

Romanian literary critics, theoreticians, and historians in the world

LIBUŠA VAJDOVÁ

In national historiographies, the inclusion of exile literature is still subject to the concept of the traditional background. This means that it is based on the convention of a unified language, ethnic group, and territory, stemming from the French identity model of *État-Nation* that was adopted by European cultures in the 18th and 19th centuries. This principle also serves as the basis for another function of the national language: it is the only one that can provide the means of expression for national literature.

On the other hand, the events of the 20th century and transition to the new millennium are showing us that cultural reality does not conform to this model. Moreover, the models of globalisation, world literature, and post-colonial studies that came widely into use in recent years challenge the limitations of the single national language principle (monolingualism) in our present world and highlight the problem in studies of the cultural processes in the past. In reality no literature's national language was fully identical to its community and throughout history its functions would often be taken over by various foreign languages. While one cannot deny all legitimacy to the national-literary concept, it still needs to be said that to remain in its embrace means to deform the cultural past and future. The lingering vestiges cause paradoxical problems; for example, by creating a disconnect between what is today considered as the literature of certain historical unit and the accepted treatment of it by the literary history. The effect is as if the language was not the expression of the same comprehensive cultural, almost anthropological situation like all other cultural realities, but something given from above.

MONOLINGUALISM AND MULTILINGUALISM IN LITERATURE

In 2013 the Institute of World Literature at the Slovak Academy of Sciences published a book by Katarína Bednárová, *Dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku I.: od sakrálneho k profánnemu* (The History of Artistic Translation in Slovakia I.: From the Sacral to the Profane), dealing with the history of translation in Slovakia. This work maps in detail the traces of foreign literatures and cultures in Slovakia, not only through translations into the national language, but also by working up a comprehensive understanding of the point of view of a single national literature and its language. By also accepting foreign languages as a means of expression of the given

national literature, it was still able to succeed in distinguishing various and quite different forms within the Slovak language itself. At first glance, it would seem that it is an exceptional situation that might apply only to Slovakia. However, upon closer examination of literatures worldwide we find that it would also be possible quote examples from (besides what are now extremely relevant works from Africa, India, and Asia) other literatures from Central and South-Eastern Europe. Hence, for example, Romanian literature is not too distant from its Slovak counterpart in terms of its geography, type, and language situation.

Alongside the Romanian language used by the ethnically Romanian population, during the history of this cultural environment several other languages were used as a medium for documents and literature: the sacral Old Slavonic language was used in the written culture of a sacred and sometimes also secular nature (the Bible, liturgy and psalters, court and legal documents, annals, chronicles and anonymous memoirs); Turkish and other Near Eastern languages were used throughout the Ottoman Empire (commerce and diplomacy); Latin was prominent in the 18th century in the works of Enlightenment intellectuals in Transylvania; the Greek language was used in the 18th century as the language of the Enlightenment-inspired school system in the Wallachian and Moldavian principalities; and finally, French was a universal language for the first generation of Romanian romantics. Under these influences, various forms of Romanian language developed throughout history. Another important factor is also that all written documents, literary works, poetry, grammar books, etc. written in the Romanian language before 1862 utilised the Cyrillic alphabet transcripts, which also had its effect upon the character of the language.

It is evident that multilingualism among the cultures of Central and South-Eastern Europe is a common, almost banal reality. However, it is banal only from their point of view, since the West European cultures, ruled for centuries by monolingualism, only started to pose more complex questions about language and identity more recently. They were forced to do so by the reality of the globalised world, in which the emerging field of post-colonial studies discovered multilingualism, not only in distant cultures of the globe or the other end of Europe (for example, on the occasion of the Balkan conflict), but also inside their own ostensibly monolingual units. We could, of course, look to the migrant, underground, popular urban, and even the hypermedia literatures, but there are also the original historical literatures of separated regions, state units, and culturally differing zones that were subsequently absorbed into larger political entities in Western Europe (Brittany, Occitania, the Gaelic areas in England, Catalonia, etc.). Hence, multilingualism and plurilingualism became the subject of various disciplines: linguistics, theory of translation, history of literature and comparative literature studies in the humanities, and sociology, anthropology, cultural pragmatism, political science, and many others in the social sciences and elsewhere. This is the reason for establishing comparative literature departments, where these and related issues can be discussed (Eugen Coseriu, Haun Saussy, Maria Tymoczko, Edwin Gentzler, Claudio Guillén and others). We cannot ignore the impact of studies and publications on this topic originating in culturally pluralistic European countries (Belgium, Luxembourg, Britain) – which these days arise in conformity with speci-

fic EU integration strategies – and we must also pay attention to the decolonisation movement in cultural studies in the USA and elsewhere. The issue was also addressed by article written by Belgian translation scientist Dirk Delabastita, who co-authored the article *Introduction. Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation* with Rainier Gruttman (2005).

