

National Literature, World Literatures, and Universality in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947

Andrei Terian

Lucian Blaga University of Sibiu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [European Languages and Societies Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Other Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Other Film and Media Studies Commons](#), [Reading and Language Commons](#), [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#), [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#), [Television Commons](#), and the [Theatre and Performance Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: [<clcweb@purdue.edu>](mailto:clcweb@purdue.edu)

Recommended Citation

Terian, Andrei. "National Literature, World Literatures, and Universality in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.5 (2013): [<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2344>](https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2344)

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 15 Issue 5 (December 2013) Article 11

Andrei Terian,

**"National Literature, World Literatures, and Universality
in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947"**

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss5/11>>

Contents of ***CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 15.5 (2013)***

Special Issue ***World Literatures from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-first Century***. Ed. Marko Juvan

<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss5/>>

Abstract: In his article "National Literature, World Literatures, and Universality in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947" Andrei Terian analyzes the relevance of systematizing international literary relationships in current theories of world literatures. Terian criticizes the "naturalist" reductionism that still dominates many contemporary studies in the field of world literatures and asserts that a particular feature of the interliterary processes is that they occur not only at the level of mere "facts," but also at the level of cultural "representations" thus supporting various strategies through which national literatures attempt to acquire more favorable positions within world literatures. Terian presents a systemic classification of these strategies and tests the efficiency of the proposed concepts through an analysis of the politics of universality undertaken in Romanian cultural criticism of the late nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth century.

Andrei TERIAN

**National Literature, World Literatures, and
Universality in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947**

Over the past two decades, the field of world literature(s) seems to have become more than one of the key concepts of literary studies: it has turned into a distinctive paradigm, one that aims to displace and perhaps even absorb older disciplines, such as comparative literature and postcolonial studies (see, e.g., Thomsen 21). Since the early 1990s and particularly in the last decade, there are numerous publications about this phenomenon, although mostly in English and/or in US-American scholarship (see, e.g., Damrosch; D'haen; D'haen, Damrosch, Kadir; Lawall; D'haen, Domínguez, Thomsen; Pizer; Sturm-Trigonakis; Tötösy de Zepetnek and Mukherjee; for a bibliography see Tötösy de Zepetnek, "Multilingual" <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/comparativeliteraturebooks>>). However, despite the large amount of scholarship in the renewed field of world literatures, a closer look reveals that the principles of the field are far from being clarified and unanimously accepted (see, e.g., Figueira; Tötösy de Zepetnek and Vasvári). First of all, its object: what is world literature(s), after all? Is it — in terms borrowed from Dionýz Durišin — an "additive" concept (the totality of world literature works), a "selective" one (the world canon) or a "historical-literary" one (a global literary system or network) (*Communautés* 6, 25-30; see also *Čo je svetová literatúra?* [What Is World Literature?]). Second, what are the study units of world literature? Can they be narrowed down to individual works or to national literatures or do we need to find new cultural constructs in order to describe this phenomenon in its specificity? And third, what are the relationships established between the various units in world literature (whichever they may be)?

Rather than to address all these challenges, however, in what follows I propose to signal an obvious disparity between the first two issues identified above and the third one. Thus, the difficulties in approaching the definition of the object and delineation of the units of world literatures arise first of all from the diversity of theories and terminologies, which, more often than not, seem not only irreconcilable, but also incommensurable. For example, while Franco Moretti — who deals particularly with the "forgotten 99 percent" of non-canonical world literatures ("The Slaughterhouse" 208) — seems to adhere to an "additive", although systemic view of this phenomenon, David Damrosch and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen favor a "selective" concept, even if it is based on certain "historical-literary" factors such as meaning gained through translation (Damrosch, *What Is* 281) or the affiliation of literary works to a transnational "constellation" (Thomsen 138-42). However, Durišin and Pascale Casanova define their object in a "historical-literary" manner similar to a web of interliterary connections of a systemic nature. Consequently, it is difficult to build a master narrative of a theoretical and methodological platform starting from these diverging perspectives which operate, frequently, at different levels.

The same applies to units of world literatures. While, for example Damrosch uses individual works as the starting point of his approach and Casanova approves the concept of national literatures, others attempt to draw new analytical categories. Thus, without forsaking the concept of "national literature" — which, in his theoretical framework covers five heterogeneous notions, although not always labeled as such — Durišin has suggested the intermediate categories of "interliterary communities" and "literary centrisms" (see Domínguez, "Dionýz Durišin" 102). Likewise, Alexander Beecroft has submitted his own terminology based on the identification of six literary "modes": epichoric, panchoric, cosmopolitan, vernacular, national, and global. Nevertheless, although "national" literatures are still the common denominator of the two taxonomies and Beecroft's "panchoric" literatures bear similarities to Durišin's "specific interliterary communities," it is difficult to identify equivalences between the other categories. Therefore, the problem of definition resides in the irreducible diversity of the premises and terminology.

On the subject of the third issue — that of the relationships in/of world literatures — the situation is different: rather than being overwhelmed by a plethora of incompatible terms, in this respect there is a lack of access to sufficiently accurate instruments. The majority of the approaches dedicated to world literature(s) so far have centered on its units rather than the relationships among them. This has contributed to the configuration of a grammar that favors morphology to the detriment of syntax.

