

**THE COLLOQUIAL REGISTER: THE LEXICAL MARK
OF ORALITY IN THE SHORT STORY *DINTELE*
BY LIVIU REBREANU**

**Mariana MATEI (BUCIU), PhD student
University of Craiova (Romania)**

Abstract

The *familiar* or *colloquial register* includes common words, used in small, familiar communities and families, being synonymous with affectivity, spontaneity, freedom, banality. It underpins artistic orality and has the role of sensitizing and “humanizing” the modern reader. A lexical mark of standard and substandard orality, the colloquial register contributes to the development of literary language, through the intentional adequacy of all compositional elements created by the author, to the suggestion of spoken language, in order to enhance expressiveness. By the lexical analysis of some words from the short story *Dintele!* ‘The tooth’ by Liviu Rebreanu, we have achieved a short, familiar “lexicography” of orality, suggestive for understanding the message of the text, and also for rediscovering hidden affectivity, as an aspect of modernity of the interwar writer.

Key-words: *orality, colloquial register, affectivity, freedom, expressiveness*

Résumé

Le registre familier ou familier comprend des mots communs, utilisés dans de petites communautés et familles familiales, étant synonymes d'affectivité, de spontanéité, de liberté, de banalité. Il sous-tend l'oralité artistique et a pour mission de sensibiliser et « d'humaniser » le lecteur moderne. Marque lexicale de l'oralité standard et inférieure, le registre familier contribue au développement du langage littéraire, par l'adéquation intentionnelle de tous les éléments de composition créés par l'auteur, à la suggestion du langage parlé, afin de renforcer l'expressivité. Par l'analyse lexicale de quelques mots de la nouvelle *Dintele!* ‘La dent’ de Liviu Rebreanu, nous sommes parvenus à une courte « lexicographie » familière de l'oralité, suggestive pour comprendre le message du texte, mais aussi pour redécouvrir l'affectivité cachée, comme un aspect de la modernité de l'écrivain de l'entre-deux-guerres.

Mots-clés: *oralité, registre familier, affectivité, liberté, expressivité*

Introduction

The *familiar* or *colloquial register* underpins at the lexical level the artificial status of orality, because in the literary creation orality is mimetic, possible only through the written aspect of language. We consider it necessary to analyze the *familiar register*, especially at present, when the tendency of narrative discourse is one of rediscovering affectivity and of invigorating it through the feeling of naturalness offered by the very *orality of the style*. The *familiar register* backs *artistic orality* in its two aspects (*standard* and *substandard*), belonging to the category of lexical marks indirectly associated with it, just like the *popular register*, to which it is actually subordinated. Today's reader, no matter how demanding in matters of literature, can rediscover the modernity of the style of a well-known writer from the middle of the last century, i.e. Liviu Rebreanu (1885-1944), even through the marks of orality, through the *familiar register*, by rediscovering the affectivity, often hidden, of the "human" in man, with good and bad things.

I. The colloquial register

Familiar expression can be identified both in popular language and in literary language, in speech and in writing, in informal, private, or intimate communication relations, in small communities such as family or group of friends. The *familiar* or *colloquial register*, a diaphasic¹ variant of language and a form of filtering popular language, is an important lexical mark of orality, which refuses, through the consent of the "actors" of communication, ceremonious address and distance, in favour of freedom of expression and a certain degree of affectivity and familiarity. The characteristics of *familiar language* were established at the beginning of the last century by Charles Bally himself (*Traité de stylistique française*, 1909): *orality*, *banality*, weak and medium *affectivity* (not maximum), *lack of self-censorship of expression* (relaxation) and *conservatism* (resistance to the new)².

In Romanian linguistics, the term *familiar* has been analyzed in relation to such terms as: *popular*, *oral*, *colloquial*, *conversational*, *familial*, *slang*, etc. Initially, it was close to *popular*, considered quasi-synonymous with it in theory, but recognized as distinct in practice, by linguists such as Iorgu Iordan³ (*Stilistica limbii*

¹ DSL 1997:118: "The term was created by Eugeniu Coșeriu, to designate one of the fundamental types of internal differentiation of historical languages: the differentiation between the types of expressive mode, depending on the constant circumstances of speech (speaker, listener, situation or occasion, subject). The type of homogeneity corresponding to the diaphasic differences is constituted by the synphasic units: the familiar, solemn language of biological groups (men, women), groups of age, social, professional groups generically called by Coșeriu language styles. However, any synphasic unit has diatopic and diastratic differences. The synphasic units interfere, having many common features".