Practically every country has experienced transfers of population to foreign parts of the world: this could be said to be a demonstration of 20th-century culture, which came about as a consequence of often remote factors and changes from the past. However, it begs the question: can the history of specific literatures still be written from traditional standpoints? How should different types of cultural spaces be included within such a history's purview? Or should we consider matters only from the point of view of world literature? How to capture the different and often contradictory aspects of a literature, which is created in a different context?

In the Romanian context, regrettably, research into intellectuals' exile (or migration, diaspora and other forms of living and writing in other countries) does not ask similar questions. It remains hostage to the traditional national concept of literature linked with monolingualism, and it is still categorised as literature written in the national language, even if the authors happened to have lived abroad. In that case, the simplest approach has been to treat the exile literature through separate individual studies or captions in encyclopaedias composed in the spirit of the monolingual/national language principle, and this was the approach adopted by the mainstream of Romanian literary criticism and history. Therefore, works by Romanian authors written in exile outside Romania are often not allowed to be incorporated into the canon of Romanian literature. This was the case with Herta Müller, who writes in German now but originally came from Romania, and who was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 2009 for her works. This event generated a lively discussion in Romania in which some of the debating parties confirmed that they do not consider Herta Müller to be a Romanian writer and said that her Nobel Prize has nothing to do with their literature. There were also those who insisted that the Nobel Prize was to be awarded to another Romanian writer, Norman Manea, who also lives in exile in the USA, but who writes his novels in Romanian. The coining and use of such an expressive word as “nobelabilitatea”¹ just for the purpose of evaluating who might be Nobel-able (suitable for being awarded the Nobel Prize) and who is not, is a very telling symptom. Doesn't such a discussion just reproduce the well-known stereotypes?

Naturally, this opinion on Müller's case could not be considered as the only valid one. There are many different points of view expressed in a wide range of articles and books of authors such as Monica Spiridon, Mircea Anghelescu, and others. In addition to this, a long-term process of re-evaluation of Romanian writers and their literary works from the outside is creating new perspectives of study.

FORMS OF WRITING AND CREATING IN EXILE

During the history of Romanian culture there were several waves of emigration abroad, although those most often mentioned are the last two from the 20th century. Even if we are inclined to mainly study the 20th-century exile and migration proce-

esses, we should also acknowledge exile waves from earlier periods; e.g., from the 17th and 18th centuries, when Romanian intellectuals were departing for foreign parts due to the threats of repression by the Ottoman Empire. Some of them quite succeeded in the European context, such as Nicolae Milescu Spătarul and Dimitrie Cantemir.² However, even in their case is it not so clear if their works written in Latin or in Greek can be considered as a part of the Romanian national heritage, so it seems that there is no difference between the early and the new waves of exile from the 20th century as concerns the authors' inclusion in the history of Romanian literature. Multilingual or foreign language works, be they literary, scholarly, or cultural, are reflecting cultural processes of the past when the function of the national language was taken over by various foreign languages (historically, of course, the classical ones). Even if it seems to be superfluous to mention the past periods in this study on the 20th-century Romanian exile literature, current opinions could be fruitfully inspired and enlarged by the previous multilingual and multicultural understanding of writing.