Thus, many current theories tend to trim interliterary relationships down to non-differentiated (or insufficiently differentiated) transnational processes. For example, Moretti's analyses of the novel and Petrarchan poetry condense the dissemination of both genres in the form of a "law" of world literature development described as "a compromise between foreign form and local materials" ("Conjectures" 60; see also "New Conjectures"). Moretti uses the metaphor of the unifying "wave" — which seems to be inspired by Itamar Even-Zohar's concept of "interferences" — but avoids a discussion of the cases where some "waves" can be diverted or even halted by the various local hindrances they encounter. Indeed, Moretti admits that in its distribution a certain form can receive various modulations in various spaces, such as the naturalist novel in France, Italy, and Brazil (see "World-Systems"). However, this very difference is then narrowed down to a higher ranking unit because beyond the particularities of the novels analyzed "the formal logic is always the same ... they mix a plot from the core, and a style from the periphery" ("World-Systems" 74). Consequently, Moretti's analysis stops precisely where it should begin.

In this respect, I find Durišin's and Casanova's approaches more useful. Durišin is one of the first to attempt to draw a typology of international literary relationships and who criticizes the vague and non-differentiated concept of "influence." According to Durišin, interliterary processes occur mainly as "forms of reception-creation" (*Theory* 166). These can be divided into two key types or functions: the "integrational" where the items received "participate in the construction of the recipient literary function in their positive significance" and the "differentiation" where "a negative attitude towards the nature of the received side" is adopted (*Theory* 166). However, this opposition is too general to be used as a working instrument and this is why Durišin associates functions as a series of intertextual categories: allusion, borrowing, imitation, filiation, plagiarism, adaptation, and translation. However, Durišin's approach raises two issues. One is that the majority of his categories apply equally not only to the description of interliterary relationships, but also to that of the intraliterary ("national") ones. The other issue, signaled by Marko Juvan, is that Durišin "mixes eclectically two levels, the discursive and the textual" which reduces interliterarity to simple intertextuality (*History* 65; see also Juvan, "Worlding" <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss5/10>>). That is, the situation is different as illustrated by the fact that the same intertextual category can be assigned to more interliterary and frequently diverging relationships. For example, the use of parody can mean at the same time an author's attempt to set himself apart from a certain literary tradition, as well as to integrate in a movement such as postmodernism. A similar typology is also suggested by Casanova, who describes the space of world literature from the perspective of a generalized agonistics, as an incessant battle of the nations for the accumulation of "literary capital." For this reason, Casanova focuses particularly on peripheral (or "poor") nations' literature, whose authors typically use two large strategies of assertion: "assimilation" and "differentiation" (179). The two categories resemble Durišin's notion, but their nature is less accurate and, at any rate, less systemic. On the one hand, Casanova equates "assimilation" with acculturation (205-19), although the former can also occur by less radical means. On the other hand, when she examines the strategies of "differentiation" (i.e., of "rebellion" against dominant literatures 220-53), she mistakes the political goals of the various literary "revolutions" for the methods used to this end (the collection of folk literature, the creation of a national theater, translations etc.).

Apart from these observations, the majority of the current attempts to approach systemically and to classify interliterary relationships there are further issues which heighten the reductionist nature of theoretical postulates. For example, many contemporary theoreticians compare cultural processes with particular physical or biological processes and, therefore, tend to describe interliterary relationships as "natural." One of the most obvious outcomes of this trend is to assign a passive or, at any rate, an instinctive role to the receiver. This happens in Even-Zohar's and Moretti's theories and, partly, in Casanova's. Although she admits that the dynamics of the literary space is determined first of all by the "strategic" moves of those dominated in their attempt to accrue literary capital, Casanova posits peculiarly that "none of them acts or works in accordance with consciously and rationally elaborated strategies" (178) and even that all of these actions take place according to a certain teleology that thus reveals "an almost universal and transhistorical order of development" (179). Oddly, by adhering to such premises, many of the current approaches to world literatures merely

reiterate one of the oldest errors of comparative literature: just as, in the analysis of individual works, comparative literature has long applied the more or less homogeneous category of "influence," world literature tends to accredit in the analysis of literary systems an equally inaccurate category, whether we call it "wave," "interference" or "transhistorical order." In the end, both procedures make the same mistake: they assume a passive attitude of the receiver, who is unable to avoid "the influence," "the wave," "the interference," and so on and, moreover, is unable to turn it to its advantage with regard to innovation. Yet, the asymmetric nature of the "interference" by no means implies its "unilateral" character, as Even-Zohar claims (58). This purported "law" of polysystems theory can be valid at most in the cases where literary dependence is determined by political dependence (such as totalitarianism or colonialism [see Terian, "Is There"]) and even there only to a certain extent. However, there are a considerably greater number of situations where a source literature chooses its target literature, the elements to be transferred, as well as the manner in which these elements are recontextualized in its own literary system. Accordingly, the "peripheral" culture develops its own concept of world literature(s). There is consequently "no such thing as the singular form of world literature" (Wang 296), since "any literature or literary history sees world literature through the lenses of how they perceive their position within the global literary system" (Juvan, "World Literature[s]" 86).

One of the first scholars of world literatures who recognized the receiver's active role in interliterary relationships is Durišin. Many of his observations — particularly the analogy between interliterary and intertextual relations — are still productive and can be used as a starting point for subsequent examinations. Nevertheless, I believe that apart from the crude equivalence drawn between intertextuality and interliterarity, Durišin has made another significant error. According to Durišin, the majority of the forms of interliterarity — with the exception of the so-called "typological affinities," which are not my concern here — are subsumed under a "reception-creation" process whereby the receiver produces, in her/his turn, a new work. Besides these types of relationships, which could be called, generically, "intertextual" (although Durišin does not use the term), there are many other "metatextual" connections where reception does not lead to the creation of a literary work, but to a critical and/or ideological comment that occurs in the form of a definition or comparison between various literary systems. In fact, Durišin and especially Moretti and Even-Zohar — partly Casanova as well, who, although she identifies various occurrences of this phenomenon places them in the category of the simple strategies of "differentiation" — tend to neglect a basic aspect: in world literatures, both the actants' positions and the rules of the systemic processes change constantly. Consequently, there are many cases in which the actants try to reach higher positions not just by "moving" according to the established rules, but also by challenging their application or trying to establish new rules. This should be no surprise: if even current theorists cannot agree on the borders and "laws" of world literatures, why should we expect to find such an agreement when we examine the way in which this system was configured several decades or centuries ago?