² See Bally 1909: 108, apud Cristina Florescu 2002: 127.
https://www.philippide.ro/Identitatea%20limbii%202002/12_Florescu.pdf.

³ See Iorgu Iordan 1944: 24, apud Cristina Florescu 2002: 125.
https://www.philippide.ro/Identitatea%20limbii%202002/12_Florescu.pdf

române, 1944) and Ion Coteanu⁴ (*Stilistica funcțională a limbii române*, 1973). The *familiar register*, considered subordinate to *popular language*, is used in both rural and urban areas, by categories belonging to the most different social strata, as pointed out by the researcher Dumitru Irimia (*Structura stilistică a limbii române contemporane*, 1986). In his opinion, the *familiar language (register)* has general features, respectively stylistic procedures characteristic of popular language, but also its own features, due to the natural, unconventional character of the linguistic relations it implies. An important feature, specific to the *familiar register*, is that its identity is conferred by the category of linguistic signs, as implicit marks. But contextually, these signs also develop explicit marks, in close connection with the subjectivity of the message. Dumitru Irimia (*op. cit.*, 1986) also considers that *expressiveness, affectivity, spontaneity, banality* and *habit*⁵ are features of the *familiar register*.

The concept of *familiar*, as a register of speech, is a challenge for various contemporary perspectives of language analysis. The research focuses more on the speech act than on language. According to the new theories on locutionary acts, concerned with the logic of conversation, such as that of Paul Grice (*Logique et conversation*, 1979), or the structure of conversation, such as that of Anne Reboul and Jaques Moeschler (*La pragmatique aujourd'hui. Une nouvelle science de la communication*, 1988)⁶, for example, a pragmatic view on language is outlined, with structures of the linguistic code from the perspective of the *4 maxims of conversation (quantity, quality, relation and manner)*. According to contemporary pragmatics, *familiar language* can be correlated, as a reality of speech, only with two of them: *quantity* (a speaker's message contains only the necessary amount of information) and *quality* (the sincerity of speech and its motivation). The other two maxims, of *relation* (speaking strictly to the subject) and the one of *manner* (unambiguous expression) cannot be associated with familiar language. Cristina Florescu (*Elemente lexicale ale limbajului familiar românesc în context romanic*, 2002) agrees with the labelling of the *familiar register* as “something”⁷ situated between “use” (from the perspective of Hjelmslev) and “norm” (from the perspective of Coșeriu). The norm is familiar to the speakers of a language, but it is different from the *familiar register*, specialized register in point of language level.

The characteristics of the *familiar* or *colloquial register*, previously mentioned, but also new ones, are also recorded by ELR: the direct and

⁴ Coteanu, 1973: 103.

⁵ Irimia 1986: 83.

⁶ In the Romanian version achieved by Liana Pop, *Pragmatica azi*, Echinoux, Cluj, 2001: 48-49, apud Cristina Florescu, *op.cit.*: 128.

⁷ Cristina Florescu 2002: 126.

spontaneous way in which communication takes place⁸, the relatively poor vocabulary, by using words from the active vocabulary and polysemantic words; the contextual factor is also important in the study of the *familiar language*, because, in the context, a multitude of interesting relations can be discovered, from a pragmatic and sociolinguistic point of view. The *familiar register* is associated with *substandard* orality, as argued by the German linguist Klaus Bochmann (*Limba română: istorie, variante, conflicte. O privire din afară*, 2004). He emphasizes, however, that the social boundaries of this register are not very clear, because there is familiarity in interpersonal communication regardless of the background of the speakers. However, it is more common in the lower areas of the social hierarchy and is characterized by unconventionality, ease of address, and a certain degree of affectivity⁹.

We consider that the *familiar register* is an expressive lexical mark of *substandard orality*, in particular, but it is also present in *standard orality*. The two aspects of orality coexist in the fictional universe of realistic literary works. The *familiar register* concretizes, at the level of artistic language, the issues of Liviu Rebreanu's short stories inspired by the village world, composed of a diversified crowd of individuals, from peasants to small village intellectuals, whose speech can be claimed by both *substandard* and *standard orality*. A fine observer of the evoked realistic world, Rebreanu masterfully highlights the *heard* and the *unheard* in the human being, constantly under the tyranny of social or psychological life. The *familiar language* he uses becomes the appropriate form of expression of different characters as social affiliation, but similar in the note of affectivity expressed by this type of language.