Emigrant or exile works can be viewed in different ways. Usually they are considered in opposition to domestic literary works of the so-called national literature, but in reality they form part of a separate cultural and social phenomenon, which includes a number of historical and psychological aspects from both contexts, the new and the old ones. If we look closer at the cultural life and activities developed by groups of the same origin in different cultural and language environments we realise how this life is varied and intensive. It is surprising how many institutions, publications, associations, and individual people participate in this milieu. Nobody has yet addressed this aspect of exile in detail, because it represents a hidden background.³ Hundreds of magazines and associations abroad are serving the communities of exiles, not only for communication or entertainment purposes, but also for building their own identity as they interface with a alien cultural environment. Sometimes it appears as if in parallel with the Romanian cultural set there was another separate set being created abroad. Since these magazines, associations and unions remain in touch with the native Romanian environment and maintain contacts among themselves abroad, while at the same time being shaped by their multilingual and multicultural environment, it appears that even if they seemed to walk the line of being different and promoting a unique identity, they were actually creating type of abstract plurality model for Romanian culture. They all feel that they are participating in the original Romanian literature and culture, while in fact representing the intercultural model of Romanian literary and cultural existence as part of a broader, European or global context (irrespective of the language they use to express themselves).

It is remarkable what an important role is played in this process by the humanities disciplines and art. Just over the past several years, there has been a number of works appearing in the Romanian milieu about exile⁴ forms such as visual art, film makers, architects and others that sidestep the topic of exile in their research. And yet, in a way, nothing new is going on: it is certainly not insignificant that when in 1916 Tristan Tzara was preparing a Dadaistic performance with the poet, playwright and musician Hugo Ball in the Voltaire cabaret in Zurich, the Romanian painter Marcel Iancu also participated in the stage design with his masks and reliefs.⁵ And the same

applies to many other artists, for example: Constantin Brancusi, Victor Brauner, Marcel Ianco, M. H. Maxy, H. Mattis Teutsch, and others, who are today firmly enshrined in the halls of European contemporary art and culture.

LITERARY CRITICISM, THEORY AND HISTORY IN EXILE

With regards to literary criticism, history, theory, and the social sciences, these appear in literary-oriented works about exile usually only as an addendum designated as “universitarii”, in other words academics (Vajdová 2011). The role of theoretical thinking escapes the majority of writers and much closer attention is paid to the authors of literary works from exile (fiction) as to the function and texts of literary critics and historians abroad. However, this only highlights the basic misunderstanding of the exile process. For it is the latter group (theorists, critics) who played a much more important role in promoting Romanian literature abroad than the literati. Of course, works by greatest Romanian writers living abroad and writing in the Romanian language, such as Norman Manea, became known through their translations into foreign languages. But without the activities of literary critics and publicists, historians of literature and theoreticians of Romanian origin living abroad who wrote about them and promoted them, they wouldn't have become known to publishing houses and readers abroad. We know what is required for an unknown work to receive a positive reception: opinions, previews, articles, lectures, and public presentations, the author's attendance at fairs and competitions and accompanying paratexts; in other words, reception by the broader cultural stratum. This is quite clear when observing the bibliographies of articles and public lectures by academics, such as Marcel Cornis-Pope, Sorin Alexandrescu, and Mihai Spăriosu, in which we find the number of references concerning their contributions to worldly dictionaries or encyclopaedias of literature, small articles in daily newspapers or on the internet, translations of short stories and poems. Herein also lies the importance of exile association magazines and unions, who disseminate information about Romanian culture in a foreign environment. However, the majority of works pertaining to exile, fascinated by “belles-lettres”-ism, does not appreciate this function.

One of the most objective works published about the Romanian exile is Florin Manolescu's *Enciclopedia exilului literar românesc 1945–1989* (Encyclopaedia of Romanian Literary Exile 1945–1989, 2013). This is a good example of a consideration that the primary and vital prerequisite for the existence of literature is its reception and reflection. This casts a light upon the significance of the whole range of personalities from the field of literary criticism and history, as well as philosophy, linguistics, sociology and other fields in the social sciences. If we were to prepare just a list of these names it would take up the whole page; therefore let us select just a few: literary critic and historian Basil Munteanu (1897–1972); prose writer and religionist Mircea Eliade (1907–1986); prose writer and philosopher Emil Cioran (1911–1995); diplomat, soldier, philosopher and historian Neagu Djuvara (1916); linguist Eugen Coșeriu (1921–2002); literary critic, prose writer and publicist Monica Lovinescu (1923–2008); literary critic Virgil Ierunca (1920–2006); literary theoretician and historian Ion Negoitescu (1921–1993); poet and literary critic Nicolae Balotă (1925);

philosopher and religionist Ioan Petru Culianu (1950–1972); sociologist and psychologist Serge Moscovici (1925); literary theoretician, historian and prose writer Matei Călinescu (1934–2009); literary theoretician and historian Sorin Alexandrescu (1937); literary historian and theoretician Virgil Nemoianu (1940); literary theoretician and historian Thomas G. Pavel (1941); literary critic and theoretician Mihai I. Spărioso (1944); literary historian and theoretician Marcel Cornis Pope (1946), and there have been many others. The list is far from complete, but even such a short roster demonstrates the strength of the emigration waves coming from Romania, and how they affected the fields of literature, criticism, and theory.