A useful framework for approaching these mechanisms is provided by a theory drafted in a "peripheral" culture, namely Mircea Martin's theory of "cultural complexes." According to Martin — who was inspired by Alfred Adler's psychoanalysis — many of the "cultural complexes" of various literatures operate similarly to the way individual complexes operate. In other words, a "complex," whether it is individual or cultural, emerges from the comparison (constantly detrimental to the subject) with an Other. But the comparison becomes a "complex" only when it is enforced by an "obsessive repeatability" which often occurs *malgré-soi*, because, apart from the "'complexes' that are declared," there are also "'complexes' that are betrayed" by a series of "positive or negative compensating initiatives" (32; unless indicated otherwise, all translations are mine). Therefore, "the presence of 'complexes' can be identified not only in their occurrences as such, but also in the attempts to hide or overcome them — we could even argue that particularly in the latter cases" (33). Formulated in this manner, the theory of cultural "complexes" can provide us with the basis of a more adequate understanding of relationships in world literatures, starting with the two large groups of procedures suggested by Martin, which I call legitimating (or retrospective) strategies and pragmatic (or prospective) strategies. Of these, pragmatic strategies are based on the open acknowledgement of a "complex" and propose a way to rectify it. In other words, they take into account the changes a certain literary system (e.g., a national literature) must carry out in order to accede to be part of

world literatures. For this reason, they are equally pragmatic (because they take place in the form of a series of measures, of an action plan) and prospective (because, unlike legitimating strategies, they act on the future rather than the past). Certainly, pragmatic strategies also involve a certain degree of examination of the past, because only based on the latter's imperfections can a direction for the future be established (i.e., the new "path" to be travelled by a particular literature). Further, this "path" can be designed differently depending on the way in which a certain individual, group, or nation defines both their own literary system and "world literatures." However, the enduring fact is that all these strategies involve a change of the existing literary system.

Legitimizing strategies, on the other hand, do not operate at the level of facts: they operate at the level of representations. They start from the (overt or covert) refusal to accept the peripheral role of a literature. Consequently, they do not attempt to change the "facts" (the literary system as such), only their interpretation, neither do they want to act on the future, but rather on the past, which allegedly was perceived erroneously by the members of their own culture or those of other cultures. In other words, they are legitimating retrospective strategies which do not intend to determine the path of things to come, but the perception of what was. Concretely, the representatives of a certain culture draw up a series of policies meant to stress the value and valuation of their literature either at the level of specific genres or overall while depreciating rival literatures. Holding no claim to completeness, the repertory of strategies adopted to this end includes 1) the favorable comparison of one's own writers or literature with foreign authors or other literatures, 2) the construction of a "national character" starting from (generic, thematic, formal, geographic, social, etc.) characteristics which should illustrate literary excellence or even universality, and 3) the attempt to appropriate an archaic or regional literary heritage which would "elevate" that particular literature. Among examples of such policies we count Voltaire's comparison between Racine and Shakespeare or Brunetièrè's attempt to accredit "universality" as the defining trait of French literature. On a broader scale, here we can fit the phenomena of "peripheries" analyzed by Edward W. Said, Roberto Dainotto, Maria Todorova, Tötösy de Zepetnek (*Comparative Central*), or Larry Wolff with regard to the various strategies of how throughout the modern era (north-Western) European cultures refined their alleged superiority by a series of successive exclusions of the "Other" and "semi-Other" whether of the Orient or of the cultures of Central, East, and South Europe.

Next, I illustrate my above-mentioned considerations with reference to the manner in which the two types of strategies (mainly the "pragmatic" ones) were applied in Romanian cultural criticism in the period between 1867 and 1947 (see also Dobrescu, "World Literatures" <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss6/15>>). Several clarifications are necessary at this point. First, I have chosen "national" Romanian literature as a unit of analysis because given its particular geopolitical situation — a neo-Latin culture isolated in a preponderantly Slavic territory and historically also included in the German expansion to the East — it constitutes a good example of the multitude of policies in a literary system that aspires to "universality." However, this does not mean that I am necessarily limiting to "national" literatures the study units of world literatures or that the policies I am going to identify cannot be retrieved in the case of other types of literary systems. Second, the time span considered is equally justified by its political and literary homogeneity. Its ending in 1947 coincides specifically with the installation of communist totalitarianism, which requires different rules for the literary system, while its beginning in 1867 coincides with the time when Romanian literary criticism was institutionalized in the form of "directional criticism" (see Terian, "Critica de direcție"). Directional criticism is a discourse characteristic of peripheral nations — mainly in Central and East Europe, but not only — which involves the formation of clearly delineated literary groups, the establishment of "directions" of optimal literary evolution determined by the stage and general direction of social-cultural development of that nation (see Dobrescu, "Povestea"), and the implementation of "direction" with the help of writers affiliated with those groups. In Romania, directional criticism emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century in the context of the emancipation from Ottoman domination and from the influence of neo-Greek ("Phanariote") culture when Romanian society underwent a rapid process of modernization resulting equally in Westernization and nationalization. However, while in the first half of the century these two phenomena were read as synonymous (following the convergence between the liberalism of the

French Revolution and Romantic nationalism), in the second half of the century a large part of the Romanian cultural elite tended to perceive the rapid Westernization (determined particularly by the overwhelming French influence) as a hindrance to the establishment of a national identity.