II. A familiar “lexicography” of orality in the short story *Dintele* by Liviu Rebreanu

As we have pointed out on other occasions, youth stories are not simple narrative exercises, but genuine pages of initiatory literature and creative lessons¹⁰ for the young Liviu Rebreanu, determined to discover the vocation of a realistic writer at the beginning of the last century. Although smaller in scope, the short stories contain a much more extensive material of life than the works of maturity, representing, from a thematic standpoint, the epic germs, either main or sequential, of his future masterpieces. A welcome example of a short story exercise is the narrative episode of the short story *Dintele*/ ‘The tooth’ (1910), in which the teacher Bujor tries to convince the teacher Aglaia to extract his diseased tooth, as the teacher Herdelea will do later with his wife, in a narrative sequence of the novel *Ion*

⁸ ELR 2001: 103.

⁹ Bochmann 2004: 151-152.

¹⁰ Sasu 1978: 36.

(1920). The heroine of the short story *Dintele* is the teacher Aglaia Bujor, who, at the age of 39, struggles and suffers terribly not only because she will have to remain toothless, but also because of the insensitivity and virile superficiality¹¹ of her husband, indifferent before the aging phenomenon, which affects her extremely seriously. Another cause of the suffering and irascibility of the female character, admirably captured by Rebreanu, is the painful awareness of the inevitable passage of time, and also of the woman's own helplessness, a soul torn by the revelation of aging and the impossibility of choice¹². Physical pain becomes an occasion for existential revelations, resulting in great emotional struggles, just as painful.

We have inventoried and analyzed a series of familiar words from the short story *Dintele*, important from the perspective of the lexical marks of orality, according to the following criteria: originality, degree of entrenchment in language (the analyzed words are recorded in MDA, with the mark "fam") and their connection with the writer's biography (his love for the village, his father's teaching profession, etc.). The familiar words in the short story *Dintele* by Liviu Rebreanu belong to the *domestic*, conjugal universe and are mainly used by the female character and the narrator. Among the words belonging to the familiar register of communication, several categories drew our attention, which we perceive as authentic sources of *artistic orality*: *diminutives (hypocoristic forms)*, *derogatory words*, *expressive familiar words*, *onomatopoeias*, but also *words that record extensions of sounds*. The inventoried familiar words have been ordered alphabetically within each category and have been analyzed according to the lexical-grammatical class to which they belong, constituting an authentic familiar "lexicography" of orality. The lexical analysis performed on them aims at aspects related to their etymology, formation, and contextual semantics, as well as some pragmatic and stylistic aspects. We have emphasized the role of the familiar register in shaping orality, as a particular feature of style, which materializes a healthy aesthetic conception through its realism and a modern one through its topicality: the illusion of life is superior to the illusion of art. The lexicographical definitions of the analyzed familiar words have also been given, according to MDA (2010).

1. Diminutives are used hypocoristically and belong mainly to the *class of nouns* and the *class of adverbs*. The words obtained by the process of progressive derivation with diminutive suffixes, of different origins, preserve the meaning of the base word, which has also been analyzed from an etymological point of view. In general, diminutive words refer to objects perceived as "small" both in the denotative and in the connotative sense, or to which the characters feel emotionally attached, functioning as lexical indices of affectivity.

¹¹ Piru 1965: 31.

¹² Sasu, *ibidem*: 32.

a. The class of nouns includes the diminutives *băbucă*, *cojiță*, *măicuță*, *nevestică*, *oglindiță*, *pușor*:

băbucă < *babă* (< Bg. *баба*, “old woman”) + suff. “-ucă” (of Slavic origin¹³); in a familiar sense, it means “wife” (MDA, 153); with the meaning of “little wife” it is also used by the teacher’s husband, as an expression of the familiar affectivity he has for her: ”și nu te necăji, băbucă, din pricina dintelui”/ ‘and don’t bother, little old woman, because of the tooth’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 59); “Ce-i cu tine, băbucă? Ce te-ai pus să te plimbi în cap de noapte ca huhurezii?”/ ‘What’s wrong with you, little old woman? What made you walk in the middle of the night like an eagle owl?’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 59). But the female character, who had not yet turned forty and who was experiencing severe toothache, perceives the offensive appellation with the meaning “old woman”; from the perspective of the meaning attributed by the recipient of the message, the words arouse dissatisfaction; a pragmatic opposition is thus installed between the intentionality with which the words are used and its reception, which will cause suffering to the female character, who goes through an unpleasant experience, but also through the crisis of a certain age, definitely advancing towards senectitude;

