

ՄՇԱԿՈՒԹԱԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ

ՍՈՒՐԵՆ ԱԲՐԱՀԱՄՅԱՆ

Բ. Գ. Դ., պրոֆեսոր,
ՀՀ ԳԱԱ Մ. Արեւիյանի անվան գրականության ինստիտուտ
surenabraham@mail.ru
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6738-864x>
հեռ. +37455624477

DOI: 10.54503/1829-0116-2023.1-313

ԻՄԱՍՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆ ԻՄԱՍՏՈՒԹՅԱՆՑ ԿԱՍ ԳԻՐՔ ԺՈՂՈՎՈՂԻ

Բանալի բառեր.-Աստվածաշունչ, Գիրք ժողովրդի, բան, լեզու, իմաստ-
նություն, մշակույթ,գրականություն:

«Ի սկզբանե էր բանն...» արտահայտության լեզվական քննության հար-
ցը առանցքային նշանակություն ունի որպես գրականության բնագրաստեղծ
նախահիմք: Նրա լեզվական նախահիմքով է պայմանավորված «բանի» բնագ-
րաստեղծ էներգիան, որի հաղորդակցական ոլորտում թաքնված է երկխոսա-
կան էվոյուցիան: Բանը, լեզվական արտահայտության ձգտելով, իբրև լեզվա-
կան նշան, պահպանում է ծագման նախասկզբի մետաֆիզիկական իմաստը:
Ուստի Աստվածաշնչի առանձին գրքերը, մասնավորապես ժողովրդի («Բանը
ժողովրդի») գիրքը ևս, գրավոր իր արտահայտությամբ, կարելի է անվանել նա-
խաբնագիր, որ արտահայտության և ձևի միասնության ձգտելով՝ պահպա-
նում է ծագման նախահիմքի իմաստը, շարժումը և նշանակությունը:

Сурен Абрамян

Доктор филологических наук, профессор
Института Литературы им. М. Абеяна НАН РА.

МУДРОСТЬ МУДРОСТЕЙ ИЛИ КНИГА ЕККЛЕСИАСТА

Ключевые слова.- Библия, Книга Екклесиаста, речь, язык, философия,
культура, литература, логос.

Вопрос о лингвистической экспертизе выражения «В начале было Слово...» имеет ключевое значение как исходная основа литературы. Этой языковой исходной основой обусловлено рукописи-созидательная энергия «слова», в чьей коммуникативной сфере лежит диалогическая эволюция. Речь, стремясь к языковому самовыражению, как языковой знак, сохраняет метафизический смысл начала происхождения. Поэтому отдельные книги Библии, особенно Книга Екклесиаста, тоже, своим письменным выражением, можно назвать прототипом, что, стремясь к единству выражения и формы, сохраняет смысл, движение и значение исходной основы.

Suren Abrahamyan

Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor,

Head of the Department of Modern Literature of the Institute of literature
after M. Abeghyan of NAS of RA.

WELL OF THE WISDOM OR THE PROVERBS OF SOLOMON

Keywords: Bible, Book of Ecclesiastes, speech, language, philosophy, culture, literature, logos.

This paper examines the biblical book “Proverbs of the Preacher” as a distinguished predecessor of the manuscript, which is elucidated from the perspective of the transformation of the writing, embodying meaning in symbols. Speech, our method of analysis is grounded on an interpretative basis, which includes such an “interpretive frame”, according to which the roots of speech induce unity of oral and written speech through deconstruction.

The problem would not have literary origin if the phrase “In the beginning was the Word...”¹ had not persecuted with its polymorphic perceptions of linguistic meanings. In the field of communication, in its “linguistic taboo” lies the energy of dialogical evolution, which seeks for expression. Meanwhile, it attains meaning and cognition and “interprets” (by decomposition) the one initiated by itself. Hence, what expresses the linguistic sign by “preserving” in itself the energy of the Platonic “eidos”, the Leibnizian “monad” strives for “linguistic consciousness”, which carries the verbal “origin”. In other words, the meaning evokes inside

¹ There will be mentioned only the chapters and their appropriate numbers from the Bible

ofit (in the language)being embodied in linguistic expression, comes to its form. However, it takes its roots from such a shape, which used to be “nothing”, and which meaning is nowhere, just preserved in itself...

Such a “structure” of speech (word) has its basis in literature, which can be called “predecessor of manuscripts”. Its manuscript-creating energy is always present, when the writer confronts the unity of meaning and form, which is accumulated based on experience; it evolves through writer’s depression and leads to such a form of “self-awareness”, that is broken by the manuscript-creating basis of the “predecessor”. Therefore, when meaning again seeks to be transformed from nothing into existence through the communion of speech, it derives to the unity of expression and form. It is the language in the ground of its creative taboo, that preserves the meaning of cognition and perception.

