the convention of chronological writing, he easily passes from historical notes to direct confession. This was also the reason for Șerban Cioculescu's censorship of a paragraph "considered too tough towards Mateiu's father."¹⁷ Here is Barbu Cioculescu's interpretation: "The critic remembered that Mateiu simply spoke there about the dementia of his father caused by the abuse of alcohol and tobacco and which, if he had lived, would have shown off in bars – an allegation probably borrowed from the memories of Mite Kremnitz."¹⁸

If the exclusion from the journal of this kind of notation is a follow-up of a certain kind of critical pudicity and a fake sense of the critics' responsibility for preserving a canonical memory of the great writers, therefore of a biographical ethics in agreement with the literary one, we cannot observe the excess of the censorship gesture. The bastard son will permanently suffer due to the father's critical excess,



feeling that all his efforts are minimalised and that he is misunderstood by his illustrious parent. His journal is a major confession that contours the dimensions of the inferiority complex his son felt compared to the disproportionate expectations of the father. Mateiu's conflict was first of all of an interior nature, to overcome the father-son dialectics and this fact is proven by the progressive intensity of the confessions in the journal.

If we read, for example, the 1931 notation referring to the interminable discussions with his father about his career, we notice that they are centered more on Mateiu's aspirational complex, even if all the criticisms of the father, "d'une violence extrême," stood under the sign of the manifestations "pénibles provoquées par l'abus de l'alcool et du tabac,"¹⁹ as if the voice speaking was that of the biographical self fighting the conceited self, it was a struggle of the self with the self.

Et il me traçait un plan d'existence et un programme de carrière qui auraient fait de moi le dernier des malheureux et qui me donnait des sérieuses inquiétudes sur son état mental. *Tu ne seras jamais*, me lança-t-il, en guise de conclusion, *chef de cabinet, jamais, jamais!*²⁰

Although he felt *left-over* in the relationship with his father, the numerous journal fragments proving this, his existence plan was more likely to be individual if we follow the numerous notations about the strategies and functions detained. And the frustrations associated with these efforts were directly proportional and progressive. If in the beginning he was cautious

about becoming involved in politics, in the Conservative Party, starting from his father's relation with the party, we later find out that his wish to win an administrative function was immeasurable. The aim of his life, according to his journal, was this one: "de me faire décorer."²¹ In the same context, he made a note about another event which provoked stupor. The Serbian authorities promised him the honors conferred by "la cravate de commendeur de Saint-Sava," as a consequence of the fact that he was the secretary of the mixed Serbian-Romanian commission for the building of a railway junction, by creating a new bridge over the Danube. After six months, he found out that he had received the immediately inferior grade. This led him to turn down the order, "Froissé par ce procédé balcanique."²² Therefore, we cannot decide between the pre-eminence of his ambition or that of his immeasurable pride, insofar as the author's biography was concerned. He had an incommensurable desire to detain functions, even minor ones, such as that of secretary or that of cabinet executive at the Ministry of Public Work. He obtained it through the influence of his illustrious father, but was very disappointed about its importance, as can be seen from his projection into the character of Pirgu. To a greater extent even than "the noble" Pașadia or "the morning star" Pantazi, who are ideal, noble characters, noble projections of a "setting" world, such as that in *Ephemerides*, Gore Pirgu seems kneaded out of the author's material, driven by the immeasurable ambition of becoming a parvenu. But Pirgu does not have destructive pride, he is driven by nothing else than extreme ambition. In the *Journal*, the image of Bogdan-Pitești corresponds to decadent Pirgu.



Mateiu's friendship with Bogdan-Pitești, dating from 1912, gave him the opportunity to analyze him in detail. "C'était un farceur, assez bon marché, sinon stéréotype, prétendant être à la fois anarchiste et catholique, fanfaron de vice contre-nature, quoique impuissant et infirme, amateur d'art très douteux et point connaisseur et avant tout escroc."²³ The portrait of his friend is comparable to that of Pirgu and the fact that he admired him when they first met reminds us of the world of Arnoteni and appears as a reconfiguration of the universe of his novel.