cojiță < *coajă* < O. Sl. *кожа*, “dry piece of bread” (MDA I: 443) + suff. “-iță” (of Slavic origin¹⁴): “S-o fi smintit când am mușcat cojița ceea uscată de pâine”/ ‘He might have grown mad when I bit the dry crust of bread’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 56); the diminutive meaning refers to the apparent insignificance of the object, but possible cause of pain, in contrast to the hard pain caused by the diseased tooth;

măicuță < *maică* (< Bg. *майка*, Srb. *majka*, the familiar meaning “mother”), (MDA I: 1420), + suff. “-uță” (of Latin origin¹⁵): “Mosafiri, măicuță!...Vin mosafirii!...”/ ‘Guests, mother!...The guests are coming!...’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 65);

nevestică < *nevastă*, < Slv. *невеста* “married woman” (MDAII: 150), + suff. “-ică” (of Latin origin): “Bravo, nevestico! Ai scăpat! strigă dascălul, mândru și voios, învârtind cleștele cu dintele prins în vârful.”/ ‘Well done, little wife! You got away! cried the teacher, proud and cheerful, turning the tongs with the tooth caught in.’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 73); “Firește că bine, nevestico, răspunse dascălul din ce în ce mai mirat”/ ‘Of course it’s well, little wife, replied the teacher, more and more astonished’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 73);

oglindiță < *oglinďă*, postverbally formed from *oglinďi*, + suff. “-iță” (of Slavic origin); *oglinďi* < O. Sl. *оглѣдѣти* “to look in the mirror” (MDA II: 201): “când casa se liniștea, dascălița Aglaia luă oglinďița de sub pernă și se privi într-însa lung”/ ‘when the house calmed down, the teacher Aglaia took the little mirror from under the pillow and looked in it for a long time’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p.

¹³ ELR 2001: 181.

¹⁴ Idem, *ibidem*.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

74); an essential object in the props of feminine elegance, “oglinzița” (=“caressed mirror”) seems to remain the discreet friend, but also the “telling” witness of the past, present and, certainly, future of the teacher’s appearance, subject to the detrimental action of time;

puișor < *pui*, inherited form Lat. * *pulleus* (MDA II: 592), + suff. “-ișor” (complex suffix formation, created on the Romanian territory¹⁶), has the meaning “sleep/nap”: “Uite-acu ți-l scot dacă vrei, și mai poți să și tragi un puișor până de dimineață...Haide repegior!”/ ‘Look, I’ll pull it out if you want, and you can even take a nap until tomorrow morning...Come on, quickly!’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 59); although 70 meanings of the word are recorded in the dictionary, the connotative meaning generated by the context “nap” does not occur; the phrase has obvious stylistic virtues, it is a substitution figure, a metonymy.

b. *The class of adverbs* includes the words *încetinel* and *repegior*. By referring to nature (*încetinel*), an outward pragmatic extension of the man’s sincere intention to help his wife (*repegior*) is made, as a potentiation of his care, but of which the teacher is not convinced:

încetinel < *încet* (inherited from Lat. **qu(i)etus*, -a, -um, meaning “with low speed”) + suff. “-inel” (complex Romanian creation¹⁷), (MDA I: 1206): “soarele toamnă se înălța încetinel, greoi”/ ‘the autumn sun was rising slowly, with difficulty’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 65);

repegior (“repejor”, with regional consonantal alternation d/ğ) < *repede* (inherited from Lat. *rapidus*, *rapide* meaning “in a hurry”) + suff. “-ior” (complex Romanian creation¹⁸), (MDA II: 691): “Uite-acu ți-l scot dacă vrei, și mai poți să și tragi un puișor până de dimineață...Haide repegior!”/ ‘Look, I’ll pull it out if you want, and you can even take a nap until tomorrow morning...Come on, quickly!’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 59);

Whether it is about nouns or diminutive adverbs, the affectivity is obvious: that of the teacher for his wife, that of the child for his mother, that of the teacher for the dear objects of her lost youth.