If this were not so, and this anxiety (of creation) did not exist forever, it would not be transformed from the existing oral practice into scripture, which is called the Book of Books, telling that “In the beginning was the Word...” and “I am the Alpha and the Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end” (Revelation 1:8 and 1:17)¹. And if we follow J. Derrida’s reference, it says: “There is only one Book, and the same Book is distributed among all the books” (Derrida 265). After revising the meaning of the Book we may understand that Logos carries generality by its unique meaning and it expresses the uniqueness through its multiple interpretations. Consequently, Logos is united by its induced and deduced “structure”. Thus, the processes of recognition (understanding) processes via two channels: abruption and supplementing. To summarize, let’s take Gadamer’s example, who analyzes the “interpretive frame” of cognition the following way: “Just as a single word is included in the whole sentence by mutual internal connection, so an individual text is included in its context - in the writer’s work” (72-73). On the other hand, according to G. Schleiermacher, the writer’s work is a system of genre realizations that “belongs to the spiritual life of the writer” (qtd. in Gadamer 73). The process of its analysis leads to the recognition of the structure, or rather its “center (nucleus)” (Ditey). But if there is no dialogic abruption based on

1 We can specify bishop Hakob Ghnchyan’s article entitled “Kohelet or Proverbs of the Preacher” published in “Sion” journal of January -June 2000, which provides detailed information about the discussed topics based on spiritual fathers’ works and from the Hebrew Talmud.

mutually conditioned and contradictive inner meaning, then the Logos is split. In that case, there is “someone else” present in the dialogic voice, which is the communication, whom the interpreter addresses and perceives with recognition. Therefore, Logos is always stressed and self-contained in “the interpretive frame”, as there is a multiplicity of meanings, such as in the example of “In the beginning was the Word...”. Logos contains a totality of meaning in which paradox (contradiction) dominates and reappears in a novel course of meaning through time. Consequently, the “textual nucleus” is split by itself, and the word, the image, and all the textual units in general, grow from a “historical” symbol into an allegorical metaphor in the process of movement. The abruption on “the interpretive frame” of metascript is searching the new meaning, which is illustrated by Charents’ writings. It seeks the unfinished and metaphorical combination of the answer to a direct dialogic question in the biblical “Proverbs of Solomon”, in the explosion of its “interpretive frame” in the semantic Charents’ perception, in “Delirium” written in 1935, then in “Ecclesiastes” (Charents 96-98). Charents directly refers to the metascripts by calling his writing as “Ecclesiastes”, which is the translation of the Hebrew word “Kohelet” in the Septuagint and means assembly, gathering. According to Hieronymus (1st century), this means Preacher (Glnchyan 116). Thus, there are many names, such as “Proverbs of Solomon”, “Book of Kohelet”, “Book of the Preacher”, etc. In this case, Charents is looking for the “starting point” of wisdom, which was hidden in the fatal meaning of the word, in its end. The poet illustrates his writing via “gentility” word in “Ecclesiastes”, by pointing out a “toothless person, whose skull resembles a monkey”, that mocked him, “distilled poison in his chest”.

This fateful “meeting” of the End and the Beginning, which takes place at the border of the Charents’ “sunset”... crossing the border (the poet) comes up with an appeal to the Limitless (the nation), whose time cannot be distinguished from “the song of the path”. Moreover, he rereads the Process in the context of its wisdom and unity of “speech” while moving towards it. The path that endowed the poet with the “abundance” of feelings to recognize the whirlwind of life, to drink the cup of bitterness with the pleasure of the heart, which is called passion, pleasure, joy, bitterness, hatred and love; no longer satisfies in a moment of wisdom

and self-awareness. The moment of fleeting life is absorbed, is looking for meaning. The smile of the “Monkey-like skull” shines everywhere pointlessly. As if his inner demon had come out against him, he smiled questioningly, which means: the mystery of existence is unsolvable in this transitory vain life, and a sage’s eternal torment is in vain. Therefore, a man and a “monkey” are opposed with a poetic paradoxical reference. And “the monkey”, which is the alias of the Logos, charms the poet mockingly, because it is the creative beginning of wisdom - inaccessible, “not approaching” the Process.