This is the context in which Romanian literary criticism emerged, with the publication of the study "O cercetare critică asupra poeziei române de la 1867" ("A Critical Survey of the Romanian Poetry as of 1867" [see 1, 3-75]), in which Titu Maiorescu (1840-1917) — leader of the cultural association "Junimea" ("The Youth") and of the journal *Convorbiri Literare* (Literary Conversations) using the concepts of German idealistic aesthetics — proclaims the autonomy of aesthetic value that he dissociates from cognitive, political, and social values (1, 11-13, 33-38, 73-75). Nevertheless, equally influenced by the evolutionary theories of the time, Maiorescu does not linger in the sphere of pure aestheticism, but correlates the evolution of literature to that of society and culture. In his work, directional criticism occurs, on the one hand, as socio-cultural criticism of the allegedly Western foundations of modern Romania and in which Maiorescu sees mere "forms without substance" and that threaten to corrupt the young "national" culture of Romania (1, 163-65). On the other hand, he employed directional criticism as criticism of nationalist romantic poetry imported mainly from French literature. Moreover, Maiorescu is the first scholar to raise the question of the status of Romanian literature within world literatures systemically. In the same 1867 article, the timid Romanian poetical attempts are mocked by a devastating comparison with works by Shakespeare, Goethe, and Schiller. In this context, the solution Maiorescu recommends to Romanian literature is the imitation of folk poetry as the only authentic tradition and the only one able to represent a national trait of "our own" (1, 83). In other words, the critic's and scholar's approach consists in "vernacularization" (i.e., the consolidation of the autochthonous literary tradition, as it was). As late as the early twentieth century, Maiorescu still believed that folk poetry could operate as a unique blueprint for Romanian literature, since the "suggestive power of our people's songs" would be a sufficient antidote to both the "paradigms of foreign classicism" and the "sickly modern sentimentalities" (1, 756).

Starting with the 1880s, the direction of "Junimea" was challenged by socialist criticism promoted in the journal *Contemporanul* (The Contemporary) by Constantin Dobrogeanu-Gherea (1855-1920). One of the first Marxist critics in Central East Europe, Dobrogeanu-Gherea was also inspired by Taine's and Hegel's theories. Realizing that the interdependence of the economic and social also occurs in the cultural sphere (6, 43-60), Dobrogeanu-Gherea found Maiorescu's solution not viable, because Romanian culture could never separate from the circuit of international intellectual life. On the other hand, Dobrogeanu-Gherea also rejected the pessimistic individualism of the era spread by some members of the "Junimea" group (the future "national poet" Mihai Eminescu included) as a result of their affinities with Schopenhauer's philosophy. At odds with both solutions, Dobrogeanu-Gherea opted for a "cosmopolitanization" of Romanian literature, which would overcome both individual and national imperatives and look at the world with the eye of social criticism based on universal solidarity. In Dobrogeanu-Gherea's opinion, this was what all the great writers of the nineteenth century had done: "citizen artists" such as Goethe, Hugo, Dickens, Mickiewicz, Tolstoy, and Ibsen had configured world literature following a pattern similar to the socialist International (7, 349-78).

The issue of the universalization of Romanian literature grows more acute at the beginning of the twentieth century when solutions ("directions") also thrive. The most radical of these was proposed by Nicolae Iorga (1871-1940), who acted as editor of the journal *Sămănătorul* (The Sower) between 1903 and 1906. Like Maiorescu, Iorga believed that Romanian literature could not escape its peripheral condition unless it stood out as a "national" (i.e., original) literature in a context in which the most "national" social class continued to be the peasants, while the upper classes displayed obvious xenophilia, transforming their country into a "French cultural colony" (*O luptă* 1, 11). Unlike Maiorescu, Iorga opined that the "Romanian" folk poetry was not exactly Romanian, since it expressed a vision shared by the entire central southern European area. Consequently, his solution concerned the development of a new rural literature, which was to be achieved by the active dissemination of culture in villages, but which would be hindered, he feared, by the Romanian elites' acculturation. Hence Iorga's advocacy of a "cultural protectionism" which would require increased taxes on foreign books in order to allow Romanians the necessary respite to produce a "national" culture (1, 60). This approach was doubled by an obvious boycott of foreign (primarily French) culture, which would reach

its peak in his diatribes against the "French boyars in Romania" (1, 56) and especially in the 13 March 1906 incidents when, prompted by Iorga, several nationalist students prevented the performance of a play in French at the National Theater in Bucharest and the police intervention resulted in approximately 100 injured and, later, in Iorga's withdrawal from the editorial board of *Sămănătorul* (Lovinescu 1, 65-70).