One of the personalities from the Romanian exile who is usually mentioned among the first is the scholar, writer and memorialist Mircea Eliade. A special chapter is dedicated to his works and opinions in this issue, therefore it should be sufficient to mention him only very briefly here. He started to work in the field of religious studies in Paris at the *École Pratique des Hautes Études* (1945), where, on a recommendation from George Dumézil, he presented the first chapters of his book *Traité d'histoire des religions* (*Patterns in Comparative Religions*, 1949) in lecture form. There he also published several of his well-known works, such as *Le Mythe de l'éternel retour* (*The Myth of the Eternal Return*, 1948), *Techniques de yoga* (*Yoga Techniques*, 1948), and *Le sacré et le profane* (*The Sacred and the Profane*, 1956), which were very successful. Despite this, he did not feel well in post-war France and decided to accept an offer to lecture in the USA at the University in Chicago Divinity School, where he renewed the Chicago School of Religious Studies. His three volumes on the history of religions *Histoire des croyances et des idées religieuses* (*A History of Religious Ideas*, 1976–1983), published in Paris deserve particular attention.

Another significant personality of Romanian origin in the global context was the linguist Eugen Coseriu. He was born in Bessarabia, and shortly before the occupation by the Soviet Army (1940), he managed to escape to Rome, where he studied classical and Romance philology. After graduating, he settled at the University in Montevideo in Uruguay where he built an influential centre of general linguistics, and Hispanic and Indo-European linguistics. Here he laid the foundations of his structural linguistics systematics, which he later enhanced with semiotic concepts and the philosophy of language. He made a name for himself working with French and Czech structuralism, introducing concepts of philosophical provenance into the systematics in order to moderate its binary vision. Coseriu is considered the Renaissance man of European linguistics and his body of work has been a unique contribution to the poststructural linguistics and semiotics. Some of his breakthrough works are *Sincronia, diacronia e historia. El problema del cambio lingüístico* (*Synchrony, Diachrony and History. The Problem of Linguistic Change*, 1958), *Principios de semántica estructural* (*Principles of Structural Semantics*, 1977), and *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung* (*Introduction to Textlinguistics*, 1980).

Serge Moscovici also came from Bessarabia, but he grew up in Romania. Like many of his generation with Jewish ancestry, he had to endure racist persecutions in the fascist atmosphere of Romania of the 1930s. He emigrated to Paris, where he

studied psychology at the Sorbonne, at CNRS, and finally at the École Pratique des Hautes Études (1964), where he worked under the tutelage of Alexander Koyré. With a group of sociologists he founded the Social Psychology Laboratory at the EHESS in 1976. Moscovici specialised in psychoanalysis, sociopsychology, and anthropology, and introduced the research of mass psychology and forms of collective behaviour into the purview of these fields. In his opinion, it was a mistake that sociology broke away from psychology and psychoanalysis, because they are necessary for analysis of collective social practices and concepts. He wrote a number of monographs, for example: *L'Age des foules: un traité historique de psychologie des masses* (The Age of the Crowd: A historical Treatise on Mass Psychology, 1981), and *La Machine à faire des Dieux* (The Machine for Making Gods, 1988), where he deals with tropisms and social complexes.

This issue also devotes a special chapter to the works of Matei Călinescu, so I will only present a few small details. When he came to the USA as a Fulbright scholarship recipient, Matei Călinescu had already engaged in research on European classicism and modernism and had experience as a successful modernist writer. He started lecturing at Indiana University in Bloomington and at Carlton University in Ottawa, focusing particularly on comparative literature and on modernity issues. The great success of his books *Faces of Modernity* (1977) and *Five Faces of Modernity* (1987) was due to his familiarity, not only with European literature from the West, but also with the cultural background of Eastern and Central Europe, where modernity played an extremely important social, aesthetic, and psychological role. Matei Călinescu succeeded in capturing and conceptually expressing the links between modern poetry and the ideas of revolution, progress, protests, and the ideological strategies expressed by the avant-garde. He also worked with European theories of literature, including Czech and French structuralism and Russian formalism. Matei Călinescu additionally evaluated the situation of the Romanian intellectual abroad, so when asked whether he considered himself to be a Romanian writer if he was not writing in the Romanian language, he replied that he had a double identity, not only a Romanian one; this was because the American way of life introduced him to plurality and taught him to understand it (Manolescu 2003, 141).