2. Derogatory words used familiarly are proper nouns (*hoască*) or formed by conversion from adjectives (predominantly masculine, since the main character who uses them is a woman), singular or plural. They have an allocutive function and express the rejection of the man (*prăpăditule*, *zevzecule*), but also of the whole world (*ucigașilor*), by the unhappy woman, who feels betrayed by her husband, by life, by time:

hoască, et. nec., cf. *hoarcă*, “old and wicked woman” (MDA I: 1079): “Acu nici tu nu mă mai slăbești din *băbucă*, parcă aș fi o hoască de o sută de ani”/ ‘Now

¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

you keep calling me *old woman*, as if I were a hundred-year-old housewife' (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 64);

prăpăditule, formed by conversion from the participial adjective *prăpădit* + enclitic definite art. “-(u)le”, familiar meaning “person who commits vile acts”; *prăpădit* < *prăpădi* + suff. “-it” (*MDA*, 502), contextual meaning “vile”: “Să-ți fie rușine prăpăditule, a-ți bate joc de suferința oamenilor”/ ‘Shame on you, vile man, don’t make fun of the suffering of people’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 59);

ucigașilor, noun formed by conversion from the adjective *ucigaș* + enclitic definite art. pl. “-lor”; *ucigaș* < *ucig*, the old indicative present of the verb *ucide* + agent suff. “-aș” (*MDA II*: 1357); in the text the connotative meaning “villains” is updated: “Mi-ați omorât sufletul, ucigașilor...mi-ați strivit viața!”/ ‘You killed my soul, you, murderers... you crushed my life!’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 66);

zevzecule, formed by conversion from the adjective *zevzec* + definite art. “-(u)le”, meaning “person who acts without judgment” (*MDA II*: 1565): “Bătă-te mânia lui Dumnezeu, urâtule și zevzecule!”/ ‘May God’s wrath reach you, you ugly blockhead!’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 59).

3. The analyzed *words of onomatopoeic formation* fall within the category of adjectives (*hodorogit*) and verbs (*șoșăi*, *sfârâi*):

hodorogit/e < *hodorogi* (*hodorog* “noise” + “-i”) + suff. “-it”, “(of objects) worn, defective” (*MDA I*: 1080), contextually meaning “broken”: “ce mai ții în gură vechituri hodorogite”/ ‘why are you keeping broken junk in your mouth’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 5), and also “hoarse”: “vocea hodorogită a pretesei”/ ‘the hoarse voice of the priest’s wife’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 70); there is also the variant derived from the noun *hodorogitură* (*hodorogi* + suff. “-tură”), meaning “defective things”: “Eu n-am ținut niciodată la hodorogituri”/ ‘I have never cared about old, defective things’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 68);

*șoșăi*¹⁹, a familiar phonetic variant of *șoșoi*, a Transylvanian form of onomatopoeic origin, meaning “to whisper”: “își netezi părul ce i se încâlcise pe frunte și șoșăi cu buzele uscate”/ ‘he smoothed his hair that was tangled on his forehead and whispered with his dry lips’ (*Dintele, N. II*, p. 56);

sfârâi, < *sfâr* (onomatopoeia) + suff. “-âi”, “to cause low and repeated whistling noises” (*MDA II*: 872); textually, the verb updates a connotative, unusual meaning, not recorded in the dictionary, with reference to an abstract element, time; the contextual meaning is “to flow monotonously and imperceptibly, to agitate”, a meaning reinforced by the following verbal form *a se măcina*/ ‘to grind oneself’ also used metaphorically: “În casă se zvârcoleau o liniște adâncă și un suflet amărât. În aer sfârâia, se măcina vremea...”/ ‘A deep silence and a tormented soul were

¹⁹ It also has the regional meaning (of leaves, waters) “to murmur” (*MDA II*: 1119).

writhing in the house. The air was sizzling, the weather was grinding...’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 74).

At the level of familiar words of onomatopoeic formation, the suggested noises are expressions of physical and emotional pain, of man’s passage through time, but also of time through man. The physiological and the concrete are closely related to the psychological.