And, charming with “tenderness” every “moment”, he mocks sage’s wisdom, calls the poet with the mockery of his “face” by defining “Vanity of vanities! Everything is meaningless” (Ecclesiastes 1:2), and commenting on what Charents said, it is reawakened again with a dialogical reference:

The same sadness of existence
Looks through the eyes of the Preacher (as people said)
Down to the last ape, the pre human, an ant,
Till every breathing creature...(Charents 98)

Charents, like the Preacher(Solomon), speaks in the first person by reading the “sadness of existence” via re-reading the smile of the monkey, his mockery, also his life, suffering, fate in general. Although the eventful time of his life transformed into the Logos in the chaos of cosmic “travel”, it is empty and extinguished. However, the infinite union of *Proverbs of Solomonis* intertwined, in it and through it, it goes on through centuries by transgressing all the limits of wisdom and unmasking both the nature, its creatures and humans, which exist in time if the Logos transforms them into existence. And Proverbs...” itself is an eternal existence, which does not act as just a creature, but a creative power giving breath to the Logos itself, not the other way around...

The mystery of Charents’ life is interpretation of wisdom, process, and progress. The poet, “who lived forty-one springs” and preserved the silence transforming into “speech” in the expression, is interrupted in Logos by fate, echoing in the “The prayer of the mount”, in the paramount of Narek’s references, in “The book of Path” generally, that faded away... in “The song of sunset”.

However, due to transformations of their unlimited meanings, the past and the living mocked with a smile everything, which is meaningless, and dual, which cognition ... of ignorance is interpreted by Chartents via the term "delusion", which includes the infinite wisdom of rationality - full of sparks of life and "sadness" of existence.

Chanents' "The book of the Path", with its historical experience and induction of wisdom, transfers to P.Sevak. The literary anxiety, that was expressed in his article entitled as "Pros and cons the foundations of realism", is "linguistic" anxiety firstly. This is interpreted in such a consistent formula of quests' of poetic forms and expressions, that causes the time to reach its transformations of existence, or it carries the time in its "nucleus" with a compound and concurrent process of complexity. And the references that are defined as pure "bases of realism" are not the theories of "realism" from a classical point of view. Rather, they are syntheses of attempts of classical experiments, that have the only background as creative "speech" which transforms into the culture. Therefore, its meaning should have "dictational-mnemonic" "structure", penetrate into "intrapersonal" spheres of the spirit, interpret via term of "spiritual practice, saying" that is such a layer of cognition, that "sees things, which need to be seen, and looks at the directions, where it is necessary..." (Sevak 191 - 192). Therefore, time is not monophonic from the perception of cognitive - spiritual point of view, but it is polyphonic, a complex symphony, that reaches its recognition of meaning in the "spirit", since "besides the heart and mind we have one more thing, which is the venue of the previous two and is called spirit or soul " (Sevak 191).

Therefore, "the basis" carries the breath of Logos to express the spirit of the time. Then, transforming it into a "poetic non-poetic", that contains the rhythm of the speech via its "nucleus of saying and does not have "lyrical" structure (the synonyms are "fairy-tales", "beautiful lies", "theatrical literature"). Instead, it is a "hilarious science" that is based on the term of "scientific ignorance". This means "the end of scholastics", the eternal law of "the immutability": "laws can be modified based on the necessity" "to reach nature" (based on the relationships of causes and consequences) and have a "point of view" (just from philosophical perspectives, cognitive- S.A.) (Sevak 200-202).

To summarize, the poet "follows" the law of Logos, to the everything

that is alive and life-giving, has biblical “basis”, that revokes in its metascript through the “law” of refracted light and re-creates Sevak’s “works” by contemporary synthesis of the induction of speech such as “The three-voice liturgy”, “The song of songs”, “The unceasing bell tower”, etc.

Of course, Charents’ and Sevak’s poetry, with the basis of appropriation, goes towards the Middle Ages, the creative sphere of the Logos, which is not divided within the system, is a living entity, exists in time and is existent.

Therefore, the internal illumination of the Logos in unity is directed towards modernity itself, within the unified system of which the historical practices and the new approaches proceed in such a relationship, that causes to assimilation and expansion of the scope. Hence, although the intertwining of “the same” and “another” enlarges the volume of the scope, they are the same parts of the system that were divided historically and is still interrelated to each other. Therefore, the most important thing is not the scale of the scope but the unity of its “laws” of existence inside the system (this is formed by the opposition of the term “same”), by which, as Sevak said (borrowed from Chernyshevsky), outlines the borders of “dialectics of the soul”, proceeding and reconciling by the law of motion through history, and within which (system) motion itself predetermines the meaning. On the whole, only the form is changeable by its rate of expression, but the meaning is eternal.