The measure of the artistic profile is given by the novel *Craii de Curtea-Veche/ Dandies of the Old Court* and the one of the biographical profile is given by the *Journal*. The biographical journey of the ambitious gradually becomes a journey of the misanthropist and of the absolute victim. In 1931, two years after publishing the novel, he found himself alone, isolated, "Voilà bientôt dix-huit ans que je ne réussis pas à me caser; aucune situation digne de ma promesse ne m'a été accessible et ne me semble plus l'être. Je suis absolument isolé, je n'ai aucune relation utile: ma femme, non plus."²⁴ A similar, emotionally regressive state can also be found in the entry he made in the *Journal* on 10 January 1934, when he complained about solitude and isolation, due mostly to the fact that he could not adjust his social relationships, especially due to the disequilibrium between social ambition and expected lack of acknowledgement: "De grandes épreuves et vicissitudes ont longuement fait de ma vie un calvaire: seul, sans aucun bien, sans parents, sans alliés, sans amis, sans relations utiles et en surcroît avec charges et entouré d'ennemis..."²⁵ This depressive state was

still overcome "par amour propre et par dignité,"²⁶ therefore as a consequence of his incommensurable pride and superiority, in order not to endanger decisively "the kin" or "ma race." But which was the "breed" of the author of *Craii/ Dandies*? How did he define his pedigree, built with so much minuteness and persistence? Was he not just an ideal project, a noble imaginary "race" which he dreamed of?

In the *Journal*, the author's breed or kin is part of a methodically constructed plan, of a continuous ennoblement by way of an alliance with an assumed public status that he gained with difficulty. He dreamed of having the destiny of the last Duke of Trémoille, who got married at the age of sixty-six and had children. Only this way, admits Mateiu Caragiale, "[m]a progéniture ne resterait certainement pas comme moi; elle aurait argent, maisons, terres..."²⁷ But the emotional fluctuations, the transition from one state to another, specific for the discourse of a journal that claims to exhibit the authenticity of lived experiences, reminds us of the dispositions of the Storyteller in the novel. More and more burdened by remorse and regrets, he admits aphoristically towards the end of his notations that: "La race m'a trompé et je l'ai trompée aussi."²⁸

Mateiu's journal must be placed under the sign of permanent contradictions, between pride and familial or quotidian disappointments, between vanity and destructive sentimentalism, between artificiality and an obsession with vice. Characters like Pantazi or Pașadia seem projections of a forgotten breed that lived in the name of art and of nobility codes. These are Mateiu Caragiale's fictional utopias, while his spirit is antagonistic, always attracted



by Pirgu's "living," his Balkanism and his transactional spirit. Therefore, the journal is a reconstruction of the biographical self from the perspective of art and especially the agitation of the Super-Ego, this Freudian "Über-Ich" which participates in the normativity of literature and his life, which seldom confound each other. Mateiu Caragiale's *Journal*, just like his novel, stands proof to that.

Another proof of the author's obsession with the old times of the old aristocrats, ignored by the literary critics who have approached the works of Mateiu Caragiale, is the text entitled *Ephemerides/Ephémérides*. Dated 1895-1916, therefore antedating the *Journal* and the novel *Craii de Curtea-Veche/ Dandies of the Old Court*, it renders, in an original manner, another "twilight" marked by the final lines of the text thus: "Fin de *L'Ancien régime*." The end of an era is marked by the author through the death of the painter Luchian and Romania's entry into the World War I and the changes it has brought in a post-imperial Europe. The *Ephemerides* finish with Romania's engagement in the war, marking the "twilight" of the old regime, a period of the dandies, in Mateiu's view, a world "sub pecetea tainei/ under the seal of mystery," which has just dissipated and which Mateiu Caragiale, writing between the two regimes, just wants to fixate in memory, making an inventory of it.

As Barbu Cioculescu observes in the "Notes" of the text, throughout the two decades recorded in *Ephemerides*, we find "a picture, a kaleidoscope of the exit scenes of various representatives of the old regime, before the social act that withdrew their political power. The material included in *Ephemerides* is enormous, seen this way,

and it would offer any novelist searching for that epoch's atmosphere at least one onomastic source of first rank."²⁹ But even more than the kaleidoscope of the Old Regime with all its luxury³⁰ and the charm of its past or, more than an onomastic dictionary of the end of the nineteenth century, *Ephemerides* reveals a prolix laboratory for the *Journal* and especially for the novel.

Ephemerides provides a radiography or a bureaucracy of death in pure Mateiu style. It aims to retrace the memory of the twilight of the nobility in the second half of the nineteenth century. It anticipates thus Pașadia's death and Pantazi's crepuscular moments in the novel. The stake of this mortuary radiography is paradoxically that of keeping a time of myth alive, through recorded memory: it is a time that Mateiu Caragiale ennobles, just like in his own biography. Metaphorically speaking, the author attributes a heraldic distinction to a dead time through this type of text.