When analysing the contribution of Romanian literary criticism in the world context, we cannot ignore the works by linguist, historian, and theoretician of French and English literature Thomas G. Pavel, whose works are also covered in another special chapter of this issue. Pavel started with his research on structural linguistics and narrative syntax under the guidance of A. J. Greimas at the EHESS in Paris, and then he moved to University in Ottawa. It was at the comparative literature department at Princeton University where his focus shifted from the poetics of narration to the study of fictional worlds in literature (*Fictional Worlds*, 1986). He was writing his theoretical works in both French and English. He also studied the topics of modernism, primarily from the linguistic point of view (*Le mirage linguistique. Essai sur la modernisation intellectuelle* – The Linguistic Mirage: An Essay on Intellectual Modernization, 1988) and in opposition to this the classical literature, the English Renaissance (*L'Art de l'éloignement. Essai sur l'imagination classique* – Art as Distance,

an Essay on the neo-classical imagination, 1996). Meanwhile, at the same time in Canada the Czech theoretician Lubomír Doležel was also at work in the same field of fictional worlds.

We could continue to explore the works of many other important personalities of Romanian origin who succeeded in the global literary context, but here we refine our focus to only a few of them. One of very active and still inspiring intellectuals from Romania who specialises in the field of the humanities is Sorin Alexandrescu. Upon invitation from Paul Zumthor, he began lecturing in the 1960s at the University of Amsterdam, where he founded the Romanian studies department and the Association for Semiotics, Institute for Semiotics, Literature and Art Sciences in Amsterdam (ISELK). He published several translations from Romanian literature and actively provided political assistance to Romanian writers.⁶ As a literary theoretician he specialised in narration, stylistic analysis, semiotics, and the history of ideas as in his works *Logique du personnage* (The Logic of a Character, 1974) and *Transformational Grammar and the Rumanian Language* (1977).⁷ Another important personality is the literary historian Virgil Nemoianu, who excelled with his works in the field of 19th-century literature from Eastern and Western Europe such as *The Taming of Romanticism* (1984), which introduces European Romanticism from non-traditional standpoint, as well as his *Imperfection and Defeat: The Role of Aesthetic Imagination in Human Society* (2006).

Currently perhaps the most visible personality of Romanian exile in the field of literary criticism, history and comparative studies is Marcel Cornis-Pope. As a specialist in English and American literature he translated and delivered lectures at home, at Timisoara University and completed several internships at British and American universities. However, when the domestic political situation deteriorated in the 1980, he applied for a Fulbright scholarship and departed for the University of Iowa. Today, Cornis-Pope is influential American comparatist at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond. He forms comparative views and studies of literature in the US through the journal *The Comparatist*, published by the Southern Comparative Literature Association (SCLA) – which he led for many years – as well as through the international association AILC/ICLA in Europe. With his innovative work on the topic of literatures and cultures from Central and Eastern Europe in four volumes *History of Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries* (2004–2010), published in cooperation with Hungarian exile John Neubauer and with an international team of authors, he promoted original comparative approach on the border of cultural history, social studies and literature. We owe thanks to him that the comparative study of literature is becoming innovative and stimulating from a wider perspective, including the European as well as the US tradition.