4. The analyzed **expressive familiar words** are *nouns, verbs* and *adverbs*:

a. *The class of nouns* includes words illustrating a typical human universe of Rebreanu, a universe stigmatized by pain, illusion, and ephemerality (*ciolan, droaie, palavre*):

ciolan < O. Sl. *члаумъ* “limb, skeleton”, by extension “human bone” (MDA I: 406): “Se clătina ciolanul naibii, mai demult și mă necăjea”/ ‘The damn limb had been swaying, and used to bother me’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 56)

droaie < Alb. *droe*, “a large number of something” (MDA I: 761): “pe urmele luminii răsăriră în casă o droaie de umbre ciudate”/ ‘a lot of strange shadows rose in the house following the light’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 55);

palavără/-e, < Tk. *palavra* “word said without seriousness and reason”, used familiarly and especially in the plural (MDA II: 249) : “Lui îi plăcea să mănânce bine, să doarmă mult și să stea la palavre cu țărani”/ ‘He liked to eat well, to sleep much and to say a word to the peasants’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 62);

b. *The class of verbs* includes words that suggest the insecurity, loneliness, and anxiety of the main character (*bălăbăni, sinchisi, zvârcoli*):

bălăbăni, et. nec., possibly has a connection with Tk. *bâlâban* “big, thick” > *balaban* “big”/ “hanging heavy” (DLR I: 444); textually, the meaning is “to sway”: “Se uită lung la limba de aramă ce se bălăbănea neobosită încoace și încolo”/ ‘He stared at the copper tongue that was swaying tirelessly back and forth’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 60);

sinchisi, of neo-Greek origin, has the meaning “not to remain indifferent to someone or to something/ to take into account the existence of someone” (MDA II: 895): “Lui îi plăcea să mănânce bine, să doarmă mult și să stea la palavre cu țărani. Ce se sinchisea dânsul de visurile ei copilărești!”/ ‘He liked to eat well, to sleep much and to say a word to the peasants. He didn’t care about her childish dreams!’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 62); it is used in the exclamatory context with the negative meaning “to remain indifferent”;

zvârcoli, of Bulgarian origin (MDA II: 1588), has the figurative meaning “to struggle”, which includes everything that means existence: “În casă se zvârcoleau o liniște adâncă și un suflet chinuit”/ ‘A deep silence and a tormented soul were writhing in the house’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 74);

tun, postverbally formed from *tuna*, inherited from Lat. *tonare* (MDA II: 1299); contextually it is an adverb formed by conversion from a noun, an affective means of achieving the absolute superlative of the adjective *sănătos*/ ‘healthy’, meaning “very”: “Ai zice că-i sănătos tun, se gândi dăscălița Aglaia”/ ‘You would say he is very healthy, the teacher Aglaia thought’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 65);

c. *The class of expressive words formed by conversion* is represented by *adverbs (tun)* and *invariable adjectives (pungă)*:

pungă, of neo-Greek origin (MDA II: 599), is contextually an invariable adjective formed by conversion from the noun, and has the meaning “tight”, as a sign of bitterness: “rămăsese cu buzele pungă”/ ‘she had pursed up her mouth’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 68).

At the level of the two words, one can notice the antithesis between the good health of the man (*sănătos tun*) and the suffering of the woman (*buzele pungă*).

5. *Familiar words with extensions of sounds* (vowels and consonants):

e-e-e/vreaaaa: “Oare ce vrea dintele ăsta? Ce-e-e vreeaaa?”/ ‘What does this tooth want? Whaaaaat does it waaaaant?’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 57); the vowel extension means the limit of the bearable, the verbalization of the unbearable;

fff: “Să ai tu colo în loc de dinte un loc negru...fff!”/ ‘And to have a black spot instead of a tooth...fff!’ (*Dintele*, N. II, p. 57); the consonant extension becomes an interjectional form and signifies contempt and revolt;