Garabet Ibrăileanu (1874-1936), Iorga's ideological ally and personal rival who edited the journal *Viața românească* (Romanian Life), was less radical. Until after the World War I, the direction promoted by Ibrăileanu was *poporanism* (populism), a movement inspired by the Russian *narodnichestvo* and based on premises similar to Iorga's (only an original — i.e. "national" — literature can adhere to world literature, that is, in Romania's case at the time, a rural literature), although different in approach. According to Ibrăileanu, as well as to Dobrogeanu-Gherea, not only could Romanian literature not be separated from foreign influences, but some of these influences had been and could still be helpful to its evolution. Ibrăileanu explained the difference between the beneficial influences and the damaging ones (which produce in Romania only "caricatures" of the Western models) in the terms of the theory of "mutual selection" borrowed from evolutionary theories and deployed to explain both the individual authors' success (2, 5-20) and the development of national literatures (1, 337-57). In the populist context, the success of a cultural import depends both on the value of the foreign model and on "national realities." In this respect, Romanian literature at the beginning of the twentieth century could tolerate at most Romanticism (in poetry) and Realism (in prose) while Baudelaire, France, and Proust were still "prohibited" to Romanians, he concluded.

An approach different from both the ruralists' and Dobrogeanu-Gherea's cosmopolitanism was proposed in the same period by Ovid Densusianu (1873-1938), director of the publication *Viața nouă* (New Life), the flagship of Romanian symbolism. In Densusianu's opinion, Dobrogeanu-Gherea's social art was damaging the autonomy of art severely, while ruralism threatened to sentence Romanian literature to "popular" epigonism (4, 87). In fact, unlike the majority of his predecessors, Densusianu believed that in order to become part of world literature, a culture must be "universal" rather than "national" (4, 173) or at least come as close as possible to this goal. To this end, Densusianu attempted to "affiliate" Romanian literature to a proximal interliterary community, that is, to the literature of Romance cultures, which would represent the most prestigious community in that age and which could, thus, transfer to Romanian literature part of its cultural capital. Thus Densusianu advocated the introduction of symbolism in Romanian literature not only because of its modern or urban dimension, but especially because of "its signally Latin nature" (5, 48). All the more so, since, while the Latinity of the Romanian language was a given for Densusianu, the Latinity of the literature of his country had to be achieved as "we have not yet managed to highlight what distinguishes us as Roman descendants in either in literature or other art forms" (5, 78).

The controversies concerning the universality of Romanian literature were resumed with renewed force in the first decade after World War II. The dominant scholar of this period was Eugen Lovinescu (1881-1943), who pleaded in favor of the modernist movement in the journal *Sburătorul* (Winged Spirit). Lovinescu's literary and ideological program relied on the phenomenon of "imitation" borrowed from Gabriel Tarde and regarded as an inevitable stage required in order to recover the lag between developed societies and peripheral ones. By then, owing to the development of means of communication, imitation occurred through what Lovinescu calls "synchronism," which meant to him the nearly instantaneous dissemination of a material or spiritual phenomenon all over the world (6, 14). Nevertheless, in Lovinescu's opinion, this process that anticipates globalization does not result in ironing out discrepancies between cultures, which will continue to "be differentiated" inescapably, by virtue of their local traditions (6, 39-40). Therefore, in Lovinescu, "synchronization" (i.e., the imitation of the cultural products of the most developed countries) represents, seemingly paradoxically, the only means of attaining "differentiation" (i.e., real literary originality), which should allow cultures to issue claims of universality. Since in Lovinescu's opinion the most developed literature of the era was the French one and its most recent product was modernism, he advocated the naturalization of this cultural form in Romanian literature.

A strategy considerably more radical than those of Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Densusianu, and Lovinescu, however, was proposed by Barbu Fundoianu (also Benjamin Fondane, 1898-1944), who, in

1922, published one of the most shocking books in the history of Romanian culture: *Imagini și cărți din Franța* (Images and Books from France). In the preface to the book, Fundoianu described Romanian literature of the past century as "continuous parasitism" of French literature and wrote that the only progress of which Romanian literature was capable in the modern era was the mutation from "bad imitation" to the condition of "a colony of French culture" (25). Since Romania had not yet been able to create its own cultural tradition, the only possible manner of universalization was, in Fundoianu's opinion, the voluntary "acculturation" of its entire literature: "We will need to convince France that, intellectually, we are a province in its geography, and that our literature at its best contributes to its literature ... We must accept with joy the role — if we are allowed — of the barely personal, but diligent citizens of French culture" (26). Unlike the above-mentioned scholars, Fundoianu was not a directional critic *per se*: he did not edit a journal nor did he have a strong following. Yet his approach fits in the same category with the others, since Fundoianu proposed its implementation at the level of his entire home culture. Moreover, not only did Fundoianu apply his ideas — in 1923, when he emigrated to France — but his action was either prefigured or followed by many other Romanian writers, such as Tristan Tzara, Panait Istrati, Ilarie Voronca, Eugène Ionesco, Emil Cioran, Paul Celan, Gherasim Luca, and others.

Several observations are required on the subject of the foregoing analysis. First, I must clarify that the "pragmatic" strategies I delineated above are not synonyms of the era's Romanian ideologies and -isms. It is frequent that a strategy can be identified in several ideologies and similarly an author or an ideological group may use several strategies in order to draw up their own cultural "direction." An example of the former case is "vernacularization," which was also recommended by the group formed around the journal *Gândirea* (Thought) — edited by Nichifor Crainic (1889-1972) — with the only difference that, in "Gândirism," the vehicle of the Romanian "national character" was the Orthodox tradition rather than the rural class. An example of the latter is an 1882 article by Titu Maiorescu — "Literatura română și străinătatea" ("Romanian Literature Abroad") — dedicated to the first translations of Romanian works into German where he claimed that writers such as Ioan Slavici and Ion Creangă should be included together with Sand, Flaubert, Dickens, Turgenev, and others in a worldwide trend of the "popular novel" which would grasp "national originality" in the "aesthetic form of universal art" (1, 545-74). It may seem that although a programmatic supporter of vernacularization, Maiorescu pleaded here for a type of "synchronization" similar to that proposed by Lovinescu. In reality, however, this is a "legitimizing" or "retrospective" strategy meant to elevate Romanian "popular" productions by associating them with works of world literature.