CONTRIBUTION BY ROMANIAN LITERARY CRITICISM TO THE NEW CONTEXTS

At the conclusion of this fragmentary review we should pose the questions of how Romanian literary critics and theoreticians succeeded in different cultural environments, and what contributions they have made to them. It must be stressed that what they have in common is their ability to apply their knowledge in the context of different epistemological traditions and the efforts they exerted to introduce and adjust to elements of alterity in them. In my opinion, it is not important to analyse whether they carried a particularly Romanian spirit or mentality into their new milieus. Their fundamental link was the fact that they succeeded in responding to the competitive process in their new settings, which were very strict in comparison with their original environment. Their preparation and originality were based on their methods of thinking and the cultural traditions of Central and South-Eastern Europe, and they applied their approach, which was predetermined by differently oriented schooling and experiences in overcoming obstacles in their home country. Knowledge of languages and foreign literatures, inspired by the typical lives in a multilingual context surrounded by divergent and mixed cultures, were of major significance for developing these abilities. Experiences like these facilitate the perception and acceptance of alterity in every shape, which sharpens one's ability to identify the hidden aspects, unnoticed relationships, illogical splits or errors and to take advantage of them in a creative manner. Literary criticism in Central Europe was based very early on the traditions of Russian literary criticism of the Formal school from the 1920s and 1930s (Shklovsky, Tynyanov etc.) and Czech structuralism from the same period (Vodička, Mukařovský, Jakobson), then in the early 1970s also on the Tartu–Moscow Semiotic School (Lotman). These epistemological inputs were absorbed by literary critics before they could spread to Western cultures (cf. the innovativeness of Bulgarian scholar Julia Kristeva in Paris as early as the 1960s). The Romanian environment also produced separate structuralist and semiotic schools in the mid-1960s founded by the author of algebraic linguistics, mathematician Solomon Marcus. It is not by accident that almost every Romanian literary theoretician who succeeded abroad started with structuralist studies, followed quickly by a shift to semiotics. Yet this does not mean that the Romanian literary criticism and historiography had a generally high level in the period of socialism, as they were mostly traditionalist and impressionist.⁸ It was rather that the political relaxation of the 1960s, accompanied by a wave of translations of literature and scholarly works from around the world, allowed literary critics to familiarise themselves with ideas of a broader epistemological reach.

There is however one more moment here, not mentioned very often in relation to literary criticism: the Romanian political situation. It was not only that entire generations of historians and critics from the communist bloc received instruction in the field of Marxism and Leninism, and in political economy and history of materialism starting with Hegelian dialectics, but also that many colleagues, friends, and family members, and sometimes they themselves, experienced the concrete consequences of this ideology: political oppression, imprisonments, exile, executions,

etc. This resulted in the conviction that arguments such as progress, modernisation, a “better” future, etc., are very relative. It is not by accident that Serge Moscovici dealt with questions of mass psychology and returned aspects of sociology to their study (cf. Pierre Bourdieu). This was coupled with the fact that modernism as a movement during the late 19th and the early 20th century was experienced by the cultures of Central and South-Eastern Europe controversially and traumatically. This allowed Romanian exiles a deeper and almost personal understanding of modernism than its perception in the Western world afforded, capturing a number of unnoticed aspects and interpreting them in a broad social and political context. Ambiguity of events, complexity of languages, religions, history, cultural customs, social groups, and negative political experience were factors heightening the perceptiveness and absorption ability of Romanian exiles, and they apply to all of these individuals, who brought their own cultural, social, political and artistic experience into the monolingual, monocultural and relatively closed environment of the Western world, making it richer and more heterogeneous. There is no doubt that the whole process took place under the pressure of cultures from the Western world. The receiving environment always displays a certain degree of resistance or lack of understanding towards something which is foreign. Therein, however lies its ability to inspire, which these personalities managed to apply in favour of enriching their own concepts, thinking and learning.

IN CLOSING

What kind of reception should we expect for works by Romanian exiles now, and what would new editions look like? Would they belong to the Romanian or the universal literature? Katarína Bednářová and many others, such as the Slovak comparative literature scholar Dionýz Ďurišin,⁹ have argued that no national literature can remain in isolation, because its living space consists of all literatures, and all cultural and historical processes take place simultaneously in the world. Each national literature contains the features of other ones, irrespective of whether we see them or not, or whether they are being talked about explicitly. They are present as a potential that can be activated, and the intertextual reality of every work makes explicit or hidden references to them even if their presence goes unrecognised.

Exiled Romanian historians of literature, critics, and other specialists in humanities or the social sciences have often achieved respected positions in the foreign cultural milieus. During the 20th century these illustrious exiles became so numerous that their presence now is highly prominent and sometimes decisive, as they act in concert with other globally-influential personalities. We mentioned only some of them here, but similar overviews could be made in the domain of the fine arts, music etc. proving the artistic stimulation and intellectual richness of what has sometimes been called little, impure, syncretic, ambiguous or hybrid endeavours anywhere in the world they could be found, from Asia, the Far East, Africa, to South-Eastern Europe.