The familiar “lexicography” resulting from the analysis of the *familiar register* in the short story *Dintele* by Liviu Rebreanu, includes 26 words (13 nouns, 5 verbs, 2 adjectives, 3 adverbs, 3 words with extended sounds). As for their etymology, 5 words come from other languages (*ciolan* comes from Old Slavic, *droaie* from Albanian, *palavre* from Turkish, *sinchisi* from neo-Greek, *zvârcoli* from Bulgarian), 2 words have unknown etymology (*hoască* and *bălăbăni*). Depending on the way of formation, 19 words are Romanian creations: 8 formed by derivation with diminutive suffixes (*băbucă*, *cojiță*, *măicuță*, *nevestică*, *oglindiță*, *puișor*), 5 by conversion (*prăpăditule*, *ucigașilor*, *zezecule*, *tun*, *pungă*), 3 are onomatopoeic formations (*hodorogit*, *șoșăi*, *sfârâi*) and 3 are formed by extensions of sounds (*e-e-e*, *vreeaaa*, *fff*). The diminutive suffixes with which the 8 derivatives were formed have different origins: 3 are of Slavic origin, 2 of Latin origin, and 3 are Romanian creations. In respect of the semantics of the analyzed words, most of them are used with a denotative meaning, and 6 with a connotative meaning. One word is used with both meanings (*hodorogit*). As expected, one can notice that, at the level of the *familiar register*, the Romanian lexical creations prevail, and its role as a mark of orality and an index of affectivity is well defined.

Conclusions

Following the analysis we have made, one can notice that, due to familiar semantic mutations, words have become expressions of different attitudes of the speaker towards the speaker or towards the surrounding objects, such as affection and appreciation or contempt and rejection. Using the *familiar register* (*diminutives, derogatory words, expressive familiar words, onomatopoeias, words that record extensions of sounds*), the writer manages to create an authentic page of rural, familiar and family life, typical of the rural environment, the protagonists being, this time, the small intellectuals of the village (the teacher and his wife), whose language makes valuable use of both aspects of orality (standard and substandard), easily identifiable throughout the analytical approach. Rebreanu's style captivates the reader through orality, in general, and through the *familiar/ colloquial register*, in particular, because it can be easily found in the pains and feelings of the characters. The modern reader rediscovers Rebreanu, the realist, as a modern and "warm" writer, despite the declared sobriety of his style. Starting from a banal physical toothache, but with multiple reverberations in the soul (from nervousness and revolt, to acceptance and melancholy), Rebreanu manages to recreate, in words, a real and ordinary page of life, which, of course, lies under his sign "fugit irreparabile tempus" (the family name of the heroine, a flower name, being suggestive in this regard). The female character discovers that life, whatever it is, is preferable to death, and the power to live must be sought within one's own being, not beyond it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bally, Charles, *Traité de stylistique française*, vol. I, Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1909.
- Bochmann, Klaus, *Limba română: istorie, variante, conflicte. O privire din afară*, Chişinău, Editura Cartdidact, 2004.
- Coteanu, Ion, *Stilistica funcţională a limbii române*, vol. I, II, Bucureşti, Editura Academiei, 1973.
- Florescu, Cristina, *Elemente lexicale ale limbajului familiar românesc în context romanic*
www.philippide.ro/Identitatea%20limbii%202002/12_Florescu.pdf,
accessed 4.09.2020.
- Iordan, Iorgu, *Stilistica limbii române*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică, 1975.
- Irimia, Dumitru, *Structura stilistică a limbii române contemporane*, Bucureşti, Editura Ştiinţifică şi Enciclopedică, 1986.
- Piru, Alexandru, *Liviu Rebreanu*, Bucureşti, Editura Tineretului, 1965.

- Reboul, Anne; Moeschler, Jaques, *La pragmatique aujourd'hui. Une nouvelle science de la communication*, Editions du Seuil, 1998, Romanian version by Liliana Pop, *Pragmatica azi*, Cluj, Echinox, 2001.
- Rebreanu, Liviu, *Nuvele II*, Text ales și stabilit, note, comentarii și variante de Nicolae Gheran și Nicolae Liu, București, Editura pentru Literatură, 1968, pp. 75-82).
- Sasu, Aurel, *Liviu Rebreanu. Sărbătoarea operei*, București, Editura Albatros, 1978.

SIGLE

- ELR=Academia Română, *Enciclopedia limbii române*, coordonator Marius Sala, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2001.
- DSL= Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela *et alli.*, *Dicționar general de științe ale limbii*, București, Editura Științifică, 1997.
- DLR= Academia Română, *Dicționarul limbii române, vol I*, București, Editura Academiei Române, 2010.
- MDA=Academia Română, *Micul dicționar academic*, coordonator Marius Sala, București, Editura Univers Enciclopedic, 2010.