Based on this, we can say that from the Middle Ages to the Sevak’s times the scope of the system is illuminated by the meaning of “the same” and by the nature of the movement of the form. To illustrate this point it is worth noticing that the speech transforms from Narekatsy to Sevak by striving to metascript, colliding with the rhythm of modernity and “splitting” by its gravity. Being different in terms of genre and nature (novel, lyrical, dramatic), it can be called as “Book...” (Narekatsy), “Song” or “Letter” (remember Parpetsi’s “Letter”, Charents’ “Letter... to comrid N.N” and A. Harutyunyan’s “Letter to Noah”, etc.). So, the text “occurs” and lives by the law of creation within this system (abstractly expressed), crystallizing itself as a unity (both within the creative system of the same author and the whole literary process or history...).

B

The question of the interpretation of the text and its “basis” is impossible without the inclusion and analysis of the “predecessor of manuscripts”, which is called “Proverbs of Solomon” in the Bible. In general, this (and not only this) Biblical Book(s) are the integration of the “literal” authority and oral expression that includes the unity of literature in the essence of “foundations”.

Inherently, the term “union” interprets the circle that is united with literature by the connection of its “foundations” and genealogy with all the elements of poetics analyzed in the system (genre, gender, structure, etc.). Hence, *Proverbs of Solomon* is unique in the process of verbal and pre-script perception of the meaning of the word, that is the creator of both Logos and script. However, this Biblical Book, has a little distance from the others (“The Song of songs” too), though the theological interpretation, that corresponds to the text, is based on God’s authority and his knowledge, which is the beginning of everything by revelation and is the condition of presence of fear, anxiety, which precedes writing (the reproduction of the text by writing, which is the continuation of revelation). But our goal is not the question of its theological interpretation, rather, how the text illuminates its meaning by transforming into writing in Logos, or how the writing illuminates the meaning itself. It is alive with communication in its “conservative” form - as a speech or language, in the same symbolic structure - polyphonic and polysemous. Lastly, it is alive and life-giving so that it illuminates itself and other texts by the union, it lives in such a presence, that the “conversion” to its “nucleus” of meaning and creation is permanent, which is embodied in the statement “Vanity of vanities! Everything is meaningless.”

Proverbs of Solomon is a Book of the way of millennia, and if we define it in terms of “effective historical consciousness”, then it should refer to the “spiritual experience (inheritance)” of its history. But “the effective historical consciousness” creates such a structure of “cultural-historical space” in which we “appear” every time. Hence, the definition of “effective history” is a transformation of inheritance in which, particularly, a given cultural society lives and ensures its vitality (Gadamer 340). So, as we may notice, the “structure” is the creative standard that preserves the heritage in terms of the “Proverbs of Solomon” that is historical in “every moment”

and reawakens, enlightening itself through consciousness. The creative consciousness or cognitive-intelligence can be only linguistic. Similarly, language is the consciousness or is interrelated to it. It is transformed by petrification in the course of history, as a sign of the language-union and has meaning via the revelation only. This proceeds in the process of recognizing its foundation, i.e. accepting the preceding being because it (the being) is the primary and enlightening, that if we consider the term of interpretation in the operation of “power”, is integrated into the creation (and before reaching it “we all... we are damned savages”) (Derrida 256). Therefore, “power”, which is “the tension of forces”, grows into consciousness overcoming the historical structure in its fossilized linguistic form (Derrida stated that this is a “reflection of past, what happened, what was built”, which means not only form, relationship, configuration, but also...the presence unity...) (Derrida 258-259).

Moreover, by overcoming the “power” which is the expression of the sovereign form of the language, the structure gains meaning through modification of act (Greece meaning is energy, objective reality) that carries the “interpretive meaning” of the Proverbs.

The evenful is absorbed “inside” the saying by the time course of the movement of the structure, transforming the speech into a proverb. It is the course of the inner movement of its meaning, that guides cognition through self-illumination (Gadamer says “natural light”) towards theological and philosophical meanings, which makes the question of the interpretation of the Proverbs so controversial. This is no coincidence that even the interpreters of this book, the authors of various philological studies, argued not only about the question of authorship, whether it is canonical or not, but also the time of editing, and the issues of influence - and the conclusions about them are not completely clear to this day¹.

