

Literary work of Mjeda at the light of philological analysis

Dr. Vjollca OSJA,
(vjollcaosja@yahoo.com)

University of Tirana, Faculty of History-Philology, Department of Literature

Abstract

This paper aims to treat an important philological issue of variants publication of Mjeda's poetic work. Many of them have undergone deviation in the important level of formal, semantic and stylistic organization from the original. Such a phenomenon has brought misreading and misconception not only for the community of common readers but for the professionals one. The case of Mjeda's poetic work, published posthumous, is offered as pattern of more arbitrary interference that led to the deviations from the original text and from the idiolect of the author. Which means that if you change an element in the structure of the verse, others lose their weight. As a consequence, this kind of texts should be subject to "operations" of textual criticism. Based on the type of interventions, we believe that it is possible to determine the typology of deviations. So, we have treated several types of deviations like:

- Deviations of full / part of diacritical marks
- Deviations of stylistic value of the poetic text
- Editorial reconstruction as the deviation of the authentic construct of the poetic text.

Keywords: *authentic texts, deviation from original, stylistic value, textual criticism, misreading, misconception*

The researches done by classical and modern philologists testify that every deviation of literary work during its republishing in different levels of formal organising and as a result meaningful from authentic text, published during author's life, not rarely leads to wrong readings and so being trapped easily not only for the common reader, but also for the professional one.

The case of Mjeda's poetry, published in-postum is offered as a model of the arbitration touches which have led to the deviation from the original one.

So, we are in a situation where it can be admitted that every new edition of Mjeda's literary work through years, can be considered as their version or we refer to the definition, that modern philology gives in such cases as fake text, which it doesn't have the same literary entity to the authorial text. Now, after touches, these creations, philologically cannot be considered as the same text anymore, so, as a result cannot be answered to the same author. Such texts should be submitted to "the operations" of textual criticism.

The risky tendency of declaring "edited" every item of the structure of poetical text, which does not mechanically fit to schoolish rules of the editors, has led them to touch until styling net of a text without being afraid of losing the author. It is clear that the reducing of the structure of a verse embedded into an open structure for interferation, openly proves the consideration of closing original text like "work in process" where every "editor" can be offered with his brush to erase or to give another tonality his authorial literary work, thus forgetting a "tiny" item, but very important, because the work in itself is a system based on an internal cohesion of all organising levels.

We think that we can set up the map of damage considering the analysis of touches. Beginning from the kind of interference, we think that it is possible to define the typology of damages

1. *The complete/partial deviation of diacritic signs.*

At the appearance of this typology we will get as a model only some of the deviations which will help us to understand better the value that the text win/lose with the presence/ missing of signs over special units which instructs the right /wrong reading and to guide us occasionally though right/ wrong interpretations.

From now, on we will get two editions of the author published in 1928 and that of Rinush Idrizi. So the below case which will illustrate our judgement is related to the first typology:

Por ça ká toka, bylbyl, ndrron moti;
Ankimi e váji nuk ásht i zoti
Per gjithmonë zêmren me na coptue;
Fillò me gëzue.

As you will see, poetry of this nature makes the text readable only in the presence of diacritic signs. On the other hand the full absence of these signs makes the road to the entrance into the system of idiolect difficult and the meanings closer to those made by author.

Referring to this poetry a version published in 1988 we find a clear model of arbitration interference made on the text:

Por ça ka toka, bylbyl, ndrron moti;
Ankimi e vaji nuk asht i zoti
Per gjithmonë zemren me na coptue;
Fillo me gëzue.

In this case, according to us the total missing of diacritic sign leads to another reading of this poetry where we can easily see that it is missed the item of phonological quality of text. We also think that in the case of Mjeda's poetry this deviation has a bigger "price", as it may lead us to a possible mistake of semantic words/ text.

At the poetry "Life dreaming" the use of sign over number *two* is useful, as long as this sign serve to create the establishment of sum which go down with Trina's death. In this case the sign is not definitive of grapheme *y*, but of the complete unit *Dý qershija/ dý çika* (is understood, the variant of 1988 doesn't save it):

Molla t'kputuna nji deget,
Dý qershija lidhë n'nji rrfanë,
Kû fillojnë kufit e Gegët,
rrijnë dý çika me nji nanë.

2) *The deviation of authorial language forms*

This misuse of text has led into tendency of interfering in order to fix language level and the style of creations. From the text "touches" are made such set ups which are far away from testimony of original text. So, the verse: *Bylbyl pâ prâ gjimò* (published by Mjeda 1928, pg.11) is transformed into : *Bylbyl papra gjimo* (edition prepared by Rinush Idrizi, 1988, pg.46) where the set-up *papra* has not a possible meaningful equivalence. Our attempt to find in the basic dictionaries of Albanian language is hopeless. The set up looks like more a parasite word than a meaningful word. In the text of author accompanied with diacritic signs, this set up has the meaning : *pâ prâ gjimò = unceasingly whine*.

3) *Editorial reconstruction*

Text touches have gone until reconstructions of leximatic units or the items inside verse structure we will be limited only into a few cases of this kind of interference. So, at the sonnet "Lissus" the unit "it call" it transformed into "it invites". Compare verse "for the happiness of country Agron calls you" with "For the happiness of country, Agron invite you". At this sonnet we look into some reconstructions inside verse structure. We have the verse: "E përdorj me cenë kujdesi e dija / të sa mjeshtrove", in the reconstruction of editor this verse is changed "e përdoroi me cen' e kujdes dija / e sa mjeshtro ve"(pg. 9). It is clear that this structure is not related to the model of verse that poet has written. At the poetry "Mahmut Pasha " we have such forms which we think they can move the meanings into the synchronic and diachronic axis. So the verse of author: "E flamorin, qi i shndritshem ushtrive/ se kje jeta ju prini n'ngadhnjime" is replacing with: "Sa kje jeta ju prini ngadhnjime". In the first case the locution: *se kje jeta* refers to the origin, refers to the diachronic axis, while the unit *sa kje je* refers to the segmentation time, refers to the synchronic axis.

The version edited by Rinush Idrizi clearly shows the general trend that has characterized the nature of work in the preparation of this publication: the lack of seriousness for a specific edition in its kind.

Conclusion

The risky tendency of declaring “edited” every item of the structure of poetical text, which does not mechanically fit to schoolish rules of the editors, has led them to touch until styling net of a text without being afraid of losing the author. It is clear that the reducing of the structure of a verse embedded into an open structure for interfeeration, openly proves the consideration of closing original text like “work in process” where every “editor” can be offered with his brush to erase or to give another tonality his authorial literary work, thus forgetting a “tiny” item, but very important, because the work in itself is a system based on an internal cohesion of all organising levels.

Beginning from the kind of interference, we have done possible to define the typology of damages.

Reference:

1. Berisha N. A. *Gjymtime dhe shëmtime të letërsisë së Arbëreshëve të Italisë*, Shpresa, Prishtinë 2001
2. Eco, U. *Struktura e papranishme*, Pejë, 1996
3. Martineli, Luçia, *Filologjia*, Medaur, Tiranë, 2002
4. Mjedja Ndré, *Juvenilia*, Shkodër, 1928
5. Mjeda.N. *Vepra letrare 1*, “Naim Frashëri”, Tiranë, 1988
6. Ndre Mjedja, *Andrra e Jetës*, Tiranë, 2006
7. Ndoja.M. *Ndre Mjeda, “Vjersha dhe Poema”*, Tiranë,1953