Second, I think the typology of interliterary strategies I propose above is preferable to the traditional clash between the autochthonists and the Westernizers, a clash often used in order to describe the cultural condition of peripheral states (particularly those in Central and East Europe, but not only there) and which seems to have been a source of inspiration for both Durišin and Casanova. Indeed, overall, some of the seven "pragmatic" strategies delineated indicate two opposed visions on the process of literary "universalization." On the one hand, "protectionism/ boycott," "vernacularization," and "mutual selection" grant access to world literature only by the creation of a strong "national" literature, which should be "differentiated" internationally. On the other hand, "affiliation," "cosmopolitanization," and "acculturation" are all based on the premise that a writer cannot stand out as "universal" except against his/her own "national" tradition. Nevertheless, the best proof of the precariousness of this duality is Lovinescu's "synchronization" according to which differentiation can only be achieved through integration.

Last but not least, all seven "pragmatic" policies denote "simple" or binary interliterary relationships. There are, however, more complex strategies also, which involve at least three terms. In order to describe them, I find useful the concept of "in-between peripherality" defined by Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek with which he designates the majority of Central and Central East European cultures vis-à-vis the "three main origins or centers of influence": a "Soviet" center (which, I add, could be labeled for the nineteenth century as "Slavic" or "Oriental"), an indigenous center, and a Western one, mainly French and/or German ("Configurations" 92; see also *Comparative* 131-36; see also Lisiak who added to said centers the post-1989 impact of US-American culture in the region). In what follows, I describe briefly three such "complex" strategies suggested in the Romanian cultural

criticism published in the time span analyzed. The first of them can be called "compensation" and defined as the attempt to trim the heavy influence of a foreign literature by reorientation toward another foreign literature. An example here is represented by the endeavors of "Junimea" for a so-called "Germanization" of Romanian culture. Thus, while admitting that France and Germany remain "two superior nations from which we have yet a lot to learn," Maiorescu proposed the limiting of the French influence by reorientation toward German culture (1, 495). The purpose of this direction was not Germanization *per se*, but — through the "Herder effect" (Casanova 77-81) — the possibility that Romania build its own "national" heritage. In fact, the rivalry between the French and German influences remained for a long time one of the main traits of modern Romanian culture. A public debate organized in 1908 by the newspaper *România liberă* (Free Romania) even asked "Are we with the Germans or with the French?" thus signaling the persistence of an identity dilemma (see Lupu and Ștefănescu 3, 202). Another approach recommended in Romanian criticism of the time was what I would call "cultural dumping." It has the same cause as the previous one, but the solution here is the multiplication of imports from as many cultures as possible, which should thus cancel the main dependence on German or French. For example, before resorting to the boycott solution one such way was proposed by Iorga in 1903 according to which Romanian literature ought to be inspired not only by French culture, but also by English, German, Italian, Spanish, Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, Polish, and Russian ones in order to gather, through translations, as much literary capital as possible (1, 11-2). Finally, the third, even more sophisticated policy is what I call "détour": here, unlike the previous two, a certain literature tries to forego the influence of a dominant culture by attempting — rather than replicate the model of a dominant culture — to retrieve the process of the systemic development of another peripheral literature that, in the meantime, has managed to integrate in world literatures. In Romanian literature up to the World War I, this catalytic role was played by Russian literature which, in the span between the two national "Unions" (1859-1918), became the third foreign literature in Romanian in terms of imports (2046 entries for the period after 1880, while the French, German and English literatures hold 16328, 3275, and 1163, respectively, for the entire interval [see Lupu and Ștefănescu]). What remains significant is the fact that despite the irreparable ideological differences among them and despite their shared aversion toward Tsarist imperialism, the canonization of the Russian novel by Melchior de Vogüé's volume *Le Roman russe* (1886) has determined critics and scholars like Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Ibrăileanu, and Lovinescu to recommend Russian-language literature as a model of evolution for Romanian literature.

It is difficult to assess which of the above-mentioned cultural policies were more successful in the Romanian literary system. Among them, only "acculturation" is quantifiable to a certain extent, but apart from the fact that authors such as Tzara, Istrati, Voronca, Ionesco, and Cioran left behind their "national" literary system, the cases mentioned above could be counterweighted by endless examples of Romanian expats who failed to make themselves known on the world literary scene. In any case, at the end of the 1920s directional criticism was beginning to abate partly because of the specialization of critical discourse, which was practiced by professionals rather than by polymaths partly because of the writers' refusal to become regimented in any particular ideological group. On the other hand, the same period witnessed an intensification of the rhythm of translations from Romanian and that supplied the possibility of a (albeit relative) "verification" of the programs drawn in the previous decades. For example, in 1930 in London alone, a selection from Eminescu's poems (prefaced by G.B. Shaw), Ion Creangă's *Recollections*, and Liviu Rebreanu's *Forest of the Hanged* were published. The limited reception these translations had abroad generated in Romania new "complexes" (see Brezuleanu, Mihăilă, Nișcov, Șchiopu, Ștefănescu 10, 192-313) which resulted not only in a series of contingent explanations — usually having to do with the translators' incompetence, poor dissemination or the foreign reviewers' opacity, and so on — but also in a general reorientation from "pragmatic" to "legitimizing" strategies. For example, in 1934 Mihail Dragomirescu (1868-1942) did not hesitate to consider the "national poet" Eminescu the "fifth great poet" of the world along with Pindar, Dante, Goethe, and Hugo (159) and seven years later Dragomirescu wrote that Eminescu surpassed Hugo in terms of the "suggestibility of his style" (172). Similarly, Iorga claimed in 1935 that medieval Romanian culture was the rightful descendant of the Byzantine heritage (*Byzance*). In an abridged version of his literary historiography published in 1946, George Călinescu (1899-1965) stated that the

"rural form of Romanian civilization" is but an effect of a bi-millennial culture with Dacian roots which enabled it to produce, in only two centuries of modernity, "a rich literature, envied by many" (14-15).