The question is not merely the fact that the philological method is ineffective, although many problems already have certain solutions, the question is in the “interpretive frame” and the evaluation of cognition. As Gadamer notes, “the goal of every cognition (understanding) is to reach a complete agreement, that’s why we communicate with each other” (Gadamer 73). Therefore, communication is a “method” of knowing the truth through dialogue that takes place “within” the text (between the interpreter of the text). For example, according to F. Schleiermacher,

pure objective interpretation, is a “grammatical” interpretation and is preferable to a “psychological” (or “technical”) method of analysis. If the above-mentioned problem refers to the question of the author and his environment (which is theoretical for the compiler’s solution) and according to which the text is interpreted, then the “grammatical method” is applied by means of the “comparative” method when the same and different meanings of words (speech) are compared within the text aiming to recognize their meanings in the given context (Gadamer 346). This process of opposition and inner movement, which is also typical for “identical” sayings from *Proverbs* (for example, the noun “vanity” is repeated 38 times), if we analyze it according to the course of its breakthrough and inner illumination, then... it is possible to have a purely literal (with the meaning of script) perception of it. But, before its “complete” recognition through definition, which we can achieve in the system of analysis of the question of philosophical and cultural influences, we should note that... experiencing God’s revelatory breath “immersed” in the Logos, we are “followed” by anxiety and fear of incapacity, spoken not by the words of the lips but of the heart. Hence, faced with its “meaning”, we adopt “alienating” to read only its speech as the culture.

Otherwise, the convergence and assimilation to the sage’s wisdom and the source of the Speech is not under the human being’s power, but it is only... a ritual of accepting the communion and living through His authority and not... recognizing it.

C

Proverbs of Solomon is a late Hebrew book that belongs to the literary genre called “chokma” (wisdom). According to the title its authorship is given to David’s son – King Solomon. According to philologists, Solomen the Wise is considered to be the author of the Proverbs due to its writing and distribution time (from the fifth to third century B.C.), as Hebrew was no longer a spoken language by 400 B.C. The dominating language was Aramaic. There are also borrowings from Persian in the Proverbs (e.g. “partez”- պարտեզ, which means garden in Armenian, “pitgam”- պիտգամ, which means commandment in Armenian). From the fragments of the Proverbs found in the cave of Qumran, it can be seen that it was already accepted as a canonical book in the 2nd century.

Doubts have been expressed in the later Middle Ages regarding both the authorship and the association with scriptural canons. In the 1st century, the Jewish poet Ibn Ezra expressed doubts about the Proverbs belonging to Solomon the Wise. Martin Luther (15th-16th century) also expressed the same doubt. A dispute between the two groups of theologians began and continues nowadays: one part defends the Solomonic authorship of the book, another part thinks that it is the work of a later period, and by virtue of the authority of the title, it entered into the canon of Scripture and was preserved from loss.

Christians never doubt the validity of the Proverbs, though it has no references in the New Testament. Church fathers often refer to the content of the Proverbs since the first century. The only exception is Theodore of Mopsuestia, who denied the Proverbs' authority in the minutes of the cosmic assembly at Constantinople in 553. He claims the Proverbs are outcomes of the human mind and have no connection to God's inspiration¹. Different points of view were expressed in the Jewish Mishnah (the oldest part of the Talmud) and in the Babylonian Talmud. On the one hand, the first source mentions that Proverbs are "dictated by the Holy Spirit" and "is not imbrued by hands" (Tosefta Jagagim 2, 14). On the other hand, the second source argues by pointing out "contradictions of (authors) own words" (Talmud Babli, Schabbat 30b) (Glnchyan 126). The denial of the canons of Kohelet was done by Pharisees, which explains the "denial", as, in contrast to them, Solomon condemned materialism, denied the immortality of the soul, did not recall the Mosaic Law, never referred to God by the name "Jehovah"...

However, based on the data of the above-mentioned philological research, the "interpretive frame" shows the edge of its historical perception to the extent that it is similar to the system of naturalization, by which is conditioned by the mystery of the unity of meaning. It is impossible not to include the question of literary relations in this question, which implies the idea of a combination of texts. The book (*Proverbs of Solomon*), as we have seen, was edited in the Hellenic period, although Greek influences are minimal. So, one can discuss the influence of the earlier Egyptian and Sumero-Babylonian eras, especially when such research is attempted by analytics of the Proverbs. If the question is

¹ This and the following notes are given based on bishop Hakob Glnchyan's article entitled "Kohelet or Preacher's Book" published in "Sion" journal (January -June 2000).