The resources of this apparently mnemonic text, especially destined to morbidly record the death of public personalities, are still precious narrative material. The probable scope of these minute notations is that of making up a register of names and personalities, which compose the world in which the author projected himself artistically and biographically. Barbu Cioculescu observes that beyond the noble sonority of the names recorded here, such as:

Darvari, Ghica, Sturdza, Cantacuzino, Lahovary, Grădișteanu, Manu, Kalinderu, Suțu, Mavrocordat, Filitti etc. etc. – and which were part of his correspondence with N. A. Boicescu –, beyond this mirage in which he included himself as bearer of the name



Caragiale, we have to look for the mechanics of the analytical act of the future vice novelist. Beyond his work of fiction a factological mountain is about to fall.³¹

Through this mortuary and honorific register, the author seems to accept the convention of historicity. The text is a formal record of the social honors and the personalities that marked the end of the Old Regime. But death and honors are recorded obsessively, with the methodical art of an ink slinger, a copyist, a scriptwriter who has a moral obligation of recording everything, without explanation, just a long sequence of names, facts and public honors. The obsession with death and its honorarium betrays a lacunar genre in which the meaning is reconfigured through associations, semantic regroupings, and literary extrapolations. The text is an elliptical laboratory of literature, a kind of dictionary of historical characters who become literary protagonists, therefore preparing and anticipating the novel, through the interest for preserving an honorable history, by capturing the portraits of outstanding figures from the end of the century who witnessed the decline of the aristocratic class.

Beyond the lack of meaning in the text, the observation of its manner of construction is also useful. If we read, for example, a representative fragment from the *Ephemerides*, from 1914, we can state that the author's favorite instruments for marking crucial factual moments are ellipses or parataxis, the absence of the linking verb:

Tache Ionescu, Margiloman and I. Lahovary gold cigarette cases. – The assassination of Archduke Fr. Ferdinand

28 June st. n. at Sarajevo. – The Darvarii seem to be away. – Ion G. Laita
17 June – Incident Athanasie Gheorghiu – Delavrancea who apologizes (Gheorghiu would have told Cuza that he was the son of Lișcală from Iași – Delavrancea strangles Gheorghiu – Albanese riddles: fire, woman and waters are the three rods; even the rooster lays eggs for the happy man; when the poor finds something, it is either a leaf or a nail.³²

The apparent heterogeneity of the *Ephemerides* reminds us of text written by his father, Ion Luca Caragiale, in 1901, entitled “Moșii (Tablă de materii).” The polymorphic vocation of the lacunar text, stylistically built on the structure of ellipses, is offered by the apparently arbitrary association of objects, sending to the image of a “fair” of the world, an image whose meaning resides in its very heterogeneity. The trans textual method in Caragiale’s “Moșii” is that of following and legitimating discursive relations which are intentionally mixed in a first phase and are independent. Therefore, the literary discourse reconstitutes the world not only at a referential level, through the reproduction of objects, but also at a visual and auditory level. The elliptical void is filled by a participative reader who activates the lexical fields in one global, semantically full image, such as a *bric à brac* universe:

[...] popcorn – sorbet – chilling – Marsilieza – pipes – German’s pipe – *Deșteaptă-te, române!* – resin – soda – chocolate – lollipops – crackers – canons – *călușari* – figs – dolls – fruit – the talking head – the Sea



lion – Vasilache – the child with three legs – the attempt of power – American fun – rings – phonographs – the Romanian weaver – balls – jugs – beer – crosses – Gods – whistles – roasted peanuts – Bragadir – pistachio – Luther [...] ³³

The compound is converted through the elliptical instrument into a polyphonic and polymorphous image of the living world. Essentially, such a fact was admirably remade by Lucian Pintilie, in the 1981 film, *De ce trag clopotele, Mitică?/ Why Are the Bells Ringing, Mitică?* In Pintilie's carnival, dead objects, used separately and solely denotatively, become alive only by participating in the global image: in other words, by participating in the connotative meaning of a world in which *Marseilleza* și *Deșteaptă-te române* can co-exist, even more, they have to co-exist in order to live.

Still, the aesthetic convention of the elliptical instrument is valid in the case