In conclusion, I refer to several potential applications of the ideas and categories developed here. First, I believe the emphasis on the role that critical and ideological discourse plays in the drawing of cultural "directions" meant to reinforce or to improve the international status of a specific literary system does more than invalidate the hypothesis of the alleged "unconscious" nature of the corresponding mutations and, consequently, restricts the success of any comparative approach based on purely "naturalist" premises. It also illustrates more compellingly the complexity of the connections within world literatures. Second, the classification above — starting from the basic opposition between "legitimizing" and "pragmatic" strategies and ending with the types of "simple" and "complex" strategies — could contribute additional accuracy both to the study of the relationships between "national" literatures and world literatures and to the comparative analysis of the types of policies used in various literary spaces. Third, the diversity of the models chosen as points of reference by some authors, scholars, critics, or peripheral literatures in the attempt to become integrated in world literatures, as well as the various attitudes toward them explain better the manner in which "small"/"minor" literatures also contribute to the validation of the "great" ones and, implicitly, to the (re)construction of the concept of "world literatures" because, in the end, a world without peripheries is a world without centers. And a world without centers or better centers would be a fiction that cannot hold either historically or systemically.

Note: Research of above article was funded by the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research (CNCS-UEFISCDI PN-II-RU-TE-2012-3-0411).

Works Cited

- Beecroft, Alexander. "World Literature without a Hyphen: Towards a Typology of Literary Systems." *New Left Review* 54 (2008): 87-100.
- Brezuleanu, Ana-Maria, Ileana Mihăilă, Viorica Nișcov, Michaela Șchiopu, and Cornelia Ștefănescu. *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în periodice (1919-1944)* (Bibliography of Relationships between Romanian Literature and Foreign Literatures in Periodicals: 1919-1944). București: Saeculum I.O., 1997-2009. 10 Vols.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M.B. DeBevoise. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2004.
- Călinescu, George. *Istoria literaturii române. Compendiu* (History of Romanian Literature. A Compendium). București: Naționala Mecu, 1946.
- Creanga, Ion. *Recollections*. Trans. Lucy Byng. Preface by Marcu Beza. London: J.M. Dent, 1930.
- D'haen, Theo. *The Routledge Concise History of World Literature*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- D'haen, Theo, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, eds. *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- D'haen, Theo, César Domínguez, and Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, eds. *World Literature: A Reader*. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Dainotto, Roberto. *Europe (in Theory)*. Durham: Duke UP, 2007.
- Damrosch, David. *What Is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.
- Damrosch, David, ed. *Teaching World Literature*. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 2009.
- Densusianu, Ovid. *Opere* (Works). Ed. Boris Cazacu, Valeriu Rusu, Ioan Șerb, and Florica Șerb. București: Minerva, 1968-1985. 6 Vols.
- Dobrescu, Caius. "Povestea celor trei triburi" ("A Tale of Three Tribes"). *Inamicul impersonal* (The Impersonal Enemy). By Caius Dobrescu. Pitești: Paralela 45, 2001. 178-86.
- Dobrescu, Caius. "World Literatures and Romanian Literary Criticism." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.6 (2013): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss6/15>>.
- Dobrogeanu-Gherea, Constantin. *Opere complete* (Complete Works). Ed. Ion Popescu-Puțuri and Ștefan Voitec. București: Politică, 1976-83. 3 Vols.
- Domínguez, César. "Dionýz Durišin and a Systemic Theory of World Literature." *The Routledge Companion to World Literature*. Ed. Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir. London: Routledge, 2012. 99-107.
- Dragomirescu, Mihail. *Mihai Eminescu*. Ed. Leonida Maniu. Iași: Junimea, 1976.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Co je svetová literatúra?* (What Is World Literature?). Bratislava: Obzor, 1992.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Communautés interlittéraires spécifiques. Notions et principes*. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1993.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Sources and Systematics of Comparative Literature*. Trans. Peter Tkáč. Bratislava: U Komenského, 1974.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Theory of Interliterary Process*. Trans. Jessie Kocmanová and Zdenek Pistek. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1989.
- Đurišin, Dionýz. *Vergleichende Literaturforschung. Versuch eines methodisch-theoretischen Grundrisses*. Berlin: Akademie, 1976.
- Eminescu, Mihail. *Poems*. Trans. Estelle Sylvia Pankhurst and Ion Olimpiu Stefanovici. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Company, 1930.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. *Papers in Culture Research*. Tel-Aviv: Unit of Culture Research, 2010.