NOTES

- ¹ “Nobelabilitatea literaturii române” is the title of an article written by Ion Simuț in which he termed the ability of Romanian literature to win a Nobel Prize (2007). Special attention is also paid to Herta Müller (359–363).
- ² Nicolae Milescu became well-known with his Greco-Latin treatise, titled *Enchiridion, sive, Stella Orientalis Occidentali Splendens, id est sensus Ecclesiae Orientalis, scilicet graecae de transsubstantione Corporis Domini, aliisque controversia*. It was commissioned by the Jansenist monastery in Port Royal for the purpose of comparing Catholic and Orthodox Christianity and was published in Paris in 1669. Dimitrie Cantemir was in contact with scholars from Western Europe where he made his mark with a treatise on the notation of Turkish music. On the basis of this manuscript he was elected to membership in the Academy of Sciences in Berlin (1714), for which he wrote a Latin treatise titled *Descriptio Moldaviae*; i.e., a description of Moldova, and a history of the Ottoman Empire in Latin, titled *Historia incrementorum atque decrementorum Aulae Othomanicae* (1714–1716).
- ³ This was also written about by Ion Simuț (2008).
- ⁴ Of course, there are many authors who dealt with exile writers, and among them are also literary critics – for example Florin Manolescu, Eva Behring, Mircea Angheliescu, Ion Simuț, Paul Cernat, Mihai Zamfir, Monica Spiridon and others. Cf. Works c.
- ⁵ In the interwar period of the 20th century Marcel Ianco was a major figure of European avant-garde visual art. He worked with Dadaists and Cubists as well as Expressionists and in 1941 emigrated to Palestine and worked in Israel.
- ⁶ After 1989 through his publishing activities and with the aid of Romanian exiles, Sorin Alexandrescu raised funds for a new building housing the BCU Central university library in Bucharest, which burned down during the fights over the secret police building during the revolution in Bucharest. He was also instrumental in publishing a collection of poems titled *Moartea citeste ziarul* (Death Reads Newspapers), which the young anti-regime poet Mircea Dinescu wanted to publish in Romania, but didn't receive permission to do because he was a banned author. The collection was published just before the revolution with an introduction by Alexandrescu.
- ⁷ Not coincidentally, Sorin Alexandrescu also published a monograph about the European humanist of Romanian origin from the 17th to the 18th century mentioned above *Dimitrie Cantemir: Roemeens historicus en politicus 1673–1723* (Bussum 1975). Recently he founded the Centre of Excellence for Image Research (CESI) at the University of Bucharest dealing with issues of figurative art in 20th-century Romania, also as a part of images of modernity.
- ⁸ And nationalist. There were, naturally, some exceptions as well, such as the extraordinary inspiring thinking of Dumitru Țepeneag. He was not included in the issue because he was active as a journalist in exile. Alexandru Duțu and Adrian Marino are also exceptions.
- ⁹ Dionýz Ǿuriřin, in his systematics of the interliterary process and his works on special interliterary communities and literary centrisms intensively studied the issues of bi-, tri- and multilingualism as well as the multilateralism.

WORKS CITED

- Angheliescu, Mircea. 2000. *Cămașa lui Nexus. Eseuri despre exil*. Bucharest: Cartea românească.
- Bednářová, Katarína. 2013. *Dejiny umeleckého prekladu na Slovensku I. Od sakrálneho k profánnemu*. Bratislava: Veda, Ústav svetovej literatúry SAV.
- Behring, Eva. 1994. *Rumänische Literaturgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag.
- Behring, Eva. 2002. *Rumänische Schriftsteller im Exil: 1945–1989*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel. 2009. “Urban Cartographies in the Post-Cold War Era: Postmodern Challenges to Ethnocentric and Globalist Mappings.” *World Literature Studies* 1, 18: 14–27.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel. 2010. “National literatures and diasporas: regarding the polycentric concept of