of Mateiu Caragiale's *Ephemerides*, too. Through ellipses, the object – a personality, an event or even a coat of arms – receives another semantic charge. The accumulation speaks about a supra-meaning which reveals its anchorage in a given time (“The Old Regime”). It reproduces the nobiliary sonority of the time, the print selected by the author or even the temporal suspension of meaning. Therefore, these figures of absence do not have a negative connotation but a positive one. They are figures of wholeness, not of nothingness. They are the marks of a time laden with aristocratic legend, of a past mystified in Mateiu Caragiale's idiosyncratic style. Furthermore, if “Moșii” are linked to the present, or better said to the reconstitution of the present, the *Ephemerides* are reprojected into a regretful past, which undergoes a process of mystification. Therefore, Mateiu Caragiale proves that history remains just a convention and that it may, at any time, be transcended by a great prose-writer who defies time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Mateiu Caragiale, *Opere/ Works*, Edition, introductory study, notes, variants and comments by Barbu Cioculescu, Preface by Eugen Simion, București, Univers enciclopedic, 2001
- George Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent/ History of Romanian Literature from Origins till the Present*, Craiova, Vlad & Vlad, 1993
- Șerban Cioculescu, *Viața lui I. L. Caragiale/ The Life of I. L. Caragiale*, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1969
- Ovidiu Cotruș, *Opera lui Mateiu Caragiale/ The Work of Mateiu Caragiale*, Pitești, Paralela 45, 2001
- Angelo Mitchievici, *Mateiu I. Caragiale. Fizionomii decadente/ Decadent Physiognomies*, București, Institutul Cultural Român, 2007
- Alexandru Oprea, *Mateiu I. Caragiale – un personaj. Dosar al existenței/ Mateiu I. Caragiale – a Character. Dossier of Existence*, București, Muzeul Literaturii Române, 1979
- Vladimir Streinu, *Mateiu Caragiale*, București, Eminescu, 1985
- Ion Vartic, *Clanul Caragiale/ The Caragiale Clan*, Cluj-Napoca, Biblioteca Apostrof, 2002

WEBOGRAPHY

- Larousse online: <http://www.larousse.fr> [18.01.2017]
- Britannica online: <https://www.britannica.com> [18.01.2017]
- Biblioteca Digitală a Bucureștilor: <http://www.digibuc.ro> [18.01.2017]



NOTES

1. Șerban Cioculescu, *Viața lui I. L. Caragiale/ The Life of I. L. Caragiale*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1969, p. 149.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 149.
3. Apud Cioculescu, *ibid.*, p. 150.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 150.
5. Angelo Mitchievici, *Mateiu I. Caragiale. Fizionomii decadente/ Decadent Physiognomies*, București, Institutul Cultural Român, 2007, p. 22.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
7. Ion Vartic, *Clanul Caragiale/ The Caragiale Clan*, Cluj-Napoca, Biblioteca Apostrof, 2002, pp. 202-203.
8. George Călinescu, *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent/ History of Romanian Literature from the Origins to the Present*, Craiova, Vlad & Vlad, 1993, p. 897.
9. Al. Oprea, *Mateiu I. Caragiale – un personaj. Dosar al existenței / Mateiu I. Caragiale – a Character. Dossier of Existence*, București, Muzeul Literaturii Române, 1979, p. XVIII.
10. Vladimir Streinu, Mateiu Caragiale I. “Remember” and “Craii de Curtea-Veche,” in *Mateiu Caragiale*, București, Eminescu, 1985, p.105.
11. Ovidiu Cotruș, *Opera lui Mateiu Caragiale/ The Work of Mateiu Caragiale*, Pitești, Paralela 45, 2001, p. 21.
12. Șerban Cioculescu, *ibid.*, p. 150.
13. Ovidiu Cotruș, *ibid.*, p. 84.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 59.
16. Mateiu Caragiale, *Opere/ Works*, Edition, introductory study, notes, variants and comments by Barbu Cioculescu, Preface by Eugen Simion, București, Univers enciclopedic, 2001, p. 324.
17. Barbu Cioculescu in “Note, variante, comentarii/ Notes, variants, comments,” in *Journal, ibid.*, p. 836.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 836.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 348.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 348.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 356.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 356.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 360.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 346.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 364.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 366.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 366.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 370.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 859.
30. “Fastes” is also the subtitle used by the author in the case of this text, linking the title to the adjective fastuous, meaning splendor, greatness, luxury; from Fr. *faste.*, with reference to the literary genre of the poet Ovidius, “Fasti,” which means, according to *Larousse* online, “Poème inachevé d’Ovide (3-8 après J.-C.) qui, pour chaque jour de l’année, décrit les phénomènes célestes et les fêtes, dont il relate les origines.” [18.01.2017]. The role of this laudative poem, according to *Britannica* online, would have been “to rehabilitate its author in the eyes of the ruling dynasty. It contains a good deal of flattery of the imperial family and much patriotism, for which the undoubted brilliance of the narrative passages does not altogether atone.” [18.01.2017]
31. Barbu Cioculescu, in *Mateiu Caragiale, ibid.*, p. 859.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 713.
33. I.L. Caragiale, “Moșii. Tablă de materii,” *Moftul român*, 2/02, no. 8, May 18, 1901, p. 6, consulted at <http://www.digibuc.ro> [18.01.2017].