Andrei Terian, "National Literature, World Literatures, and Universality in Romanian Cultural Criticism 1867-1947" page 11 of 11 *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.5 (2013): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss5/11>> Special Issue *World Literatures from the Nineteenth to the Twenty-first Century*. Ed. Marko Juvan

- Figueira, Dorothy M. "Comparative Literature versus World Literature." *The Comparatist* 34 (2010): 29-36.
- Fundoianu, Barbu. *Imagini și cărți din Franța*. 1922. (Images and Books from France). Ed. Vasile Teodorescu. București: Minerva, 1980.
- Ibrăileanu, Garabet. *Opere* (Works). Ed. Rodica Rotaru and Al. Piru. Minerva: București, 1974-1981. 10 Vols.
- Iorga, Nicolae. *O luptă literară* (A Literary Battle). Ed. Valeriu Râpeanu. București: Minerva, 1979. 2 Vols.
- Iorga, Nicolae. *Byzance après Byzance. Continuation de l'Histoire de la vie byzantine*. București: L'Institut d'Etudes Byzantines, 1935.
- Juvan, Marko. *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*. Purdue: Purdue UP, 2008.
- Juvan, Marko. "World Literature(s) and Peripheries." *Literary Studies in Reconstruction: An Introduction to Literature*. By Marko Juvan. Bern: Peter Lang, 2011. 73-86.
- Juvan, Marko. "Worlding Literatures between Dialogue and Hegemony." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 15.5 (2013): <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol15/iss5/10>>.
- Lawall, Sarah, ed. *Reading World Literature: Theory, History, Practice*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1994.
- Lisiak, Agata Anna. *Urban Cultures in (Post)Colonial Central Europe*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2010.
- Lovinescu, Eugen. *Istoria literaturii române contemporane* (History of Contemporary Romanian Literature). București: Ancora, 1926-1929. 6 Vols.
- Lupu, Ioan, and Cornelia Ștefănescu, eds. *Bibliografia relațiilor literaturii române cu literaturile străine în periodice (1859-1918)* (Bibliography of Relationships between Romanian Literature and Foreign Literatures in Periodicals: 1859-1918). București: Academiei R.S.R., 1980-1985. 3 Vols.
- Maioreescu, Titu. *Opere* (Works). By Titu Maioreescu. Ed. Dimitrie Vatamaniuc and Eugen Simion. București: Fundația pentru Știință și Artă, 2005. 2 Vols.
- Martin, Mircea. *G. Călinescu și "complexele" literaturii române* (G. Călinescu and the "Complexes" of Romanian Literature). Pitești: Paralela 45, 2002.
- Moretti, Franco. "Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54-68.
- Moretti, Franco. "More Conjectures." *New Left Review* 20 (2003): 73-81.
- Moretti, Franco. "The Slaughterhouse of Literature." *Modern Language Quarterly* 61.1 (2000): 207-27.
- Moretti, Franco. "World-Systems Analysis, Evolutionary Theory, *Weltliteratur*." *Immanuel Wallerstein and the Problem of the World: System, Scale, Culture*. Ed. David Palumbo-Liu, Bruce Robbins, and Nirvana Tanoukhi. Durham: Duke UP, 2011. 67-77.
- Pizer, John. *The Idea of World Literature: History and Pedagogical Practice*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 2006.
- Rebreanu, Liviu. *The Forest of the Hanged*. Trans. Alice V. Wise. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1930.
- Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1978.
- Sturm-Trigonakis, Elke. *Comparative Cultural Studies and the New Weltliteratur*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2013.
- Terian, Andrei. "Critica de direcție. Note despre istoria și semantica unui concept în literatura română" ("Directional Criticism: Notes on the History and Semantics of a Concept in Romanian Literature"). *Comunicare, context, interdisciplinaritate* (Communication, Context, Interdisciplinarity). Ed. Iulian Boldea. Târgu-Mureș: Petru Maior UP, 2012. 309-18.
- Terian, Andrei. "Is There an East-Central European Postcolonialism? Towards a Unified Theory of (Inter)Literary Dependency." *World Literature Studies* 4.3 (2012): 21-36.
- Thomsen, Mads Rosendahl. *Mapping World Literature: International Canonization and Transnational Literatures*. London: Continuum, 2010.
- Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. *Comparative Literature: Theory, Method, Application*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1998.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "Configurations of Postcoloniality and National Identity: Inbetween Peripherality and Narratives of Change." *The Comparatist* 23 (1999): 89-110.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven. "Multilingual Bibliography of (Text)Books in Comparative Literature, World Literature(s), and Comparative Cultural Studies." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture (Library)*: <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweblibrary/comparativeliteraturebooks>>.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, ed. *Comparative Central European Culture*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2002.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, and Louise O. Vasvári. "About the Contextual Study of Literature and Culture, Globalization, and Digital Humanities." *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures, and Comparative Cultural Studies*. Ed. Steven Tötösy de Zepetnek and Tutun Mukherjee. New Delhi: Cambridge UP India, 2013. 3-35.
- Tötösy de Zepetnek, Steven, and Tutun Mukherjee, eds. *Companion to Comparative Literature, World Literatures, and Comparative Cultural Studies*. New Delhi: Cambridge UP India, 2013.
- Vogüé, Melchior-Eugène de. *Le Roman russe*. Paris: Plon, 1886.
- Wang, Ning. "'Weltliteratur': From a Utopian Imagination to Diversified Forms of World Literatures." *Neohelicon: acta comparationis litterarum universarum* 38.2 (2011): 295-306.
- Wolff, Larry. *Inventing Eastern Europe: The Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.

Author's profile: Andrei Terian teaches Romanian literature at Lucian Blaga University. His interests in research include theories of comparative and world literatures, the history of literary theory, and modern literary criticism. In addition to numerous articles in Romanian and English, his recent book publications include *Critica de export. Teorii, contexte, ideologii* (2013) (Exporting Criticism: Theories, Contexts, Ideologies) and *G. Călinescu. A cincea esență* (2009) (G. Călinescu: The Fifth Essence). E-mail: <andrei.terian@ulbsibiu.ro>