- culture." *World Literature Studies* 2, 19: 10–25.
- Delabastita, Dirk, and Gruttman, Rainier. 2005. "Introduction. Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation." *Linguistica Antverpiensia New series – Themes in translation studies*, 4.
- Đurišin, Dionýz et al. 1987–1993. *Osobitné medziliterárne spoločenstvá / Les communautés interlittéraires spécifiques. I–VI*. Bratislava: Veda.
- Đurišin, Dionýz et al. 1998. *Medziliterárny centrismus stredoeurópskych literatúr I*. České Budějovice: PF Jihočeská univerzita.
- Đurišin, Dionýz et al. 1999. "Centrisme interlittéraire des littératures de l'Europe centrale." *Literární studie*. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Exilul literar românesc – înainte și după 1989*. 2011. Ed. Jana Páleníková and D. Sitar-Tăut. Bratislava: Comenius University.
- Glodeanu, Gheorghe. 1999. *Incursiuni în literatura diasporei și a disidenței*. Bucharest: Libra.
- Manolescu, Florin. 2003. *Enciclopedia exilului literar românesc 1945–1989*. Bucharest: Compania.
- Simuț, Ion. 2008. "Cronologia exilului literar postbelic." *România literară*, 23, 24.
- Simuț, Ion. 2007. *Valențe europene ale literaturii române contemporane*. Oradea: Editura Universității din Oradea.
- Spiridon, Monica. 1996. *Apărarea și ilustrarea criticii*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.
- Spiridon, Monica. 2011. *Europa centrală de peste Ocean. Exil și construcție identitară*. Craiova, Fundația Scrisul Românesc.
- Terian Andrei. 2013. *Critica de export*. București: Editura Muzeului Național al Literaturii Române.
- Vajdová, Libuša. 2011. "O față neglijată a exilului românesc: 'universitarii'." *Observator Cultural*, 28. iulie, 585.

SELECTED LITERATURE BY AUTHORS CITED

- Alexandrescu, Sorin. 1974. *Logique du personnage*. Paris: Mame.
- Alexandrescu, Sorin. 1977. *Transformational Grammar and the Rumanian Language*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Calinescu, Matei. 1987. *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*. 2nd ed. Durham: Duke University Press Book.
- Coseriu, Eugen. 1977. *Principios de semantica estructural*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Coseriu, Eugen. 1981. *Textlinguistik. Eine Einführung*. 2., durchges. Auflage, hg. und bearb. von J. Albrecht. Tübingen: Narr.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel. 1991. *Hermeneutic Desire and Critical Rewriting: Narrative Interpretation in the Wake of Post-structuralism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cornis Pope, Marcel. 2001. *Narrative Innovation and Cultural Rewriting in the Cold War Era and After*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cornis-Pope, Marcel, and Neubauer, John, eds. 2004–2010. *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe. Junctures and disjunctures in the 19th and 20th centuries. I–IV*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Moscovici, Serge. 1981. *L'âge des foules: un traité historique de psychologie des masses*. Paris: Fayard.
- Moscovici, Serge. 1988. *La machine à faire des Dieux*. Paris: Fayard.
- Pavel, Thomas G. 1986. *Fictional Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pavel, Thomas G. 1988. *Le Mirage Linguistique. Essai sur la modernisation intellectuelle*. Paris: Editions de Minuit.
- Nemoianu, Virgil. 2006. *Imperfection and Defeat: The Role of Aesthetic Imagination in Human Society*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Nemoianu, Virgil. 1984. *The Taming of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Monolingualism. Multilingualism. History of literature. Cultural institutions in exile. Literary criticism, theory, and history in exile. Contributions of Romanian criticism and theory of literature.

The following text is based upon research of Romanian literary criticism and literary history, written and published by a range of personalities of Romanian origin outside the context of Romania. The contemporary discussions in the Romanian literary environment focus on literature by exiled authors, while literary theory and criticism receives little attention. Few realise that it is exile literary criticism in particular that has contributed to the spreading of awareness about the work of Romanian exile writers abroad. Exilic literary criticism of Romanian writers has, however, made an impact in scholarly circles. It has contributed to the diversification of literary studies abroad and continues to direct its interests and orientation. It is not an accident that it is the writing from the outside, from discourses outside of the established canon and frames of scholarship, that was able to relax its norms and widen the thinking about literature towards less-known aspects. Scholars of Romanian origin must be recognised as belonging among those literary critics, scholars, and historians who in the last decades have most significantly contributed to the discourse of literary scholarship in the world.

PhDr. Libuša Vajdová, CSc.
Institute of World Literatures
Slovak Academy of Sciences
Konventná 13
811 03 Bratislava
Slovakia
lvajdova@chello.cz