related to purely philosophical (aesthetic) relations in the case of Greek influence, and there are some elements of the world knowledge of Epicureans and Stoics in the Proverbs, then the relationship of Sumerian-Babylonian literature is “direct”. There is a writing in Babylonian literature called “Ludlul bēl nēmeqi (translated as “I praise the lord of wisdom”). It was edited in B.C. 16-12th centuries and was known to the peoples of the Middle East in the 7th century. Theologians also note that the author of the Proverbs was familiar with the Sumerian Epos of Gilgamesh and that there are some similar passages of the text. Gilgamesh, who seeks immortality, is urged by Shenkin to enjoy life because the Gods have decreed death for humans. A similar meaning of words is echoed in the Proverbs, which is a message to overcome the anxiety of death and pessimism, and says, “Come, eat your bread with joy and drink your wine with a joyful heart, because God has already approved your works. May your clothes always be white, and may the oil on your head be perfect. Enjoy life with the woman you love for all the days of your fleeting life that God has given you under the sun” (Ecclesiastes 7-9). If we compose each part of the Proverbs with “fragments” (as Sevak says), then the text turns into a poetic line. Therefore, it has a (creative) structure, the rhythm of which is the expression of the “foundation” of the speech, a complex harmony of the thinking process, which is interpreted with the elements of poetics.

Hence, it has a dialogic structure in this purely literary sense, that is clarified by the characters of aesthetic perception. Thereby, if the “dialogic” is formed in the process of event perception, which is a verbal unit, it means “turning to where the happened and the happening is “simultaneous” states” (this is interpreted not as “event” in Heidegger and Gadamer’s analysis, but on the edge of its historical course (which “is in the process of fulfilment, is not finished in time and carries the possibility of it”) (Gadamer 347).

Therefore, the saying “Vanity of vanities!” is the constructive and meaning-bearing (simultaneous) unit in the Proverbs. It is “eventful” in time. Therefore, it is “divisive” and “dialectical” in speech (by which it is alive and life-giving). Thus, it is necessary to “interpret” the meaning in it (in the Logos), which is eventful, and the purely rational appears in the aesthetic and philosophical system. We mentioned above that philologists

see a connection between the Proverbs and the philosophical systems of the Epicureans, the Stoics, and also materialists. The saying of the Proverbs is broken and so spatially distributed that its “solution” seems impossible even for aesthetics (only the reliability of the theological interpretation remains).

But the question is about the “universality” of the Proverbs’ statement: the scope of its meaning can be decomposed in materialism (Epicureans of Abdera’s school), or in the universal aesthetics (which is in the teaching of the Stoics), or in the perspective of academics, ordinary scholastics and those philosophies that tend to examine logical, scientific and the entirety of friendly matters.

Therefore, while applying the meaning of the saying “Vanity of vanities!...” directly (from Herbeu’s “Hebel hebelim”, which means mild wind), abstractly, it describes the unimportant and transient nature of a phenomenon. Therefore, “nothing” is eventful and it contains an entity of the Speech, which can be interpreted as “existence”. Hegel writes in the book “Philosophical Introduction”: “The Nothing is existence and thanks to its purity, it is just like the same existence, as is the first” (Edoyan 436). So, the saying confirms the integrity of “existence”, which is an expression of Speech embodied by an event, which is the meaning, that is a creation and a creature. And it is the meaning and the form according to its “pre-” meaning, a way in which everything arises. Hegel reaffirms: “Therefore, there is no difference between existence and nothing. The only fact is that there are claimed to be different, which causes their disappearance of them due to contradiction – purity” (Hegel 221).

Thus, if the saying has a time “plot”, in which it exists (through contrast) as “purity”, it is an expression of itself, that finds its meaning in the Logos and through time. Therefore, the circular process, which is the part of “interpretative frame” of the proverbs, is the existence and the meaning at the same time. Hence, by analysing its structure, we can notice that it transforms into the generic structure from genre perspectives (at the verbal level), which has a rhythm of a philosophical poem and keeps inner “dialogic” and dialectic flexibility. From this point of view, the saying summarizes everything in the aspect of continuous events, it “describes” life in the “plot” of experimentations and presents the evolution of modifications of its interpretations. Therefore, it contains

both the question and the answer, which are inseparable from each other, like life and death. In this regard, Bakhtin explains this phenomenon the following way: “Dialectics are born from dialogue to return to the dialogue again at a higher level (individuals’ dialogue)” (Bakhtin 364). Thus, the “interpretation frame” is endless and goes to “its new cycle”, as a pure cognition of life (in time evolution process) by preserving the infinity of the saying of the Proverb.

From the perspectives of the book structure, the book of Proverbs follows the law of Logos, as it has 12 chapters and a clear “structural framework”.

The first chapter clarifies the meaning of life (by contrasting “clarity” and “meaningless” according to the Proverbs). It refers to the deputy. This is titled as “Life is pointless”, and it (the meaning) includes other chapter titles that have a general title “Philosopher’s Experience”, in which the revelation is explained by the “philosopher”. So, analyzing life and its phenomena, he comes to the recognition of its phenomenon in time, because “everything has its time”, and “Everything ends with death”. The existence, anchored in a lifetime, searching its meaning of the existence of happiness, wealth, love, power, youth, glory, work by which is alienated from itself because everything is vain. Moreover, “injustices in social life” are eternal, so wisdom is the only cognition, the key to “salvation” and the art, which is converted to the meaning of “same” (“purity”) in the Proverbs, which declares again: “Everything is meaningless!”. However, from the “positive” or purely philosophical points of view, the Proverbs advise meaningful suggestions, that are entitled “Wise counsels”. These can be interpreted as statements of “pure cognition” based on the inner cognition of Logos, those are illuminated via terms of contradiction, and are similar to the suggestions that were derivated from the above-mentioned system (life is meaningless; the philosopher’s experience; everything has its time; everything finds its end with death, injustices in social life). Therefore, the Proverbs surpass the creative “higher” level of the Logos (Bakhtin mentioned as the “dialogue of individuals”) by preaching “not to make reckless promises”, “wealth is useless”, “it is wise to obey the king” and that it is better to “be fair, than contentious,” as that is the way to reach the wisdom. Therefore, the Proverbs “answers” the question “what does a wise man do?” via referencing the Speech:

“Cast your bread upon the waters, for after many days you will find it again.” (Ecclesiastes 11:1). Moreover, everything is examined based on the wisdom of “the heart” by claiming that “He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver...” (Ecclesiastes 5:9), “A good name is better than precious ointment” (Ecclesiastes 7:2), “It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house of feasting...” (Ecclesiastes 7:3), “Do not be rash with your mouth, and let not your heart utter anything hastily before God” (Ecclesiastes 5:1), as the Preacher has acquired the wisdom and knowledge by patience and merit. Hence, he says: “So I became great and surpassed all who were before me in Jerusalem... And I gave my heart to know wisdom, advice and proverbs. I perceived that this also is vexation of spirit, as for in much wisdom is much grief: and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow” (Ecclesiastes 1:16-18). If the fable is a “simple” allegory of speech “interpretation frame”, which is what Jesus does when he tells the fable of the wheat and the tares, then the meaning of *chokma* (wisdom) is complex, “covered” by the proverbial condensations in the Logos, which perceives time in synthesis. The meaning appears through the paradigm shifts, in which the Logos seems “taboo” and by recognizing its “taboo” (linguistically) we arrive again (at the textual level) at another “infinity” that carries the unlimitedness of its meaning.

Although the “integrated” sayings of the Proverbs have a structural clarity, which is conceived in the context of a “spiritual story talk”, the text is written in the first person (according to philological research, there is an intervention by the editor in preface and conclusion, and the Preacher addresses in these cases in the third person). Therefore, ultimately, the speech also becomes a means of “illustrating” from which it (from the self) originates, and then it assimilates with “another-second self” by dialogue. Generally, this process represents life with its temporal and eventful infinite sense. Therefore, the Logos tries multiple options: on one hand, it strives to enlighten (recognize) the essence of life in the philosophical and subjective meanings with a paradigm shift, which proceeds with Epicurean “renunciation”, on the other hand, it chooses “living according to nature” based on Stoic moral understandings. After, it expresses such a perception of the identity of existence that is limited by death. According to the Preacher, “Wherefore I perceive that there is

nothing better, than that a man should rejoice in his own works; for that is his portion: for who shall bring him to see what shall be after him?" (Ecclesiastes 3:22).

Hence, the finite world, in which the infinite edge is the God (vanity himself) and is unrecognizable ultimately, by striving to recognize him, his nature, decomposed his unity by the Logos. Based on this, the wise become wiser, but neither people's suffering nor greediness decreases, which would give opportunities to enjoy the knowledge more that can the Logos provide, to reduce the suffering that is predefined for man "under this sun". Hence, the Author is a "poet" (gifted with Speech), who decomposed the unity of creation and the Logos, which reflection revokes inside the poet and the poesy via transformation of spiritual experience, as its sound of perception, its rhythm. This process eternalizes the time of existence, making the being ... be alive...

Charents' and Sevak's predecessor, H. Tumanyan, was able to "entice" the cosmic sound in the massive echoes of the same (the Logos), which is so thick in his quartets: they have succinct form, volumetric meaning, and tend to the "infinity..." in poems and poesy. As deep emphasises the poet to people's faith (transient and historic), the issues of human- nature relationships in the God's world, as he becomes thoughtful and wise, like Solomon, and notices prudently:

You are an unknown poet, overlooked until today.

You create songs without words with bright views.

Suppose, I'm a lucky and amazed reader,

Who reads those songs so easily and so deeply. (Tumanyan 32)

However, the poet's soul "is an traveller in the endless universe", having the wisdom of the Preacher, "knows that he knows nothing" (Socrates), because "how can you know the Creator's unsearchable secrets?" Even the Logos, which is insatiable, longing, is "powerless" to consume (by living) the "vanity", which has no limit in the universe. Thus, "the poets lure and elapse" remains in the echo of the Speech, in its sound, which is imperfect in the eternal path of reaching the paramount of wisdom:

Every time You take something from what You gave,

Every time, when I look at how much is still left,

Oh the Generous, I wonder, that You gave to me too much,

That I ought to return so much when we again reunion. (Tumanyan 50)

...The Preacher and the Poet go to the bottomless (toward its limit), calls to “lure the happy sources and elapse”, to preserve the “vanity” of existence in the “silence” of the Logos, towards which our literature goes. It “incarnates” the Speech of our identity, which is destiny and a mystery at the same time, created by Narekatsy’s “luminousness”, Tumanyan’s wisdom, Charents’ reliving, Sevak’s “enlightenment” exploration of “preliminary bases” ... and...

Բ. Գ. Պ., պրոֆ. Սուրեն Աբրահամյան.- գիտական հետաքրքրությունների շրջանակը հայ նորագույն գրականության, քննադատության և տեսության հարցերն են: Գիտական մամուլում հրապարակել է հարյուր երեսուևից ավելի հոդված, աշխատություն և երեք մենագրություն: Գիտական երկերի առաջին հատորը՝ «Տեքստ և բնագիր»(2010) և «Արդի հայ պոեզիայի գեղարվեստական համակարգը»(2020), արժանացել են Նիկոլ Աղբալյանի անվան մրցանակին գրականագիտության գծով:

Доктор филологических наук, профессор Сурен Абрамян: Сферой научных исследований являются вопросы современной армянской литературы, критики и теории. Первый том научных трудов “Текст и оригинал” (2010 г.) и “Художественная система современной армянской поэзии” (2020 г.) удостоены премии Никола Агбальяна в области литературоведения.

Ph.D. and Professor Suren Abrahamyan: The sphere of scientific research is the issues of contemporary Armenian literature, criticism and theory. The first volume of scientific works “Text and Original” (2010) and the other “The Artistic System of Modern Armenian Poetry” (2020) were awarded the Nikol Aghbalyan Prize in Literary Studies.

References

1. Bakhtin, Mikhail [Бахтин, Михаил].*Эстетика словесного творчества*. [Aesthetics of verbal creativity] Москва, Art, 1979.
2. *The Bible* [Աստվածաշունչ], Sn.Echmiadzin,1994
3. Charents, Yeghishe [Չարենց, Եղիշե]. *Անսով և չհավաքված երկեր* [Atypical and uncollected writings]. Yerevan, RSR NA Publisher, 1983.

4. Derrida, Jacques [Դերիդա, Ժակ]. «Ուժը և նշանակությունը»[“Power and Importance”]. Translated by Astghik Simonyan, *Literary journal*, vol.1 Yerevan, 2004, pp. 256- 276.
5. Edoyan, Henrik [Էդոյան, Հենրիկ]. *Չարենցի պոետիկան* [Charents' poetics]. Yerevan, YerevanUniverityPress.,1986.
6. Gadamer, Hans-Georg [Гадамер, Ганс-Георг]. *Актуальность прекрасного*. [The Relevance of the Beautiful]. Moskow, Art. 1991.
7. Ghnchyan, Hakob [Գըլնճեան, Հակոբ]. «Կոհեւէրէ կամ Գիրք ժողովրդի».[“Kohelet or Preacher's Book”]. Jerusolim. *Sion*, vol.74, num 1-6. 2000, pp. 116-135.
8. Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich [Հեգել, Ջորջ Վիլհելմ Ֆրիդրիխ]. *Փիլիսոփայական պրեպտերաթիկա* [The philosophical propaedeutic]. Երևան.1964.
9. Sevak, Paruyr [Սևակ, Պարույր]. *Երկեր* [Writings]. 3rd ed., Yerevan, Sovetic writers' publish.,1983.
10. Tumanyan, Hovhannes [Թումանյան, Հովհաննես]. *Երկեր, հտ 2* [Writings, vol.2]. Yerevan, 1991.